Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 2902-W

DATED 16 Nov '98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Taluk Cutcherry at Pattikonda

Endorsement in the Rev. Dept.
Stating that the new ______, Kurnool dt.,
may be built on the site in the manner
suggested by Mr Johnston, the Executive Engineer,
Communicated to the S.E. III Circle.

Indexed. 19/11

[P. W. 2
800—11-10-98.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 9282

B

From The Revenue Department

No: 2902 W. of 16.11.98.

Communicated to the Supdg. Engr., III Circle.

ACW
11.11.98.
Dw.

No. Mis 4271.

Dated 2 November 98

Received 3 8"

Registered

Enclosures 7. (3 plans).

T / B. Plans

Spare copies

Rw.

To

The Supdg. Engr., III Circle with 3 plans

SUBJECT

New Taluq Cutcherry at Pattikonda, Kurnool Dt. Transferring report regarding the site for the

11/11/98

P. W. 29.
1,000—5-9-98.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1887 C	d 28·3·98	
579	W* d	4·3·98	
412	W d	18·2·98	
186	W d	21·1·97	
12	W d	5·1·97	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
3349	W d	21·11·96	
4209	C	d 17·11·96	

0/18 2,000—30-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 6914.

~~Order~~

Endt.Mis.No.4271, d/2nd Novr. '98.

Transferred to the Public Works Department with reference to its Endt. No.1887 C. dated 28th March 1898. The Cutcherry may, in the circumstances reported, be built on the site and in the manner suggested by Mr.Johnston.

(By Order)

Marjoribanks

Ag.Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Public Works Dept. with encls.
,, Bd. of Rev., Land Rev.

Re

From

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue.

No. 1118 Ref.

Dated 4th Octr. 1898.
Received 7th ,,
Registered 8th ,,
Enclosures 5
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government the report called for in re: the site the new Taluk Cutcherry at Pattiko Kurnool Dt.

BACK PAPERS.

G O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Revenue

~~Public Works~~ (1898) Department.

~~2563.~~

CURRENT No. ~~2369~~

BOARD'S GOVT. REG. No. 636 OF 1898
REVENUE

II A
20/4

BOARD OF REVENUE,
19 APR. 98
MADRAS.

Df 14/4/98

No. 1887C of 28th March 1898

~~Order~~ Govt.:

Referred to the Revenue Department for consideration, with advertence to G.O. No. 4375 Rev. dated 6 November 1896.

2. The position selected by the Board of Revenue is considered too cramped.

C. H. Marlow
for Secy. to Govt.

Endorsement No. 683 R.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for early remarks
(By order)

Ootacamund
14th April 1898
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

6/4/98

From the Superintdg. Engineer
3rd Circle
Bellary

No. 6408W

Dated 12-3-98.

Received 30/3
Registered 31/3.
14.3.98

Enclosures 4. (3 plans)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Taluq Cutcherry Pattikonda:

Forwards Kurnool Executive Engineer's proposals regarding the site for the

1118/4-10-98

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Copy of letter No. 6033 dated 9th February 98 from J. C. Johnston Esq Exec: Engineer Kurnool Division to the Suptg Engineer III Circle Bellary.

+ See G.O. No 413 W of 13-2-98. flagged Q

I have the honour to explain why I have considered it necessary+ to surrender almost the whole grant for the Pattikonda Taluq Cutcherry.

I + I

G.O. 5629/21.12.92

1389/18.4.93

B.P. 73/10.1.93 & 2711/2.5.93

flag L & P

+ Site plan No 1

2. In G.O Nos 3323 W and 827 W dated 3d December 92 and 27th March 93 respectively an Estimate amounting to Rs 36610 was sanctioned for constructing a Taluq Cutcherry at Pattikonda. The site chose was No. I+ in the tracing enclosed and is 5 furlongs north of the existing old building and not far from the Pattikonda - Kurnool road. Work was commenced a the trenches for the foundations had bee excavated when orders were issued fro this office on 25th June 1894 to stop wor as the Collector intended the building to constructed at Tugli on the Southern M haratta Railway 7 miles south of Pa konda. The Collector however a

eventually chose a site at Pattikondah itself. No 2 on tracing situated 7 furlongs south of the old building site No 1 did not meet with the approval of the Assistant Deputy Inspector General of Police and Superintendent of Police, and Collector but these officers were in favour of site No II.

Site No 2 is far the best being on a hill to be raised some 30' above the country — JCL

The police Officers considered site No 1 too far and remote in case the Police guard required assistance during a decoity. The Police lines are just opposite the existing building on the other side of the road and if the new Cutcherry were built on site No 1 would be 7 furlongs distant from it. Site No II is 2 furlongs further from the Police lines but is not far from the Pattapetta.

Cutcherries are not as a rule built near the Police Stations

The inhabitants of Pattikonda did not approve of site No 2 and after petitioning Government and the Board of Revenue orders were issued to the Collector in B.P. dated 28th May 1895 to chose another site [illegible] Munro's petta as possible be- [illegible] ment attaches much importance to Munro's petta and the state memorials therein erected.

The objections raised were [illegible] and led. Instigated it is said by a clerk in the Cutcherry + flag I

The only memorial to Sir Thomas Munro is a rough Chunam plaster relief of him let into the wall of the old building and with the removal of the building this memorial cannot but be destroyed.

Why should this not be preserved? [illegible]

4. The Collector reported there was no suitable site between the old and new pettas and that Munros tope was unsuitable as it was condemned by the District Sanitary + Medical Officer as low and swampy and that the following Officers concurred in expressing an opinion that the site No 2 was the best available.

1. Acting Collector Mr A. C. Tate.
2. Dy Inspector General of Police.
3. Superintendent of Police Mr J. W. Stoddart
4. Superintendent of Police Mr H. B. Pendergast
5. Surgeon Major A. L. Patch.
6. Deputy Collector Mr Sufther Hussain
7. Tahsildar Mr Gurusawmy Naidu

5. The Board of Revenue thereupon in their B.P. Land Revenue dated 20 December 95 No 6356 Miscellaneous stated that site No 2 was objectionable owing to the proximity of Chucklers' huts. Now site No 2 is on a hill and about 30' above and 100 yards distant from these huts, which did not strike me as being too close to be in sanitary. However the Board of Revenue objected to site No 2 and over ruling the objections of the Collector as to insufficiency of space ruled that the new building should be erected within the space denoted by me on survey (No 2) with a purple edge that a space measuring 400 feet × 150 feet (60,000) square feet was available if certain houses were acquired. The space however s not 150 ft wide throughout or at any oint. To the East against the road from e front doors of the houses to the edge the cross road between the Mantapam l temple the width is scarcely 150 feet we cannot acquire all this and

flag R 52
G.O. 4375 / 6.11.96
[illegible]
in file flag
R–

v B.P. 4587 Mis / 8.10.96
flag C

quite an unsuitable site
gel

and leave no margin for the fronts of the houses on one side and to the cross road on the other. The extreme width at the west end near the temple is about 125 feet. I enclose a block out line+ of the proposed Cutcherry cut out of paper and by placing it lengthways East and West it will be seen at a glance how cramped the position wil be. If then it is necessary to commemorate the memory of Sir Thomas Munro, it can surely be done better than in erecting a handsome buildin in such a cramped position with its frontage not 20 feet from the doors of some small huts. Sir Thomas Munro was a great man and is memor is still venerated locally and it would be advisable to associate the new Cutcherry with his name by erecting it i the Munro's petta but let it be done a suitable manner. The Munro' is a good site but very expensiv

+ not sent forward by the S.E. [illegible] and if it is actually necessary to build on it I would propose the new building to face east (and I really see no objection to its facing east) and I would take up all the houses coloured green within ABCD, and thus secure a plot of ground 310 × 250; a site more suitable to the memory of Sir Thomas Munro than the one proposed by the Board. I enclose estimates showing what it will cost to erect on sites No 1 and 2 on the Board's site, and on the one I proposed.

Site No 4 saves Rs 4000 cheaper than the sanctioned site

6. The compensation I have allowed in my estimate is high. I am still – ×awaiting correct figures from the Tahsildar. Some site must be chosen and that quickly but I must really request permission to protest being called upon to build on the site – approved by the Board. The extreme idth of the building is 102 feet and the d practically available is not more 115 feet wide.

received & entered.

7.

7. The state memorial alluded to by the Board is at the point marked with a cross ×- on survey sheet No 2. The panel measures about 3' × 2'. Its only value is that it is not very recen and if the new building is to be place as directed by the Board then this state memorial must be destroyed. If my proposal is accepted then th wall with the memorial could be left standing with a roof over it and a railing round it. Site No 2 however is quite good enough an very much cheaper.

Enclosur
3 sketch
1 statem
4

(Copy)

No 6408W of 12 March 1898

Submitted to the Chief Engineer P.W. Madras with a request that he will b good enough to obtain the sanct of Government to the proposals o Exec. Engineer Kurnool Divn in p

a
on
to
to
up
A1
31
M
or
or
or
6.
in
An
Da
An
re
Cal
2pp
id
d
115

the selection of
regard to a better site. Site No 2 originally [illegible] it far in a way the best. & the soil being gravel, ordinary foundations will suffice. While it is not certain that the soil in the Pettah is made & will involve only costly foundations.
Comparison of cost
III accompanies
73

J. C. [illegible]
Supdg Engineer
III Circle
9/3/98

12 W
flagged R
& 3349 W
21-11-96
flagged P

1
VENUE DEPT.
No.

---

no remarks	Site No. I as originally proposed – Estimate	Rs 36,610
	Add for cartage of wood work, tiles &c now stored in the room – – – – – –	" 700
		37,310
	Site No. II	
	Estimate Rupees – – – – – –	36,610
Board of Revenue advocate this. I do not think it is actually necessary. The site is on a Hill and ground is not level. A lump sum has been added for levelling. The soil on surface is gravelly and for some depth	Removal of Madiga houses, ~~extra~~	2,000
	Extra foundations with levelling & road –	1,000
		39,610
	Board's site. (vide BP 4587/8.10.96) flag	
	Estimate – – – – – – – –	Rs 36,610
Gravel is at about 8 ft. depth here.	Extra foundations for 8 ft. depth	" 2,850
Information obtained from old records –	Compensation – Nil as merchants proposed to purchase and present the site.	
This will be necessary of course.	Removing old building and with it the memorial to Sir Thomas Munro – – – –	1,300
also this.	House rent for another building for holding Cutcherry for 2 years @ 50 Rs a month –	1,200
also this.	Alteration to Ha	

egarding the selection of
onda.

----

ted 4th October 1898

My

Estimate – –

ts orders 3323 W / 3-12-'92 & 827 W / 27-3-'93,

ment sanctioned estimates aggre-
truction of a first class Taluk
he Kurnool District. Government
ndation of the Board to extend
herry at Munropeta by acquiring
nd lying to the west and to erect
de Government Order, 4375 Misc. / 6-11-'96

as explained above. The renting of a building for 2 years – and alteration to it will not be necessary as present Cutcherry need not be removed till after construction of new building.

Extra founda
Compensation
Removing old

In above estimate
which may be consi

1
REVENUE DEPT.
Encl. No.
Curr. No. 6914

VENUE DEPT.
No.
No. 6914

Office of the Board of Revenue,

(Land Revenue)

Read the following :-

1. Endorsement of the Ag. Under Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, No. 683 R, dated 14th April 1898, on that of the Acting Secretary to Govt. P.W.D., No. 1887 C, dated 28th March 1898.

And the following Reference No. 480, dated 27th April 1898

Referred to the Collector of Kurnool for very early report.

2. Also letter from Muhammad Raza Khan Esquire, Collector of Kurnool, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, R.C. No. 414/B & G of 1898, dated 19th August 1898, submitting the report regarding the new Taluk cutcherry at Pattikonda, called for by the Board in its Reference No. 480, dated 27th April 1898.

And Reference No. 1026, dated 13th September 1898.

3. Also letter from the Hon'ble P. Rajaratna Mudaliar, Dewan Bahadur, Inspector-General of Registration, Madras, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, Chepauk, Madras, G. No. 6955, dated 26th September 1898, submitting opinion called for in Board's Reference No. 1026, dated 13th September 1898 regarding the selection of a site for the Taluk Office, Pattikonda.

Reference No. 1118, dated 4th October 1898

In its orders 3323 W / 3-12-'92 & 827 W / 27-3-'93, Government in the P.W. Department sanctioned estimates aggregating Rs. 36,610 for the construction of a first class Taluk Cutcherry at Pattikonda in the Kurnool District. Government also approved of the recommendation of the Board to extend the site of the present Cutcherry at Munropeta by acquiring the Chattram and its compound lying to the west and to erect the new building thereon vide Government Order, 4375 Misc. / 6-11-'96

But the Executive Engineer, Kurnool Division, being of opinion that the site, even when thus enlarged, would be too cramped, for a cutcherry building, suggested that the extension should be made towards the South instead of to the West so as to secure a plot of ground measuring 310 feet by 250 feet. Government referred this proposal to the Board for remarks. Vide Endorsement No. 683 R / 14-4-98

× edjed with purple
in site plan No.2

△ ABCD in Site plan no. 2

2. Both the Collector and the Divisional officer have after personal inspection come to the same conclusion as the Executive Engineer and state that there will be no difficulty in acquiring the houses required for the purpose. It is also reported that the amount of compensation to be granted to the owners of the houses will not exceed Rs. 3,000. This reduces the total cost of the building, as estimated by the Executive Engineer, from Rs. 46,710 to Rs. 43,710 which is but slightly in excess of the amount that would be required if the Cutcherry were constructed on the site selected by the Board.

* Coloured green in site plan no. 2

‡ Rs 43,535

3. The Board has also consulted the Honourable P. Rajaratna Mudaliar, Dewan Bahadur, who has personal knowledge of the local conditions of Pattikonda and he has expressed himself in favour of the Executive Engineer's proposal. In these circumstances it recommends that the Taluk Cutcherry may be built on the site marked A B C D in the site plan No.2 forwarded by the Executive Engineer.

Lionel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with the Enclos. & plans returned

Md.R.H.