

Page 2.

I was always curious in examining the plat that the front dimensions of Lot 11 through 4 increased 0.1 foot per lot, yet the rear lot dimensions, which consist of ditto marks were assumed to all be 121.3 feet as shown on Lot 12. Using this assumption, the rear dimensions of Lots 15 through 3 total 1602.50 feet, and subtracting 358.3 feet for Tract B-1 gives the 1244.2 shown on the plat. I was always mildly skeptical that a surveyor would create a whole tier of lots thusly, where the side lines would not be parallel. It was not logical.

However, if one assumes that the ditto marks indicate the same as the front lot dimension, the side lines are parallel and the lots compute the 1 acre as indicated. This is the reasonable and logical way these lots would have been created. With this reasoning, the sum of rear lot dimensions would be 2220.40 feet, compared to the previously described inverse of 2221.15 feet, or a difference of only 0.75 feet.

A close examination of the hard copy further revealed a faint penciled dimension of 1606.1 to the left of the 1244.2. If you follow the reasoning that the ditto marks be applied to the front lot dimensions, record lots 3 through 15 total 1606.1 feet. Using the previously inversed dimension of 2221.15 feet and subtract the plat dimension of 614.3 leaves 1606.85 feet.

It is therefore my conclusion that the dimension of 1244.2 is incorrect, and was added to the plat during one of the numerous corrections and erasures, the draftsman mistakenly assuming the ditto marks all meant 121.3 feet. The penciled 1606.1 feet would seem to verify this conclusion, as do the computations around the subdivision, and the distance of 2221.99 feet for rear lot lines from the field measurements. A record distance of 2220.40 feet was therefore used for pro-rate computations.

The south line of Lot 10, and the adjusted boundaries of T. L. 8601 were monumented as shown on the accompanying plat.

T. L. 8601 37-2W-12D REGISTERED PROFESSIONA August, 1986 newas Verlyn Thomas SURVEYOR: 304 South Holly 13. 1960 VERLYN D. THOMAS Medford, Oregon \* \* RECEIVED Date 12-12-88 By St This survey Consists of: \_\_ sheet(s) Map page(s) Narrative JACKSON COUNTY 33 4775

SURVEY NARRATIVE TO COMPLY WITH O.R.S. 209.250

FOR:

Bruce Bateman 3040 Table Rock Road Melford, Oregon

PURPOSE:

To survey and monument a Lot Line Adjustment in GARDEN ACRES. S. E. 1/4 Sec. 12, T. 37 S., R. 2 W., W.M., Jackson County, Oregon.

PROCEDURE:

A survey was conducted from the south line of GARDEN ACRES, north along Table Rock Road to the brass cap set by Survey No. 2287 on the South line of D.L.C. 58. Numerous monuments, origin unknown, were recovered and tied to the survey. It soon became apparent that they were too far from record to be accepted as legitimate lot corners.

The south boundary of GARDEN ACRES, described as the north boundary of MIDWAY SUBDIVISIONS, was established by extending the south boundary of MEADOWCREST VIEW SUBDIVISION, also described as being the north boundary of MIDWAY SUBDIVISIONS, easterly to a location for the southeast corner of Lot 15, GARDEN ACRES. A 1½" iron pipe described in D. R. Volume 287, Page 351 as being on the north boundary of MIDWAY SUBDIVISIONS was recovered and confirms this location very closely.

The northerly boundary of GARDEN ACRES was established from the brass cap in the center of Table Rock Road, at plat record distance of 385 feet using the angle recorded by Survey No. 9335.

From boundaries established in this manner for Lots 1 through 15, computed pro-rate data.

It should be noted that the plat of GARDEN ACRES contains some significant errors. A computation around the record outside boundary of GARDEN ACRES was made, with a closure of 0.27 feet in latitude and 1.57 feet in departure. From these coordinates, an inverse was made from the northeast corner of Lot 1 to the southeast corner of Lot 15 of S 0° 10' 56" E, 2221.15. However, adding the plat dimensions of 358.3, 1244.2 and 614.3 results in a total of 2216.80 feet, or a difference of 4.35 feet. Further computations indicated there was something wrong with the plat dimension of 1244.2. I noted that the plat was a 1936 copy of the original. Speculating there might be an error in the copy, I examined the original hardcopy in the Recorder's Office. This hardcopy shows evidence of many changes and erasures; however the dimension of 1244.2 had been correctly copied.