9th July 1894, No. 1712 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads. Civil Works.

Read—the following papers :—

From M.R.Ry. S. T. RUNGASWAMI IYER Avergal, B.A., B.L., Rao Bahadur, Chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department (through the Deputy Collector of Trichinopoly), dated Trichinopoly, 18th April 1894, No. 9.

I have the honour to submit the following for the favorable consideration of Government.

2. Because of the floods that now and again used to create terror in the minds of people here, it was considered by the Public Works Department authorities necessary to raise the level of the Tirutandoni and the Chintamoni roads, and some years ago they were so raised accordingly by the said department. The road being narrow and the sides being steep, the latter had to be protected by rail fencing, in order to prevent accidents to men, animals and things. One-half of this cost was borne by the Municipality, the other half being contributed by the Public Works Department, whose action necessitated the rail fencing. Even in 1890–91 the said department paid us a contribution of Rs. 694 on this account.

3. The recent floods of October that have caused such considerable damage to our water works have not spared our roads either, and the Tirutandoni and Chintamoni high level roads above mentioned were most seriously breached in places. The rail fencing fixed on the sides have also been washed away to a considerable length, and the rails are lying about torn and twisted and many of the stone posts themselves broken.

4. The department of Government Public Works which at first wanted that the Municipality should close up the breaches has, however, since been doing the work itself on my pointing it out that as the raising was their work, the re-raising should be done by them too.

This re-raising has in its turn further necessitated the refixing of the displaced rail fencing; and the question now is by whom is the cost of this to be borne. The Executive Engineer of the Trichinopoly division intimates to me in his letter No. 676 M. of the 13th February 1894, that the cost of the rail fencing should be borne by the Municipality and this refusal is reiterated in his letter No. 783 M. of 27th March 1894.

5. I beg to submit that this is hardly just or fair. The raising was their work, the washing away was to a great extent because of their raising, and if we are now put to expenses towards rehabilitation, the same, it is submitted, should be borne by the parties originally responsible for the raising. Besides the reasons mentioned above, our finances have considerably fallen down, not to say that the contribution from tolls have been much reduced from what they were. With this limited resources of ours, we have to maintain and keep up our roads which because of increased traffic cost us much more than before. For these and other considerations I submit that the expenses in connection with the refixing of the rails should be borne more by the Public Works Department than by ourselves.

6. A copy of the resolution of the council passed on the matter is enclosed.

Enclosure.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Trichinopoly town, passed at the meeting held on the 31st March 1894.

* * * *

Paragraph 11.—Read letter No. 783 M. of the 27th March 1894, from the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly division, informing that as Government has borne the whole cost of closing the breach, he thinks that the cost of the railing on the Chintamoni and Tirutandoni roads might be left to the Municipality.

* * *

The Government will be addressed in the matter.

* * * * *

Trichinopoly,
18th April 1894.
(Signed) S. T. RUNGASWAMI IYER,
Chairman.

Forwarded.

2. As the road was raised by the Public Works Department to serve as a flood bank and as the raising necessitated the rail fencing, I think it is the Public Works Department that ought to maintain the rail fencing.

Trichinopoly,
23rd April 1894.
(Signed) SYED KHADER PADSHAH,
Deputy Collector.

Forwarded.

I know nothing of the former correspondence, but judging from this letter I should say that, for the reasons given by the Divisional officer and the Chairman, the Public Works Department should bear the costs.

Togamalai,
27th April 1894.
(Signed) J. ANDREW,
Acting Collector.

No. 331.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

Fort St. George,
5th May 1894.
(Signed) L. DAVIDSON,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

No. 1948 C.

Referred to the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, for report.

17th May 1894.
(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

From Major O. V. BODDY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 14th June 1894, No. 465 T.C.

Your endorsement No. 1948 C. of the 17th May 1894, referring for report an application made to Government by the Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, for refixing, at the expense of the Government, the rail fencing on the roads of Chintamoni and Tirutandoni.

2. In returning the above endorsement, I have the honour to state that the Chintamoni road, which is also called the Carur road, runs over the Cauvery right bank; this bank was raised by Government $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet in 1883, on the estimate of Rupees 6,790 sanctioned in G.O., No. 529 I. of the 8th July 1882, to prevent flood water passing over it. As this raising rendered the embankment a source of danger for wheeled traffic, railings were put up on both sides of the road at a cost of Rs. 1,030 by the Municipality in 1884, Government contributing half the cost of Rs. 515, as reported in this office letter printed with G.O., No. 612 I. of the 30th June 1884, and as decided by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his No. VI-9-T.C. of the 4th March 1884.

3. The Tirutandoni road, which is also called the Worayur road, runs over the right bank of the Kodamurty river. As this bank was seriously damaged by the heavy floods of December 1884, it was raised 3 feet by Government above the height of that flood in 1885 on an estimate of Rs. 9,220 sanctioned by this office—*vide* reports printed in G.O., No. 230 I. of the 5th March 1885. As in the preceding case this raising was also considered dangerous to traffic, and iron rail fencing was consequently constructed in 1887–88 at a cost of * Rs. 3,240 by the Municipality, receiving from this department half the cost of Rs. 1,620—first Rs. 1,565 and then Rs. 55, the balance of the revised estimate. The estimate for this work was sanctioned by this office under the authority conveyed in the Irrigation Chief Engineer's No. VI-9-T.C. of the 5th October 1887, and the amount required, as per original estimate, was transferred in G.O., No. 733 I. of the 23rd November 1887.

	RS.
* Original estimate	3,130
Revised do.	3,240

4. Subsequently in 1891 the above rail fencing of Tirutandoni or Worayur road was extended to a further distance of 1,226 feet at a cost of Rs. 1,000 by the Municipality; in this case also half the cost was contributed by Government.

5. The two roads or banks in question were much damaged by the heavy rains and flood of November last, and in closing the breaches the full width of the roads has been made up and the cost thereof has been borne by Government, the estimates for the works being Rs. 620 for the first or Chintamoni road and Rs. 2,350 for the other.

6. I do not understand the statement made in paragraph 5 of the Chairman's letter that the washing away of the road was to a great extent due to the original raising of the road. That raising was done quite as much in the interest of the town of Trichinopoly as of Government.

7. As, however, Government contributed half the cost of the original fencing, I am of opinion that the same course may now be followed in restoring the fencing, if Government is willing to assist the Municipality in this matter.

Office-note from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 22nd June 1894, No. 167.

I think half the cost may be fairly borne by the Government. The Municipal Commissioners must bear in mind that if the roads had not been raised to their present level they would have been utterly obliterated instead of sustaining so little damage as they had done by the floods.

Order—dated 9th July 1894, No. 1712 W., Public Works.

In the circumstances stated by the Superintending Engineer, the Government agrees to contribute half the cost of restoring the rail fencing on the roads in question.

2. The charge will be met from the current year's grant to the Trichinopoly division for repairs to river embankments.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Local and Municipal Department.
" Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Gobt. of {1894} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 9th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 9th July 1894, No. 1712 W.

JULY.

Rail Fencing

Agreeing to contribute half the cost of restoring the — on the Chintamoni and Tirutandoni roads at Trichinopoly from the grant to the division for repairs to river embankments.

[illegible]AL COUNCILLORS' OFFICE,
[illegible]NOPOLY 18th April 1894.

No. 9

From, M.[illegible] swamii Iyer avl B.A. B.L.
Rao Bahadur
[illegible]HAIRMAN,
Municipal Council,
TRICHINOPOLY.

925 M

To, The Hon[illegible] Secretary to Government,
[illegible] and Municipal Department,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Throu[illegible] [illegible]r of Trichinopoly.

Sir,

[illegible] ve the honour to
[illegible] ing for the favorable
submit [illegible] Government.
Considera[illegible]
[illegible] cause of the floods that
[illegible] ed to create terror
now and [illegible] people here, it was con
in the minds [illegible] P.W. authorities neces
sidered [illegible] level of the Tiruttan-
sary to [illegible] intamoni roads,
-doni and [illegible] s ago they were so
and [illegible] by the said de-
raised [illegible] road being narrow
particularly [illegible] being steep, the latter
and the [illegible] by railfencing, in
had to [illegible] accidents to men,
order to [illegible] things. One half of the
animals [illegible] by the Municipality
Cost was [illegible] ing contributed
the other ha[illegible]

by the D.P.W. whose action necessitated the rail fencing. Even in 1890-91 the said department paid us a contribution of Rs 694 on this account:

3. The recent floods of October that have caused such considerable damage to our water works have not spared our roads either and the Tirutandoni and Chintamoni highlevel roads above mentioned were most seriously breached in places. The rail fencing fixed on the sides have also been washed away to a considerable length, and the rails are lying about torn and twisted and many of the stone posts themselves broken.

4. The department of Government Public works which at first wanted that the Municipality should close up the breaches has however since been doing the work itself on my pointing it out that as the raising was their work, the reraising should be done by them too.

This reraising has in its turn further necessitated the refixing of the displaced rail-fencing; and the question now is by whom is the cost of this to be borne. The Executive Engineer of the Trichinopoly Division intimates to me in his letter No 676 M of the 13th February 1894 that the cost of the rail fencing should be borne by the Municipality and this refusal is reiterated in his letter No 783 M of 27th March 1894

5. I beg to submit that this is hardly just or fair. The raising was their work, the washing away was to a great extent because of their raising, and if we are now put to expenses towards rehabilitation, the same, it is submitted should be borne by the parties originally responsible for the raising. Besides the reasons mentioned above, our finances have considerably fallen down, not to say that the contribution from tolls have been much reduced

from what they were. With this limited resources of ours, we have to maintain and keep up our roads which because of increased traffic cost us much more than before. For these & other considerations, I submit that the expenses in connection with the refining of the rails should be borne more by the S.P.W. than by ourselves.

6. A Copy of the resolution of the Council passed on the matter is enclosed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient,

P. Rungaswami
Chairman.

P. W. CURRENT No. 3405

[9]

~~LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.~~ 4783

no 2467 W d/ 5-9-92

~~Local & Municipal Dept~~

~~CURRENT No.~~ 9251/4

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE, No 1/287 VI CIRCLE.

6 P

From

The Chairman, Municipal Council,
Trichinopoly

No. 9

Dated 18-4-94
Received 30-4-94
Recd 7-5-94
Enclosures 1

SUBJECT.

Requesting that for the reasons stated orders be issued for the refixing of the rail fencing on the high level roads of Chintamani and Tirutandoni at the expenses of the P. W. Department

(with anlud.)

No: 331

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

Lionel Davidson
ag 3rd assistant Secrety

F.R.
2/5/94

Fort St. George
6th May 1894

To
The Public Works Department

No: 1948 C, d/ 17th May 1894.

Referred to the Supt.g: Engineer, VI Circle, for report.

Col: R.E.
Secretary to Govt: P. W. D.

14.5.3

a 9/5

2103

Cy 18.11.5.94

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Trichinopoly Town, passed at the Meeting held on the 31st March 1894.

Present

M.R.Ry. S. T. Rungasawmi Iyer avl BA & BL Rao Bahadur	Chairman
Syed Kadher Padsha Sahib Bahadur	Rev: offr.
M.R.Ry R. Kaliyanarama Iyer avl	Councillor
Mohamed Faridudin Sahib	Do
M.R.Ry. W. Siwaswami Pillai avl	Do
Do A. C. Chidambaram Mudr avl	Do
Do. T. S. Ponnusami Dever avl	Do
Do T. A. Soosai Pillai avl	Do
Do. T. Kristnasami Naidu garu.	Do
Do T. S. Narayanasami Pillai avl	Do
Do T. M. Subramonia Pillai avl	Do
Do T. K. Arumuga Mudr avl	Do
Mohamed Sirajudin Sahib	Do
M.R.Ry N. Subramonia Iyer avl	Do
Do T. S. Umamaheswara Iyer avl	Do
Do V. S. Chellappa Chettyar avl	Do
Do. T. Ramasami Chettyar avl	Do
Do K. Vythilingam Pillai avl	Do
Do M. Pattmanabha Chettyar avl	Do

× × ×

Para. 11. Read letter No 783 M of the

27th March 1894 from the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly Dn. informing that as Government has borne the whole cost of closing the breach, he thinks that the cost of the railing on the Chintamoni and Tiruttandoni roads might be left to the Municipality

× × ×

The Government will be addressed in the matter

× × ×

× × ×

(Signed) S T Rungaswami
Chairman

(True extract)

P.W.E. ×3
~~3605~~/94
~~4052~~
4783

Municipal office
Trichinopoly
18th April 1894 }

Rungaswami
Chairman

1/925 M of 94

OFFICE O SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
of 94
6TH CIRCLE,

No. 465 TC

Trichino 14 June 1894.

14/-

FROM
Major C Boddy R.E.,
~~THE~~ SUPERIN NG ENGINEER,
6th CIRCLE.

TO
THE CHIE INEER,
P.W.D.

SIR,

ENCLOSURES 1
1. Endorsement

Yo endorsement No: 1948C of the 17 May 1894 referring for report an application made to Government by the Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, for refixing, at the expense of the Government, the rail fencing on the roads of Chintamoni and Tiruttandoni.

2. In returning the above endorsement, I have the honor to state that the Chintamoni road, which is also called the Carur road, runs over the Cauvery right bank; this bank was raised by Government 4½ feet in 1883 on the estimate of Rs 6,790 sanctioned in G.O. No: 5293 of

To General record

500—13-11-93.

of the 8° July 1882, to prevent flood water passing over it. As this raising rendered the embankment a source of danger for wheeled traffic, railings were put up on both sides of the road at a cost of Rs 1,030 by the Municipality in 1884, Government contributing half the cost Rs 515, as reported in this office letter printed with G.O. No: 612 I of the 30° June /84 and as decided by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his No: $\frac{VI}{9 I.C.}$ of the 4° March 1884.

In Genl Record

3. The Tirutandoni road, which is also called the Worayur road, runs over the right bank of the Kodamurty river. As this bank was seriously damaged by the heavy floods of December 1884, it was raised 3 feet by Government above the height of that flood in 1885 on an estimate of Rs 9,220 sanctioned by this office. Vide reports printed in G.O. No: 230 I of the 5° March 1885. As in the preceding case, this raising was also considered dangerous to traffic, and iron rail fencing was consequently constructed in 1887-88 at a cost of Rs 3,240 × by the Municipality, receiving from this department half the cost Rs 1,620 – first Rs 1,565 and then Rs 55, the balance of the revised estimate. The estimate for this work was sanctioned by this office under the authority conveyed in the Irrigation Chief Engineer's No: $\frac{VI}{9 I.C.}$ of the 5° October 1887, and the amount required, as per original estimate, was transferred in G.O. No: 733 I of the 23rd November 1887.

×

Original Estimate	Rs 3,130
Revised	" 3,240

4. Subsequently in 1891 the above rail fencing of Tirutandoni or Worayur road was extended to a further distance of 1226 feet at a cost of Rs 1,000 by the Municipality; in this case also half the cost was contributed by Government.

5. The two roads or banks in question were much damaged by the

heavy rains and flood of November last, and in closing the breaches the full width of the roads has been made up and the cost thereof has been borne by Government, the estimates for the works being Rs 620 for the first or Chintamony road and Rs 2,350 for the other.

6. I do not understand the statement made in para 5 of the Chairman's letter, that the washing away of the road was to a great extent due to the original raising of the road. That raising was done quite as much in the interest of the Town of Trichinopoly as of Government.

7. As however Government contributed half the cost of the original fencing, I am of opinion that the same course may now be followed in restoring the fencing, if Government

is

is willing to assist the Municipality in this matter.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

OVBodley

Major R.E.
Superintending Engineer
VI Circle

P. W. CURRENT No. ~~4532~~

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE. 4783

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER,
PWD

No. 465 rc

Dated 14 } June 1894
Received 14 18 26. 6. 94

Enclosures. 3

Roads of Chintamani and Tirutandoni: —

Reporting on the application made by the municipal council Trichinopoly for refixing at the expense of the Govt. the rail fencing on the —

No 230 I d 5. 3. 85
" 733 I d 23. 11. 87
" 1948 C d 17. 5. 94
" 1948 C d 17. 5. 94

No 422 D d 22nd June 18

To, I R118

For favour of disposal

21st

W

21. 6. 94

No 167 d 22 6. 94

To W.

I think half the cost may be fairly borne by the Government. The Municipal Commissioners must bear in mind that if the roads had not been raised to their present level they would have been utterly obliterated instead of sustaining so little damage as they had done by the floods.

22/6

I

143

---

24 1-2-94
1129 25-8-73
1605 SDL 17-7-84

3

Forwarded.

2 As the road was raised by the D.P.W to serve as a flood bank and as the raising necessitated the rail fencing I think it is the D.P.W that ought to maintain the rail fencing.

Deputy Collector

Trichinopoly
23 April 894

4

Endt. on current No $\frac{2280}{Rev}$ of 94.
Despd 27. 4. 94

Forwarded.

I know nothing of the former correspondence, but judging from this letter, I should say that, for the reasons given by the Divisional officer & the Chairman, the D.P.W. should bear the cost.

Collector

Camp - Tayamalai.

Current $\frac{2280}{Rev}$

HEAD QUARTER DEPUTY COLLECTOR TRICHINOPOLY

From, M.R.Ry. S.T. Rungasawmi Ba & Bx Rao
CHAIRMAN
Municipal Council,
TRICHINOPOLY.

Local & Municipal D
CURRENT No 975

To,
The Chief Secretary to
Government,
Local and Municipal
Department,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Through the Dy Collector Trichinopoly

Dated 18 }
Despatched 20 } April 1894.
Received 30 APR. 94 }

No. 9

Enclosure. 1

Rev 82
~~4532~~/94
4783

SUBJECT.

Requesting that for the reasons stated orders be issued for the refixing of the rail fencing on the high level roads of Chintamani & Tirutandoni at the expenses of the P. W. Department.

COLLECTOR AND MAGISTRATE
24 APR. 94
TRICHINOPOLY.

Camp

Government of Madras.

1894.

P. W DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 4783

DISPOSAL.

No. dated

From

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

ENCLOS. 3

No. 167

Dated 22. 6. 94

Received 26. 6. 94

SUBJECT.

Roads of Chintamani & Tiruvandoni: Stating that half the cost of refixing the rail fencing on the — may be fairly borne by the Government.

Connected Papers
No 4220 d/ 22-6-94

oss. 167 / R 9/7.

29—2,000—6-2-94.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 1712 W d/ 9—7—1894

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Endorsement in the L & M Dept: on letter from the chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, No: 9. d/ 18-4-94 } H. E. No: 331 d/ 5-5-94

~~From~~ the Suptg: Engineer VI circle " No: 465 T.C. d/ 14-6-94.

Office Note from the Chief Engineer for Irrn: " No: 167 d/ 22-6-94.

[illegible]

W
6 July

In the circumstances stated by the Suptg: Engineer the Government agrees to contribute half the cost of restoring the rail fencing on the roads in question.

2. The charge will be met from the current year's grant to the Trichinopoly Division for repairs to river embankments. J 4/7/94.

2.7

Rules
3/7

~~3.7~~

(40—2,000—22-3-94)

3. ~~The Government entirely agrees with the remark made by the chief Engineer for Irrigation.~~

Restoration of rail fencing on Chintamani & Tirutandoni Roads, Trichinopoly

~~The Hon the Chief Secy for favour of consulta- [illegible]~~

DESPATCHED
24 JUL. 94

To
The Local & Municipal Dept:
" Suptg: Engineer VI Circle
" chief Engineer for Irri:
" Exar: P.W. accounts.

C.No. 4783

Govt. of (1894) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

18/12/33 B III
12-11-35 III
2-12-35 III

Dated

Recd. Fwd.

G.O. 9. July 1894 No. 1712 W.

Rail fencing.

greeing to Contribute
alf the Cost of restoring
he – on the Chintamani
nd Tirutandoni roads
t Trichinopoly, from the
rant to the Division for
pairs to river embankments.

100/5

Jc. 10/7.

10/