APPRAISAL

58 Division Street Danbury, Connecticut

CITY & STATE Danbury, Connecticut BY ROBERT N. NOCE ASSOCIATES PROJECT NAME Mid-Town East U. R. Project PROJECT NO. Connecticut R - 104 BLOCK 11 PARCEL NO.

ADDRESS 14 LIBERTY STREET

OWNER GRAHAM WAGENSELL

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDINGS

BOOM DWELLIES -FRAME 2 Pamily & Store



DATE BUILT 163 140L. 369 PAGE 187 8 PURCHASE DATA

: PURCHASE PRICE

8 IMPROVEMENTS SINCE PURCHASE WITH APPROXI-8 MATE COST AND NECESSARY STRUCTURAL REPAIRS

| ASSESSMENT | | 9 | | | 1316 | 00 | 1 | lee | Add | den | de | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|-----------------|--------|------|----------|---|------|------|-----|-----|-------|---|----|
| Land | 3630 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Buildings | 6400 | 8 | | | | | | | | - | | | | -0 |
| | | 8 | | DIMENS | | | | - 87 | 3 | 77 | 19/ | 99.05 | X | 20 |
| | | 9 | | 2796 | 84. | 20. | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 10030 | 0 | 71 11 1 1 1 1 1 | | | | | | 2012 | | | | | 51 |
| TAX RATE | 47.79 | 8 | ZONING | : 01 | 2 | 2 20 100 | T | POGR | APF | Y | 676 | SO E | W | |
| TAXES | 479.33 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SPECIAL ASSE | SSMENTS | | None | Know | m | | | | | | | | | - |
| HIGHEST and | BEST USE | | Pres | ent I | se | | | | | | | | | _ |

VALUATION

TWENTY ONE THOUSAND GUE HUNDRED DOLLARS

\$21100.00

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that we have no interest, present or contemplated, in the property and that neither the employment to make the appraisal nor our compensation is contingent on the value of the property. We certify that we have personally inspected the property and that, according to our knowledge and belief, all statements and information in this report are true and correct.

DATE 12/27/67

Robert N. Noce, S.R.A.

TYPE - 8 ROOM - 2 PAMILY - FRAME & STORE

EXTERIOR - Foundation -Concrete Cinder Block - 1/3 - Brick & Stone Walls -2/3 wood shingle & cement block

Windows - store has steel sash-2nd & 3rd floor - wood

Screens -Aluminum storm and screen combination upstairs-New

Gutters and Leaders - Galvanised

Roof-Asphalt Shingle

Porches - 2 closed over all front of building

Dormers - Hone

Condition -Pair/Good

INTERIOR - Basement - Pull Coment

Heat -Stere- ferced hot air furnace - baseboard radiators Space heaters - 2 apartments Hot Water Supply -2 Gas Hot Water heaters

Plumbing -Copper

Wiring -Commercial - Br

Rooms-- 1st Floor -Office - storage area - 1 Toilet & Lavatory 2nd Floor -1 Apt. - 3 rooms - Bath - 2 closed porches

3rd Floor -1 Apt. 3 rooms - 1 Bath

Floors - Asphalt - 1st. Hardwood - 2nd., & inlaid

Walls - Plastered - smooth surface wood panelling (Masonite) 1st. 11, 778i

Ceilings -Office-Block-Apt, plastered-2nd, fl. 9'

Kitchen -Older style, cupboards, plastered, small

Bathroom-2 full - 1-1

Closets •

Fireplace -

RENT "

Condition Fair/good

Outbuildings -None Fire Escape See Income Approach

COST APPROACH

LAND Market Data Approach does not involve a breakdown of component parts. Separate land value is not necessary. Property residual approach of capitalisation process does not involve a land value.

BUILDINGS

The subject building is old and outmoded in type of construction, layout and architecture. In view of these factors and the amount of Market Data available for study, the Gost Approach is inapplicable

CAPITALIZATION OF INCOME

| UNIT Sq.Pt. | Mo. ACTUAL | Annual | S | TABILIZED | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|----|-----------|----|
| encell Realty 788 | 130.00 net | 1560.00 | | 1970.00 | |
| 1-3 Room Apt, | 65,00 | 780,00 | | 780.00 | _ |
| 1-3 Room Apt. | 40.00 | 480.00 2620.00 | | 480.00 | - |
| | | | | | - |
| ESTIMATED STABILIZED GRO | OSS INCOME (annual) | | \$ | 3239.00 | - |
| VACANCY and RENT LOSS | 5 % | | \$ | 161.50 | |
| GROSS INCOME AFTER V & F | R LOSS | | \$ | 3068.50 | _ |
| EXPENSES: Taxes | \$ 479-33 | | | | |
| Insurance | \$ 55.00 | | | | |
| Water 37.10 | \$ 74.20 | | | | |
| Repairs & Maint. | \$ 200.00 | | | | |
| Heat | \$ By Tenents | | | | |
| Management 5 % | \$ 153.43 | | | | |
| **** | \$ | | | | |
| | | | | * | |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | | | \$ | 961.96 | (1 |
| Not to Land & Bulldi CAPITALIZATION CALCULATI | | | | 2106.54 | 52 |
| | | | | | |

(a) Based on Store & Residential Rental Data,
(b) Expenses are average for a building of this type,
(c) Based on prevailing Mortgage rate of 7% plus recapture rate of 3% considering remaining economic life of 33 years.

| ELEMENTS OF COMPARABILITY: | SUBJECT | COMP. #12 | COMP. # 9 | COMP. # 2 |
|---|--------------|--|-------------|-----------|
| Quality of Location | PAIR | GOOD | 0000 | GOOD |
| Quality of Construction | PAIR | 6000 | GOOD | GOOD |
| Physical Condition | PATR/000 | PAIR | PAIR | PAIR |
| No. of Stories | 1.3. | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Sq. Ft. Area Excl. Base. | 1988 | 4330 | 4110 | 2157 |
| Price per Sq. Ft. Gross Bldg. Area | 40 | \$11,00 | \$9.00 | 49.50 |
| No. of Rooms (Residntl.) | 6 | 15 | • | • |
| Price per Room | - | \$2882 | • | • |
| Facilities: Kitchen | OLD | OLD | OLD | • |
| Bath | STANDARD | OLD | OLD | |
| Heat Apts, | SPACE | SPACE HW OIL | STEAM/OII | 3rd-SPACE |
| Lot Size Square Foot | 2796 | 3876 | 2408 | 810 |
| Income (Actual & Vac. Est.) | Angen | \$5400 | - | • |
| No. Floors or Apts. Occ. at Time of Sale Units | 3 | 7 | h. | 2 |
| Gross Income Multiplier | - | 9 | • | • |
| Date of Sale | - | 9/19/66 | 7/12/66 | 1/24/67 |
| Sales Price | • | \$49000 | 837500 | \$20500 |
| INDICATED COMPARABLE VALUE (| OF SUBJECT P | ROPERTY: | \$21900 | |
| CONCLUSIONS & REASON FOR MAI | RKET APPROAC | H VALUE: | | |
| ST-12 Larger, mere la | nd, better | location, | time | |
| ST-9 Larger, less la | | the second secon | | |
| OP-2 Larger, less le | nd, better | location, | sime, pe | SPAT |
| eondition, | | | | |
| After analysis and adj | ustment th | e indicate | d value | or oq. |
| ft. of building area i | s \$11,00. | This is t | he sounde | st basis |
| for comparison in this | case. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

CORRELATION AND FINAL ESTIMATE

Gost Approach Yet Applicable

Income Approach \$21100

Market Data Approach \$21900

Pinal Estimate of Value \$21100

Greatest weight is given to the Income Approach. The Market Data Approach provides strong support. The Cost Approach does not apply for reasons proviously stated.