0/9 3,000—5-2-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2810

DATED 2nd July 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Approving the construction of a Combined Office for the Tahsildar & the Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Melur & stating that orders will issue in the P. W. D. for the preparation of the necessary Estimate.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ca. o. 7/4/98							

Revenue (189 8) Department.

CURRENT No. 3/52.

From

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, Madras.

Ref No. 463.

Dated 25rd April 1898.

Received 27

Registered 28

Enclosures 5

Spare copies

Order

SUBJECT.

Submitting for the orders of Govt. letters from the Collector of Madura requesting that the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Melur may be postponed if a combined office for the Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate is to be built within a reasonable period of time.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Reference on *No.* *of* 1898.

In replying the above should be quoted.

(LAND REVENUE.)

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE. MADRAS.

Read the following :-

~~1. Read the following :-~~

1. Letter from J.Twigg,Esquire,Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras, R.O.C.No.1053/Genl. of 1897,dated 29th November 1897.

And the following Reference,dated 14th December 1897.

In the letter read above,the Collector states that the cutcherry at Melur is the oldest of the Taluk office buildings in the district and quite unsuited for present requirements.Full explanation should be given as to how far the existing accommodation is insufficient and whether the inconvenience is so great as to render a new office absolutely necessary.The Collector is requested to forward a plan of the existing Taluk Cutcherry at Melur showing the accommodation available therein.

2. Also Letter from J.G.D.Partridge,Esquire,Acting Collector of Madura,to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras,Ref.on Cur.No.1053/genl. of 1897,dated 23th February 1898.

-------:0:-------

Reference No.465,dated 25rd April 1898.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In his letter No.802,dated 25th December 1894 disposed of in Board's Proceedings No.140,dated 15th January 1895,the Collector of Madura reported that the Taluk Cutcherry at ~~Melur~~ Melur was an old building,constructed before 1363 on

a very unsuitable site,and recommended the construction of a new cutcherry on the revised standard design,providing accommodation for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate also.In its Proceedings No.140, dated 15th January 1895,the Board supported the Collector's recommendation ,but in Government Order,No 534 Rev.,dated 29th January 1895,the Government decided that it would suffice merely to construct an office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate,deeming it unnecessary also to provide fresh accommodation for the Taluk office.An estimate amounting to Rs.7755 was accordingly sanctioned for a Sub-Magistrate's office in Government Order,No.2203 W,dated 29th July 1896.

5. In the letters read above,the Collector requests a reconsideration of these orders to which,presumably for financial reasons, effect has not yet been given.He points out that the accommodation available in the present Taluk cutcherry at Nelur is quite inadequate for the taluk clerks,the records and the sub treasury.The building is further stated to suffer from defective ventilation and lighting,to such an extent as to cause grave inconvenience to the Tahsildar and his clerks,while the situation of the cutcherry is open to serious objection on account of its noisy surroundings,being in close propinquity to the Police station,the Sub Registrar's office and a public thoroughfare.The Collector also deprecates the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate on the ground of the inconvenience which would be felt during the absence on tour of the Tahsildar;the site which has been selected by the Executive Engineer is at a considerable distance from the present Taluk cutcherry and the Stationary Sub Magistrate would thus find considerable difficulty in attending to treasury work as well as his Magisterial functions.

4. The ground plan of the present cutcherry shows that the existing accommodation is both inadequate and ill-arranged and the actual superficial area is apparently only about two-thirds of the space provided in the standard design.In these circumstances the Board fully agrees with the Collector in considering it expedient to postpone the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate if there is any prospect of a combined building being sanctioned within a reasonable period of time.It should be added that the present building which is in the heart of the Nelur village is reported to be likely to fetch a good price,if not required for the use of other departments.

Lionel Anderson

Ag.Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government,Revenue Department,with
5 letters & Enclosures in original to be retd.

Md.R.H.

a very unsuitable site,and recommended the construction of a new cutcherry on the revised standard design,providing accommodation for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate also.In its Proceedings No.140, dated 15th January 1895,the Board supported the Collector's recommendation ,but in Government Order,No 534 Rev.,dated 29th January 1895,the Government decided that it would suffice merely to construct an office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate,deeming it unnecessary also to provide fresh accommodation for the Taluk office.An estimate amounting to Rs.7755 was accordingly sanctioned for a Sub-Magistrate's office in Government Order,No.2203 W,dated 29th July 1896.

5. In the letters read above,the Collector requests a reconsideration of these orders to which,presumably for financial reasons, effect has not yet been given.He points out that the accommodation available in the present Taluk cutcherry at Nelur is quite inadequate for the taluk clerks,the records and the sub treasury.The building is further stated to suffer from defective ventilation and lighting,to such an extent as to cause grave inconvenience to the Tahsildar and his clerks,while the situation of the cutcherry is open to serious objection on account of its noisy surroundings,being in close propinquity to the Police station,the Sub Registrar's office and a public thoroughfare.The Collector also deprecates the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate on the ground of the inconvenience which would be felt during the absence on tour of the Tahsildar;the site which has been selected by the Executive Engineer is at a considerable distance from the present Taluk cutcherry and the Stationary Sub Magistrate would thus find considerable difficulty in attending to treasury work as well as his Magisterial functions.

4. The ground plan of the present cutcherry shows that the existing accommodation is both inadequate and ill-arranged and the actual superficial area is apparently only about two-thirds of the space provided in the standard design.In these circumstances the Board fully agrees with the Collector in considering it expedient to postpone the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate if there is any prospect of a combined building being sanctioned within a reasonable period of time.It should be added that the present building which is in the heart of the Nelur village is reported to be likely to fetch a good price,if not required for the use of other departments.

Lionel Dawkins

Ag.Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government,Revenue Department,with 5 letters & Enclosures in original to be retd.

Md.R.H.

Bds Progs. No 463 / 23-4-98 (Con 3152)

To Secretary

In 1894 the Collector of Madura submitted a proposal for the construction of a Stationary Sub Magistrate's office at Melur. Seeing that the Taluk Cutchery at Melur was quite in the old style and that, if it should be found necessary to erect a new Taluk Cutchery, it would be cheaper to construct a Combined office for the Tahsildar and the Stationary Sub Magistrate, the Govt requested the Collector to report whether he contemplated the construction of a new Taluk office. The Collector (Mr Miller) reported that the Taluk Cutchery was an old building constructed before 1868 in a very unsuitable locality and very much cramped for space, and proposed the Construction of a new office to accomodate both the Tahr and the Stationary Sub Magistrate.

The

Ep. 3999 / 17-10-94

Paras 2 & 7 of the Collector's report in the current Flag D

C 2/6/98

The Board supported the Collector's proposal; but the Govt thought that the objections to the existing building were not sufficiently weighty to justify the construction of a new building for Taluk office and accordingly approved the original proposal to Construct a stationary Sub Magistrate's office. An estimate amounting to Rs 7735 was sanctioned in G.O. 3360 dt 19-8-96; but no effect was given to this order presumably as the Board thinks, for financial reasons.

B.P. in Jo. 384/29-1-95- flag C

Go. 384/29-1-95: flag C.

Flag H.

2. Last year the Collector (Mr Twigg) while he was at the Board of Rev, pointed out that Mr Miller's report of 1894 referred only to the unsuitability of the position of the present Taluk cutchery, and did not say anything as to the unsuitability and inconvenience of the buildings themselves — a more important point. He stated that the Cutchery at Melur was the oldest of the taluk office buildings in the district, consisting of a row of rooms and cells in a square; and quite unsuited for the present requirements. He also pointed out that the site chosen for the Stationary Sub Magistrate's office was unsuitable owing to its distance from the Taluk Cutchery and that the Stationary Sub Magistrate would find it difficult to attend to Treasury work during the absence of the Tahsildar on tour. He therefore requested the construction of a new taluk cutchery and the cancellation of the order sanctioning the erection of a separate Stationary Sub Magistrate's office. The Board called for a fuller explanation as to how far the existing accommodation was insufficient and whether the inconvenience was so great as to render a new office absolutely necessary

Para 2 of this letter etiketed with the Current. flag G.

In reply the Collector (Mr. Partridge) who has not seen the building himself submits the reports of the Tahsildar and Asst. Collector in which it is pointed out that the accommodation available in the present cutchery is quite inadequate for the taluk clerks, the records and the Sub. treasury; that the building is defective as regards ventilation and lighting and that the situation of the building is open to serious objection on account of its noisy and unhealthy surroundings. Mr. Partridge himself is of opinion that the present building is unsuitable.

3. The Board, in the current read above, states that the ground plan of the present cutchery shows that the existing accommodation is both inadequate and ill-arranged and that the actual superficial area is apparently only about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the space provided in the standard design, and recommends that the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Submagistrate may be postponed, if there is any prospect of a combined office being constructed shortly.

4. It will be seen that three successive Collectors have been in favour of the construction of a combined office and the Bd. supports their views. No alternative proposals are made for improving the building so as to extend the accommodation; and as the building is 30 years old, it may perhaps be cheaper in the long run to build a new office on the other hand the P.W. Officer has expressed his opinion as to the present condition of the building

building - and whether it would not be possible to effect improvements in it so as to meet the present requirements of the office. The Dy Collector states that the building, being in the heart of the city, will fetch proper price in auction if it is not required for any other dept. This would seem to imply that the building though old is sound enough; in fact Mr Miller reported in 1894 that the building was in good order.

ES
20-5-98

Please show in a comparative statement the space allowed for each purpose (Taluk room relating room clerks records etc) in the existing building & in the standard design.

Ulk
21.V.98

Please see the statement put up.
RS
26-5-98

Para 2 of his letter in the current file

Levy

The Jail part & the existing building could not be conveniently adapted for the uses of a Taluk cutcherry. So the construction of a separate one for the Stationary Sub-magistrate with clear only four rooms totalling 976 sq ft fee for the accommodation of the Taluk Office; this is 1856 sq ft short. This calculation takes into account merely the superficial area of the rooms. But it will be seen that the existing rooms are, further, of most inconvenient sizes. There is no room big enough for the Taluk Court-room (except the which is already used as the clerks room) Records has to be

scattered in several small rooms. Lastly the Local Officers in charge the Tahsildar reports that the building is badly lighted & ventilated and that the surroundings are noisy & unhealthy. The existing building is reported to be likely to fetch a good price. In the circumstances the best course would seem to be to get estimates for a new Standard plan Taluk cutcherry & Submagistrates office combined & build when funds are available on completion of which the existing building may be sold.

MK
27.V.98

A.M. & H.E.

H.
29/5/98.

Yes. The plans submitted shows that the ground existing is used in every way, & there can be no doubt that it is very badly situated.

JG
31/5/98

Approved
19.6.98

Description of rooms	As per type design		As per plan of the existing building		Difference between cols. 3 & 5	
	Dimension	area	Dimension	area		
	2	3	4	5		
Tahsildar's office		sq ft		sq ft	sq ft	
Private room	18'×11'	198				
Court room	18'×25'	450	14'×24'	336		
Clerks' room	20¾'×18'	373	24'×7'	168		
Do	24'×18'	432	43'×10½'	451		
Hd accountants room	16'×18'	288				
Cashiers room	10'×18'	180				
Treasury room	10'×18'	180	8'×8'	64		
Property room	18'×7¼'	129	11'×9'	99		
Record room	60'×16'	960	24'×9'	216		
		3190		1334	−1856	
Sub-Magistrate's office						
Private room	11'×18'	198				
Court room	18'×25'	450	14'×24'	336		
Record room	8¾'×9¼'	81	24'×9'	216		
Do			13½'×9½'	176		
Store room			8½'×11½'	98		
Stationery room			24'×6¼'	152		
		729		976	+247	
Police Jail						
Taluk Record room	8¾'×9¼'	81	24'×8½'	204		
Suspts room	10'×18'	180	11½'×8½'	98		
Arms room	10'×16'	160				
Yard room	16'×15'	240	24'×9'	216		
Do	16'×7½'	120	24'×9'	216		
Do	14½'×15'	217	14½'×9	130		
Do	14½×15'	217	14½'×9'	130		
		1215		994	−221	
Grand Total		5,134		3,304	−1830.	

The accommodation of the existing office is nearly ⅔ of the space in use

Standard Office.

RA 24-5-98

GD 23/5/98.

Read again Ep. 3360 / 19-8-96
Read B.P. 463. / 28-4-98 (Cus 3152)

Ep. misc no. 2810 d/ 2nd Jul 98.

In the circumstances now reported the Govt sanctions the construction of a combined office for the Tahsildar and the Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Melur on the revised Standard plan, and Cancels its previous order sanctioning the construction of a separate office for the Stationary Submagistrate. Orders will issue in the P.W.D for the preparation of the necessary estimates for a combined office.

RS
30-6-98

1.7.98

1.7.98

1.7.98

To P.W.D. for Counter-initials.

To the Board of Rev (L.R.) } 2nd
" P.W.D with cycs to Chairman } 7-7-98.

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined ——
When signed ——
} 189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.