

---

# Community Survey 2009

---

Spring Creek  
Mountain Village

---

June 2009

---

# **SPRING CREEK MOUNTAIN VILLAGE**

## **2009 SURVEY FINDINGS**

**Prepared for:**  
**Spring Creek Mountain Village**

**Prepared by:**  
**The Praxis Group™**

**22 June 2009**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.0 SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0 SCMV TRAILER PARK SURVEY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Residential Characteristics .....	4
3.2 Occupants.....	5
3.3 Housing Satisfaction .....	7
3.4 Impacts from Construction .....	12
3.5 Resale Process .....	15
3.6 Final Comments .....	16
<b>4.0 SCMV NEW RESIDENT SURVEY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 Residential Characteristics .....	19
4.2 Permanent and Seasonal Residents .....	22
4.3 Non-permanent Residents .....	26
4.4 Spring Creek Mountain Village Community .....	30

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

In 2002, the owner of Spring Creek Mountain Village (SCMV) surveyed the residents of the SCMV Trailer Park (formerly Restwell Trailer Park) regarding options for the redevelopment of the trailer park. In May 2009, a follow-up survey of trailer park residents was conducted to collect information about housing occupancy, housing satisfaction and the impacts of redevelopment. The information from the survey will be used to identify opportunities for improvements and to update the Town of Canmore on the status of redevelopment.

In parallel with the trailer park resident survey, owners and residents of new residential units in the first two buildings in SCMV (Glacier Rock Lodge and Morriane Ridge) were surveyed. The purpose of the survey was to collect feedback about housing occupancy and patterns of use. Survey results will be used to determine future market potential and demographics, and to update the Town of Canmore for the second phase of rezoning. SCMV contracted The Praxis Group™ to assist with both surveys.

Praxis, working in conjunction with the SCMV team, prepared a survey for trailer park residents and a separate survey for residents and owners in Glacier Rock Lodge and Morriane Ridge. For the purpose of comparison, the survey for new residents included questions from the *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey*<sup>1</sup> and *Canmore Second Home Owner Survey*<sup>2</sup>, and several questions from the 2002 trailer park survey were incorporated into the 2009 survey.

In early May, SCMV representatives distributed the *SCMV Trailer Park Survey* and postage paid return envelopes to the 160 residences in the trailer park. The *SCMV New Resident Survey* and postage paid return envelopes was distributed to 120 units in Glacier Rock Lodge and Morriane Ridge. Owners and residents of Glacier Rock Lodge and Morriane Ridge had the additional option of completing the survey online. Deadline for survey submission was May 22, 2009. Eighty surveys were received from trailer park residents and 60 surveys were completed and submitted by Glacier Rock Lodge and Morriane Ridge owners and residents. All individuals completing the survey received either a \$50 gift certificate to Sobey's or a \$50 gift certificate to Iron Goat Restaurant.

To ensure confidentiality, the surveys were received, reviewed and analyzed by the Praxis. The findings from each survey are summarized in this document. It is important to note that because participation in the surveys was voluntary and sample sizes were relatively low, particularly where respondents were streamed, the data in this report is not statistically valid and cannot be considered representative of the entire population. Instead, the information presented in this document is intended to provide a general indication of occupancy, use, issues and preferences.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey* (October 2008) – Prepared by HarGroup Management Consultants for the Town of Canmore, Community Enrichment Service Area. The purpose of the survey was to establish benchmark measures that could be used to assess residential feelings of community, belonging, efficacy, neighborliness, safety, civic pride and satisfaction.

<sup>2</sup> *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey* (October 2008) - Prepared by HarGroup Management Consultants for the Town of Canmore, Community Enrichment Service Area. The purpose of the survey was to establish benchmark measures that could be used to assess residential feelings of community, belonging, efficacy, neighborliness, safety, civic pride and satisfaction.

## **2.0 SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS**

### **SCMV Trailer Park Survey**

- Almost all (96.2%) survey respondents indicated they are permanent (full-time) residents of Canmore, down just over 2% from 2002.
- Housing ownership dropped from 94.4% in 2002 to 77.5% in 2009.
- There are slightly fewer retired residents in 2009 (17%) than there were in 2002 (21.8%).
- The number of boarders and renters increased 3.4% since 2002.
- 67.5% of survey respondents have lived in Canmore for 11 or more years; 47.5% have lived in SCMV for 11 or more years; nearly 70% respondents have lived in SCMV for three or more years.
- Consistent with 2002, the most popular reason for choosing SCMV Trailer Park was affordability.
- Housing satisfaction remained consistent from 2002 to 2009; with over 75% of respondents indicating they are satisfied with their current housing.
- 18.2% of respondents said their level of housing satisfaction has decreased since the redevelopment process began.
- Over half (57.5%) of the survey respondents indicated that they have not experienced negative impacts from construction.
- Over half (53.6%) said that measures taken by the developer to reduce negative impacts have been effective.

### **SCMV New Resident Survey**

- Over half (53.4%) of the individuals responding to the survey indicated they are permanent residents.
- 6.1% of the permanent residents responding described their housing unit as an investment property for resale.
- The top three property descriptions among non-permanent respondents were: investment property for resale (22.7%); get-away/second home residence (18.2%); and eventual retirement residence (13.6%).
- Both permanent and non-permanent residents top three most important amenities in Canmore were: scenery and surroundings; small town atmosphere; and recreational amenities.
- The majority of survey respondents (86.7%) agreed that there is a strong sense of community in Canmore.
- 23.9% of respondents used to live in SCMV Trailer Park.
- 32.6% of the permanent residents responding indicated they are very satisfied with SCMV; an additional 43.5% said they are satisfied.
- The majority of non-permanent SCMV residents responding (88.9%) reside full-time in another location in Alberta.
- Categories that reflected increased use by the owner's family and friends were the majority response regarding intended future use of their property.

## **3.0 SCMV TRAILER PARK SURVEY FINDINGS**

### **3.1 Residential Characteristics**

#### **Type of Residency**

The vast majority (96.2%) of survey respondents indicated they are permanent (full-time) residents of Canmore. In 2002, 98.3% of respondents were full-time residents of Canmore.

<b>Residency in Canmore (N=79)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Permanent	76	96.2
Non-permanent	1	1.3
Seasonal	2	2.5

#### **Housing Type**

Of the 80 respondents, 90% live in either a mobile home or a manufactured home. More than half of the respondents (56.3%) live in a mobile home. Results from 2009 are largely consistent with the findings from the 2002 survey.

<b>Type of Housing</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=140)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=80)</b>
Trailer	8.6	10.0
Mobile home	60.7	56.3
Manufactured home	30.7	31.2
Other	-	2.5

#### **Year Housing Unit Built**

Of the 71 people who responded to this question, over half (52.1%) said they live in housing units built between 1986 and 1995. These results differ from the 2002 survey where almost one half (46%) of respondents lived in housing units built between 1971 and 1980.

<b>Year</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=140)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=71)</b>
1970 or before	6.6	1.3
1971-1975	19.7	9.8
1976-1980	26.3	26.8
1981-1985	8.0	7.0
1986-1990	14.6	23.9
1991-1995	20.4	28.2
1996-2000	4.4	2.8

## **Housing Unit – Rented or Owned**

In 2002, 94.4% of the 143 respondents owned their housing unit. According to the results from the 2009 survey, rate of ownership has dropped to 77.5%.

Rent or Own	% 2002 (N=143)	% 2009 (N=80)
Own	94.4	77.5
Rent	5.6	22.5

## **3.2 Occupants**

### **Total Residents and Gender**

Seventy-eight respondents answered the question about gender and accounted for 170 residents. Of this total, 50.6% are males and 49.4% are females. These results closely parallel the 2002 findings where 54.6% were males and 45.4% were females.

Person	Number of Respondents	Total Males	Total Females	% Males	% Females
Person 1 (Respondent)	78	37	41	47.4	52.6
Person 2	51	26	25	51.0	49.0
Person 3	29	15	14	51.7	48.3
Person 4	10	7	3	70.0	30.0
Person 5	2	1	1	50.0	50.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>49.4</b>

### **Relationship to Respondent**

Of the 49 second persons identified by the respondent, 83.6% are the spouse or partner. The majority of the third, fourth and fifth persons are children. In terms of overall numbers of other people identified by the respondent, 44.5% are spouses and 40.2% are children. In 2002, the percentage of spouse/partners identified was lower (40.7%) and the percentage of children was significantly higher (52.3%).

Person	Total Identified	Spouse/ Partner	Child	Family Member	Non-family Member
Person 2	49	41	2	2	4
Person 3	29	-	23	2	4
Person 4	11	-	9	1	1
Person 5	3	-	3	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>9.8</b>

### **Age Distribution – Frequency and Percentage**

Based on the results from the 2009 survey, the age range with the largest number of residents is 45 to 54 years (20.8%). Nearly half (48.0%) of residents surveyed are between the ages of 25 and 54. In 2002, the age range with the largest number of residents was 35-44 years of age.

<b>Person</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Age Distribution – Percentage</b>										
		<b>Years of Age</b>										
		0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-69	70+
Person 1	75	-	-	-	-	3	10	13	21	12	3	13
Person 2	51	1	-	2	-	5	10	10	13	5	3	2
Person 3	28	6	2	4	5	7	3	-	1	-	-	-
Person 4	11	3	2	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Person 5	3	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>8.9</b>

### **Employment Status**

Of the 147 individuals represented, 69.4% are employed and 17% are retired. These figures are slightly lower than in 2002 where 73.6% of the combined first and second persons were employed and 21.8% were retired.

<b>Employment (N=147)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Employed	102	69.4
Unemployed	8	5.4
Student	12	8.2
Retired	25	17.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### **Presence of Boarders or Renters**

Of the 78 people answering this question, 9% indicated they have boarders or renters. This represents a 3.4% increase over 2002.

<b>Boarders or Renters</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=143)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=78)</b>
Yes	5.6	9.0
No	94.4	91.0

## **Number of Boarders or Renters**

Of the seven respondents who indicated they have boarder or renters, the majority (71.4%) had one renter, mirroring the 2002 results.

<b>Number of Boarders or Renters</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=7)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=7)</b>
One	71.4	71.4
Two	28.6	14.3
Three	-	14.3

## **3.3 Housing Satisfaction**

### **Length of Time Residing in Canmore**

In 2002, 55.3% of survey respondents had lived in Canmore for 11 or more years. By 2009, 67.5% of SCMV residents have lived in Canmore for 11 or more years.

<b>Length of Time Living in Canmore</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=143)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=80)</b>
3-5 months	0.7	-
6-11 months	0.7	-
1-2 years	2.8	8.8
3-5 years	16.8	12.5
6-10 years	21.7	11.3
11-19 years	22.4	25.0
20 years or more	32.9	42.5
Intermittently for years	2.1	-

### **Most Important Reasons for Coming to Canmore**

According to 2009 survey results, the three most important reasons for coming to Canmore were career (22.5%); born in Canmore or are a long-time resident (21.2%); and personal or family reasons. The top three reasons in 2002 were: moved to Canmore for permanent work; born in Canmore or are long-term residents; and like the setting and/or mountains.

<b>Most Important Reason for Moving to Canmore</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=131)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=80)</b>
Born here/long time resident	22.1	21.2
Permanent work	34.4	1.3
Career	7.6	22.5
Study	0.8	6.3
Recreation	0.8	2.4
Retirement	7.6	10.0
Like the setting/mountains	15.3	13.8
Personal/family	10.7	20.0
Other	0.8	2.5

## **Live Prior to Canmore**

2009 survey respondents were asked where they lived prior to coming to Canmore. Of the 60 providing a response, 45% originate from another location in Alberta and 43.3% are from another Canadian province.

<b>Live Prior (N=60)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Other location in Alberta	27	45.0
Other Canadian province	26	43.3
United States	1	1.7
Foreign country	6	10.0

Specific locations of origin mentioned include<sup>3</sup>:

<b>Location in Alberta</b>	<b>Canadian province</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>Foreign country</b>
Banff	British Columbia	North Dakota	Australia
Canmore	Saskatchewan		Britain
Calgary	Manitoba		Scotland
Edmonton	Ontario		
Exshaw	Quebec		
Granum	Nova Scotia		
Lake Louise	Prince Edward Island		
Ponoka	Nunavut		
Provost	Northwest Territories		
Sundre			
Three Hills			
Wainwright			
Wetaskiwin			

## **Length of Time Residing in SCMV Trailer Park**

Of the 80 respondents, 47.5% reported living in SCMV (formerly Restwell) Trailer Park for 11 years or more. Nearly 70% of survey respondents have lived in the Park for three years or more.

<b>Length of Time Residing in SCMV</b>	<b>% 2002 (N=143)</b>	<b>% 2009 (N=80)</b>
Less than 3 months	0.7	7.5
3-5 months	2.8	7.5
6-11 months	2.1	3.8
1-2 years	9.8	10.0
3-5 years	28.0	11.2
6-10 years	29.4	11.2
11-19 years	16.1	32.5
20 years or more	10.5	15.0
Intermittently for years	0.7	1.3

<sup>3</sup> Some locations of origin received more than one mention.

## Reason for Choosing SCMV

Consistent with the responses from the 2002 survey, 2009 respondents' most popular reason for choosing SCMV Trailer Park by a significant margin was affordability. In both surveys, the park's location and proximity to downtown was cited second most often. The park's environment (e.g. quiet, beautiful scenery, neighbours) was the third most popular response in both 2002 and 2009.

Sample Statements:

- "Affordable, great place to raise kids, lots of good neighbours."*
- "Beautiful setting, close to downtown, very clean, friendly, peace and quiet"*
- "Affordable housing, good quiet location."*
- "Beautiful location, sunny, convenient, affordable."*
- "Inexpensive way to access Canmore. Access to Main Street and location was a plus."*

## Satisfaction with Current Housing

Survey results show that housing satisfaction has remained consistent from 2002 to 2009. In both surveys, over three-quarters of respondents indicated they are satisfied with their housing in SCMV Trailer Park.

Satisfaction with Current Housing	% 2002 (N=141)	% 2009 (N=80)
Very satisfied	35.5	35.0
Satisfied	43.3	43.8
Neutral	17.7	17.5
Dissatisfied	2.1	1.2
Very dissatisfied	0.7	2.5
No opinion	0.7	-

## Change in Level of Satisfactions after September 2004

SCMV residents were asked if their level of housing satisfaction has changed since the redevelopment process began in September 2004. Over one third of the 71 respondents said their satisfaction level is the same; 18.2% indicated a decrease in satisfaction.

Change in Level of Satisfaction (N=71)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Significantly less satisfied	4	5.6
Less satisfied	9	12.6
About the same	26	36.6
More satisfied	2	2.8
Significantly more satisfied	1	1.4
No opinion	29	40.8

## **Plans to Move from Current Housing**

Just under two-thirds (62.0%) of the 79 respondents indicated they do not plan to move from the current housing.

Plans to Move from Current Housing	% 2002 (N=135)	% 2009 (N=79)
Yes	34.8	38.0
No	65.2	62.0

## **When Planning to Move**

Of the 33 respondents who indicated they were planning to move, almost half (48.5%) indicated the move would occur in six to ten years; 12.1% are planning to move in less than a year.

When Planning to Move (N=33)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Less than 3 months	2	6.1
3-5months	1	3.0
6-11 months	1	3.0
1-2 years	3	9.1
3-5 years	10	30.3
6-10- years	16	48.5
20 years or more	-	-

## **Reasons for Moving from Current Housing Unit**

Thirty respondents gave reasons why they were planning to move from their current housing unit. Most frequently, respondents cited the redevelopment as the primary reason for moving. Others said that they were planning to relocate because they wanted a different type of housing (e.g. house, condo) or housing that offered different features (e.g. greenhouse). A few respondents are moving from SCMV because they are relocating to another community. A few others cited financial or personal reasons for moving from SCMV.

Sample statements:

- “Forced to move due to redevelopment.”
- “To have larger yard with garden—must have green house.”
- “Will be moving away from Canmore.”
- “Retiring and relocating to a cheaper place to live.”

### **Expectation to Move to a Different Type of Housing in Canmore**

Just over one third (35.1%) of the 79 respondents expect to move to a different type of housing in Canmore in the next ten years.

Move in Next Ten Years	% 2002 (N=125)	% 2009 (N=79)
Yes	44.0	35.1
No	56.0	64.9

### **Type of Housing Anticipated**

Of the 43 respondents, almost three quarters (72.1%) expect to live in a multi-family unit while 27.9% expect to move to a single-family house; 60.5% expect to own. Three respondents (7.0%) anticipate living in a perpetually affordable unit at SCMV.

Type of Housing Anticipated	Number of Respondents	Percentage	Expect to Own	Expect to Rent	Percentage Own	Percentage Rent
Single family house	12	27.9	8	4	66.6	33.3
Duplex unit	3	7.0	3	-	100.0	-
Fourplex unit	2	4.7	2	-	100.0	-
Row or townhouse unit	4	9.3	4	-	100.0	-
Apartment/suite	8	18.6	3	5	37.5	62.6
Seniors apartment/lodge	7	16.3	1	6	14.3	85.7
Perpetually affordable unit in SCMV	3	7.0	1	2	33.3	66.6
Perpetually affordable unit in Canmore	2	4.7	2	-	100.0	-
Other	2	4.5	2	-	100.0	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>39.5</b>

### **Planning to Move From Canmore**

Almost three quarters (71.6%) of the 79 respondents do not plan to move from Canmore.

Planning to Move from Canmore (N=74)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	21	28.4
No	53	71.6

### **When Planning to Move from Canmore**

Most (80.8%) of the 26 respondents who expect to move from Canmore indicated they would move in three to ten years.

<b>When Planning to Move from Canmore (N=26)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
3-5months	2	7.7
6-11 months	1	3.8
1-2 years	2	7.7
3-5 years	9	34.6
6-10- years	12	46.2

### **Reasons for Moving from Canmore**

The high cost of housing in Canmore was the reason for moving from Canmore given most frequently (47.1%).

<b>Reasons for Moving (N=34)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Want to be closer to friends/family	2	5.9
Work has transferred my household	2	5.9
Generally want to live in another community	5	14.7
Living expenses high in Canmore	9	26.5
Housing costs are high in Canmore	16	47.1

### **3.4 Impacts from Construction**

#### **Experienced Negative Impacts**

Over half (57.5%) of the 80 respondents from SCMV Trailer Park indicated they have not experienced any negative impacts from construction.

<b>Construction Impacts (N=80)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	34	42.2
No	46	57.5

## Level of Impact Experienced

Dirt, dust and mud were identified most often as negative consequence of construction, with 82.8% of the 32 respondents indicating a moderate or significant impact. Over one third (34.4%) indicated they are not experiencing negative impacts from garbage and debris at the construction site. Only a small few provided examples of other impacts; these included traffic stoppages, and loss of phone cable, phone or electricity.

Impact	% No Impact	% Slight Impact	% Moderate Impact	% Significant Impact
Increased traffic (N=32)	18.8	28.1	34.3	18.8
Noise (N=32)	9.4	37.5	40.6	12.5
Garbage and debris (N=32)	34.4	18.8	15.6	31.2
Dirt, dust and mud (N=32)	8.6	8.6	31.4	51.4

## General Comments Regarding Construction Impacts

When asked for general comments regarding construction impacts, 45 survey respondents provided a response. Comments centred around six key themes and are summarized as follows.

**Traffic issues** –reduce traffic stoppages and road closures; timed traffic light is annoying (wait unnecessarily; contractors are speeding in front of the playground; general issues around people driving too fast in the park

**Damage to vehicles** – flat tires from nails and construction debris; cracked windshield

**Access** – road degradation and traffic closure reduce access; construction on sidewalks reduce pedestrian access

**Dust** - better dust control is required; dust, dirt and mud are problematic

**Signage** – clearly mark dead end streets; better signage for detours

**Minimal impacts** – impacts have been few

Sample Statements:

“Construction workers speed, do not follow rules of the park.”

“I've had flat tires from nails on the ground.”

“Clearly marked dead-end streets would slow turn around traffic.”

“The park isn't very pedestrian friendly—sidewalks are constantly being dug up making it difficult to get around with small children.”

“Just satisfied- everything seems to be taken care of during this time.”

“Impact has been minimal.”

## Awareness Measures to Reduce Impacts of Redevelopment

Overall, residents have a high level of awareness about measures that have been implemented by the developer to reduce the impacts of redevelopment. Almost all of the 79 respondents (98.7%) are aware of the new access road to Bow Valley Trail, moved post boxes (94.9%), and the option to buy perpetually affordable condo in the new development (94.8%)

Mitigation Effort	% Aware
New access road to Bow Valley Trial (N=79)	98.7
Construction from north to south in a phased redevelopment (N=76)	83.6
Moved post boxes so residents do not have to go through construction zone to get mail (N=79)	94.9
Constructed 14 new sites to relocate homes in the construction area (N=79)	83.8
Provided 15 years notice to all residents in Sept 2004 where the Mobile Home Site Tenancies Act only requires 1 year notice (N=79)	87.3
Offer to purchase trailers in areas where redevelopment is imminent if owner wants to sell (N=78)	88.5
Residents living in Spring Creek prior to Sept 2004 were given the option of buying a perpetually affordable condo in most of the new Spring Creek condo buildings at a reduced price. (N=77)	94.8

## Effectiveness of Measures to Reduce Impacts

Over half (53.6%) of the 80 survey respondents indicated that measures taken by the developer to reduce impacts have been effective.

Level of effectiveness (N=80)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Very ineffective	11	13.8
Somewhat ineffective	8	10.0
Neutral (neither effective nor ineffective)	11	13.8
Somewhat effective	18	22.4
Very effective	25	31.2
No opinion	7	8.8

## Suggestions for Other Measures

Survey respondents offered a range of comments when asked for suggestions for other measures that could be implemented to reduce impacts. Verbatim responses are listed as follows.

- Perimeter garbage control (daily).
- Can anything be done to reduce construction dust factor?
- To make the access road to the trailer park along the creek all the way to the entry of Spring Creek.
- The temporary traffic lights can be confusing at times- signage to announce when they are in effect would be helpful.

- Additional speed bumps and signs around playground on Fox Street.
- Route construction traffic away from residential areas; install speed bumps.
- Lack of traffic control, or flagmen who are inexperienced.
- Build a pedestrian bridge across Policeman's Creek at the south end of park (near Fox Street) so we can walk downtown without having to walk through construction.
- Encourage those making the decisions to try and live in the park for a while.
- None, excellent job already in place
- Weather has been a big problem.
- Doing a great job, keep it up.
- Less visible workers working on site.
- Keep everything clean and tidy.
- Stop the development.
- Stricter rules for construction workers regarding littering.
- Complete one phase at a time.

### **3.5 Resale Process**

#### **Awareness of Policies Related to Tenancy**

Survey respondents are most aware of the 15-year notice to terminate residency (89.9%) and the offer to purchase a perpetually affordable condo in the SCMV development (89.6%). Overall, awareness of policies related to tenancy is relatively high (over 75% of respondents) with the exception of the rental credit for removing homes where just over half of survey respondents (57.1%) are aware of this policy.

<b>Policies Related to Tenancy</b>	<b>% Aware</b>
Your site rent (your tenancy) is not with your home it is with the person registered on the lease. (N=75)	85.3
Both the Tenant and the Landlord are legally bound to follow The Mobile Home Site Tenancies Act, which is legislation under the Government of Alberta. (N=77)	87.0
Under the Mobile Home Site Tenancies Act the Landlord is required to give one-year notice to terminate tenancy for redevelopment. (N=78)	77.0
In September 2004, Spring Creek developers gave Restwell Trailer Park residents an unprecedented 15-year notice to terminate tenancy for redevelopment. (N=79)	89.9
Spring Creek has policies in place that must be followed if residents choose to sell their home (policies are available for review at the Spring Creek office). (N=77)	79.2
Residents, prior to September 2004, have an option to purchase a new condo in Spring Creek at a reduced price; however the units will be price restricted as Perpetually Affordable Homes.	89.6
Spring Creek will credit owners three free months rent if they choose to remove their home from Spring Creek.	57.1

Following are respondents' verbatim comments regarding the resale process.

- It is my understanding the person who owns the trailer has the option of selling to Spring Creek or moving.
- Give buyers details of what they can and cannot expect.
- The price is totally biased to the [developers] from SCMV not to owners. There seems to be a major difference in appraisals.
- Process doesn't work well when there is a vast difference between the two assessors in the Valley. Buyer feels they pay too much, seller doesn't feel they get enough.
- Will there be a date when sales of units will no longer be accepted due to the development? For continued residence not moving the unit.
- I think it is reasonable and appropriate.
- Not good or fair.
- Resale process is very fair.
- Stop gouging us.
- Wish we could afford to stay here.

### **3.6 Final Comments**

Survey respondents were invited to provide suggestions for making living at SCMV more enjoyable. Verbatim responses have been organized by key theme and are presented as follows.

#### ***Dissatisfaction with SCMV Management and Redevelopment***

- It's too late, too much construction and destruction, removals of units and roads.
- We are aware that Spring Creek gave residences 15-year notices but we do not think that the Town Council would [have] allowed redevelopment without a long-term plan for residents. Social-economic impact was part of the development plan. I find it very sad to slowly watch the neighborhood changing and long-term residents moving away. It is a good thing that Spring Creek put in PAH but the numbers being able to take advantage has been low compared to the approximate 300 trailers lived in before redevelopment.
- Try to show a bit more respect, not expenditures, to those who live in the park. This is still a community, not a refugee camp.
- I find they seem to be letting the rest of the park go to hell; no repairs or not cleaned up much when problems arise very slow to react to them.
- Removing the only trailer park in Canmore and replacing it with expensive housing, getting rid of \$600 rent and replacing it with \$1500 rent.
- Stop raising rentals fees.
- The condo purchase offer should be available to all residents; regardless of length of time lived in Spring Creek.
- It would be nice to see the area not under construction.
- Staff at front desk and management treat homeowners better.
- Stop raising rent.
- Rent freeze, considering the economy.

### ***Facilities and Amenities***

- Perhaps replacing skating rink and maybe in the future a swimming pool for the residents.
- Put a solid fence around the next to be developed areas.
- Build a footbridge at south end crossing Spring Creek.
- Bike trails.
- A foot bridge over Spring Creek towards the back of the park. I would like to enlarge the playground area to include swings, basketball area, ice rink in the winter, and a larger toddler area. With the increase in children in the Spring Creek community, this would be a wonderful addition.
- Put in squash courts.
- Leave the back as a park; finish the park (plant grass, put basketball court back in, etc).
- Build homes in the park.
- A swimming pool for kids in the summer time.
- Could use a green space for community garden plots.
- There is a dense bushy pathway from where the road end and the construction site begins. Could this be opened up for safety reasons?
- Streetlights around the park.
- Would like to see "get togethers" in the community.

### ***Praise for SCMV***

- The house is enjoyable, the "sighting" is beautiful, living in Spring Creek is great.
- No, everything is wonderful.
- We just moved in, we have to see that is living here like—so far we enjoy it.
- We like our spot and have always been treated very fair. It is affordable.
- No, we like living here and are very happy with everything!
- Everything is great. Very easy place to live.
- No, it's ideal right now
- No, it's an awesome place to live.
- Thank you for planning care initiated from the beginning of the new construction.

### ***Park Regulations***

- Implement stronger rules for cleaner yards, some have become eyesores! Broken fences, garbage etc. No excuse when you just provided a free pick-up services. Thanks for keeping the campground noise down as well appreciate that.
- Encourage all residents to take care of their yards including junk and dandelions and weeds.
- More controls on old vehicles parked in Spring Creek with no plates,
- Keep as family living with very quiet hour after 11 pm.
- Control over "scum bags" the park rents trailers to.
- Neighbours play music and TV too loud until 3 am in the morning.
- General upkeep of yards and property should be enforced.
- In the street I live on (Deer St) there are staff accommodation trailers that need to be kept in check. They sit outside and party in summer they are loud, leave beer cans, don't follow noise rules.

***Site Maintenance***

- Please maintain vacant or rental lots better (i.e. yards mowed often and weed control).
- Keep the sewers clean out so it does not back up and can flow freely down drains.
- Take down "no trespassing" sign at back of park.
- Add gravel in front of trailers to ease the muddy parking situation.
- Get the rest of trailers moved back and landscape; the area is unsightly.
- Turn up the water pressure.
- Keep construction areas clean, clean streets, offer car washing coupons.
- Include a fall clean up for leaves.
- We live in the very last street, which is Muskrat, since the new homes have been moved down here. The work area at the end of the street is unsightly for people coming to our homes. It definitely needs cleaning up.

***Roads and Traffic***

- Please install speed bumps on Elk Street to slow down increased traffic.
- Make the roads a little better.
- Just road repair. I realize winter is hard on the area but many places are in bad shape and need some repair.
- Fill in dips and holes in roads especially on Spring Creek side near Lynx.
- Fix the roads.
- Repairing roads/potholes.
- Install speed bumps on Muskrat Street as many people speed on that street.
- Slow down traffic and clean streets.
- The new pedestrian bridge connecting to the boardwalk is wonderful.

***Other***

- I love the Spring Creek area but do not have the funds to buy a unit right out right. Would the rent I now pay for my trailer home site be considered as a mortgage payment if I wanted a new unit?

## **4.0 SCMV NEW RESIDENT SURVEY FINDINGS**

### **4.1 Residential Characteristics**

#### **Residency in Canmore**

Of the 59 respondents, over half (53.4%) indicated they live in Canmore on a full-time basis (permanent residents); slightly over a third live permanently in another community or town (non-permanent residents). Individuals selecting “other” did not provide an explanation.

<b>Residency in Canmore (N=59)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Permanent	31	53.4
Non-permanent	22	37.9
Seasonal	2	3.4
Other	3	5.2

#### **Housing Unit – Rented or Owned**

81.4% of all survey respondents own their housing unit. Of the permanent residents responding, 68.8% are owners and 18.6% are renter. Almost all (95.5%) of non-permanent respondents own their unit.

<b>Rent or Own</b>	<b>Total Percentage (N=59)</b>	<b>Permanent Percentage (N=32)</b>	<b>Non-permanent Percentage (N=22)</b>
Own	81.4	68.8	95.5
Rent	18.6	31.3	4.5

#### **SCMV Building**

Overall, just under two thirds of survey respondents reside in Glacier Rock Lodge. Over three quarters of permanent residents live in Glacier Rock, while over half of the non-permanent residents responding own in Morraine Lodge.

<b>SCMV Building</b>	<b>Total Percentage (N=58)</b>	<b>Permanent Percentage (N=31)</b>	<b>Non-permanent Percentage (N=22)</b>
Glacier Rock Lodge	63.8	77.4	40.9
Morraine Lodge	36.2	22.6	59.0

## Type of Housing Unit

Of the 59 respondents, 98.3% live in condominiums. The lone townhouse owner was a non-permanent resident.

Housing Type	Total Percentage (N=59)	Permanent Percentage (N=32)	Non-permanent Percentage (N=22)
Town Home	1.7	0	4.5
Condominium	98.3	100.0	95.5

## Size of Housing Unit

Nearly 75% of the 60 respondents live in a unit that is between 800 and 1399 square feet, with slightly one quarter (25.0%) of respondents living in an 800-900 square foot unit.

Size (N=60)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
600-799 sq. ft.	1	1.7
800-999 sq. ft.	15	25.0
1000-1199 sq. ft.	20	33.3
1200-1399 sq. ft.	10	16.7
1400-1599 sq. ft.	7	11.7
1600 + sq. ft.	7	11.7

## Description of Property

As expected, the majority (87.9%) of permanent residents described their property as permanent; exceptions included investment property for resale (6.1%); eventual retirement residence (3.0%); and other (3.0%).

The top three property descriptions among non-permanent respondents were: investment property of resale (22.7%); get-away/second home residence (18.2%); and eventual retirement residence (13.6%).

Property Description	Total Percentage (N=60)	Permanent Percentage (N=33)	Non-permanent Percentage (N=22)
Permanent residence	48.3	87.9	0
Investment property for resale	15.0	6.1	22.7
Investment property for rental	3.3	0	9.1
Rec property for friends & family	1.7	0	4.5
Get-away/second home residence	20.0	0	18.2
Eventual retirement residence	6.7	3.0	13.6
Corporate residence	1.7	0	1.8
Other	3.3	3.0	0

Responses from non-permanent residents are fairly consistent with the results from the *Canmore Second Home Owner Survey*<sup>4</sup> where the top three descriptions, in order of frequency, were: get-away/second home residence, recreation property of family and friends; and eventual retirement residence. Investment property of resale was identified fourth most frequently.

### Importance of Canmore Amenities

Both permanent and non-permanent residents top three most important Canmore amenities were: scenery and surroundings; small town atmosphere; and recreational amenities. These results were consistent with the top three amenities identified in the *Canmore Second Home Owner Survey*.

Amenity	Total Percentage (N=60)	Permanent Percentage (N=33)	Non-permanent Percentage (N=22)
Recreational amenities	60.0	54.4	68.2
Air and water quality	43.3	48.5	36.4
Proximity to ski resort(s)	36.7	33.3	40.9
Small town atmosphere	76.7	78.8	68.2
Retirement in Canmore	28.3	15.2	45.5
Vacation home	20.0	0	50.0
Affordable mountain resort	21.7	18.2	27.3
Close to family and/or friends	23.3	30.3	18.2
Good climate	16.7	21.2	9.1
Proximity to Banff National Park	31.7	33.3	27.3
Access to Calgary airport	25.0	27.3	22.7
Proximity to City of Calgary	46.7	48.5	40.9
Scenery and surroundings	81.7	81.8	77.3
Wildlife observation	36.7	42.4	27.3

### Sense of Community in Canmore (Agree or Strongly Agree)

The majority of survey respondents (86.7%) agreed that there is a strong sense of community in Canmore. Respondents exhibit strong affinity to emotional aspects of sense of community, such as civic pride (85%), satisfaction (88.3%) and belonging (80%) with approximately eight out of ten respondents concurring with statements that measured these issues.

Statement (N=60)	# of Agree Somewhat and Completely Agree	Total Percentage
There is a strong sense of community in Canmore	52	86.7
When away from Canmore, proud to tell others where I live	51	85.0
I like living in Canmore	53	88.3
I feel very much like I belong in Canmore	48	80.0
It would take a lot for me to move away from Canmore	39	65.0
I attend community events and activities in Canmore	40	66.7
I help out by volunteering in Canmore	20	33.3

<sup>4</sup> Canadian, American and United Kingdom descriptive statistics from were aggregated for purposes of comparison.

SCMV new residents had a stronger sense of community in Canmore (86.7%) compared to respondents from the *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey* (70%). However, Canmore survey respondents demonstrated a stronger affinity to the emotional aspects of sense of community, with approximately nine out to ten agreeing with the statements that measured civic pride, satisfaction and belonging.

## **4.2 Permanent and Seasonal Residents**

Nearly 80% of respondents have lived at SCMV for less than a year.

### **Length of Residency in SCMV**

<b>Length of Residency (N=42)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 3 months	3	7.1
3 to 5 months	8	19.0
6 to 11 months	22	52.4
1 to 2 years	6	14.3
3 to 5 years	3	7.1

### **Live Prior to SCMV**

Just under half of the permanent resident respondents (43.5%) lived in another location in Canmore prior to moving to SCMV. Slightly more than one-quarter (26.1%) resided in another location in Alberta previously. Of those specifying a location, Calgary was mentioned three times and Edmonton and Cochrane were each mentioned once. Just under one-quarter (23.9%) of respondents used to live in SCMV Trailer Park.

<b>Live Prior (N=46)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
SCMV Trailer Park	11	23.9
Other location in Canmore	20	43.5
Other location in Alberta	12	26.1
Other Canadian province	1	2.2
United States	1	2.2
Foreign country	1	2.2

### **Total Residents and Gender**

44 respondents answered the question about gender and accounted for 87 permanent residents. Of this total 48.2% are male and 51.7% are females. The majority (52.3%) of the respondents (person 1) are female.

Person	Number of Respondents	Total Males	Total Females	% Males	% Females
Person 1 (Respondent)	44	21	23	47.7	52.3
Person 2	31	16	15	51.6	48.4
Person 3	8	2	6	25.0	75.0
Person 4	4	3	1	75.0	25.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>51.7</b>

### **Relationship to Respondent**

Of the 28 second persons identified by the respondent 85% are the spouse or partner. The majority of the third and fourth persons are children. In terms of overall numbers of other people identified by the respondent, 47.0% are spouses and 11.7% are children.

Person	Total Identified	You	Spouse/ Partner	Child	Family Member	Non-family Member
Person 1	45	39	3	-	-	3
Person 2	28	1	24	1	1	1
Person 3	8		-	6	1	1
Person 4	4		-	3	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>

### **Age Distribution – Frequency and Percentage**

The almost half (48.7%) of the permanent residents surveyed are between 45 and 64 years of age; an additional 30.3% are between the ages of 25 and 44.

Person	Number	Age Distribution – Percentage										
		Years of Age										
0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-69	70+		
Person 1	42	-	-	-	-	7	9	11	12	-	3	
Person 2	28			1	-	3	5	6	10	2	1	
Person 3	8	1	-	3	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	
Person 4	4	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>

### **Reasons for Choosing SCMV**

The most popular reason given for choosing to reside at SCMV by a significant margin was location/proximity to downtown. This followed by, in order of frequency of mention: quality of the unit/development; opportunity for perpetually affordable housing (PAH); SCMV vision/developer reputation; and affordability.

Sample comments include:

- “Close to downtown, shops within walking distance, property was modern and new.”
- “Quality and layout of unit as well as proximity to downtown.”
- “Love it here, PAH opportunity.”
- “Impressed with overall vision of SCMV.”
- “Affordable mountain home.”

## Satisfaction with SCMV

Of the 46 individuals providing a response, 15 (32.6%) indicated they are very satisfied with SCMV and additional 20 respondents (43.5%) said they are satisfied with their living arrangements. Notably, none of the respondents are dissatisfied with SCMV.

Level of Satisfaction (N=46)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Very satisfied	15	32.6
Satisfied	20	43.5
Neutral	9	19.6
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
No opinion	2	4.3

Survey respondents cited a range of reasons for their level of satisfaction, most frequently: the design and quality of their unit and the development; location and its proximity to downtown; and the sense of community and neighbours within the development. Comment was made regarding deficiencies within units, with some indicating that helpful SCMV staff had completed repairs promptly while a few others suggested that deficiencies should have been resolved prior to possession. Several respondents indicated that the impacts of construction have diminished their level of satisfaction. One individual said the noise in the hallway from the exercise room was problematic.

Sample comments include:

- “We feel the level of detail in the buildings and landscaping is top-notch.”
- “Close to centre of town, able to walk to important places (library, hospital, grocery stores).”
- “Nearly everything is as we anticipated it would be. Sense of building community is fun. Appreciate Frank's vision.”
- “I am very satisfied living at SCMV however indicated only "satisfied" because the on-going construction of the 3rd building in the complex.”
- “Quality of building, SCMV staff's responsiveness to fix deficiencies”

## Planning to Move from SCMV

The majority (82.6%) of permanent respondents indicated they are not planning to move from SCMV. Individuals with plans to move did not provide explanations.

Planning to Move (N=46)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	8	17.4
No	38	82.6

## Sense of Community in Neighbourhood (Agree and Strongly Agree)

SCMV permanent residents were asked a series of questions from the *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey* to gauge sense of community in their neighbourhood. Just under two thirds (63.1%) of permanent residents agreed completely or somewhat that living in their neighbourhood gives them a sense of community. The majority (88.9%) feel they belong in their neighbourhood and nearly three-quarters wish to remain in their neighbourhood for many years to come. Half of respondents agreed that they get involved in neighbourhood events or activities.

Statement	# of Agree Somewhat and Completely Agree	Percentage
Living in my neighbourhood gives me a sense of community (N=46)	29	63.1
I feel like I belong in my neighbourhood (N=45)	31	88.9
I would like to stay in my neighbourhood for many years (N=45)	33	73.3
I get involved in neighbourhood events or activities (N=44)	22	50.0
I have influence in changing my neighbourhood for the better (N=43)	16	37.2
I help out in my neighbourhood by volunteering (N=44)	12	27.3

Findings from the SCMV survey are fairly consistent with the results from the *Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey*, where 70% agreed completely or somewhat that living in their neighbourhood gives them a sense of community, 83% feel like they belong in their neighbourhood, and 80% would like to stay in their neighbourhood.

## 4.3 Non-permanent Residents

### Date of Purchase

The majority of non-permanent residents purchased their unit between 2006 and 2008.

Date of Purchase (N=30)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
2005	1	3.3
2006	12	40.0
2007	7	23.3
2008	9	30.0
2009	1	3.3

### Permanent Place of Residency

The majority of non-permanent SCMV residents reside full-time in another location in Alberta.

Place of Residence (N=27)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Other location in Alberta	24	88.9
Other Canadian province	1	3.7
United States	2	7.4
Foreign country	-	-

Ten survey respondents specified the location of their permanent residence:

*Other location in Alberta*

- Calgary (2)
- Edmonton (2)
- Canmore
- Coleman
- Rocky Mountain House

*Other Canadian Province*

- British Columbia

*United States*

- Colorado
- Florida

### Rent Unit Out

Over three quarters (75.9%) of the 29 non-permanent respondents do not rent out their unit to non-family members.

Date of Purchase (N=29)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	7	24.1
No	22	75.9

### **Number of Groups Per Year**

Of the seven non-permanent respondents who rent out their unit, 85.7% rent it to a single group; 14.3% rent to up to three groups per year.

<b>Number of Groups (N=7)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	6	85.7
1 to 3	1	14.3
3 to 5	-	-
5 to 10	-	-
10 +	-	-

### **Maximum Rental Capacity**

Over half (57.1%) of the rental units have a maximum capacity of two people; none have a capacity greater than four people.

<b>Capacity (N=7)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
2 people	4	57.1
3 people	1	14.3
4 people	2	28.6
5 people	-	-
6 people	-	-
Over 6 people	-	-

### **Average Rental Days Per Year**

Of the three respondents providing a response to this question, all of them indicated their unit is rented out 365 days a year.

### **Use or Reside in Unit**

Just under two-thirds (65.5%) of the 29 non-permanent respondents use or reside in their SCMV unit at some time during the year.

<b>Use or Reside (N=29)</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	19	65.5
No	10	34.5

### Average Use Per Year

Two thirds (66.6%) of the 18 non-permanent respondents use their unit between one and four months a year.

Use (N=18)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Under 1 month	2	11.1
1 to 2 months	6	33.3
Over 2 months to 4 months	6	33.3
Over 4 months to 6 months	1	11.1
Over 6 months	1	11.1
Full year	1	11.1

### Timing of Use

Timing (N=21)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Spring	16	76.2
Summer	17	81.0
Fall	17	81.0
Winter	17	81.0
Holidays	15	71.4

### Total Residents and Gender

Eighteen non-permanent respondents represented a total of 51 non-permanent residents. Of this total 43.1% are male and 56.9% are females.

Person	Number of Respondents	Total Males	Total Females	% Males	% Females
Person 1 (Respondent)	18	8	10	44.4	55.6
Person 2	15	6	9	40.0	60.0
Person 3	7	3	4	42.9	57.1
Person 4	5	3	2	40.0	60.0
Person 5	4	2	2	50.0	50.0
Person 6	2	-	2	0.0	100.0
Person 7	1	1	1	50.0	50.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>56.9</b>

### Relationship to Respondent

Of the 17 second persons identified by the respondent (Person 1) 82.3% are the spouse/partner. The majority of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh persons are children. In terms of overall numbers of other people identified by the respondent, 40.7% are spouses and 52.3% are children.

*Spring Creek Mountain Village 2009 Survey Findings*

Person	Total Identified	You	Spouse/ Partner	Child	Family Member	Non-family Member
Person 1	19	16	1	1	-	1
Person 2	17	-	14	2	-	1
Person 3	4	-	-	2	2	-
Person 4	5	-	-	5	-	-
Person 5	4	-	-	2	2	-
Person 6	2	-	-	1	1	-
Person 7	2	-	-	1	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>

### **Age Distribution – Frequency and Percentage**

Just over half (50.9%) of the non-permanent residents identified are between 45 and 64 years of age. Almost one-quarter (24.4%) are between 20 and 34 years of age.

Person	Number	Age Distribution – Percentage										
		Years of Age										
0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-69	70+		
Person 1	16	-	-	1	-	-	2	5	7	1	-	-
Person 2	12	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	6	4	-	-
Person 3	8	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	-	2	-	-
Person 4	5	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-
Person 5	4	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Person 6	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Person 7	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

### **Intended Future Use**

Non-permanent respondents selected options, which reflected the intended future use of their SCMV unit. Combined, the categories that reflect increase personal use by the owners including friends and family was the majority response.

Future Use (N=31)	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Increase personal use	13	41.9
Increase friends/family use	6	19.4
Maintain current use	3	9.7
Decrease use	0	0.0
Sell the property	13	41.9
Use as rental	8	25.8
Full time retirement property	5	16.1
Second home retirement property	8	25.8
Become a full time resident	3	9.7

Responses from the SCMV survey were fairly consistent with the results from the *Canmore Second Home Owner Survey* where the top three responses, in order of frequency, were: increase personal use; increase friends and family use; and second home retirement property.

Of the 19 respondents indicating when they anticipated a change in use to occur, just over half (57.8%) said use would change within the next 12 months. 21.1% indicated use would change in 1 to 2 years and 15.8% said 3 to 5 years.

Eight non-permanent respondents reported that the intended future use of their property at SCMV had changed since the time of purchase. Explanations for changes in intended use included: dissatisfaction with the development; purchased land elsewhere; immediate resale not feasible due to economic downturn; health issues; moved out of the country; and work related reasons.

#### **4.4 Spring Creek Mountain Village Community**

##### **Interest in Participating in Spring Creek Foundation (Yes)**

Respondents would be most willing participated in SCMV Foundation by volunteering their time.

<b>Interested in...</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Volunteering your time (N=57)	39	68.4
Fundraising (N=50)	16	32.0
Donating money (N=47)	18	38.3

##### **Interest in Participating in SCMV Events and Activities (Yes)**

Survey respondents would be most interested in participating in block parties, wine clubs and dinner clubs.

<b>Interested in...</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Block parities (N=55)	38	69.1
Dinner club (N=49)	26	53.1
Canada Day parade (N=46)	20	43.5
Book club (N=46)	21	45.7
Poker club (N=42)	9	21.4
Wine club (N=52)	31	59.6
Dart club (N=41)	9	22.0
Running club (N=42)	14	33.3

Survey respondents offered a variety of suggestions for additional SCMV events and activities. The following list includes the suggestions forwarded most frequently.

- Hiking club
- Barbeques
- Walking club
- Music concerts
- Ski club

Suggestions receiving fewer mentions include:

- Wine and cheese get-togethers
- Craft club
- Green seminars
- Artspeak
- Charity duck race
- Organized volunteer activities
- Knitting club
- Painting club
- Dairy Days celebrations

### **Suggestions for Amenities or Businesses**

Following are suggestions for future amenities and businesses on the SCMV site. The number of mentions each suggestion received is presented in brackets.

<b>Amenities</b>	<b>Amenities</b>	<b>Businesses</b>
Swimming pool (3)	Pilates studio (1)	Coffee shop (18)
Hot tub (2)	Painting studio (1)	Liquor store/wine (9)
Canada Post box or stand (2)	Recycling (1)	Pub/wine bar (5)
Bike rack/lock ups (2)	Basketball nets (1)	Bakery (5)
Tennis courts (2)	Handball wall (1)	Convenience store (4)
Outdoor skating rink (2)	Conference and meeting facilities (1)	Restaurant (3)
Playground (1)	Art studios (1)	Bookstore (2)
Barbecues and/or fire pit (1)		Deli (2)
Community pottery (1)		Spa (2)
Centre/craft centre/classes (1)		Video store (1)
Visual artists (1)		Dry cleaners (1)
Farmer's market (1)		Flower shop (1)
Table tennis (1)		Pizza take-out (1)
Larger weights in the gym (1)		
Bigger gym/exercise room (1)		
Common room (1)		
Bags and bins for dog waste (1)		
Wireless internet access (1)		

## **Impacts of Construction**

Most often, survey respondents said the most significant impact from construction on the SCMV site is dust. In this context, some respondents talked about the residual dirt on windows and decks as well as in common areas and within individual units.

*“Mainly, just the dust has caused some frustration with trying to keep decks and windows clean!”*

Construction noise, particularly early in the morning, is a source of frustration for some residents.

*“On two occasions the incessant noise was unbearable. On a daily basis it has been merely frustrating.”*

A few survey respondents indicated dissatisfaction with construction debris and an untidy construction site.

*“The overall untidy presentation from [flags] blowing in the wind, blown or knocked over fencing, coffee cups, trades tools, ladders, material on decks, marketing signs blowing down off.”*

The time required to address a few respondents raised deficiencies and complete construction as a negative impact.

*“Very few of our deficiencies have been addressed...perhaps this is due to the construction crews being overly committed to new construction and not finishing existing units???”*

Survey respondents identified a range of other construction impacts that have affected them personally, including: increased traffic due to construction vehicles; lack of advanced notice regarding about construction activities that affected residents (water turned off, garage door not working); and security concerns.

Alternatively, responses from some individuals indicated they had experience few or no impacts from construction, or demonstrated an acceptance and understanding of the construction process.

*“Not affected. Understand and expected to continue for the life of the project. No worries.”*

Suggestions for reducing the impacts of construction centred around four main areas: communication with residents; construction traffic; site cleanliness; and work schedule. Recommendations outside these areas are presented as ‘other’.

***Communication with residents*** - provide advance notice about construction activities that will affect them (water turned off, electrical outages, staff inspection of premises, traffic signals, extreme noise); post in a communal area the rollout of the construction plans and dates

**Construction traffic** - divert construction traffic to the entrance south of Morraine Ridge; establish separate entrance for construction vehicles; move construction buildings and equipment yards south of new construction areas eliminating heavy traffic through finished areas; dead end Morraine Ridge

**Site cleanliness** - ensure that construction sites are maintained and tidy; minimize or hide storage of materials; ensure airborne debris and garbage is disposed of; offer a free cleaning service for decks and balconies; sweep debris from streets

**Work schedule** - enforce quiet hours (7pm to 7am); disallow work on Sundays; restrict early morning noise; implement later start times on Saturdays

**Other** - remove vacant trailers; redevelop area with trailers and cabins as soon as possible; establish a criteria early for the parking issue; hurry up; complete landscaping as soon as possible

Some survey respondents indicated that the impacts of construction have been minimal and are to be expected and praised the SCMV team for their efforts.

*“I feel the developer has construction organized in the best interests of the clients.”*

*“You have to do what you have to do in order to keep on going we just have to work around things.”*

*“Your team is already more than considerate.”*