





SITE PLAN FOR PROPOSED 6-V STORED RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLAN OF SRI. RAM GOPAL DEY, SRI. NARAYAN DEY, SMT. ARATI DEY, SMT. BITHIKA DEY, SRI. ANUP DEY, SMT. SIBANI DEY, SMT. SHIKHA DEY, SRI. MANAS KUMAR DEY, SRI. TAPAS KUMAR DEY, SRI. AMIT KUMAR DEY, SRI. MALAY CHATTOPADHYAY, SRI. SUJOY KUMAR CHATTERJEE, SRI. BIBEKANANDA CHATTERJEE, SRI. SUBHAS CHATTERJEE, SRI. ARABINDA CHATTERJEE & SRI. SUBHANKAR SOM TO BE CONSTRUCTED AT R.S. PLOT NO. - 210, CORRESPONDING L.R. PLOT NO. - 340, L.R. CH. NO. - 6312, 6313, 6314, 6315, 6316, 6317, 6318, 6319, 6320, 6321, 6384, 6386, 6387, 6388 & 6505 MOUZA- ASANSOL, T.L. NO. - 35, BEARING HOLDING NO. - 8477, M. COLONY B/A, P.S. - ASANSOL(S), DIST. - PASHIM BURDHAMAN IN WARD NO. - 86 (New), UNDER ASANSOL MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

NATURE OF LAND - COMMERCIAL BASTU
 HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING - 18.55 M FROM THE CENTER LINE OF THE ROAD



NOTES:
 1. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 2. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 3. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 4. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 5. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 6. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 7. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 8. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 9. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.
 10. THE ARCHITECT HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE CLIENT THAT THE BUILDING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON A PLOT OF LAND WHICH IS NOT A RESIDENTIAL PLOT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1973, AND NOT THE BUILDING REGULATIONS, 1956.

