

Memorandum



Community Development Department

Date: February 25, 2013
To: Neighborhoods and Education Committee
From: Kersbergen, William
Subject: Neighborhood Code Enforcement and Aesthetic Survey

The Code Enforcement Division has completed a survey of 640 single family residences spread throughout the City of Tempe. This survey was initiated in order to establish a baseline record of the existing condition. This places a measurable value to the quality of the residential appearance, rather than making decisions based on opinions from Council or staff.

Staff established six City Code enforcement criteria to be evaluated. These represent some of the most often cited violations. The scoring for these code items ranges from 1 to 5, with a value of 5 being attached to a property with no violations, lower values assigned to areas of concern and a value of 1 attached to the worst offenses. Additionally, an aesthetic value was generated. This was done because it was recognized that a property could have no violations of the Zoning and Development Code or City Code, but still be an unappealing property.

The evaluation criteria for code items and aesthetic opinion are listed on page 2.

Of 640 residences surveyed, 409 (64%) displayed at least one of the code violations evaluated.

The following represents the result of this survey, for each violation type, and a summary for the City as a whole. Code assessment (5 is good, 1 is not good)
To determine "average", the total scores were simply added together and the sum was divided by 640.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Weeds: | 4.46 |
| Dead Vegetation: | 4.90 |
| Un-registered vehicles: | 4.56 |
| Vehicular Parking: | 4.51 |
| Building Maintenance: | 4.36 |
| Visible Debris: | 4.73 |
| Total result: (Maximum score 30, minimum Score 6) | 27.52 |

The six violation categories resulted in city wide average scores from 4.36 to 4.90. No single violation presented a remarkable result.

Aesthetic value (3 is good, 1 is not good) citywide average 1.74

For comparison, averaged total numeric values for the different areas of Tempe are listed by Zip Code. The first number represents the code assessment, the second number represents aesthetic opinion.

| | |
|-------|--------------|
| 85281 | 26.34 : 1.75 |
| 85282 | 26.70 : 1.58 |
| 85283 | 28.29 : 1.83 |
| 85284 | 29.31 : 1.95 |

Evaluation criteria included:

1. Weeds

- 5: no indication of weeds.
- 4: weeds have sprouted but not reached a height of 6 inches.
- 3: weeds have exceeded a height of 6 inches.
- 2: weeds have exceeded a height of 12 inches, or cover more than 25% of the property.
- 1: weeds exceed a height of 18 inches or cover more than 50% of the property.

2. Dead vegetation

- 5: no indication of dead landscape materials.
- 4: Lawn areas are not green, when in season, or not uniformly dormant during winter months. Exposed soil is visible to public areas.
- 3: signs of missing shrubs, such as large areas of moistened decomposed granite, or visible drip irrigation lines.
- 2: stumps where materials have not been completely removed.
- 1: standing dead trees or foliage.

3. Un-registered vehicles

- 5: no indication of non-functional vehicles.
- 4: at least one vehicle with an expired registration, but the vehicle appears clean and drivable.
- 3: at least one vehicle without any registration or license plate, but the vehicle appears clean and drivable.
- 2: a vehicle which has a flat tire, or has signs that it has not been moved for a long period of time.
- 1: a vehicle which is missing body panels, wheels or other functionally necessary parts.

4. Vehicular parking

- 5: sufficient garage, or driveway space to park all vehicles associated with it.
- 4: indications that a vehicle is routinely parked in landscaped areas, which have not been designed for vehicular parking, such as crushed grass or wheel track in granite ground cover.
- 3: vehicles parked in landscaped areas, which have not been designed for vehicular parking, such as crushed grass or wheel track in granite ground cover.
- 2: developed areas which have been used for the parking of vehicles which exceeds 35% of the front yard area or street frontage.
- 1: UN-developed areas which have been used for the parking of vehicles which exceeds 35% of the front yard area or street frontage.

5. Building maintenance

- 5: Painted surfaces appear to have been recently painted, and the work has a professional appearance.
- 4: Painted surfaces show signs of dust, but do not appear to be faded.
- 3: Painted surfaces show signs of fading, color shift or chaulking.
- 2: Painted surfaces show signs of cracking and mild peeling, and/or corrosion.
- 1: Painted surfaces show large areas of missing paint, rotting wood and/or corroding metal.

6. Visible debris

- 5: no signs of excessive materials or debris.
- 4: materials stored in carport, porch or side-yard in neatly arrayed stacks.
- 3: materials left in carport, porch or side-yard in random piles.
- 2: materials discarded in areas of front yard, which are visible to the public.
- 1: materials accumulated in areas of rear yard, which exceed the height of the fence.

Aesthetic Evaluation:

- 3: That looks good. I like that. I'd live there.
- 2: I've got no opinion. It's ok.
- 1: That looks ugly. That looks boring.



Bill Kersbergen