

(1) Number of pages _____
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	121	(W)	Press
B.P. No.			Mis.
Dated	20-1-		1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
20th January 1876.*

No. 236. Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Chingleput, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated St. Thomas' Mount, 12th January 1876, No. 4,114:—

In reply to G.O., No. 3,545, of 15th December, I have the honor to observe that

1 Copy of letter from the Superintending Engineer, Chingleput District, to the Executive Engineer, Chingleput Range, No. 541, dated May 1874. it is by no means unusual for the Local Fund Board to enter in the Budget a sum of money on the suggestion of any member, subject to further consideration on the submission of the regular estimate,

1 Do. do. No. 192, dated 15th April 1875. and that it has always been considered important to know when any portion of the road has been remetalled on extra grants.

2. This information has been usually entered in the report setting forth the reasons for making such a demand, and if omitted by any accident it has been supplied generally in a day or two.

3. The system is, I think, peculiar to the 3rd range of this district. I have as District or Superintending Engineer been in charge of eleven districts, and have found that such remetalling has been included in the maintenance allowance, as it is in Nos. 1 and 2 ranges of this district, and, I believe, in accordance with the intention of Chapter V., paragraphs 65 and 66, Code, which is not as clear in stating this as is Chapter XIII., Section 3, Government of India Public Works Department Code.

4. I did not understand that the Local Fund Board had authority to alter the rules of Government in a matter of this kind, a matter of accounts and detail, not affecting their responsibility in any way. But, in fact, I did not know that the Board had decided this, and thought, till Mr. Lowry replied, that he had made the alteration.

5. As regards paragraph 3, I would point out that in my letter, No. 3,224 of 3rd November, I reported that the estimates were prepared and a considerable quantity of work done on the roads mentioned in G.O., No. 1,586, of 15th June, before Mr. Lowry or I came to the district. There were consequently no instructions issued by me.

6. I found Mr. Lowry had made very considerable alterations in execution, and I stopped all work not sanctioned till a revised estimate was submitted and passed by proper authority.

7. The alterations were principally made in the masonry works, dimensions of tunnels, or substitution of slopes for bridge and tunnels. I desired Mr. Lowry to state his grounds for making these changes, and to show that the works designed by him were sufficient and better suited to the places in which they were to be built than those sanctioned by Government on the original estimate.

8. These revised estimates and papers connected with them were sent by me to the Local Fund Board in April 1875, but have not yet been sanctioned.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
20th January 1876.

No. 237.

ORDER THEREON, 20th January 1876, No. 121.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 13.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, Chingleput.

Extract from Madras G.O. Code
Chap. V 65. 66

Definition of 65. The repair of a made road shall consist of the destruction of its decayed or wasted parts of earth, gravel, metal, stone or iron work. In repairing bridges and drains, the dimensions may be altered when necessary.

Maintenance Grants 66. Every Govt. road shall be kept in repair by means of an annual maintenance grant from Govt, which shall be allotted to each road upon its completion.

N^o 192

Superintending Eng^r's Office

15th April 1875.

From

The Superintending Engineer
Chingleput

To The Executive Engineer

Chingleput Range.

Sir,

In acknowledging receipt of your

X N^o 3420 of 30th March 75

" 3422 of do.

" 30 of 6 April 75

letters as per margin enclosing estimates

for the roads named in the margin I

SS Road from 41st mile stone on

Great Southern

Road to Saty

via Utramalur. 2

Road from Chingle-

put to Sirpurur.

Do. from Stree-

permatu to

Trivellur.

have the honor to observe that they are still in my opinion insufficiently drawn out.

It does not matter whether the water passes the road by a slope or a bridge. The point required is information as to the Capacity of the work for the object required. for this it is necessary to know the area of Catchment basin and the fall of stream near the point of crossing.

3 From this and the area of the water way may be deduced the velocity &c, and arrangement made for a proper crossing; in many cases it will be advisable

the previous estimate which had not been sanctioned. and by one description for all the road slopes which appear to differ only in point of length.

9 If a little of the time spent on this had been employed in making a tracing of Mr. Maitland's survey and marking on it the works which you now propose instead of those signed by him the plan submitted would have borne a less slovenly appearance than it now does.

X X X
I have &c &c

/Signed/ F. J. Moberly, Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer
Chingleput
/True Extract/

F. J. Moberly. Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer
Chingleput

Enclosure in a letter
from the Supy. Engr. Chingleput
to the Secy to Govt. P. W. D.
No. 4114 of 12th Jan'y 1876

No. 541

Superintending Engineer's Office
20th May 1874.

From The Superintending Engineer
Chingleput 5

To The Executive Engineer
Chingleput Range.

Sir,
In returning the enclosed papers regarding the road from Southern road to Petry forwarded with your No. 169 of 25th April 1874 I have the honor to request that you will report in each case of deviation from sanctioned plan who made and who authorized the deviation and the reason why no report has been made in the 2 years that you have been in the range as to the utter insufficiency of the original estimate.

I regret to find that no attention is paid to the remonstrances of the Local Fund Board as to the high standard of road which you are making. I have

Enclosures

2 Plans.

1. Detailed estimate.

1. Abstract do.

1. Comparative.

Statement.

not been able to go over the line myself and could not do much good if I did, as many tunnels have been already built. Some so close to one another that I cannot think they were all necessary and that distributing channels from a well placed one could not have been cut. e.g. in 6th mile there are 7, and 2 road dams each of 30 feet, and all this immediately under 2 tanks and away from their calingulas.

The tunnels under Melvoj tank are more than can be required for irrigation, and quite insufficient for surplus from the tank, which clearly should be discharged into the stream above the road crossing.

I believe that it is only in rare cases that any wall is necessary to a well arranged road slope, one that is so long and well splayed as to reduce the velocity of the water crossing it to a minimum. The bed of the channel above the road should be cut out, and a pool formed so as to check the current some feet above the road. If stone and gravel be so laid as to

form no obstruction I see no reason why the water should cut up the road any more than it does its own natural bed.

The same remark applies to the rivers. The ramps into them should be cut in the bank, and their feet at the edge should be on the level of the river; the pavement in the bed should be laid with its surface flush with, or 1" below the bed, and across its full width. The ramps near Melvoj are in this respect quite right.

The Cortelias on the North line has for many years been passed by a pavement of this description without any retaining walls, and by no means level as it went over a sand bank in one case.

The omission of these walls will materially reduce your estimate, and the system can at any rate be tried as an experiment.

Another point which I would urge is the cross sectioning of all your roads. If you will calculate the velocity with which the water runs off your road I do not think

demand, and if omitted by any accident it has been supplied generally in a day or two.

3 The system is I think peculiar to the 3^d range of this District. I have as District or Superintending Engineer been in charge of 11 districts and have found that such remetting has been included in the maintenance allowance, as it is in Nos 1 and 2 ranges of this district. And I believe in accordance with the intention of Chapter V Paras 65. 66 Code which is not as clear in stating this as is Chapter XIII Section III Government of India Public Works Department Code.

4 I did not understand that the Local Fund Board had authority to alter the rules of Government in a matter of this kind. a matter of accounts and detail, not affecting their responsibility in any way. But in fact I did not know that the Board ^{had} decided this, and thought, till Mr Lowry replied, that

he had made the alteration.

5 As regards para 3 I would point out that in my letter No 5224 of 3^d November I reported that the estimates were prepared and a considerable quantity of work done on the roads mentioned in G.O. No 1586 of 15th June before Mr Lowry or I came to the District. There were consequently no instructions issued by me.

6 I found Mr Lowry had made very considerable alterations in execution and I stopped all work not sanctioned till a revised estimate was submitted and passed by proper authority.

7 The alterations were principally made in the masonry works. dimensions of tunnels or substitution of slopes for bridges and tunnels. I desired Mr Lowry to state his grounds for making these changes and to show that the works designed by him were sufficient, and better suited to the places in which they

in copy of
minutes
7m

were to be built than those sanctioned
by Government on the original estimate.

8 These revised estimates and
papers connected with them were sent
by me to the Local Fund Board
in April 1875 but have not yet
been sanctioned.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. H. B. Colonel R. B.

Superintending Engineer

Chingleput

485-hme/75-12-130
-30th Nov - - 625-626.
-16 Dec - - 293-294.
Extract from known before (Chingleput) 65-11.

to
the
Chingleput
draft - 27-1-76

No 121

Received -

Chingleput

to Chingleput

L. H. 1876 Dept
The Supt Engineer
Chingleput

To The Secretary to Govt
S. P. Works

Dated 12th January 76
Received 13th

L. 2. A-14114

Offers explanation
for the delay in submit-
ting revised estimates
of the Roads from Chingle-
put to Enuburu and
from 14 1/2 mile stone
to Entry -

No 336-237

Cir 15-1-76-

251/2
Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To *Asst. Commr. Chingleput*

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 20 Jan. 1876, No. 21

Nos. 235-237

*From Chingleput to
Erupoor and from 4/8
mile stone to Saty Chingle
put Dist - Explanation
of the Supd. Engr. regarding
the delay in the submission
of the revised estimates
for the — recorded*

R.S. 7