

1770 4/27/85 450  
 39 W 4 7/1/85 2329 4/27/85  
 300 W 4 5/2/84  
 1253 C 4 2/3/7/85  
 1210 C 4 16/7/85  
 2062 D 4 19/11/84  
 123 C 4 17/1/84  
 No. 20 38 W 4 20 Sept/85

July 12

Govt. of (1885) Madras.  
 FINANCIAL.

Communicated to the  
 Supply Engineer V Circle & the  
 Consulting Architect.

S.S.C

2. The attention of  
 the former officer will  
 be directed to para 3.

Issued

Recd. 24/8/85.

Encl.

G.O., 10th August 1885, No. 378 M.

No. 20 38 W 4 20 Sept/85  
 has no connection with the  
 question of  
 AUGUST.

C.S.  
 25.8.85

W  
 26.8.85

Supply Eng. V Circle ✓  
 Consulting Architect ✓ per  
 Enr. P. W. Accounts. 2/9

Oct. 1/4/8.  
 Co. 26.8.85. 2.31.8.85

Government Buildings.

Recording letter from the President, Madras Municipality, furnishing information regarding the assessment on —, and passing orders on the remarks of the Consulting Architect on the mode of assessment.

10TH AUGUST 1885, No. 378 M., FINANCIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.  
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras, dated 12th November 1884, R. No. 1259.

ABSTRACT.—Forwards a budget estimate for assessment on Government buildings and lands from 1st January 1885 to 31st March 1886.

From Colonel H. L. PRENDERGAST, R.E., Superintending Engineer, V Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk, 14th July 1885, No. 1576.

One endorsement, No. 2062 D.  
„ letter, No. 1259.  
„ budget estimate.

In returning your endorsement, No. 2062, dated 19th November 1884, I have the honor to report that the municipal assessment on—

Additions to the Medical College,  
Do. General Hospital,  
Do. Presidency Magistrate's Court,  
Do. Small Cause Court,  
Do. Penitentiary,  
Do. Ordnance quarters, and  
Do. Stamp and Stationery office

is correct. But, as the work on the last building is not yet completed, the assessment should be admitted only on the understanding that it is to be claimed from the date on which the building is brought into use.

2. The assessment as claimed by the municipality on the additions to the Leper Hospital, Rs. 201-4-10, and on the Police tannah, Rs. 22-14-0, are incorrect, and should be Rs. 192-14-6 and Rs. 19-8-4, the actual cost of the works being Rs. 21,076 and Rs. 2,140.

3. The assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal are not reported on, as these buildings are in charge of the Consulting Architect.

No. 1210-C.

Referred to the Consulting Architect for the early submission of a report on the municipal assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
16th July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

From R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk, 20th July 1885, No. 622.

I have the honor to return the papers received with your endorsement, No. 1210-C, dated the 16th instant, and to state that, without knowing the total assessment on the

Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal, it is impossible to say whether the additional assessment on account of additional accommodation is correct or not, for the added portion, when alterations are effected in an existing building, can never enhance the value of the building by the amount expended. In order to arrive at the correct enhanced value we must know what parts of the building were removed, how much was expended in converting existing parts to new uses, and a variety of questions connected with repairs extremely complicated.

2. It appears that the principle the municipality adopt is simply to add to a former assessment an additional assessment based on the amount expended on the particular building during the year.

3. This seems to me to be wrong, and I would venture to suggest that the valuation on which assessment is made should be the cubical contents of the buildings at a fair valuation per foot.

4. I have so valued the two buildings in question, and find they should be assessed respectively at 2,394 rupees and 1,389 rupees per annum. As I before stated I do not know what the actual sums claimed amount to.

No. 1253-C.

Transferred to the Financial department, and the referred papers returned.

2. Special attention is invited to the Consulting Architect's remarks.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
23rd July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 10th August 1885, No. 378 M., Financial.

Recorded, the information furnished in the first of the letters above read being no longer necessary as the Provincial Service budget, for which it was intended, has already been passed by the Government and the Government of India.

2. With reference to the Consulting Architect's remarks, to which attention is invited by the Public Works department, it is observed that the municipal assessment expected to let (section 123 of Act I of 1884) and not on the amount spent on the buildings, nor their value calculated on the cubic contents. Should this assessment appear excessive, it is the duty of the officers in charge of the buildings to see that all legal measures are taken to reduce it (*vide* section 196 of the Act).

3. There appears to have been very great delay in the disposal of the matter by the Superintending Engineer.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,  
Chief Secretary.

To the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras.  
„ Public Works department.  
„ Revenue department.  
„ Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

2790  
No. 2038 Wd. 2<sup>d</sup> Sept 1885

Communicated to the Supply  
Engineer V Circle, and the  
Consulting Architect.

2 The attention of the  
former officer will be  
directed to para 3.

Sd/- J.S.S.  
W.

Supply Engineer V Circle  
Consulting Architect  
Enr. S. W. Accounts.

Govt. of 1885 Madras.  
FINANCIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 10th August 1885, No. 378 M.

No. 2038 Wd. 2<sup>d</sup> Sept 1885

AUGUST.

Government Buildings.

Recording letter from the President, Madras  
Municipality, furnishing information regarding  
the assessment on —, and passing orders on the  
remarks of the Consulting Architect on the mode  
of assessment.

10TH AUGUST 1885, No. 378 M., FINANCIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras, dated 12th November  
1884, R. No. 1259.

ABSTRACT.—Forwards a budget estimate for assessment on Government buildings and lands  
from 1st January 1885 to 31st March 1886.

From Colonel H. L. PRENDERGAST, R.E., Superintending Engineer,  
V Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk,  
14th July 1885, No. 1576.

One endorsement, No. 2062 D.  
,, letter, No. 1259.  
,, budget estimate.

In returning your endorsement, No.  
2062, dated 19th November 1884, I have  
the honor to report that the municipal  
assessment on—

Additions to the Medical College,  
Do. General Hospital,  
Do. Presidency Magistrate's Court,  
Do. Small Cause Court,  
Do. Penitentiary,  
Do. Ordnance quarters, and  
Do. Stamp and Stationery office

is correct. But, as the work on the last building is not yet completed, the assessment  
should be admitted only on the understanding that it is to be claimed from the date  
on which the building is brought into use.

2. The assessment as claimed by the municipality on the additions to the Leper  
Hospital, Rs. 201-4-10, and on the Police tannah, Rs. 22-14-0, are incorrect, and should  
be Rs. 192-14-6 and Rs. 19-8-4, the actual cost of the works being Rs. 21,076 and  
Rs. 2,140.

3. The assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amir Mahal are not  
reported on, as these buildings are in charge of the Consulting Architect.

No. 1210-C.

Referred to the Consulting Architect for the early submission of a report on the  
municipal assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amir Mahal.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
16th July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

From R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras,  
to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk, 20th July  
1885, No. 622.

I have the honor to return the papers received with your endorsement, No. 1210-C,  
dated the 16th instant, and to state that, with the above, I am forwarding the total assessment on the

Public Works offices and the Amfr Mahal, it is impossible to say whether the additional assessment on account of additional accommodation is correct or not, for the added portion, when alterations are effected in an existing building, can never enhance the value of the building by the amount expended. In order to arrive at the correct enhanced value we must know what parts of the building were removed, how much was expended in converting existing parts to new uses, and a variety of questions connected with repairs extremely complicated.

2. It appears that the principle the municipality adopt is simply to add to a former assessment an additional assessment based on the amount expended on the particular building during the year.

3. This seems to me to be wrong, and I would venture to suggest that the valuation on which assessment is made should be the cubical contents of the buildings at a fair valuation per foot.

4. I have so valued the two buildings in question, and find they should be assessed respectively at 2,394 rupees and 1,389 rupees per annum. As I before stated I do not know what the actual sums claimed amount to.

No. 1253-C.

Transferred to the Financial department, and the referred papers returned.

2. Special attention is invited to the Consulting Architect's remarks.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
23rd July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 10th August 1885, No. 378 M., Financial.

Recorded, the information furnished in the first of the letters above read being no longer necessary as the Provincial Service budget, for which it was intended, has already been passed by the Government and the Government of India.

2. With reference to the Consulting Architect's remarks, to which attention is invited by the Public Works department, it is observed that the municipal assessment on buildings is based on the annual rent at which such buildings might reasonably be expected to let (section 123 of Act I of 1884) and not on the amount spent on the buildings, nor their value calculated on the cubic contents. Should this assessment appear excessive, it is the duty of the officers in charge of the buildings to see that all legal measures are taken to reduce it (*vide* section 190 of the Act).

3. There appears to have been very great delay in the disposal of the matter by the Superintending Engineer.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,  
Chief Secretary.

To the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras.  
" Public Works department.  
" Revenue department.  
" Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 2038 Waf. 2<sup>d</sup> Sept 1885.

Communicated to the  
Supt Engineer V Circle, and  
the Consulting Architect.

2 The attention of the  
former officer will be  
directed to para 3.

(Sd) J.S.S.  
W.

Govt. of (1885) Madras.  
FINANCIAL.

Issued  
Recd. Encl.

G.O., 10th August 1885, No. 378 M.

No. 2038 Waf. 2<sup>d</sup> Sept 1885

Original file with  
C.S. 5367-24-4-85  
AUGUST.

Supt Engineer V Circle  
Consulting Architect  
Es. P. W. Accounts

Government Buildings.

Recording letter from the President, Madras Municipality, furnishing information regarding the assessment on —, and passing orders on the remarks of the Consulting Architect on the mode of assessment.

10TH AUGUST 1885, No. 378 M., FINANCIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.  
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras, dated 12th November 1884, R. No. 1259.

ABSTRACT.—Forwards a budget estimate for assessment on Government buildings and lands from 1st January 1885 to 31st March 1886.

From Colonel H. L. PRENDERGAST, R.E., Superintending Engineer, V Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk, 14th July 1885, No. 1576.

One endorsement, No. 2062 D.  
" letter, No. 1259.  
" budget estimate.

In returning your endorsement, No. 2062, dated 19th November 1884, I have the honor to report that the municipal assessment on—

- Additions to the Medical College,  
Do. General Hospital,  
Do. Presidency Magistrate's Court,  
Do. Small Cause Court,  
Do. Penitentiary,  
Do. Ordnance quarters, and  
Do. Stamp and Stationery office

is correct. But, as the work on the last building is not yet completed, the assessment should be admitted only on the understanding that it is to be claimed from the date on which the building is brought into use.

2. The assessment as claimed by the municipality on the additions to the Leper Hospital, Rs. 201-4-10, and on the Police tannah, Rs. 22-14-0, are incorrect, and should be Rs. 192-14-6 and Rs. 19-8-4, the actual cost of the works being Rs. 21,076 and Rs. 2,140.

3. The assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal are not reported on, as these buildings are in charge of the Consulting Architect.

No. 1210-C.

Referred to the Consulting Architect for the early submission of a report on the municipal assessment on the Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
16th July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

From R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Chepauk, 20th July 1885, No. 622.

I have the honor to return the papers received with your endorsement, No. 1210-C, dated the 16th instant, and to state that, without knowing the total assessment on the

Public Works offices and the Amír Mahal, it is impossible to say whether the additional assessment on account of additional accommodation is correct or not, for the added portion, when alterations are effected in an existing building, can never enhance the value of the building by the amount expended. In order to arrive at the correct enhanced value we must know what parts of the building were removed, how much was expended in converting existing parts to new uses, and a variety of questions connected with repairs extremely complicated.

2. It appears that the principle the municipality adopt is simply to add to a former assessment an additional assessment based on the amount expended on the particular building during the year.

3. This seems to me to be wrong, and I would venture to suggest that the valuation on which assessment is made should be the cubical contents of the buildings at a fair valuation per foot.

4. I have so valued the two buildings in question, and find they should be assessed respectively at 2,394 rupees and 1,389 rupees per annum. As I before stated I do not know what the actual sums claimed amount to.

No. 1253-C.

Transferred to the Financial department, and the referred papers returned.

2. Special attention is invited to the Consulting Architect's remarks.

(By order.)

CHEPAUK,  
23rd July 1885.

(Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E.,  
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 10th August 1885, No. 378 M., Financial.

Recorded, the information furnished in the first of the letters above read being no longer necessary as the Provincial Service budget, for which it was intended, has already been passed by the Government and the Government of India.

2. With reference to the Consulting Architect's remarks, to which attention is invited by the Public Works department, it is observed that the municipal assessment on buildings is based on the annual rent at which such buildings might reasonably be expected to let (section 123 of Act I of 1884) and not on the amount spent on the buildings, nor their value calculated on the cubic contents. Should this assessment appear excessive, it is the duty of the officers in charge of the buildings to see that all legal measures are taken to reduce it (*vide* section 190 of the Act).

3. There appears to have been very great delay in the disposal of the matter by the Superintending Engineer.

(True Extract.)

*M. M. M. M. M.*  
for Chief Secretary.

To the President of the Municipal Commission, Madras.  
" Public Works department.  
" Revenue department.  
" Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

It seems to me that  
order in the Fin. Dept. this  
(No. 378 M of 10.8.85)  
should have been  
by me before issue

27.8.85

*Now*

The order should  
apparently have been  
sent to you for consult.  
initials before issue.

If however para 3 of  
the order be regarded as  
a passing remark, no  
special notice need perhaps  
be taken of the omission.

The Ch. Secy. in the  
Public Dept. notes that  
it was quite his oversight  
that the draft order was  
not sent to you.

Noted  
28.8.85