

(1) Number of pages 14(2) Date of repair 13-11-38(3) Initials of the Referencer CR

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.
See 31/3/60

G.O. No. <u>685</u>	Press Mis.
<u>13.14</u> Dated <u>21-3-</u> 18 <u>60</u>	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
for the month of March 1860.*

No. 13. Read the following letter from Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer, to the Secretary to Government, dated 27th February 1860, No. 10,695 :—

With reference to the correspondence quoted in the margin,* regarding the proposed Bridge across the Tammilēru at Gutapād in Masulipatam, Godavery District, I have the honor to forward the accompanying letters received from the District Engineer. From these documents it will be observed that the traffic on the road crossing the Tammilēru at Gutapād is but small, the District Engineer, however, considers it desirable to construct the Bridge in question as the traffic which now crosses by sundry fords between Chinnamapetta and Sittanagaram would then, doubtless, take advantage of the easier and safer means of communication.

1 Letter from District Engineer, 14th September 1858, No. 171, 1 Report.
1 Abstract Estimate, 1 Plan.
1 Letter from District Engineer, 16th June 1859, No. 77.
1 Plan.
1 Letter from District Engineer, 15th December 1859, No. 370.
1 Do. do. 14th January 1860, No. 400.
Proceedings of Government, No. 1892, Public Works Department, dated 6th August 1859.
To Government, No. 3819, dated 13th August 1859.
No. 370, dated 15th December 1859.
No. 400, dated 14th January 1860.

2. On referring to the former correspondence on the subject of this proposed Bridge, I find that it was intended to provide for the passage of the traffic generally between the frontier towns of Hyderabad and the Masulipatam District, and that Captain Greenaway's opinion on the subject is, therefore, correct. As the Budget for 1860-61 is closed, I now recommend the sanction of the Estimate of Rupees (8,600) eight thousand and six hundred and its entry in the Budget of 1861-62.

No. 14. ORDER THEREON, 21st March 1860, No. 605.

This Estimate of 8,600 Rupees provides for a masonry Bridge over the Tammilēru at Gutapād in the Masulipatam portion of the Godavery District, and it is in substitution of an Estimate of 4,120 Rupees for a wooden structure, on which Orders were passed in the Proceedings of Government dated 19th November 1857, No. 2128.* The construction of a Bridge over the river at this point was approved under the

* Paragraph 17.
impression that there was much traffic on the road, but it is now stated that the traffic is very trifling. It seems also from the sketch map, that there is not yet any road to the site of the proposed Bridge, but that one has to be made.

2. The Acting District Engineer still advocates the Bridge, arguing that it will attract traffic which now crosses at neighbouring fords. But this would be to meet a want not yet felt; while many pressing wants remain unsupplied from deficiency of funds.

3. On these grounds the Government decline to sanction the Bridge. Further it seems undesirable that Government should at this early period sanction an Estimate for entry in the Budget of 1861-62.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Central Office of P.W.
Tirupattur.

27 February 1860.

No. 10695

Public.

Enclosures 8.

1 Letter from Dist. Engr.

14. Sept. '58 No. 171.

1 Report.

1 Abstract Estimate.

1 Plan.

1 Letter from Dist. Engr.

15 June '59 No. 77.

1 Plan.

1 Letter from Dist. Engr.

15 Dec. '59 No. 370.

1 14 Jan'y '60 No. 400.

Proceeding of Govt.

No. 1893 B.S. dated

5 Aug. 1859.

Do Govt. No. 3819 dated

13 Aug. 1859.

From

The Chief Engineer

To

The Secretary to Government.

Public Works Department.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence quoted in the Margin regarding the proposed Bridge across the Tummeel at Judapudy in Masulipatam Godavari District, I have the honor to forward the accompanying letters received from the District Engineer. From these documents it will be observed that the traffic on the road crossing the Tummeel at Judapudy is but small. The District Engineer however considers it desirable to construct the Bridge in question as the traffic which now crosses by sunder ford between Chinnampet and Sectanagaram would then doubtless take advantage of the easier and safe means of communication.

No. 370 of 15 Dec. '59.

400 14 Jan'y '60.

Tammileru

Judapad

Godavari

Chinnampet

On

2 On referring to the former correspondence on the subject of this proposed bridge, I find that it was intended to provide for the passage of the traffic generally between the frontier towns of Hyderabad and the Maoulpattam District, and that Captain Greenaway's opinion on the subject is therefore correct. As the Budget for 1860/61 is closed, I now recommend the sanction of the Estimate of Rupees 8,600 eight thousand and six hundred and its entry in the Budget of 1861/62.

Central Office of P. & S.
Sephakham
27 February 1860

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.

Major
Dy. Ch. Eng. 1860

W. M. D. Colonel
Chief Engineer

To
The Secretary to Government.
P. & S.

W. M. D.

of the traffic passing over it,

Memo:
From the Chief Engr, 27th Feb/60, No 10645. Recommending
for entry in the Budget of 1860/62 an estimate of 8,000 Rs
for a bridge over the Tamileru at Sutapadi in the Masulipatnam
town portion of the Godavari district.

2) Chief Engr's Report,
22, 6th Dec/58, No 8666.

The estimate of 4,120 Rs was
originally sent in for a wooden bridge on
masonry abutments and piers. The work
was said to be for the convenience of the
traffic from the interior and principal
frontier towns in the Hyderabad country,
and from Kadachellam to the towns
between the Tamileru and the Kistnah,
so on to Masulipatnam and Junton, via
Condapilli and Nojid. It was also said
that as the road thro' ~~the~~ Chintalapudi,
Burampalem, Yernagudem, & Rajahmundry
also crossed the river at the same side, the
construction of a bridge was much required
to obviate the inconvenience to which the
extensive traffic through the country was
being subjected. The Govt remarked in reply
that as the river was rapid while in flood
its banks were steep and high, it did
certainly be bridged for the convenience
of the ^{extensive} traffic passing over it, but that they

Govt P.O. 19 Nov/57, No 2128,
Para 17.

27th Dec/59 No 10645
- 26th Dec/59 - 10645-109

27th Dec/59 No 10645
- 26th Dec/59 - 10645-109

From
The Chief Engineer
to The Secretary, Govt.
19/12/59.

Recd 28th Feb/60
19/12/59

Engr's Report
No 605.21st March.

Submitted for
consideration, Comd. and Engrs.
from the 20th Dec/59. Engrs.
Godavari regarding the
proposed bridge over
the river at Sutapadi.
Study.

27th Dec/59

19/12.

were of opinion that a ^{more} ~~substantial~~ ^{substantial} work would be preferable; ~~and that the Chief Supr~~ ^{therefore to} ~~decided that the Chief Supr~~ ^{procure} and formed a revised estimate for entry in the budget of 1859/60.

In July last year, the Chief ^(c) From Chief Supr, 29 July/59, No 3219.

Supr in compliance with the above requi- sition, sent in an estimate of 8,600 Rs for entry in the budget of 1860/61; but as

Govt did not find anything in the papers ⁽²⁾ to shew the nature of the road on which the proposed bridge was to be placed, or the quantity of traffic, they called for infor-

mation on these points, and at the same time ^{directed} ~~called~~ the Chief Supr's attention to

Rule XIV of the Proceedings dated 18th Feb 1855, No 896. In reply, Col Laingford ⁽³⁾ ~~expressed~~

the Central Office on the plea that Govt themselves had admitted the existence

of a large traffic; but this admission was apparently a simple repetition of the

Chief Supr's own statement. Col Laingford said, however, in his letter that as no state-

ment appeared to have accompanied the original ~~estimate~~ report (QQ), he had called

upon Capt Pundall to furnish the particulars

Govt No: 6 Aug/59, No 1892.

* Report on road estimates to state description of road, its length &c, and amount of traffic.

⁽³⁾ From S^d Chief Supr in charge, 13 Aug/59, No 3819.

⁽⁴⁾ Govt No: 26 Aug/59, No 2057.

required. This letter was recorded.

Col Bell in resubmitting the esti- mate of 8,600 Rs for entry in the budget of 1860/62, now writes to say that the traffic on the road crossing the Jumilera at Jula- padli is but small; but that the District Supr considers the bridge desirable, as the traffic which crosses by sundry fords be- tween Chinnamapotta and Shanaganna would, ^{doubtless} on its construction take advantage of the easier and safer means of communica- tion.

Govt. This bridge was sanctioned under the impression that there was much traffic on the road, but it is now stated that the traffic is very trifling - It seems also from the Sketch Map, that there is not yet any road to the bridge, but that one has

been made.

The Actg. Dist. Engineer

still advocates the bridge,
saying that it will
attract traffic which
was confined at neighbouring
fords. But this will be
a matter a matter not yet
settled; while many bridges
will remain uncompleted
from deficiency of funds.

Further it seems un-
desirable that Govt. should
at this early period
sanction an Estimate for
entry in the Budget for
the year 1867/68.

W. H.
March 8.

W. H.
March 14.

I concur with Mr
Mourdillon

W. H. M.
March 10 March 1867

W. H. M.

W. H. M.

W. H. M.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 21st March 1867.

Read the following
letter from the Chief Engineer

Submitting for information
correspondence from the District
Engineer Godavari regarding the
proposed bridge over the Tummala
at Gudalapudi.

Received 27th February 1867
N. 10695

Godavari
Tummala
Gudalapudi

Rest Under
order.

* para 17.

This estimate of
8,600 Rs provides for a masonry
bridge over the Tummala at Gudala-
padi in the Masulipatam portion
of the Godavari district, and it is
in substitution of an estimate
of 4,120 Rs for a wooden structure,
in which orders were passed in the
Proceedings of Govt dated 19th Nov 67,
No 2128. The construction of a bridge
over the river at this point was ap-
proved under the impression that
there was much traffic on the road,
but it is now stated that the traffic
is very trifling. It seems also from
the sketch map, that there is not
yet any road to the bridge, but that

one has to be made.

2 The Acting District Engineer

still advocates the bridge, arguing that it will attract traffic which now crosses at neighbouring fords.

But this would be to meet a want not yet felt; while many pressing wants remain unsupplied from deficiency of funds.

3 On these grounds the Board declines to sanction the bridge.

(Further it seems undesirable

that Govt should at this early period sanction an estimate for entry in the budget of 1864/65.

[Signature]

10 Copies to the Chief Engineer
with 8 Enclos
Dy. 22.

Public Works Dept. Report.
Chief of Post Inspection.

1906-05.

Office of the Chief of Post
Inspection, Wash. D. C.

April 1906.

Declining to come to the
the bridge over the river
between the bridge and
the main station
portion of the post
district.