



The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College

The Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences

Policy Research Shop

Claremont Housing Inventory Project

Housing Stock Surveying Options for Claremont, NH

Presented to the City of Claremont

PRS Policy Brief 1011-09

May 23, 2011

Prepared by:

Travis Blalock

Kelsey Clark

Austin Major

Eric Yang

This report was written by undergraduate students at Dartmouth College under the direction of professors in the Rockefeller Center. The Policy Research Shop is supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The PRS reports were developed under FIPSE grant P116B100070 from the U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents of the PRS reports do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.



Contact:

Nelson A. Rockefeller Center, 6082 Rockefeller Hall, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755
<http://rockefeller.dartmouth.edu/shop/> • Email: Ronald.G.Shaiko@Dartmouth.edu



The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College

The Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences

Policy Research Shop

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. METHODOLOGY	2
3. HOUSING SURVEYING TECHNIQUES	2
4. EXTERIOR SURVEYING	3
4.1 CONDENSED METHOD	4
4.2 COMPREHENSIVE METHOD	5
4.3 OTHER OPTIONS	5
5. INTERIOR SURVEYING	6
5.1 CONDENSED METHOD	6
5.2 COMPREHENSIVE METHOD	7
6. DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEYING	7
6.1 CONDENSED METHOD	7
6.2 COMPREHENSIVE METHOD	7
7. VERIFYING THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES	8
7.1 GRANTING ANONYMITY	8
7.2 LEGAL MANDATES	8
7.3 EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL VERIFICATION	8
8. CONCLUSION	9
APPENDIX A. DOOR-TO-DOOR INTERIOR SURVEY METHODS	10
DOORWAY SURVEY	10
INTERIOR WALKING SURVEY	11
COMPREHENSIVE INTERIOR INSPECTION	12
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE HOUSING SURVEYS FROM OTHER LOCALES	13
NEW YORK CITY SAMPLE SURVEY	13
CALIFORNIA SAMPLE SURVEY	15
ENGLAND SAMPLE SURVEY	16



Policy Research Shop

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Claremont, New Hampshire approached the Rockefeller Center's Policy Research Shop about methods for surveying housing stock in the city. At that time, Claremont had just received a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant with provisions attached to its award. One of these, the one we were charged with researching, was to determine the current state of the housing inventory in Claremont. Two important goals were to collect accurate information about residents and about basic measures of quality for each residential unit via a housing survey. An analysis of housing survey methodologies and options are contained in this report. After doing preliminary research on other cities throughout the United States and their housing survey methods, we have compiled a wide range of factors that a housing inventory survey should address. We have divided these into three categories – exterior, interior, and demographics – with the measures in each section categorized into a condensed method and a more comprehensive one. We have tried to ensure that varying amounts of time and resources are taken into account so that the combination of methods Claremont ends up choosing will meet its needs.

1. INTRODUCTION

The City of Claremont is undergoing planning for a rezoning project that utilizes the funding it recently received from HUD. The assessor data and census data that the city currently has is inconsistent with actual conditions, especially for residences in high-risk neighborhoods and does not measure everything the current project would like to measure. To update and verify the data for the downtown housing stock, city officials are interested in finding a cost-effective way to gather accurate information about the all residences in downtown Claremont. The recommendations in this report are specifically for conducting a housing stock survey, but many of the surveying techniques that are discussed are common across many surveys. In addition to collecting information on the downtown housing stock, Claremont will follow these surveys with focus groups and opinion-based surveys that are separate projects from this housing stock survey.

While governments have conducted housing inventory surveys for generations, there is neither a universally recognized best method nor a defined set of metrics. There are tradeoffs involved with data collection and the varying resources and purposes of the data collectors. This report examines several of the leading techniques in housing inventory surveying and how they may be applicable to Claremont. We also evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of general surveying methods. Finally, for each housing survey method, the report identifies common metrics of housing quality and occupancy.



Policy Research Shop

2. METHODOLOGY

After a debriefing from Claremont city officials on the history and nature of the housing in the city, a student research team at the Policy Research Shop began developing options for a housing survey in Claremont by examining a number of different housing surveys spanning the state, local, and international levels. A variety of locales, among them New York City, Milwaukee, California, and England, all had readily available online documentation of their housing inventory studies (see Appendix B for samples). Current surveying methods and the metrics used by each one were compared and were then applied to the specific conditions of the City of Claremont. In general:

1. Larger locales had longer surveys that looked at the interior and exterior of residential units in addition to asking residents about specific demographic and land use/rent/ownership information.
2. Surveys that required less time to administer focused mostly on exterior qualities of residences.
3. Surveys used a combination of binary and gradient-based (Yes/No vs. 1-5 points) metrics.
4. It was very difficult to find surveys from a locale similar in size to Claremont. This suggests that smaller cities often rely on existing statewide or national surveys for their data.

The research team also examined the literature on the efficacy and formulation of housing survey techniques. Before completing the report, the research team visited and toured Claremont, observing the unique housing characteristics of the city. These factors were taken into account for the analysis of the surveying procedures produced within this report.

3. HOUSING SURVEYING TECHNIQUES

Most housing surveying techniques involve tradeoffs between time intensiveness/cost and the quality of data. Figure 1 contains a summary of the information for each survey type, and Appendix B integrates the survey methods into the exterior, interior, and demographic housing surveying discussed in later sections. The following are brief descriptions of popular general surveying techniques that can be used for housing surveys:

Door-to-Door Surveys

Door-to-Door surveys consist of a survey going house to house in a selected area and administering a survey. Door-to-Door surveys are typically the most expensive, but also typically generate the highest response rates and allow for the widest range in data collection methods.



Policy Research Shop

Mail Surveys

A mail survey consists of a survey being sent to an individual either by mail or by hand delivery that asks respondents to either mail back the results or send in information online. This method is inexpensive and allows for the collection of large amounts of data, but it can also have large time delays before the data is collected and lower response rates due to the lack of immediacy.

Telephone Surveys

Telephone surveys involve a random selection of telephone numbers of a selected population and calling them to administer a survey. This method can be expensive, but it saves travel expenses and centralizes the data collection. Also, due to problems with landline telecommunication (i.e., cell-phone-only households, time-of-day issues) the results may be skewed.

Estimation Based Surveys

Estimation based surveys involve the analysis of a known variable to speculate on the status of another variable. This method can be done with little cooperation from the intended respondent, but may be inaccurate and therefore is often used as a last resort.

4. EXTERIOR SURVEYING

Surveying the external features of a house is the easiest and least intrusive way to determine the characteristics of a home. Exterior surveys can also offer a reliable way to infer many characteristics of the home's internal features, as long as it is reasonable to believe that a poor exterior correlates to a poor interior. Almost every housing survey contains some measurement of external characteristics.

When conducting an exterior survey, it is usually disadvantageous to use a mailed survey or a telephone survey. These methods are dependent upon input from the residents, which may be biased if the residents do not want to draw attention to exterior defects. Instead, two ways of collecting the information are with door-to-door inspections or with the street-view function of Google Maps.

Using Google Maps can greatly reduce the amount of labor and time needed to conduct an exterior survey and only requires a small level of technical proficiency. However, the satellite images only offer certain angles of viewing and are often several years old. Having surveyors go from door to door will increase the accuracy of the data that is collected but will require greater resources. The following systems of exterior surveying will work for either of the two methods:



Policy Research Shop

Figure 1: Survey Methods Pros and Cons

	<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
<i>Door-to-Door</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher response rates • Can answer respondent questions • Can note things not on survey • Most able to collect information from disabled populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expensive • Potential for interviewer bias
<i>Mail</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No potential for interviewer bias • Low costs • Convenient for respondent • Can obtain large amounts of information • Can incorporate Online survey components 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large time delay • Lower response rate • No ability to offer clarification
<i>Telephone</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inexpensive • Easy to randomize • Interviewer advantages, clarification, high response rate • Quick 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low telephone density • Some interviewer bias
<i>Estimation based</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inexpensive • Requires little cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be inaccurate • Hard to design

4.1 Condensed Method

Surveys with little reliance on the exterior component or a time constraint will assign a two-point binary system to each category. These points are either a 1 or a 0 where each category is given either 1 – for adequate or 0 – for not adequate (i.e. a “yes” or a “no”). The surveyor may determine this adequacy subjectively or by determining if a category meets specific criteria. For example, if the component in question was the windows of the residence, the surveyor would mark ‘adequate’ if there was no major damage to any of the windows, they appeared to be well kept, and the frames were undamaged. If the category receives a 0, that portion of the exterior component is marked inadequate as determined by the surveyor’s subjectivity or if the component does not meet one of the



Policy Research Shop

criterion above. Under this method, the residence is not assessed holistically, but rather by each category. For example, if a residence receives all 1's, and one 0, the category in which they received the 'inadequate' grade is brought to the attention of the city and property owner. A survey that focuses only on the main aspects of the exterior should include the condition of the siding, windows, doors, roof, and area immediately surrounding the residence.

4.2 Comprehensive Method

Surveys with medium reliance on the exterior component of a residence typically assign a five-point gradient system to each category/item surveyed. These surveys also typically include the condition of the siding, windows, doors, roof, and area immediately surrounding the house. However, they also include condition of the property, condition of the molding, level of upkeep, etc. Typically, points are awarded in each category with 1 being the lowest point value and 5 being the highest that a property may receive. Each point is assigned based on the specific condition of the category rather than just sufficient or insufficient. For example, if a surveyor were grading the siding of a residence, they would award a 1 if the siding had major structural damage that needed immediate repair, a 2 if the siding had some instances of structural damage that were very serious, a 3 if the siding had several minor damages that needed repair, a 4 if the siding had no only a few minor damages that did not require attention, and a 5 if the siding had no damage. In these surveys, a residence is assessed holistically based on its total score rather than on individual categories. The comprehensive surveying method involves only a few more minutes of the surveyors' time per residence surveyed. The level of assessment is more involved, so often, there are more categories surveyed and more knowledge is needed by the surveyors to standardize the collection methodology and increase accuracy. Human resources are also a factor because each residence must also be given a score, which would take a few minutes to calculate. This survey method is best used if the city is willing to focus primarily on the exterior of each residence and has the necessary human resources.

4.3 Other Options

There is also a third, less expensive, but less accurate option involving a "drive by" survey. Using this strategy, surveyors drive by the property, inspect it holistically for a very short amount of time, and determine without any official criterion whether the house is adequate or inadequate. This method requires little in terms of human or financial resources and takes only a short amount of time. However, it lacks the accuracy of both the condensed and comprehensive and is more subjective. It may also be hard to replicate this survey because of the subjectivity in labeling a residence as inadequate or adequate. On the other hand, if only a rough sense of housing quality or if identifying the worst units is the goal, this method may be perfectly adequate.



Policy Research Shop

5. INTERIOR SURVEYING

The goal of the interior survey is to gather specific information about the composition and quality of the residence. Unlike an exterior survey, an interior survey requires some degree of cooperation by the owner or occupant of the residence. It also eliminates the need to use inference to assess the condition of a house because it provides a more complete set of data. In most cases, the interior survey is a secondary analysis that follows an external survey and is used for areas where a greater level of information is desired.

Claremont will have to determine its goals before determining the need for interior surveying. Based on conversations with Claremont officials, the most important characteristics to check are the number of residents and/or rooms in the residence and some basic measure of quality. While more detailed responses can be obtained, we believe that these basic measures will offer at the very least a basic picture of the housing conditions and supply in Claremont.

An interior survey can be administered using any of the popular survey methods, but due to the subjective nature of many of the elements and the personal biases of the respondent a door-to-door survey is often considered the best option. See Appendix A for an in-depth recommendation for door-to-door interior surveying options. The following sections present a general overview:

5.1 Condensed Method

The condensed method of interior surveying involves only superficial examination and reliance on the cooperation and answer of the residents. Interior surveys ask about the number and size of each of the rooms in a house as well as the number of occupants. An interior survey will also assess the quality of a residence by identifying problems in areas of the residence. Examples include:

- Cracks in walls
- Floor conditions
- Pests and infestations
- Fire hazards

The quality of these areas can be judged on either a gradient or a binary basis, depending on the desired thoroughness of surveying. Due to the large amount of potential disparity in each of the problem areas, a gradient-based scale is often preferred, and an interviewer must be capable of determining the appropriate classification. The different numerical scales were previously discussed in the exterior surveying section and apply here as well.



Policy Research Shop

5.2 Comprehensive Method

Comprehensive interior surveys will also include the analysis of detailed structural components of a residence, such as plumbing, heating, and electrical systems. These surveys require a significant amount of time, full cooperation from the residents, and a degree of technical expertise. Appendix A identifies specific areas that should be covered by the comprehensive method in addition to the areas already addressed in a condensed survey.

6. DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEYING

While not an immediate feature of the physical plant of a residence, demographic information about occupants can often shed light on the functionality and condition of a home. For these reasons, basic demographic information is often collected during housing inventories.

Demographic data can be collected reliably using any of the popular general survey methods, due to its non-subjective nature.

6.1 Condensed Method

Number of Residents:

The most basic demographic metric is how many people live inside the house. The number of residents will tell you how many people use the facility for basic shelter and is important when trying to determine what proportion of the population lives in certain types of homes.

Number of Families:

Along with the total number of residents in a house, another basic question is how many families live in the house. Due to the belief that there may be a number of unregistered multifamily homes in Claremont this information may be of special importance and is further examined later in the report.

6.2 Comprehensive Method

Rent or Own:

Due to fundamental differences in the behavior of renters and owners, it is often beneficial to know what proportion of residents fit into each demographic.



Policy Research Shop

Length of ownership:

Respondents are often asked to disclose how long they have owned the house. This information can help determine important trends in home ownership.

Mortgages:

Whether there is a mortgage on the home as well as the amount, length and monthly payment are commonly asked questions on housing inventory surveys. This helps to determine the homeowner's stake in the home.

7. VERIFYING THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES

One of the more important demographic measurements is determining the number of families living inside each housing unit. Like most other cities, Claremont has zoning regulations dictating that the majority of housing units are required to be maintained by a single family. However, there is a widely held belief that many housing units are in violation of this policy. Due to the delicate nature of the legal situation, there is a strong possibility that some respondents may answer dishonestly about the number of families living in their home. There are three common ways surveys try to get around the problem of respondents reporting inaccurate information.

7.1 Granting Anonymity

Many surveys grant that all answers will be anonymous and will not be associated with the respondent. This has been shown to increase response rates and increase survey accuracy, but the effect may be small if, like in Claremont, there is a low level of trust between citizens and the city government on housing issues.

7.2 Legal Mandates

In some cases, the government can mandate that people must honestly answer survey questions. The effects of these mandates usually involve an increased response rate, but have not been shown to reliably increase accuracy of surveys. The imposition of a penalty for giving false answers to survey questions is a way to potentially deter misinformation, but this has many legal issues that the city government would need to sort out.

7.3 External and Internal Verification

The most reliable method for determining the accuracy of the responses of residents is to test the data by using another data point that is indicative of the number of families living a unit. For Claremont, two key features to verify would be the number of people living in



Policy Research Shop

each residence and the number of units per structure. Suggested ideas include looking at the number of satellite dishes outside of a home, the number of cars parked near the residence, the electrical wiring, the amount of trash produced, or the amount of water consumed. These external and internal verifications can be conducted on every home as part of the exterior and interior surveys discussed earlier; however, since accurately verifying the responses of every residence is likely cost prohibitive, it may be better to conduct the verification on a random sample of homes to determine the average level of dishonesty in survey responses.

8. CONCLUSION

There are several key points made throughout this report that will be important in the formulation and implementation of the Claremont downtown housing survey:

First, the main component and most efficient of the housing survey tactics is the exterior survey. Exterior surveying is effective because it does not require the consent of the owner of the property and any property can be evaluated. Also, there is less subjectivity, as assessors are able to view the house without the bias of the property owner. The broad range of methods available to conduct an exterior survey (using enumerators, drive-bys, or Google Maps/Earth) increases flexibility. If the correlation between outside and inside is deemed to be strong enough, most goals can be achieved with exterior surveys only. This correlation can be estimated with a sample of interior and exterior surveys and may allow for quick exterior-only surveying in the future.

Secondly, an interior housing survey would be very useful for checking the accuracy of assessor data, ACS data, and data gained from an exterior survey. As illustrated throughout the report and in Appendix A, there are several successful methods to go about conducting this aspect of the survey. It is important to remember that for the interior survey, resident participation is required in order to legally enter the property. This may skew the survey results, as residents with the most dilapidated housing may question the intent of the surveyors and will refuse entry. Also, residents are likely to oversell the positive aspects of the property as opposed to showing surveyors the major problems of the residence.

The final component of the survey involves demographics. In this aspect, surveyors assess the number of residents that reside in a property, the status of the property (leased, rented, owned), etc. This component is more difficult to accurately assess because it requires the honest participation of residents, which may be difficult to attain at times. The residents that the city has the least information on are also the least likely to participate in a housing survey, as they may feel that sharing the truth about their residence will confer legal consequences, especially if they are living on the property illegally. Therefore, the variety of external methods available can be used to gain a more accurate idea of how many residents each property contains. Also, when surveying, there



Policy Research Shop

needs to be a distinction between surveying the tenant and surveying the landowner. Oftentimes, the results of a housing survey will be very different depending on who in the residence is surveyed, so it is important to perhaps survey both tenants and landowners.

For the City of Claremont, the best housing survey will entail using various methods and various levels of surveying depending on the city's goals for policy changes in housing and urban development. Due to the nature of the neighborhoods in the downtown area, certain residences may need a more in-depth surveying than other residences. To conserve resources, Claremont should consider using the condensed and comprehensive methods and the general types of surveying on a situation-by-situation basis. The city's goal of surveying 20% of the residences can be achieved with the surveying techniques discussed in this report and is an adequate percentage for identifying general policy concerns, as long as the residents who are surveyed are representative of the entire population.

APPENDIX A. DOOR-TO-DOOR INTERIOR SURVEY METHODS

In a door-to-door survey, surveyors will knock on each door in a residence. If there is no answer, the surveyor should look at external features of the residence to verify that it is indeed occupied and that the residents are simply not present. If so, the surveyor should come back at a more convenient time (i.e. weekday dinner time, weekend, etc.). If the resident is home and answers the door, then the surveyor will ask the resident a series of questions. We have split the interior part of the survey into three levels of complexity – those that can be done at a doorway, those that can be done inside, and those that can be done with a thorough tour of the house. Given the varying levels of resources and time needed and the type of data desired, the City of Claremont could easily use one method or a combination of these levels to obtain housing information.

Doorway Survey

The most cursory level of surveying would entail the surveyor conducting the survey in the resident's doorway and having some view of the inside of the house. Ideally, this survey would take three to five minutes to conduct, which makes it the fastest interior surveying method listed in this paper. Another advantage is that residents may be more likely to participate if the surveyor is not physically inside the residence. On the other hand, a weakness is that the questions focus on obtaining the most basic information to fill out data. Sample questions, with their explanations for inclusion in this survey, are included below.

These questions are the most important questions because they deal with the physical constructions of the homes, as these give the most important yet unobservable information.



Policy Research Shop

- How many rooms are in this apartment (or house)? Do not count bathrooms, porches, balconies, halls, foyers, or half-rooms.
- Of these rooms, how many are bedrooms?
- While you've lived here, have there been any major renovations done on your unit? Do you know of any that were done before you moved in?

These next questions should help in two ways: 1. They serve as fact checking, and can determine if there has been illegal subleasing and 2. Length of lease will help surveyors and the city know when presumably the current tenants may be moving, which might make it easier next time they survey.

- What is the length of the lease on this apartment (house) – that is, the total time from when the lease began until it will expire?
- How long have you been living here?

Since people may give a more realistic assessment about their neighbors' residences than about their own residences, asking these questions may be a better indicator of quality:

- How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structure in this neighborhood – would you say they are on the whole excellent good, fair, or poor?
- On a scale of 1-5, rate the physical condition of the units/houses of your neighbors.

While at the doorway, it would be useful to make a quick visual check of the visible part of the apartment. This will give at least a somewhat accurate, if incomplete, idea of the quality of the unit. The rating system through a doorway visual check will be similar to the method described in the exterior surveying section of the report and may look like this:

- 1 - Needs major repair, 2 - Needs slight or minor repairs, 3 - No evidence of problems
- Paint
 - Cracks in walls/ceilings
 - Evidence of mold
 - Evidence of infestations (cockroaches, mice) -- Yes/No

Interior Walking Survey

If residents give the surveyors permission to enter, a 10-20 minute survey could be conducted that gives a better overview of the individual characteristics of the house and any hazards within the house. The walking survey would involve a walk through of the rooms in the house and does not require the surveyor to touch or measure anything in the residence. A major benefit of this method is that the surveyor can verify the responses of



Policy Research Shop

the resident concerning current occupancy and room conditions. In some houses, the doorway area is not representative of the house as a whole, meaning that an inspection would generate lasting, accurate data. However, many residents will find the survey invasive and will decline requests for entry.

To check for occupancy, the surveyor should look for signs of multiple individuals or multiple units, for example, clothing, toys, and beds. Signs of overcrowding, like excessive kitchenware or many pairs of shoes, should also be taken note of. The level of overcrowding can be determined by taking a ratio of the number of residents to the size of the rooms.

The following items are items that should be addressed by an interior walking survey: The metrics of these internal items can be on a scale or on a binary “adequate/yes” and “inadequate/no” basis. Qualities to consider for each item would be:

- Kitchen: check for unsafe setups of kitchen appliances and cooking machinery as well as the general condition of counters, cupboards, etc.
- Bathrooms: note the cleanliness of the bathrooms and the presence of toilets, sinks, showers, and baths
- Lighting/Electricity: check for electricity hazards with poor wiring and cable setups in addition to the safety and functionality of electric lights
- Stairs: check for loose or weak steps and the condition of the railing
- Doors: observe the functionality of locks on doors both for entry into the house and for rooms
- Miscellaneous Rooms: check the condition of the basement, the loft, and any other marginal rooms
- Walls/Ceiling/Flooring: check for refurbishing, cracks and faults, and unsafe material composition
- Fire Hazards: check for fireplace access and ventilation, fire alarm functionality, and the presence of sprinklers or extinguishers

It is important to make a record of all the potential sources of hazard in each residence due to the high risk levels of many of the urban residences. Physical and chemical hazards and other safety concerns should be noted and used to address problems for individuals living in low-quality residences.

Comprehensive Interior Inspection

Given the time constraints of the surveyor and the number of units that must be surveyed, this final method is only practical in a case where the number of surveyors is large and where the response rate is high. The result of this method is a fully comprehensive data set for each residence, and the survey may take around 30-40 minutes to complete. The difference between this method and the previous method is that the comprehensive



Policy Research Shop

survey requires looking at the non-visible functionalities of different items in the residence. In some cases, this type of survey would actually elucidate information about the number of units in a residence and can be used to verify the answers of the homeowner. In addition to the previously mentioned items, the comprehensive survey would cover the following:

- Water Supply/Plumbing: check sources of running water for functionality and the plumbing system
- Central Heating/Cooling: check for A/C and heater/furnace functionality
- Electricity and Wiring: check for functionality of outlets, check for cable setups or landlines for phones, check for multi-unit wiring
- Room Sizes: measure the sizes of rooms

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE HOUSING SURVEYS FROM OTHER LOCALES

New York City Sample Survey

D. EXTERNAL WALLS	
001	<input type="checkbox"/> Missing bricks, siding, or other outside wall material
002	<input type="checkbox"/> Sloping or bulging outside walls
003	<input type="checkbox"/> Major cracks in outside walls
004	<input type="checkbox"/> Loose or hanging cornice, roofing, or other material
005	<input type="checkbox"/> None of these problems with walls
006	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to observe walls
E. WINDOWS	
007	<input type="checkbox"/> Broken or missing windows
008	<input type="checkbox"/> Rotted/loose window frames/sashes
009	<input type="checkbox"/> Boarded-up windows
010	<input type="checkbox"/> None of these problems with windows
011	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to observe windows
F. STAIRWAYS (exterior and interior)	
012	<input type="checkbox"/> Loose, broken, or missing stair railings
013	<input type="checkbox"/> Loose, broken, or missing steps
014	<input type="checkbox"/> None of these problems with stairways
015	<input type="checkbox"/> No interior steps or stairways
016	<input type="checkbox"/> No exterior steps or stairways
035	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to observe stairways
G. FLOORS	
017	<input type="checkbox"/> Sagging or sloping floors
018	<input type="checkbox"/> Slanted or shifted doorsills or door frames
019	<input type="checkbox"/> Deep wear in floors causing depressions
020	<input type="checkbox"/> Holes or missing flooring
021	<input type="checkbox"/> None of these problems with floors
022	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to observe floors



The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College

The Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences

Policy Research Shop

California Sample Survey

CONSTRUCTION TYPE:

Wood Frame ☐

Masonry ☐

Mobile ☐

Modular ☐

Other _____

STRUCTURE TYPE:

Single Family with Detached Garage ☐

Single Family with Attached Garage ☐

Duplex ☐

Multi-Family ☐ # of Units _____

Other _____

FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS IF APPLICABLE:

Curbs Yes ☐ No ☐

Paved Street Yes ☐ No ☐

Gutters Yes ☐ No ☐

Sidewalks Yes ☐ No ☐

Driveway Yes ☐ No ☐

Adequate Site Drainage Yes ☐ No ☐

#1 - FOUNDATION:

0 Existing foundation in good condition.

10 Repairs needed

15 Needs a partial foundation

25 No foundation or needs a complete foundation.

#4 - WINDOWS:

0 No repair needed.

1 Broken window panes

5 In need of repair.

10 In need of replacement.

#2 - ROOFING:

0 Does not need repair

5 Shingles missing

5 Chimney needs repair

10 Needs re-roofing

25 Roof structure needs replacement and re-roofing.

#5 - ELECTRICAL:

0 No repair needed.

5 Minor repair

10 Replace main panel.

#3 - SIDING/STUCCO:

0 Does not need repair.

1 Needs re-painting.

5 Needs to be patched and re-painted.

10 Needs replacement and painting.

10 Asbestos/Lead-Based.

STRUCTURAL SCORING CRITERIA

Sound: 9 or less

Minor: 10 - 15

Moderate: 16 - 39

Substantial: 40 - 55

Dilapidated: 56 and over

DILAPIDATED UNIT

56 A unit suffering from excessive neglect, where the building appears structurally unsound and maintenance is nonexistent, not fit for human habitation in its current condition, may be considered for demolition or at a minimum, major rehabilitation will be required.

	#1 Foundation	#2 Roofing	#3 Siding/Stucco	#4 Windows	#5 Electrical	TOTAL POINTS
Points based on criteria outlined above						



The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College

The Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences

Policy Research Shop

England Sample Survey

5. Interior

Does room exist?

Level (B, G, 1, 2, 3 etc)

Function (L, K, S, T, D, B, U, C, X)

Room inspected?

Ceiling height (metres)

Width (metres)

Depth (metres)

Ceilings (answer in tenths)

Faults?

Take down and renew

Isolated repair, fill cracks

Leave

Floors (answer in tenths)

Solid floors?

Faults?

Replace structure

Replace only boards or screed

Leave

Walls (answer in tenths)

Faults?

Rebuild partition wall

Doors (answer in numbers)

Faults?

Renew

Repair/rehang

Windows/Frames

Faults?

Means of escape?

Secondary glazing for sound insulation?

Heating & Services

CH/prog. appliance?

Fixed other heater?

Fluorescent/low energy lighting?

Defects

Rising (ground level) damp

Penetrating (higher level) damp

Serious condensation/mould growth

Inadequate natural light

Inadequate artificial light

Inadequate room ventilation

Inadequate appliance ventilation

Wood boring insect attack

Dry/wet rot

Evidence of mice

Evidence of rats

Living room	Kitchen	Bedroom	Bathroom	Circulation
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Living room	Kitchen	Bedroom	Bathroom	Circulation	Other rooms
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Integral garage	Integral balcony	Extra room 1	Extra room 2	Extra room 3	Extra room 4	Extra room 5	Extra room 6	Extra room 7	Habitable rooms (specify No)
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Stairs within dwelling

Present?

Open Plan?

Faults?

Replace structure

Replace treads

Replace balustrades

Repair/refix treads/balustrades

Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N

Security of dwelling

Main entrance door

Other external doors

Accessible windows

High	Fairly high	Fairly low	Low	Very low	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	8
1	2	3	4	5	8
1	2	3	4	5	8

Burglar alarm present?

Door viewer present?

Smoke detector(s)

Y	N
Y	N
Y	N

Accessibility

Flush threshold <15mm?

Room on entrance level suitable for bedroom?

Bathroom at entrance level?

WC at entrance level?

Stair lift/thru floor lift?

Hoists?

Electrical modifications?

Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N

Health and Safety Rating System

Falling on stairs etc

Falling on level surfaces

Falling between levels

Fire

Flames, hot surfaces, etc

Damp and mould growth

Entry by intruders

Noise

Collisions and entrapment

Significantly lower risk than average	Average risk	Significantly higher risk than average
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3

If '3', score HHSRS in Section 22

Excess heat

Lighting

Domestic hygiene, pests and refuge

Significantly lower risk than average	Average risk	Significantly higher risk than average	Extreme risk
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

Describe 'extreme risk' in Section 22

Rats and Mice

Type of evidence

Traps seen?

Chemicals seen?

Other visual evidence?

Told about it?

Y	N
Y	N
Y	N
Y	N