

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் June 89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் long

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(58)

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>1521</u> <u>1522</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	8-6-1889	198

மடிக்கலோ கண்டயடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

15 Sheets

Bontel Sheet 1 and 2
 (13 + 2)

To W. J. Ogden.

I think we have sufficient
 information to go up to
 the cost of Indian masonry
 made I (h) of this ¹⁵²¹ ~~1522~~ ¹⁵²¹
 13 of 4 Sept. 1880, ¹⁵²¹
 The St. Routes that the ¹⁵²²
 cost of construction is considerably
 more in Manipalotum than
 in the masonry, and has
 been indicated the cost of
 the Collector's residence (an
 upstart building at Manipalotum)
 at the rates paid for the
 L. E.'s residence, a bungalow
 Begumda. ¹⁵²¹ - ¹⁵²²
 As these circumstances is
 not the impossible for
 to fix a lower valuation
 according to the ¹⁵²¹ ~~1522~~ ¹⁵²¹
 As I remarked in my
 former note on this subject,
 everything depends on
 the 1589 judgment of S^r Mayrho
 and I might suggest that
 the most equitable way of
 fixing the valuation of
 the building would be
 to take the actual expenditure
 on it, and add to this
 25% ¹⁵²¹ ~~1522~~ ¹⁵²¹

a portion of the purchase money - To say a portion, the reason given in my former note -

If the value of the land at the time it was purchased is taken at 5000 Rs.

we have Cap. 8000 Rs.
 7592 }
 14305 }
 At 29907

Say At 30,000, on which
 rent will be At 19000
 to be considered too high, the
 At 5000 can be reduced to
 5 or 6000

At 190 per annum would
 be only a small fraction
 8 per cent on the price of
 Collection; and 30,000
 would therefore seem
 a proper valuation for
 the building.

W. W. W.

9.4.09

Quack
 12.4.09

3229.

1521

3221

Dr.

The sum of Rs. 34,215
 has been checked and
 found correct - it repre-
 sents the nr. of sq. ft.
 in Collector's residence
 including out-houses
 multiplied by the rate
 per square foot of plinth
 area of the S. E. residence
 at Bezawada. Apparently
 the correct rent on a
 capital cost of
 Rs. 34,215 would be:-

4 percent for interest - 1368.60
 3 " " repairs - 1026.45
 20 " " on repairs - 205.29

12 2600.34

R 216.695

Rent per annum
 as it is not understood
 why the S. E. takes Rs. 2600
 as the rent for 10 months.
 The remark that the
 monthly rent can
 be reduced under the
 8 per cent maximum
 rule shows that the
 S. E. has not read the
 rules carefully. The 8
 per cent limit is taken
 only in the case of a
 proposed building or purchase.

The matter does
 not yet seem ripe for
 a reference to India -
 it seems advisable

7

2

that the S. E. should state his professional opinion of the actual value of the building (after the repairs) without reference to any fixed rate per square foot. For the purpose of fixing ^{at so much as the spot} the rent the fact of the (apparent) waste of space in out house accommodation should be considered after it has been decided what would be a fair rent to charge the collector it is proposed to address India with reference to para I ^(b) of their Resolution in G.O. 2981.W. & 22.9.80 and not to say anything about para II. If however it is desired to go up in India under para II as well as I (b) as previously suggested by the collector it will be necessary to get together the requisite information ^{if available} in regard to the situation of Masulipatam.

J.B.
9.4.89.

Statement showing the value of the Collector's Residence at Masulipatam calculated as required in G. O. No. 854.W. dated 21st March 1889.

Details	Amount	Details	Area Rate in square feet	per sq. ft.	Cost of Collector's Residence calculated at the rate of 1/2 sq. ft. of Suppl. which cost Govt. Rs. 15,457. Engrs. residence.

1. Original purchase money 20,000	Excluding	Excluding	19,940
2. Subsequent improvements 7,692	Out houses 7,315	Out houses 7,225	19,940
3. Improvements to house	Including	Including	34,215
2. Bonded in G.O. No. 372.W. 14,305	Out houses 8,505	Out houses 8,344	34,215
of the 1st February 1888			
4,997			
Say 42,000			

1521
7502

Supl. Engrs. Office,
2d Circle, Benavada
3rd April 1889

3

J. A. Munnau

Superintending Engineer
D. Circle.

Engineer's Quarters at Bezvada
and this is all on ground floor.
I have however compared the
cost for your information. The
cost of construction in Masulipatam
is considerably more than in
Bezvada; nevertheless if the cost
of the house at the former place
be calculated at the known rate
per square foot of the Superintend-
ing Engineer's Bungalow, the rent
so arrived would be Rs. 260 or
reduced under recent rules fixing
maximum at 8 per cent. of
salary, to Rs. 187. The out-house
accommodation provided for the
Collector's residence is more than
twice that provided for the
Superintending Engineer's bungalow.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt.,

J. Hummel
Superintending Engineer
II Circle.

H.
24.89.

13 21
15 22

5

Jv. Bm. 851W of 21. 3. 87
 A. 248W of 30. 1. 87
 . . . 2981W of 22. 9. 87
 . . . 372W of 1. 2. 88
 . . . 1668W of 21. 6. 87
 memo no 81D of 9. 5. 87
 . . . 978C of 15. 3. 87
 S.O. Bm. 1994W of 10. 8. 86.
 memo no 429D of 21. 7. 86.
 S.O. Bm. 1450W of 11. 6. 86
 . . . 1215W of 13. 5. 86.
 A. 215W of 27. 1. 85
 B. 2944W of 28. 11. 84.
 A. 2662W of 29. 10. 84
 . . . 2136W of 29. 8. 84
 . . . 1957W of 11. 8. 84
 . . . 2265W of 14. 8. 83
 B. 3332W of 21. 8. 78.

PWC No. 3229

From

The Supty. Engineer
 II Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
 P.W.D.

Dated 3rd April 1887
 196.4.87
 No 17 KS

Encls: 1.

Collector's Residence
 at Masulipatam -
 Enclosing a statement
 showing the required value
 of the - for fixing its rent -

10/4 - P.W.D. 33/4. Am

319 No.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Ootacamund,

188

OFFICE NOTE.

From

W

To

D.O.

C.No. 3229

In this letter the Supty
 Engineer reports that in
 addition to the purchase
 money of Rs 20000 for the
 Collector's residence at Masulipatam, the following sums
 have been spent on
 repairs and improvements.

I -	Rs 7692
II -	14305

Please obtain the
 accounts from C's office
 and carefully analyze the
 expenditure to show how
 much is due to (a) repairs
 & (b) improvements. It is
 only (b) that should be

added to Capital ~~cost~~ for
purpose of calculating rent.

Due

15.4.89 W

No. 1966 C of 18 April 1889

To C

Please let me see
these accounts to enable
me to comply with W's
request.

W's
15.4.89

D. W.

To W.
No. 675 of 18/5/89

The accounts received for
the Collector's residence at Masulipatam
have been referred to and the outlay
incurred therein is as noted below, —

Provincial Civil Buildings

Original Works

August 1880

(1) Excavating a channel by G. Nawab
of

Ass. 33/4 in 18/11

TO

Due

1521
1522

of Pander for bringing Kistna
Water to the purchased buildings
by Government for Kistna —
Collector's residence ————— Rs 405

January 1881

(2) Amount paid to the Nawab
of Masulipatam on account of
interest &c. on the purchase —
money paid to him for his house
at Masulipatam ————— Rs 2,449

1883-1884 to 1884-1885.

(3) Repairing and restoring Collector's
house with subsidiary buildings at
Pander ————— Rs 4,638

1886-1887 to 1888-1889.

(4) Repairing Collector's house at
Masulipatam ————— Rs 1,153

Total Rs 21,845

Repairs

Repairs

1882 - 1883

- (5) Putting up props to verandah
of Collector's house at Masulipatam — Rs 46

1883 - 1884

- (6) Inspecting roof of Collector's
house at Masulipatam — Rs 15

- (7) Repairing Collector's house
at Bander — Rs 60

1884 - 1885

- (8) Repairing Collector's house
and kitchen at Bander — Rs 129

1885 - 1886

- (9) Repairing Collector's house,
Masulipatam — Rs 507

- (10) Re-laying the roof of stable
and coach house in the compound

of

Carried over Rs 887

1521-22
B

Brought forward Rs 837

of collector's house Masulipatam - Rs 149

Grants Rs 1486

1815

1815

4626.

15 2 2

W

I have received the accompanying abstract of the accounts of the Collector's residence at Masulipatam, which I cannot make ~~the figures~~ agree with those given by the S.E. I do not think any useful purpose would be served by going through the detailed accounts, as the expenditure would not be classified under Repairs & Improvements, and the vouchers would not convey more information than is given in the abstract furnished by C.

Rs Original Vouchers Repairs
21,545 Rs 1486

The repairs that have been classified as original works will without doubt "restoration" works and should be charged to the Capital cost of the building.

I have discussed this matter with C. who agrees with me that no object would be served by examining the accounts unless there is some practical point as to which doubt exists whether it was an ordinary repair or an improvement; but in this case the communication should be conducted by some one acquainted with the building, and having some knowledge of the work carried out.

It will be observed that up to 55-56 original works & repairs were carried on side by side; the repairs classified as original works being doubtless of a special nature & practically restoration work.

From 1856-1859 ~~at~~ 14, 15 here speak on Repairs & although there are classified under original works, it might be advisable for the purpose of calculating the

152/-1552
to omit this item. The Classification would then be

- (a) repairs ~~at~~ 15639
- (b) improvements ~~at~~ 7692

of which the latter would be charged against the Capital cost of the building; but as I said in my former note on this subject, the conditions of the franchise were such that some arbitrary

Capital cost should be fixed with a view to bringing the rent within a reasonable amount, but I propose this £0 on the ground that much of the expenditure is due to ordinary repairs is I

consider impossible, and the ground on which the ~~same~~ Capital cost should be reduced (for repairs) is that the original amount paid for the building was higher than necessary from a commercial point of view.

Quek 23.5.59

W. W. W. 22/5

OPC No 4626

VS 21
1522

Read the following:—

Proceedings of the Board of Rev. No 810 Mis dated Feb. 9, 1889.
Endorsement therein in Rev. Dept. 1262 dated " 28. "
Proceedings of the P. W. Dept. 854 W dated March 21.
Letter from the Supt. Engr. II (Ind. 17 K.S. dated April 3.

FOR ORDERS.

	£
Cost of improvements	7,692
do	14,305
	<u>21,997</u>
add 20 per cent for Estimate &c	4399
add purchase money	20,000
	<u>46,396</u>
add 4 p.c. for interest	1855.84
3 p.c. for repairs	1391.88
20 p.c. on repairs	278.37
Rent per annum	3526.09
Rent per mensem	293

* This is not a valuation at all. It is an approximate estimate of the cost of constructing a similar building.
It seems to be more than built out houses.

Taking the actual capital outlay on the building, the cost comes to — £ 41,997 and the prescribed rent on this sum would be £ 293 per mensem. If, however, the present valuation of the building be taken for purposes of rent, the cost would be — £ 34,215 and the rent £ 216 as against £ 150 now paid by the Collector. If the rent - £ 216 fixed by actual valuation of the building is considered too high, application will have to be made to the Govt of India.

||

22/5

for reduction, and it will be necessary to explain the circumstances under which so large a sum as Rs 20,000 was originally given for the property.

Should it be decided to refer the matter to the Govt of India, it might be suggested that the most equitable way of fixing the valuation of the building would be to take the actual expenditure on it, and add to this a portion of the purchase money, say Rs 8000.

The capital cost would then be

Valuation at time of purchase	Rs 8000
Subsequent improvements	Rs 7692
do	Rs 14305
Total	Rs 29,997

or say Rs 30,000, on which the rent would be Rs 190.

*Look this up
P. 151
1876-77*

This sum was for repairs & improvements. How much of each? Repairs ought not to be charged to capital cost. The Rs 7692 ought to be analysed in the same way. I am prepared to go up to India for a while to examine the old records of

*1521
1876-77*

If this be considered too high, the valuation at time of purchase must be reduced still further. Rs 190 would be only a small fraction over 8 per cent on the pay of a Collector, and Rs 30,000 would therefore seem a proper valuation to attach to the Collector's residence.

*P. 151
W*

19

Rs 150. If you charge interest only on improvements & can can be made out. I wish we were rid of all these residences.

*1st
14 Apr*

R.S.

The Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes

Resubmitted for
orders with a note dated
22nd May 1889 by the
Under Secretary on
the amounts of expenditure
incurred on the building

Phueds

27.5.89

Make out any case you can
for obtaining the expenditure
to apply to India.

M.S.
28 May

Hm 27/5

11075.
Aug. 26/4. In 13/4.

11075.
Hm 27/5

Hm 3

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

1521
1522

UNDER date the 8th June 1889

READ the following

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (H. E. No. 810 Mis. of 9th Febry 1889)
Endorsement thereon in the Rev. Dept. " 1262 " 28th "
Proceedings of the P. W. Dept. " " 854 W " 21st March.
Letter from the Supt. Engr. II Circle " " 17th " " 3rd April ")

Ordered that the Govt of
India be addressed.

(H. E. No. 1522 W of 5th June 1889)

To
The Secy to the Govt of India
P. W. Department.

Recd.
4 June

13

Sir

In Proceedings of the

Government of India, No. 479 B
dated 7th Sept 1886, certain rules
are promulgated for the
recovery of rent on buildings
occupied as residences by
Govt officials. These rules
have been adopted generally
in this Presidency, but they
are found to be wholly
inapplicable to the case of
the residence at Masulipatam
of the Collector of the Krishna
District - The building in
question was purchased in 1898
from the head of the
Masulipatam family, ~~more~~
~~as a pecuniary relief to~~
~~the representative of an~~
ancient house ~~who was~~
then in very embarrassed
circumstances, ~~than because~~
~~it was actually worth~~

17522
The house had been occupied
by officials for many years
at a rent of Rs 100 per mensem
after the purchase this rent
continued to be paid by the
Collector ~~who occupied it~~.

3/ and the results have shown that in its
the sum of Rs 20,000 paid for
it - The Collector then
occupied the building as a
residence, and it had been
so occupied by previous ^{officials} ~~collectors~~
for many years at a monthly
rental of Rs 100 - The building
on coming into possession
of Govt was found to be in
a very bad state of repair, and
various sums of money have
from time to time had to be
expended to keep it in proper
order - The total expenditure
to date has thus amounted to
Rs 23,331, which, together with
the original purchase money
of Rs 20,000, raises the cost of
the building to the large sum
of Rs 43,331.

18
Of the expenditure incurred
on repairs and improvements
it is calculated roughly

4

that a sum of Rs 7692 should be classed as original work, the balance being due to repairs proper. The Govt decided before the receipt of the revised rules regarding rent that a monthly rental of Rs 150 would be an equitable charge for the use of the building by the collector - and I am to request, under the circumstances of the case, that this rental may be confirmed by the Govt of India, and that the future value of the building for rent purposes may be assumed to be the capitalised value of Rs 100/- per mensem, the sum at which the building actually let when in private hands.

15 21 / 15 22

Rs 7692

comes to Rs 58.4, thus

Capital -	Rs 7692
20 p.c for interest -	1538.40
	9230.40
4 p.c for interest -	369.21
3 p.c for repairs -	276.91
20 p.c on repairs -	55.38
	Total per annum 701.50
Per mensem -	58.4

11 / 7692
699

15

5

plus Rs 7692, the sum spent on improvements - Calculated on this basis the rent will come to something slightly over Rs 150/- which may however be fixed as the present rent of the building -

Approved
3.6.89

7.6.89

8/11/89

R.S.

10/2/11

11-4-24-BII ✓

26.5-27 III ✓

1521-1522 W

8-6-89

1806-89 W

Capt
8/6/1

my

15

Feb 18
Oct. 11/18. At m 3/6. m 5/6.