

L. & M.  
2,000-4-1-97.

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2003/n

DATED 15-9-97

INDEXED. *CR*

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Godavari Bridge

Comd. to the mnl. Council of Rajahmundry G.O. P.O.D. stating that the diff. proposals for an approach line to the — through the town of Rajahmundry have been carefully considered & that the Govt. finally approves of a lineament No. 2. for the reasons set forth by the Engr. in Chief.

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

RAILWAY.

# Government {1897} of Madras. PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. 30 AUG. 1897

Regd.

1897.

Enclosures *one plan*

Spare copies *6*

G.O., No. 473 R., 17th July 1897.

JULY.

*This order No 2003 N. mis. d/15.9.97  
Communicated to the  
Munt Council Rajahmundry*

*18  
7/9/97*

*M. S. S. S.*

*To  
The Chairman M. C. Rajahmundry  
thru the collr of Godavari  
one plan*

*O. M. S. 18/9/97*

## Godavari Bridge

Stating that the different proposals for an approach line to the — through the town of Rajahmundry have been carefully considered and that the Government finally approves of alignment No. 2 for the reasons set forth by the Engineer-in-Chief.

*2/9 2/9/97*

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

## Railway.

Read again the following paper :—

G.O., No. 138 R., dated 4th March 1897.

Read the following papers :—

Telegram from KHAJA MAHAMED AMIN KHAN, KAJEE, Rajahmundry, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 5th December 1896.

People not approved railway through Rajahmundry proposed by Mr. Walton. It is detrimental to comfort and safety, sweeps away several houses, passes through two Muhammadan cemeteries. Pray don't sanction. Submitting memorial.

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated 1st January 1897, Ref. No. 1552 M.

I have the honour to state that the Engineer-in-Chief of the Gódvári bridge proposes to run the railway line in continuation of the bridge to be constructed on the Gódvári, either in the line marked 1 or 2 as per plan enclosed. These two lines pass through a large part of the town, and as the level of that portion is such that a deep cutting will have to be made, it will be very inconvenient to the public, and it is highly undesirable that the town should be cut in the way proposed. The Council therefore considers, as the least objectionable course, that the line originally surveyed from the Sha Saheb's metta No. 4 should be adopted, failing which line No. 3, as per plan, is the next best, as in this case the line would not pass through a large part of the town or necessitate removal of many houses. Lines Nos. 1 and 2 pass through more houses than line 3, and the houses that lie in Nos. 1 and 2 are more substantial than those in line 3. Besides, line No. 1 passes through two wells, and line No. 2 through one well, and it is not advisable to pass the line through wells as that portion of the town depends for a large part of its water-supply on wells. The line originally surveyed from the Sha Saheb's metta No. 4 is the best of all, and the Council requests that Government will be pleased not to sanction the alignment by No. 1 or No. 2. The Council is also of opinion that, as far as possible, a station be constructed near the river. I therefore request that you will be pleased to move the Government to issue orders to adopt the original line from Sha Saheb's metta No. 4 or line No. 3 as the next best, so that the town may not be cut through by the railway line, thus causing much inconvenience to the public and hardship to several house-owners.

2. A copy of the Council's resolution on the subject is enclosed.

## ENCLOSURE.

EXTRACT from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, dated 26th December 1896.

Read memorandum by the Councillors requesting to address the Railway authorities as well as the Government to fix the bridge line in a different place from that proposed by the Railway Engineer.

Resolution—No. 1200, dated 26th December 1896.

The Council is of opinion that the bridge line, as originally surveyed from Sha Saheb's metta be adopted, as that is the most convenient line, very few houses being in the way, and, if for any reason that line cannot be adopted, the Council prays that line No. 3 as per plan be adopted as the next best, the other lines proposed (Nos. 1 and 2) being very undesirable, as they cut through a large portion of the town and as they pass through substantial houses. The Council at the same time desires that as far as possible a station be erected near the river.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. JALADURGAPRASADARAYODO,  
Chairman.

No. 84, Local and Municipal.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,  
28th January 1897.

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,  
Secretary to Government.

From the Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Engineer-in-Chief, Gódvári Bridge, dated Madras, 10th February 1897, No. 509.

I have the honour to forward copy of a letter from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, together with a plan, in original, which please return.

I understood from our conversation that the matter of the alignment through the town had been settled by you to the satisfaction of the Municipal Council. I shall be glad if you will inform me if this is the case, and which of the different lines you propose to adopt.

From the Engineer-in-Chief, Gódvári Bridge, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Rajahmundry, 15th February 1897, No. 270.

In reply to your letter, No. 509, dated 10th instant, I have the honour to forward a plan showing in full red line the alignment selected through the town of Rajahmundry.

2. The line shown in dotted red is that first proposed but it was abandoned at the instance of the Municipal Council who objected to interfere with two burial-grounds and two wells. At that time the survey was not completed for the new alignment, but I went over the ground with the Sub-Collector and the Municipal Council and approximately located the line and they expressed their approval of it.

3. I afterwards received a letter from the Sub-Collector on the subject, a copy of which I enclose.

4. In setting out this new line every care was taken to avoid wells and also to keep the line in sufficiently deep-cutting that roads and drainage could be passed over the line and thus avoid objectionable level-crossings and blocking of drainage.

5. A line shown as No. 3 in municipal plan has an impossible curve of 1,700 feet radius, and roads and drainage being on lower ground cannot be easily passed over the line and the line itself must join the bridge with a reverse curve if a workable curve is used through the town. There is practically no difference in the number of houses on alignments 2 and 3.

6. With regard to line No. 4, which is Mr. Spring's former alignment, it cannot be followed unless the Government of India adopts the position selected by him for the bridge. The alignment from the bridge to the present Rajahmundry station would have these objectionable features:—

1st,—It would pass on a high embankment close to the Judge's and the subordinate cutcherries and would separate them.

- 2nd,—It would pass close to the church and cut up the parade ground.  
 3rd,—It would be impossible to satisfactorily deal with the numerous roads crossed by it.  
 4th,—It would do more damage to house property than the alignment selected.  
 5th,—It would be 1,200 feet longer.

7. The plan sent by the Municipal Council is so hopelessly incorrect that the lines cannot be properly considered from it.

8. Those of the Municipal Council who were present when the Sub-Collector went over alignments 1 and 2 expressed themselves at the time so strongly in favour of No. 2 that I am at a loss to understand now their altered views. It is evident also from the Sub-Collector's letter that the majority present voted for it, but whether they were on the Council or not I am unable to say. They were in any case considered by the Sub-Collector as representing the public.

9. I am of opinion that the line selected interferes least with private or public interests, though, of course, there will always be some to object to every alignment.

10. You will note from the plan that it is proposed as desired by the Municipal Council, to place a station near the river bank. This station will serve for the civil lines and a large population to the north and east of them as well as the north end of the town itself, while the existing Rajahmundry station will meet the wants of the other end of the town.

#### ENCLOSURE.

Copy of a letter from G. W. ELPHINSTONE, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, Górávari Division, to the Engineer-in-Chief, Górávari Bridge, No. 4557-Rev. of 1896.

I have the honour to inform you that, on the evening of the 5th instant, a public meeting was held to discuss the proposed alignment of the railway between the bridge and the existing railway. Owing to the shortness of the notice it was impossible to obtain the presence of as many as might have been wished, but twenty-five gentlemen, representing all classes, were present, and the matter was fully discussed.

On my taking a vote on the question six voted in favour of the line originally proposed by you with a station near the present police buildings and eleven in favour of the alternative line to the north. The gentlemen voting in favour of the latter line were, however, mainly Muham-madans, who objected to the line passing through a burial-ground. Their objection to this is not however serious, and they will be perfectly satisfied if they are consulted regarding the removal of any remains that may be found. It may, therefore, be considered that either route will meet the wishes of the public.

Order—No. 138 R., dated 4th March 1897.

The Chairman of the Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, will be informed that the Engineer-in-Chief of the Górávari bridge appears to have done all that was in his power to meet the wishes of the Municipality, and that the Government considers the alignment selected, viz., No. 2, on Mr. Walton's plan, is the best. A station near the river will be provided.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) F. D. FOWLER,  
 Offg. Joint Secy. to Govt.,  
 Railway Branch.

Read also the following papers:—

Telegram from M.R.Ry. BONDADA GUNGAYYA, Rajahmundry, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 14th April 1897.

Railway line No. 2 most detrimental to house-property, dangerous to men and cattle passing through heart of town. Public mahazar, through District Collector. Third line quite possible and least objectionable. Pray orders suspending action till perusal and disposal by Government of our memorial and Collector's remarks.

From M.R.Ry. Y. L. NARISIMHAM Garu, B.A., Chairman-Delegate, Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department (through the Collector of Górávari), dated 7th May 1897, Dis. No. 181.

With reference to G.O., Mis. No. 616 M., dated 18th March 1897, disposing of this office letter, No. 1552 M., dated 1st January 1897, and approving of alignment No. 2 of the Górávari bridge approach line, I have the honour to forward, for favourable consideration of Government, a copy of the Council's Resolution, dated 12th April 1897, and the memorials submitted by the people concerned to the Municipal Council.

2. The plan forwarded with the letter is a tracing of the enclosed plan of Mr. Walton's and it also shows the railway embankment at the Rajahmundry station which the proposed approach line is intended to meet.

The Council has been in favour of alignment No. 3 (as per above plan), as very few houses stand in its way, and these few houses are not of a substantial nature. Besides this, there are no wells in that alignment (3) and, taking all things into consideration, this seems to be most desirable line. Line No. 2 proposed by Mr. Walton is not so desirable as more houses (some of which are of a substantial nature) will have to be removed in that alignment, and there is a well in its way.

3. As submitted in my previous letter to Government, that part of the town depends for its water-supply mostly on wells, and it is a great pity that under such circumstances, wells should be interfered with by the proposed railway alignment. Mr. Walton's line No. 2 also passes between the Mission school-house on one side and the Lutheran Protestant Church on the other side, the railway cutting (which will be pretty deep) approaching these buildings so near as to diminish practically their value. At that place four important roads meet, and it is much to be regretted that the beauty and convenience of that portion should be marred by a deep cutting which Mr. Walton's line necessitates. Line No. 3 passes behind the Mission school-house and the Mission authorities have no objection to it, whereas they strongly oppose line No. 2 which impairs the value of their school-house and their church.

4. Mr. Walton says that the line No. 3 has an impossible curve of 1,700 feet radius, whereas his line No. 2 has a workable curve of 2,865 feet. The plan that I submitted with my previous letter was a rough sketch and it is no wonder that it is inaccurate as Mr. Walton remarks. The plan now submitted, I believe, is pretty accurate, and it will be seen therefrom that line No. 3 has a workable curve of 2,945 feet but not 1,700 feet, as Mr. Walton says, and joins the railway embankment from the Rajahmundry station without the necessity of making another curve in the opposite direction, whereas Mr. Walton's line has a radius of 2,865 feet only, and cannot approach the railway embankment from the Rajahmundry station (which it is intended to meet) without making another curve, which in my humble opinion is not a very desirable thing if it can be avoided. Mr. Walton also says with reference to alignment No. 3 that the drainage in a certain place being on a lower ground cannot be easily passed over the line. Both the alignments Nos. 2 and 3 pass through the same drains, but No. 3 passes through a certain drain at a point which is nearly 3 feet lower than the point at which No. 2 passes it, but this circumstance alone cannot be considered to stand in the way of No. 3 being adopted. Mr. Walton says that it cannot be easily passed over and it can therefore be managed with some difficulty which is nothing, seeing the advantages that the No. 3 has over No. 2. There will be side drains on both the sides of the railway line, and if the drainage of the above spot cannot be passed through the drains a small drain may be cut by the side of the railway ground and the water may be drained into the low ground to which the side drain water of the railway line flows. Alignment No. 3 in which there is a punta about 600 feet long will be longer than No. 2 by about only 500 feet, but this additional expenditure on this will be counterbalanced by the saving that will be made by adopting No. 3 in the amount of compensation to be paid for acquisition of property. Lines Nos. 2 and 3 are so very near each other and at the time some councillors accompanied Mr. Walton over the ground, no survey was made and the lines marked out. So it is quite possible that there was some misunderstanding in

the matter. When the survey has been made and the lines marked out, their respective advantages and disadvantages are easily perceived and this accounts for any change of opinion of any member of the Council referred to by Mr. Walton.

5. As regards Mr. Spring's line, as Mr. Walton says, that the portion of the bridge itself will have to be altered, the Council is unable to urge anything in respect thereto. But the alignment No. 3 seems to be the best for the reasons above submitted, and as it is desirable that a line that passes through the town should cause as little inconvenience and hardship as possible, the Council prays that Government will be pleased to pass orders that alignment No. 3 should be adopted in preference to No. 2, and the Council wishes to express its gratitude to Mr. Walton for having made provision for a station near the river.

## ENCLOSURE.

EXTRACT from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Rajahmundry, dated 12th April 1897.

Read—Mahazar petitions Nos. 1452 and 26 requesting that the third line be fixed for constructing the railway in the town.

Resolution—No. 11, dated 12th April 1897.

The Council agrees with the memorialists that the third line is the best, under the circumstances, as the engineering difficulties apprehended by Mr. Walton can be obviated without much difficulty. The mahazars will be submitted to Government through the District Collector, who will be requested to wire to Government to stop the breaking up of houses pending its final orders on the subject.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) Y. L. NARISIMHAM,  
Chairman-Delegate.

Dis. No. 645-Eng.

Forwarded. No doubt line No. 3 is that preferred by the public as it interferes with fewer buildings and those it interferes with are not such substantial structures as No. 2 runs through but for the most part huts of very small value. The difficulty is, I understand, that No. 3 necessitates a sharper curve than the railway rules allow of. If this is so, of course it is out of the question, but the Council apparently deny this and the most satisfactory course seems, therefore, to be to settle the point definitely by having line No. 3 surveyed in detail. Another difficulty is that of controlling the drainage if No. 3 be adopted. In the case of No. 2, the cutting is so deep that where the greater part of the town drainage crosses the line it can be carried over the line by an aqueduct, but this is not feasible in the case of No. 3 as, if it be adopted, the cutting where the town drainage now principally crosses it will be some 3 or 4 feet less deep. This necessitates either some arrangement for carrying the water under the line which will be very costly or an arrangement of side drains to carry the drainage water alongside the cutting until such low ground is reached that it can be passed underneath. The question is one of engineering on which I am not competent to offer an opinion. All I can say is that the public desire No. 3 rather than No. 2 and that I think it should therefore be adopted unless its adoption will endanger the safety of the line at the point or entail heavier expenditure upon works than No. 2 has to render its adoption out of the question because of cost. So far as compensation for land goes and also as regards excavation, I am inclined to think No. 3 would be distinctly cheaper than No. 2, but the latter will cost much less than No. 3 as regards provision for getting rid of the surface drainage.

(Signed) V. A. BRODIE,  
Collector.

26th May 1897.

No. 661, Local and Municipal.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,  
11th June 1897.

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,  
Secretary to Government.

From the Officiating Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Railway Branch, to the Engineer-in-Chief, Gó dávari Bridge, dated Madras, 18th June 1897, No. 568 D.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter, No. 270, dated the 15th February 1897, I am directed to forward, for your perusal, a copy of an endorsement, No. 645, dated 26th May 1897, with its enclosed letter and plan, from the Collector, Gó dávari district, and to request that you will favour me with a full expression of your views for the information of Government.

From the Engineer-in-Chief, Gó dávari Bridge, to the Officiating Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Railway Branch, dated Rajahmundry, 25th June 1897, No. 1268.

I have the honour to return the correspondence and plan received with your No. 568 D., dated 18th instant.

I have shown on the plan in red the alignment No. 2 which has been set out and for which land plans have been submitted.

On this plan I have shown the correct position of the railway approach already formed to connect the existing line with the bridge over the Gó dávari.

The alignment No. 3, as proposed by the Municipality, is shown to meet this approach in a position and direction which is quite incorrect.

In order to give you a clearer understanding of the matter, I beg to forward a plan, 400 feet to an inch, showing the different alignments that have been proposed.

No. 1 line is the most direct, but this was abandoned in consequence of objections made with reference to burial-grounds.

No. 2 is the line now set out, the general direction of which was approved by the Municipality when No. 1 was abandoned.

No. 3 is the line now asked for by the Municipality on an incorrect assumption as to the position of the existing approach.

No. 4 is an alignment conforming with the present wishes of the Municipality when reduced to a correct plan.

I first prospected on line No. 4, but alignment No. 2 was decided upon in preference for the following reasons:—

1st,—It was found that the ground level on line No. 4 at the main roads A and B would not admit of the roads or drainage being passed over the railway at a sufficiently high level to give the standard headway.

2nd,—The two main roads are better crossed over one bridge where the cross roads meet.

3rd,—The Mission School compound is cut in two by line No. 4, whereas this is not the case with line No. 2, which interferes very slightly with either the school or church compounds.

4th,—Line No. 2 avoids the market buildings entirely, whereas line No. 4 would completely destroy them.

5th,—The houses on line No. 2 are not more numerous or of a better class than on line No. 4 with the exception, perhaps, of one house, the owner of which is better able to make his complaints heard.

6th,—The length of line No. 2 is about 500 feet less than that of No. 4.

For these reasons, I decided on alignment No. 2 and I am convinced that it is the best for both the railway and the town. There will of course be opposition to any alignment passing through house-property, but I believe that the alignment No. 2 does as little damage to property as any other that can be selected. In any case the Engineering objections as regards levels on line No. 4 are unanswerable and in order to explain this clearly to you I enclose also a longitudinal section of line No. 2.

The main roads A and B on line No. 4 are, respectively, 5.20 and 7.70 feet below their level on line No. 2 each having grades of about 1 in 50 and you will readily see the difficulty in passing such roads over the line at so much lower levels. It would entail long disfiguring embankments, the slopes of which would damage property on each side of the roads. Even on line No. 2 the road and drainage have to be slightly raised.

The drainage from chain 20 to 26 must pass over the line at chain 26. This is rapidly collecting drainage from that portion of the town lying near line No. 1 which now finds an outlet on the east side of the Mission School compound, and the sooner it is passed across the line the better.

There will be quite enough drainage to carry down to the low ground without dealing with that between chains 20 and 26.

I propose now to deal with the objections made by the Chairman of the Municipal Council to line No. 2.

As I have stated above there is nothing to choose between the 2 lines Nos. 2 and 4 with regard to house-property except, perhaps, that one house which I have mentioned.

There is one well near the line No. 2 (marked C on the municipal plan), but this can be preserved since it is about 15 feet clear of the centre line and such access can be given to it as will, I think, meet the public wants. Even if this were not so we could sink another well in the neighbourhood.

I have already referred to the Mission property. The land will be less cut up by line No. 2 than by No. 4. I fail to see how any damage can arise to the school or church for the soil is very hard gravel and the buildings are, respectively, 40 and 135 feet clear of the proposed railway fence. I have had no complaints from those in charge of these buildings nor does it seem to make much difference to the school itself, whether there is a cutting behind it or in front of it. Access between the school and the church will not be less easy than at present since there will be the road bridge between them.

As regards the beauty and convenience of the town you will see from the section that the line must in any case be in cutting and that one bridge at the cross roads will be less unsightly than two bridges with long raised approaches.

To avoid these approaches the railway cutting would have to be about 7 feet deeper than is now proposed and the damage to property would be increased.

The drainage cannot be passed under the railway as proposed by the Chairman, because syphon culverts will be sure to choke up with refuse and sand.

I can only add that the line has been laid out to the best of my ability with a view to do as little damage and to cause as little inconvenience to the public as possible. Inconvenience to individuals must and will occur, and it appears to me that similar objections as were urged against line No. 1 are now being urged against line No. 2 and would be urged against any line where those who are inconvenienced for the public good can make their objections heard.

ORDER—No. 473 R., dated 17th July 1897.

The different proposals for an approach line to the Gódávári bridge through the town of Rajahmundry have been carefully considered and Government finally approves of alignment No. 2 for the reasons set forth in letter from the Engineer-in-Chief, Gódávári bridge, No. 1268, dated 25th June 1897, read above.

(True Extract.)

*F. D. Hunter*

Under Secretary to Government,  
Railway Branch.

To the Local and Municipal Department, with one plan.  
„ Engineer-in-Chief, Gódávári Bridge.

Exd. W. D'Moss.

When given for copying *17/7*  
When copied *17/7*  
When examined  
When signed *17/7* 189.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.  
189.

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH  
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.  
B = Not to be copied.  
P = Copy abstract only.  
Q = Copy heading only.