CHAPTER 20.

THE GLEDEN BEQUEST.
On the 6th November 1927 a letter was received from Stone James & Co., informing the University of the Death the previous day of Robert John Gledden. By his will made in 1925 he bequeathed the whole of his estate subject only to several small annuities, to relatives and old friends, to the University. The Vice Chancellor in a circular letter to the members of the Senate gave an estimate of the value of the bequest as approximately £60,000.

This Will provided that the "rents, profits and income from the estate were to be allowed to accumulate for 10 years and might be used to erect buildings on the estate or to acquire adjoining estate. It also provided in clause 3 -

"I direct the said University to invest the residue of my estate and devote the net income thereof from time to time for the promotion and encouragement of education at such University to provide for two or more scholarships in applied science, more particularly relating to surveying engineering or mining or cognate subjects upon such terms and conditions as the University shall from time to time by Statute direct provided that such scholarships shall be known as the Robert Gledden and the Maud Gledden scholarships. I leave the University a description as to the amount to be paid in respect of and the duration of each scholarship and realising as I do the value of travel and post graduate work I hope one at least of such scholarships will be travelling scholarships if practicable I should prefer two and that my name shall be attached to one and the name of my late wife Maud Gledden to the other."

As Gledden had expressed a wish to be buried in the same grave as his wife the body had to be taken to Brighton Victoria for internment. A funeral Service took place in the Anglican Cathedral, Perth at 4.30 p.m. on Wednesday November 9th, 1927. The Archbishop delivered a funeral Oration and said inter alia -

".......Mr. Gledden was a very generous man and if anyone was sick or hard up he was always ready to help and when he came to the end of his life and wanted to make a Will we are told by Mr. Kirwan that he talked over things with him just as Dr. Hackett talked over things about the University with me time after time, and he came to the conclusion that he would like to leave his money to be of the greatest use to this State of W.A. He knew that all the nations of the World were educating their youth. He knew we required men and women of intelligence and education to hold our own in the world and so he said, I will leave my money to the University to help the youth of the State to fit themselves for the battle of life."
In order to show what manner of man Gledden was the following extracts from various sources are copied.

He was born in England (locality not mentioned) in 1856 so when he died he was aged 71. He was trained as a Land Surveyor and spent some years in Germany and Finland and other parts of Europe. He came to W.A. from Queensland in 1892 and went to the Goldfields at the request of W.P. Harman, the Minister for Lands. At that time the Latitude and Longitude of Coolgardie was (as described by Sir John Kirwan in his book My Life's Adventure) unknown and there was a possibility that it might be within the freethold property of the Hampton Plains Co. This was an enormous area of country which had been acquired from the Government for the purpose of exploiting whatever it might be found to contain by an English Co. If Coolgardie had proved to be within its boundaries, then the confusion and fighting both physical and with Legal weapons, over the ownership of the large amount of Gold being won would have been formidable. Fortunately when the preliminary survey was made the Coolgardie field proved to be a few miles outside the Hampton Plains boundary. He also, about a year later, made a preliminary survey of Kalgoorlie. He also acted at times as Mining Registrar and occasionally as Warden in the absence of Warden J.M. Finnerty.

Sir John Kirwan also speaks of-

"Another friend, Bob Gledden a curious mixture, a surveyor by profession, who was successful in wise speculation chiefly in town blocks in mining centres and in Perth. In a few years he had all the wealth he wanted and he left the Goldfields. After that his wanderings were far and wide. Once I met him accidentally in London. He had just returned from an extensive tour of Algeria. He was dressed rather shabbily but I afterwards found that he was living in a London Mansion in style and fashion.

Many years later it was in 1927, he returned to Western Australia. He was over 70 years of age; he was very ill and he was depressed in spirits. In the meantime his wife, to whom he was deeply attached had died; they had no children and he was a lonely man. A great admirer of Cecil Rhodes and his scholarship system, he had discussed with me our W.A. University of the Senate of which I was a member. We talked of its early struggles its finances and its future. He told me in strictest confidence that he intended to leave all his money to the University for scholarships.

Later visiting him at a hospital, I found him worrying about a business deal. I told him not to worry during his illness over business affairs, but to leave them to his agent.

"I would not worry about my own affairs said he, but they are not now my own affairs. I want to make the best deal I can for the University."

The next day the collapse came and he was no longer able to do business or even recognise his friends.

When he told me the contents of his Will, he estimated his estate as then worth £68,000, and said almost apologetically, I wish I had a greater amount to leave to the University, but I have done what I could."
I assured him he need have no regrets. A property such as his was a substantial bequest to any University and it was bound, owing to its location in the heart of the City of Perth to increase in value. Even if it were far less valuable, it was the whole result of his life's labours, and after all no man can give the public more than that.

A return prepared by Mr. Parker gives the following estimate of the value of the Gledden estate when it came into the possession of the University.

Corner of William & Hay Streets valued at -
Kalgoorlie Hotel, Kalgoorlie 500
Angel Hotel (delicensed) Boulder 50
Money due from one mortgage 13,000
Money due from another mortgage 10,000
Balance due from City of Perth for sale of land 2,400
Money due from buyers of land in Brighton, Victoria, 7,000
145 shares in Queensland Bank 1,200
186 shares in A.B.C. Bank 290
Commonwealth Bond 100

£84,540

Liabilities
Money owing on mortgage to Marmion our William Hay Street Corner £15,000
Overdraft Bank of Australasia 1,000
£16,000
£68,540

These values must have been accepted by Gledden for according to Sir John Kirwan just before he died, Gledden estimated the value of the estate he was leaving to the University at £68,000.

The land upon which the Gledden building has been erected was granted in September 1833 to William LEEDER. The block extending from Hay Street to St. George's Terrace. After passing through various hands and being put to various uses, the Corner block which became University property was purchased by Mr. Gledden somewhere about 1900 for £55,000, it had a frontage of 37 feet 2 inches to Hay St., and 60 feet to William Street - to be strictly accurate this should be 59 feet 11½ inches. In December 1927 the University bought an adjoining block known as Kinniments, having a frontage to Hay Street of 20 feet for £16,500.
So the total ground area under Gledden buildings is 57 feet frontage to Hay Street and 60 feet to William Street.

The vultures soon appeared. Nine days after the funeral, the Vice Chancellor was advised by a Land Agent of a grand scheme by which if certain blocks of land were purchased and certain mortgages (including one held by the proposer of £7,000 over a right of way) were lifted at a total cost of £89,000 and a modest sum of £50,000 were spent as a cheap building then the University would get a net return of £11,500 per annum on a total expenditure of £139,000 Capital.

But there was no cash in the Gledden estate and its returns had to accumulate for 10 years, so the Land agents scheme was not approved of. It is mentioned here for it was undoubtedly the germ which led in 1936-1937 to the demolition of the old buildings and the erection of the New at a cost of . These new buildings have up to the time of writing (1947) yielded a less annual net revenue than the old.

Owing to certain peculiarities in the foundations and walls of the old buildings and the acquirement on purchase of certain lighting rights it was deemed advisable to purchase Kiniments Hay Street block of 20 feet frontage for £16,808 or £40 per foot instead of £1,000 per foot asked. The money for this purchase was borrowed from the Hackett Bequest.

The old buildings were two storied, shops on Street level and Offices etc. in the second story. They had been erected in 1886. Shortly after acquiring them, the University spent the sum of £1,326 in renovating and slight alterations.

According to a return supplied by Mr. Parker the net return in 1934 was £2,916 and in 1935 it was £3,058. There is no reason to doubt that this net return was secured for all the years back to the date the Univer-
sity took possession (December 1927). So in eight years and nine months up to the date of the demolition, November 1937, the old buildings yielded a net return to the University of £27,000 approximately. This return was greater than the property would have yielded to another owner for being University property it was exempt from both Federal and State Land Tax. In 1936 Messrs. Summerhayes and Cox estimated the State Land Tax at £240 and the Federal at £430 per annum.

Up to this stage, if the University could be said to have an official architect, it was Mr. Baxter Cox. He had prepared very thorough reports on the proposals to purchase the Sandover property and also the Brennan. In conjunction with Mr. Summerhayes he had prepared plans for a £60,000 block of flats on the Trethowan block, which was not proceeded with because the Anglican Church desired the block for extensions to Mount Hospital. The firm had also reported on a building for the Gledden Site. But the Chancellor, Sir Walter James, thought it desirable to have an alternative scheme, with the result as will be seen by the attached report of the Finance Committee Messrs. Oldham Boas and Ednie Brown were able to persuade it to adopt a more ambitious plan. I do not think Messrs. Oldham and Ednie Brown had much to do with matter. All subsequent transaction were conducted by Mr. Boas.

In the meantime I had frequently stressed the advisability of making provision in the new buildings for rooms suitable for University work in the City, as for instance Adult Education and Senate Committees. One record of this is in Senate minutes for April 1936. The result of this is the very convenient Board room on 7th floor.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - REPORT OF SPECIAL MEETING OF FINANCE COMMITTEE, 11th JUNE, 1936.

1. PROPOSED RE-BUILDING OF GLEDDEN PROPERTY at corner of Hay and William Streets, Perth, and proposal to amplify the project of erecting a block of flats, etc. on the University Land (Hackett Bequest) at the west end of St. George's Terrace.
(a) **Proposed re-building of Gledden Property.**

The Committee considered a report submitted by Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes on the proposed re-building of the Gledden property. A report, under date 11th June 1936, was also received from Mr. J.G. Milner commenting on the proposal submitted by Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes.

The Committee also had before it the report from Messrs. Oldham, Boas and Ednie Brown which was previously considered.

The following letter, dated 6th June 1936, was received from the Hon. Secretary, the Institution of Engineers, Australia, Perth Division:

"It has been the object of the Perth Division, Institution of Engineers, Australia, for some time to obtain rooms which would be considered suitable to adequately house professional bodies. At the last Committee meeting it was decided to write and ask you, if the University intends building in the City, would they consider the possibility of adding an extra floor for which the Institution would be prepared to consider financing the cost."

Consideration of the letter from the Institution of Engineers, was deferred until after the proposed re-building scheme had been considered.

Mr. Milner in his report on the scheme submitted by Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes, drew attention to the new proposed City Council by-laws, and stated as follows:

"The New Proposed City Council By-laws" provide that buildings can be erected to a height equivalent to 1½ times the width of the street, plus 8 feet for a parapet. Also that premises can only occupy 83% of the area of the site."

I have made enquiries from the City Council and am informed that, whilst consideration is being given to new City By-laws as above, no by-law of such a nature has been adopted or gazetted, and any new premises are only subject to existing by-laws.

In the layout of the plan submitted by Mr. A. R. Baxter Cox, I understand provision has been made for both of the proposed alterations, but if the University decides to build at an early date, no difficulty should be experienced in having the plans passed under the existing by-laws, without making provision for the light area shown on the plan.

The right-of-way at the rear of Lot 2, 10 feet widening to 12 feet at the rear of the Orient Line Building should provide the light and ventilation necessary, as on the previous plan."

The Vice Chancellor submitted the following summary of the proposals submitted by Messrs. Oldham, Boas, and Ednie Brown, and Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes:

**Scheme 1.** Messrs. Oldham, Boas & Ednie Brown - Estimate and Plans on 100% of area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals</th>
<th>Outgoings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,500 new nett income £6,500 Boas' estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>2,914 &quot; &quot; &quot; £4,846 Milner's estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheme 2 - Cox & Summerhayes, Estimate and Plans on 83% of area.
Basement and 6 floors to cost £29,725 (£2600 for extra floor, if required).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals Gross</th>
<th>Outgoings</th>
<th>Nett income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,038</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>5,100 Cox &amp; Summerhayes' estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>4,704 Milner's estimate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheme 3 - Milner's Figures for what can be done with present building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals Gross</th>
<th>outgoings</th>
<th>Nett income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>1,605 (on same basis as 2)</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary - taking Milner's Estimates.

Scheme 1, shows an increase of income of £2,375 on £40,000 = 5.94%. Scheme 2, shows an increase of £2,233 or 7.2%. If the Institution of Engineers come in by taking an extra sixth floor this would be improved by perhaps 0.5%, and also would attract tenants.

After considering the two schemes the Committee considered that as Mr. Boas, in the scheme for an expenditure of £40,000, had planned to build on the whole area and had included two storeys more than the scheme submitted by Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes, the cost under the latter scheme would probably be about the same as that submitted by Mr. Boas, if it were decided to build to the limit allowable under the present City Council by-laws.

After a full discussion, it was decided to forward the following recommendations to the Senate:

1. That the Senate should authorise the expenditure of approximately £40,000 in erecting a new building on the Gledden block.
2. That authority be given to meet the expenditure from the Hackett Bequest funds at 5% interest.
3. That Messrs. Oldham, Boas & Ednie Brown be asked to prepare plans for the building, the supervision of the architects to be left in the hands of the Chancellor, Chairman of the Finance Committee and Chairman of the General Purposes Committee.

Signed W.E. Thomas,
Chairman Finance Committee.

One of the reasons why the Boas plans were adopted is rather peculiar. New Perth City By-Laws were under discussion. One of a small Committee framing these by-laws was Associate Professor Blakey and one of the Councillors who would have to deal with the Committee's report was Chancellor Boas. It was known that when they came
into force the height of buildings would be limited to 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) times the width of the street, plus 8 feet for a parapet. It was also known that premises would only be allowed to occupy 83\% of the area of the site. The remaining 17\% must be reserved for light and ventilation wells.

The plans prepared by Cox and Summerhayes were drawn to accord with both these proposed provisions. Councillor Boas was able to assure the Senate -

"......no difficulty should be experienced in having the plans passed under the existing by-laws without making provision for the light area shown on Cox & Summerhayes plans."

The enlightened University Finance Committee of which I was one, decided to do what any "grasping landlord" would have done under similar circumstances namely get on with the job before the new by-laws come into effect, and make our tenants do without the light wells.

The decisions of the Senate were as follows:--

The Senate, June 15th, 1936 -

1. That the Senate authorises the expenditure of approximately £40,000 in erecting a new building on the Gledden block.

2. That authority be given to meet the expenditure from the Hackett Bequest funds at 5\% interests.

3. That Messrs. Oldham, Boas & Ednie Brown be asked to prepare plans and specifications for the building, to be approved by the Chairman of the Finance Committee in consultation with the Chancellor and the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, for submission to the Senate.

It was agreed that the sketch plans submitted by the Architects should be regarded as tentative only, subject to discussion and amendment by the Committee of the Senate.

Further discussions with Mr. Boas are as follows:--

90 A.M.P., Chambers, St. George's Terrace, Perth, 25th June, 1936.

The Vice Chancellor, University of Western Australia, Crawley.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDINGS

Following our Mr. Boas' conference with you this morning, and the Chairman of the Finance Committee,
Mr. Thomas, in our desire to confirm the points raised, after review of the original layout submitted to you, we confirm that, in our opinion, the building should be used for the following purposes.

**Basement.** Failing any alternative proposal, endeavours should be made to have this occupied as a Restaurant. The alternative proposal, if the Basement was used for other purposes, was to provide a restaurant on the flat roof, which would have unique facilities, unequalled by any other Restaurant in Perth.

The only disadvantage of a Restaurant in the Basement is the question of the possible smell of food, through the building, but this should be overcome by effective ventilation.

The question of the use of the Basement will be finally subject to review, after the question of Tenancies has been dealt with, to which we refer later.

**Ground Floor:** We confirm that, in our judgment, the original layout of providing an Arcade from Hay to William Street, and the provision of nine distinct, separate units, to be let as Arcade Shops, in one or more units, is the best proposal, from the point of view of getting the maximum revenue.

The question of Staircases or Escalators, up and down to the first floor and basement, will require detailed consideration.

**First Floor:** We also confirm that, in our judgment, the best revenue could be secured from a similar Arcade, which would make available small, modern shops, in a position where the rental would meet the capacity of a large number of retail shoppers, who could not afford to pay the rentals required for the ground floor.

**Other Floors:** In our judgment, provision should be made, to enable these floors to be subdivided, to the specific requirements of available tenancies, and not laid down in a fixed design.

Provision would be made in the Contract for a system of partitions, that could be adjustable, and moved as required, without damage to the building, or loss of capital cost. This matter, however, will need further review, later, when dealing with the whole question of tenancies.

One or two of the uppermost floors could be considered for the purpose of Professional Chambers, Meeting Rooms, and Offices, and provision would be made for a Meeting Room, for the University's exclusive use.

**Flat Roof:** The use to which this will be put will remain, pending further consideration of tenancies.

The plans are now being evolved in larger scale, and we will take occasion to discuss these problems in greater detail with you, as the working plans develop.

**Tenancies:** Following our discussion re tenancies, we make the following suggestions to you, for your consideration.

We understand that you have already advised the tenants of the intention to re-build, and that they are under a weekly tenancy. It is also agreed that the tenants
are to have the first option on any space available, to suit their requirements, at rentals which are yet to be fixed.

You agreed to our Mr. Boas interviewing the Tenants, with a view of ascertaining their requirements.

We confirm your instructions to take steps to advertise that space is available in the new buildings, and also to have a signboard painted, indicating this, and put up in a conspicuous position on the building.

We understand that it is the University's desire to have the building completely erected not later than October, 1937. In this connection, we advise you that it will take approximately three months for us to complete the plans and specifications, call for tenders, and let a Contract, and that the building will take approximately twelve months to complete, so that there is every prospect of the building being completed by the date suggested.

In connection with the owner of the adjoining land, on your eastern boundary, we confirm having been approached by his Architect, with a view to giving consideration to the question of a Party Wall, and we are advising the owner, through his Architect that the University definitely cannot consider such a proposal.

In our judgment, there is no reason, that would be to the advantage of the University's interests, why such an arrangement should be entered into.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) HAROLD BOAS.

A meeting was held at Mr. Somerville's office on Tuesday, June 30th, at 9:30 a.m., Dr. Battey (Chancellor) Mr. Somerville (Pro Chancellor), Professor Whitfield (Vice Chancellor) and the writer being present.

A letter from Mr. Harold Boas as to proposed new building on the Gladstone corner, Hay and William Streets, was considered and the following decisions arrived at.

(1) Mr. Boas to prepare for submission to Senate as soon as possible a general plan of the proposed building subject to modification for accepted tenancies.

(2) Mr. Boas to be authorised to suggest for approval by the Committee some agent to work in conjunction with him in connection with tenancies until the building is completed.

(3) That circumstances (i.e. results from negotiations with existing tenants or from advertising) decide as to whether restaurant be on roof or in basement.

(4) That the principle of unit construction for the different upper floors apply also to the ground floor. The position being a key position might tempt bigger people.

(5) That the replies to advertisements decide as to nature of first floor tenancies.

(6) That Mr. Boas consider possibility of basement being used as a garage, also that the question of offices or storage for shops on ground floor be alternatives.

(7) That Mr. Saunders be definitely informed that there will be no parti-wall.
729.

(8) That the purchase of Saunders' site be considered at a reasonable figure not to exceed £20,000.

(Sgd) W.E. THOMAS,
CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE.

---

J. Charles, Esq., PERTH.

2nd July, 1936.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDON'S BUILDINGS, CR. WILLIAM AND HAY STREET.

The University of Western Australia, the owners of this property, are about to demolish the existing structures and erect thereon a nine-storey building, comprising Basement, ground and first floors, and six floors above, for Office and other purposes.

We have been asked to arrange to appoint an Agent, for the purpose of negotiating tenancies, so as to let as much of the building as possible, before its completion.

It has been definitely decided to give the existing tenants the option of going into the new building, on terms and conditions to be mutually agreed upon.

We should be glad if you will indicate to us what your terms would be for acting as Consulting Agent, with us, in respect to the above matter only. It must be clearly understood that this work does not involve, in any way, an obligation on the University to appoint you as agents for the building, or to continue your services after the question of the original tenancies are disposed of.

It is also to be understood that the arrangement entered into can be terminated by us, at any time.

It will be a condition of the appointment that the services of Captain J.E. Lloyd be made available specially for this work, to work personally in conjunction with our Mr. Boas, in regard to the matter.

If arrangements can be mutually arrived at, that will be satisfactory, and the appointment of your firm is made, we shall require you to set out a programme, by which you propose to draw public attention to the building project, and to secure tenancies.

Certain negotiations have already been taken with the existing tenants, and consideration will have to be given as to whether these are to be included in any remuneration, which will become due to you, in regard to other tenancies. We should like your suggestions in this connection.

Our Mr. Boas will be glad to discuss the matter personally with you, at your earliest convenience.

Faithfully yours,

HAROLD BOAS.
The Vice Chancellor, University of Western Australia,
Crawley,

Dear Sir,

GLEDDON'S BUILDINGS.

Following our Mr. Boas' interview with the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Thomas, on the 1st instant, when discussed the business of the Finance Committee, held on Tuesday, 30th June, a copy of the minutes of which were handed to us, we beg to report as follows:

1. We will endeavour to be able to submit to you, at the Senate meeting on July 20th, the general plan of the proposed buildings, as a result of our negotiations over tenancies, with the existing tenants.

2. Our Mr. Boas has given this matter very serious thought, and recommends that Mr. J. Charles be authorised to act as Agent, for the purpose of arranging tenancies, prior to, and during the erection of the building, subject to Mr. Charles making available the special services of Captain J.E. Lloyd, of his staff, for this purpose, and upon terms and conditions contained in a letter, which we propose to send to him, if you approve, copy of which we enclose, for your information.

In connection with the tenancy proposal, it is our object to pursue a vigorous policy of publicity, for the purpose of concentrating public attention upon the proposal, with a view of getting as much of the building as possible let, before its completion, and, in this connection, we suggest that we be permitted to use our discretion, to a limited extent, in the necessary publicity. This programme will be formulated definitely, after the appointment of the Agent has been made, and we have had an opportunity of evolving the same.

3. Preliminary negotiations with Mr. Billett, in regard to the Restaurant, suggests that he will be glad to take the whole of the Basement, as a Restaurant, subject, of course, to satisfactory terms being arranged. Later, when it is finalised, the question will then arise, as to the use of the flat roof.

4. The form of construction of all floors, including the ground floor, will be of such a nature that the whole sub-division of the floors can be removed readily, and without structural alterations, to provide for any future change of tenancy.

FOOTNOTE. In view of subsequent development this paragraph 4 is of importance.

5. Further consideration as to the use to which the first floor will be put, confirms us in our judgment that this could quite easily be used as an Arcade floor. This will not, in any way, prevent it being used for other purposes, such as offices, but it will provide an increased avenue of rentals for shopping purposes, that are not in a position to pay the high rentals of the ground floor.

This, however, will be more definitely submitted to you, as a result of negotiations regarding tenancies.

The question of storage and office space for the shops on the ground floor will be considered during negotiations regarding tenancies, and provided for, if required by the tenants.
7. Mr. Saunders has been definitely advised that the University is not prepared to consider any Party Wall or conjoint arrangement.

8. We are of opinion that it would be invaluable for the University to secure the adjoining site, and we consider the sum of £20,000 to be a reasonable present-day value.

We suggest that we be given authority to approach the owner, through Mr. Charles, with a view of seeing whether something further cannot be done. In our judgment, it would be a valuable addition to the property, even at some little excess in value.

Yours faithfully,
H. Boas,
OLDHAM, BOAS AND EDNIE-BROWN.

MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETING HELD THURSDAY, JULY, 23rd, 1936, 10 a.m.

PRESENT: Dr. Baty, Chancellor, Mr. W. Somerville, Pro Chancellor, Professor H. Whitfeld, Vice Chancellor and the writer.

Gledden Buildings.

It was resolved that the Vice Chancellor prepare for submission to the University Solicitors a letter to Mr. Joseph Charles engaging him to secure tenancies for the Gledden Building; it being understood that a stipulation appear in the letter giving an option to the University, should Mr. Charles appear to be unlikely to let the whole of the tenancies three months prior to the completion of the building, to employ other agents in addition to Mr. Charles.

It was further agreed to expend the necessary money on newspaper advertising as well as a brochure on the lines suggested by Mr. Charles.

It was resolved that a recommendation for submission to the Senate be placed before the Finance Committee that an agreement be come to with Mr. Boas to be approved by the Union Solicitors.

(Sgd) W.E. THOMAS,
Chairman, Finance Committee.

The Senate, August 1936.

(9) NEDLANDS PROPERTY (Samaha Bequest). At its last meeting, the Senate decided to authorise an expenditure of about £1,000 on the Nedlands property on the lines of Mr. Cox's report, and that the matter be left in the hands of the Finance Committee to deal with.

The Finance Committee reported that it had agreed to leave the matter in the hands of the Chairman and the Vice Chancellor to make the necessary arrangements for the expenditure on the property.

The action of the Finance Committee was approved by the Senate.
(10) **QUESTION OF SALE OF ANGEL HOSTEL.** The Finance Committee reported as follows:

At its last meeting the Senate decided to reply to Messrs. Brown (tenderer for Hostel) and Bizzaca (lessee of premises) that the sale of the Hostel would be considered at £2,000 for reply within a few days, and that if the replies be not satisfactory, the Finance Committee be empowered to make the necessary repairs to the buildings, at an estimated cost of about £572.

No replies were received from Messrs. Brown and Bizzaca. Mrs. M.A. Harrild, of 32 Hovea Terrace, South Perth, has since agreed to take over the balance of Mr. Bizzaca's lease to 31/12/36 on the understanding that a new lease of £4/-/- could be arranged as from the beginning of 1937.

The finance Committee decided as follows:-

1. That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to make the necessary repairs to the Angel Hostel, at an estimated cost of £572.
2. That the Senate be recommended to lease the premises to Mrs. M.A. Harrild for a term of three years, as from 1st January 1937 at a rental of £4/-/- per week.

**Other matters in connection with Gledden Building.**

**Question of Structural Engineer for Steelwork.** The Vice Chancellor reported that he had received the following letter from Mr. H. Boas, dated 3/8/36, in connection with the matter.

"**Structural Engineer:** I wrote to L.C. Cutt, regarding the proposal that he should become associated with Colonel Steele.

I also received your letter, and indicated that he is not prepared to consider the proposal. Under the circumstances, I am proceeding in the usual way, with Colonel Steele's office."

The Vice Chancellor reported that Mr. L.C. Cutt who was a West Australian Graduate, would be working on the steelwork for the St. George's Terrace building and would probably be very busy in connection with this building. In the circumstances he recommended that the employment of Colonel Steele for the steelwork of the Gledden Building be approved by the Committee.

The Finance Committee reported that it was decided to agree to the employment of Colonel Steele by the Architects for the steel work of the Gledden Building, it being understood that he is not in any way associated with the people who supply the steel for the building.

**The action of the Finance Committee was approved by the Senate.**

---

**UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE HELD AT THE UNIVERSITY CRAWLEY MONDAY, 10th SEPTEMBER, 1936, at 5.15 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** The Pro Chancellor (Mr. W. Somerville), in the Chair, the Vice Chancellor (Professor Whitfield), the Hon. Sir, Walter James, Dr. J.P. Ainslie, Rabbi D.I. Freedman, Associate Professor A.C. Fox, Mr. E.W. Gillett, Dr. L.E. Le Souef, Rev. Dr. J.T. McMahon, Mr. G.S.J. Norton, Professor
A.D. Ross, M.C., Stevens and Mr. W.E. Thomas (Dr. J.S. Battie) and Mr. J.J. Klein.

1. NEW GREENFIELD BUILDING.

The Finance Committee reported that Messrs. Oldham, Bos and Kinley-Brown had submitted plans for the new Greenfield Building, including perspective designs of the Basement, Ground, First and Upper Floors. In an accompanying report, the architects stated:

"The plans comprise a building occupying the whole site, having a basement, ground, floor, second and third floors. The ground floor will be for shops, the first and second floors for offices, and the third floor for dwellings. The building will be constructed of brick and stone, and will be provided with a central heating system. The plans also include provision for a roof garden."
The working drawings have now been completed in their initial stages, and are now being traced, and we anticipate being in a position to call for tenders within the next fortnight. The tenders will be returnable in the second week in October.

Demolition: Tenders for the demolition have been called and an independent report, dealing with these, is attached hereto.

It will be necessary for the tenants to vacate the premises about the 1st of October, to enable the demolition to be completed in time, to allow the Contract to be started in the middle of October."

The following recommendations were made by the Finance Committee:-

(1) That the plans received from Messrs. Oldham, Boas and Ednie-Brown be accepted provisionally, and that they be appointed architects for the buildings and that the Vice-Chancellor and the University Solicitors be given power to draw up an agreement with the architects. The outside cost is expected with the £45,000, plus architects fees.

(2) That Mr. L.C. Cutt, B.E., be engaged to check the steelwork design for the building.

After discussion the recommendations were approved by the Senate.

The Senate also made the following further decisions:-

(1) That the Architects be empowered to call for tenders immediately an agreement is signed between the University and the Architects.

(2) Demolition of the old Gledden Building -

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had received a report from Mr. A.R. Baxter Cox who had been appointed architect for the construction of residential quarters to the Nedlands property (Samaha Bequest) regarding the use of the old material at the Gledden Building for the additions to the Nedlands shops.

Mr. Cox stated in his report -
"re Nedlands Shops Estate

We beg to advise you that a tender was submitted to Messrs. Oldham, Boas and Ednie-Brown yesterday on behalf of the above estate, offering £200/-/- for the purchase and removal of the buildings on the Gledden Estate.

A careful survey of materials and figures was made which showed that after taking out sufficient of the usable materials for the erection of the Nedlands Shops, materials to the value of at least £375/-/- remained. As the cost of pulling down would amount to approximately £125/-/- the tender was submitted at £200, leaving £50/-/- to pay commission on sales, disconnecting fees, and incidental expenditure.

It is estimated that at least £200/-/- will be saved on the Nedlands shops, bringing their cost down to £800/-/- and that a large quantity of bricks and rubble which would be of use to the gardeners would still be available for, say, the cost of carting.

The following procedure is therefore suggest-
(1) The University Nedlands shops Estate handle the pulling down, removal and sale of materials, paying the Gledden Estate the sum of £200/-/- for the right to do so.

(2) The work of pulling down etc., be placed in the hands of Mr. T. Harper at a commission on sales of 10%. Mr. Harper to organise the whole of the work under the supervision of the Architects for the Nedlands Shops Estate, who will watch the interests of the Nedlands Estate.

(3) All cheques received and payments of wages to go through a Trust Account with the Nedlands Shops Architects.

(4) All material required for the shops to be carted to Nedlands.

(5) All saleable materials to be disposed of on the site, again on the authority of the Architects.

(6) Balance of rubble etc., to be handed over to the gardeners at the cost of cartage.

(7) The shops to be built on commission under the supervision of the Architects, as it would be almost impossible to call tenders under these conditions.

(8) The contractor for the work to be Mr. T. Harper at a commission of 10% as it will entail a great deal of detail work in having the old materials adapted for use. The cost of the work not to exceed £800.

(9) Architects to handle and certify all accounts and payments.

After discussion the Senate decided that the tender of Mr. Cox, on behalf of the University Nedlands Shops Estate, for £200 for the demolition of the old Gledden Building, on the lines outlined in Mr. Cox's report, be accepted.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the highest tender received for the demolition of the old building was £202, compared with £200 from the Nedlands Shops Estate. The Senate decided that the Gledden Bequest should be credited with £202, representing the amount of the highest tender for the demolition of the building.

The Finance Committee recommended that the offer of £10,500 Archbishop Le Fanu for the purchase of the land be accepted.

The Chairman of the Finance Committee further reported that a letter, dated 9th September 1936, had been received from Messrs. Cox and Summerhayes, stating that according to the scale of fees issued by the Royal Institute of Architects of W.A., they were entitled to a fee of 4% (£2420) on the estimated cost of the proposed building of £60,500 but that a fair and reasonable settlement would be £2015, made up as follows:

| 3% on £60,500 | £1815. 0. 0.
| Consulting Engineer | 200. 0. 0. |
| **£2015. 0. 0.** |

The Chairman of the Finance Committee stated that the cost of the land in the books of the University was £8267, which with the payment of £2015 to the Architects would make a total cost of £10,282, compared with £10,500 offered by Archbishop Le Fanu.
After discussion the Senate decided that the offer of Archbishop Le Fauz of £10,500 for the purchase of the land be accepted by the University, and that a settlement be made with the Architects in the terms of their letter.

Confirmed.

CHAIRMAN.

-----

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF MEETING OF BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE - HELD IN MR. SOMERVILLE'S OFFICE AT THE ARBITRATION COURT, PERTH - MONDAY, 26TH OCTOBER, 1936, AT 9.30 A.M.

PRESENT: Mr. W. E. Thomas (Chairman), the Chancellor (Dr. J. S. Battye), the Pro-Chancellor (Mr. W. Somerville), and the Acting Vice Chancellor (Professor W. L. F. Murdoch).

1. APPROVAL OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS OF THE NEW GLEDDEN BUILDING, AS SUBMITTED BY MR. BOAS.

At its last meeting on Monday, 19th October, the Senate decided that the final approval of the plans and specifications of the new Gledden Building be left in the hands of the Building Sub-Committee, and if the Sub-Committee is satisfied with the plans, that they be authorised to call for tenders.

Mr. Boas, in a letter to Vice Chancellor dated 15/10/36, stated that he was arranging to have tenders returnable on Monday, 9th November.

Before leaving for Melbourne on 22nd October, the Vice Chancellor in a letter to the Chancellor, stated:

"I think that the final approval of the plans and specifications of the Gledden Building can be left until my return, when we should have Cutt's and Byatt's comments also. In the meantime, provisional approval must be granted by the Building Committee so that the Architect can call for tenders in accordance with Clause 3 of his Agreement. I think that this can safely be done."

The Clerk of Senate reported that he had been interviewed that morning by Mr. L. C. Cott, who had been appointed to check the steelwork design of the Gledden Building. Mr. Cott had stated that the checking of the plans would take slightly more than a fortnight, and that his report should be available by about November 11th or 12th.

The approval of the plans and specifications was considered by the Committee, and it was decided to advise the Architect, Mr. Boas, as follows:

"The Building Committee advises Mr. Boas to call for tenders. The Committee is not able finally to approve the plans and specifications, owing to the absence of the Vice Chancellor in the Eastern States, but the Committee is agreeable to Mr. Boas calling for tenders as the Committee does not wish to delay progress in the matter. There may be some modifications in the plans when the Vice Chancellor returns. No tenders will be accepted by the University until the plans are finally approved. Tenders may be called so as to close a fortnight after the quantities are made available to contractors.

It was also decided to advise Mr. Boas that the correct name of the Building is "Gledden Building."
2. ADDITIONS TO NEDLANDS PROPERTY (SAMAHU BEQUEST) A letter was received from Mr. C óx (Architect for the additions to the Nedlands Property) as per copy attached, stating that it was necessary to give the existing tenants notice of intention to commence the building operations. Preliminary work would be started during the week commencing 26th October, but it was not proposed to interfere in any way with the existing tenants until Monday, 2nd November.

In regard to the tenant Donaldson, the Chemist, who at present occupies the third shop, Mr. Cox stated:

"With reference to Mr. Donaldson, Chemist, we have had discussions with him with regard to the change over from his present lock-up shop to the new corner shop and living quarters behind. Mr. Donaldson is prepared to take over these corner premises and desires finality in connection with his present lease and a new lease. We believe the new premises will be worth 37/6 per week. Mr. Donaldson has already offered 35/- per week and desires a new lease of 10 years' duration. We feel it would be in the best interests of the Estate to secure a good tenant of this nature for a long period. We recommend that a lease of 10 years be granted to Mr. Donaldson at 37/6 per week."

After discussion the Committee decided to approve of a 10 years' lease at 37/6 per week to Mr. Donaldson for the new corner shop and living quarters behind, as recommended by Mr. Cox.

The Chairman was authorised to lower the rental to 35/- per week if Mr. Donaldson would not accept the lease at 37/6 per week.

In regard to the tenant Hammond, Dentist, Mr. Cox stated:

"The notice to Mr. Hammond, Dentist, is purely formal as his business will not be inconvenienced during building operations. It is suggested however, that Mr. Hammond be asked if he is prepared to take a lease of his premises at 15/- per week, which is in effect an increase of 2/6d. We believe nevertheless, that to secure this tenant under a lease of 12/6d per week would be sound."

After discussion, the Committee decided that Mr. Hammond be offered a lease of his premises at 15/- per week as recommended by Mr. Cox. The Chairman was authorised to lower the rental to 12/6d per week if necessary.

Confirmed.

CHAIRMAN.

29th October, 1936.

Mr. T. Harper, Airways House, St. George's Terrace, Perth.

Dear Sir,

re GLEDEN BUILDING.

Excavation: Yours of the 29th to hand.

We confirm your acceptance of Mr. Duffy's tender for the excavation work, at the price quoted, viz. 1/8 per cubic yard solid, together with an allowance of £10 to cover the cost of his trucks.

It is to be made quite clear that we have the right to terminate the excavation at any time, and that this ex-
cavation is to be done, as directed by us, in a way that will not necessitate timbering, in respect to any of the boundary footpaths, or walls.

It is also to be distinctly understood that the sub-contractor will only be paid for the amount of surface or dirty sand that is removed, and not required to be re-tumed, and that the amount due on the clean, yellow sand, will be with-held until such time as he returns same, if required, after the letting of the main contract.

It is understood that you will be entitled to a commission of 10% upon the cost of this work.

It will be necessary for you to keep a thorough check as to the amount of material removed.

Yours faithfully,

OLDHAM, BOAS and EDNIE-BROWN.

OLDHAM, BOAS and EDNIE-BROWN - 90 A.M.P. Chambers, St. George's Terrace, Perth, Western Australia. - 9th Nov. 1936.

The Vice Chancellor.
University of Western Australia,
CRAWLEY.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDING.

I have to advise that, by arrangement, tenders were called for this work, in accordance with the Plans and Specifications submitted to you, and Quantities produced by Mr. E.F. Henshaw.

These were returnable to-day, at noon, and two-tenders were received. These were opened in the presence of Mr. Thomas, of your Building Committee, and the representatives of the two contracting firms tendering.

The prices submitted were as follows:-

General Construction Co., Ltd. ... £48,065.2.0.
Concrete Constructions (W.A.) Ltd. ... 49,950.0.0

The General Construction Co., Ltd. submitted with their tender an additional letter, making an alternative offer to carry out the work on a basis of cost, plus commission at 7%, with a guaranteed maximum not to exceed the amount of their tender. Should the building cost less than the amount of their tender, this to be a credit to the University, whilst any extra, other than that caused by authorised or legitimate additions, would be a debit against their commission.

My estimates for this work was £45,000, but subsequent to the preparation of this estimate, certain factors have had the effect of increasing the cost.

These include a rise in the price of structural steel and certain other increases in the cost of wages and materials.

My estimate of the increased value of these items is approximately £1,000.
In addition to this, certain additional provisions were made by me in the plans and specifications.

The most important, in this regard, was the inclusion of two Lifts, instead of one, as originally intended, and this was added to a cost of approximately £2,000. I adopted this course after a review of the position with Mr. J. Charles, and having regard to the height of the building, and the number of tenancies provided for.

Provision has been made for the two Lifts to be of the most modern type, incorporating the latest developments in respect to their speed, control, and other modern conveniences, and a sum of £4,500 has been allowed for these two Lifts.

One Lift would certainly do the work effectively, but may at peak periods cause some little congestion and delay. This question is one which I would like an opportunity of thoroughly reviewing with you, to make a final decision, as to the wisest course to adopt.

Other items throughout were added and ample provision was made for all contingencies, including the sum of £500, which is included in the tender as a contingent amount, to provide for unforeseen circumstances.

Provisional sums and P.C. amounts have been provided which will be subject to competitive tenders, later, and which I have estimated on an ample scale.

I have no doubt whatever that savings can be made, which would bring the cost of the work down to the original estimate, if it were so desired, and that this could be done without in any way affecting the stability of the work, or its rental value.

I would like an opportunity of going through the respective items with you, so as to arrive at the basis of any adjustments that may be desired.

In regard to the proposal to use Donnybrook stone for the two main fronts, unfortunately I have not been able to get a definite quotation for this work, but I have had an interview with the President and Secretary of the Stonemasons' Union, and also went into the matter fairly thoroughly, and have ascertained that it would cost approximately £3,000 extra to carry out this work.

Whilst this would undoubtedly improve the character of the main fronts, it would add very little to the capital value of the building, and would penalise the nett return on the building by this additional capital impost.

The nature of the design, and the method that we propose to use will, in my opinion, be quite satisfactory. If there were large surfaces to be treated, this statement would be qualified, but as the whole of the fronts are broken up into perpendicular alignments, I see no great value in the adoption of this extra expense, or any detriment in the method that has been specified.

The work will be carried out to be almost identical in texture to Donnybrook Stone, and although not being as permanent in its nature, will unquestionably be quite satisfactory for all practical purposes.

As far as the tenders submitted are concerned, we estimated originally receiving at least another half a dozen tenders, but through circumstances which were beyond my con-
trel and of which your Building Committee has cognizance, following my recent conference with them, the tenders were limited to the two large Construction Companies, referred to above.

I am of opinion that the prices are competitive, and that the lowest tender is a fair and reasonable value for the work although slightly higher than my anticipations. I am convinced that the tender is in no way inflated by the existing circumstances.

I am advised by the lowest tenderer that their offer to carry out the work on a commission basis, with the guaranteed maximum price of their tender, has been made to indicate their bona fides, that the situation which has arisen, limited the competitive price has in no way influenced them in the preparation of their tender, and that it has not in any way been inflated in consequence thereof.

The lowest tenderer is a building Company which has recently been established in Western Australia by Western Australian principals, and Western Australian capital, and is now fully established in operating, with one of the most up-to-date and modern plants, and with a highly qualified personnel and staff.

The Manager, Mr. J.A. Davis Gofer, has had a very wide experience throughout Australia and New Zealand, in large construction works and I personally was able to see in Melbourne and Sydney, large City buildings erected under his management for one of the biggest building Companies in Australia.

At the present time this Company is erecting a large construction works and I personally was able to see, in Melbourne and Sydney, large City buildings, under our direction, costing approximately £80,000 and is carrying out the work on a high-class and efficient standard.

I see no reason whatever why the lowest tender should not be accepted, subject to any amendments that your Committee may decide upon, which would be made on the basis of the rates stipulated in the quantities.

I am of opinion that the Company is able to erect the building within the stipulated period, viz. twelve months, and possibly less.

In connection with the suggestion made by the lowest tenderer, of carrying the work out on commission, in ordinary circumstances I see no reason why the commission basis should be adopted, unless there was some definite assumption that considerable savings could be made.

There is nothing in the work which suggests any reason, other than this question of economy, for departing from the safe and sound system of Contract.

In this particular offer, however, the basis is on a guaranteed maximum, which will not exceed the original tender. Even so, there are circumstances which, in my judgment, make it inadvisable to depart from the contract system, and for the following reasons.

Under Contract, the full responsibility, in every direction and aspect of the job, is shoulders by the Contractor.

Under Commission, these obligations are shoulders by the Principal.
Under present circumstances, with rising costs of materials and wages, and with uncertainty as to the industrial situation, arising out of the general tendency of unrest at present existing in the building trades, there is every reason to believe that costs of building will rise considerably during the next twelve months.

Under Contract system, this would be the Contractor's responsibility.

Under Commission, it would be the University's.

Weighing the whole of the circumstances up, I am of opinion that it would be most unwise for the University to assume this responsibility, with every prospect of a disadvantage, and very little prospect of an advantage.

I have made an investigation into the financial stability and the capacity of the lowest tenderer, to carry out this work, and through the proper official channels have secured sufficient information indicating their financial position, which is undoubted, and I have satisfied myself of the efficiency of the Plant that is available as well as the capacity of the Contractor to carry out the work.

In respect to the carrying out of the work, apart from my own services as Architect, and the responsibility which I carry, to see that the University obtains the full value of this Contract, it is possible that Mr. Byatt may be appointed Clerk of Works, following the previous negotiations I have had with you in this connection.

Mr. Byatt is, possibly one of the most responsible and efficient Clerk of Works in Australia, and with his co-operation there is no reason why there should be the slightest doubt as to the lowest tenderer being able to fulfil the obligations of the contract to the University's entire satisfaction.

I should be glad of an opportunity of going thoroughly through the plans and specifications with you, at your earliest convenience, and would be available to attend any meeting of your Building Committee, should you feel so disposed, to review the whole situation and arrive at a decision.

I await the favour of your further instructions.

Faithfully yours,
(Sgd) HAROLD BOAS.

LEONARD C. CUTT,
St. George's House,
St. George's Terrace,
PERTH.

9th November, 1936.

Clerk of the Senate,
University of Western Australia,
CRAWLEY.

Dear Sir,

Gledden Buildings.

As instructed I have investigated the structural design of the Gledden Buildings as prepared by the Architects Messrs. Oldham, Boas, and Ednie-Brown and submit the following report for your consideration.
(1) **Structural Steel Design.** Considerable correction of the sizes of the required steel sections on all floors is necessary to the structural design, if the basis of floor loading upon which the building has been designed by the Architects is adopted.

These adjustments would not materially affect the tonnage of steel shown on the Sheets S1 to S9 inclusive.

(2) **Floor Loads (superimposed).** The structure as submitted has been designed on the upper floors 2nd to 7th inclusive for subdivision by brick on edge (3") partitions placed in any required position, as specified on page 23 and 35 (Specification), and as verified by reference to the Architect Mr. Beas.

The loading of each of the six upper floors with heavy partitions results in thicker floors, (heavier dead load) considerably increased beam and stanchion sections, and foundations, and cannot reasonably be considered economical.

The loading of these floors by heavy partitions also produces in certain sections of the floor concentrations of load, which cannot be resisted by the floor as designed or reduced by the partitions if such are made self supporting.

If this loading is adopted, a fixed layout must be determined for upper floors and secondary steel beams (not shown on plan or included in specification) must be added to relieve these excessive loadings of floors.

Similarly beams would necessarily have to be inserted under all 4½" brick partitions of the Ground and 1st Floors, where several partitions are shown on plans unsupported by such.

(3) **Alternatively Light Weight Partitions.** The economy and serviceability of light weight but solid partitions is unquestioned in the building design and practice of Australia, America, and other countries and many office buildings in Perth such as Shell House, Anzac House, London House, etc., are completely subdivided by these light weight partitions. They are as sound proof as brick but 35% only of the weight of brick.

Even for subdivision of the Ground and 1st Floors for shops the use of light weight bricks similar to those recently produced by the State Brickworks (in weight less than 50% of the ordinary brick) could be used to economical advantage.

In support of the above fact and assuming that steel framed construction is adopted, an estimated saving of £1,300 can be made in the cost of this building by using light weight partitions for subdivision of the upper floors.

(4) **Alternatively Reinforced Concrete Construction.** I would urge the consideration of the undisputed economy of reinforced concrete construction in place of steel framed construction.

I have estimated the saving on the original cost of the building due to the use of reinforced concrete throughout the frame of the building as £3,400.

The use of reinforced concrete would not delay the time of delivery of the building or increase the sizes of the column to an objectionable degree as investigation shows.

When the congestion of the site is considered, with the difficulties attendant upon delivery of steel to the site in this busy area, the use of reinforced concrete would undoubtedly tend to shorten the time of delivery of the building.

Concrete construction also guarantees a greater degree of rigidity, which is most desirable in a building of this area and great height.
If necessary I can produce figures of the comparisons of buildings recently constructed in Perth, of equivalent and similar floor areas which prove conclusively a saving of reinforced concrete construction over steel framed construction of £3,000 per floor of approximately 3,200 square feet letting area.

All comparisons in design and checking comply with the Standards Association Building Code of Australia, the basis of the building regulations of most cities of Australia, and the basis of the building by laws of Perth (now in draft and prepared by Mr. O.F. Blakey.)

All estimate figures have been prepared irrespective of the complete cost of the building as designed, and any variation in this cost either above or below the intended construction figure would not alter the figures stated above.

The above estimates have been prepared from detailed analysis of alternative designs, and the figures of saving stated above are considered conservative.

(5) Rigidity of Construction. The rigidity of the William and Hay Streets elevations is decreased by the raising of the window heads on all floors to the soffits of all external beams. The remaining brick panel has little value in the rigidity of these elevations, and if steel framed construction is adopted riveted web cleat connections on all external beam to column connections of these frontages must be used, in order to obtain the utmost rigidity.

(6) Fire Insurance Economy. The building as designed is 90% fire resisting, but fails to satisfy the Fire Underwriters requirements for fully fire resisting buildings. Such requirements are fulfilled if the wall surrounding the lifts and dividing the rear stairs from the main building is 6" concrete, instead of single brick as shown on plan. The lift doors, and door dividing passage and main building, and the rear windows of lavatory and stair, must also comply with the Underwriters requirements by the provisional amounts allowed for the respective items in the specification would cover these. The annual reduction in premium if this were adopted in place of the design shown on plan and based on a building of £40,000 would be £33 per annum approximately.

The extra cost of these walls would be approximately £150.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) L.C. CUTT.

=XXX=

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF MEETING OF OF BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE - HELD IN MR. SOMERVILLE'S ROOM AT ARBITRATION COURT, PERTH - THURSDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER, '36 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Mr. W.E. Thomas (Chairman), The Chancellor (Dr. J.E. Batyke), the Pro Chancellor (Mr. W. Somerville), and the Vice Chancellor (Professor H.E. Whitfield).

BUSINESS.

CONSIDERATION OF TENDERS FOR NEW GLEEDEN BUILDING.

A letter was received from Mr. Harold Boas, architect for the Gleeden Building, dated 9th November, 1936, as per copy attached, stating that tenders for the Gleeden Building closed at noon on 9/11/36.

Mr. Boas stated in his letter -

(1) Tenders Received:
   "General Construction Co., Ltd.  £48,065. 2. 0.
   Concrete Constructions (W.A.) Ltd.  49,950. 0. 0."
The General Construction Co., Ltd., submitted with their tender an additional letter, making an alternative offer to carry out the work on a basis of cost, plus commission at 7%, with a guaranteed maximum not to exceed the amount of their tender. Should the building cost less than the amount of their tender, this to be a credit to the University, whilst any extra, other than that caused by authorised or legitimate additions, would be a debit against their commission.

My estimate for this work was £45,000, but subsequent to the preparation of this estimate certain factors have had the effect of increasing the cost."

(2) **Lowest Tenderer — General Construction Co., Ltd.**

"The lowest tenderer is a building company which has recently been established in Western Australia, by Western Australian principals, and Western Australian capital, and is now fully established and operating with one of the most up-to-date and modern plants, and with a highly qualified personnel and staff.

The Manager, Mr. J.A. Davis Goff, has had a very wide experience throughout Australia and New Zealand, in large construction works, and I personally was able to see in Melbourne and Sydney, large City buildings erected under his management for one of the biggest building Companies in Australia.

At the present time this Company is erecting a large City building, under our direction, costing approximately £20,000, and is carrying out the work on a high-class and efficient standard.

I see no reason whatever why the lowest tender should not be accepted, subject to any amendments that your Committee may decide upon, which would be made on the basis of the rates stipulated in the Quantities."

**REPORT BY MR. L.C. CUTT ON THE STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF THE GLEDDEN BUILDING.**

Mr. Cutt's report could be summarised as follows:

(1) Considerable correction of the sizes of the required steel sections on all floors was necessary to the structural design, although this would not materially affect the tonnage of steel required.

(2) **Light weight partitions.** Mr. Cutt drew attention in his report to the fact that the building had been designed as a steel framed building, with brick on edge partitions. The leading of the upper floors with heavy brick partitions would result in heavier dead load, considerably increased beam and stanchion sections and foundations, and could not reasonably be considered economical.

If light weight partitions were used, they would be only about 35% of the weight of brick. He estimated that a saving of about £1,300 could be made in the cost of the building by using light weight partitions.

(3) **Alternative Reinforced Concrete Construction.** Mr. Cutt drew attention to the economy of reinforced concrete construction, in place of the present design of steel framed construction.

Mr. Cutt estimated that a saving on the original cost of the building of about £3,400 could be made by the use of reinforced concrete throughout the frame of the building.
DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The matter was discussed by the Committee, and it was decided as follows:

(1) That the architect, Mr. Boas, be informed that the Building sub-committee is not satisfied that the range of tenders places the University in a position to make a reasonable selection, and consequently the sub-committee would like to discuss the whole position with Mr. Boas.

It was decided to ask Mr. Boas to meet the Building sub-committee in Mr. Somerville's room at 9.30 a.m. on Friday, 13th November.

(2) Tender from General Construction Co. Ltd. The tender from the General Construction Co. Ltd., was considered and the Committee was of the opinion, for various reasons, that it would not be desirable to consider accepting the tender from the Company.

(3) Report to the Senate. It was decided to report to the Senate that Mr. Boas has been advised that the Building sub-committee is not satisfied with the range of tenders received.

Confirmed,

CHAIRMAN.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF MEETING OF BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE - HELD IN MR. SOMERVILLE'S ROOM AT ARBITRATION COURT, PERTH - FRIDAY, 13th NOVEMBER, 1936 AT 9.30 A.M.

PRESENT: Mr. W. E. Thomas (Chairman), the Chancellor (Dr. J. S. Bettwe), the Pro Chancellor (Mr. W. Somerville), and the Vice Chancellor (Professor H. E. Whitfield).

BUSINESS:

CONSIDERATION OF TENDERS FOR NEW GLEDDEN BUILDING.

Following upon the meeting of the Building Committee the previous day, the Architect (Mr. H. Boas) was advised that the Building Committee is not satisfied that the range of tenders places the University in a position to make a reasonable selection.

Mr. Boas attend the meeting at the request of the Committee, and the position was discussed with him.

Mr. Boas suggested that he should be allowed to attempt without publicly calling for tenders again, to get a price for the work from a local Contractor, someone who would be acceptable to the University, or perhaps two or three Contractors, the tenders to be on exactly the same basis as those of the two tenders already received, so that the tenders received could be described as reasonable comparable.

After discussion, the Committee informed Mr. Boas that his suggestion would be placed before the meeting of the Senate on Monday 16th November.
At the request of the Vice Chancellor, Mr. Boas agreed to see that the excavation of the site of the Gledden Building did not go down too far, and that everything should be made safe so that the footpath would not fall into the excavation.

Mr. Boas then retired from the meeting.

After further discussion, the Committee decided that the Chairman should report the whole position verbally to the meeting of the Senate regarding the tenders which had been received, so that the Senate could make a decision on the matter.

Confirmed. CHAIRMAN.

This meeting on 13th November was in some way quite dramatic. Boas was much distressed and embarrassed while he explained the reason why only two tenders had been received. These were not only much in excess of the estimate Boas had prepared but were from firms which were only temporarily operating in Perth and one of them even if the amount had been satisfactory was not acceptable for other reasons. The reason why no local firms had tendered was in persuasion of a resolution by the Builders and Contractors Association to boycott any job Boas was architect for until he had made separation for something he had done to one of the members of the Association who had contracted for a new edition to one of the Breweries. What it was he had done was not disclosed and the Committee did not inquire but the result was, that any delay would cost the University a comfortable net revenue of £250 per month because of a quarrel due to no fault of the University. The old buildings were in course of demolition and revenue ceased at the end of September 1936.

At the same time there was received the report by Mr. Cutt in which he condemned the steel framwork in Boas' plan as not being strong enough to carry the weight of the brick on edge adjustable petitions which Boas had provided to subdivide each floor as the tenants desired. Mr. Cutt also recommended the abandonment of the steel framed structure in favour of a reinforced concrete structure. In view of the issue of safety which had been raised
the University Building Committee had practically no option but to accept the advice in favour of a reinforced concrete structure. This involved a change of the plans which in turn opened a way out of the stalemate caused by the Builder and Contractors strike against the University Architect Boas. As will be seen by the report of the next Committee meeting this was done. Mr. Boas was apparently quite successful in making his price with the Builders and Contractors Association for 10 tenders were received from W.A. Firms.

Only Witfeld's peculiar mentality, his constant desire and determination to suppress anything unpleasant can explain why, as is shown by the two following letters under dates 12th and 16th November, 1936, the Senate was not informed fully of the Contractors strike against Boas. Apart from the few members of the Building Committee the members of the Senate were apparently not interested in the reasons for nearly 5 months delay and loss of revenue.

12th November, 1936.

Mr. Harold Boas, Architect, 90 A.M.P. Chambers, St. George's Terrace, Perth.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDING.

I have to inform you that your letter of 9th November conveying particulars of the two tenders received for the construction of the new Gledden Building, has been considered by the University Building Committee.

Our Committee is not satisfied that the range of tenders places the University in a position to make a reasonable selection. The Committee would therefore like to discuss the matter with you at a meeting to be held in Mr. Somerville's room at the Arbitration Court, Perth at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, 13th November,

Yours faithfully,

E.E.W.

Vice Chancellor.

16th November, 1936.

MEMO - CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Harold Boas called this morning (Monday) and discussed the Gledden Building and his letter of Saturday, 13th November.
He would like us to report simply to the Senate that the tenders received for the Gledden Building are not satisfactory and that the Committee is exploring the position with Mr. Boas, under his agreement, to see whether a satisfactory tender can be obtained.

P.S. I telephoned the Chancellor, Pro Chancellor and Chairman of the Finance Committee, who agreed to limiting the Report to the Senate in this way. Mr. Boas thought that any general discussion in the Senate might jeopardise his negotiations.

---

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF MEETING OF BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE - HELD IN MR. SOMERVILLE'S ROOM AT ARBITRATION COURT, PERTH - MONDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1936 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Mr. W.E. Thomas (Chairman), the Chancellor (Dr. J.S. Battye), the Pro Chancellor (Mr. W. Somerville), and the Vice Chancellor (Professor Whitfield.)

BUSINESS:

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF TENDERS FOR NEW GLEDDEN BUILDINGS

Matters in connection with the tenders for the new Gledden Building were discussed, and the Building Committee decided as follows:-

It was resolved that the Architect, Mr. Boas, be instructed to call for fresh tenders on amended plans and specifications, and the following amendments were agreed to as suggested in the letter from Mr. Boas, dated 11th November, 1936:

(1) Shopfronts.
   Reduction of P.C. item from £3500 to £3000. 
   Estimated saving ... £500

(2) Office Subdivisions.
   Reduction from £3000 to £2000. 
   Estimated saving ... £1000

(3) Matters held over.
   (i) Proposal by Mr. Boas for conversion of windows from steel frames to wood box frames at an estimated saving of £1000.
      It was decided to leave this matter open for the present.
   (ii) Proposed reduction from 2 lifts to 1 lift, at an estimated saving of £2000.
      It was decided to leave this matter open for the present, in order to make further enquiries as to the likely effect on the letting of the upper offices and the convenience of getting to the restaurant in the basement and the shops on the first floor.

(4) Reductions in cost of building recommended by Mr. L.C. Cutt.

It was decided to leave it to the Vice Chancellor to put these matters to Mr. Boas, and recommend the substitution of lightweight partitions, and also the
substitution of reinforced concrete for steel girder construc-
tion, if any substantial economy can be made thereby.

Confirmed, 

CHAIRMAN.

COPY OF REPORT BY MR. HAROLD BOAS - 90 A.M.P. Chambers,
Perth.
16th January, 1937

The Vice Chancellor, University of Western Australia,
Crawley.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDING.

I have to report that tenders were today received for the erection of the above building, and were opened at this office, at noon, in the presence of The Registrar, Mr. R.E. Parker, and a number of the Contractors.

I enclose herewith a list of the ten tenders received. It will be seen that that of Messrs. A.T. Brine and Sons Ltd. was lowest, at the sum of £36,845, and approximately £1,900 below the next tender, of Messrs. Finlay and Stoneman.

The average of the ten tenders received was approximately £40,500.

It will be noted that there is a difference of £2,138 between the first and third tenders.

For your information, it might be noted, also that Messrs. J. Hawkins and Son, at £39,888, are the Contractors for the work on the adjoining premises of Mr. J.R. Saunders, and would normally have made extra endeavours to secure this larger contract, which would have considerably assisted towards the economical running of both this and Saunders' job.

These facts help to emphasise the exceptional cheapness of the lowest tender.

The tenders were invited upon plans and specifications, as originally designed, with the following variations:

(1) The whole of the structural steel was converted into reinforced concrete, in accordance with the detail plans submitted by Mr. L.C. Cutt.

(2) The basement was lowered approximately 9" in depth.

(3) An Electric Power and Meter Room has been provided for in the Basement.

(4) The back main staircase has been reversed, from the first floor to the flat roof, so as to create an additional and direct passageway to same, independent to the passageway to the Fire Escape.

This is to meet the requirements of the Fire Brigades Board.

A sum of £100 has been allowed, in this connection, for seven fireproof doors, shutting off this staircase.
(5) The whole of the Lift Wells have been enclosed in reinforced concrete, in lieu of brickwork as originally provided for.

(6) All windows on south and east sides, and in Area, have been provided with wired plate glass, also at the request of the Fire Brigades Board.

(7) Provision has been made for the installation of a Booster for the Fire Hydrant Service, at a cost of £30, at the request of the Fire Brigades Board.

(8) The allowance for Hoarding and Footpaths has been increased by the sum of £50, from £200 to £250.

No alterations have been made whatever to the original Prime Cost and Provisional Sums allowed for in the original specifications, which remain intact.

Other than the conversion of the building into reinforced concrete, the above additional items would amount in value to approximately £250 to £300.

It will be seen, therefore, that a considerable saving has been effected by the conversion of the building from structural steel into reinforced concrete, and by the acquisition of a large number of competitive tenders. Taking the original tenders of General Construction Co., Ltd., and Concrete Constructions (W.A.) Ltd., the savings thus effected amount to, in the case of General Construction Co., Ltd., to £1,352 on their original tender, and £6,150 in the case of Concrete Constructions (W.A.) Ltd.

It will be seen, therefore, that the delay, and re-tendering, has been to some considerable advantage.

The lowest tender seems to us to be exceptionally cheap for the work, which has been specified in the best of materials, and the latest and most up-to-date methods of construction.

Messrs. A.T. Brine and Sons Ltd. are well known to me, and to the University, and there can be no question of their capacity to carry out the work satisfactorily. I have no hesitation in recommending the immediate acceptance of their tender.

 Provision has been made in the Contract for the work to be completed within eleven months from the signing of the Contract, subject to a penalty of £100 per week, with the condition that the Basement, Ground and First Floors are to be completed, and handed over, by the 30th of November next.

This will enable the main tenancies to be in occupation for the Christmas trade.

It will therefore be seen that it is essential that an immediate decision should be arrived at, and the Contract entered into, if this programme is to be fulfilled.

Quantities have been prepared for the work, and upon which tenders were called, by Mr. E.P. Henshaw, and owing to the amendment to the form of construction, these had to be done twice. The tenders provide for the Quantity Surveyor's fee to be 1½%, which is 2% greater than the amount ordinarily charged. (See note by Vice Chancellor.)

This will be taken up with the Quantity Surveyor, to ascertain the justification for this additional charge.
The question of the appointment of the Structural Engineer for the work will also have to be given consideration, and I should be glad of your instructions in this regard.

You will recollect that originally Mr. Clive S. Steele was appointed to design the plans on the Structural Steel basis, and when the amended conversion into concrete was decided upon, the work was done by Mr. L.C. Cutt. The question now arises as to who is to be appointed to see that the structural work is carried into effect.

I should be glad to discuss this aspect of the problem with you.

You will recollect, also, that in your letter to me of November 25th, you pointed out certain adjustments that might be made in respect to the provisional sums, but I suggest that, at this stage, these be left as originally provided for, and that each be treated on its merits, as they arise during the course of the work, when separate tenders would be called for same, and decisions arrived at, at that time.

All of the sums are more than sufficient to meet the complete requirements, with the exception of Electric Light, which may have to be increased somewhat.

Otherwise, there should be considerable savings, and these should occur particularly in relation to the cost of Office Subdivisions, which are to be carried out in light-weight bricks, and in respect to Steel Windows.

In the latter regard, a decision will have to be arrived at, as to whether the steel frames should be adhered to, or wood box frames substituted therofor. A saving of approximately £1,000 might be made in this direction.

I presume that you will require to install the two Lifts as originally provided for.

You also raised the question of Accoustical Plaster and the Damp-proofing of the exterior walls. In regard to the latter matter, I am of opinion that ample provision has been made to protect the building, in this regard, and, in connection with the Accoustical Plaster, this matter can be gone into more in detail, after the signing of the Contract, and a variation made, as required.

I take it that it is not intended to reconsider the question of substituting Donnybrook Stone for the white cement rendered face, now provided for.

I presume that Mr. Byatt is to be appointed Clerk of Works, and he would be available almost at any time now to take up his work, from the start of the new building, and arrangements could be made for him to satisfactorily complete his obligations in connection with the Adelaide Steamship Company's new premises, on St. George's Terrace, which it is estimated will be finally completed by the 10th of March next.

I await the favour of your further instructions.

Faithfully yours,
(Signed) HAROLD BOAS.
Note by Vice Chancellor with regard to fee to quantity surveyor.

The specification on which Messrs. A.T. Brine & Sons tendered specifies a fee to the quantity surveyor of 1%. The extra 2% due to the change from a steel-frame building to a reinforced-concrete building (£184) must, I think, be paid by the University in the same way as the extra fee for the steel construction to Mr. Cutt, as Brine & Son have not allowed it for in their tender.

--------

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE - HELD AT ANZAC HOUSE, PERTH, WEDNESDAY, 20TH JANUARY, 1937 AT 5 P.M.

PRESENT: The Chancellor (Dr. J.S. Batty), the Vice Chancellor (Professor Whitfield), Dr. J.P. Ainslie, the Hon. J. M. Drew, Rabbi D.L. Freedman, Mr. E.W. Gillett, Dr. Jull, Mr. J.A. Klein, Dr. L.B. Le Souef, Rev. Dr. J.T. McMahon, Mr. H. Middleton, and Mr. G.S.J. Norton.

An apology was received from the Hon. Sir Walter James.

BUSINESS:

New Gledden Building

Consideration of the following tenders received for the construction of the new Gledden Building, and any other matters connected therewith.

List of Tenders Received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenderer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.T. Brine and Sons Ltd.</td>
<td>£36,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlay and Stoneman</td>
<td>£38,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Fairweather and Son</td>
<td>£38,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Allwood</td>
<td>£39,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Motteram</td>
<td>£39,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hawkins &amp; Son</td>
<td>£39,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missen and Mills Ltd.</td>
<td>£39,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Construction Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>£43,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Constructions (W.A.) Ltd.</td>
<td>£43,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totterdell Bros. Ltd.</td>
<td>£47,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A confidential report by Mr. Harold Boas on the Tenders was received as per copy attached.

The Vice Chancellor reported as follows:

"Mr. Boas recommends that Messrs. A.T. Brine & Sons Ltd., tender be accepted immediately. The members of the Building Committee who are in Perth at present (the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor) discussed the matter fully with Mr. Boas today and endorsed the recommendation. The members consider that certain improvements to the building could be added later in the way of provision of acoustics, and possibly the use of Donnybrook stone, now that a low tender has been obtained for the main structure. Possibly Associate-Professor O.F. Blakely, who has been studying the latest developments in buildings in Europe and America, will also have some useful suggestions when he returns early in March, but the building should be begun as soon as possible if the shops in the lower floors are to be ready for the Christmas trade at the end of the year."

The Chancellor stated that, as the tenders were so much under what was originally estimated, the Building Committee had discussed with Mr. Boas several matters not
included in the specifications, such as the question of Acoustic plaster for the walls, hot and cold water service, and the question of using Donnybrook Stone. These would be considered in due course by the Building Committee and brought before the Senate, but the present tenders did not include any of these items.

The Donnybrook Stone would probably cost about £3,000, and if all the items were included, the total amount of the lowest tender would probably be from £41,000 to £42,000. The Senate originally stipulated that the cost of the Building, excluding Architects Fees, was not to exceed £45,000.

Matters in connection with the tenders were discussed, and the following decisions made by the Senate.

(1) That the tender of Messrs. A.T. Brine & Sons Ltd., of £36,845 be accepted, subject to the Building Committee being satisfied as to their financial ability to carry out the work.

(2) Clerk of Works.

Mr. Boas recommended the appointment of Mr. Eyett as Clerk of Works. This was agreed to by the Senate. (Note:- Salary is £10 per week.)

(3) Use of Donnybrook Stone.

It was decided to ask the Building Committee to report on the matter, for consideration at the next meeting of the Senate.

(4) Supervision of Structural Work.

The Senate decided that Mr. L.C. Cutt be appointed to supervise the Structural work.

Confirmed, 

CHAIRMAN.

25th January, 1937.


Dear Sirs,

In connection with the tender which we submitted for Gledden Building, there is one matter to which my Directors have particularly asked me to refer; the prospect of a 40 hour week becoming the law of the land is of such paramount importance that should this eventuate during the currency of the Contract about to be entered into this Company desires your Principals to undertake to reimburse this Company for the additional expense involved by this action.

This request does not apply to basic wage fluctuations of the normal variations in market costs but only to the possibility of the 40 hour week becoming the law of the land.

While we personally feel that this is not likely, at the same time the indications are pointing to early action by the trades Hall authorities in order to force this shorter week into operation.

Yours faithfully,

For A.T. Brine & Sons Ltd.

(Sgd) W.L. BRINE.
Copy.

OLDHAM, BOAS and EDNIE-BROWN,
90 A.M.P. Chambers,
St. George’s Terrace,
PERTH.

26th January, 1937.

The Vice Chancellor,
University of Western Australia,
CRAWLEY.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDING.

I beg to report that I have today signed up the contract with Messrs. A.T. Brine and Sons Ltd., in accordance with your instructions, at the sum of £36,845.

The contract documents are now ready for completion by the University, and I should be glad of your indication as to when and where you would like these documents to be submitted, for completion.

I enclose herewith copy of a letter which I have received from Messrs. A.T. Brine & Sons Ltd., relative to the question of a 40 hour week.

As the matter is one which might involve serious costs, in the case of such eventuating, I should be glad of your instructions in the matter.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd) HAROLD BOAS.

Encls.

---

90 A.M.P. Chambers,
St. George’s Terrace,
PERTH.

The Vice Chancellor, University of W.A. Crawley.

Dear Sir,

GLEDDEN BUILDING.

Donnybrook Stone front: I have received from the contractors a price for substituting Donnybrook stone front in lieu of the cement rendering provided for in the Contract, and I attach hereto a Statement of their schedule, showing that the additional cost, after omitting work allowed for in the Contract, is £5,090.

This provides for the whole of the William and Hay Street frontages, from the first floor to the top floor and parapet inclusive, but does not include the Tower.

There are approximately, 6,034 square feet of face work and 1,440 square feet of reveals, showing approximately 7,474 square feet of dressed face work, which works out at approximately 13/- a square foot for dressed work, including all mouldings.

There is no question that Donnybrook stone gives greater character to the general appearance of the building than does the cement rendered work.

There should be no reason why the cement rendered work should craze or crack, although, in some circumstances, it is impossible to prevent this, and the reasons are inexplicable.
It is proposed to finish the front with a cement rendered finish, moulded out in the same colour and texture as Donnybrook Stone.

Actually, in appearance, there will be very little difference, as it will be possible to vary the cement rendering texture and colour, to give the effect of Donnybrook grain finish.

There is no question, however, that the face of the rendered work is coarser than the Donnybrook stone, and therefore holds the dust much more easily, and, as the years go by, the buildings get a dirty appearance, which necessitates re-colouring. We do not, however, anticipate that this would be necessary at shorter periods than every five years.

It would cost approximately £100 to colour the face of the building.

Donnybrook Stone, however, requires cleaning down approximately every ten years.

On the financial side, it will be appreciated that there will be no increase of rentals, and, therefore, the expenditure of this extra sum would be on a pure basis of appearance.

Constructionally, the building would be as sound one way as the other.

As the matter is one of urgency, I should be grateful of your immediate decision on this matter.

Windows: I have gone into the question of substituting box frame wood windows in lieu of the steel frames specified, with the Contractors.

On the basis of the Quantities, there would be a saving of approximately £900 on the actual superficial area.

The steel windows were incorporated merely because they fitted in with the perpendicular type of building.

From an architectural point of view, and from the view of fire-proofing, they are superior to the wood-box frame windows. In all other respects, I think that the box frame wooden window would be an advantage.

The box frame has the advantage of being easier of adjustment for opening, much more waterproof than steel pivot hung sashes, will take venetian or other blinds better than pivot hung sashes, and can be more readily cleaned.

Another advantage is that they are a local produce, against the imported steel.

On the question of general maintenance, I don't think that there would be very much of importance in this regard.

I am of opinion that it would be an advantage to include venetian blinds to all external windows, on the North and west sides, which would be a distinct and added value to the tenancies. These venetian blinds should be on the outside, so as to keep the hot sun off the glass.

I am not favourably disposed to the type of blinds which swing outwards, as these are affected by the wind, discolour, and eventually have to be entirely renewed.
In any case, they distort the face of the building, if not hanging uniformly.

The venetian shutter is the best, in my judgment, for this purpose.

The estimated cost of covering the whole of the front windows with venetian shutters is on a basis of 4/- per square foot externally, and 2/- per square foot internally, so that the estimated saving of £900 would more than pay for the whole of the external venetian blinds.

Reviewing the whole of the circumstances, and on the score of time, as well, I am definitely of opinion that it would be an advantage to have the box frame windows to the two main fronts. Steel frame windows would still be retained on the eastern and southern walls, for fire protection purposes.

I think the windows in the large central area could also be in wood box frames.

I should be grateful for your early decision in this regard.

Faithfully yours,

(Sgd) HAROLD BOAS.

A.T. BRINE & SONS LTD. 8th February, 1937.

GLEDDEN BUILDING = STONE FRONT.

Stone in Yard 5500 c.ft. 8/- £2200.0.0
Fixing on Job 6000 c.ft. 1/6 450.0.0
Provision for cramps etc. 60.0.0 £2710. 0. 0

Workings:

First Floor Cills, face molds including reeds, sinkings, etc. 662.5.0
Cills heads piers etc. 624.18.0
Mullions etc. 249.9.0 1533.12.0
Face work 6000 s.ft. 2/- 600. 0.0
Quoins (small faces) 1440 s.ft. 2/6 180. 0.0
Beds & Joints 4200 s.ft. 1/6 315. 0.0
Backs 5800 " 1/- 290. 0.0 1385. 0.0
Parapet 102. 0.0 5730.12.0

By Brickwork omitted

8 rods 30/- 240. 0.0
Rendering Omitted 400. 0.0 5090. 0.0

Area Cost Stone in C.Ft.

Adelaide S.6. 71x50 3550 3200 3400 (1 c.ft.to s.ft. area)
University 81x114 9234 5730 5500 (0.59 c.ft.to s.ft. area)
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - GLEDDEN BUILDING - PROPOSED ALTERATION OF GROUND FLOOR ARCADE etc. - MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 17th, 1939 IN THE GLEDDEN BUILDING AT 9.30 A.M.

PRESENT: Mr. Ellis, Mr. Norton and the Vice Chancellor. The Architect (Mr. Harold Beas and the Agent (Mr. J. Charles) attended by invitation.

After discussion it was decided that the stairs rising to the First Floor Arcade should be removed and that the kiosk, although it could still remain in position had also better be removed, and the portion of the shop formerly occupied by Mrs. Billett which would not be required for the stairs be offered to Mrs. Wilson in lieu of the kiosk.

It was decided that the stairs descending to the Basement on the Hay Street side should be put back from Hay Street a sufficient distance to leave at least 5 ft. between the corner of the shop front and the corner of the stairs. These stairs might be made in jarrah, so as to facilitate erection.

The Architect estimated that the cost would not exceed £500. He was asked to get a confirmatory price from Messrs. A.T. Brine & Sons, and if satisfactory the work would be proceeded with on a cost plus 10% basis by Messrs. Brine & Sons. It was considered that the work should be put through quickly, and the long week-end (January 28th - 30th) might be utilised so as to interfere as little as possible with business. The sketch plan submitted by the Architect was approved as the basis for the work, and it was left to him to arrange for the two stairs descending into the basement to be adjusted so as to give the best effect in the Basement restaurant.

Confirmed, CHAIRMAN.

The buildings were completed on 3rd March, 1938 when the first tenants obtained possession of ground floor premises, the upper floors were let from 26th April 1937.

The contract was signed on 26th January, 1937 and provided for the completion of the building in eleven months from date. This would be 26th December, 1937. The Basement, Ground and First floors were to be completed and handed over by 30th November, 1937; the penalty for delay was to be £100 per week. Whether this penalty was enforced or not "history saith not".

Some illuminating figures from a return prepared by Mr. Parker in August, 1939 are given. They show that after spending £45,597 on a new building and £18,134 on purchase of 20 ft frontage to Hay Street and for 1939 was £1,326, an average of £1,286 which is less than half
the net revenue from the old shops. If to these net returns
is added the rent of unoccupied rooms the return might be
£2,775 which is still short of the net returns from the old
shops.

But this is not all, the probate value of the pro-
perty the University acquired was £45,000 making a total of
Capital involved £108,731. To this must in my opinion be
added -

Loss of 4 months and 3 weeks rent
from old buildings due to Con-
tractors strike against our Archi-
tect say 5/12ths of £3000 £1,250
Loss of rent of new buildings during
erection, say 2,000
Removal of Stairs and structural
alterations in February & March 1939 870

£24,120

If this sum is added to the £108,731 we have a
total cost of £112,851. If, to the sum of £1,326 which Mr.
Parker estimated would be the net return for 1939 is added
his estimate of the revenue which would have been received
if all the rooms had been let during 1939 namely £1,449 we
get the sum of £2,775 as the maximum which could have been
got for an absolutely full building for 1939.

A net return of £2,775 on a Capital of £112,851
is about 2.4%.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, CRAWLEY, 29th August, 1939.

NOTES RE GLEDDEN BUILDING BY MR. PARKER.

Net Revenue from Building.

(1) OLD BUILDING.
1934 - Net Revenue £2916
1935 - 30- £3058
1936 - Net revenue to
3/10/36, when building
was demolished £2094

(2) New Building (After expenditure of £46,000).
1937 - No revenue
1938 - About 9 months £1251
1939
Estimated not revenue for 1939 = £1326
(if all the building were let, it is estimated that
the net revenue might be £2775.)

Notes
(1) Comparison of rates (Increase of £1000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council Rates 249</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rates 289</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) **Rentals New Building.**

(a) Mr. Charles' original estimate of rentals

\[ \text{£10,300} \]

(b) Present rentals, 1939, excluding basement.

Estimate by Mr. Parker of possible rentals of unlet shops and rooms, including £10 per week for basement.

\[ \text{£1,440} \]

\[ \text{£2,119} \]

(3) No provision has been made in the estimate of net revenue for any annual allowance to be set aside for maintenance or repairs to the building or for possible liability for State or Federal Land Tax.

A charge of £400 p.a. is made by the University against the Gledden Bequest generally for general charges of administration of the Bequest. This has not been taken into account in assessing separately the net revenue from the Gledden Building.

**Capital Value of Gledden Building.**

The capital value of the Gledden Building in the accounts is as follows:

(a) Bequeathed by Mr. Gledden - Probate value

\[ \text{£4,500} \]

(b) Cost of new shops, William Street, erected several years ago.

\[ \text{£1,326} \]

\[ \text{£16,808} \]

\[ \text{£18,134} \]

(c) Cost of new building - To 31/12/38

\[ \text{£4,567} \]

\[ \text{£1,430} \]

\[ \text{£4,597} \]

\[ \text{£108,731} \]

---

**UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, CRAWLEY, 25th August '39.**

**GLEDDEN BUILDING.**

**Notes re Gledden Building by Mr. Parker.**

**Revenue from Gledden Building - Old Building.**

(1) **Year 1934.**

Gross rents ...

\[ \text{£3606} \]

**Less expenses.**

Rates City Council

\[ \text{£246} \]

Water Rates

\[ \text{£281} \]

Cleaning, etc.

\[ \text{£163} \]

\[ \text{£690} \]

Net revenue

\[ \text{£2916} \]

(2) **Year 1935.**

Gross rents ...

\[ \text{£3712} \]

**Less Expenses.**

Rates City Council

\[ \text{£253} \]

Water Rates

\[ \text{£280} \]

Cleaning, etc.

\[ \text{£63} \]

\[ \text{£654} \]

\[ \text{£3058} \]
Year 1936.
Rents were collected up to 3/10/36, when demolition of old building commenced.

Gross rents, 9 months .......................... £2760

Less Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates City Council</td>
<td>£249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rates</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning, etc.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                            | ======

Demolition of old building commenced on 3/10/36, but a dispute between the Architect and the Master Builders' Association took place, and the Senate did not accept a tender for the new building until nearly 4 months later, viz. on 20th January, 1937.

Year 1937 - No revenue from Cledden Building.

Year 1938.
The ground floor shops were let from 3rd March, 1938, and the upper floors from 26th April, 1938.

Net Revenue 1938
Gross rents collected by Mr. J. Charles .......................... £1967

Less Expenses paid by J. Charles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission, J. Charles</td>
<td>£510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management fee, J. Charles,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light and Gas</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rent, Institution of Engineers, 9 months.......................... £1251

Less General Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages of Caretaker, Liftman,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleaning, rates, etc.</td>
<td>£1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on £35,000 at 5%</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net revenue 1938 .......................... £1251

Notes:
(1) Payment of annuities, general administration charges of bequest, etc., reduced the net revenue from the Cledden Bequest for 1938 to £867, which was carried forward to 1939 as a credit in the Income A/c.

Notes:
(1) Structural alterations amounting to £879 were made in February and March, 1939, but the cost can be met from the credit in the Income A/c of £867 carried forward from 1938. For this reason, the cost of the alterations is not taken into account in the net revenue for 1939.

It may also be noted that no resolution has been passed by the Finance Committee regarding setting aside any annual amount to cover maintenance or repairs to the building. Probably very little will be required for a few years, but the amount may be considerable in later years, and affect the net revenue.
(3) Estimated rentals for building fully let.
(a) Mr. Charles’ original estimate for building was £10,300
(b) Present position:
Present rentals £6,670

At the present stage it appears that Mr. Charles’ original estimate of the rentals was £2200 above what is likely to be realised. In addition, there is a strong demand for a reduction in rentals from the tenants of the Ground Floor Shops.
If the building, therefore, were fully let on the above basis, the net revenue would probably be:

Estimated net revenue 1939 £1326
Additional revenue unlet shops 1442
£2775

On this basis, the net return on the capital value of £109,000 would be about 2½%.

In reporting on the probable net income the Vice Chancellor (Professor Whiffeld) stated as follows:

"The capital value of the land left by Mr. Gledden as a gift to the University amounted to £45,000. Let 2 adjoining was purchased for £16,800, and additions to the old shops cost £1,300.
The capital cost of the land may therefore be set down as £63,000.
A net return of 5% on £63,000 would be £3150. If the net return required is based on the £63,000 (instead of on £109,000, viz. land £63,000 plus new building £46,000) the return on the buildings, if fully let at £10,300 would be 6½%.

Loan on £35,000 from Hackett Bequest.

Although the Gledden Bequest is only earning 1½% at present, it may be noted that it is paying the Hackett Bequest interest at 5% on the loan of £35,000.

Charges against Gledden Bequest for general charges of administration.

A charge of £400 p.a. is made against the Gledden Bequest for general charges of administration of the bequest. This amount has not been taken into account in assessing the net revenue from the Gledden Building.
In actual fact, it would be reasonable to charge say £300 of this against the revenue from the Gledden Building, to cover the time of the Vice Chancellor and Mr. Parker in dealing with the building.
At present, it is a general charge against the income of the Gledden Bequest for the year.

(8) Question of whether University is liable for State and Federal Land Tax.

So far the University has not been charged any State or Federal Land Tax on the Gledden Building, and no allow-
ance for this is made in the estimates.

The matter has been discussed informally at Committee meetings several times, and by the Vice Chancellor but it was more or less decided not to press any inquiries as to whether the University would be liable for land tax.

(Sgd) R.E. PARKER

CLERK OF SENATE.

This is a gloomy picture of the net result of our Building operations. But the relief comes on considering the time factor. The old buildings had been erected in 1886 and by 1946 they would have been 60 years old and near the end of their profitable use. Against this view, there is the example of a very similar building on the opposite corner of William Street being remodelled internally to suit the Commonwealth Bank and now apparently good for many years service. The poor results of the first years letting are explained by the fact that in the period between the first planning of the Gledden Building and its completion there had been erected the Plaza and the Piccadilly Arcades containing a large number of shops and moreover the State had not completely recovered from the great depression of the thirties. The year in which the Gledden Buildings were finished was the last year before major building operations ceased by reason of the war. If the University had not built in 1937-8 it would not have been possible to build before 1948 at the earliest. In the interim building costs have almost doubled. A witness giving evidence in the W.A. Arbitration Court on February 10th, 1947 testified that an average five roomed brick house that would have cost £794 in 1939 cost £1398 in 1946. This is an increase in building costs of 86% and it has since risen above 1946 figures, so that a building costing £45,000 in 1937-8 would in 1948 cost at least £80,000. With labour costs and prices still on the up grade this estimate of present building costs is underestimated. Another reason is that the requirements for a major building such as Electrical lifts, plate glass etc. have risen much more than the
materials required for a Workers Home.

Most of the £80,000 required for a present day building equal to the Gledden would have had to be borrowed for the period of accumulation provided by Gledden's Will expired in 1937 and whatever revenue the old building yielded would have been spent in Scholarships. Rents have remained fixed by War regulation since 1939.

So on the whole, notwithstanding some bungling, it is fortunate that the building was erected when it was. It has a long life ahead and if the freedom from State and Federal Taxation continues the revenues will suffice to train many bright West Australians for an unknown period into the future.

The optimistic not to say extravagant estimates of the probable revenue from the Gledden buildings led to repercussions in other directions. When the Vice Chancellor, Professor Whitfeld, in 1938 was drafting the University Statute relating to the Gledden Trust he anticipated a revenue of at least £6,000 per year. This is clear from several statements made to the Senate. Consequently the Statute he drafted contained elaborate provisions for the spending of this handsome sum, which were far beyond the revenue actually received.

There was provision for (1) "The Robert Gledden and Maude Gledden Travelling Fellowships", for (2) The Robert and Maude Gledden Travelling Studentships" and (3) for "The Robert and Maude Gledden Scholarships". To accord with the term of the Will the first of these 3 was the only one which should ever have been enacted. Owing to the war and its many repercussions on the possibility of travel etc., and also to the paucity of candidates of a Calibre worthy of such a handsome provision as £750 per year, very few had been awarded up to 1946. But some money was there and the itch to spend it resulted in considerable sums being wasted in financing what were little better than personally conducted pleasure excursions to the Eastern States enjoyed by some
engineering students and their teacher. The provision in the Statute of any grant to a teacher is totally inconsistent with the whole spirit of the Will and considerable ingenuity had to be exercised on legal advice before payment could be made to a few who were selected without any regard to any merit or ability such as invariably governs the award of any scholarship.

The difficulties in administering the Statute were increased by the unfortunate use by Sir Walter James when drafting the Gledden Will of the word "Cognate". The phrase used is as follows - "applied science more particularly relating to surveying engineering or mining or cognate subjects." Owing to the presence of the word "cognate" no two persons could be got to agree as to the meaning of the phrase. There were two contradictory opinions from legal authorities. The Professor of Law was of the opinion that the will expressed a definite preference for Surveying, engineering or mining over any other form of applied science. The University Solicitors were of the definite opinion that no preference was expressed in the Will and that the words used were merely descriptive.

Actuated by a desire to clear up the obscurity created by these diverse opinions and also by my dislike to the waste of money and breach of principle involved in the so called Travelling Studentships, I moved for the appointment of a Committee to examine and revise the Gledden Statute. The Senate agreed to this early in 1946. The Committee would not agree to the abolition of Travelling Studentships. With the Senate, the question of principle as to whether it was proper for a teacher to benefit by payments from scholarship monies was ignored and they attached importance to the supposed benefit a student would acquire by a walk through a factory. So I failed in one objective directly, but succeeded indirectly, for an interpretation was agreed to, which so widens the meaning to be attached to applied science that it is unlikely in the
future that money will be available for the pleasure
trips to the East. The widened interpretation given by
the Committee and adopted by the Senate is as follows:-

"The Senate of the University on the 17th June
1946 decided to recognise the following interpretation of
the phrase "applied science more particularly relating to
surveying, engineering or mining or cognate subjects":-

(a) Any graduate in Applied Science could apply and be
considered for a Fellowship - for instance, graduates
in Science, Agriculture, Engineering, Medicine, Dent-
istry.

(b) Applied Science which had more particular relation to
Surveying, Engineering, or Mining would have prefer-
ence over Applied Science not so relating.

(c) An application from a person holding a degree in
Science or in any Applied Science (e.g. B.Sc., B.Sc.
Agric., etc), the content of which had a demonstrable
relation to Surveying, Engineering or Mining should
receive exactly the same consideration as an applica-
tion from a person holding a degree in Engineering
or Surveying (e.g., B.Sc. Eng., B.E., etc.).

The Gedden Statute is much the better for the
1946 Revision.