FISHMAN RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

Public-Record Search on Window and Sliding-Door History

Sample Tower, 100 Sample Street, Sample City · Client A

All sources retrieved during a recent review. Raw evidence would be stored in a companion folder in a full engagement.

SAMPLE PORTFOLIO DELIVERABLE. Names, places, amounts, dates, and other identifying details have been changed or generalized. This is not a document from a real client matter. It is not legal advice.

Bottom line

• Window age is not documented. No public source states when the building's windows and sliding doors were installed, or how old they are. Searches of the city's permit data, building-department complaint files, contractor listings, news, building databases, listings, and reviews found no such statement.

• Indirect evidence points to original windows in most units. Sources agree the building was completed in the mid-1960s. The city's digital permit archive (records from the early 1980s forward) shows no permit for a building-wide window, sliding-door, curtain-wall, or facade replacement. A small number of undated tenant reviews describe the windows as old and single-paned. Together this suggests most openings are original construction, but no document confirms it. That is an inference, not a finding.

• Documented replacements are limited to one unit. Only two permitted replacements were found, both in Unit A: one door-to-window change, and a later replacement of a handful of sliding windows. No permit was found for window work in Unit B or Unit C, where the contractor's proposal said mock-ups had been installed.

• Who made earlier "attempted repairs": a reported repair period in a prior year is not tied to any permit, contractor, or scope in public records. The building-department file shows only that the property manager reported work progress and that an inspector later found the then-open violations corrected. The phrase "attempted repairs" comes from a later tenant complaint. The complaint form names a property-manager employee in a work-performed field; that name is omitted here, and the department's public field is truncated.

• A contractor statement that flashing dams "were added to the windows at some point" has no date or permit in any public record reviewed.

Method

The search used the city's open permit and complaint datasets, the building department's public complaint pages, contractor listing sites, news and listing sites, and a review of files already in the research corpus. Every finding below is tied to a source type. Where two official sources disagree, the conflict is stated rather than resolved.

Selected findings (generalized)

#	Finding	Source type
1	Completed mid-1960s; a mid-rise tower of roughly 15 to 20 stories and about 100 units. Original construction, so windows are presumed original unless replaced.	Assessor and listing databases; city permit data for story and unit counts
2	No building-wide window or facade-replacement permit in the digital archive, which begins in the early 1980s.	City open-data building permits
3	Two unit-level permits in Unit A only; no permits located for the stated mock-up units.	City permits and contractor-contact records
4	Repeated water-intrusion complaints and notices on windows and sliding doors in at least two units, over several years.	Building-department complaint pages and open-data notices

#	Finding	Source type
5	A reported repair interval with no matching permit or named contractor in the public file.	Complaint chronology; manager progress note; inspector close-out

Discrepancies and open questions

• Notice status. The open-data system showed one notice as still active, while the department’s complaint page ended with an entry that all violations had been corrected, with no formal “case abated” line. The two sources conflict and were not resolved.

• Truncated text. The public complaint system truncates long narratives, so the full tenant and technician statements cannot be retrieved from that system alone.

• Open questions include: the original make and glazing (construction plans were not in the digital archive; a records request or a local history collection may hold them); what repair work was done in the undocumented interval, and by whom; whether other units received undocumented flashing or window work; the building’s historic-resource status; and whether a later review claiming a court case about window replacement can be matched to a docket (none was found in this pass).

Permit numbers, unit numbers as they appear in the official file, employee names, and exact complaint identifiers are omitted from this sample.