

Workflow Automation & Booking-Funnel Audit — Castle Corporate Rentals (castlecr.com)

Revision v2 (Sept 13, 2026). Independent QC (Anna, House A) verified this document against the live site and returned six defects; this revision repairs all of them and adds the current-state score the published offer promises (Klark ruling: ship the score; page unchanged). Change log: **(D1)** Finding 7(b) corrected — contact details (email + two phone numbers) render in the site-wide footer of every page, not only the AI-data page; a second phone number, (412) 613-9759, was previously unreported and is now covered in Finding 9. **(D2)** the /contact mechanism rewritten as the observed catch-all 404, previously stated as a route-table entry. **(D3)** current-state scores (0–10) added for capture, follow-up, visibility, and handoff, each traced to a numbered finding; method note states the scale is ours (the offer page specifies none). **(D4)** metrics file: effort turns recounted from the session transcript by script (31 rounds / 55 calls; capacity fact exact). **(D5)** GATES.md carries an appended correction entry; no history rewritten. **(D6)** event dates corrected to the two observed surfaces: bundle strings Dec 5–24, 2025; visitor-displayed Dec 4–23, 2025. **(Rebrand)** byline and all references updated to Castle Creative; "Final Odyssey" now appears in this document only as the client's own AI-platform brand, never as ours. Fresh verifications behind this revision: served bundle re-fetched Sept 13 ~18:40 EDT (600,039 bytes, sha256 e581d05b...b3c6 — byte-identical to the audit-time bundle, so every code-level observation stands unchanged); footer and event dates re-verified in a live browser on the same date.

Prepared for: Castle Corporate Rentals (Daniel & John, Co-Founders) **Prepared by:** Castle Creative — Workflow Automation Audit **Date of audit:** September 13, 2026 **Method:** Public-surface review only. Every observation below was made directly on castlecr.com's publicly accessible pages and publicly served code on Sept 13, 2026 (17:18–17:37 EDT; select re-verifications ~18:40 EDT). No login, no admin access, no form submissions, no non-public data.

Scope and method

We reviewed the public pages a prospective tenant touches: the homepage, the all-properties listing, all six property detail routes (/property/1 through /property/6), the AI data-usage policy page, the terms and privacy routes, robots.txt and sitemap.xml, and the site's publicly served page code (the JavaScript bundle the site delivers to every visitor's browser). We did not submit any inquiry form (we verify behavior by reading the form's code, not by sending fake leads), we did not test the phone number, and we did not attempt to contact the mailbox. Where something cannot be seen from the outside, we say so explicitly.

This is an analysis of the site as it served content on the audit date. Findings are ranked by revenue impact, highest first; current-state scores appear in "The score: where the funnel stands" below, each traced to the finding that justifies it.

Current state of the booking funnel

Capture. The entire funnel runs on one mechanism: an inquiry form ("Request Booking Information") on each property page asking for name, email, phone, company, move-in date, stay length, and guest count, with a promised 24-hour response. There is no availability calendar, no booking engine, no instant-quote path — inquiry-only by design, which is a legitimate model for corporate housing. The capture mechanism itself, however, is where the funnel's most serious problem lives (Finding 1 below).

Follow-up. The only response promise we found attached to the form itself is "we'll get back to you within 24 hours," printed above every property form. The form is the only capture element beside the property content — no "email us instead" link sits next to it — but the site does carry an always-visible fallback: a footer on every page with contact@castlecr.com, two phone numbers — (240) 415-8324 and (412) 613-9759 (see Finding 9 on the second number) — and the Silver Spring address, alongside stated support hours ("AI Assistant: 24/7 · Human Support: Mon–Fri, 9am–5pm"), plus the same contact block repeated on the AI data-usage policy page. So a determined customer can reach a human without the form; what the funnel lacks is any alternative capture path at the moment of decision, beside the form itself. Whether follow-up actually happens lives in the operator's mailbox and CRM, which are not publicly visible — see Limits.

Visibility. How easily a searching customer finds and verifies the listings. The six properties exist only as client-rendered routes: search engines indexing the site's raw HTML see one generic homepage shell for every property URL, the sitemap contains no property pages at all (Finding 5), and the two featured penthouse/premium routes display the wrong property's content (Finding 2). The homepage also advertises amenities ("24/7 AI Concierge") with no corresponding on-site feature a visitor can find or try (Finding 4).

Handoff. What happens between "customer clicks Submit" and "operator receives the lead." On every property page we audited, this step is missing entirely: the lead is never sent anywhere (Finding 1). This is the single most consequential finding of the audit.

The score: where the funnel stands

As promised in our published offer, here is the workflow's current-state score across capture, follow-up, visibility, and handoff, each on a 0–10 scale where 10 means the step works reliably for every customer without manual rescue. The scale is ours — the offer names the four dimensions but no numeric scale — and each score below is justified only by the numbered findings in this document; nothing is scored from outside knowledge.

Dimension	Score (0–10)	Why
Capture	1	The funnel's only conversion step is the property inquiry form — and it is cosmetic: the submit handler delivers the lead nowhere (Finding 1), so the effective capture rate of on-site leads is zero. It scores above 0 only because a full, well-designed form and the site-wide footer contact block (Finding 9) give a visitor two ways to attempt contact.
Follow-up	2	A clear 24-hour response promise is printed on every form, and the footer exposes email, two phone numbers, and stated support hours on every page — the promise and the channels exist (Finding 9). Nothing observed shows the promise being kept: no confirmation, no auto-acknowledgment of any kind (the form's own success toast is the only feedback a customer ever gets, Finding 1). Delivery lives in unseen systems (Limits).
Visibility	1	Six rent-paying property pages are invisible to crawlers as anything but homepage duplicates (Finding 5), the two highest-value routes show the wrong unit (Finding 2), pages disagree on prices (Finding 3), and the site advertises last December as upcoming (Finding 6). Individual visibility exists only for the homepage, which itself carries stale and contradictory content.
Handoff	0	There is no handoff to repair: the lead is never transmitted anywhere (Finding 1). The step does not exist on any audited page, and analytics is measuring the void (Finding 8).

Overall (average of the four dimensions): 1.0 / 10 — a funnel whose every stage between "customer tries to act" and "operator learns of it" is effectively absent, despite polished presentation at the point of capture. The fix path is short and concrete (see the three next steps below); each score moves as its named findings close.

Findings — prioritized by revenue impact

Finding 1 — CRITICAL: the inquiry form on every property page has no destination; submitted leads are not delivered anywhere

What we observed. The form's submit handler, in the site's own publicly served code, contains no network request of any kind. It logs the lead to the visitor's own browser console and then shows a success message. Verbatim from the code the site serves on the audit date:

```
r = s => {
  console.log("Booking form submitted:", { ...s, propertyId: e, propertyTitle: t }),
  Bi.success("Inquiry submitted successfully!",
    { description: "We'll contact you within 24 hours to discuss your booking." }),
  n.reset()
}
```

We searched the entire served application code for any submission backend — form services (Formspreet, Web3Forms, Basin), CRMs (HubSpot), automation (Zapier), mail APIs, custom /api/ endpoints, Supabase/Firebase — and found none. The application bundle contains no XMLHttpRequest and no sendBeacon calls at all, and the only fetch() call present references a placeholder URL (fetch("undefined/functions/v1/edit-image")), a template variable that was never filled in. (The only

beacon-style outbound traffic on the site belongs to a third-party form-analytics script posting to `api.tinybird.co` — see Finding 8.)

Why it matters (revenue impact). Every prospective tenant who fills out the form — the funnel's only conversion step — believes they have inquired and is waiting for a reply that no system will ever generate. With monthly rents of \$2,800–\$6,500, a single lost corporate lead can represent \$33,600–\$78,000 in annual contract value. This one defect affects 100% of on-site leads.

Recommended fix. Point the form at a real endpoint that writes the lead somewhere durable and notifies a monitored mailbox (the form services above, a small serverless function on the existing host, or any CRM webhook — the mechanism matters less than the existence of one). Cost class: small; this is hours of work, not days. After it ships, submit one real test inquiry from each property page and confirm receipt before declaring it fixed.

Finding 2 — CRITICAL: the two highest-value property pages display the wrong property

What we observed. `/property/5` and `/property/6` — the pages linked from the homepage for "Corporate Executive Penthouse" (\$5,000/mo, 4bd/3.5ba, 3,500 sqft) and "Urban Studio Elite" (\$3,500/mo, Dupont Circle) — both render the content of property 1: "Contemporary Silver Spring Apartment," 2bd/2ba, 1,500 sqft, \$4,500/mo, with property 1's photo gallery. The listing page ("All Properties") disagrees with the homepage on what should live at those addresses entirely:

Route	Homepage card says	Listings page says	Detail page actually shows
<code>/property/5</code>	Corporate Executive Penthouse, \$5,000/mo	Spacious Dupont Circle Apartment, \$2,800/mo	Contemporary Silver Spring Apartment, \$4,500/mo
<code>/property/6</code>	Urban Studio Elite, \$3,500/mo	Premium Downtown DC Penthouse, \$6,500/mo	Contemporary Silver Spring Apartment, \$4,500/mo

The site's code contains two separate hard-coded property lists that disagree: one used by the homepage (string prices), one used by the listings page (numeric prices), mapping the same ID numbers 5 and 6 to four different units between them. The detail router then falls back to property 1's record for those IDs.

Why it matters. A customer interested in the \$6,500/mo Premium Downtown DC Penthouse — the site's most valuable unit — clicks through and sees a \$4,500 Silver Spring apartment with the wrong photos. The most expensive conversions on the site are the ones most likely to walk away confused, or worse, to book the wrong unit type. This is also a trust defect: prices that change between pages read as bait-and-switch even when the cause is an accident.

Recommended fix. Collapse the two property lists into a single source of truth that powers homepage cards, the listing page, and the detail pages alike; fix the ID 5/6 mapping; give each property its own real description (all six detail pages currently share one generic "modern loft with floor-to-ceiling windows" text written for property 1, shown even for the 4-bedroom penthouse and the 1-bedroom studio).

Finding 3 — HIGH: homepage and listing page quote different prices for the same units

What we observed. Beyond IDs 5/6, all four properties shown on both pages carry different prices depending on which page you're reading:

Property	Homepage card	Listings page & detail page
Contemporary Silver Spring Apartment	\$3,800/mo	\$4,500/mo
Warm Woods Retreat Suite	\$3,500/mo	\$3,800/mo
Executive Metro District Residence	\$4,500/mo	\$5,000/mo
Classic Comfort Studio	\$3,500/mo	\$2,800/mo

The homepage also features an "Urban Studio Elite" (Dupont Circle) that exists nowhere on the listing page, while the listing page shows a "Spacious Dupont Circle Apartment" that appears nowhere on the homepage.

Why it matters. Whichever set is current, half the site is misquoting rent by \$300–\$700/month — \$3,600–\$8,400/year per unit. Corporate tenants reconcile quotes across pages and colleagues; inconsistencies either lose the booking or force the operator to honor the lower printed number.

Recommended fix. Solved by the same single-source-of-truth work as Finding 2; then a one-time pass confirming every displayed price against the real rent roll before publishing.

Finding 4 — MEDIUM-HIGH: headline AI claims have no on-site fulfillment a customer can

verify

What we observed. The homepage's top-line promises include "24/7 AI Concierge," "24/7 intelligent chatbot support with instant responses," "machine learning from hundreds of guest interactions," and an AI uptime/response-time stat block. We found no chat surface on any audited page: no chat widget vendor in the homepage HTML or the served JavaScript bundle (we checked for Tawk.to, Crisp, Intercom, Drift, and similar), no chat entry point, nothing a visitor could use. The AI-data policy page describes chatbot data collection in the present tense. Separately, the stats block ("500+ Guest Stays," "2,000+ AI Conversations," "40%+ Returning Guests," "4.9/5 Guest Rating") carries no on-page verification method or date.

Why it matters. Two distinct risks: (a) conversion — the headline differentiator is invisible at the moment of decision, so it sells nothing; (b) credibility — claims a customer cannot verify, attached to stats without sourcing, undercut an otherwise unusually candid site (the About pages and honest-context notes read as genuine, which makes unverifiable numbers stand out more). If a chatbot exists on another channel (e.g., Airbnb messaging), nothing on the site connects the claim to it.

Recommended fix. Either surface the concierge where the promise is made (embed or link the actual chat/phone/messaging channel beside the claim), or soften the copy to what is demonstrably true today. Same pass: date or footnote the stats block ("as of [month/year], across [platform]"), or cut the unsourceable numbers.

Finding 5 — MEDIUM-HIGH: search engines effectively cannot see any individual property

What we observed. All six /property/N routes return the same raw HTML shell with the generic homepage `<title>` ("Castle Corporate Rentals | Luxury AI-Powered Corporate Housing") — no property name, no property meta description, no per-route structured data. The page content is assembled by JavaScript after download, so only crawlers that execute JavaScript see property content at all. Compounding factors, all verified: sitemap.xml contains exactly five URLs — homepage, /properties, /terms, /privacy, /ai-data — and no property pages, with every `lastmod` dated 2025-10-29 (~10.5 months stale); robots.txt has no Sitemap directive; no canonical tag on any audited page; `https://www.castlecr.com/` serves the full site with a 200 instead of redirecting to the apex host (duplicate-site risk for indexing); and the homepage's social-share image (og:image) points to a placeholder hosted at lovable.dev, the site-builder used to create the site.

Why it matters. Corporate housing demand is search-led ("2 bedroom corporate apartment Silver Spring MD"). Today, a property page can rank only as a duplicate of the homepage. The listings that exist are effectively invisible as individual results, and an indexer that hits www gets two copies of everything. This suppresses organic lead volume — the cheapest channel the site has.

Recommended fix. One-time technical pass: per-route titles/descriptions (derivable automatically once Finding 2's single source of truth exists), property URLs added to a regenerated sitemap with a Sitemap line in robots.txt, a canonical tag, a www→apex redirect, and a real og:image. Small effort, permanent payoff.

Finding 6 — MEDIUM: stale content signals an unattended site

What we observed. A "Community Events" section on the homepage lists four events dated December 2025, each with a live "RSVP Now" button — nine months past, presented as upcoming. Both date surfaces observed on the site agree the content is stale: the code the site serves stores the event dates as 2025-12-05, 2025-12-12, 2025-12-18, and 2025-12-24 (span December 5–24, 2025), while the dates displayed to visitors in the rendered page read Thursday, December 4 through Tuesday, December 23, 2025 — a consistent one-day offset between stored and displayed values, cause not determinable from outside the site. (This revision supersedes v1, which reported the displayed range "December 4–23" as the stored data; the displayed figures were correct, the attribution to the bundle strings was not.) The homepage badge claims "10+ Premium Properties" while the site's own listing page offers six. The sitemap's 2025-10-29 lastmod (Finding 5) corroborates a site that has not had a content pass in over ten months.

Why it matters. Corporate bookers are risk-averse and detail-oriented; a site advertising last December's party as an RSVP-able event, with a property count that doesn't match its own catalog, reads as a company that isn't currently paying attention. That doubt lands directly on the "is someone on the other end?" question the booking form already has trouble answering (Finding 1).

Recommended fix. Short recurring ritual, calendar-reminder cadence: archive past events, reconcile counts, and re-check the homepage against the catalog monthly. Owner + 30 minutes/month.

Finding 7 — LOW-MEDIUM: trust-hygiene details on the conversion path

What we observed. (a) The 404 page offers "About Us / Technology / Team / FAQ" links that all point to the homepage anchor rather than distinct sections; (b) no /contact route exists — the site's route table defines exactly eight paths (/ , /property/:id, /properties, /terms, /privacy, /ai-data, /image-editor, and a catch-all), and visiting /contact renders the catch-all 404 page; the site-wide contact block lives in the footer (Finding 9); (c) the header badge "Google Cloud + Vertex AI" is a vendor claim a prospective tenant cannot act on, and the things a booker most needs beside the form — real-time availability and evidence anyone reads the inbox — remain absent; contact channels do exist in the site-wide footer (Finding 9), including stated support hours ("AI Assistant: 24/7 · Human Support: Mon–Fri, 9am–5pm"), but nothing beside the form connects those hours to the form's own 24-hour promise or shows who actually replies; (d) several property photos are hotlinked from Unsplash stock rather than the site's own unit photography — on the homepage, the "Urban Studio Elite" card is stock (1 of 6 cards), and on the listing page both cards for the disputed units 5 and 6 are stock (2 of 6) — meaning on the two units with the worst identity problem (Finding 2), the customer is looking at generic stock instead of the real unit; the four Community Events photos are stock as well.

Why it matters. Each is small; together they are the micro-signals a corporate travel coordinator uses to rank one operator against another. They compound Findings 2–6 rather than standing alone.

Recommended fix. Fold into the Finding 2/3 pass: real photo set per unit, a proper /contact page — or at minimum a visible pointer beside each form to the site-wide footer contact details that already exist — and honest 404 links.

Finding 8 — NOTE: analytics exists for the form, but the form does not

What we observed. The site injects a third-party form-analytics script that posts events to api.tinybird.co. It measures form engagement on pages whose form has no destination (Finding 1). We did not audit what fields the tracker captures — outside this audit's scope — but the arrangement itself is telling: measurement was wired up on a step of the funnel that delivers nothing. (We flag it as a workflow-culture observation, not a defect: fix the pipe before polishing the gauge on the pipe.)

What we deliberately did not test. Whether the mailbox or phone works, whether any backend lead sink exists outside the site code, and what the tracker records — none of these are publicly observable, and probing them would exceed a read-only audit.

Finding 9 — NOTE: an unexplained out-of-market phone number sits in the site-wide footer

What we observed. The footer on every page lists two tappable phone numbers: (240) 415-8324 — an area code matching the Silver Spring, MD address printed beside it — and (412) 613-9759, an area code associated with Pittsburgh, PA, with no location, label, or explanation anywhere on the public site. The 412 number appears exactly once in the served code (the single footer link); the contact block on the AI data-usage policy page lists only the 240 number. (Added in revision v2: the number was present in the audit-time evidence but went unreported — corrected here, per QC.)

Why it matters. An unexplained second line is a small but real trust signal on the exact surface customers use when the form gives them no confidence (Finding 1): corporate travel coordinators notice whether the number on screen matches the address beside it. And if the 412 line is live, it implies a second market or answering arrangement the site never describes; if it is not live, the footer invites calls that go nowhere. Either reading is unresolved from the outside — which is precisely why it needs the client's one-line answer.

Recommended fix. One decision, no code risk: label the second number ("Pittsburgh office," "text only," or whichever team answers it) or remove it. Fold into the Finding 2/3 data-cleanup pass.

The three highest-value next steps

In priority order, with effort estimates. Effort classes: S = under half a day, M = 0.5–2 days, L = multi-day.

1. Give the inquiry form a real destination. (S — hours, plus one verification cycle.) Wire every property form to an endpoint that durably stores the lead and notifies a monitored mailbox. Then, before calling it done: submit one real test inquiry per property page and confirm it arrived. Without this step, nothing else on the site can pay for itself — it is the funnel's only door, and the door opens onto nothing.

2. Unify the property catalog into one source of truth. (M — 0.5–2 days including copy.) One dataset powering homepage cards, the listing page, and the detail pages; corrected ID 5/6 mapping; per-property unique descriptions and photos; prices verified against the actual rent roll. This closes Findings 2, 3, and 7 in one pass, and produces the data structure Finding 5's SEO fixes hang off (per-route titles,

descriptions, sitemap entries — same source, generated automatically).

3. Run a freshness-and-claims pass, then put it on a calendar. (S — 2–6 hours for the first pass; recurring cost ~30 min/month.) Archive or date-stamp the December 2025 events; reconcile "10+ properties" with the real count; align the AI-concierge claims with a real, reachable channel or soften them; date or remove the unsourced stats. Then schedule the same check monthly. The site's honesty in its About copy is an asset — this pass makes the rest of the site match it.

Items we recommend scheduling after these three (out of the "top three" scope, noted for completeness): the SEO technical pass if not absorbed into step 2 (sitemap, canonical, www redirect, og:image); and a decision about whether the booking funnel should grow an availability calendar — which we flag as a strategy question, not a defect.

What this audit could not see (honest limits)

- **Lead handling after submission.** Whether any inquiries ever reached a mailbox or CRM historically is not publicly visible. If a working intake exists outside the site code (e.g., leads manually collected some other way), Finding 1's blast radius changes from "all leads" to "all leads submitted through the website forms" — which is still all form leads.
- **Operational reality.** Response times, actual occupancy, rent-roll accuracy, and the state of the Airbnb/VRBO/Booking.com listings referenced on the homepage were not audited — those live on third-party platforms and private systems. The homepage's platform badges were not verified against those platforms.
- **The client's own AI platform.** "Final Odyssey" — the AI-platform brand Castle Corporate Rentals uses throughout its own site copy — cannot be assessed from public pages; this audit covers only what a site visitor experiences.
- **The analytics script's data collection.** Noted in Finding 8, deliberately not dissected.
- **Nothing was submitted, logged into, or modified.** The audit is reproducible from the public pages and code as served on Sept 13, 2026; the site serves its full application code to every visitor, so any technical reader can verify each code-level finding above in their own browser's developer tools.

Prepared as a productized audit matching Castle Creative's published deliverable: a written, dated review of one named business workflow — here, the website lead-capture and booking funnel — with its current-state score across capture, follow-up, visibility, and handoff, prioritized findings, and three next steps. Scores are assigned only in "The score" section above, on the 0–10 scale described there; every score traces to the numbered findings in this document, and no claim in this document is sourced from anywhere other than the observed public pages and code cited above.