

(1) Number of pages 28
(2) Date of repair 1/87
(3) Initials of the Referencer luis

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2886	Press.
B.P. No.	w	Mis.
Dated	14-12-1880	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 2329

MADRAS,
Chepauk, 20th Sept. 1880.

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF WORKS,
PRESIDENCY,

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Deptt.

Sir,

Enclosures. 4

- 1 Comp. Statement
- 1 Rev. & Det. Est.
- 1 Abst. Est.
- 1 Data for kind works.

4

In G.O. No. 331 W-dated 18th February 1880, an Estimate of Rs 7681 was sanctioned for boundary walls and gateways to the Chepauk Grounds, but as the amount of this Estimate is insufficient, I have the honor to submit a revised Estimate, with a Comparative Statement, showing a further demand of Rs 2589 to allow of the completion of the work.

2. The causes of the revision of the Estimate are chiefly the insufficiency of some of the rates that were given in the Estimate made by

by the Consulting Architect, and additional work in the basement being required, owing to the fall in the ground.

3. The Consulting Architect had prepared some bricks which cost Rs. 9 per thousand, but these were not enough and more bricks of the size and description required could not be got in the market. When the supply was found to be exhausted, it was considered necessary to push on with the work and not to wait for an indefinite time till more similar bricks could be made, the Consulting Architect was therefore applied to, for bricks and the price of these came to Rs. 13, there being no other good description of bricks available. The excess on brick-work amounts to Rs. 1049. 5. 6, but there is a set off

off against this amount of Rs. 711. 6. 0, owing to a part of the old foundations being utilised and the necessity for laying down concrete, being thus removed. The actual excess for brick work is thus Rs. 337. 15. 5.

4. The rate Rs. 2/- per cubic foot allowed for cut-stone work in the sanctioned Estimate is the ordinary rate for three lines dressed on a plain surface, and it has been found impossible to carry out the ornamental work at this rate for the gate pillars and coping. As this is a style of work not usually done in departmental practice, detailed data are now furnished, in support of the rate that should have been allowed. The excess on this item amounts to Rs. 671. 8. 6.

5. The construction of the gates was entrusted to the I.D. Workshops.

A

A sum of Rs 665. 10. 4 was provided in the sanctioned Estimate, but the Superintendent of the Workshops could not carry out the work owing to its intricacy and the labor involved, except at a higher cost of Rs 908 is estimated by him. The excess on this item is Rs 242. 5. 8.

6. There has been an excess of Rs 977. 6. 10 on plastering due to the extra quantity necessary for the greater amount of basement constructed owing to the fall of the ground, and to colored plaster being used instead of white as estimated for; this change having been made at the Consulting Architect's suggestion.

7. The expenditure on sundries is increased with the higher outlay on work. In consequence of this, and the entertainment of watchmen, not

not provided in the original Estimate to look after the materials, there has been an excess of Rs 255. 5. 8 on this item.

8. The net excess is arrived at thus -

Brickwork, —————	337. 15. 5
cut stone, —————	671. 8. 6
Gates, —————	242. 5. 8
Plastering, —————	977. 6. 10
Sundries, —————	255. 5. 8
Other minor items, ————	104. 5. 11
	<u>Rs 2589. . . .</u>

I request that an allotment of Rs 2589 may be granted for the completion of the work.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obed^t servant
Hew Sen dey
Lt. Col. Rb.
Suppl^y
For Supt of Works
Presidency

recd.
18.

Mis No 3316 d/13-2-80
Mis No 627 d/26-2-80
2664 d/3-12-79
C.E. No 3221 d/20-10-79

From, *N.D.*
L. SEP 80
N^o 5045 7725
The Supth of Works,
Residency.

N^o 2329

Dated 20th Sept 1880.
Recd 21st

Encl^o. 4.

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

Chepank Grounds.

Submits a revised
Estimate of Rs 10,270
with Comparative Statement
to allow of the completion
of boundary walls and
gateways to the —

O. 24.9.80

Sent by air 2-10-80 Bk 6-10-80

ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

No. 423

CONSULTING ARCHITECT'S OFFICE,
Chepank, 1st October 1880

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT,

To

THE CHIEF ENGINEER, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH.

SIR,

Enclosures.

1 File

1 Drawing

I have the honor to return the Comparative
Statement forwarded to me with your Memo N^o
479 dated the 29th September shewing an increased
expenditure on the Compound wall of the Chepank
grounds of Rupees 2589 over my Estimate of
Rupees 7681.

I prepared the Estimate under the impression
that I would myself carry it into execution, and
I was satisfied therefore that the rates provided
by me were liberal, except in the items of lamps
and terracotta which it is impossible to
estimate with accuracy.

The wall is too high throughout, and to
this fact is due the excess on Brickwork and
plastering. The wall should have been of
an average height of 4' 4" in every bay
following the fall of the ground, in place
of which, it starts with a height of 5' 1" and
is on an average 6' 4" high. The enclosed

average Sections as designed and as executed will illustrate this point.

The Estimate provides the following rates; -

Teakwood	Rs. 3-0-0
Plastering (Colored)	3-0-0
Grubstone	2-0-0

These rates on Execution have risen to;

Teakwood	3-13-6
Plastering (Colored)	4-8-7
Grubstone	3-5-2

At the Cricket Pavilion within a stones throw of the wall and executed at the same time I actually paid for;

Teakwood	2-14-6
Plastering (Colored)	3-1-0
Grubstone	2-0-0

I should explain that the rate for cut stone was struck when the entire wall was to have been built in stone of a comparatively plain nature, and when the Brick wall was substituted the rate should have been raised from 2/5 to 2-8-0 for the smaller quantity of work - but allowing for this, there is still a serious difference in rates which is probably due to the method of working -

I have the honor to be
sir

Your most Obedt. servt.

W. H. Wilson

Const. Archt. to Government

ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

P.W.D.

20CT80

No. 423

From

The Consulting Architect
to Government,

To

The Chief Engineer, P. W. Department,
Buildings and Roads Branch.

No. 423

Dated 1st October 1880

Received

No. of ENCLOSURES. 2

Returns Comparative State-
ment of Revised Estimate-

No. 3241

MADRAS,
Chempauk, 3rd Decr. 1880.

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF WORKS,
PRESIDENCY,

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Dept.

Sir,

Enclosures. 5

- 1 Comparative Statement.
- 1 Revised Detailed and Abstract Estimate made for Rs 10270.
- 1 Dabaf, Plans and work.
- 1 Letter No. 2329 of 30th September 1880.
- 1 Letter from Mr. C. L. S. to Mr. C. L. S. of 1st October 1880 with 1 Plan.

I have the honor to return the enclosures of your Memorandum No. 2261 dated 6th October 1880 regarding compound wall, Chempauk Park, with the following remarks.

2. Observing that the ground along the line of the wall falls considerably and that the old foundations were good, I authorized that the latter should be utilized and raised to one uniform level to receive the superstructure. This increased the height of the wall, a result which I considered desirable as the wall runs along

along a thickly populated portion of the town. I sanctioned this deviation as it involved no extra outlay and was more than covered by the saving from the item of concrete for foundations allowed in the sanctioned estimate. (Vide Comparative Statement)

Mr. Chisholm's statement, therefore that the excess on brickwork is due to the wall being too high is not correct.

The wall was designed to be 9 inches thick in superstructure (not 10" as shown in Mr. Chisholm's Section) but the bricks supplied being 10" long the wall had to be made 10" thick which caused in the whole length of the wall an excess in quantity of 29 cyds. This, with the high rate of Rs. 13 per 1000 paid for stock bricks, has

has been the cause of the excess on brick work.

3. The rate allowed for brick work in the sanctioned estimate was per cyd. Rs. 4.12.0 in foundation and Rs. 5 in superstructure. These rates provided for building with field bricks at Rs. 9 per 1000 and though the better description of bricks (viz. stock bricks at Rs. 13 per 1000) has been used, the actual cost of the work done viz. Rs. 5.14.4 per cyd is still below the rate Rs. 6.8.0 per cyd allowed for building with stock bricks in Mr. Chisholm's estimate for the compound wall for St. Andrew's Kirk. Thus it would appear that the expenditure on brick work though in excess of the sanctioned estimate is not in excess

excess of the value of work done.

4. The excess on wood work is solely due, as has been reported in letter N^o 2329 of the 20th September 1880, to the work having been entrusted to the P.W. Workshop, owing to its intricate nature and to the Workshops not being able to carry it out at the estimated rates. The work was executed upon an estimate of the Superintendent of the Workshops, and the amount of this Estimate is that now entered in the Comparative Statement for this item.

5. The description of stone work carried out is in accordance with the estimate. No comparison can be made between the stone work at the Western Gateway and that at the Cricket Pavilion - for the latter is simply two lines dressed while ornamental carved work has

has been done to the Gateway and coping. Mr. Chisholm in the last para of his letter admits the insufficiency of the rate viz: R^o 2 in the sanctioned estimate, and adds that R^o 2.8.0 should have been allowed. The actual cost of the stone wall has been R^o 2/9th per cft. or a trifle above the rate Mr. Chisholm admits should have been allowed. But the gate piers I consider ought to have been estimated for separately, as the work in them is considerably different from that in the stone wall and far more intricate: hence higher wages had to be paid for skilled workmen for the Gate Piers work or otherwise the work could not have been satisfactorily executed. I further beg to add that similar work not having been previously carried out in this Division, there was no regular data to work from.

6. I trust that under the above explanation, the revised estimate for the work may be sanctioned and the requisite funds allotted to admit of the accounts being closed.

7. I would beg to state in conclusion that it would certainly be more convenient if hereafter, works designed and estimated for by the Government Architect were carried out under the orders of that Officer.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant
Charles W. B. T. Rajah.
Supt. of Works
Residence.

Sb. No. 1481 W. 29-5-79.
 " " 1827 W. 12-7-79.
 C.E. 3221. 20-10-79.
 " " 3664. 3-12-79.
 " " 647. 26-2-80.
 " " 479. 29-3-80.
 " " 2261. 6-10-80.

S. W. C. No. 7725

From

The Supt. of Works
 Presidency.

No. 32101

Dated 3rd }
 Recd 6th } December 1880.

Enclosures. 5

Campbell Hall, Chepauk
 Park.

Returns the enclosure
 of Memorandum No 2261
 dated 6th October 1880
 regarding — with
 remarks.

Cir 10.12.80. R. 11.12.

S. W.

The S of W shall
 see this as it is not
 clear why the wall
 was not carried out
 as designed or why
 the ~~extra~~ water are
 in excess of Mr. Chisholm
 own work of the
 same character close
 by.

Again if a different
 class of stone work
 became necessary, the
 but originally designed
 an immediate response
 should leave him and
 instead of waiting till
 the class of the work

Atty
 10/10/80.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 14th Decr 80.
 Read the following:—

No 2327 of 20th Sept 1880)

No 423 of 1st Oct 1880)

No 3241 of 3rd Decr 1880)

appears from the above
 evidence that the es-
 te of Rs 7681 sanction-
 in G. O. No 331 W. of 18th
 may last for the
 truction of boundary
 and gates to the
 bank grounds will
 exceed by Rs 2589
 about thirty four per
 cent

N. C. No. 1481 W. 29-5-79.
 " " 1827 W. 12-7-79.
 C. E. " 3221. 20-10-79.
 " " 3664. 3-12-79.
 " " 647. 26.2.80.
 " " 479. 29-3-80.
 " " 2267. 6-10-80

Cir 10.12.80. N. 16.12.

No. 2886 H.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 14th Decr 80.

Read the following:—

From

The Superintendent of Works } (N. C. No 2327 of 20th Apr 1880)
 Presidency

From

The Consulting Architect } (N. C. No 423 of 1st Oct 1880)
 to Government

From

The Superintendent of Works } (N. C. No 3241 of 3rd Decr 1880)
 Presidency

It appears from the above
 correspondence that the es-
 timate of Rs 7681 sanction-
 ed in G. O. No 331 W. of 18th
 February last for the
 construction of boundary
 walls and gates to the
 Chepauk grounds will
 be exceeded by Rs 2589
 or about thirty four per
 cent

cent.

2. The principal causes of excess are an increase of quantities of brickwork and plastering, and an increase of rates for all the principal items of the estimate.

3. With regard to the increase of quantities the explanation given by the Superintendent of Works is not satisfactory, although owing to the set offs mentioned in para 2 of his letter No 3241 of the 3rd December the actual excess on the item of brickwork itself is small, the alteration in the height of the wall involved a considerable increase in the quantity of plastering required. For this alteration, which should not have been made without proper authority, the Superintendent of Works is entirely responsible.

4.

For the

the excess upon the cost of the gates the responsibility rests with the P. W. Workshops but it may be admitted that the nature of the work was such as to render the framing of an accurate estimate difficult.

5. For the insufficiency of the rates originally provided for stone work, brickwork and plastering the Consulting Architect is ~~responsible~~ ^{answerable}, and the Government are not prepared to allow him to transfer ^{responsibility} that to the Superintendent of Works. The nature of the work to be done, and the materials to be used were well known to Mr. Chisholm, the brick being obtained from the brickfield under his own supervision, while the actual cost of the stone work for the wall was but slightly

slightly in excess of the
rate which he himself
admits should have been
entered in the estimate

6. With these remarks
the revised estimate amount-
ing to Rs 10270 is sanc-
tioned.

MM

9/12/50.

This sanction has been
registered as Provincial
No. 61 S. of 1880-81 and
cancels Pro. No. 90 S. of
1879-80 & is classified
as Civil Buildings
Original Works.

S. of W. Presidency 6
Con: Architect 3
En P. W. a. 12

to sendos
said ests & comparative statement

22-12-80

7725 4a

1870
Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

16-12
G. O. No. 2886u
1880

Nos. 6366y

Chopant grounds
Sanctions with remarks
the revised estimate
for the construction of
boundary walls and
gates to the —