Recording Information Vol. 331 Pg. 551 Est. of Stefania Grodski to the above parties 6/18/58 Party wall agreement, west wall.

Assessment: Land . . . \$ 6,140 **Building Improvements** Taxes . \$15,620 Total Assessment .

Photographs and/or Sketch



INSide Lot

P. L.99 Elm St.

Market Value (Appraisers Final Valuation)

\$ 8,600 Land Improvements **Building Improvements** 13,400 Total \$22,000

Certification: I certify that I inspected the property on <u>January 28</u> 1960 and that this appraisal has been made in accordance with standards of ethics and practice of The American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers.

February 14, 1960 Date of Appraisal

Appraisers Signature

NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION Zoning Business 2 Boundaries Neighborhood boundaries coincide with the Redevelopment area which lies westerly of Main Street. Character and Trend Neighborhood is a combination of old factories, warehouses, stores and tenements and a few dilapidated dwellings. Immediate area of Flm Street is stores and tenements. Residential occupancy is non-LAND DESCRIPTION white. Trend is downward. Size 49 x 70 /85 x 49 2 rear Frontage 49 Area 3,750 sq. ft. Description Lot is fairly level and goes back to the Still River at the rear. Building is built right up to the front line and covers the entire width of the lot. Utilities Sewer, water, gas, electricity, curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Land Improvements None except retaining wall at brook. Highest and Best Use of Property As store and tenement building. LAND VALUATION Please refer to Market Data - on page 4. My analysis of the land sales has brought me to the conclusion that lend at this point on Elm Street is worth \$200 per front foot for 100 feet depths. Subject property being 78' deep on the average, I adjust as follows: \$200 x 88% depth factor = \$176 per front foot Land Value . 3176 x 491 \$8,624 Land Improvements incl. Total Land \$8,624 BUILDING DESCRIPTION AND COST APPROACH Occupancy Store and Tenement Building Class D Quality Low Age about 70 Condition Fair Number of Rooms 3 strs. 4apt Number of Baths 3 Number of Stories 3 16 rm Total Height 30 Av Number of Lay. Average Story Height Single Floor Area 2117 Total Area 5266 Shape: Approximate Square X Rectangle or Slightly Irregular Long Rectangle or Irregular Very Irregular **Total Unit Cost Per Square Foot** (From Page 3) Correct for Size and Shape. . Height . . . Dist. Multiplier . Total Adjusted Cost Per Square Foot . . 7.10 Total Area 5, 266 X \$7,10 Per Square Foot 37,389 Replacement Cost Less Depreciation Physical 55 Functional 10 Economic Building Value By Cost Approach . . Value of other Building Improvements Add Land Value (include land improvements) 8.624 TOTAL VALUE BY COST APPROACH

\$21,710

In Round Figures

Plant of the same of the same

Comments:

The	
Friday	
Press,	
Box	
297,	
Meriden,	
Con	
· A.	

FORM 141

1 5		Component Part Check List	Unit Cost		
1. FC	FOUNDATION: Concrete Conc. Post Masonry X Wood Blocking				
	Other		.18		
2. E)	XTERIOR WALL: Conc. Block	Stone			
	Asbestos Siding Masonry & Steel Sash	Stucco X			
	Brick Common Masonry Veneer				
	Brick Face Metal Clad				
	Conc. Metal Panel	WoodX			
	Other		1.52		
3. RC	OOF STRUCTURE:				
	Conc. Conc. & Tile Wood Other	Frame with Wood Sheathing X			
4. RC	Divide Cost by Number of Stories) . 63/3		.21		
	Asbestos Shingle Galv. Iro	nShakes			
	Built-up Composition 18 Roll	Tile	*		
	Composition Shingle Slate				
	0.1				
(D	Other Divide by Number of Stories) RAME: Cast Iron Columns Steel Open		.06		
5. FR	RAME: Conc. Reinf.	Steel Fireproofed			
		Wood_x			
	Other				
	ecrease% for bearing wall.		.14		
6. FL	LOOR: Conc. on Groun				
	Brick on Ground Reinf. Conc	Softwood			
	Other		63		
7. FL	LOOR COVER: Linoleum 1 st	ore 12% Softwood on Conc.			
	Asphalt Tile Marble	Tenazzo			
	Cork Tile Rubber Tile	Tile, Ceramic			
	Hardwood on Conc Slate	Vinyl Tile			
	Other 12% x 35		.04		
8. CI	LILING.				
	On Wood Structure X On Steel or	Conc. Structure	H		
	Other		.16		
0 11	NTERIOR CONSTRUCTION: Single Res	Othor	and, other		
Z. III	.Min Few Ave	Many			
	.Jviiii Tew Ave		1.30		
O. H	EATING and COOLING: Gravity Furnace	Steam with Boiler			
	Forced Air Heaters				
	Furnace Floor or Wall Hot Water Radi	ators Boiler			
	Gas Steam Radiators Radiant Floor				
		ined Heat & Air Conditioning			
1. EI	LECTRICAL: Min Few_X	Ave Many	.20		
2. PL	LUMBING: Min Few	Ave. X Many	.67		
В	ASEMENT: Unit Cost \$1.50 × Area 1538	Divided by Total Area 5,266	.44		
	Total Unit Cost / Square F	oot	\$5.55		
orche	es:AreaX Unit Cost	Value			
Garag	e				
)utbui	ildings	The Paris of the Control of the Cont			
	Sum Additions_				

MARKET DATA APPROACH In analysing my land value, I have taken the following transactions into consideration (please refer to Market Data Book).

A. LAND

Land 1 at \$150 per front ft., \$1.50 per sq. ft. Although this is an industrial lot and subject a business zoned lot, it is close to Main Street and as such has an element of comparison. Not as good as subject property.

Land 12 at \$473 per front ft. and \$2.37 per sq. ft. will break down to \$270 per front ft. or \$2.70 per sq. ft. for 100' depth; using 4-3-2-1 depth rule.

Land 13 at \$402 per front ft. and \$2.01 per sq. ft. will break down to \$230 per front ft. or \$2.30 per sq. ft. for 100' depth using 4-3-2-1 depth rule. It is adjacent to Land 12.

Land 24 at \$160 per front ft. and \$2.46 per sq. ft. works out to \$200 per front ft. or \$2.00 per sq. ft. for 100' depths. It is in the same block as subject property but at the far end away from Main Street, an inside lot on the south side of Elm Street.

B. PROPERTY

Please refer to Market Data Book, "Stores and Apartments" section. In analysing my transactions, I have graded each one "low" or "average". I have added \$1.00 per sq. ft. to the three transactions where the building had no basement.

The average per sq. ft. figure of 10 transactions in the low category is \$6.52 per sq. ft. The range in the "low" category is primarily within the \$4.50 per sq. ft. to \$7.50 per sq. ft. bracket.

After careful study, my conclusion is that the stores and apartment properties on Elm Street on the average lie within the lower end of this range, primarily from \$4.50 to \$5.50 per sq. ft.

This is a poor property physically, and I think it should be at the lower end of the above scale from \$4.25 to \$4.50 per sq. ft. indicating \$22,381 by to \$23,697 by the Market Approach.

RENTAL DATA

GROSS MULTIPLIER

INDICATED VALUE

(See Income Approach).

Case	90
* * * * * *	BROTE
2000	5
	297
5	riden
00	4

Rent	Tavern \$75 per Church 45 per	month month month	\$1,920		
apart	The two upper floors h	ave 4 apartments at \$16 each on a f	totalling 16 rooms. urnished basis.	Each	
Estim	ated Gross Income Store Rental (O.K. as	above)	1,920		
	Apartment rental-I prefer to do this on an unfurnished basis in line with other properties in the neighborhood. 16 rooms at \$11 per room per month2,112 Total Gress Income \$4,032				
	Less allowance for vacancies and lost rent 10% 403				
	Effective Gross Income		\$3,629		
Less:	Expenses Taxes Insurance	\$625			
	Fire \$150 Liability 210 Water Repairs Management	360 75 350 145	21NDAOARRA TO MOI 1,555		
	Income Attributable to		\$2,074		
	Less: Interest on \$8,600 x 8%	Land	688		
	Income Attributable to	Improvements	\$1,386		
	Capitalized at 13.6% (depreciation based on	8% Interest plus gestimated 18 year	5.6% straight line remaining life.=		
		Add Land	10,191		

COMMENTS

Interest rate used above is based on the following estimate: 6% mortgage rate on 50% = 3% 10% equity rate on 50%

Interest rates 8%

Note: The 50% of value 6% mortgage loan is the most likely in this area. Equity requirements of from 10-13% are applicable. However since I am using straight line depreciation, vacancy allowance, and realistic economic Page 5 life, I will use 10%.

\$18,791

CORRELATION OF APPROACHES

Indication of Cost Approach

Indication of Market Approach 22,381 to \$23,697

\$21,700

Indication of Income Approach 18,800

In this case the Market Approach probably indicates a little high. The Income approach is on the low side. Actual income based on furnished room occupancy is higher than my stabilized figure. However I am not inclined to depart too much from this approach. My final estimate of value is \$22,000.