

adequate light and air, row houses should not be more than two rooms deep. The usual plan is one large room across the front and one or two smaller rooms at the back. The proper width for such a house is 18 or 20 ft. The end houses of rows may be put on lots 27 to 30 ft. wide, so that two such end houses of adjacent groups require three of the lots designed for interior houses.

It is difficult to make a lotting scheme which will serve for both row houses and for semi-detached and detached houses. In cases where row houses are anticipated, lotting should accompany the plan for grouping the dwellings instead of preceding it.

#### Expense is in Frontage

While it is generally recognized that 50 ft. is sufficient distance for light and air between the fronts of small houses, and while this same distance is also a sufficient minimum between backs, in practise such shallow lots as these dimensions produce are seldom found necessary owing to the fact that added lot depth does not correspondingly increase the cost of most utilities. It is frontage that is expensive, and rear land must be considered to remain close to the acreage cost of raw land. This is a particularly important factor where topographical conditions or irregular boundaries would involve considerable extra length of streets to produce but few more lots of standard depth, the alternative of fewer and deeper lots with much less street construction being much cheaper and involving only a slight loss in gross selling value.

On all except the main thoroughfares, the needs of traffic are not sufficient to affect the distance between the fronts of houses. In detached house neighborhoods, experience indicates that 20-ft. front yards are not excessive. For semi-detached houses, 15 ft. is found suitable. For row houses, 10 to 15 ft. may usually be provided. A variation in set back not exceeding 5 ft. usually adds to the attractiveness of the street. Unnecessary depth runs up the cost of service lines from the utilities that are placed in the street. If the street line were placed at the building line, as in Washington, D.C., the utility lines might be run close to the houses, thereby saving considerable expenditure necessary under any of the present methods.

Houses of moderate price normally range from 18 to 32 ft. in depth, the vast majority being from 20 to 30 ft. deep, though certain designs for narrow semi-detached houses may require 34 to 35 ft. In the depth of rear yards even more variation occurs, both because their use varies and because it frequently proves to add so little to the cost to make them ample. For detached houses, an ample garden space for a person working elsewhere during the day is 40 by 50 ft. If not so used, this is still not too large for children's play.

On streets of ordinary width, lots for detached houses should normally be planned 90 to 110 ft. deep; for semi-detached houses, 80 to 100 ft.; and for row houses, 70 to 90 ft., including to the centre of alleys where introduced.

Where extreme land values do not preclude, a scheme of lots based on a standard minimum of 40 to 44 ft. by 90 to 100 ft. is proper. In extreme cases, where row houses are certain to come, lots as small as 16 to 18 ft. by 70 ft. may be necessary, but intermediate widths so common in most of our cities are not easily adapted to modern housing standards.

#### Corners are Special Problems

The best size for corner lots in cases where practically all the houses are to face one set of roughly parallel streets may be fixed as ranging from the same width to 5 ft. wider than corresponding interior lots, and approximately the same depth.

With houses fronting on all streets, to secure the maximum salable frontage and the least interruption to the architectural motive along each street and around the corner, the corner lot is best made approximately square. It should be equal in area to the corresponding interior lots. A somewhat large square corner lot may be cut diagonally in two, and a pair of semi-detached houses set across it, though this expedient is not always pleasant. It is not apt to be a good

plan to attempt to crowd houses at a street intersection and still give sufficient square feet of rear yard space by violent skewing or irregularity in lot boundaries. Acute interior lot corners should be particularly avoided. Lot lines should usually be run back at least 40 ft. to a point not less than 5 ft. behind the house, approximately at right angles to the street.

Block widths are normally twice lot depths, though many irregular blocks are bound to be platted, especially in layouts on rough or peculiarly shaped land, to economize in construction cost and in land used for streets.

Block lengths are controlled by the needs of traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, and by factors of safety. Experience shows that in residential areas, blocks 600 to 700 ft. long cause little dissatisfaction. Shorter blocks are wasteful of land in cross streets. Blocks longer than 800 ft. are found to cause undue detours in going from one side to the other. This is more noticeable in the case of foot traffic than the modern automobile. Inasmuch as adequate footways require but one-sixth the space of cross streets, and even less proportionate construction cost, their use midway across blocks of lengths up to 1,200 ft. is permissible, particularly in districts with steep slopes, making connecting streets expensive. In areas designed with deep courts and blind streets only partially cutting up the blocks, if each such court and street has a path leading from it across the block, most of its disadvantages will disappear, though it will still be less easily policed or protected in case of fire than regular blocks.

While variations to the ordinary block and lot system which do not easily conform to rule have hitherto seldom been laid out, the increased attractiveness attending their use in a reasonable number of instances demands that the opportunity be not closed by rigid standards. As they are apt to be integral parts of the group designs for the actual houses, their layout cannot be determined until the building program is adopted. Where interesting variations are not anticipated, the minimum standard of blocks, 180 to 200 ft. by 600 to 800 ft., with lots 40 to 44 ft. wide, is more apt than any other to be adapted to the future needs of a neighborhood.

#### THE NEW MUNICIPAL STANDARD

VERY illuminating is the story of two Ohio cities told by the State Department of Health. These cities are Wellsville and Ironton, with the unenviable distinction of having as many cases of typhoid fever in five months as two score of larger cities of the state had in the same period. Speaking exactly, these cities had 51 cases, while 80 remaining cities had 180 cases during the same period. Reduced to averages, while Ironton and Wellsville had an average of 25 cases each in five months, other cities had an average of three each. Ironton is now taking steps to remedy its defective water supply and citizens of Wellsville are waking up to past dereliction. Consumption of untreated Ohio river water is not consistent with municipal health. When both cities have completed their works they will soon lose the sorry reputation which they have gained in this vital health respect. Looking at the matter in its broader phases there is an interesting field for study opened here. Let comparisons be made among remaining cities of the state. The success of local municipal government may be told with greater accuracy in death and morbidity statistics than in any other form. If the state makes these comparisons, local communities may wince under the sting of the lashing that comes to them. But there should be no complaint in the revelations: rather obligation for demonstration of the manner in which the unfavorable showing can be converted into a favorable one.—Cincinnati Enquirer.

The Town Planning Conference for Southwestern Ontario will be held at the Royal Connaught Hotel, Hamilton, Thursday, November 27th, and Friday, November 28th. This change in time was necessary due to the Victory Loan.