

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 28

DATED 4th January 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Comm^g G. O. Public Works Department to the B of R
approving the recommendations of the Chief Engineer to build
a wall in continuation of the existing edge hedge round the
Taluk office at Tiru Kkolilur, and stating that, in the
matter of enclosures to be provided for public buildings
local circumstances must determine the material to be
used in each case.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue Department

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Government {1898} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Current No 8606

Recd. } 16 Dec 1898.
Regd. }

Enclosures

Spare copies

Genl 4/1/99

G.O., No. 3097 W., 2nd December 1898.

DECEMBER.

Encl No 28 74 Jan. 1899.

Communicated to the
Board of Revenue.

rs
17-12-98

16
4/1/99

Done

17 To the Bd of Rev (Land Rev)

Taluk Office at Tirukkoyilur

9
16-12-98 Des. 5-1-99

Approving the recommendation of the Chief Engineer to build a wall in continuation of the existing hedge round the —, and stating that, in the matter of enclosures to be provided for public buildings, local circumstances must determine the material to be used in each case.

24
16/1/99

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following papers:—

From C. A. SMITH, Esq., Executive Engineer, South Arcot Division, to the Superintendent Engineer, V Circle, dated 20th May 1898, No. 373 S.E.

[Reference.—Your No. 19 S.A. of 12th January 1898.]

I have the honour to point out that the site is a very exposed one and it is not likely that either a mud wall or a sun-dried brick in mud wall will prove satisfactory.

2. I, however, submit data for—

- (1) Mud;
- (2) Sun-dried bricks in mud;
- (3) Burnt stone in mud;

and would strongly recommend the adoption of No. (3).

3. I have also to bring to your notice that, out of a length of 1,221 feet provided in the original estimate, a length of 421 feet is at present occupied by an excellent prickly-pear fence, and, as it is some distance from the cutcherry, it may, I think, be allowed to remain. This 421 feet as well as the remainder of the southern boundary, 321 feet in length, or altogether 742, is demarcated by a line of well grown Korakapalli saplings, which with a little attention would soon form a very good hedge, and I would recommend that, with a view to economy, no wall be provided for this part of the compound.

4. I enclose a comparative statement showing the cost of the various proposals.

5. I have also to remind you that an estimate has already been sanctioned for a compound wall for the adjoining Sub-Magistrate's cutcherry of the same design as that objected to for the Tahsildar's cutcherry (estimate Rs. 750, Register No. 36 of 1896-97) and that it is desirable to adopt the same design for both, as there will be a continuous wall round the two buildings.

No. 388 W.

Submitted to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with reference to G.O., No. 3575 W., dated 25th December 1897. An alternative design for a brick in mortar wall, $4\frac{1}{2}$ " thick, with 9" pilasters, is estimated for in the last column of statement.

15th June 1898.

(Signed) A. W. SMART, Colonel, R.E.,
Offg. Superintendent Engineer, V Circle.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated 25th July 1898.

ORDER—No. 2097 W., dated 2nd December 1898.

With his letter, No. 254 M., dated 2nd September 1897, the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, submitted an estimate of Rs. 2,140 for constructing a masonry compound wall round the Taluk office at Tirukkóyilúr, in the South Arcot district, and this estimate was forwarded by the Collector to the Board of Revenue for the sanction of Government. The Board called upon the Collector to state whether a mud wall with tiled coping, which would be much cheaper, could not be substituted. The Collector reported that the erection of mud walls would prove less economical in the long run, as they would have to be repaired almost every year, and recommended that a wire fence at an estimated cost of Rs. 300 might be provided, and that the Korakapalli hedge which existed in some parts only be also completed. He also remarked that mud for erecting walls would have to be carted to the spot from a distance of a mile. The Board thereupon recommended the construction of a plain wire fence at a cost of Rs. 300. The Government, however, observed—*vide* Proceedings, No. 6355-Rev., dated 9th December 1897, that wire fencing was generally stolen, that the replacing of stolen wire would cost more than the repair of a mud wall, that the repairs to such a wall would afford excellent employment for the convicts in the sub-jail, and that a wall of sun-dried bricks or mud as originally suggested by the Board would therefore answer the purpose best. The Superintending Engineer was accordingly directed in G.O., No. 3575 W., dated 22nd December 1897, to submit an estimate for a wall of sun-dried bricks or mud with tiled coping.

2. The Executive Engineer, South Arcot Division, submits data for the following descriptions of wall and recommends the construction of a wall of burnt stone in mud:—

	RS.
Mud wall with tiled coping	537
Wall of sun-dried bricks with tiled coping	865
Wall of burnt stone in mud	1,042

He states that the site is a very exposed one and that it is not likely that either a mud wall or a wall of sun-dried bricks in mud will prove satisfactory. He also remarks that, for a portion of the compound measuring 742 feet which is well protected by prickly-pear and Korakapalli saplings, no wall need be provided. As a further reason for recommending the burnt stone wall, the Executive Engineer states that an estimate for this description of wall for the adjoining Sub-Magistrate's office has been sanctioned and that it is desirable to adopt the same design for both, as there will be a continuous wall round the two buildings. The Superintending Engineer submits another alternative design for a brick in mortar estimated to cost Rs. 490.

3. The Chief Engineer in his note quoted above recommends that, as it will be incongruous and unsightly to have walls of different descriptions adjacent to each other, the advice of the Executive Engineer be followed, *viz.*, to leave as it is the existing length of 742 feet already protected by prickly-pear and Korakapalli saplings and to build a burnt stone wall for the remaining 480 feet at an approximate cost of Rs. 400. This recommendation is approved.

4. The Chief Engineer also re-opens the question of the relative merits of wire fences, mud walls and walls of sun-dried bricks and compares the cost of eight kinds of enclosures. He argues that wire fencing is very economical, that walls of sun-dried bricks or mud walls are perishable and not necessarily economical even as compared with walls built of stone or brick in mortar, since the cost of repairs to these walls would soon make up for the difference in prime cost, and that if the use of wire fencing is to be abandoned, brick or stone walls must generally be substituted with the inevitable result of a large increase in the total cost of buildings without any corresponding advantage. He also states that wire fences, supplemented by a hedge—the wire fence affording protection for the hedge to grow—are suitable in cases where the cost of other materials is considerable, and where the unimportance of the building does not warrant outlay on an enclosure wall, and that if wire fences are properly secured and cared for, they are not easily stolen. He suggests therefore that there should be

No. 3097 W., 2ND DECEMBER 1898.

no hard and fast rule in regard to the kind of enclosure to be provided for public buildings, and that each case should be decided on its own merits, local circumstances, and local prices of materials being the proper factors to determine what class of wall or other protection is both economical and advisable.

5. His Excellency the Governor in Council agrees with the Chief Engineer that it is inadvisable to lay down any hard and fast rule in regard to the kind of enclosure to be provided for public buildings. Local circumstances must determine the material to be used in each case.

(True Extract.)

A. K. Smith.

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, V Circle.
 „ other Superintending Engineers.
 „ the Consulting Architect to Government.
 „ the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse Division.
 „ the Revenue Department.

20/12/98
A A A A A A A

Exd. M.J. Pahlwan.

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.

DATED

189

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. 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.