

135

INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT
CITY HALL
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

135

135

Y E A R L Y R E P O R T

1 9 5 2

135

January 15, 1953

The Honorable City Council of the
City of Providence
City Hall
Providence, Rhode Island

Honorable Sirs:

I respectfully submit for your information and consideration, a report of the work of the Department of Inspector of Buildings for the year 1952.

Attached hereto are two tables setting forth by wards and types of occupancies, the number of buildings and miscellaneous structures, including the estimated costs, for which permits were issued. The table marked "New Work" contains data pertaining to the construction of new buildings and miscellaneous structures. The table marked "Additions and Alterations" contains data pertaining to building operations on existing buildings in order to provide additional space or to make interior changes to satisfy current and anticipated needs.

The estimated costs as set forth herein, taken from the accompanying tables, do not include the costs of heating, plumbing and electrical installations.

From the tables, the estimated cost of construction for the year 1952 is as follows:-

New buildings - 377 Permits.
Estimated cost \$6,806,750.00.

Additions & Alterations - 959 Permits.
Estimated Cost - \$1,999,450.00.

Permits (not included in tables) issued during the year 1952, are as follows:-

Razing of Dilapidated Buildings	- 87 Permits
Sandblasting of Buildings	- 13 Permits
Moving of Buildings	- 4 Permits
Gasoline Stations (Storage & sale of Petroleum)	17 Permits
Erection of Billboards	- 70 Permits
Erection of Wall Signs	- 76 Permits
Erection of Signs over Sidewalks	- 188 Permits
Erection of Fire Escapes	- 117 Permits
Construction of Vaults	- 1 Permit
Use of Street & Sidewalks	- 178 Permits

Erection of Fences	- 9 Permits
Storage of Dangerous Chemicals	- 22 Permits
Storage of Petroleum Products in Bulk	- 4 Permits

Note:

- 1) The above installations, not included in the tables, do not include estimated costs (not required by Ordinances).

233 Family Units have been added during the year 1952 as a result of building activities through private channels as follows:-

(a) New Buildings	-	207 Family Units
(b) Reconversions	-	26 Family Units

Total Inspections for the year 1952 - 13,384

Total Fees collected during year 1952 - \$16,321.64

BUILDING ACTIVITIES DURING THE YEAR 1952

Private building operations, during the year 1952, in the City of Providence with a total declared estimated cost of \$8,806,200 was only \$2,350 or .2% short of the year 1951 construction totals. It must be noted that these figures are neither total nor accurate due to a number of reasons, some of which have already been mentioned and others are: declared estimated costs of construction, as set forth on applications for permits to build, are often times lower than actual costs due to a popular reluctance to provide information that will lead to increases in property valuations and higher tax payments; lack of a professional estimator and legal obstacles greatly reduces the possibility of figuring fair estimated costs where the construction plans are processed in the office; estimated costs are not required when filing applications for permits to erect many types of miscellaneous structures. Approximately 50% of the total estimated cost of construction during the year 1952 was due to the permits issued to erect new buildings, expanding the Narragansett Electric Co. plant, the new Tockwotten Street Elementary School,

the Fireman's Mutual Co. building and the Temple Emanuel. Other new buildings accounted for 27% of the total estimated cost of construction; thus leaving 23% of the total for the estimated cost of construction on additions and alterations to existing buildings. Percentage-wise, the estimated cost of additions and alterations, to existing buildings, is lower than it has been for many years past. This downward trend still continues dipping below levels that cannot be solely attributed to seasonal influences. Causes for this condition may be found in: Government controls - now in process of relaxation - high costs of labor and materials; lack of land area of sufficient size for large scale home building projects; resistance to the building of modern homes on plots of land lacking sufficient frontage and area to satisfy modern architectural requirements; excessive land costs in built-up sections for off-street parking areas to satisfy modern commercial and industrial building requirements; a mounting opposition to the new Zoning Ordinance and Map which is having a depressive effect on new construction; undesirable environmental conditions due to blight and obsolescence; topography and other deteriorative factors that are common to all old cities.

The present administration has come to grips with some of these adverse conditions and is now taking positive steps that will give some measure of relief, within its financial means, through its city planning and redevelopment agencies which will provide short range as well as long range building and land reprocessing programs. It is also hoped that the new Zoning Ordinance and accompanying Map will be revised, where necessary, without further delay so that greater benefits may be derived by the community through its application. However it is impossible to eradicate all the deteriorative and undesirable conditions that are rooted so deeply in the past. Rapid physical changes, in an old city, are almost as remote and fanciful an expectancy as the quest for the fountain of youth when old age has taken possession of the body. Long range benefits, based upon an intelligent understanding of sound economics, social progress and scientific developments, can be realized and are healthier for the community than short-sighted palliatives that are short-lived.

The present condition of private building activities is causing some concern and anxiety, with the prospect rather dim, for 1953. Yet, there is no great cause for alarm when one takes into

consideration the magnitude of public construction planned or in process of planning by the city, state and federal government for our community. It is not unreasonable to assume, that the downward trend in private building activities will be partially stemmed by public construction.

Nationally, construction activity during the year 1953, according to reliable forecasts, shall remain strong with a possibility of surpassing the 1952 total new construction figures of approximately \$32 billions. The hard core of home construction is passed and a decline is expected with a slight drop to 900,000 new homes from the 1,000,000 starts annually for the last three years.

This decline in home building will be offset by a rise in public construction. Government curbs and controls will be greatly eased during the year 1953 and scarce materials will be available to satisfy demands. Prices will generally remain stable during the year according to the best analysts.

INSPECTIONAL ACTIVITIES PERTAINING TO
SAFETY REQUIREMENTS IN BUILDINGS

The annual inspections of all licensed occupancies (hotels, assembly halls of all types and sizes, cafes, barrooms, restaurants, etc.) were carried on in the usual manner by checking:

- (a) The general structural conditions of the building;
- (b) The type, construction; protection and accessibility of exits, the swing of exit doors, exit signs and lights;
- (c) The type, condition and location of heating and cooking equipment including their safety devices and controls;
- (d) The type, condition and location of fire protective equipment; such as, automatic sprinkler systems (wet and dry), fire extinguishers; fire hose and standpipe installations, fire alarm systems, etc.

This program of annual inspections, started some years ago and now considered routine, provides that type of inspectional service that is entirely devoted to the elimination or correction of hazardous conditions that come within the purview of the rules. All transfers of licenses require inspection before approval is given and applications are signed by this office. This type of service is the

key to the maintainance of our standards of safety. Laxity or relaxation will not be permitted and, when found, proper steps are taken for prompt compliance. In the last two or three years, with few exceptions, it has not been necessary to recommend suspension or revocation of licenses for public occupancies because of the existance of fire hazards and/or structural hazards. The exceptions mentioned were cleared without resort to suspension or revocation; a stern written warning was sufficient to effect compliance.

Proper maintainance of fire safety standards cannot be attained through our efforts alone, but with the combined efforts of the members of the Fire Prevention Bureau and the owners and operators of public assembly occupancies, that goal can be realized and attained. Periodic inspections, over the years, have produced beneficial results due to the active cooperation of the Fire Prevention Bureau and due, in part, to a progressively better cooperation rendered by the owners and operators of these licensed public occupancies. As this cooperation becomes progressively better, so will the incident of fire and the spread of fire be reduced. Similarly, the extent of property damage, the possibility of injury and fatality, will be greatly reduced. Public awareness and cooperation will be necessary in order to produce the best results in the field of fire prevention and fire protection.

Every year there are many buildings added to the list of buildings that have been made safer because of complaints reported to this office, citing hazards or violations existing in buildings other than licensed occupancies. After inspections are made, appropriate action is taken for the correction or elimination of the hazardous conditions. Many years have been devoted to this type of inspectional service and many buildings have been made safer by such remedies as: the installation of approved automatic sprinkler systems, fire resistive enclosures around stairways, vertical shafts and openings of all types, fire division walls and other barriers horizontally and vertically to stop the spread of fire, fire resistive partitions, opening protectives on windows where exposure distances to other buildings and lot lines are not sufficient, opening protectives on horizontal exits to provide access to refuge areas, exterior fire escapes, fire extinguishers, fire alarm systems, emergency lighting, adequate fire dampers (where necessary) on

ventilating and air-conditioning systems, etc.

Real and positive benefits have been attained through this effort, even though the results are not readily noticeable. This program is pushed vigorously because compliance is effected with reluctance and opposition, often requiring stern warnings and court action. The processing of cases, involving sub-standard buildings, is a very slow and complex task requiring patience, tenacity, good judgment and technical ability. Obstacles in the path of greater progress are many and varied. Experience, during the past seven years, has furnished us with ample proof of the magnitude of the task and the barriers that have been encountered, the most formidable of which are: personnel deficiencies qualitatively and quantitatively; adequate remedies are either difficult to attain or are unattainable due to characteristics of construction and/or occupancy; building code requirements applicable to new buildings, when applied to existing buildings, usually cause undue hardship both physically and financially; the use of litigation, with its attendant delays and uncertainties, as an instrument of compliance.

The adoption of the Proposed Building Code will provide the remedy for some of the obstacles, and the assignment of a member of the Law Department exclusively to the prosecution of cases pertaining to violations of the Building Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Health Ordinances, and the Fire Prevention Ordinance, will provide the means for speedier action. With the Proposed Building Code in effect, coordination and cooperation of a number of agencies will be possible because it provides for a central control where action can be started, directed and guided to successful completion; thus making it possible to take on a much greater work load with more than just a hope that this safety program, on existing buildings, can be expanded to cover the entire city. The regrouping of related municipal agencies and the centralization of authority will only provide the driver and vehicle, but the efficiency and effectiveness of both is directly based upon the quality of performance rendered. Obviously, the quality of performance is based upon the adequacy of the Proposed Building Code and the number and competency of the persons selected to administer it. If the adequacy of the Proposed Building Code can be assumed, then it only becomes necessary to raise personnel standards to attain higher standards of performance, and

this can be done without placing additional financial burdens on the city budget when the proposed fee system, as now set forth in the Proposed Building Code, becomes effective.

It is my opinion that the Proposed Building Code holds the key to the elimination of most of the barriers that lie in the path of better performance.

THE ZONING ORDINANCE

About sixteen months ago, September 21, 1951, the City Council approved the Zoning Ordinance and Map. During this period, approximately 1800 applications, accompanied by plans for permits to build, have been processed and permits to build have been issued - these building permits necessarily complying with zoning requirements. While this office kept no record of permit denials and inquiries pertaining to zoning during the entire period of time herein mentioned, it is safe to state, because of a fairly reliable daily count made by the office staff at my request, that more than 400 applicants were denied permits to build and more than 1000 persons were interviewed on complaints and questions pertaining directly to zoning matters and the interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance. Oftentimes decisions, rendered by me, were questioned further by seeking private legal advice or by consultation with the City Solicitor or members of his staff. Moreover, the occasional conference with the City Solicitor and/or a member of his staff soon became a routine daily occurrence.

This experience, plus more than 20 years of active contact with zoning matters as your enforcing officer, should provide sufficient background for me to set forth some observations, pertaining to the new Zoning Ordinance and Map, focusing on public reaction to this new legal instrument and the urgency of taking proper steps: to correct, by revision, those provisions that are generally considered deficient; to repeal those provisions that are considered arbitrary and serve no useful public purpose; to correct, by revision, the new Zoning Map where changes from commercial and industrial uses to residential uses have caused undue hardship and are not in keeping with existing environmental and topographical conditions.

Since the last yearly report was written, the number of complaints

and objections has been slowly but steadily increasing. Restrictions, of any type, on the use of land and buildings have always caused a certain amount of opposition and resistance; and anyone familiar with the history of zoning certainly would anticipate a stronger than normal adverse reaction when the status quo was disturbed by the advent of a new Zoning Ordinance and Land Use Map. Chapter 544, the new Zoning Ordinance was not in effect too long when, with the passing of time, the complaints were rising in number, pitch and tone with an occasional overtone of threat, accusation and vituperation.

It can be said that some errors and ambiguities have crept in, which can and should be eliminated, but the problem goes deeper than that. No one can ever hope that any person or group of persons will come up with a perfect code, but neither is it wise to be insensitive to conditions that are beginning to affect our economy by the creation of undue hardship. No obstacle should be permitted to stand in the path of the normal and healthy growth of a city.

It is extremely difficult to apply new, strong remedies to a city that has developed, without plan, for a period of 267 years to 1923, when the old Zoning Ordinance became effective. Since that time the growth and development of our city was guided, shaped and protected by the old Zoning Ordinance. Greater benefits could have been realized during this period if the people fully understood and appreciated the value of the protection provided for them under its terms. Due to a number of factors, public acceptance and cooperation moved slowly during this period. The new Zoning Ordinance followed with a new concept applying much stronger remedies. Maybe the change from the (Zoning Ordinance) to the new is too great; time alone can furnish the true proof of such reasoning.

However, the grumbling still goes on whenever a permit to build is denied, and the frequency of such denials has certainly provided a strong reason for positive action. Yet, to some persons, all of this talk about opposition seems incredible, exaggerated. Why didn't they voice their objections at the public hearings - no great remonstrance was in evidence at any of the public hearings? The reasons may be found if one is willing to consider the following statements:

- (a) The average unqualified taxpayer has never shown any great interest in a Zoning Ordinance, unless exposed

to its terms because of some building problem.

- (b) The average unqualified taxpayer will not read a Zoning Ordinance from cover to cover; his interest and competency will not permit any such ordeal.
- (c) The taxpayer, who is engaged in the real estate or building business, may have enough interest in the Zoning Ordinance to read it and possibly study its provisions; but he is going to discuss the provisions that he does not understand with his colleagues rather than appear at a public hearing and run the risk of not making an intelligent presentation of his objections. He will depend upon his organization for representation.
- (d) Persons engaged in the professions of architecture, architectural or structural engineering, or the law will read the Zoning Ordinance because of the usefulness of such knowledge in the practice of the above listed professions. A very small percentage of this group will devote sufficient time to become intimately acquainted with every provision of the Zoning Ordinance.

It is obvious from a study of groups (a), (b), (c) and (d) that the preponderance of numbers - people who own, rent, lease or manage real estate - belong to groups (a) and (b). Mass remonstrances are not likely to come from groups (a) and (b) for reasons previously mentioned, thus leaving the burden of public remonstrance to groups (c) and (d) with group (d) supplying most of the talent. At the public hearings, the remonstrance was less than impressive and according to reports and subsequent experience, was even less effective. Public reaction, pertaining to a Zoning or Building Ordinance, cannot be gauged through the medium of one, two or three public hearings because of the type, variety and complexity of the subjects covered by these ordinances.

However, the most persistent objections pertained to: land use map changes including zone boundaries, revision of certain area regulations, increase of percentage of lot occupancy, revision and clarification of non-conforming uses, reduction in number of commercial zones adjacent to residential zones, revision of off-street parking requirements pertaining to certain minimum areas in commercial and industrial occupancies, repeal of distance requirements for certain industrial uses located on lots adjacent to residential

zones, revision of site plan requirements for alterations on existing buildings.

The comments set forth hereunder do not cover the objections mentioned and are only intended to stimulate thought and focus attention on certain provisions that should be given further study for purposes of clarifications, deletion or revision.

Land Use Map. It is advisable to reconsider the Zoning Map of the entire city. Experience gained, through the filing of applications for permits to build on certain plots of land, has pointed-up errors of zoning that demand attention due to existing conditions: topographical, high cost of construction due to type of soil, type and use of buildings, scarcity of unimproved land area and other environmental conditions.

Sec. 21, Definitions - After A-3, add the definition of the word "Billboard" so that ground signs, wall signs and roof signs advertising products etc., that are not made, sold, used or served on the premises, known as billboards, can or will not become confused with the word "Sign" as set forth in Section 51 A-5 (a) (b) (c).

Sec. 23, Continuance of Nonconforming Uses or Buildings - The whole subject of nonconforming uses should be reconsidered thoroughly since decisions based upon established legal precedent have been thrown in jeopardy by a recent court decision which will, if not reversed by a higher court, affect the rights and privileges of every owner of nonconforming uses where cessation of use is an important factor. In the same decision, abandonment of use was mentioned. To my knowledge, cessation and abandonment of use were not given any serious consideration, if at all, by the City Council, before and during the time the Zoning Ordinance was under consideration. It is my belief that proper contemplation of such factors would have resulted in regulations specifying in clear language the definition and time limits

attendant to cessation and abandonment of uses.

Sec. 24, As Amended C-2 Parking - Parking Space Buildings Other Than Dwellings. The last paragraph relating to parking space, as required, shall be on the same lot with the main building or another lot located not more than 600 feet away. This provision is practically unenforceable, particularly the part that relates to parking spaces 600 feet away. Periodic inspections of all occupancies would be necessary because of lease and/or sale of land etc.

Sec. 26, General Area Requirements - A-2 (b).

This sub-section should be deleted because of its ambiguity, it is meaningless. The amendment to A-2 approved September 4, 1952 by the City Council should be further revised so as to clarify the meaning of the language applying to the ownership of adjoining recorded lots less than the minimum area when the total width exceeds 120 feet. Does this apply to a parcel of land with some lots built upon, or does it apply solely to open unimproved adjoining lots?

Sec. 27, Special Exceptions - 6 - Educational Institutions. This section should be revised so that the language cannot be misinterpreted. The last three lines only apply to new buildings thus making it possible for the owners and tenants of these institutions to acquire, for such use, existing buildings that do not comply with the 30 foot requirement from R Zones, thereby defeating the purpose of this requirement.

Sec. 31, Establishment of Zones - This section should be revised reducing the number of business zones because of the difficulties created in trying to enforce such regulations, especially when questions of damage arising from classified permitted uses have to be resolved and distinctions drawn, such as a bakery under C-1 and a bank under

C-2, etc. In my opinion, a bank, should be placed in a higher classification, C-1 and a bakery in C-2. The understanding of zoning rules and regulations has not progressed to such extent that the public or a layman can justify or rationalize fine differences of use. Experience has shown that this type of education moves at a snail's pace.

Sec. 32, Zone Boundaries - The second paragraph should be revised. Experience has shown that the 30 foot extension of a lower use into the more restricted portion of the lot divided by zone boundaries, is, more often than not, of no effect, due to rear yard requirements in commercial and industrial zones.

Sec. 41, R-1, One Family Zone A-5 Public Parking Areas. This section should be reconsidered in view of the strong opposition raised to this type of encroachment. Also a provision should be added pertaining to the area requirements for the erection of a private garage including the minimum number of vehicles permitted within such building. This should be done so that a person would not have to refer to the definition of the words "private garage".

Sec. 41, C-3 Side Yards. The 30% provision should be reconsidered based upon the width of the lot and some reduction should be allowed to corner lots where two sides are bounded by streets. Modern design trends demand flexibility.

Sec. 41, C-4 Rear Yards. The 25% minimum requirement should be reduced since it does not serve any useful purpose and may be classified as an arbitrary requirement. Most lots are already improved and new homes are built with attached garages.

Sec. 41, C-5 Lot Coverage. The 30% requirement can be increased without affecting yard requirements in most cases. Some cases have been brought to my attention where this requirement has caused hardship since all other requirements were shown to comply.

Sec. 51, C-1 Limited Commercial Zone C-1 Front Yard - The third sentence should be reconsidered because of the existing physical development of these zones, where buildings erected on single lots, located between lots with existing buildings that are built on the street line, must provide for a setback for no obvious good reason.

Sec. 54, C-4 Heavy Commercial Zone - 9, 10, and 11. These paragraphs should be reconsidered since the distance requirements and the zone boundaries, in most cases, actually rule out the possibility of compliance due to the depth of the Heavy Commercial Zones, in most cases only 100 feet in depth.

Sec. 73, Area - J-5 Open Porch. This regulation should be further revised so that a roofed porch of generous dimension can be built in the rear yard.

Sec. 81, Building Permit - A Site Plan. This regulation should be revised so that alterations on existing buildings, where the exterior surfaces of these buildings are not enlarged in any manner, should not require a site plan showing the location of buildings on other lots within 50 feet of the boundaries of the lot for which a permit is requested.

The foregoing general comments relating to specific sections and sub-sections of the Zoning Ordinance have been offered with the hope that the members of the City Council will take whatever steps are deemed advisable to correct defects brought to light by the application

and administration of the Zoning Ordinance. It may also be advisable to invite all the groups, in interest, again in order to get the benefit of their comments based upon the experiences gained from the application of zoning regulations to specific building problems. The result of a comprehensive review will be worth the effort.

THE PROPOSED BUILDING CODE

The Proposed Building Code was presented to the City Council on February 15, 1951 and, according to legislative procedure, was referred to the Ordinance Committee for study and recommendation. After four meetings, the members of the Ordinance Committee, at a meeting held on March 12, 1951, adopted a new method of procedure by authorizing the members of the Providence Building Code Revision Committee to conduct a series of meetings and hearings so that all of the outside groups, in interest, would have ample opportunity to present in writing, their comments, criticisms and/or recommendations with the further privilege of discussing such comments, etc. Last year's report contains a full list of persons and groups.

A schedule of meetings was arranged and the plan was put into action, thus giving every group an opportunity to be heard through its selected representatives. Every request for a hearing was honored and a hearing was arranged and held according to schedule with each group participating separately; thus avoiding confusion and interference.

The success of this method soon became evident and no time or effort was spared by the members of the Providence Building Code Revision Committee to keep the schedule of meetings and hearings moving at the rate of at least one meeting per week from April 1951 to December 18, 1952, when the committee terminated its duties - completing an intense schedule of 46 meetings and 43 hearings, a total of 89 conferences.

In order to keep pace with the intense schedule of meetings, the members of the Providence Building Code Revision Committee had to set aside many business appointments and their personal affairs. The same was true, in a lesser degree of the representatives of the participating groups, in interest. All those who participated, applied themselves vigorously and willingly to the task of airing their views and resolving their differences; thus making it possible

to give mutual sanction to a number of revisions that are now being compiled and set forth in a report. This report, the result of many months of tedious work, will be submitted to the Ordinance Committee of the City Council with the knowledge that the Proposed Building Code, as further revised, has been studied and deliberated by the greatest array of talent found within the borders of our state and to a considerable degree beyond the borders of our state.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander C. Coder
Inspector of Buildings

IN CITY COUNCIL
FEB 5 - 1953

RECORDED:

WHEN RECEIVED IT IS ORDERED THAT
THE SAME BE RECORDED.

R. Everett Whelan
CLERK

WARDS													NO.	EST. COST
I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII		
Dwellings 1 Family	No. 12	183,000	76,000	174,700	836,150	126,300	113,500	33,300	94,500			6,500	183	1,643,950
Dwellings 2 Families	No. 1	20,000	8,000	19,800	47,000	41,300		12,000					12	148,100
Multi Families	No. 1													
Churches, Homes, Etc.	No. 1			60,000									1	60,000
Amusement & Recreation	No. 1													
Office buildings and Banks	No. 1	19,000	15,000	1,200	1,200						1,000		6	42,400
Public & Municipal	No. 4													
Schools	No. 4	2,019,000	300,000										5	2,319,000
Gasoline Stations	No. 5												4	40,500
Garages	No. 5	5,800	9,600	6,600	44,100	18,300	13,200	3,600	12,500	10,500	3,200	25,300	131	166,350
Stores	No. 2		40,000	23,000	7,200	40,000	45,000						11	156,600
Storehouses	No. 2	1,900			250	5,000		1	50,000	7,700			7	64,850
Manufactories and Shops	No. 1					3,500	150,000	23,000	1,490,550	497,950			17	2,165,000
Oil Burners	No. 1													
Miscellaneous	No. 12													
Total Number by Wards	12	21	20	35	149	40	25	13	25	18	7	4	8	
Estimated Cost by Wards	2,032,150	527,800	148,600	285,300	935,900	234,400	126,700	252,400	192,000	1,518,750	501,150	26,300	25,300	

Total Cost 6,806,750

Total Permits 377

MAJORS															
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	No.	EST. COST
Dwellings 1 Family	No. 21 Est. Cost 12,950	No. 29 30,300	No. 15 15,150	No. 13 10,600	No. 35 34,350	No. 21 22,700	No. 15 10,450	No. 13 8,500	No. 23 15,250	No. 16 6,900	No. 5 3,200	No. 2 600	No. 8 5,700	216	176,650
Dwellings 2 Families	No. 13 Est. Cost 6,500	No. 11 6,500	No. 10 10,300	No. 24 24,600	No. 20 9,250	No. 26 29,100	No. 19 16,300	No. 14 10,800	No. 30 20,600	No. 20 10,950	No. 13 6,100	No. 19 17,150	No. 18 8,700	237	176,550
Multi Families	No. 20 Est. Cost 15,050	No. 6 11,450	No. 14 13,000	No. 17 14,450	No. 8 7,300	No. 11 12,700	No. 15 12,000	No. 19 12,300	No. 11 11,400	No. 11 6,900	No. 20 9,100	No. 15 9,600	No. 18 12,000	185	147,250
Churches, Homes, Etc.	No. 1 Est. Cost 16,000		No. 2 7,250	No. 3 19,800			No. 2 14,000	No. 2 750	No. 2 70,000	No. 1 2,700		No. 1 31,000	No. 1 4,500	15	166,000
Amusement & recreation	No. 2 Est. Cost 22,000												No. 150	3	22,150
Office buildings and banks	No. 1 Est. Cost 1,200				No. 1 2,500		No. 2 20,250	No. 2 5,000	No. 2 1,100	No. 2 6,800	No. 2 4,300	No. 7 39,750	No. 2 12,900	21	93,800
Public & Municipal	No. 3 Est. Cost	No. 2							No. 1 4,500			No. 7 13,450		8	17,950
Schools	No. 3 Est. Cost 98,500	No. 2 30,000							No. 3 9,000	No. 2 5,600		No. 6 2,000	No. 4 11,550	7	139,500
Gasoline stations	Est. Cost		No. 3 9,800	No. 4 5,650		No. 1 10,500	No. 1 8,000	No. 2 2,300	No. 3 8,450	No. 2 5,600		No. 7 7,900	No. 4 11,550	27	69,150
Garages	No. 1 Est. Cost 150	No. 3 1,300	No. 6 6,650	No. 3 2,500	No. 4 650	No. 1 150	No. 3 1,300	No. 1 800	No. 3 3,300	No. 1 4,400	No. 3 500	No. 59 128,650	No. 15 49,000	33	24,800
Stores	No. 8 Est. Cost 29,250	No. 1 350	No. 3 4,200	No. 5 7,950	No. 1 850	No. 2 1,350	No. 12 32,750	No. 4 2,450	No. 1 400	No. 5 29,450	No. 3 21,900	No. 9 128,650	No. 5 49,000	119	308,750
Storehouses	No. 1 Est. Cost 3,800		No. 2 5,000	No. 2 350				No. 1 350	No. 1 400	No. 6 43,100	No. 4 87,000	No. 18 15,000	No. 4 24,500	31	179,300
Manufactories and Shops	No. 4 Est. Cost 9,700				No. 1 1,000	No. 3 9,300	No. 2 17,000	No. 3 127,500	No. 4 30,800	No. 6 12,850	No. 8 103,650	No. 18 115,050	No. 4 49,000	53	475,850
Oil Burners	Est. Cost														
Miscellaneous	No. 1 Est. Cost 100			No. 1 250										2	
Total Number by Majors	76	52	55	72	70	65	71	61	81	72	58	144	82	4	1,750
Estimated Cost by Majors	215,200	79,900	68,750	86,150	55,900	85,800	132,050	170,550	170,700	134,050	235,750	381,550	183,100		

Total Cost 1,999,450
Total Permits 959