

Summary
Survey Spring 2007



Seymour Arm Community Association

SURVEY SUMMARY

Demographic Analysis

On the basis of returned surveys the community of Seymour Arm makes up more than half of those surveyed or 54.6 per cent with the next largest being Dasnier 18.4 per cent followed by Southside residents 13.2 per cent, Shemar 10.5 per cent and lastly an “other” category in which respondents claimed to reside in none of the four communities listed above. The five respondents that answered “other” are made up of those who live in other areas of the south shore and 2 respondents who chose not to indicate in which community they lived.

The other unique aspect of the areas surveyed is that the population is made up of only 13.2 per cent of full time residents and 86.8 per cent of part time residents. It should be noted, however, that of the 132 part time residents 78 of them (51.3 per cent) have indicated that they reside in this area for up to six months of the year.

The above information gives a picture of the demographics of the community on the basis of those people living in this area of the Shuswap lake. If one expands the picture to property owners in the area a slightly different view can be seen.. For this purpose an analysis of the breakdown of all property owners was used. The chart below lists the total number of properties in the North Shuswap area. It also lists the total number of properties in each community and lastly, the breakdown shows privately owned properties and publicly owned or crown properties.

There are 659 properties in the Seymour Arm area of which 613 are privately owned and 44 are publicly owned crown lands plus 2 other non privately owned pieces of property. The breakdown by areas is as follows:

Area	No. of Properties	Privately Owned	Publicly Owned	% of Total Properties
Dasnier	103	96	7	15.63
Shemar	51	48	3	7.74
Seymour Arm	416	385	31	63.13
Southside	89	84	5	13.50
TOTALS	659	613	46	100.00

In summary then the 282 questionnaires mailed out to those identified property owners means that the mailout comprised 46 per cent of all of the privately owned properties (occupied and unoccupied) in this area of the Shuswap. In short this means that in the Seymour Arm area of the North Shuswap we are approaching 50 per cent development of privately owned properties. This does not include development proposals either in the works or proposed which in effect subdivide current listed properties into smaller parcels or the addition of new property listings formed from a rezoning process of the crown lands surrounding our communities.

It is in light of the above demographics that the Seymour Arm Community Association (SACA) conducted this survey which is analyzed in the sections that follow. The count of the priority choice values, and the computed weight value total of each of the seven identified items are listed in ranked priority order for all communities and each of the identified communities

The survey was given in the spring of 2007 and 152 (52.8 per cent) of the residents responded. Community breakdowns are Seymour Arm 83, Dasnier 28, Southside 20, Shemar 16 and Other 5. Full time residents numbered 20 and part time residents 132. Residents ranked priority choices on a scale of 1 thru 7 and for the purposes of this survey a choice of 1 was given a weight of 7 down to a choice of 7 which was given a weight of 1. The charts below for all communities and each of the community areas list the priorities in ranked order with the total weight value and the percent this weight value contributes to the combined total weight value. The first priority in all of the communities was Access Roads. The next three priorities were Phone, Fire Protection and Power. Finally, Town Roads, Sani-dump, and Parks were ranked in the fifth, sixth and/or seventh position.

ALL COMMUNITIES

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	805	19.70
2. PHONE	695	17.01
3. FIRE PROTECTION	694	16.98
4. POWER	588	14.39
5. TOWN ROADS	477	11.67
6. SANI-DUMP	425	10.40
7. PARKS	403	9.86
	4087	100.00

SEYMOUR ARM

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	410	18.37
2. PHONE	368	16.49
3. FIRE PROTECTION	372	16.67
4. POWER	324	14.52
5. TOWN ROADS	288	12.90
6. PARKS	236	10.57
7. SANI-DUMP	234	10.48
	2232	100.00

SOUTHSIDE

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	105	19.96
2. PHONE	100	19.01
3. FIRE PROTECTION	92	17.49
4. POWER	73	13.88
5. TOWN ROADS	60	11.41
6. PARKS	51	9.70
7. SANI-DUMP	45	8.56
	526	100.00

DASNIER

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	157	21.19
2. FIRE PROTECTION	125	16.87
3. PHONE	120	16.19
4. POWER	96	12.96
5. SANI-DUMP	90	12.15
6. TOWN ROADS	84	11.34
7. PARKS	69	9.31
	741	100.00

SHEMAR

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	103	23.62
2. PHONE	83	19.04
3. FIRE PROTECTION	80	18.35
4. POWER	74	16.97
5. SANI-DUMP	43	9.86
6. PARKS	33	7.57
7. TOWN ROADS	20	4.59
	436	100.00

OTHER

RANKED PRIORITIES	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	30	21.43
2. FIRE PROTECTION	25	17.86
3. PHONE	24	17.14
4. POWER	21	15.00
5. PARKS	14	10.00
6. TOWN ROADS	13	9.29
7. SANI-DUMP	13	9.29
	140	100.00

Comparison of the Weighted Priority Values Full Time and Part Time Residents Seymour Arm Community

The following two charts indicate the priority choice rated and ranked values of both the full time and part time residents of the community of Seymour Arm. The third chart lists the differences in the per cent weighting value (full time resident weighting contribution minus part time resident weighting contribution). A difference of +/- 3 per cent does not really indicate anything significant. Any value above or below the 3 per cent value should be examined more carefully.

Seymour Arm Full Time Residents N=17

ALL AREAS	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. POWER	88	19.51
2. PHONE	79	17.52
3. ACCESS ROADS	74	16.41
4. TOWN ROADS	63	13.97
5. FIRE PROTECTION	56	12.42
6. SANI-DUMP	50	11.09
7. PARKS	41	9.09
	451	100.00

Seymour Arm Part Time Residents N=66

ALL AREAS	WEIGHT	% CONTRIBUTION
1. ACCESS ROADS	336	18.94
2. FIRE PROTECTION	316	17.81
3. PHONE	289	16.29
4. POWER	236	13.30
5. TOWN ROADS	218	12.29
6. PARKS	195	10.99
7. SANI-DUMP	184	10.37
	1774	100.00

Priority Area	Full Time Resident % Weighting	Part Time Resident % Weighting	Difference Full Time to Part Time
Town Roads	13.97	12.29	+1.68%
Access Roads	16.41	18.94	-2.53%
Phone	17.52	16.29	+1.23%
Fire Protection	12.42	17.81	-5.39%
Power	19.51	13.30	+6.21%
Sani-Dump	11.09	10.37	+0.72%
Parks	9.09	10.37	-1.28%

Comments Analysis

Most of the comments on the first two choices made by residents completing the survey, of course, centered around the first four priority rankings of Access Roads, Phone, Fire Protection and Power. All of them showed concern concerning community access, emergency access, emergency communication and protection of property. Many residents also showed concern over town roads, sewage and sani dump facilities and park access and maintenance.

Other Topics Considered Important

Residents were given the opportunity to list other topics that were of concern to them. The topics were sorted into four major categories or areas. They are:

1. General Community Concerns.
2. CSRD and other Government Concerns.
3. Law Enforcement and Safety Concerns.
4. Ecological and Environmental Concerns.

When more than one resident expressed the same topic a tally is made beside the choices. The tallies are also ranked in the list from most to least.

General Community Concerns

Boat launch inc. wharf facilities and Marina |||||
Safe Drinking Water to the House |||
Water provided equally to all residents ||
Garbage and Litter ||
Hall renovations and Hall maintenance |
Equal water pressure over whole system |
Clean up Beaches
Upper Ball Field needs proper soil
Better maintenance of the wharf area
Make sure area is kept remote
Recreation
Dogs running loose
Community Relations
More full time residents on directorship
Available Contractors
Recreation

CSRD and other Government Concerns

Taxes |||||

Emergency and/or Medical Services |||||

Land Use Planning and better citizen involvement |||

Lake Access for non campers including better Maintenance of Lake Access Roads & Areas ||

Ditching and Brushing ||

Septic system inspection and guidelines ||

Land set aside for Parks

Eliminate the CSRD in this area

Sewer & Garbage removal for boats & houseboats

Better use of the park area west of the main wharf

Dust Abatement

400 Unit development

Building Standards

Emergency Planning Response

Law Enforcement and Safety Concerns

More Law Enforcement and summer policing |||||

Too many ATV's and motor bikes ||

Crime Watch and better RCMP relations ||

Speed of Large Boats

Speed Limits in the community

Noise and Behavior

Ecological and Environmental Concerns

Logging and Reforestation ||

Lake Water Quality ||

Environmental Protection

Bear and Cougar Control

Stop deforestation

River Front Wetlands maintenance

Better monitoring of riparian areas

Erosion of point area

Protect the watershed

Ecology of the Lake

Pine Beetle Measures

Wildlife