PROPERTY REPORT

October 2018



811 DIVISION AVE

Niagara Falls, New York



Matthew Chavez
Niagara-Orleans Regional Land Improvement Corp. (NORLIC)

716-278-8751 • Matthew.Chavez@niagaracounty.com niagaraorleanslandbank.com



Jon Claeys AIA
CJS Architects
716-856-6448 • JClaeys@cjsarchitects.com
cjsarchitects.com



Derek King
Preservation Studios
716-725-6410 • info@preservationstudios.com
preservationstudios.com

The information provided in this report was compiled by CJS Architects in October 2018. Any developer should contact CJS Architects for any questions or concerns regarding its content.

November 6th, 2018

Mr. Robert Richardson
Managing Partner
Niagara Falls Development Fund One
500 Seneca St
Buffalo, New York 14204



Re: Niagara Falls Property/ Building Assessments

Mr. Richardson,

On October 17th & 19th, 2018 CJS Architects, along with representatives from Siracuse Engineers PC, M/E Engineering, and Sienna Environmental Technologies set out to field survey 38 various properties/ buildings in Niagara Falls, NY, with the purpose of providing cursory general conditions reports for each property/ building surveyed. A typical survey lasted less than one hour, and the intent of the reports is to share first impressions of overall conditions only. A more detailed survey of each property will be required to evaluate, verify, and expand upon the initial commentary presented herein. The following is a list of the properties that were to be visited:

1628 Main St	830 Lincoln Pl
1632 Main St	813 Cleveland Ave
1636 Main St	819 Cleveland Ave
1708 Main St	2001 Main St
1802 Main St	2011 Main St
1810 Main St	2019 Main St
1812 Main St	2025 Main St
811 Division Ave	2109 Main St
717 Division Ave	2111 Main St
723 Division Ave	2113 Main St
803 Division Ave	2217 Main St
1643 ½ 8 th St	2637 Main St
1902 Main St	917 Niagara Ave
1908 Main St	915 Niagara Ave
2002 Main St	1509 Main St
2018 Main St	1105 Cleveland Ave
802 Lincoln Pl	1600 Cleveland Ave
808 Lincoln Pl	1010 South Ave
826 Lincoln Pl	1915 10 th St

Attached for your use/ review are individual surveys of each of the properties/ buildings listed above. Please contact our office should you have questions related to any of the information within.

For the purposes of grading various building components/systems, the Structural and Architectural reports utilized the following 1-5 ranking system to evaluate building components/systems:

- 1. Building component/ system completely failing, recommend complete removal, replacement, and/or demolition.
- 2. Building component/ system in extreme disrepair, reuse would require extensive cost/labor but could be accomplished.
- 3. Building component/system in in a state of general disrepair, reuse feasible depending on costs.
- 4. Building component/ system in generally good condition, reuse would require little repair.
- 5. Building component/system in good condition, requires no repair.

And the MEP and Hazardous Materials reports utilized the following grading system:

Good: Building component/system in good condition and requires little to no work

Fair: Building component/system in working condition but does require maintenance or some

upgrade

Poor: Building component/system is in need of replacement.

Respectfully,

Jonathan Claeys, AIA

811 DIVISION AVE

Parcel Info

One structure Lot Size: 3,659 SF

Existing Structure: Partially Occupied Retail/Residential

Year Built: 1950

Structure GFA: 4.320 SF Structural Height: Two Story

Zonina: C2-A

Mixed-Use Commercial



The existing building at this address has two different structures that abut each other. The front building along Division street is a two-story building with a basement below. The first floor is wood framed with interior posts down to the floor. The basement walls are of cmu construction. The exterior walls of this building are cmu with the front façade having face brick.

The back building is a typical two-story residential style home with a basement below. The first floor is wood framed with interior posts down to the floor. The basement walls are of stone rubble construction.

The second floor and roof construction for both structures was not visible due to interior finishes.

The first-floor wood framing and basement walls on the back structure were in good condition. Only minor cracking was observed in some of the stone rubble walls that would require repairs.

The first-floor wood framing on the front structure was in good condition in terms of deterioration however there were some areas where additional posts and headers were added to re-support the floor. These areas would need to be addressed and possibly reinforced to ensure they had the proper structural capacities.

A more detailed structural assessment will be required should this structure be renovated. The additional assessment would include determination of floor live load capacities as well as the criteria for seismic retrofit should the proposed renovation change the building occupancy to a higher risk category.

ARCHITECTURAL

The building exterior is in relatively good condition. Brick and CMU exterior walls on the front portion of the structure appear to be in good repair with little to no repointing necessary. Original second floor metal windows on the front portion of the structure are intact and, from grade, appear to be in good condition. First floor storefront has been covered with plywood, its condition is unknown. Wood siding and windows on the residential back portion of the building appear to be in good shape with some re-painting necessary.

The finishes on the front portion of the structure show varying levels of damage. The ceiling and flooring likely require replacement but the drywall on the exterior walls appears to be in good condition. The basement in the front portion of the structure appears dry, and other than the shoring that has been added, exhibits no other signs of deterioration. The second floor of this portion of the structure was not observed but assumed to be in a similar condition to the first-floor.

The back portion of the structure is currently occupied as a residence. The basement appeared dry and the first-floor framing was in good shape. Only a portion of the residence was observed due to it being occupied, finishes appeared to be in good condition, though dated.

Future re-use of this structure would require mostly cosmetic work and updating of finishes & fixtures.



MEPFP

Observations of the building's MEP systems overall appear to be in generally fair condition. Potential renovations would require some known upgrades in order to meet current codes. This property is partially occupied. The MEP systems could be re-used in the residential portion if the layout doesn't change. The MEP systems in the commercial portion are inadequate for any use and would need to be upgraded. Specifically, there is no apparent means for ventilation in the front of the building.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<u>Potential Asbestos Hazards:</u> Based on the age of the original build and onsite observations, multiple materials are likely to be asbestos containing, including:

- Floor Tile
- Gypsum Board
- Joint Compound
- Wire Insulation
- Window Caulk
- Parging
- Aircell Pipe Insulation, a known asbestos-containing material
- Mud Fittings on Pipe Insulation
- Duct Paper
- Linoleum
- Plaster

<u>Potential Lead Based Paint Hazards</u>: Based on the age of the building all paints/surfaces are suspect to contain Lead Based Paints. Poor paint conditions were observed on the exterior and in the main room of the building.

Potential Microbial Growth: No microbial growth or moisture issues were observed during the inspection.

Other Issues: The back apartment is occupied and was mostly inaccessible at the time of inspection.

<u>Potential Hazardous Material Remediation</u>: Known asbestos-containing materials were observed during the site visit. Further testing would be needed prior to any renovation work to determine the presence of asbestos, lead based paint, microbial growth. The building is generally in good shape, with no visible significant damage to walls, floors, or ceilings. Based on the general condition of the building most components may not need remediation/renovations, depending on the scope of work proposed and testing results. Any plumbing and/or mechanical renovation work would involve remediation of asbestos containing pipe insulation and duct paper.

SEE ATTACHED APPENDICES FOR INDIVIDUAL FIELD REPORTS BY TRADE



Catherine M. Styn, PE | Dale T. Cich, PE | Darren K. Geibel, PE | Principals Julie A. Marwin, PE | Associate

<u>Property Address:</u> 811 Division Street

Niagara Falls, New York

Assessment Date: October 17, 2018

Assessment Type: Visual observations only

General Building Construction

The existing building at this address has two different structures that abut each other. The front building along Division street is a two-story building with a basement below. The first floor is wood framed with interior posts down to the floor. The basement walls are of cmu construction. The exterior walls of this building are cmu with the front façade having face brick.

The back building is a typical two-story residential style home with a basement below. The first floor is wood framed with interior posts down to the floor. The basement walls are of stone rubble construction.

Structural Element Condition Ranking

- Exterior Masonry at Front Building 4
- First Floor Wood Framing at Front Building 3
- First Floor Wood Framing at Back Building 4
- Cmu Basement Walls at Front Building 4
- Stone Rubble Basement Walls at Back Building 4

Additional Comments & Observations

The second floor and roof construction for both structures was not visible due to interior finishes.

The first-floor wood framing and basement walls on the back structure were in good condition. Only minor cracking was observed in some of the stone rubble walls that would require repairs.

The first-floor wood framing on the front structure was in good condition in terms of deterioration however there were some areas where additional posts and headers were added to re-support the floor. These areas would need to be addressed and possibly reinforced to ensure they had the proper structural capacities.

A more detailed structural assessment will be required should this structure be renovated. The additional assessment would include determination of floor live load capacities as well as the criteria for seismic retrofit should the proposed renovation change the building occupancy to a higher risk category.



BUILDING SURVEY



PROPERTY EVALUATED: 811 Division Ave

Niagara Falls, NY 14305

SURVEY DATE: 10.17.2018

CATEGROY	DESCRIPTION	CONDITION (1-5)	ADDITIONAL NOTES
	SITE ANALYSIS		
Neighborhood Type	Commercial		
Access From Street	Pedestrian access		
Parking	Street parking		
Walks	On (1) sides of building (North)		
	CONSTRUCTION TYPE, SYSTEMS,	FINISHES	
Construction Type	Front Portion - III - Mix of combustible/non-combustible Back portion - IV - Combustible		
Foundations	Front - CMU. Back - Stone	5	
Frame	Front - CMU bearing walls with wood floor framing Back - Wood framed	4	
Roof	Not observed	?	
Exterior Walls	Masonry & wood framed with siding	4	
Windows & Doors	Original existing	4	
Interiors			
Walls	Plaster, drywall	2	
Ceilings	Tln/drywall	2	
Floors	carpet, VCT	3	
	ACCESSIBILITY		
Elevator(s)	No		
Plumbing	Facilities not observed		
Building Access	Yes - from Division ave		

See attached photos



PROPERTY EVALUATED: 811 Division Ave

Niagara Falls, NY 14305







PROPERTY EVALUATED: 811 Division Ave

Niagara Falls, NY 14305







PROPERTY EVALUATED: 811 Division Ave

Niagara Falls, NY 14305







PROPERTY EVALUATED: 811 Division Ave

Niagara Falls, NY 14305



MEP Building Survey



Buildi	ing Name:	811 Divi	sion Ave.		Date:	10/17/	18		
Occu	pancy Type:	Comme	rcial (front); Resident	ial (rear)					
Squa	re Feet: 4,3	320	Stories Tall:	2	Ye	ar Built:	1950		
Gene	ral Overall C	ondition:							
			s MEP systems over me known upgrades				condition	. Potential	
HVAC	Observation	<u>ns</u>							
1.	Heating Sys	tem: Gas	UH and elec. fin in f	ront building; F	HW boiler i	n Basen	nent rear	building (2	2007)
	HW radiator	s in uppe	r floors	Cond	ition: Poc	r	Fair X	Good	
2.	A/C System	: Non	e in front building; no	ne in rear buil	ding				
				Cond	ition: Poc	r	Fair	Good	
3.	Ventilation S	System: _	None in front building	g; operable wir	ndows, nati	ural ven	t		
				Cond	ition: Poc	r	Fair	Good	
4.			: Thermostats						
-				Cond	ition: Poc	r	Fair	Good	
Pluml	oina/Fire Pro	tection C	bservations						
	· · ·								
5.	Domestic Wa	iter Service	: 3/4 in. service in B						
			BFP: Y_	N X Cor	ndition: Poo	r	Fair X	Good	
6.	Fire Water Se	ervice:	None			Fire	Pump: Y	′ N	
			BFP: Y_	_ N Cor	ndition: Poo	r	Fair	Good	
7.	Natural Gas S	Service: _	1-1/2 in. service outs	ide with meter	r at grade,	1 in. dis	tribution _I	oiping	
				Cond	dition: Poo	r	Fair X	Good	
8.	Domestic Hot	t Water Sys	stem: Gas-fired com	bination heatin	ng/domestic	water l	ooiler/tan	k in Basen	nent
	(2007), som	ne copper	and PEX distribution	piping Cond	dition: Poo	r	Fair	Good	Χ
9.	Sanitary Sew	er System:	Mostly PVC piping	in Basement					
				Cond	dition: Poo	r	Fair	Good	<u>X</u>
10.	Storm Water	Sewer/Roo	of Drainage System: R	loof drain not	observed, g	gutters,	downspo	uts and su	mp
	pump in Bas	sement		Cond	dition: Poo	r	Fair X	Good	
11.	Plumbing Fixt	tures:	Not observed						
				Conc	dition: Poo	r	Fair	Good	
					11011. 1 00	· —	·		-

Condition: Poor ____ Fair ____ Good ____

MEP Building Survey



Electrical Observations

13.	Electrical Service Overhead X Underground	Mete	r Location	Inside X (Outside
	Voltage: 208 240 _X	acity: 100	X 225 _	400	Other
	One (1) house and one (1) store meter	Condition:	Poor X	_ Fair	Good
14.	Electrical Distribution: Fuses Breakers X	Squar	e-D Type X	O load cente	ers
		Condition:	Poor X	_ Fair	Good
15.	Backup Power: Gas Diesel Battery	None			
		Condition:	Poor	_ Fair	Good
16.	Lighting: Incandescent and fluorescent				
		Condition:	Poor X	Fair	Good
17.	Emergency Lighting: No visible emergency lighting)			
		Condition:	Poor	_ Fair	Good
18.	Tel/Data: Telephone punch down blocks in Baser	ment; inactiv	/e		
		Condition:	Poor X	Fair	Good
19.	Fire Alarm System: System manufacturer is not vi	sible. Minim	nal coverag	e	
		Condition:	Poor X	Fair	Good
20.	CO Detection: None			_	
		Condition:	Poor	Fair	Good
21.					
		Condition:	Poor X	Fair	Good
A .ا ما ؛ 4					
Addit	ional Comments/ Code Issues				
This	property is partially occupied. The MEP systems co	ould be re-us	sed in the r	esidential por	tion if the
	ut doesn't change. The MEP systems in the comme d need to be upgraded. Specifically, there is no app				
build		areni inean	is for verifin		JIIL



81 Fall St., Suite 4 | Seneca Falls NY 13148 | 315.257.0270

811 Division Avenue – Assessment Date of Site Visit: October 17, 2018

<u>Brief Description of Property</u>: A 3 story building built in 1950, formerly utilized as a paint store and currently vacant in the front store space. The back addition of the building is residential and currently occupied. The buildings have a flat asphalt roof (store front) and shingle roof system (back residential).

<u>Potential Asbestos Hazards:</u> Based on the age of the original build and onsite observations, multiple materials are likely to be asbestos containing, including:

- Floor Tile
- Gypsum Board
- Joint Compound
- Wire Insulation
- Window Caulk
- Parging
- Aircell Pipe Insulation, a known asbestos-containing material
- Mud Fittings on Pipe Insulation
- Duct Paper
- Linoleum
- Plaster

<u>Potential Lead Based Paint Hazards</u>: Based on the age of the building all paints/surfaces are suspect to contain Lead Based Paints. Poor paint conditions were observed on the exterior and in the main room of the building.

<u>Potential Microbial Growth:</u> No microbial growth or moisture issues were observed during the inspection.

Other Issues: The back apartment is occupied and was mostly inaccessible at the time of inspection.

<u>Potential Hazardous Material Remediation</u>: Known asbestos-containing materials were observed during the site visit. Further testing would be needed prior to any renovation work to determine the presence of asbestos, lead based paint, microbial growth. The building is generally in good shape, with no visible significant damage to walls, floors, or ceilings. Based on the general condition of the building most components may not need remediation/renovations, depending on the scope of work proposed and testing results. Any plumbing and/or mechanical renovation work would involve remediation of asbestos containing pipe insulation and duct paper.