





## Moore Survey (Continued)

D. (see Page 62)

Shower to Newsom Vol. 131 Page 284

Deed 43' X 220" → Chkd.

old J.N. Wilson Land

43' Malsen to Hambley Vol. 127 Page 147

E. Hamilton to Moore Vol. 142 Page 459

Deed 48½' X 220

old Rankin Land

Deed Dist U to Y  $48\frac{1}{2} + 43 = 91\frac{1}{2}$   
Measured 87.7Deed Dist V to Z  $48\frac{1}{2} + 43 = 91\frac{1}{2}$   
Measured 88.5

F. old City Land

see City Record #1 Page 65

Survey May - 12 - 1902

Y-2. old established line.

V U " " "

Set X X By pro rate shortage

$$91.5 : 87.7 = 43 : X \quad X = 41.21$$

$$91.5 : 87.5 = 48\frac{1}{2} : X \quad X = 40.49$$

Set W. Z By pro. rate shortage

$$91.5 : 88.5 = 43 : X \quad X = 41.59$$

$$91.5 : 88.5 = 48\frac{1}{2} : X \quad X = 40.91$$

1892

INDEXED ON MAP







Moore Survey (continued)

Moore Lot 142-459

Being 1/4 out of S.E. of 1A

Wilson To Whitehill

Jan 1851

Begin Post S.W. Cor Hamilton lot

W N. side of Hill  $48\frac{1}{2}$ ' To Wilson lot

N 220' with Wilson lot

E  $48\frac{1}{2}$ ' To N.W. Cor Hamilton lot

S 220'

Same as FOLK To Stamp

Vol 77 Page 318

CAT BTL To Hamilton 90 Pse 411

Folk To Stamp Vol 77 Page 318

W -  $48\frac{1}{2}$ ' To center of said lot

$48\frac{1}{2}$ ' Hamilton To Whitehill

Vol 95-124

Detrol To Any 1/8 Vol 28 Pse 171

508.0 N 2S

442.0 E & W.

Carr To Hart

Vol 47 - 31

Part of Acre divided Carr to Detrol

Being S.E. Quarter of said

Acre

Lamb To Riddle.

Same as above S.E. Quarter of Acre

Riddle To City Vol 101-552

Being Part of one Acre

Same as Above

July - 1905

City To Camella Vol. 128-86

Begin Iron Bar N. Line of Chilliater

322.28' E of E of Plum Valley end

186.64' E of line at S.E. corner of

closed lot,

N. 220' to Iron

E. 45'

S 220'

W. 45'

1192

INDEXED ON MAP



More survey continued

Rhodes to Wilson 63-576  
43' wide  
Begin Point S.W. corner Rankin to B.  
W. 43'  
N. 220  
E. 43'  
S. 220'

Note:-

City Book No 135 Page 34 to 53  
This survey fixed City Property  
on page 48 it says measured  
East.  $46.66 \times 4 = 186.64$   
 $\frac{186.64}{2} = 93.32$

There is no explanation of why this  
distance was used. It does not  
conform to deed distance.  
on page 52 it gives excess of 1.56  
If deed distances are used there  
would be no excess.

From a study of this survey  
It is my opinion that the distance  
used for city lot was in error.  
Note in deeds Carr to Lamb

Lamb to Riddle.

Riddle to City No distance  
is given but this is always  
described as being S.E. Quarter  
of said A.C.K. This would give  $\frac{1}{2}$   
of land.

Using east line of City lot as  
fixed and old fence on W.  
side of Newson lot as the  
fixed lines. I divided this  
distance as shown. Note this  
Leaves 43' O.K. and  $48\frac{1}{2}'$   
O.K. as per deed with no  
shortage. This would indicate  
as conforming to old distances  
when deeds were written.

See plat next page as  
surveyed May-10-1930



