A ROADY EXTERIORS CASE STUDY | ROADY PROTECT

The True Cost of Reactive Building Maintenance

How an $18,000 Misdiagnosis Became a $7,000 Repair at a HUD-Assisted Senior Living Facility

01 / THE CHALLENGE

Limited budgets, expensive problems

For HUD-assisted senior living facilities, every maintenance dollar matters. Property administrators must balance aging infrastructure, resident needs, regulatory requirements, and limited financial resources.

When water intrusion began affecting a common area at a senior living facility, the initial assessment pointed toward a roofing problem. The facility received a quote of approximately **$18,000 for a roof replacement.**

However, the roof was not the source of the leak.

02 / THE DISCOVERY

The wrong problem was being addressed

Further investigation revealed that deteriorating masonry joints, rather than the roofing system, were responsible for the water intrusion. The actual corrective work required tuckpointing, at a cost of approximately **$7,000.**

Identifying the correct source of the problem avoided an unnecessary roof replacement and reduced the immediate proposed exterior expenditure by **$11,000.**

Financial comparison	Cost
Originally proposed roof replacement	$18,000
Actual tuckpointing repair	$7,000
Proposed exterior expenditure avoided	**$11,000**
Reduction from original quote	**~61%**

Comparison excludes interior restoration and disruption costs. See limitations on page 2.

03 / THE HIDDEN COSTS

Damage beyond the building envelope

Unfortunately, the underlying problem had already caused significant damage. Water intrusion resulted in interior damage requiring a **complete tear-out of the affected space.** The facility's common area was unavailable for **more than a month.**

For senior living communities, common spaces are more than amenities. They provide opportunities for social engagement, activities, and connection among residents. The consequences extended beyond the repair invoice:

- Interior demolition and restoration expenses
- More than a month of lost common-area use
- Disruption to normal facility operations and resident activities
- Additional pressure on an already constrained property budget

Although the full financial impact of these secondary consequences has not been quantified, they illustrate how an unidentified exterior failure can generate costs far beyond the original maintenance issue.

04 / THE LESSON

Inspection is an investment in financial stewardship

This case highlights two separate opportunities for cost avoidance.

First, accurate diagnosis prevents unnecessary spending. A comprehensive evaluation of the building envelope helps ensure that maintenance funds are directed toward the actual source of a problem rather than its visible symptoms.

Second, proactive inspections may prevent more expensive damage. Identifying deteriorating masonry, sealants, flashings, roofing, and drainage components before water intrusion occurs can help owners prioritize smaller repairs before they become major restoration projects.

For HUD-assisted senior living facilities, proactive exterior asset management is a practical approach to financial stewardship, preservation of existing assets, and continuity of resident services.

05 / THE ROADY PROTECT APPROACH

From reactive repairs to planned asset management

Roady Protect is designed to help owners and property managers move from reactive repairs to planned exterior asset management. Through scheduled inspections, documented condition assessments, maintenance recommendations, asset history tracking, and forward-looking capital planning, the program provides greater visibility into the condition of building exteriors.

The objective is straightforward: identify problems earlier, make informed repair decisions, and preserve limited capital for the needs that matter most.

We Take Care of Your Buildings
So You Can Take Care of Your Business.

Limitations and calculation note. Case study details are based on a specific project as reported by Roady Exteriors and have not been independently verified. The $11,000 comparison is $18,000 minus $7,000; the approximately 61% reduction is $11,000 divided by $18,000. It reflects the difference between the original roof replacement quote and the actual tuckpointing repair cost, excludes interior restoration expenses, and does not represent guaranteed savings. The full extent of avoidable interior damage has not been independently quantified. The facility is anonymous; HUD assistance does not imply HUD endorsement.