Cleary, Neil

From: EmmersonKnight <ie@emmersonknight.com>

Sent: 16 August 2013 15:32
To: Docherty, William
Cc: Simon Knight
Subject: 79 Gordon Road

Attachments: Scanned from a Xerox Multifunction Device.pdf; ATT737768.txt

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed

William,

As discussed earlier please find attached a sketch illustrating the relative heights of the proposed drawings submitted for planning and the built heights on site.

As discussed earlier the discrepancy is between the ground levels. As measured on site the garden is 225mm lower than the planning set. The garage extension is 160mm lower than the planning set and the rear extension is 300mm lower.

We believe the existing FFL should be used for setting out as this is the only fixed point. Dan Neighbour (the contractor) checked this when the discrepancy became evident with Ian Sutherland Thomas from your office and he was of the same opinion.

Please could you call back to discuss today, as you can appreciate our client is keen to resolve this issue as soon as possible.

Thanks in advance

Ian Emmerson

AS ILLUSTRATED ON PLANNING SET. PROPOSED ROOFLINE PROPOXED +3150 GARAGE ROOF +2160 PROP FEL ENTER FFL ± 0 10 GARAGE EXENSION FFL - 825 GARDEN LEVEL - 1525 MS BUILT ON SITE extension AS MEMBURED FROM 200+ + 2850 THE SETTING OF POINT THE GARAGE GARAGE ROOFLINE EXTENSION IS 160 MM + 2000 BELOW ME PROPOSED LINE. SETTING OUT POINT exter FFZ PROP FFL ± 0 士。 UMRACIT CYTENSION OPPROON LEVEL - 1750