

ackd. 29/7

PORT-GLASGOW

25th July, 1924.
Friday.

Plan

Dear Mr. Scott,

- GRETASTON -

I have to acknowledge yours of 23rd and revert to yours of 10th enclosing copy of some further remarks on the question of Top Deck Strengths under various loading conditions, as well as a print of remarks submitted to the Technical Committee in November, 1906 on the same subject, and about which I had the advantage of an interview with the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and yourself.

As explained to the Chairman, I think that the Table given on page 2 of the Remarks clearly brings out the point under discussion, and I fully agree with the Chairman's suggestion that the views of the Members of the Committee who are experts in the handling of cargo vessels which are in the habit of taking all sorts of cargo and ballast voyages, should be obtained as to what conditions of loading they think an ordinary normal vessel should be capable of sustaining. Having ascertained this the next step is for the Technical Staff and Committee to consider whether any alteration in the present methods is called for, either by adjusting scantlings or by defining what the standard scantlings are intended to cover. For my part, both from my own ideas of what the highest class at Lloyd's should signify, and from what I believe to be the expectations of our customers in regard to it, I believe that an ordinary vessel fitted with a deep tank, which presumably will always be filled on a ballast voyage, should also be capable of carrying sufficient coal for a round "Plate" voyage conveniently situated for access to the bunkers. My personal opinion therefore is that the standard scantlings ought to render the vessel capable of fulfilling condition "c" on page 2 of the memorandum, under ordinary reasonable conditions of weather. I am encouraged to express this opinion by a belief that my Firm's experience points to these conditions as brought out in the memorandum having been met by us in the past.

As I have explained to you, my Firm had complaints from time to time, and we ourselves have had occasion/

W282-0134 112

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

occasion to remark that under certain conditions of loading, not unusually met with, Bridge Decks were inclined to buckle. We were familiar with the steps taken in 1906 to meet this, and have followed the matter through the various steps of development of your Society's Rules. After the amended Rules of 1911 had been in use we made a practice in vessels built to our own specification and intended for the general cargo trade, of fitting the Bridge Deck slightly in excess of the Rules, namely, by adding 1/20th to deck plating (not stringers) between aft end of saloon and fore end of side houses. It would appear from the information given in yours of 23rd instant that this action of ours would have reduced the compressive stresses on the Bridge Deck plating of a vessel such as the "Gretaston" to 8.3. Our experience would appear to show, therefore, that the memorandum is perhaps placing the safe limit a little too low, but that it is not far from the mark. It seems to me that whatever conditions of normal loading, (or shall we say normal abnormal loading), are accepted as being covered by our scantlings, these scantlings should provide for a stress not greatly exceeding $7\frac{1}{2}$ tons.

Why?
I am sending for the private information of the Chairman a "section" of a vessel passed by the British Corporation, and I suggest that it would be of decided interest to this discussion if the conditions produced with this vessel loaded in Condition "c" could be given in a figure exactly corresponding to the 9 tons represented in the Table of your memorandum. My view is that a vessel built to this plan would fulfil Condition "c" without trouble arising.

Yours faithfully,

James W. Brown

A. Scott, Esq.,
Lloyd's Register of Shipping,
L O N D O N.

Encl.



© 2020

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

W282-0134 2/2

