# Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 2009 W

DATED 9th August 1898

11/8/98

[Despatch Abstract.] Taluk office at Gudiwada: Revised Estimate of Rs 56,200 for constructing a ——— in the Kistna Dt, sanctioned, with remarks, in supersession of the previous Estimates aggregating Rs 39,540

280/15

Indexed.

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

# Government {1898} of Madras.

## PUBLIC WORKS.

*Recd.* } 1898. *Enclosures*
*Regd.* } *Spare copies*

**G.O., No. 2009 W., 9th August 1898.**

**AUGUST.**

**Taluk Office at Gudivada**

Revised estimate of Rs. 56,200 for constructing a — in the Kistna district, sanctioned, with remarks, in supersession of the previous estimates aggregating Rs. 39,540.

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

### Buildings and Roads.
### Civil Works.

READ—the following papers :—

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, II Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Bezwada, 27th April 1898, No. 1264 K.E.

In continuation of this office No. 1005 K.E., dated 6th April 1898, I have the honour to forward herewith, for your approval and sanction of Government, revised estimate and comparative statement for Rs. 56,200 for the construction of taluk cutcherry with out-houses and wire fencing in Gudiváda.

2. The original estimate, with the exception of ryots' shed, was sanctioned by Government in the orders quoted in the comparative statement.

3. The original estimate, amounting to Rs. 1,170, for the ryots' shed was sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer in 1897–98.

4. Explanations as to the cause of excesses over the original sanctions have been given by the Executive Engineer in the remark column of the comparative statement.

5. The work is now approaching completion. The revised estimate should have been submitted two years ago, and I know of no reason why it was not submitted. The general practice nowadays, as far as my experience goes, is to quite ignore Code rules regarding the submission of revised estimates in proper time.

---

From the Executive Engineer, Kistna Eastern Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 6th July 1898, No. 261 S.E.

With reference to your No. 1906 K.E., dated 21st June 1898, I have the honour to forward herewith the original sanctioned estimate for constructing first-class taluk cutcherry with its out-houses at Gudiváda, as requested by the Chief Engineer in his No. 2862 C. of 15th June 1898.

---

No. 2127 K.E.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with reference to his No. 2862 C. of 15th June 1898.

13th July 1898. (Signed) J. S. WILSON,
*for* Suptg. Engineer, II Circle.

---

*Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.*

The original estimate for constructing a taluk cutcherry at Gudiváda, Kistna district, was sanctioned in G.O., No. 2865 W., dated 7th November 1893, and amounted to Rs. 34,500. This sum was subsequently increased to a total of Rs. 39,540 by



four s parate supplemental estimates sanctioning (*a*) record racks and a wire fence, (*b*) a latrine, (*c*) a well, (*d*) a ryots' shed. The revised estimate now forwarded by the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, for the sanction of Government amounts to Rupees 56,200, the excess requiring sanction being thus Rs. 16,660.

2. This large excess is made up as follows :—

| Item No. | Sub-head. | Amount of Excess. | Remarks. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | RS. | |
| 1 | Excavating foundations .. | 382 | On excavating pits at the sanctioned site, the nature of the soil was found to be so bad as to make it dangerous to build on it. The site was therefore altered, and this was sanctioned in G.O., No. 756 W., dated 2nd March 1896. The section of the foundations was also altered to suit the new site, both depth and width being increased. |
| 2 | Concrete in chunam .. .. | 4,181 | This is principally due to the excess in quantity occasioned by the change in site, as sanctioned in above Government Order, 249 units being executed instead of 96·25. The rate was also increased from Rs. 23-8-0 to Rs. 25-14-0 to provide for cartage from the old site to the new, &c. |
| 3 | Rough stone in mortar .. | 3,366 | Due partly to excess in quantity owing to the necessity for increased foundations, partly to the substitution of rough stone for bricks in the superstructure because no good bricks were obtainable, and partly to materials having to be carted from the old site to the new ; the second cause being the principal one. |
| 4 | Faced dressed stone at quoins .. | 588 | Not provided in the sanctioned estimate, but necessitated by the substitution of rough stone for brick as per last item. |
| 5 | Tiled roofing .. .. | 922 | Roofing with ordinary pan tiles was provided for, but Mangalore tiles were substituted when the standard design was subsequently issued in 1896. |
| 6 | Flooring with Bezwada stone in concrete. | 900 | Due to increase in rate from Rs. 25-8-0 to Rs. 37-8-0 owing to the original rate being much too low for labour. |
| 7 | Terrace roofing to subjail wards, &c. | 791 | Substituted for tiled roofing as per G.O., No. 3085 W., dated 1st December 1894. |
| 8 | Plastering under rafters .. | 2,405 | Provided as per memo., No. 4169 C., dated 6th December 1893, issued after the estimate was sanctioned. |
| 9 | Pointing with surki and cement.. | 543 | Pointing the stone flooring was apparently omitted in the original estimate, and the rate allowed was much too low. |
| 10 | Petty supervision .. .. | 556 | Provision made in the original estimate proved insufficient. |
| 11 | Land compensation .. .. | 450 | Seven acres have been occupied instead of 2·40 originally provided. |
| 12 | Minor items .. .. | 1,576 | Net amount reduced by savings on other items. |
| | | 16,660 | |

3. It will thus be seen that half the excess is due to the change of site. The site plan is signed by Mr. Chatterton, the Professor of Engineering in the Civil Engineering College, Madras, who was at that time (1893) acquiring practical experience in the Public Works Department and was acting as Executive Engineer of the division. It was, probably, due to his inexperience that so unsuitable a site and such inadequate foundations were provided. The attention of all officers of the department will be called to the necessity for the most careful investigation of sites before framing estimates for building thereon.

4. Of the remaining excesses, items 5, 7 and 8 were due to orders of Government and the Chief Engineer passed subsequently to the sanctioning of the estimate, but the substitution of Mangalore for pan tiles should not have been made without proper sanction. A standard design is not intended to be of universal application as regards the materials to be used, which must depend largely on local circumstances.

5. The excesses on items 6 and 9 were due to insufficient provision in the original estimate, which was signed by Mr. Ussher, now Executive Engineer, 1st grade, and by a Superintending Engineer who has retired from the service. Superintending Engineers will be again requested to see that the divisional schedules of rates are accurate and up to date in all respects.

6. The excesses are recommended for sanction.

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Chief Engineer.

28th July 1898.

ORDER—No. 2009 W., dated 9th August 1898.

The revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 56,200, for constructing a taluk office at Gudiváda in the Kistna district, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimates aggregating Rs. 39,540 sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, and in the undermentioned G.Os.—

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 2865 W., dated 7th Nov. 1893. | No. 2448 W., dated 4th Oct. 1895. |
| „ 254 W., „ 2nd Feb. 1895. | „ 1286 W., „ 20th Apr. 1896. |

His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that this work was estimated for in an unsatisfactory and inaccurate manner.

2. The attention of the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, is drawn to the Chief Engineer's note read above, and of other Superintending Engineers to paragraphs 3 and 5 of the note.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 47 W. of 1898–99, and classified as Civil Buildings—Original Works.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, with enclosures.
„ other Superintending Engineers.
„ the Consulting Architect.
„ the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division.
„ the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
„ the Revenue Department.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated , from

„ „ 3845 „ 1898, „ 3 May , „ the S. E. II Circle

„ „ 5947 „ 1898, „ 16 July , „ do

Note by the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. of 28th July 1898.

ORDER.

No 2009 W of 9.8.98

The revised estimate amounting to Rs 56,200 for constructing a Taluk office at Gudiváda in the Kistna District is sanctioned in supersession of the estimates aggregating Rs 39,540 sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer II Circle and in the undermentioned Gos

No 2865 W of 7th Nov 1893
" 254 W of 2nd Feb. 1895
" 2448 W of 4th Octr 1895
" 1286 W of 20th April 1896

The attention of the Superintending Engineer II Circle is drawn to the Chief Engineer's note read above and of other Supt. Engs

(To The Rev. Department for favour of counter initials)

1. Unsatisfactory and inaccurate estimating
2. Sanctioned.

A.G.P. 4.8.98

Flag A

H-E The Governor in Council considers that this work was estimated for in an unsatisfactory & inaccurate manner.

Flag U

Flag W

Issue with addition as above

T.F.R.

[P. W. 4. / 500 / 24-3-98.]

Engineers to paras 3 and 5 of the note.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No 47 W of 1898-99, and classified as Civil Buildings, Original Works.

Maj

Note. This estimate has been dealt with in the accompanying technical note and the note by the Chief Engr. P.W.D.

T/B

The S.E. II Circle with Encls:
Other Supty Engineers
The Consulting Architect
" S. of W. L. H. D.
" Ch. Engr. for Irrigation
" Examiner P. W. Accts
" Revenue Department

P.W. Department.

Note by the Chief Engineer

The original estimate for constructing a Taluk Cutcherry at Gudivada, Kistna District, was sanctioned in G.O. No 2865 W, dated 7th November 1893 and amounted to Rs 34,800. This sum was subsequently increased to a total of Rs 39,540 by 4 separate supplemental estimates sanctioning (a) Record racks and a wire fence; (b) a Latrine; (c) a well; (d) a Ryots' shed. The revised estimate now forwarded by the Superintending Engineer II Circle for the sanction of Government amounts to Rs 56,200, the excess requiring sanction being thus Rs 16,660.

2 This large excess is made up as follows:—

| Item No | Subhead | Amount of Excess Rs | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Excavating foundations | 382 | On excavating pits at the sanctioned site, the nature of the soil was found to be so bad as to make it dangerous to build on it. The site was therefore altered, and this was sanctioned in G.O. 756 W dated 2nd March 1896. The section of the foundations was also altered to suit the new site, both depth and width being increased. |

C.O. 382

| Item No | Subhead | Amount of Excess | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | B. A. Rs 382 | |
| 2 | Concrete in chunam | 4,181 | This is principally due to the excess in quantity occasioned by the change in site, as sanctioned in above G.O. 249 units being executed instead of 96·25. The rate was also increased from Rs 23-8-0 to Rs 25-14 to provide for cartage from the old site to the new &c. |
| 3 | Rough stone in mortar | 3,366 | Due partly to excess in quantity owing to the necessity for increased foundations, partly to the substitution of rough stone for bricks in the superstructure because no good bricks were obtainable and partly to the materials having to be carted from the old site to the new; the second cause being the principal one. |
| 4 | Faced dressed stone at quoins. | 588 | Not provided in the sanctioned estimate, but necessitated by the substitution of rough stone for brick as per last item. |
| 5 | Tiled roofing | 922 | Roofing with ordinary pan tiles was provided for, but Mangalore tiles were substituted when the standard design was subsequently issued in 1896. |
| 6. | Flooring with Bezwada stone in concrete. | 900 | Due to increase in rate from Rs 25·8 to Rs 37-8 owing to the original rate being much too low for labour. |
| 7. | Terrace roofing to subjail wards &c. | 791 | Substituted for tiled roofing as per G.O. 3085 W dated 1st December 1894 |
| 8. | Plastering under rafters | 2,405 | provided as per Memo No 4169 C dated 6th December 1893 issued after the estimate was sanctioned. |

C.O 13,535



| Item No | Subhead | Amount of Excess | Remarks. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | B. A. Rs 13,535 | |
| 9 | Pointing with surki and cement | 5743 | Pointing the stone flooring was apparently omitted in the original estimate and the rate allowed was much too low. |
| 10 | Petty supervision | 556 | Provision made in the original estimate proved insufficient. |
| 11 | Land compensation | 450 | 7 acres have been occupied instead of 2·40 originally provided. |
| 12 | Minor items | 1,576 | Nett amount reduced by savings on other items. |
| | | 16,660 | |

3. It will thus be seen that half the excess is due to the change of site. The site plan is signed by Mr. Chatterton, the Professor of Engineering in the Civil Engineering College, Madras, who was at that time (1893) acquiring practical experience in the P. W. D, and was acting as Executive Engineer of the Division. It was, probably, due to his inexperience that so unsuitable a site, and such inadequate foundations were provided. The attention of all officers of the Department will be called to the necessity for the most careful investigation

investigation of sites before framing estimates for building thereon.

4. Of the remaining excesses, Items 5, 7 and 8 were due to orders of Government and the Chief Engineer passed subsequently to the sanctioning of the estimate, but the substitution of Mangalore for pan tiles should not have been made without proper sanction. A standard design is not intended to be of universal application as regards the materials to be used, which ~~much~~ must depend largely on local circumstances.

5. The excesses on items 6 and 9 were due to insufficient provision in the original estimate, which was signed by Mr. Usshex, now Executive Engineer 1st grade, and by a Superintending Engineer who has retired from the service. Superintending Engineers will be again requested to see that the divisional schedules of rates are accurate and up to date in all respects.

6. The excesses are recommended for sanction.

Seen. A.G.H.

28-7-06

Note by Chief Engr.

The original estimate for constructing a Salty Interceptory at Pedirada, Kistna District, was sanctioned in G.O 2065-W, dated 7 Nov/93, and amounted to Rs 34,500. This sum was subsequently increased to a total of Rs 39,540 by 4 separate supplemental estimates sanctioning (a) Round-racks and a wire fence; (b) a Latrine; (c) a Well; (d) a Ryot's shed. The revised estimate now forwarded by the Sr. Engr. for the sanction of Government amounts to Rs 56,200. The excess requiring sanction being thus Rs 16,660.

2. This large excess is made up as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Increase due to insufficient rates in original estimate | Rs 1996 |
| Increase due to deviations from original estimate | 30,896 |
| Total increase | 32,892 |
| Total savings | 16,231 |
| Net increase | 16,660 |

For the cost see statement attached

3. The site originally selected was in soil of a most treacherous character, & the foundations allowed were not only actually inadequate for building on such soil, but were altogether insufficient even for the better site ~~originally~~ finally determined

on. It was not until materials had been partially collected at the original site that it was found ~~that~~ that it was not safe to build there, and that an alteration of site was necessary. The change of site was approved in G.O. (Ten) No. 808, dated 24 Feb/96, and this change, together with the insufficiency of the foundations allowed in the original estimate, is the main cause of excess on the original estimate, since it involved not only an excess of Rs 6,598 in cost of foundations over the provision for that item in the sanctioned estimate, but also involved a further excess in payment for extra cartage to the new site for materials already collected at the original site. The ~~increase in the cost of foundations~~ amount paid for extra cartage cannot be ascertained from the papers sent up, but the increase in the cost of foundations and for forming a road at the new site is, by itself, nearly half the total excess on the original estimate. It is made up of the following items:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Increase in foundations | Rs |
| ~~Increase in~~ Excavation — | 361 |
| ~~Increase in~~ Concrete — | 3,952 |
| ~~Increase in~~ Rubble — | 1,462 |
| Land compensation — | 450 |
| Forming a road | |
| Metalling — | 281 |
| Gravelling — | 90 |
| Total excess | 6,598 |

The site plan, containing sections of foundations originally proposed, and sanctioned, is signed by Mr Chatterton, Professor of Engineering in the C.E. College, Chepauk, who was at that time acquiring practical experience in the P.W. Dept, & was acting as Ex. Eng.r of the Div. This presumed therefore that the officer is responsible for the original mistake made in proposing to build on such a site, & in allowing foundations altogether inadequate.

4. The second cause, excess over the original estimate is due to alterations in materials, which involved a total excess of Rs 5,048. The main items of this excess are:—

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Mangalore tiles and terrazzo in place of pot & pan tiles allowed in original estimate | Rs 3,659 |

| | Rs |
|---|---|
| (b) Painting ceiling — | 804 |
| (c) Roughcast in superstructure in place of brickwork allowed in original estimate | 612 |

the substitution of terracing ~~was ordered in G O 3088 W, dated 1 Dec/94, & the~~ this item ~~therefore calls for no remark.~~ The explanation given for the excess caused by using Mangalore tile is, that these tiles were substituted for ordinary tiles in accordance with the standard design circulated in 1896. This explanation cannot be accepted. A standard design is ~~of course~~ not intended to be of universal application as regards the material to be used, which must depend largely on local circumstances, and is of course no authority at all for substituting Mangalore tiles for ordinary tiles in a sanctioned estimate. The explanation given for the excess on (b) is unintelligible and the Subdy. Engr. should have called for proper explanation. (c). The explanation given for the excess on item (c) is, that it was impossible to obtain good bricks at L

for the sub-jail wards, police guard, & arms room of Taluq office was ordered in G O 3088 W, dated 1 Dec/94, and this G O was, it is stated, taken as sufficient authority for deviating from the Pot & Pantile roof sanctioned for the Sudi vada Cutcherry

site. It is not explained whether the change of site was the cause of this alteration.

5. The increase of Rs 1996 in rates is composed of a number of items, of which are not individual important, except in the three following cases:—

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Flooring with stone over 4" of concrete | 944 |
| (b) Concrete — | 228 |
| (c) Pointing — | 201 |

The excess on (a) is due to carriage of materials from the condemned site, as well as to the insufficient rate allowed in the original estimate, while the excess on (b) is entirely due to extra carriage to new site, & the ~~bot~~ excess on (c) to inadequate provision in the original estimate.

6. The excesses dealt with in the three preceding paragraphs ~~account for all~~ include all material items of excess, amounting in all to Rs 13,660, the ~~though~~ remaining excesses, though numerous, comprising 8 items that are individually unimportant. These

Esha

are due to a variety of causes. The original estimate is signed by Mr Walker, and by a superintending Engineer who ~~has~~ retired some years ago from the service. But for the serious mistake ~~signatory made~~ referred to in para 3 supra, which is also accountable for the other excesses under the head of extra cartage, and for the excess referred to in para 4, the total excess on the estimate would not have amounted to a large figure. ~~There is nothing in the~~ The SR does not indicate who is responsible for the main excesses. & the responsibility for such excesses cannot be definitely ascertained from the records submitted by him.

AGK
19.7.98.

| Item No | Sub head | Amt of excess Rs. | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Excavating foundns | 382 | In excavating into the sanctd site, the nature of the soil was found to be so bad as to make it dangerous to build on it. The site was therefore altered & this was sanctd in G.O. 706 to of 2.3.96. The section of the foundns was also altered to suit the new site, the both depth & width being increased. |
| 2 | Concrete in chunam | 4101 | This is principally due to the excess in quantity occasioned by the change in site as sanctd in above G.O. 249 units being executed instead of 96.25. The rate has also increased from Rs 23.8.0 to Rs 25.4. to provide for carriage from the old site to the new one. |
| 3 | Rough stone in mortar | 3366 | Due partly to excess in quantity owing to the necessity for increased foundns, partly to the substitution of rough stone for bricks in the superstructure because no good bricks were obtainable & partly to materials having to be carted from the old site to the new. The second cause being the principal one. |
| 4 | Facing dressed stone chajjamo | 588 | Not provided in the sanctd estimate but necessitated by the substitution of rough stone for bricks as last item |
| 5 | Tiles roofing | 922 | Roofing with ordinary pan tiles was provided for, but mangalore tiles were substituted when the standard design was subsequently issued in 1896. |
| 6 | Flooring with Segunda stone in concrete | 900 | due to increase in rate from Rs 25.4 to Rs 37.4 owing to the original rate being much too low for labour. |

10339

| Item No | Details | Amt of item | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Brought forward | Rs 10339 | |
| 7 | Terrace roofing to outport hands | 791 | substituted by tiled roofing under G.O. 3085 W of 1.12.94 |
| 8 | Flooring under verandas | 2405 | provided under G.O. 4169 C of 6.12.93 issued after the estimate was sanctioned |
| 9 | Pointing with Surkhi cement | 543 | Pointing the stone flooring has always omitted in the original estimate & the sub-ahmed has made to bus |
| 10 | Petty supervision | 556 | Provision made in the original estimate based insufficient |
| 11 | Land compensation | 450 | 7 acres less than occupied instead of 2.40 originally provided |
| 12 | Minor items | 1576 | Net amount recovered by savings in other items |
| | | 16660 | |

3. While thus we see that half the excess is due to the change of site. The site plan is signed by Mr. Clatterton, the Professor of Engineering in the C.S. College Roorkee, who was at that time (1893) acquiring practical experience in the P.W.D. & was acting as helper of the Dy. Commr. Yet this was sufficient to inaugurate a site which inadequate foundations were provided. The attention of the Officers of the Dept while called to the necessity of the most careful



investigation of sites before preparing estimates for building therein.

4. The remaining ~~estimate~~ excess. Items 5, 7 & 8 were due to orders of Govt. passed subsequently to the sanctioning of the estimate. ~~other~~ but the substitution of hand-pulse for pan-tiles should not have been made without proper sanction. A standard design is not intended to be of unlimited application as regards the materials to be used, which must depend largely on local circumstances.

5. The excess in items 6, 9 & 10 were due to insufficient provision in the original estimate, which was signed by Mr. Foster, an helper who appears only a subordinate & who has retired from the service. Yet the same helper will be appointed to sanction the Annual schedules. See that the Annual schedules of rates are accurate & free from defects.

6. The excesses are recommended for sanction

UN 26 7

# Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5947

From The Superintending Engineer II Circle

Order

No. 2127 K.E.

Dated 13.7.98

Received } 16.7.98

Registered }

Enclosures 24 + (5 plans) ~~13. (sent by B post)~~

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Constructing a 1st class Coing office at Gudivada — forwards the original sanctioned estimate for — as requested.

28 Ire

0.2.5 247

## BACK PAPERS.

| No. | Date. |
|---|---|
| 2289C | 26-4-98 |
| 725C | 8-2-98 |
| 1356C | 5-3-98 |
| 3163C | 24-8-96 |
| 2946C | 29-7-96 |
| 756W | 2-3-96 |
| 536C | 30-1-96 |
| 4158C | 26-12-96 |
| 2448W | 4-10-95 |
| 2219W | 6-9-95 |
| 254W | 2-2-95 |
| 1709W | 9-7-94 |
| 2865W | 7-11-93 |
| 3085W | 1-12-94 |
| 4169C | 6-12-93 |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| No. | Date. |
|---|---|
| | |

Copy of the letter from the Executive Engineer Kistna Eastern Division to the Superintending Engineer II circle dated 6th July 1898 No 2761 S.E.

With reference to your No 1906 K.E. dated 21st June 98, I have the honor to forward herewith the original sanctioned estimate for constructing first class Zahirk butchery with its out-houses at Gudiwada as requested by the Chief Engineer in his No 2862C of 15-6-98.

No 2127 K.E. / 13.7.98

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer Public Works Department with reference to his No 2862C of 15th June 1898.

Executive Engineer

for Superintending Engineer II circle.

Encl:—
1 Main Building Est of Rs 34500
1 Data
1 Site plan
1 Estimate for Cook room for Rs 730, with data
1 Tracing
1 Estim of Rs 290 for Calrine
1 Tracing.
1 Estimate of Rs 860 for well with report etc
1 plan.
1 Estimate of Rs 1280 for wooden racks
1 Estimate of Rs 710 for wire fencing
1 Estimate of 1170 for out-houses
1 Tracing.

13

Cir. 5947

DW

Submitted
with reference to
your note of 14.6.98
flagged D.

CN
15/7/98

Mr Beale.

Please put up & flag
the 2 references mentioned by you in your explanation of causes of excess of items 10 & 11 of Mains Building.

A.E.H
19-7-98

No. 2862 C.D. Memo 15/6/98

S.S. II Circle.

With reference to letter No. 1264 K.S., dated 27 April/98, from the S.S. II Circle, forwarding a revised estimate, amounting to Rs 56,200, for a tailor's lodgers at Jodhpur, the undersigned has the honour to request that the original estimate & plans may be forwarded for reference.

A.E.H
14-6-98.

2862 C
15.6.98

T
15/6/98

✓ D

To The S.S. II Circle.
15/6/98

**Public Works Department.**

Current No. 3845

Letter No. 1264 - K. I.

Dated 28-4-98

From the Supt. Engineer II Circle

NOTE BY TECHNICAL SECTION.

Name of work. Revised Estimate for Constructing a Taluq Cutcheri and out-houses in Gudivada - Kistna District.

Est. Rs 56,200.

The Superintending Engineer II Circle forwards for Sanction of Govt. a Revised Estimate and comparative Statement for the construction of a Taluq Cutcheri with out-houses and wire fencing in Gudivada - Kistna District. In G.O. No 2865 W dated 7th Novr. 1893 an Estimate amounting to Rs 36,600 for constructing a Taluq Office at Gudivada, reduced to Rs 34,500 by excluding the provision for aloe hedge & ditch was sanctioned for execution, and a supplemental Estimate for providing record racks & a barbed wire fence for the compound

On

On orders

CW 10-6-98

S.A.W

I have called on SS for the original estimate & plans. When they are received, I will dispose of the estimate

A.K 14-6-98.

CW 14-6-98

[P.W. 60 / 250-30-9-97.]

called for.
This was submitted and sanctioned in G. O. No 254 W dated 2nd July 1895 for Rs 2720.
An Estimate for Rs 290 for constructing a latrine in the compound of the Taluq Office at Gudivada was sanctioned as supplemental to the Estimates sanctioned in G. O's No 2865W dated 7th Novr 1893 and No 254 W dated 2nd July 1895 - in G. O. No 2448 W dated 4th October 1896. The total estimated cost of the work amounting to Rs 37,510.
In G. O. No 1286 W dated 20th April 1896 an Estimate for Rs 860 for sinking a well in the compound of the Taluq Office at Gudivada was sanctioned as supplemental to the Estimates aggregating Rs 37,570.
In Supr Engineer's Provincial Register No 62 of 1897-98 the constructing of a Ryots' Shed was sanctioned for execution [amounting] raising the total estimate to Rs 39,540.
The revised Estimate now submitted for sanction amounts to Rs 56,200.
Net increase requiring sanction being Rs 16,660.

The change of site is primarily responsible for the excess on the estimate, involving as it did a heavy excess in cost of foundations & extra cartage of material. The original foundations were ~~of course~~ wholly insufficient for the site finally proposed, and were also quite inadequate for the better site finally decided on.

Original plans & estimate called for & found recorded. The site plan is signed by Mr Chalkerton, and sections of foundations proposed is theirs thereon. He is presumably responsible for selecting the site, though there were several changes of officers about this time in the Divn, and reference will have to be made to them to find out for certain who selected site

The Kistna Eastern has been notoriously very behind hand in office work for years past. V the 88, instead of uttering platitudes of this sort, might

The excess is due to deviations from sanctioned plan principally; owing to change of site very considerable extra depth and width had to be allowed in foundation.
The alteration of site and section of foundations is fully explained in Executive Engineer - Kistna Eastern Division letter to the Supr Engineer II Circle dated 14th Decbr 1895 No 3995 (see flag B) forwarded with Supr Engineer's No 2016 Ks/17-12-95 to Chief Engineer.
G. O. No 756 W of 2nd March 1896 sanctions the alteration of the site.
The party responsible for the error of site cannot be traced as the original Estimate is not in file.
The Supr Engineer remarks that the delay in the submission of the revised Estimate is very unsatisfactory, and that Code rules regarding the submission of revised Estimate in proper time are ignored.
Rates. The Estimate is accompanied with detailed data in support of rates allowed.

## Comparative Statement

The following increase is due to Excess in rates.

### Main Building

| | Rs. | As. |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Excavating & filling in | 19 | 0 |
| 2. Concrete in mortar | 228 | 9 |
| 3. Cut Stone in Chunam | 17 | 0 |
| 4. Flooring with Stone over 4" concrete | 900 | 0 |
| 5. Teakwood P & V doors | 65 | 0 |
| 6. Venetian Windows | 105 | 0 |
| 7. Teak Lattice windows & | 41 | 0 |
| 8. Teak V-windows | 58 | 0 |
| 9. Fixed Plain Ventilators | 12 | 0 |
| 10. Wire netting | 8 | 0 |
| 11. Plastering 2 coats | 88 | 0 |
| 12. Pointing Exterior with Surki | 165 | 0 |
| 13. Iron Gates | 1 | 0 |
| 14. Metal for roadway | 88 | 0 |
| Total for Main Building | 1795. | |

### Constructing a Cook Room

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Concrete in mortar | 8 | 0 |
| Teakwood wrought & put up | 45 | 0 |
| Plastering interior | 2 | 0 |
| Pointing Exterior | 12 | 0 |
| Flooring 6" concrete | 12 | 0 |
| Total Rs. | 79 | 0 |

### Constructing a Latrine

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Concrete in mortar | 9 | 0 |
| Rubble in mortar | 14 | 0 |
| Pointing with Surki mortar | 10 | 0 |
| Total Rs. | 33 | 0 |

### Constructing a well in compound

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Concrete in Chunam | 9 | 0 |
| Cut Stone in Mortar | 1 | 0 |
| Cement Plastering | 2 | 0 |
| Total Rs. | 12 | 0 |

### Constructing Ryots' Shed

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Concrete in Mortar | 26 | 0 |
| Rubble in Mortar | 41 | 0 |
| Teakwood wrought & put up | 6 | 0 |
| Plastering with Chunam | 3 | 0 |
| Pointing with cement | 1 | 0 |
| Total Rs. | 77 | 0 |

Grand Total Rs. 1996-0

have provided this data and suggested remedies. With an Office establishment keeping well abreast of work, revised estimates should be prepared without much delay, but not otherwise

### Cause of Increase in rates

#### Main Building.

1. Soil found unfit to build on & site altered. Sections of foundn altered. Sanctioned by Govt in G.O. No. 756 W dated 2-3-96.

2. Excess due to above cause & additional cartage to new site &c.

3 & 4. Excess due to insufficient rate allowed in orig. Est. materials having to be carried from the condemned site.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Due to Workshop charges & cartage.

11, 12, 23, 29. Insufficient provision in original Estimate.

14. Change of site increased distance.

#### Cook Room

1-3-4-5. as per Main Building

2. Increased workshop charges

#### Constructing a Latrine

1-2-3. as per Main Building

#### Constructing a well in Compound

1-2. as per Main Building

3. Inside of wall plastered Surki instead of cement.

#### Constructing a Ryots' Shed.

1-2. as per Main Building

3. Due to Tiles being used instead of country tiles.

### Excess due to deviations-

#### Main Building

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Excavating & filling in | 362 | 0 |
| 2. Concrete in Mortar | 3953 | 7 |
| 3. Rompstone in Mortar | 12,963 | 0 |

4. Flat & Semi-Cir. Archework — 43-0
5. Faced Dressed Stone work — 588-0
6. Cut stone in chunam — 245-0
7. Wrought iron work — 40-0
8. Roofing with Mangalore tiles & teak rafters — 3206-0
9. Flooring with ¾" asphalt — 580-0
10. Terraced roofing — 791-0
11. Pine Ceiling planking ½" 2405-0
12. Teak wood P.W. doors — 122-3
13. Teakwood hand doors — 6-0
14. Small iron safe for Cashier's room — 77-0
15. Iron grated windows — 45-0
16. Plastering 2 coats — 146-0
17. White washing — 9-0
18. Pointing Exterior with Surki — 36-0
19. Pointing basement & flooring with cement — 384-0
20. Painting doors & windows — 8-0
21. Painting outside & ceiling 804-0
22. Painting woodwork under ceiling 397-0
23. Cost of Masonry Rain — 70-0
24. Painting Verandah posts — 49-0
25. Cornice work — 145-0
26. Grooving work — 142-0
27. Receptacle for cash box — 5-0
28. Metal for roadway — 193-0
29. Gravel — 90-0
30. Sheds for Masons &c — 70-0
31. Lead for fixing doors &c 180-0
32. Tacking woodwork — 20-0
33. Petty Supervision — 556-0
34. Compensation for land 450-0

Total Rs. 29,180

## Wooden Record Racks.

1. Teakwood wrought & fitted up — 207-0
2. Wood oiling — 85-0
3. Petty Supervision — 13-0

Total 305-0

## Plain Wire Fencing

1. Concrete in mortar — 20-0
2. Galvanized wire iron — 28-0
3. Oval posts galvanized — 21-0
4. Flat bar iron — 9-0
5. Field gate with straining posts 98-0
6. Carriage from Bombay — 70-0
7. Labor for fixing — 5-0
8. Petty supervision — 8-0

Total Rs. 259-0

## Constructing Cook room.

1. Concrete in mortar — 8-0
2. Rough stone in mortar — 251-0
3. Teakwood wrought & fitted up. 9-0
4. Dressed face — 17-0
5. Roofing with Mangalore tiles 119-0
6. Petty supervision — 3-0

Total Rs. 407-0

## Constructing a Latrine

1. Teakwood wrought & fitted up 33-0
2. Dressed faces — 6-0
3. Roofing with Mangalore tiles — 21-0
4. Earthwork Excavation & filling in — 11-0
5. Chatties — 1-0
6. Petty supervision — 2-0
7. Contingencies — 3-0

Total Rs. 77-0

## Constructing a Well in compound

1. Brick in Surki mortar — 87-0
2. Plastering with Surki Mortar. 46-0
3. Excavating & filling in — 9-0
4. Sinking bottom 10'×12' — 50-0
5. Making well curb — 70-0
6. Raising water including Charge for bric supplies — 100-0
7. Petty supervision — 20-0

Total Rs. 382-0

## Constructing Hydri Shed

1. Roofing with Mangalore tiles — 260-0
2. Scaffolding — 10-0
3. Petty Supervision — 18-0
4. Contingencies — 7-0

Total Rs. 285-0

Cause of Excess due to deviations.

Main building

1 & 2 - Change of site - Sanctioned by Govt in G.O. No 756 W of 2.3.96. and modified section of foundations to suit new site.

3. Orgl Est provided for rubble stone in chunam only in foundations & basement. As no good bricks were to be got at the site rubble stone in chunam was provided for the whole building with the approval of the Supts Engr.

4. Extra doors windows being provided in Standard Est circulated with G.O. No 2393 dated 19-9-93.

5. Found necessary owing to use of rubble stone in superstructure.

6. Same as 4.

7 Found necessary

8. Mangalore tiles substituted for ordinary tiles as per S.D. circulated with Memo No 170 C dated 11-1-96.

9. Caused by different quality of asphalt being used - vide data.

10. Substituted for tiled roofing as per Govt order No 3085 W dt 1-12-94.

11. Ceiling provided under rafters as per Memo No 4169 CW dt 6.12.93

12. Increase due to alteration in Standard Est in G.O. 2393 dt 19/9/93.

13. Due to Workshop charges.

14. added under orders in G.O. No 1417 W dt 7/6/94.

15. Extra window as per S.D. circulated with G.O. No 2393 W dt 19/9/93.

16-17. Insufficient provision in Orgl Estimate.

18-19. Increase due to puntage, Cartage, vide data

~~Key~~ This is merely a standard design for Kutcherries

Flag B in linked file.

Naturally, if Mangalore tiles are used, ceiling boards are necessary.

Unintelligible. There is no explanation at all.



20. Extra labour - vide data

21. Owing to various classes of painting being provided for different classes of wood.

22-23. Not provided in Orgl Est

24-30 33. Provision insufficient

25-26-27-31-32. Found necessary.

28-29. due to change of site

34. out of 10.30 acres sanctioned in G.O No 1686 W dated 6th June 1896, 7 acres have been taken for Taluq Cutcherri.

Wooden Record racks.

1-2. Due to Workshop charges.

3. Provision insufficient.

Main Wire Fencing.

1. Due to extra galvanized barbs used on increased area.

2-3-4. Due to increased extent of land acquired.

5. Gate originally provided had no straining parts.

6-7-8. Original provision insufficient

Constructing Cook room

1-2. Same as main Building

3. Due to increased Workshop charges vide data.

4. Found necessary owing to use of rubble stone in superstructure.

5. Mangalore tiles substituted for ordinary tiles.

6. Original provision insufficient.

Constructing a latrine

1. Same as main Building

2. Necessary owing to use of rubble stone in superstructure.

3. Mangalore tiles used instead of ordinary tiles.

4. Provision made for Paving work.
5-6-7. Provision insufficient.

Constructing a well in compound

1-2-Brick in Surki mortar carried to a greater depth than originally provided.
3. Excess due to extra width taken out owing to increased depth of well.
4-5-6-7. Insufficient provision in original Estimate.

Constructing Kyots' Shed

1. Mangalore Tiles used instead of ordinary Tiles.
2-3-4. As found necessary.

Savings due to deviations

| | Rs. |
|---|---|
| I. Rough stone in mortar foundation & basement | 3866 |
| 2. Superstructure with Stock bricks | 5731 |
| 3. Naga Stone Slab Ventilators | 223 |
| 4. Teakwood wrought & put up | 499 |
| 5. Tiled roofing | 2284 |
| 6. Flooring with asphalt 3/4" | 536 |
| 7. Teakwood battened door | 2 |
| 8. Iron plated door in Treasury | 41 |
| 9. — do — with batten Shutters | 520 |
| 10. Iron plated windows | 63 |
| 11. Iron plated gate | 27 |
| 12. Fixed iron barred Ventilators | 30 |
| 13. Pointing basement with Cement | 42 |
| 14. Painting 3 coats Zinc | 911 |
| 15. Lead Sheeting for Valleys | 3 |
| Contingencies | 738 |
| Total Rs. | 15,516 |

Wooden Record Racks

| | |
|---|---|
| Contingencies | 25 |
| Total Rs. | 25 |

Plain Wire Fencing

| | |
|---|---|
| Field Gate | 58 |



| | |
|---|---|
| 2. Contingencies | 11 |
| Total Rs. | 69. |

Constructing a Cook room

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Foundations & basement | 59 |
| 2. Superstructure brick in mortar | 170 |
| 3. Roofing flat & pan Tiles | 66 |
| 4. Paving woodwork | 5 |
| 5. Contingencies | 16 |
| Total Rs. | 316. |

Constructing a Latrine.

Nil

Constructing a well.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Brick in mud | 109-0 |
| 2. Cement pointing | 24-0 |
| 3. Contingencies | ~~134~~ 0 |
| Total Rs. | 134-0 |

Constructing a Kyots' Shed

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Roofing flat & pan Tiles | 150- |
| 2. Chunam Shed | 22 |
| Total Rs. | 172- |

16,231

Total Savings Rs. 16,660

Cause of Savings

Main Building

1-2. Due to rough stone being used instead of bricks for the whole building as good bricks could not be had.
3. Mangalore Tiles used.
4. Due to reduced scantlings as per Memo No. 170 C d/11-1-96 required for Mangalore Tiles.
5. Ordinary tiled roofing provided in Orgl. Est but Standard

Design received with Memo No 170 e dt 11-1-96 provided Mangalore Tiles.

6. Due to difference in quality of asphalt used.

7. Due to Standard Estimate circulated with G.O. No 2393 dt 19-9-93 & in No 4610 dt 4-12-96.

8. on workshop charges

9. Due to alteration as per Standard Estimate circulated with G.O. No 2393 dt 19/9/93.

10-11-12. Due to workshop charges.

13. Surki pointing used instead of cement.

14. Painting provided for different classes of wood. vide data.

15. Due to provision of Tenancy to Jail Wards &c

16. Total Savings on Contingencies and Supervision to option.

Wooden Record Racks

1. not wanted

Plain wire fencing.

1. not wanted as Gate with Straining posts has been provided.

2 not required.

Constructing Cook room

1-2. as for main building.

3. Mangalore Tiles substituted for country Tiles.

4. as for main Building

5. not wanted.

Constructing a Latrine.

Nil

Constructing a well.

1. Due to brick in Surki mortar carried to a greater depth than originally provided.

2. Inside of well was plastered with Surki mortar instead of pointing with Cement.

3. not required.

Constructing a Kyoto Shed.

1. Mangalore Tiles used instead of ordinary Tiles.

2 not wanted.

Abstract.

| | |
|---|---|
| Increase due to deviations | 30896 |
| Increase due to rates | 1996 |
| Total increase | Rs 32,892 |
| Savings — | Rs 16,231 |
| Total increase requiring sanction of Govt. | Rs 16,660 |

APW
19-7-98.

H.Z.W.
11.6.98

N.B. This note does not enable the main causes of excess to be clearly traced — the essential thing which Govt require. This should always be done in future.

APW
19-7-98.

# Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 3845

From The Superintending Engr. at Cuttack.

Order

No. 1264 K.Ed.

Dated 28.4.98

Received } 3.5.98

Registered }

Enclosures 14 (4 plans ~~sent by B. post~~)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Construction of a Tahsil Cutchery and outhouse in Gadawara - Forwarded for approval and sanction of Govt. revised estimate for the ——.

I am sorry Cu 3/6/98

I submit revised estimate

BACK PAPERS.

| No. | Date. |
|---|---|
| 2289 C | 26-4-98 |
| 725 C | 8-2-98 |
| 2154 W | 24-7-96 |
| 3163 C | 24-8-96 |
| 2946 C | 29-7-96 |
| 1822 W | 3-7-96 |
| 1886 W | 20-6-96 |
| 750 W | 2-3-96 |
| 536 C | 30-1-96 |
| 4158 C | 26-12-96 |
| | & papers |

FURTHER PAPERS.

| No. | Date. |
|---|---|
| | |

No. 1264 K.E.

Superintending Engr's office
N Circle, Bezwada.
dated 27th April 1898.

From

J. Hannan Esquire,
Superintending Engineer
N Circle

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Encl:-
1 General abstract
1 Comp: Statement
7 Detailed & abstract Ests.
1 Data sheets
4 Tracings
14 Stat.

Sir,

In continuation of this office No. 1005 K.E. dated 6th April 1898, I have the honor to forward herewith for your approval and sanction of Government revised estimate and Comparative statement for Rs 56,200/- for the Construction of Taluqa Cutcherry with outhouses and wire fencing in Gudivada.

2. The original estimate with the exception of ryots shed was sanctioned by Government in the orders quoted in the Comparative statement.

3. The original estimate amounting

to

to Rs 1170/ for the ryots' shed was sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer in 1897-'98.

4. Explanations as to the cause of excess over the original sanctions have been given by the Executive Engineer in the remark column of the comparative statement.

5. The work is now approaching completion. The revised estimate should have been submitted two years ago and I know of no reason why it was not submitted.

The general practice now a days as far as my experience goes, is to quite ignore Code rules regarding the submission of revised estimates in proper time.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obt Servt

W Hamner
Superintending Engineer
to Cmd.