

Tide & Timber website and local visibility audit

Owner decision brief and technical remediation specification

- **Audit date:** September 1, 2026
- **Prepared by:** Ready for Discovery
- **Audited property:** <https://tideandtimber.example/>
- **Primary visitor goal:** Request a home inspection
- **Scope:** Public website and public local-profile comparison; audit only, no changes made
- **Report status:** Fictional sample showing the approved R4D report standard v1

Current decision: Repair the estimate route before promoting the site.

The fictional site presents a credible operating business, and its main service information, telephone route, working scheduling form, and representative mobile layout perform normally. The estimate button on a primary service page ends at an error, however. The owner should also confirm Saturday hours and decide whether two unfinished sitemap pages have any business purpose.

How to use this report

Part 1 is for the business owner. It explains what was found, why it matters, what remains uncertain, and the recommended order of work.

Part 2 is for the person performing the work. It preserves the demonstrated routes, repair direction, limitations, and acceptance criteria needed for an owner-led or vendor handoff.

Part 3 preserves the methodology and claim limits. It distinguishes checked conditions from traffic, indexing, customer behavior, and owner-system evidence that were not available.

Severity describes consequence. Priority describes the recommended work order, including dependencies. Evidence state describes what was actually established. An unknown is not represented as a defect, and a possible consequence is not represented as an observed outcome.

Part 1 — Owner decision brief

ALL BUSINESSES, ROUTES, FACTS, OBSERVATIONS, AND EVIDENCE IN THIS SAMPLE ARE FICTIONAL

1. Overall assessment

The public website clearly describes the inspection service and provides a working telephone link and scheduling form. The homepage, six priority pages, primary navigation, and representative mobile route display normally in this demonstration. A redesign is not necessary to correct the findings.

The first repair is direct and bounded: the “Request an Inspection” button on the main residential inspection page points to a missing URL instead of the working form. Someone following that visible route reaches an error after choosing to inquire.

Two lower-priority conditions need owner decisions. Saturday hours conflict between the website and the public business profile, so the correct operating fact must be established before either source is changed. Two unfinished theme pages are not linked from primary navigation, but the current XML sitemap gives search systems a public route to them. This sample does not claim that either page is currently displayed in Google results.

2. What was and was not examined

Surface	Coverage	Result or limitation
Public website	Homepage, six priority pages, navigation, telephone link, and inquiry route	Reviewed; findings and strengths recorded below
Search access	Public robots instructions, XML sitemap, page identity, and indexing instructions	Reviewed from public evidence
Local profile	Public business name, website, telephone, and hours	Public comparison only; owner settings and history were not accessed
Mobile and desktop	Representative routes at phone and desktop widths	No material layout failure observed on the checked routes
Search Console and analytics	No access in this demonstration	Index coverage, queries, traffic, inquiries, and conversions remain unknown
Website administration	No access in this demonstration	Editor settings, plugins, redirects, and historical intent remain unknown

This demonstration is not a security penetration test, legal review, formal accessibility certification, complete search-index audit, or guarantee of business performance.

3. Verified strengths

- Seven of the eight checked primary navigation and inquiry destinations worked.
- The telephone link and the independently verified scheduling form opened normally.

- The representative homepage-to-service route showed no horizontal overflow at the tested phone and desktop widths.
- Primary service copy was understandable without relying on decorative imagery.
- Automated warnings about several long page titles were rejected: the titles were distinct, readable, and accurately described their pages.

These checks do not certify every page, device, browser, accessibility requirement, or future state.

4. Prioritized owner action plan

Order	Severity	Action	Why it matters	Evidence state
1	High	Reconnect the estimate button to the intended working form	A visible inquiry route from a primary service page currently ends at an error	Demonstrated
2	Medium	Confirm Saturday hours and make the website and public profile agree	The correct business fact must be established before either source is changed	Verified mismatch; correct value unknown
3	Medium	Remove, finish, or intentionally exclude the two theme-demo pages	The sitemap gives search systems a current route to unfinished material	Demonstrated public route; search-result display not established
4	Preserve	Retest the working navigation, telephone link, form, and mobile route after repair	A narrow correction should not disturb the parts already working	Strengths demonstrated within checked scope

5. Owner finding summaries

O-01 — The estimate route ends at an error

- **Severity:** High
- **Priority:** First
- **Evidence state:** Demonstrated
- **Current effect:** A visitor using the visible estimate button reaches a 404 page

What we found: The “Request an Inspection” button on the residential-inspection page points to `/request-an-estimate/`, which returns a missing-page response. The working request form is at `/schedule/`.

Why it matters: This is a direct visitor route, not a guessed URL. The audit does not claim that a visitor abandoned the site or that a booking was lost.

Recommended decision: Confirm the intended form, repair this one destination, and retest the complete route on desktop and mobile.

Technical reference: T-01

O-02 — Saturday hours conflict across owner-controlled sources

- **Severity:** Medium
- **Priority:** Second
- **Evidence state:** Verified mismatch; correct value unknown
- **Current effect:** Visitors can receive two different answers about Saturday availability

What we found: The website contact page says Saturday is open from 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM. The public business profile says Saturday is closed.

Why it matters: Both statements cannot describe the same current schedule, but the public evidence cannot decide which one is correct.

Recommended decision: Confirm the real customer-facing schedule, including whether Saturday is appointment-only, then update the inaccurate source.

Technical reference: T-02

O-03 — Two unfinished pages are published in the sitemap

- **Severity:** Medium
- **Priority:** Third
- **Evidence state:** Demonstrated public route; current search-result exposure not established
- **Current effect:** Search systems can retrieve two pages that do not represent finished services

What we found: Two pages containing placeholder text are listed in the current XML sitemap, identify themselves as their preferred URLs, and permit indexing. They are not linked from primary navigation.

Why it matters: The sitemap is a plausible discovery route. That does not prove Google currently shows either URL in results or that a visitor has seen them.

Recommended decision: Decide whether each page has a business purpose. Finish and retain a needed page; otherwise unpublish it or exclude it appropriately.

Technical reference: T-03

6. Recommended work sequence

First

1. Confirm that `/schedule/` is the intended inquiry destination.
2. Update the visible estimate button and retest the route on desktop and mobile.

Then

1. Establish the real Saturday schedule before copying either public source into the other.
2. Decide the intended disposition of each unfinished theme page.
3. Update the inaccurate hours source and apply the approved page dispositions.

After repair

1. Recheck the estimate route, telephone link, form submission boundary, representative navigation, mobile display, final theme-page responses, and the current sitemap.
2. Preserve the before-and-after evidence with the repair record.

7. Implementation and handoff paths

Path A — Owner-led repair

The owner can use the technical finding and acceptance criteria below to make each bounded change. Back up current values and preserve the original routes before editing.

Path B — Existing website provider

Provide the report to the current provider. The $\circ$ -## owner priorities and matching $\mathbb{T}$ -## specifications keep business decisions, evidence, and completion tests aligned.

Path C — Separately scoped R4D implementation

This audit does not authorize changes. A separate repair proposal would identify the exact changes, access required, price, assumptions, rollback considerations, evidence to preserve, and acceptance tests.

Part 2 — Technical evidence and remediation specification

DEMONSTRATION EVIDENCE ONLY — NO REAL WEBSITE OR PUBLIC PROFILE WAS TESTED

T-01 — Primary estimate control points to a missing route

- **Severity:** High
- **Priority:** First
- **Evidence state:** Demonstrated
- **Affected surface:** Residential-inspection page inquiry control

Observed condition

The visible “Request an Inspection” control points to a route that returns a missing-page response. A separate scheduling route displays the working request form.

Evidence

```
Start: https://tideandtimber.example/residential-inspections/  
Control: "Request an Inspection"  
Current destination: https://tideandtimber.example/request-an-estimate/  
Observed response: 404 — Page not found  
Working form verified at: https://tideandtimber.example/schedule/
```

Consequence and claim boundary

A visitor who follows the checked control reaches an error instead of the form. This evidence does not establish visitor volume, abandonment, a lost inquiry, or lost revenue.

Repair direction

Confirm that `/schedule/` is the approved destination, change only the incorrect link target, and preserve the existing button label unless the owner chooses a separate copy change.

Acceptance criteria

1. The button reaches the owner-approved form without an error or unintended redirect.
2. The final route works at representative phone and desktop widths.
3. The telephone link, navigation, and direct form URL still work after the change.

T-02 — Website and public profile publish conflicting Saturday hours

- **Severity:** Medium
- **Priority:** Second
- **Evidence state:** Verified mismatch; correct value unknown
- **Affected surface:** Website contact page and public local profile

Observed condition

Two owner-controlled public sources publish different Saturday schedules.

Evidence

Website contact page: Saturday 9:00 AM-2:00 PM

Public business profile: Saturday closed

Owner confirmation: Not available in this demonstration

Consequence and claim boundary

The contradiction is established. The audit does not determine which source is correct, whether Saturday is appointment-only, or whether anyone relied on the inaccurate value.

Repair direction

Obtain the owner's actual customer-facing schedule first. Update only the source that is inaccurate; if Saturday is appointment-only, use wording each platform can represent accurately.

Acceptance criteria

1. The owner confirms the intended Saturday schedule in writing.
2. The website and public profile display compatible values after platform processing.
3. Telephone, footer, contact, appointment, and structured-data hours are checked for the same fact.

T-03 — Sitemap exposes two unfinished theme pages

- **Severity:** Medium
- **Priority:** Third
- **Evidence state:** Demonstrated sitemap route; current search-result display not established
- **Affected surface:** XML sitemap and two public page URLs

Observed condition

Two unfinished theme pages return normal public pages, contain placeholder material, appear in the current page sitemap, use self-referencing canonical addresses, and permit indexing.

Evidence

```
/layout-samples/ - "Sample heading" and placeholder paragraphs
/service-grid-demo/ - stock service cards and unfinished buttons
Discovery route: /page-sitemap.xml
Page instructions: index, follow
Canonical state: self-referencing
Primary navigation links: none observed
Search-result display: not established
```

Consequence and claim boundary

The sitemap gives search systems a current public route to content that does not represent the business. Public reachability and sitemap inclusion do not prove indexing, ranking, impressions, or human visits.

Repair direction

Make an owner-approved decision for each URL. Finish and retain a purposeful page; otherwise remove it from publication or apply the appropriate exclusion. Redirect only when a genuine replacement exists.

Acceptance criteria

1. Each URL has a recorded keep, finish, unpublish, exclude, or redirect decision.
2. Removed or excluded pages no longer appear in the generated sitemap.
3. Final URL responses, canonical values, and indexing instructions match the approved decision.
4. Primary navigation and the working inquiry route remain unaffected.

Part 3 — Measurements, methodology, and claim limits

THIS SECTION DEMONSTRATES DOCUMENTATION BOUNDARIES; THE MEASUREMENTS ARE INVENTED

Checked surfaces and measurement summary

Check	Method	Demonstrated result	Limitation
Priority public routes	Direct navigation and control-following	Seven of eight checked destinations worked; one visible inquiry control reached a 404	Not a complete crawl of every historical URL
Sitemap and page identity	Public XML and page instructions	Two unfinished pages had a current sitemap route, self-canonical identity, and index permission	Search-engine indexing and result display were not established
Local hours	Public source comparison	Website and public profile disagreed on Saturday	Correct hours require owner confirmation
Representative responsive route	Rendered phone and desktop checks	No material horizontal overflow observed	Not every device, browser, zoom level, or page was tested
Automated page-title warnings	Tool output plus human review	Warnings were rejected because checked titles were distinct and accurate	Search performance was not assessed

Methodology

This fictional demonstration models an audit performed from public evidence. It follows visible visitor controls, checks representative navigation, records final route behavior, reads public sitemaps and page identity instructions, compares owner-controlled public facts, and subjects tool warnings to human verification before treating them as findings.

The method separates existence from consequence. A broken control is demonstrated when the checked control reaches an error. A sitemap route is demonstrated when the current sitemap lists a public URL. Neither condition alone establishes traffic, human behavior, search-result exposure, or a commercial loss.

Evidence not available

- Search Console indexing, query, impression, and link evidence
- Analytics, call, form-completion, booking, and revenue data
- Website-editor, plugin, redirect, and historical configuration
- Business Profile owner settings, edits, and platform history
- Mailbox or campaign evidence

- Owner confirmation of the intended Saturday schedule

Unavailable evidence is not represented as checked.

Claim limits

- The report does not certify every page, device, browser, accessibility requirement, security control, third-party platform, or future state.
- It does not claim that the unfinished pages appear in search results.
- It does not claim that a visitor encountered an error, abandoned the site, or failed to inquire.
- It does not claim ranking, traffic, inquiry, booking, or revenue outcomes.
- It does not infer the intent behind an existing configuration.
- Repair recommendations remain subject to owner decisions, appropriate backups, access review, and post-change validation.

Final perspective

This fictional business does not need a redesign to address the demonstrated conditions. It needs one direct inquiry-route repair, two owner decisions, and a bounded validation pass. The same report gives the owner a clear work order and gives the implementer the evidence and acceptance criteria needed to complete that work without inflating what the audit established.

TIDE & TIMBER HOME INSPECTIONS IS FICTIONAL. THE RESERVED .EXAMPLE DOMAIN DOES NOT IDENTIFY A REAL WEBSITE. NO REAL CLIENT, TRAFFIC, INDEXING, CUSTOMER BEHAVIOR, OR BUSINESS OUTCOME IS REPRESENTED.