



Lloyd's Register of Shipping.

342, Argyle Street, Glasgow.

ENCLOSURES.

ack 23/11

21st November, 1921.

Reference

Dear Mr. Scott,

As promised in my letter of the 19th instant, I now beg to submit the remarks which follow on the case of the steamer "ARBROATH", ex "ALEXNDRA", No. 08630 in the Register Book, which was the subject of yours of the 17th instant.

2 On the 8th March, 1921, Mr. Potts proceeded to Dundee in order to assist the Dundee Surveyors, at their request, in the carrying out of the requirements for the class referred to in the official letter of the 20th November, 1920, addressed to the Owners. That letter stated that, inter alia, "provided the pillaring arrangements in the bridge and poop 'tween decks be found or made efficient; the requirements of Section 48 of the Rules be complied with; the scantlings and arrangements where not indicated on the plan, including the panting arrangements and strengthening of the bottom forward, be found or made to the Surveyors' satisfaction on completion of the survey, and on a favourable report being received from the Surveyors, the vessel will be eligible for the class 100A." The bridge deck beams were not referred to in that letter, and it was concluded that,

as/

W1081-0141/3

as the bridge and poop 'tween deck space was full of accommodation, it was only desired to know whether the pillaring shewn on the midship section was fitted throughout this space. Mr. Potts found that at the ends of the hatchways additional pillars required to be fitted, and, after discussion with the Owners' representative, this was done. As above stated, the bridge deck beams were not discussed with the Owners.

3. Apart from that however, and considering the case on its merits, I would venture to suggest that some qualification is necessary of the statement made in the second paragraph of your letter, to the effect that the beams in this space, as required by the Rules, are bulb angles, $7\frac{1}{2}$ " x 3" x .46". This is the size required by the Rules for one row of pillars, but for forty-one feet of the length of the bridge the beams are supported by a steel casing which reduces the unsupported span from say, 15'0", to say, 9'6". The size of beam required by the Rules for a span of 8'0" is $5\frac{1}{2}$ " x $3\frac{1}{2}$ " x .44" angle, and the beams as fitted in the ship at this part are, therefore, equivalent to the requirements of the Rules. This leaves, say 6, beams forward of the casing, and 1, or at most, 2 beams aft which are supported by one row of pillars. It should be noted however, that on the top of the bridge deck a continuous steel house is fitted which is supported by a steel bulkhead at the forward end, and by another steel bulkhead fitted near the forward end of the casing. The effect of this is to reduce the unsupported span of the beams in question to 11' 6".

4 It is also desired to point out that the beams below/

below the bridge deck are 25 per cent stronger than those required by the Rules, and the Committee have in many cases accepted an increase in the beams below the bridge as part compensation for a deficiency in the bridge deck beams.

5 Further, it should be noted that the effect of the fitting of the steel deck house, above referred to, is to protect the bridge deck from the weather and to make it impossible for the bridge deck beams to have to sustain any weight of cargo or water; so far as these beams are concerned, in fact, they form the floor of the main saloon. In all the circumstances, I would suggest that no action is necessary in respect of the bridge deck beams in this vessel. The plans and correspondence are returned herewith.

Yours very truly,

J. Montgomerie

A. Scott, Esq.,
LONDON.



© 2020

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

W1081-0141 ³/₃

W1081-0142

