(1) Number of pages 58

(2) Date of repair 6/87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	2543-W	Press. Mis.
Dated	28-9-1882 ~~19~~	

o be folded or roughly handled.

—1 10,006-9 80

A-Main

28TH SEPTEMBER 1882, No. 2543 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 219.

READ—the following papers :—

Note by Consulting Architect to Government.

I have the honor to call your attention generally to the subject of standard designs.

Not long ago a standard design was drawn out by me and circulated for the opinions of the several Collectors of districts; out of twenty gentlemen upwards of fourteen were unanimous in condemning the plan—as the plan in question was carefully prepared from drawings of buildings of its class known to have been successful, I must conclude that with most of the objectors a natural antipathy to standard plans unconsciously swayed their opinions. It is an antipathy I fully share, and hence I venture respectfully to suggest the entire abolition of such drawings.

I consider standard plans objectionable from many points of view. In the first place, no two localities, in my opinion, or no two sites in the same locality can be built over in exactly the same way with a moderate chance of success, and even in the same locality the surroundings and the requirements continually alter. Again, the adherence to standard designs prevents Government from reaping the benefit of officers of standing, who (if want of practice gave them no clear connected idea) could always from superior local knowledge suggest improvements in construction or diminution of materials where peculiar circumstances secured greater strength than usual. Again, that deeper interest and earnestness which all men would naturally feel if executing their own design is eminently calculated to secure to the Government the very best work; while, on the other hand, the feeling of irresponsibility in case of failure, which many men would feel while carrying out the designs of another, must be more or less prejudicial to sound work. Lastly, the impossibility (to which I can testify) of any one man issuing a plan, even backed by a Committee, of which he himself would approve six months after date, shows the hopelessness of endeavouring to attain perfection in this way. Indeed, looking at the question from the most favorable point of view, I can only advocate standard plans from one particular stand-point and that is a questionable one. In the possession of a standard plan a man incompetent of portraying a connected idea can secure to the Government a fair and reasonable structure, but how far it may be good to the department generally for such an one to rank with officers of real ability is open to question.

I would not venture to advocate the wholesale abolition of an established custom were I not able to point out a course which, though a little more troublesome at first, would, I am certain, eventually succeed, and while securing to this Presidency the maximum value of the money expended on public works, would at the same time tend to raise the individual efficiency of every officer in the department. I allude to the publication at the end of each year of lithographed plans and sections of every building constructed during the year, with a short descriptive notice by the builders. The merits of their published plans would be keenly appreciated by the inexpert craftsman, and a careful analysis of their excellencies a welcome relief to the drudgery of strict adherence to a standard plan. The defects would be continually modified by the more expert, whose plans, in their turn, would come under consideration. The expense to Government would not, I think, be more than the cost of issuing standard designs, but even if it were so a small charge for each copy would cover the cost of production.

It is by means similar to these that the present high standard of design has been attained in Europe and America, and I see no reason for doubting the issue so far as this country is concerned.

I think for the first it would be advisable to pass every plan through the hands of the Consulting Architect, who could without any difficulty point out any serious error of construction or waste of material, and who would be useful in suppressing meaningless additions of questionable ornament, for I have observed that a great many buildings in this country are marred by apparently an insatiable crave for ornament. The competition and desire to excel would probably render this procedure unnecessary in a very short time.

Although I am regarding this question from an architectural point of view, and with reference to those standard designs which Government have honored me by entrusting to me professionally, I think such a scheme would work equally well in regard to engineering works. The annual volume would not be unlike the "Roorkee papers," only that I would confine its sphere to the illustration and description of works actually executed.

16th June 1882.
(Signed) R. F. CHISHOLM,
Consulting Architect to Government.

No. 1298 C.

Memorandum by Chief Engineer.

In forwarding a copy of the Consulting Architect's Note upon the subject of "Standard Designs," the Chief Engineer remarks that although owing, in some instances, to deficiency in special architectural training, officers of the department may require the guidance to a certain extent of the Consulting Architect, he would nevertheless prefer to designate the Consulting Architect's "Standard Designs" as "Type Designs," and give full liberty to officers of the department to modify or even entirely change the "style" of such designs, when they feel themselves able to strike out a happy thought. He considers that all such modified designs should go to the Consulting Architect for criticism, and that the best of them should in turn be adopted or circulated as "types."

2. The Chief Engineer requests that he may be favored with the opinions of Superintending Engineers on this subject.

(By Order.)
20th September 1882.
(Signed) ROSS THOMPSON, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Ag. Dy. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

From the Superintending Engineer, First Circle, dated 3rd August 1882, No. 236 G.I.
" " " Fifth Circle, " 5th " " " 1685
" " " Sixth Circle, " 5th " " " 808 T.J.
" " " Fourth Circle, " 9th " " " 323
" " " Second Circle, " 24th " " " 204 G.L.
" " " Third Circle, " 5th Sept. " " 982

No. 220.

ORDER—dated 28th September 1882, No. 2543 W., Public Works.

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council, agreeing with the Consulting Architect and the majority of the officers consulted, as to the useful results likely to be attained by some relaxation of existing practice in regard to "Standard" Designs, resolves to direct that designs of this character shall in future be termed "Type" Designs, and that they shall be liable to modification to suit local requirements; such modifications being approved by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, after consultation when necessary with the Government Architect.

2. Type Designs will be lithographed and circulated under the same arrangements as Standard Designs have hitherto been supplied.

(True Extract.)

Lieut.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Consulting Architect to Government.
To Superintending Engineers.
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Consulting Engineer for Railways.
" General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops.
" Financial, &c., Departments.
" Revenue Department.
" Military "

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated September, 28th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 28th Sept. 1882, No. 2543 W.

SEPTEMBER.
Nos. 219-220.

"Standard Designs."

Designating the Consulting Architect's — as "Type Designs" with the object allowing alterations in them if necessary.

Note by R. F. Chisholm Esq.re
Consulting Architect to Government
dated 16th June 1882

2543/3

I have the honor to call your attention generally to the subject of Standard designs.

Not long ago a Standard design was drawn out by me and circulated for the opinions of the Several Collectors of districts; out of twenty Gentlemen upwards of fourteen were unanimous in condemning the plan - as the plan in question was carefully prepared from drawings of buildings of its class known to have been Successful, I must conclude that with most of the objectors a natural antipathy to Standard plans unconsciously Swayed their opinions, It is an antipathy I fully Share, and hence I venture respectfully to suggest the entire abolition of Such drawings.

I consider Standard plans objectionable from many points of view. In the first place no two localities in my opinion or no two sites in the same locality can be built over in exactly the same way with a moderate chance of Success and even in the same locality the Surroundings and the requirements continually alter. Again the adherence to Standard designs prevents Government from reaping the benefit of officers of Standing who (if want of practice gave them no clear connected idea) could always from Superior local knowledge suggest improvements in construction or diminution of materials where peculiar circumstances secured greater Strength than usual. Again, that deeper interest and earnestness which all men would naturally feel if executing their own design, is eminently calculated to secure to the Government the very best work while on the other hand the feeling of irresponsibility in case of failure which many men would feel while carrying out the designs of another must be more or less

prejudicial

judicial to sound work lastly the impossibility (to which I can testify) of any one man issuing a plan even backed by a Committee of which he himself would approve 6 months after date shows the hopelessness of endeavouring to attain perfection in this way. Indeed looking at the question from the most favourable point of view. I can only advocate Standard plans from one particular Stand point and that is a questionable one. For the possession of a Standard plan a man incompetant of portraying a corrected idea can secure to the Government a fair and reasonable structure but how far it may be good to the department generally for such an one to rank with officers of real ability is open to question.

I would not venture to advocate the wholesale abolition of an established custom were I not able to point out a course which though a little more troublesome at first would I am certain eventually succeed and while securing to this Presidency the maximum value of the money expended on Public Works, would at the same time tend to raise the individual efficiency of every Officer in the Department; I allude to the publication at the end of each year of lithographed plans and Sections of every building constructed during the year with a short discriptive notice by the builders. The merits of their published plans would be keenly appreciated by the inexpert craftsman and a careful analysis of their Excellencies a wellcome relief to the drudgery of strict adherence to a Standard plan. The defects would be continually modified by the more expert, whose plans in their turn would come under consideration. The expense to Government would not I think be more than the cost of issuing Standard designs but even if it were so a small charge for each copy would cover the cost of production.

It is by means similar to these that the present high Standard of design has been attained in Europe and America and I see no reason for doubting the issue so far as this country is concerned.

I think for the first it would be advisable to pass every plan through the hands of the Consulting Architect who could without any difficulty point out any serious error of construction or waste of material and who would be useful in suppressing meaningless additions of questionable ornament for I have observed that a great many buildings in this country are marred by apparently an insatiable crave for ornament. The competition and desire to excel would probably render this procedure unnecessary in a very short time.

Although I am regarding this question from an Architectural point of view and with reference to those Standard designs which Government have honored me by entrusting to me professionally, I think such a scheme would work equally well in regard to Engineering works. The annual Volume would not be unlike the "Roorkee Papers" only that I would confine its sphere to the illustration and discription of works actually executed.

25/4

Public Works Depart.
No. 1298 C. dated 26th June 1882
Circular.

P 2

In forwarding a copy of the Consulting Architects' Note upon the subject of "Standard Designs," the Chief Engineer remarks that although owing in some instances to deficiency in Special Architectural training Officers of the Department may require the

guidance

guidance to a certain extent of the Consulting Architect he would nevertheless prefer to designate the Consulting Architect Standard Designs as Type Designs and give full liberty to officers of the Department to modify or even entirely change the "Style" of such designs, when they feel themselves able to strike out a happy thought. He considers that all such modified designs should go to the Consulting Architect to criticism and that the best of them should in turn be adopted or circulated as types".

2. The Chief Engineer requests that he may be favored with the opinions of Superintending Engineers on this Subject.

(By order)

R. D. Thompson
Lieut. Col. R.E.
Ag. Dy. Chief Engr.
P.W.D.

To
All Supg. Engrs.
Cong. Archt. for information

54/5

To
all Superintending Engineers

In forwarding ~~the case~~ a copy of the Cons Architects ~~remarks~~ note upon the subject of "Standard Designs" the Chief Engineer remarks that, although owing in some instances to deficiency in special architectural training officers of the Department may require the guidance to a certain extent of ~~the~~ ~~professional~~ Consulting Architect. he would nevertheless prefer to designate the Cons Architects "Standard designs" as "type designs" and give full liberty to officers of the Department to modify or even entirely change the "Style" of such designs, when they feel themselves able to strike out a happy thought. — He considers that all such modified designs should go to the Consulting Architect

preparation

for Criticism — and that the best of them should in turn be adopted or circulated as "Types" — The Chief Engineer requests that he may be favored with the opinions of Supdg. Engrs on this subject.

by order.

20.6.82

Seen

21/6/82

Supdg: Engrs
C.A. for information

Seen 21/6

NO. 236 G. L.

FROM

Executive
THE ~~SUPERINTENDING~~ ENGINEER
in charge FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

Enclos.

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
P.W. Department
FOR ~~IRRIGATION~~.

Dowlaishweram, 3rd August 1882
Despd 4th Do

SIR,

With reference to Circular No. 1298 C of 26th June 1882, I have the honor to state that as far as standard or type plans now exist they are in my opinion a decided advantage.

2. It must be remembered that the buildings for which type designs have been sanctioned Cutcherries Registrar's Offices &c &c offer little or no scope for a display of Architectural skill in design; such buildings are mere combinations of tiled roofs pillars walls & verandas, of course one man might make a better combination than another but the type designs answer pretty well and in a District like this where Executive Officers and their Draughtsmen have but little spare time much delay is saved in the preparation

preparation of estimates by merely having to trace the type designs & fill in the rates of the locality in the estimate.

3. For any buildings likely to be ever required of an original character such as residences for Civil Officers, Clock towers, Churches &c standard plans would I think be a mistake, as Mr Chisholm remarks some spirit of emulation should be encouraged and where considered necessary changes & if possible improvements on type designs allowed, but I am not so sure that such alterations should be submitted to the Consulting Architect, who could scarcely be expected to approve of changes in his designs the Superintending Engineer would correct any fault of structural detail.

4. In the Irrigation Department a certain number of type designs of Aqueducts, sluices and bridges have been issued these serve as guides, but separate designs are prepared to suit the nature of varying localities.

5. I quite agree with Mr Chisholm in the much greater feeling of interest a man feels in carrying out a work of his own design – but as I have

mentioned

mentioned the general run of building to be constructed by this Department are so similar in character that little scope for variety of design is afforded. As far as I have seen, the general tendency of design is the very reverse of ornamental× sufficient stability of design coupled with neatness and suitability to the proposed requirements and locality should generally be aimed at, in preference to ornament, for the general run of mofussil buildings.

× Mr Chisholm's Plans excepted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant
E C
Exe: Engineer in charge 1st Circle

Compd by
OB

Memo: 1298C-26-6-82.

P.W.L. 205529

From

The Supg. Engineer
1st Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

Dated 3rd }
Despd. 4th } August 1882
Received 10th }

No. 236 G.L.

Enclosure

Standard or type Plans — Offering Opinions as to the —

Con file —

CM 10/8

No. 1685.

25/8

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
5TH CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepauk, 5th August 1882.

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5TH CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
D.P.W.

Enclosures.

SIR,

In reply to your Circular No. 1298 of the 26th June 1882, I have the honor to state, that in my opinion, type designs are of great use, and that the Standard plans to serve as such should not be abolished.

2. I think it would be of advantage, as recommended by the Executive Engineer of South Arcot, if each of the approved type designs were accompanied by a detailed and abstract estimate and if each Division were supplied with a suffi-

=cient

sufficient number of copies for use when wanted, instead of time & labor being wasted in having the designs copied. Major Smith also points out that dimensions should be entered fully upon the type design, as without them the plan loses much of its value.

3. The Consulting Architect considers he would alter a plan of his own after 6 months time, and I think any one who sends him a plan for criticism must expect that it will certainly be altered — Hence there is not much encouragement to an Officer to send in what he may consider an improved design. The Consulting Architect would, I presume, send the Executive Engineers plan with his Remarks to the Chief Engineer for orders, and I think the Executive Engineer should send his plan in pencil before making out his estimate so as not

---

not to have the fair drawing and calculations made out a second time.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant
Alexr Grendey Lt Col R.E.
Superintendg Engineer
5th Circle

Memo 1298C. 26-6-82.

P.W.S. No. 5232

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5TH CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Dated 5th } August 1882
Recd. 9th }

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1685.

Type designs &ca.

Gives his opinion regarding the use of ______

P.L. 30/9.
Rly 14/9 Re 28/9

No. 808 T.J.

Supdt. Engineer's office
5/ Lower Circuit. 5th August 1882.
Despd: 9th.

From

Colonel J. Beatty R.E.
Supdt. Engineer, 5th circle.

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey C.B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Sir,

In reply to your Circular No. 1298C of 26th June 1882, I have the honor to state that I agree with you that all that is necessary is the alteration of the term "standard" to "Type" in regard to Mr. Chisholm's designs, permission being given to officers who desire to do so to modify or even entirely alter the design when necessary.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant.

J. Beatty - Col. R.E.
Supdt. Engineer, 5th circle.

Memo 1298C. 26. 6. 82.

P. W. C. S. 1537/4

From.

The Supt. Engineer
6. Circle.

To.

The Chief Engr.
P. W. D.

No. 808 T. J.

Dated 5. August/8

Recd 14 August/82

Mr. Chisholm's
Designs—

Offers his opinion
in regard to—

Cont

Ofl. 30/9

acky 14/9 Re 28/9

No. 323

Superintending Engrs. Office IVth Circle
Camp Arnee 9th August 1882.

From

The Superintending Engineer
IVth Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

Sir

With reference to your circular No. 1298C dated 26th June 1882 forwarding the note by Mr. Chisholm Consulting Architect to Govt. regarding standard plans I have the honor to report that I consider standard plans as absolutely necessary the mere fact of 14 Collectors out of 20 condemning a plan proposed by the architect (most probably all on different grounds or giving no definite reasons for their disapproval) shews the real facts of the case namely that most Collectors or heads of departments in districts consider that they are capable of designing a building and that as it is to be built for their department that they and they alone ought to be the sole judges of what should be built what accommodation is necessary and that all their ideas (often most crude) should be carried by the Engineer without a word.

2 Any Officer of any standing in the Deptt. will be able to bring forward instances of the

difficulty

difficulty & trouble he has often had in designing buildings in communication with Officers who consider that it is Engineers' duty to carry out without question their crude ideas which often are impracticable.

3. I consider that standard plans sanctioned by Govt. are as necessary for civil buildings as they are for military so that there may be no question as regards the space allowed and the arrangements to be made, it is right and necessary therefore that this should be settled and laid down by authority once and for all and the question not opened and discussed whenever a building has to be designed.

4. As above stated in my opinion standard designs are necessary and it is great help to the department that they should be lithographed and the specifications & detailed estimates printed but few Officers have time even if they have the talent to make out new designs. I consider however that Officers should be allowed, should they wish to do so, to send in alternative designs for sanction but I cannot see the advantage of these being sent through the Govt. architect. I consider Govt. must, through the Chief Engineer, decide which is the best the Govt. architect's design (the standard) or the alternative design sent in by the Officer. If the Govt. architect is to be allowed to critisize the design, the Officer should be allowed to see the critisism and make a reply and possibly the Officers plan may become the standard.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servt.
Lieut. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engr. IVth Circ

Memo 1298C - 26.6.82.

P.W.C.S. 13

From

The Supg Engineer,
~~Fourth~~ Circle

Dated 9th
Despd. 10th } Augt 1882.

No: 323.

Standard Plans.—

Reports that he considers — absolutely necessary.

ol 30/9.
G 14/9 Re 28/9

Compile
Cr
1/8

No 204 G.L.

Superintending Engineer's Office
2nd Circle, Masulipatam
24th August 1882

25/8

From

The Superintending Engineer,
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor, in reply to your No 1298.C of the 26th June, to state that, the issue of Type designs would in my opinion be preferable to Standard designs. It is, of course, necessary, in the case of all Buildings that there should be fixed limit as to the maximum amount of accommodation and space to be provided, and of the cost which will be permitted.

2 A Standard design has this advantage that it fixes definitely the accommodation to be provided, and thus prevents the Departments concerned demanding increased

space, which would otherwise probably be the case.

3. Mr Grant whom I have consulted in the matter, notes that, from an Executive Engineer's point of view, there is this great advantage in a standard plan, that it saves much time in the preparation of Estimates; not only are the quantities ready to his hand, when once the depth of foundations have been determined, but that after spending much time to produce a design to satisfy the requirements of the case, and to have at the same time some claim to beauty, he might find that after all the Consulting architect's design would be very much better.

4. Captain Henderson R.E. thinks standard designs, from which no deviations are allowed, objectionable, and considers that if within certain limits the Executive Engineer, may make alterations, type designs will encourage Officers to seek for improvement both in design and in construction.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obdt. Servant

J. W. Rendall
Superintending Engineer,
2nd Circle

memo 1298C - 26-6-82.

P.W.C. No. 5893

From

The Supg: Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Dated 24th August 1882
Recd 30th August/82

No. 204 G.L.

Standard Designs-
Informing that type designs are preferable to the—

these are [illegible]
compilation [illegible] Sep/82

Campbell
CE
20/9

[illegible] 30/9

ooty 16/9 Re 28/9

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
~~MADRAS~~,
Bellary ~~Chepauk~~, 5th September 1882.

No. 982

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
III ~~1st~~ CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P. W. Department
Madras.

SIR,

Enclosures.
1

With reference to your Circular No. 1298.C, dated 26th June 1882, on the subject of "Standard Designs", I have the honor to say that I am of opinion that Standard or Type designs should continue to be circulated, with the understanding however that Officers need not be bound by them in every detail, but that they are at liberty if so inclined (and qualified) to suggest modifications, or to prepare new designs and submit them for sanction.

2. Some Officers of the Department are deficient in special Architectural training, and they require to be guided to some

extent by the Consulting Architects' designs; but from their superior local knowledge, practical experience &c, such Officers will often be able to suggest appropriate modifications of a design, or introduce new features suitable to local or other circumstances.

3. Such modified, or new and original designs, might then be sent to the Consulting Architect for his remarks, and the proposed modifications, or the whole new design, be adopted, if approved of.

4. Standard designs are objectionable only if, as Mr. Chisholm calls it " the drudgery of strict adherence " to them is enforced.

5. The Consulting Architects designs should be considered as Type designs, with liberty to Officers to modify them.

6. The circulation of a modified design, after a building has been completed and found successful, and an improvement under its particular circumstances on the standard design, would I think be useful; and the annual volume thus produced of lithographed plans and sections of buildings constructed during the year would form a valuable book of reference.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Offg: Superintending Engineer

III Circle

[illegible] 1298C. 26 6 82

From

The Superintending Engineer,

~~1st~~ III Circle,

Bellary

To

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.

Madras

Dated 5th September 1882
Recd.

ENCLOSURES.

No. 982

Standard Designs

Reporting on the—

O.d. 20/9.
on 14/9 Re 20/9

~~[illegible]~~ For private circulation

Consulting Architects Office
Chepauk ~~[illegible]~~ 1882

From

The Consulting Architect
to government

To

The Chief Engineer P. W. D.
Roads and Buildings branch

Sir,

I have the honor to call your attention generally to the subject of Standard designs.

Not long ago a Standard design was drawn out by me and circulated for the opinion of the several Collectors of districts; out of twenty Gentlemen upwards of fourteen were unanimous in condemning the plan. As the plan in question was carefully prepared from drawings of buildings of its class known to have been successful, I must conclude that with most of the objectors a natural antipathy to Standard plans unconsciously swayed their opinions. It is an antipathy I fully share, and hence I venture respectfully to suggest the entire abolition of such drawings.

I consider Standard plans objectionable from many points of view. In the first place no two localities in my opinion or no two sites in the same locality can be built over in exactly the same way with a moderate chance of success and even in the same locality the surroundings and the requirements continually alter. Again the adherence to Standard designs prevents Government from reaping the benefit of officers of standing who (if want of practice gave them no clear connected idea) could always from superior local knowledge suggest improvements in construction or diminution of materials where peculiar circumstances ~~[illegible]~~ secured greater strength than usual. Again, that deeper interest and earnestness which all men would naturally feel if executing their own design is eminently calculated to secure to the Government the very best work while on the other hand the feeling of irresponsibility in case of failure which ~~any~~ Many men would feel while carrying out the designs of another must be more or less prejudicial to sound work, lastly the impossibility (to which I can testify) of any one man issuing a plan even backed by a Committee of which he himself would approve 6 months after date shows the hopelessness of endeavouring to attain perfection in this way. Indeed looking at the question from the most favorable point of view. I can only advocate Standard plans from one particular stand point and that is a questionable one. In the possession of a Standard plan a man incompetent of portraying a connected idea can secure to the Government a fair and reasonable structure but how far it may be good to the department generally for such ~~[illegible]~~ an one to rank with officers of real ability is open to question.

I would not venture to advocate the wholesale abolition of an established custom were I not able point out a course which though a little more troublesome at first would I am certain ~~eventually~~ Eventually succeed and while securing to this Presidency the maximum value of the money expended on Public Works, would at the same time tend to raise the individual efficiency of every Officer in the Department; I allude to the publication at the end of each year of lithographed plans and sections of every building constructed during the year with a short discriptive notice by the builders. The merits of their published plans would be keenly appreciated by the inexpert craftsman and a careful analysis of their Excellencies a welcome relief to the ~~drudging~~ drudgery of strict adherence to a Standard plan. The defects would be continually modified by the more expert, whose plans in their turn would come under consideration. The expense to Government would not I think be more than the cost of issuing Standard designs but even if it were so a small charge for each copy would cover the cost of production.

It is by means similar to ~~those~~ these that the present high standard of design has been attained in Europe and America, and I see no reason for doubting the issue so far as this country is concerned —

I think for the first it would be advisable to pass every plan through the hands of the Consulting Architect who could without any difficulty point out any serious error of construction or waste of material and who would be useful in suppressing meaningless additions of questionable ornament for I have observed that ~~nearly all~~ a great many buildings in this country are marred by apparently an insatiable crave for ornament. The competition and desire to excel would probably render this procedure unnecessary in a very short time. —

Although I am regarding this question from an Architectural point of view and with reference to those Standard designs which Government have honored me by entrusting to me professionally, I think such a scheme would work equally well in regard to Engineering works. The annual Volume would not be unlike the "Roorkee Papers" only that I would confine its sphere to the illustration and description of works actually executed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedt. servant
R. Chisholm
Consg. Archt. to Government

Rough draft

Roads and Buildings

From

The Consulting Architect
to Government

To

The Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Roads & Buildings branch

No. ~~[illegible]~~

Dated ~~[illegible]~~ June 1882

Received.

No. of enclosures

— Standard plans

P.H. 54/6 –

W.

Please see S.A.W.'s
Summary of replies – Committee
The S.Es. agree on the
following points.

I. That Standard Designs
are useful and good
all round.

II. That by substituting
the title "Type" for
"Standard" designs
Elasticity would be gained.

III. That the Chief Engr
and not the Consulting
Architect, should criticize
and decide upon the
merits of any modified
Standard, or original designs
Submitted by D.P.W. officers.

I suppose all that is to be
done now – is in future
to call the C.A.'s designs
"Type" instead of "Standard"
The final decision on
the merits of modified or
original designs submitted
by D.P.W. officers naturally
rests with the Chief Engr.
subj to Govt. 10/6/82

modify or even entirely

is no reason why he should
[illegible] when he pleases call
on the C.A. for criticism
and scrutiny of such plans
designs.

16.9.82

[illegible] W

Approved —
[illegible] accordingly.
The C.E. can of
course always ask
the opinion of the
C.A. who is necessarily
his professional ad-
-viser in such matters

16.9.82

C.A.W.
Please intimate to the
C.A. and S.Es. that in future
"Type" will be substituted for
"Standard" both for existing
designs and for designs not
yet published. — The object
of this being to allow officers
to depart from the "Type" in
the designs they submit, should
they find any good grounds for
doing so.
17.9.82

O.L. 54/6

No 1298C d/26 16/10

2573/2 16 June 1882.

My dear Sankey.

As the steamer's departure is delayed two days, among other things I knocked off enclosed. Read it at your leisure and tell me if you think

---

modify or even entirely

is no reason why he sho

it wise to submit it officially, and if not consign it please to the waste paper basket.

Yours faithfully

H Chisholm

Dr. W

Please look over this and let me know what you think -

Owing to deficiency in special architectural training I doubt from what I have seen of the designs that have reached the office whether our men can get on without guidance but instead of calling Chisholm's "Standard" I would prefer to designate them "type" designs and give full liberty to modification or even to entire change of "style"

ol. 54/-

modify or even entirely

when the Executive felt himself able to strike out a happy ~~thought~~

All such should go to [illegible] for Criticism

The best of the designs might in turn be adopted or circulated as types

Before taking any action in this matter would it not be well to circulate C's note with a few observations to the S E's Enquiring [illegible] and if you see your way to this kindly do so

13·6·82

P.H. 54/6

No 1298C d/26/6/82

Circular

In forwarding a copy of the Consulting Architect's Note upon the subject of "Standard Designs," the Chief Engineer remarks that although owing in some instances to deficiency in special architectural training officers of the Department may require the guidance to a certain extent of the Consulting Architect: he would nevertheless prefer to designate the Consulting Architects' "Standard designs" as "type designs" and give full libert to officers of the Department to modify or even entirely change the "style" of such designs, when they feel themselves able to strike out a happy thought. He considers that all such modified designs should go to the Consulting Architect for criticism – and that the best of them should in turn be adopted or circulated as "types."

2. The Chief Engineer requests that he may be favored with the opinions of Supdg Engineers on this subject.

22-6-82

1298 C. d/ 26-6-82.

Lithograph with Cons. Architect's letter in full

[illegible] 27.6

·25

Drwd 12/7

To

All Superintending Engineers

~~Consg Architect~~ for [illegible]

Sketch in Receipt Regr

To Dy W.

Summary of replies from Supdg Engrs to Ch. Engr's Circular No 1298C dated 26th June 1882 – relative to a proposal to substitute "type" for "Standard" designs – & to give officers of the dept. liberty to modify, or even entirely alter the style of such designs, when they wish to do so

S.E. I – Considers that as far as Standard designs now exist, they are a decided advantage – the general run of official buildings offer but little scope for a display of architectural skill, & as officers of the dept have but little spare time, much delay is saved by having designs ready to hand – For buildings of an original character however, such as residences Churches &c, a spirit of

[illegible] 14/7

emulation should be en-couraged, & changes ~~of~~ and improvements on type designs allowed, but he is not so sure that such alterations should be submitted to the Consg. Architect who could scarcely be expected to approve of changes in his designs –

S.E. II – Type designs would be preferable to Standard designs, but it is necessary in the case of all buildings that the maximum amount of accommodation & cost should be fixed – Mr. Executive Engr. Grant considers that much time is saved in the preparation of estimates by the issue of standard plans, but Capt. Henderson is of opinion that if within certain limits Ex. Engrs. are allowed to make alterations, type designs will encourage officers to seek for improvement both in design and construction –

[illegible] 26-6-82

S. E. III – Agrees with the circular in all points, & thinks that if modified designs, when found successful, be lithographed & circulated to the dept, the annual volume thus produced would form a valuable book of reference

S. E. IV – Considers that Standard designs are absolutely necessary, in order that there may be no question as to space allowed & arrangements to be made – Most Collectors or heads of depts in districts consider themselves capable of designing a building & expect Ex: Engrs. to carry out their (often most crude) ideas without a word. Standards should therefore be fixed by authority once & for all, so that discussions cannot be raised every time a

Officers – who will set

building has to be designed. Officers of the Dept. should however be allowed, ~~should~~ if they wish to do so, to send up an alternative design, but the decision in such cases should rest with the Ch. Engr. & not the Consg. Architect.

S. E. V. – Standard plans are of great use, & should not be abolished. If, as the Consg. Architect says, he would alter a plan of his own after six months, he would be certain to alter the plans of another, & hence there would not be much encouragement to an officer to send in what he may consider an improved design.

S. E. VI. Agrees with the Chief Engineer that all that is necessary is the alteration

of the term "Standard" to "type", permission being given to officers who desire to do so, to modify or even entirely alter the design when necessary.

For orders.

Cy
14/9/82

Recd. [illegible] 26-6-82

Retd. in receipt

Officers – "who will ab

[illegible] 26-6-82 Entd in Receipt

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 188 . { P. W. DEPT.

SECRETARY.

188 .

OFFICE NOTE.

2543 W

To W.

Your office Note of 19.6.82 – re – Chisholms. D.O. regarding Standard Designs.

I think with you that as yet our people cannot quite walk alone in the matter of designs for buildings of any importance – ~~and~~ but that with the relaxation you and Chisholm propose – viz – considering the Cons. Architect's designs as "type" – and not absolutely "Standard" many valuable ideas and modifications may be offered by Executive Officers – who will ab-once. be put upon this matter — we do not know what talent in the direction we at present possess in the Department — but your proposal will I think go far to elicit what there is.

I would of course at first pass all designs of the officers through the Cons. Architect's mill — but in time — with the opening before them of distinguishing themselves — good men will I have no doubt come to the front, whose knowledge skill and taste may be accepted without much question. —

In short I think the proposal is good all round — and must eventually prove advantageous to the Govt. and the Executive Officers of the Department.

I am having copies of the Cons. Archt's remarks made to send to each Supdg. Engr. with a note conveying the gist of your office note done on this subject.

20.6.82

D. W

Very good — I quite approve

21/6/82

No: 2543 N

Pl. [illegible]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 28th Septr. 82

Read the following:—

From

The Consg. Architect to Govt. (H. E. No. — d/16th June /82)

Chief Engineer's Memo: (— 1298 C d/d/26th —)

From The Supg. Engr. First Circle (— 236 G.L. d/ 3rd Augt. —)

" — do — Second " (— 204 G.L. d/ 24th ")

" — do — Third " (" " 982 d/ 5th Septr. —)

" — do — Fourth — " — (" — " 323 d/ 9th Augt. /82)

" — do — Fifth " (" — " 1685 — " — 5th — " — ")

" — do — Sixth " (" — " 808 I. J. d/ 5th — " — ")

The Right Honble the Governor in Council, agreeing with the Consulting Architect and the majority of the officers consulted, as to the useful results likely to be attained by some relaxation of existing practice in regard to "Standard" Designs, resolves to direct that designs of this character shall in future be ~~designed~~ termed "Type" Designs, and that they shall be liable to modification to suit local requirements;- such modifications being approved ~~of~~ by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Dept., after consultation when necessary with the Govt. Architect.

2. Type Designs will be lithographed and circulated under the same arrangements as Standard Designs have hitherto been supplied.

170
18

pnd 6/10

Consg. Architect to Govt. √
Supg. Engineers 8 √
Chief Engr. for I. 9 √
Cons. Engr. for Rys. 11 √
Genl. Supdt. P.W. Workshops √
Financial &c. Depts. 7 √
Revenue Dept. 21 √
Military Dept. 15 √

R.S.
1/4

Ex. Ed. Cir. 3/19 Rel 26/4

11/9/83

5:3748 n

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated. 27/9

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 28th Sept. 1882, No. 2545 W.

Nos. 219 & 220

"Standard Designs"

Designating the Cons: Architect's — as "Type Designs" with the object of allowing alterations in them if necessary.

r. 8/9

Dr 8/9

Entd. in Receipt Reg.