

Cambridge Oct 1st 1871.

City of Cambridge

To S B Withy Dr

Sept 1 to 12 to filling front of my house a hole  
caused by widening st 38 yards at 80 cts per yard 30.40  
Sept 31 to Sept 10 putting fence & lights to protect the lot 10.00  
40.40

Sept 1 to 12 to filling 51 yards in front of Evan Brown  
house, at 80 cts per yard 40.50  
Or by 24 yards filled by the City 19.20  
31.30

|       |       |
|-------|-------|
| 31.30 |       |
| 71.70 | 21.30 |
| 16    |       |
| 61.70 |       |

In Board of Aldermen. June 12, 1872.  
Referred to the Committee on Roads and Bridges,  
on the part of this Board.  
Attest: Justin A. Jacobs. City Clerk.

See

J. S. B. Wiley

June 12. 1872.

City of Cambridge



To the Honorable the Board of Mayor  
and Aldermen of the City of Cambridge,

This petitioner respectfully represents that  
on the       day of November 1871 an order  
was passed instructing the Superintendent  
of Streets to construct a sidewalk in front  
of his estate at the corner of Brattle and  
Story Streets by setting edgestones - that this  
petitioner therefore notified the said  
Superintendent that he would himself  
furnish the stone necessary for that purpose,  
but that nevertheless said Superintendent  
caused stone furnished by the city to be set  
without notice to this petitioner that he was  
ready to proceed with the construction of  
the said sidewalk in front of said estate -  
And this petitioner further represents that  
by inquiry of and among dealers in stone,  
suitable for said purpose, he learned that  
the market price of ~~such~~ stone was seventy  
five cents per running foot, but that he has  
since been assessed the sum of ninety seven  
dollars and seventy-eight cents ( $\$97\frac{75}{100}$ ) for  
said sidewalk on Brattle Street and the sum  
of fifty-seven dollars and thirty-eight cents  
( $\$57\frac{38}{100}$ ) for said sidewalk on Story Street -  
that the actual cost of the edgestones is the  
only item of expense in constructing said

sidewalk for which according to the custom of the city, he ought to be and was liable to be assessed - and that there was  $78\frac{1}{2}$  feet in length of edgestone on Brattle Street and  $86\frac{4}{10}$  feet in length thereof on Story street and that the rate per foot which he is charged for this came in said assessment is about ninety-two cents. per foot.

Wherefore he prays that the said assessment may be abated by an amount equal to the difference <sup>E</sup> between the actual market value of said edgestone being 75 cents per foot as aforesaid and the amount so assessed, being at the rate of 92 cents per foot as aforesaid. -

Samuel B. Widney

In Board of Aldermen, June 12, 1872.  
Referred to the Committee on Roads and Bridges, on the part of this Board, with instructions to hear the parties, and ascertain and report all the facts to this Board.

Attest: Justin A. Jacobs. City Clerk.

Petition  
of Samuel B. Widney  
Siderwalk Assessment.

June 12, 1872.



# City of Cambridge.

In Board of Aldermen, Dec. 11. 1872

Ordered,

on the part of this Board

The Committee on Roads & Bridges to which were referred the Bill of S. B. Withey, and communication from the same gentleman charging that the Supt. of Streets had made an overcharge against his estate on Brattle St. and Story St. for edgestone furnished; having given the petitioner a hearing.

Reports,

That the statements made by said Withey as to action of the Supt. of Streets in the matter, and price charged, are in no wise warranted by the facts as shown by the evidence. The price charged for the edgestone instead of being 92 cts per foot as stated by said Withey, was but 75 cts per foot for the straight stone and \$1.50 per foot for the circular stone which was as usual and right.

And, On his bill for compensation for filling,  
That inasmuch as the City has been compelled to pay \$2650, + for what is deemed

to have been his neglect in not properly  
guarding his premises while making repairs,  
Your Committee consider it inexpedient  
to approve his said bill for any amount,  
and

It is therefore recommended that  
the petitioner be granted leave to with-  
draw, on both his Communication and  
Bill.

For the Committee,  
C. S. Harding

Accepted. ~~Same~~ ~~clear~~ ~~for~~ ~~concurrence~~.

Attest: Justin A. Jacobs. Secy. Ctd.



Brattle & Stuy.  
187

Referred  
in an letter of S. D. Willey  
Dec. 11, 1872.