File No. 488.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, SUB-DEPARTMENT OF CITY ENGINEER.

Baltimore, December 3, 1903.

Hon. W. Cabell Bruce,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

749

The attached letter from Mr. Charles A. Hook, Jr., is respectfully referred. I fully agree with Mr. Hook regarding vitrified brick
crossings. In this particular instance, the contract for the work has
already been let, and the flag crossings have already been provided for,
and I do not know whether any change may now be made. The question I
would like you to decide however, is, whether or not, in the face of
Section 38, of Article 48 of the Code of 1893, I could legally lay a
vitrified brick crossing.

A vitrified brick crossing costs less money and on streets where the traffic is light, is in every way more desirable than a flag crossing. Where a smooth pavement is used, such as asphalt block, sheet asphalt, vitrified brick, wooden block or bituminous macadam, the construction of a flag crossing, as set forth in the section above referred to, would not only be a waste of money, but a distinct nuisance; yet, upon a strict interpretation, it appears to me that this section of the Code would compel me to use such flag crossings under all circumstances.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) B. T. Fendell,

City Engineer.

7410 No. 488.

Baltimore, December 2d, 1903.

Mr. B. T. Fendell,

City Engineer.

My deer Str:-

With respect to crossings to be laid on the Walbrook work I would much prefer to lay vitrified brick crossings instead of flagging. You have laid quite a number of these crossings and they seem to be more adapted to macadam than flagging.

If you will allow us to lay brick we will use the best block

750