(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 9/91

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். / மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 2836 அச்சகம் / பலவகை

நாள் : 12·10·1892 ~~198~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

16 Sheets

ஆவண, கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

Exe: Engrs office W. C. D.
Calicut 9th April 1892.

No. 1013

From

A. Joyce Esq.
Executive Engineer
W. C. Division.

1/2826

To

The Supdg. Engineer
4th Circle, Coimbatore.

Enclosures 4.

1 Detailed Estimate
1 Gl Abstract D-
1 Comparative statement
1 Report.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for sanction a revised estimate amounting to Rs 37,400 for Constructing a First class Taluq Kutcherry at Perintalmanna.

2. The necessity for the revision is Explained in the Report and Comparative statement which accompany the estimate.

I have &c

Sigd A. Joyce
Executive Engineer

(True copy)

Rudolph Brickmay Lt Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 4th Circle

R 5.5/5703/92

S.G. 249

Supt'g: Eng'rs Office 4th C
No. 185/4.C
19th April 1892.

Memo.

Letter No. 1013 of 9th April 1892, from the Executive Engineer, West Coast Division.

Enclosures 4
1 Estimate
1 Abstract
1 Report
1 Comp: statement.

The revised estimate with comparative statement amounting to R 37,400 for constructing a first class Taluq Cutcherry with out-buildings at Perintalamanna received with the above are herewith returned with the following remarks:-

2. Cut stone steps are unnecessary. Laterite must be used as provided in the Original Estimate.

3. It is not understood why the scantlings of timber should be increased if the original

-ginal estimate was based on the standard design; this point should be explained by means of sections of roof.

4. It is irregular that the revised estimate involving an increased expenditure of 9% over the original estimate should have been submitted so long after the work was commenced and the Executive Engineer is requested to report why the increases he considered necessary were not submitted in good time for the orders and approval of the undersigned and the sanction of Government.

5. The excess work should not be carried out without previous reference to this office & until the orders of Government are received.

OW [illegible]

(Sigd) R. Brooke Brockman Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer 4th C.

(True copy)

R. Brooke Brockman Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 4th Circle.

SG

No. 124.

Calicut Sub Dn. Office,
Calicut, 13th May 1892.

From

The Assistant Engineer,
in ch: of Calicut Sub Dn.
Calicut.

To

The Executive Engineer
West Coast Dn.
Calicut.

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No. 1173/30-4-92, on a copy of the Supdg. Engineer's Memorandum No. 185/W.C of 19th April 1892, I regret to have to report that the item of cut stone steps cannot now be removed from the Revised Estimate as they are at site and work far advanced.

2. On inspecting the laterite stone available for the work in the neighbourhood of Perinthalmanna and finding that it was

not very good, but had to be used in the masonry of the Taluq Cutcherry after careful selection, I considered that for so important a public building it would in every way be more satisfactory to have granite steps and thus avoid complaints hereafter from the Revenue Department about the unsatisfactory nature of the steps to the building which would occur, if such laterite or even flooring tiles were used. Being informed of the difficulty experienced in getting, not only granite stone, but also stone-cutters to dress the stone, I ordered its early collection.

3. I would add that cut-stone is the only material which will answer satisfactorily where there is much traffic,

and

and were it not for the high rate which has to be paid according to the contractor's tender for a cubic foot of cut stone, the item would not have attracted attention as it has done.

4/2836

4 As regards revision of the scantlings of woodwork in roofing to the building, I would mention that on scrutinising the sanctioned estimate I found the scantlings given for several items of woodwork seriously wrong, being chiefly deficient, such as bressummers over verandah posts. such posts are from 6½ to 10 ft apart and are 5"×5" in section. Hence I went carefully through each item of the wood work and revised the scantlings so to secure safe and satisfactory dimensions for the timbers

in different parts of the building.

5. As the alterations &c. chiefly in roofing provided for in the revised estimate are intimately mixed up with the general work in progress to stop such excess work as directed by the Supdg. Engineer would mean to stop the work as it is now progressing, hence I would solicit special order on this point.

6. I need hardly point out that in the first instance, the original estimate was not carefully framed and several items were also omitted. Next, the Contractor's rates are very high, in some items above the estimated rates and hardly if ever under. Evidently the estimated rates were not fixed with reference to the locality in which the work was to be carried out for it is an

out

5/886

out of the way spot and timber and chunam have to be brought from long distances. Sand itself has to be carted some 7 miles from the nearest river.

7. It would be well in submitting the information required by the Supdg. Engineers to forward a copy of the plan & section &c. of the building from which can be readily obtained the necessary details as to lengths of spans for purlins, rafters &c. and their dimensions calculated.

8. The revised estimate ought to have and would have been submitted earlier were it not for the several changes which occurred in the subordinates who were in charge of the building. The unavoidable delay which has taken place in submitting the revised estimate

has at least enabled it to be drawn up with greater accuracy and there is now no likelihood of the chief items being exceeded much more the total estimate.

I have &c.
Sigd W. V. Baker
Asst Engineer.

(True copy)
Sigd A. Joyce
Executive Engineer.

(True copy)

Archdale Anderson, Lt Col. R.E.,
Superintending Engineer 4th C.

C.B.
P.W. 470 3/92

Exe. Engr Office W.C.Dn
No. 1570.
Camp Cannanore, 30th May 1892.

From

A. Joyce, Esq.
Executive Engineer,
West Coast Dn.

0/483

To

The Supdg. Engineer,
4th Circle, Coimbatore,

Enclosures 11.
1 Copy of letter
3 Orig: drawings
1 Detail Estimate
1 Gl abstract
1 Report
1 Revised Detaily Estimate
1 Do Gl abstract
1 Do Comp: Stat:
1 Do Report.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your No. 185/WC of April 19th, 1892.

2. In reply I would beg to forward copy of No. 124 of May 13th, 1892, from the Assistant Engineer, Calicut Sub Division. This I think explains the matter pretty fully. But I would beg to add in answer to the letter in question as follows:–

3. If laterite steps had been used they would not, I consider, have lasted six months with the ordinary Kutcherry wear. As

Geologists well know, there is no true laterite on the West Coast. Concerning what passes for laterite, there are still diverging opinions, but the general opinion is that it is decomposed gneiss.

4 With regard to your remarks in para 3 which Mr Baker has answered in his para 4, I send you up the Original drawings. They will, I think, shew every thing. When you have done perusing them, I shall be much obliged if you will kindly return them.

5. The estimate (revised) was sent up as soon as this discrepancy was discovered. Mr Baker is quite correct in stating that the excess was chiefly in the roof. The original design appears to have been prepared by Lt Col. Ross Thompson R.E.; I am very sorry to state that I

I am afraid now the excess work has been carried out all practically.

6. The revised estimate is resubmitted for sanction.

I have &c.
Sigd A. Joyce
Executive Engineer

7/2836

(True copy)

[illegible]
Lt Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer
[illegible]

A.G.

Executive Engineer's Office,
WEST COAST DIVISION.
Camp Calicut, Pundalur 19th Septr 1892.
Despd 21st Do

No. 2761

FROM

A. Joyce Esqre
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION,

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

ENCLOSURES.

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No 356/W.C of 15th August 1892, on G.O. No 2148 W of 3rd Idem, calling on me to explain the delay in the submission of the revised estimate for the construction of Taluq Office at Perintolmna and also the arrangements made to carry out the revised work without your knowledge, I have the honour to inform you that I regret to have to remark that if the letter No. 124 of 13th May 1892, a copy of which was submitted with my letter No 1510 of 30th May 1892, had been read again you would perceive that necessary explanation on matters noticed had been given

2. I repeat here, for ready reference of the Chief Engineer my explanation:—

"The revised estimate ought to have and would have been submitted earlier, were it not for the several changes which occurred in the subordinates who were in charge of the building. The unavoidable delay which has taken place in submitting the d estimate has at last enabled it drawn up with greater accuracy and there is no likelihood of the chief items being exceeded much more than the total estimate."

3. The names of Subordinates who were in charge of work were as follows:—

1. Conductor Frankland, Sub Engineer
2. Mr. J. Pereira, Overseer
3. Doresawmy Moodaliar, Sub Overseer.
4. Mr. P. D'Sylva, Sub Overseer
5. Mr. E. C. Noronho, Overseer.
6. M. Gnanapragasam Pillay Sub Overseer
7. Mr. C. B. D'Rebello Overseer

4. The revised estimate was submitted so early as 9th April 1892, but returned for explanation as to the necessity for certain items.

5. Explanation as to their necessity was furnished with my letter quoted in par one above.

6. The chief excess aggregating Rs 2437 incurred on woodwork and cutstone was explained already thus:—

Woodwork.—"As regards revision of the scantlings of woodwork in roofing to the building I would mention that on scrutinizing the sanctioned estimate I found scantlings given for several items of woodwork as bressummers over verandah po posts are from 6½ to 10 ft. apart and the bressumers are 5"×5" in section. Hence I went carefull through each item of the woodwork and revised scantlings, so as to secure safe satisfactory dimensions for the timber in different parts of the building."

Cutstone.—"On inspecting the laterite stone available for the work in the neighbourhood of Perintalamana and finding that it was not very go but had to be used in the masonry of the cattle butchery after careful selec I considered that for so important a public

P. W. D.
WEST COAST DIVISION.

From

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION.

To

THE SUPERINTENDING
ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

Dated
tched 189

No.

Enclosures.

Subject.

---

public building it would in every way be more satisfactory to have gneiss steps and thus avoid complaints hereafter from the Revenue Department about the unsatisfactory nature of the steps to the building which would occur if such laterite, or even flooring tiles were used. Being informed of the difficulty experienced in getting not only gneiss stones, but also stone cutters to dress the stone, I ordered its early collection.

7. As regards para 7 of the note of the Chief Engineer to wit–

"The original estimate appears to have been carefully prepared." I would beg to urge that I do not think it is carefully prepared with regard to rates at least in as much as the rates provided in the original estimate for timber and mortar, chief items in the estimate were not I consider prepared with reference to the (Angadipuram) locality. They were most probably prepared and have every appearance of being prepared in the office by the regular style of rate schedule

P. W. D.
WEST COAST DIVISION.

From

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION.

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

Dated
Despatched } 189

No.

Enclosure.

Subject.

---

schedules. Angadipuram is an out of the way place. Timber is to be got from Coimbatore, Chunam from Calicut and sand from 7 miles, to the site

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A Joyce
Executive Engineer

P. W. D.
WEST COAST DIVISION.

FROM

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION.

To

THE SUPERINTENDING
ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

Dated 19th }
Despatched 21st } September 1892.

No. 2761

ENCLOSURE.

G.1
PW 9703/92

SUBJECT.

Taluq office at Perintalmanna

Explains the delay in the submission of revised estimate for ——— with certain observation

---

Current No 9703

Sir

It is not known on what Type design the Taluq Office at Perintalmanna is based, apparently on the design approved in G.O. W. 795 dated 23rd March 1874. (herewith put up) If so, the E.E. is correct in stating that the distance between the verandah pillars vary from 6½ to 10 feet apart & that the bressummers 5"×5" in section (as provided in the printed schedule of quantities) is weak, especially over the pillars placed 10 feet apart. The majority of the pillars are 8 feet between points of support & the width of the verandah 6½ feet, a section of 5½"×7" throughout for the bressummers is thought would be fair considering the roof is light being of Mangalore tiles. The alterations are not only in verandah bressummers but in other parts of roof timbers such as

---

Supdg. Engr. Office 4th C.

1892,

R.E.,

increased sections to the
principal rafters &c.

The estimate with plans
not been sent up with the
papers so as to check the
scantlings carefully they
may be called for again

4.

9703

13/2836

Thru

Please have this file completed, & send up the original notes – Ask T. to check the scantlings again in the light of the E.E.'s remarks –

The original estimate was drawn up years ago, & there is a contemporary remark to the effect that the estimate was carefully drawn up – This estimate was submitted originally with another estimate for a building at the same place the name of which I do not remember.

The 2 estis. came up together –

9703.

Dil

Original papers sub-
mitted –

Estimate for the
Badagara taluk Office
came up with the
original estimate for
the Perinthalmanna
Cutcherry, vide T's
note attached to G.O.
No. 2350 W d/ 12.10.9
There is a remark
in each case that
the estimate had
been carefully pre-
pared –

With regard to the
scantlings, a note by
T is submitted.

The revised esti-
mate was returned
to T.S. with G.O. No. 2148
d/ 3.8.92, & the orig.
estimate with G.O.
2350 W of 1891 –

Ca
4.10.92

2836

Sir. – This estimate
was drawn up apparently
in accordance with
the Standard Design,
& the authorised
dimensions should
not have been
departed from, without
due cause shown, &
previous approval
to change obtained

OWS
7.10.92

4-10-92

Supdg: Engrs: Office 4th C:
No. 408/W 24 September 1892,

From

Lt Col: R.R.E. Drake-Brockman R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
4th Circle.

16/2836

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department.

Sir,

Enclosures 5.
1 Ol letter No: 2761 of 19-9-92 from Ex: Engr: W.C. Dn
1 Copy of letter No. 1013 of 9-4-92 from Ex: Engr: W.C. Dn to S.E.
1 Do of memo: No: 185/W.C. of 19-4-92 from S.E. to Ex: Engr: W.C. Dn
1 Copy of letter No. 1570 of 30-5-92 from Ex: Engr: to S.E. with 1 copy of letter No. 124 of 13-5-92 from Sub-Div: officer Calicut to Ex: Engr: W.C. Dn

With reference to para 3 of G.O. dated 3rd August 1892, No. 2148 W, I have the honor to forward the accompanying letter No. 2761 dt 19th September 1892, with copies of correspondence therein quoted with the following observations.

2. For the first time a revised estimate for the work was received in this Office on the 13th April 1892. It was returned for further information with this Office No. 1854 W.C. dated 19th idem, with instructions not

to proceed with the work till sanctioned by Government.

3. The Executive Engineer being in possession of the required information obtained the same from the Subdivisional Officer Calicut and retransmitted the papers with his No. 1510 dated 30th May 1892 (received in this office on the 4 June) after a delay of 6 weeks.

4. From the above it was plain that the excess over sanctioned estimate had been incurred from the commencement of the work, and on the date of submission of the revised estimate the work was almost completed.

5. The outlay up to April 1892, i.e. at the date of submission of the revised estimate was Rs 30,006 exclusive of guarantee fund, or more than Rs 33,000 inclusive, against the original sanctioned estimate of Rs 34,07

6. Had the Executive Engineer paid any attention to the work this state of affairs would doubtless have been brought to the notice of higher authorities before incurring unauthorized liabilities.

7. The other reasons given by the Executive Engineer to justify the delay in the submission of the revised estimate are not satisfactory, and he has made no attempt to explain the delay of 6 weeks in its resubmission.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt.
Lt Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer

P. W. CURRENT No. 9703

From

The Supg. Engr.
4th Circle

Dated 24 }
Despd 26. } Septer/92
Recd. 27.9.92

No. 408
W

Encls - 5

Taluq Cutcherry at Perin
talamana
Submits letter from the
Ex. Engr. West Coast Dn
explaining the delay in
the submission of re-
vised estimate for —

Gr. Ans. 2148w. d/ 3.8.92
" " 2380w d/ 12.10.85
Memo No. 3717C d/ 22.8.92

Gr. Ans. 2380w d/ 12.10.85 Gr. Ans. 1058w d/ 4.92
" " 502w d/ 4.2.75 " " 1136w d/ 20.9.92
" " 2196w d/ 17.9.85 Memo No. 572E/A d/ 8.9.85
" B. 3712w d/ 2.11.83
" A. 2407w d/ 8.10.84 " 2405E d/ 17.6.85
" B. 780w d/ 10.3.83 " 821C d/ 21.4.85
" A. 262w d/ 23.1.83 Gr. Ans. 2148w d/ 3.8.92
" " 1501w d/ 28.5.83 " " 1752w d/ 13.6.92

No. 2836 W d/ 12th October 92
B

WS
8 oct

Recorded.

2. The Govt. agrees
with the remarks in paras
6 and 7 of the Supdg.
Engineer's letter.

OWB
7.10.92

B.T. WD

S.C. IV Circle

13/10/92

0/27/9 sent again 5/10

J 17/10.

R 12.10.92

Old. 1797
An 29-9
Ans 7-10 Gi co-04

J.C. 14/10