

City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Variance Application

TO: BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY OF ROCHESTER

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

CASE NO. 2-19-14

DATE FILED 1-13-20


Dee Mondaw
ZONING BOARD CLERK

Applicant: Thomas J. Demchak, Sr.
E-mail: t demchak@aol.com Phone: 203-605-7255
Applicant Address: 13 Riverwalk, Branford, CT. 06405
Property Owner: same
Property Owner Address: same
Variance Address: 72 Crown Point Rd.
Map Lot and Block No: 235, 50
Description of Property: See cover letter, attached
Proposed use or existing use affected: u

The undersigned hereby requests a variance to the terms of the Rochester Zoning Ordinance, Ch. 275, Section 23.2(A)(3)(e)
and asks that said terms be waived to permit Accessory to residential use
(Not carried out as a business)

The undersigned alleges that the following circumstances exist which prevent the proper enjoyment of his land under the strict terms of the Zoning Ordinance and thus constitute grounds for a variance.

Signed: [Signature] for Thomas Demchak Date: 1-10-2020





City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Variance Criteria

1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

Please see cover letter, attached.

2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

u

3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

u

4.) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

u

5.) Unnecessary Hardship:

a. Owing to special **conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area**, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:

i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

u

And:

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use of it.

Thomas Demchak
72 Crown Point Road
Rochester, NH

Rochester Zoning Board of Adjustment
31 Wakefield Street
Rochester, NH 03867

RE: LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION:
Variance application of Thomas Demchak

To whom it may concern:

I Thomas Demchak, owner of property at 72 Crown Point, Rochester, NH hereby authorize Attorney Scott Hogan to represent me in regards to the above-referenced application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Demchak', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Thomas Demchak

The Law Office of Scott E. Hogan

P.O. Box 33
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Phone: 603-969-1183

hoganlaw@comcast.net

Fax: 603-659-9092

TO: Rochester Zoning Board of Adjustment (Zoning Board, Board, or ZBA)

FROM: Thomas Demchak
72 Crown Point Road, Rochester, NH

BY: Scott E. Hogan, Esq.

DATE: January 10, 2020

RE: Request for Variances

PROCEDURAL HISTORY/ SCHEDULING REQUEST

This is a re-submission of applications for variance relief that were previously submitted to the Board back in the Spring of 2019. In that process the Board was twice unable to provide a full five member Board, and that, together with the Applicant's own scheduling conflicts resulted in a determination that the applications were formally withdrawn, subject to this resubmission.

In order to avoid any such scheduling/notice issues for this re-submission, the Applicant Thomas Demchak notifies the Board and parties that the Board's scheduled February 12, 2020 hearing on these applications presents a conflict for the Applicant Thomas Demchak, and so for these applications he asks to exercise his one continuance request per the Board's rules, so that all parties will have notice of that conflict, and can plan to attend the Board's March 11, 2020 public hearing on these applications.

INTRODUCTION

The property at 72 Crown Point Rd. is owned by the Applicant Thomas Demchak. His daughter Karen Demchak resides on the property, where for the past 13 years she has been keeping and raising horses, other livestock (goats) as well as chickens/poultry. The property is a long, narrow parcel, abutted on one side by a residential neighbor, and otherwise abutted by undeveloped property. (See maps, images, attached as A). This variance application seeks to allow the Demchaks to continue the long-standing agricultural/equestrian uses of the property that have engaged in there for over a decade. The specific variance requests are detailed below.

Karen Demchak has an outstanding reputation in the New Hampshire equestrian community, based upon her knowledge and care of her animals, as well as her exemplary

breeding program. (See letter from Attorney Christine Tebbetts, Attachment B). Attorney Tebbetts' letter also included that:

"During my first visit, Karen took me on a tour of her farm, and I was not only impressed with her knowledge and land use, but also the love and care she clearly had with her animals... Put simply, it was hard to believe that such a little farm in Rochester, New Hampshire, had such impeccable breeding lines."

Equine veterinarians familiar with Karen, her animals, and her care and raising of them have submitted letters supporting her and her practices, including Dr. Lauren Sikorski, DVM, DACVIM (IM), whose letter includes:

"I have been in the company of Ms Demchak's horses numerous times, witnessing them in action on the field, on trail rides as well as in the company of small children and adults. Ms. Demchak takes time to practice the best husbandry possible, basing every decision on compassion and sound medical advice. Clinically, the horses disposition and body condition scores are excellent. Their housing and land allowance appears ample and they are exercised at regular intervals. Therefore, I believe Ms. Demchak is in good standing to continue to own her horses and maintain them at her residence." (See Dr. Sikorski letter, Attachment C).

Dr. Alyssa E. Warneke, DVM, and Dr. Grant D. Myhre, DVM also wrote in support of Karen, including that:

"I have been the ambulatory veterinarian for their property for six (6) years, and Dr. Grant Myhre has provided in-hospital care to a few of their horses for well over a decade. To the best of our knowledge and experience caring for them, all of the horses in Karen and Robert's care are in proper body condition,...provided with ample feed (hay and grain) and fresh, clean water daily and have adequate shelter and turn-out. Most of their horses are also ridden on a regular basis to supplement their exercise availability.

It is in our professional opinion that these horses are well cared for and provided for adequately." (See Dr. Warneke and Dr. Myhre letter, Attachment D).

Another person familiar with Karen and her practices also wrote in support of her, including:

"In all the years I have known Karen, I have known her to be very experienced and knowledgeable about horses. Her horses are all very well taken care of and loved. They mean so very much to her and it shows. They are clean, well-fed and well-behaved.

They are a major part of her life and are like family to her. She manages her horses very well. She is very smart about their space and living conditions and feeding program. People seek her out for advice and training assistance and she is

more than happy and willing to accommodate their requests.” (See letter of Cheryl S. Robinson, Attachment E).

RECENT PROCESS WITH CITY OF ROCHESTER

As described above, the agricultural and equestrian uses of the Demchak property have been conducted for over a decade. Several years ago the prior owner of the abutting residential property, just before listing that property for sale, submitted complaints to the City regarding the agricultural/equestrian uses of the Demchak property. The abutting property was purchased by a new buyer, who was aware of these long-standing agricultural uses at the time of purchase, and who has also submitted complaints to the City since then. The City subsequently brought various Land Use Citations against the Demchaks, after which it was agreed that the Demchaks would seek the current variance requests from the Zoning Board.

Since that time the Demchaks retained the undersigned counsel, and have arranged site visits between counsel, and the City Code Enforcement Officer and City Attorney O'Rourke, as well as a representative from the NH SPCA, who was responding to a complaint from the abutting neighbor. ((Mr. Sprowl from the SPCA found no issues or violations). Site visits were also arranged with officials from the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture and the NH DES, as well as a licensed NH civil engineer. From those contacts, Counsel and the Demchaks have been researching and pursuing various grant opportunities from UNH Cooperative Extension and state and federal agencies, and other resources to provide technical outreach and assistance for agricultural properties. The grant programs offer funds and assistance for issues including site planning, manure management, engineering, surface water and wetland issues. The application cycle for these resources is in the Spring, so Karen has recently met with officials at the Natural Resources Conservation Service, who are in the process of arranging a site visit so they can assess the resources and provide technical assistance, or advice for the property. (One issue being explored is obtaining grant resources for the installation of a stream-crossing equestrian bridge). Karen has been working with Karen Bishop of Linden Woods farm in Durham on this process, and has been partnering with their facility.

STATUTORY PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL USES

As a ‘back-drop’ for the Board’s consideration of the specific variance requests outlined below, please note the following provisions of New Hampshire statutory law:

“NH RSA 672:1: III-b. Agriculture makes vital and significant contributions to the food supply, the economy, the environment and the aesthetic features of the state of New Hampshire, and the tradition of using the land resource for agricultural production is an essential factor in providing for the favorable quality of life in the state. Natural features, terrain and the pattern of geography of the state frequently place agricultural land in close proximity to other forms of development and commonly in small parcels. Agricultural activities are a beneficial and worthwhile feature of the New Hampshire landscape. Agritourism, as defined in RSA 21:34-a, is undertaken by farmers to contribute to both the economic viability and the long-term

sustainability of the primary agricultural activities of New Hampshire farms. *Agricultural activities and agritourism shall not be unreasonably limited by use of municipal planning and zoning powers or by the unreasonable interpretation of such powers...* (Emphasis added).

III-d. For purposes of paragraphs III-a, III-b, III-c, and III-e, "unreasonable interpretation" includes the failure of local land use authorities to recognize that agriculture and agritourism as defined in RSA 21:34-a, forestry, renewable energy systems, and commercial and recreational fisheries, when practiced in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, are traditional, fundamental and accessory uses of land throughout New Hampshire, and that a prohibition upon these uses cannot necessarily be inferred from the failure of an ordinance or regulation to address them..."

(NH's "Right to Farm" statute, RSA 432:33):

"432:33 Immunity from Suit. – No agricultural operation shall be found a public or private nuisance as a result of changed conditions in or around the locality of the agricultural operation, if such agricultural operation has been in operation for one year or more and if it was not a nuisance at the time it began operation. This section shall not apply when any aspect of the agricultural operation is determined to be injurious to public health or safety under RSA 147:1 or RSA 147:2."

NH RSA 674:32-c:

"II. Nothing in this subdivision shall exempt new, re-established, or expanded agricultural operations from generally applicable building and site requirements such as dimensional standards, setbacks, driveway and traffic regulations, parking requirements, noise, odor, or vibration restrictions or sign regulations; provided, however, that in circumstances where their literal application would effectively prohibit an agricultural use allowed by this subdivision, or would otherwise be unreasonable in the context of an agricultural use, the board of adjustment, building code board of appeals, or other applicable local board, after due notice and hearing, shall grant a waiver from such requirement to the extent necessary to reasonably permit the agricultural use, unless such waiver would have a demonstrated adverse effect on public health or safety, or the value of adjacent property. Such waiver shall continue only as long as utilized for the permitted agricultural use." (Emphasis added).

Variance Requests

In communication with the City Attorney and other staff, the following variance requests are being submitted to the Board:

- It should be first noted that the City's Land Use Citations identified a potential issue regarding an existing "shed", and the possible need to request variance relief from

Section 40.16.a- [Permit for shed/stable] and possible setback relief. This shed structure is intended to be removed, as the existing 'stable' structure will be improved, pending the amendment of the stable Building Permit application to reflect the value of the proposed improvements. Given that no variance relief is being requested for that structure;

- 275-20.2(Q): (Commercial stable);
- 275-23.2(A)(3)(e): (Accessory to residential use [keeping of horses]);
- 275-23.2(A)(3)(e): (Accessory to residential use [not carried out as a business])

Variance Requirements

Under RSA 674:33, I(b), a zoning board of adjustment has the power to grant a variance if: (1) "[t]he variance will not be contrary to the public interest"; (2) "[t]he spirit of the ordinance is observed"; (3) "[s]ubstantial justice is done"; (4) "[t]he values of surrounding properties are not diminished"; and (5) "[l]iteral enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship." RSA 674:33, I(b)(1)-(5).

Public Interest/ Spirit of the Ordinance

In *Perreault et. al. v. Town of New Hampton* (2017-0225), the New Hampshire Supreme Court recently reiterated that:

"With respect to the first and second criteria, we have recognized that "[t]he requirement that the variance not be contrary to the public interest is related to the requirement that the variance be consistent with the spirit of the ordinance."

"As the provisions of the ordinance represent a declaration of public interest, any variance would in some measure be contrary thereto." *Id.* (quotation omitted). Therefore, "[m]ere conflict with the terms of the ordinance is insufficient." *Id.* *Rather, to be contrary to the public interest and inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance, the variance must unduly and in a marked degree conflict with the ordinance such that it violates the ordinance's basic zoning objectives.* See *id.*; *Nine A, LLC*, 157 N.H. at 366. "*In determining whether granting a variance violates an ordinance's basic zoning objectives, we look to, among other things, whether it would alter the essential character of the locality or threaten public health, safety or welfare.* Such examples are not exclusive." *Nine A, LLC*, 157 N.H. at 366 (citation omitted). (Emphasis added).

In the present case, the current agricultural and equestrian uses have been ongoing on this property for 13 years, and are completely consistent with this agricultural zone and the agricultural history of the City. 'The essential character of the locality' is and has been agricultural, and is no way changed by the recognition required by these variance requests.

Granting the Variance Would do Substantial Justice

On this requirement the New Hampshire Supreme Court has stated:

“...the only guiding rule [in determining whether the requirement for substantial justice is satisfied] is that any loss to the individual that is not outweighed by a gain to the general public is an injustice.” Malachy Glen Associates v. Town of Chester, 155 N.H. 102, 109 (2007).

There is no gain to the general public by denying the requests, and clear loss to the individual if denied.

If the Variance were Granted the Value of Surrounding Properties Would not be Diminished

As discussed and documented, the existing agricultural/ equestrian uses of the property have been conducted on the property for over a decade. The abutting residential property owner lived for years with no complaints, until just before listing the property for sale. Despite those complaints, the current owner purchased the abutting property, knowing of the long-standing agricultural uses. The existence of a traditional New Hampshire agricultural use on abutting property is a selling/marketing attribute, and has no effect of diminishing neighboring property values.

Unnecessary Hardship

“"unnecessary hardship" means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property; and

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one.

(B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.” RSA 674:33(I)(b)(5).

As discussed, the subject property is a long, narrow parcel, with elevations that slope down to a central surface water stream at the base, which present unique conditions as to the property’s use. The Demchaks have devised unique uses of this unique property that allow the agricultural/equestrian uses, in proper coordination with the special conditions of the property. Their use of the

property is reasonable, and in harmony with the traditions of New Hampshire agriculture, and there is no fair and reasonable relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons stated above, the current request for variance meets the five requirements, and should be granted by the Board. The Applicant looks forward to discussing the details of these issues directly with the Board.

Request for Site View by Board Members

The Applicant requests that Zoning Board members schedule a site view of the property and structures, so that the current design and variance request can be considered with knowledge and understanding of the specific site conditions.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Demchak

By his attorney,
THE LAW OFFICE OF SCOTT E. HOGAN

DATE: January 10, 2020

/s/ Scott E. Hogan

Scott E. Hogan, Esq.

P.O. Box 33

Durham, NH 03824


603-969-1183

Hoganlaw@comcast.net

NH Bar ID#: 10542


CC: Client
Joe Devine, Compliance Officer
Terence O'Rourke, Esq., Town Attorney

Map 235 - 0500



Crown Point Rd.

Map 235 - 0500



Google Maps 72 Crown Point Rd



Imagery ©2017 Google, Map data ©2017 Google 50 ft

Rock & Tebbetts, P.C.

Attorneys at Law
61 Church Street
Laconia, New Hampshire 03246
Tel. (603) 524-2775
Fax (603) 524-7114

Christine A. Tebbetts

Of Counsel:
Suzanne L. Rock

April 20, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter at the request of my friend, and fellow equestrian, Karen Demchak.

By way of background, I met Karen approximately 2-years ago. This happened when a mutual equestrian friend on Facebook forwarded a post recently made by Karen. The post was hoping that some mutual friend might know where a horse she previously owned, Maple (APHA "Whoops Katie Lady"), was currently located. I immediately reached out to Ms. Demchak, and learned that when she had sold Maple previously, the Bill of Sale contained a provision that should she be sold, that Karen would have first right of refusal. This to ensure that Maple did not end up at auction or be placed in an unsuitable location. Put simply, as a responsible horse owner, she wanted to ensure that Maple was safe.

During our conversation, that was followed up with several additional calls, we became fast friends, and arranged for Karen to come to my farm to visit with Maple. Since that time, we have been in regular contact, with each visiting the others farm.

Unbeknownst to me, Maple is/was a mother, and I learned that Karen was not only the breeder, but still had Maple's daughter "Joesy" (APHA "Little Brown Joesy Two") at her farm in Rochester. During my first visit, Karen took me on a tour of her farm, and I was not only impressed with her knowledge and land use, but also the love and care she clearly had with her animals. I spent time with each of her horses, to include her stallion "Joe" (AQHA "Little Joe Brown"), who is also Joesy's father. Put simply, it was hard to believe that such a little farm in Rochester, New Hampshire, had such impeccable breeding lines. Approximately 1-year later, I purchased Joesy, and she is adored by all visitors to my farm.

Put simply, Karen has an outstanding reputation in the New Hampshire equestrian community, based upon her knowledge and care of her animals, as well as her exemplary breeding program. I would not hesitate to allow her to care for my animals, nor would I have any concern for any animals placed in her care. She is the epitome of what people commonly refer to as an "animal lover," both through thought and deed.

Thank you for the opportunity to write this letter in support of Karen, however, should you have any further questions in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'C. Tebbetts', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Christine A. Tebbetts



4.24.18

To Whom this May Concern:

I was asked to write an evaluation letter concerning the 8 horses kept at 72 Crown Point Road, Rochester, NH. I have been in the company of Ms. Demchak's horse's numerous times, witnessing them in action on the field, on trail rides as well as in the company of small children and adults. Ms. Demchak takes time to practice the best husbandry possible, basing every decision on compassion and sound medical advice. Clinically, the horses disposition and body condition scores are excellent. Their housing and land allowance appears ample and they are exercised at regular intervals. Therefore, I believe Ms. Demchak is in good standing to continue to own her horses and maintain them at her residence.

Sincerely,

Lauren Sikorski, DVM, DACVIM (IM)

Myhre Equine Clinic

45 YEARS OF COMPASSIONATE CARE



**NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL
VETERINARY IMAGING CENTER**

LOCATED AT THE MYHRE EQUINE CLINIC

April 15, 2018

To whom it may concern,

Karen Demchak and Robert Elliott have been long-term clients of Myhre Equine Clinic. I have been the ambulatory veterinarian for their property for six (6) years, and Dr. Grant Myhre has provided in-hospital care to a few of their horses for well over a decade. To the best of our knowledge and experience in caring for them, all of the horses in Karen and Robert's care are in proper body condition (scored at 5-6 / 9 on the Henneke Body Condition Scale), provided with ample feed (hay and grain) and fresh, clean water daily and have adequate shelter and turn-out. Most of their horses are also ridden on a regular basis to supplement their exercise availability.

It is in our professional opinion that these horses are well cared for and provided for adequately.

Sincerely,

Alyssa E. Warneke, DVM

Grant Myhre, DVM

Alyssa E. Warneke, DVM

Grant D. Myhre DVM

January 22, 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

I have known Karen Demchak for many years. She was just a neighbor to me, but now has become more than a dear friend. She is almost like another daughter to me.

Through the years, I have always known Karen to be a go-to type of person. If there is anything you need help with, and she can help you with it, she will be by your side to help.

Karen and I have a common love and interest in horses. We both help each other out with our horses when a feeding needs to be done or the horses just need to be checked on. In all the years I have known Karen, I have known her to be very experienced and knowledgeable about horses. Her horses are all very well taken care of and loved. They mean so very much to her and it shows. They are clean, well-fed and well-behaved.

They are a major part of her life and are like family to her. She manages her horses well. She is very smart about their space and living conditions and feeding program. People seek her out for advice and training assistance and she is more than happy and willing to accommodate their requests.

She is a good neighbor and friend and I am very fortunate to know her.

Thank you.



Cheryl S. Robinson

174 Crown Point Road

Rochester, NH 03867

603-923-3096

[3] The animal does not pose a health hazard; and

[4] The animal does not pose a nuisance to neighbors.

(e) Horses and other large livestock. Keeping fewer than 10 horses or other large animals defined as livestock is an accessory use to a residence subject to the following standards:

[1] The activity is not carried out as a business.

[2] The residence is not located in the Residential-1 or -2 District.

[3] A lot in the AG District is at least three gross acres.

[4] A lot in all other districts is at least two gross acres.

[5] There is an additional 1/4 acre of land beyond the minimum specified in Subsection A(3)(e)[3] and [4] above for each animal kept beyond the first one.

[6] No area or structure for the housing, stabling, storage of manure/animal waste, or feeding of animals shall be located within 100 feet of any property line.

[7] Handling of manure/animal waste must follow best management practices and not be a nuisance for neighbors.

[8] No animals shall be pastured within 25 feet of any side or rear property line except where the abutting property owner consents to a reduced setback.

(f) Chickens, fowl and other small livestock. Keeping fewer than 10 chickens, ducks, rabbits, bee hives, or other small animals defined as livestock is an accessory use to a residence subject to the following standards:

[1] The activity is not carried out as a business;

[2] No roosters are allowed and the number of chickens is limited to fewer than 10 in the Residential-1 and -2 Districts;

[3] No area or structure for the housing, storage of manure/animal waste, or feeding of animals shall be located within 20 feet of any abutting property lines; and

[4] Handling of manure/animal waste must follow best management practices and not be a nuisance for neighbors.

(4) Clubhouse, community center, recreation facilities, laundry, storage areas, and other facilities for a residential development.

(a) The Planning Board shall review these uses for location, design, size, additional parking, and setback requirements.

(b) These uses and facilities shall only be used by residents of the development and their guests.

(c) There shall be no outside storage of materials or equipment.

(d) Buffers and screening shall be used to help alleviate any adverse effects on abutting residential properties.



72 Crown Point Rd

Rochester, NH

1 inch = 70 Feet



May 22, 2019

www.cai-tech.com



Data shown on this map is provided for planning and informational purposes only. The municipality and CAI Technologies are not responsible for any use for other purposes or misuse or misrepresentation of this map.

EXTERIOR INFORMATION

Type: 04 - CAPE	Rating: SAME
Sy Ht: 1.75 - 1.75	Rating: SAME
(Liv) Units: 1	Rating: SAME
Foundation: 1 - CONCRETE	Rating: SAME
Frame: 01 - WOOD	Rating: SAME
Prime Wall: 1 - WD SHINGLES	Rating: SAME
Sec Wall: 1	Rating: SAME
Other Fix: 1	Rating: SAME
Roof Struct: 1 - GABLE	Rating: SAME
Roof Cover: 1 - ASPH SHINGLE	Rating: SAME
Color: TAN & NATURAL	Rating: SAME
View / Desir: A - AVERAGE	Rating: SAME
GENERAL INFORMATION	Rating: SAME
Grade: C - AVERAGE	Rating: SAME
Year Blt: 1987	Rating: SAME
Alt LUC: 1	Rating: SAME
Jurisdic: 1	Rating: SAME
Const Mod: 1	Rating: SAME
Sum Adj: 1	Rating: SAME

INTERIOR INFORMATION

Avg H/F/L: STD	23.1 %
Prim Int Wall: 6 - AVERAGE	%
Sec Int Wall: 1	%
Partic: T - TYPICAL	%
Prim Floors: 8 - AVERAGE	%
Sec Floors: 1	%
Bsmnt Fr: 12 - CONCRETE	%
Bsmnt Gar: 1	%
Electric: 2 - GOOD	%
Insulation: 2 - TYPICAL	%
Int vs Ext: SAME	%
Heat Fuel: 10 - PROPANE	%
Heat Type: 3 - FORCED HW	%
# Heat Sys: 1	%
% Heated: 100	%
% AC: 1	%
Solar HW: NO	%
% C: 1	%
% Sprinkled: 1	%

DEPRECIATION

Phys Cond: AG - Avg-Good	23.1 %
Functional: 1	%
Economic: 1	%
Special: 1	%
Override: 1	%
Total: 23.8 %	%
Basic \$ / SQ: 78.95	
Size Adj: 1.06476188	
Const Adj: 1.00000000	
Adj \$ / SQ: 84.063	
Other Features: 28100	
Grade Factor: 1.00	
Neighborhood Inf: 1.11000001	
LUC Factor: 1.00	
Adj Total: 175515	
Depreciation: 41772	
Depreciated Total: 133742	

SPEC FEATURES/YARD ITEMS

Code	Description	A	Y/S	Qty	Size/Dim	Qual	Con	Year	Unit Price	D/S	Dep	LUC	Fact	NB Fa	Appr Value	JCod	JFa	Juris	Value
31	SHED FRAME	D	Y	16X8		D	FR	1980	7.30 T	55	101	101	200		200				200
58	WORKSHOP	D	Y	14X16		C	AV	1999	24.07 T	30	101	101	3,800		3,800				3,800
45	LEAN TO	A	Y	14X14		C	AV	2010	3.53 T	20	101	101	600		600				600
14	PATIO BRICK	D	Y	1310		C	AV	2009	4.01 T	20	101	101	1,000		1,000				1,000
37	STABLE	D	Y	11X30		C	AV	2015	36.96 T	10	101	101	12,900		12,900				12,900
10	CANOPY	A	Y	18X19		C	AV	2015	5.03 T	10	101	101	700		700				700
45	LEAN TO	D	Y	18X10		D	AV	2006	3.72 T	20	101	101	200		200				200
45	LEAN TO	D	Y	18X12		D	AV	1995	3.53 T	30	101	101	200		200				200

COMMENTS

Full Bath: 2	Rating: SAME
A Bath: 1	Rating: SAME
3/4 Bath: 1	Rating: SAME
A 3QBth: 1	Rating: SAME
1/2 Bath: 1	Rating: SAME
A HBth: 1	Rating: SAME
Other Fix: 1	Rating: SAME
Roof Struct: 1 - GABLE	Rating: SAME
Roof Cover: 1 - ASPH SHINGLE	Rating: SAME
Color: TAN & NATURAL	Rating: SAME
View / Desir: A - AVERAGE	Rating: SAME
GENERAL INFORMATION	Rating: SAME
Grade: C - AVERAGE	Rating: SAME
Year Blt: 1987	Rating: SAME
Alt LUC: 1	Rating: SAME
Jurisdic: 1	Rating: SAME
Const Mod: 1	Rating: SAME
Sum Adj: 1	Rating: SAME

RESIDENTIAL GRID

1st Res Grid	Desc: Line 1	# Units: 1
Level	FY LR DR D K FR RR BR FB HB L O	
Other		
Upper		
Lvl 2		
Lvl 1		
Lower		
Totals	RMS: 6 BRs: 3 Baths: 2 HB	


REMODELING

Exterior:	No Unit	RMS	BRS	FL
Interior:	1	6	3	M
Additions:				
Kitchen:				
Baths:				
Plumbing:				
Electric:				
Heating: 2014				
General:	1	6	3	

COMPARABLE SALES

Rate	Parcel ID	Typ	Date	Sale Price
Basic \$ / SQ: 78.95				
Size Adj: 1.06476188				
Const Adj: 1.00000000				
Adj \$ / SQ: 84.063				
Other Features: 28100				
Grade Factor: 1.00				
Neighborhood Inf: 1.11000001				
LUC Factor: 1.00				
Adj Total: 175515				
Depreciation: 41772				
Depreciated Total: 133742				

SKETCH



SUB AREA


Code	Description	Area - SQ	Rate - AV	Undert Value	Sub	%	Descr	Sub	%	Qu	Ten
BMT	BASEMENT	768	19,840	15,236	BMT	100	FBM				
FFL	1ST FLOOR	768	84,060	64,560							
TOS	3/4 STORY	576	84,060	48,420							
CNP	CANOPY	132	5,170	682							
WDK	WOOD DECK	96	11,690	1,122							

SUB AREA DETAIL

Code	Description	Area - SQ	Rate - AV	Undert Value	Sub	%	Descr	Sub	%	Qu	Ten
BMT	BASEMENT	768	19,840	15,236	BMT	100	FBM				
FFL	1ST FLOOR	768	84,060	64,560							
TOS	3/4 STORY	576	84,060	48,420							
CNP	CANOPY	132	5,170	682							
WDK	WOOD DECK	96	11,690	1,122							

Net Sketched Area: 2,340	Total: 130,020
Size Adj: 1344	Gross Area: 2532
FinArea: 1344	

IMAGE



AssessPro Patriot Properties, Inc

More: N

Total Yard Items: 19,600

Total Special Features: 19,600

Total: 19,600



Abutters List Report

Rochester, NH
May 22, 2019

Subject Property:

Parcel Number: 0235-0050-0000
CAMA Number: 0235-0050-0000
Property Address: 72 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: DEMCHAK THOMAS J SR
72 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867-4103

Abutters:

Parcel Number: 0235-0050-0000
CAMA Number: 0235-0050-0000
Property Address: 72 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: DEMCHAK THOMAS J SR
72 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867-4103

Parcel Number: 0235-0051-0000
CAMA Number: 0235-0051-0000
Property Address: 76 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: PERCEY PENNY
76 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867-4103

Parcel Number: 0235-0055-0000
CAMA Number: 0235-0055-0000
Property Address: 0 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: LAMONTAGNE LAROCQUE RACHELE &
LAROCQUE DAVID W
98 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867-4103

Parcel Number: 0235-0066-0000
CAMA Number: 0235-0066-0000
Property Address: 69 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: BRASILEIRO ILDEUBERG & ADELJA
69 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867

Parcel Number: 0235-0066-0001
CAMA Number: 0235-0066-0001
Property Address: 73 CROWN PT RD

Mailing Address: HOPE TERRI & HENSEL WALTER
73 CROWN POINT RD
ROCHESTER, NH 03867



www.cai-tech.com

Data shown on this report is provided for planning and informational purposes only. The municipality and CAI Technologies are not responsible for any use for other purposes or misuse or misrepresentation of this report.