

3.3.09

FOR ORDERS.



20.1.82

No. 1000

Recirculated
with the standard
design.

By

Att

22/1/82

B. No. 237 Wd 30th January 1882

Recorded.

No alteration of standard
plant needed.
plain *new* *Att*

26/1/82

Subd. in *Facilit. Regr*

10/3/1

Circ 20.1.82
R. 24.1.82 R. 26.1.82

From the Comm. Architect No 798 of 18th January 1882.

FOR ORDERS.

I confess I do not like a verandah less than 10 ft. which is practically that of the old type given by the enclosure 8'6" + 1'6" diam. of columns.

W. H. Barker

Colonel R. D.

Secy to Govt P.W.D.

As being the present standard plan. I find there is more protection than I thought. I know the matter in the C.S. lands. Probably it is as good as the standard plan rather the standard plan.

L.F.
25/1/82

As shown the standard design since my recollection is that they have no verandahs at all. Perhaps the design has been altered. M

GO 2294 W of 6.9.79.
CL 255 of 4.8.80.

ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

From

The Consulting Architect
to Government,

To

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

No. 798

Dated 18th January 1882

Received

No. of Enclosures. 1 (the)

Breadth of Verandah for
Standard design of Sub Judge
and Munsiff's Court.

Circ. 20.1.82. R.D. 1882
Rel. 24.1.82 R. 26.1.82

an altitude of 45°

In the particular case in question I have compared the Standard plan with the Verandah of the Judges Court at Salem. I selected this Verandah as a fair Typical form after inspecting numerous Verandahs in various parts of the country. In a Verandah lying true north and south and a maximum diurnal duration the sunshine would clear the main wall of the Standard plan about 22 minutes sooner than the Typical plan. 7 or 8 feet is ample breadth for a corridor, and ample as the diagrams will show to secure shade. Any breadth over this therefore not only represents useless expenditure but becomes a source of continual temptation to the owner or occupier. The desire to utilize what must be regarded as waste space is so great, that nearly every Verandah over 10 ft is closed and made into a room. It is unnecessary to point out that this arrangement is more objectionable than building originally without Verandahs at all.

I have the honor to be
sir

Your most obed^t. servant

M. H. Wilson.

Cons. Archt. to Government.

ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

No. 798

CONSULTING ARCHITECT'S OFFICE,
Chopank, 18th Jan'y 1880

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT,

To

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

SIR,

I have the honor to apologize for leaving your Memo No. 255 dated the 4th August 1880 so long unanswered. The delay arose in the first instance from my desire to collect as much information as I could on the subject of the breadth of Verandahs, and latterly the neglect to reply arose from oversight.

2 I am of opinion that in the Presidency town in structures like the new Post and Telegraph Office or in First class residences like Government House Calcutta the Verandahs should be as broad as the funds will admit of, in the former building I have made them 12 ft on the East side and at Government House Calcutta 20 ft on the west. In all other buildings the Verandahs should not be in my opinion broader than the breadth of a roomy corridor and so arranged that the Sunshine should be off the main walls when the orb has attained

Enclosures.

1 Sketch

Memo No. 255 d/4th Aug/80
To the Cons. Architect.

Just being of opinion that the Standard plans of Subjudgets & district magistrates' Court houses, approved for adoption in O.F. No. 2294 W. dated 6th Sept. 1879, have the defect of insufficient protection from the Sun, and need to be revised in that respect, the asst. has the honor to request that the attention of the Cons. Architect to the matter, and to ask for such explanation as Mr. Disbrow may wish to offer.

2. A direct & graphic note turns in feasible.

comparison between the
Standard design and
previous designs might,
the Chief Engineer think,
be obtained by placing
side by side sections
of the veranda allowed
in the Standard design
and in typical examples
from buildings of the
old style with columns
& architraves, showing
the shadow line for
the same angle in
each respectively of
the two elevations.

11/11
3/8

Att

3/8/80

C. A. W.

The H. W.'s remarks
must be communicated
to the Consulting Archi-
tect for such explana-
tions as he may wish
to offer

The best plan
will probably be to
place side by side
sections of the veranda
of this design, and of
typical examples
from buildings of the
old style with columns
and architraves, showing
the shadow line for
the same angle in each
respectively of the two
elevations — A dis-
cussive comparison
will thus be feasible.

2/8/80

Note.

The standard plans of sub-judges' and district munsiffs' court-houses, approved in O.G. No. 2294 W dated 6th September 1879, are forwarded for the Honble Member's inspection, with reference to a remark made by him on a draft order lately returned from circulation.

W. S. S. Col. J. E.
for Secy. to Govt. P. W. D.

W. S. S.
28/7

28th July 1880.

W. S. S.

C. A. W.


The H. M. 2 rooms
to be constructed
at the Consulting Engineer
but for such explanation
in view of no minute
to Office

The last plan
will probably be to
place side by side
sections of the various
of the character, and
typical examples
from buildings of the
old style with columns
and arches, etc.
to show how the
the same style can
be adapted to the
character of the
building.

Mr. W. H. ...


*Submitted to Mr. ...
with plans (in two cases) ...
2/8 ...*

*Cir 28.7.80 Rd 29.7.80 -
O.K. Phil 70 July.*



*NOTE. Additional shade
afforded by Standard
design at the same
moment of time is
shown by light tint.*

SECTION OF VERANDAH.
JUDGES CUTCHERRY. SALEM.



SECTION OF VERANDAH.
STANDARD DESIGN FOR A SUB JUDGE
OR DISTRICT MUNSIKS COURT.

*H. M. ...
18/1/82*