

Town of Vail Town Council Meeting  
October 16, 2018  
Statement of Michael L. & Betti B. Tiner  
1045 Homestake Circle  
In Respect of Proposed New Construction At  
DRB 18-0271 - 1012 Eagles Nest Circle

We appeared and made an oral statement at the July 18, 2018 Design Review Board Meeting. We submitted a letter to the DRB prior to the September 5, 2018 meeting because we were not able to attend the meeting. We understand that letter is in your packet and we hope you have had time to review it.

The fundamental objection that we have previously stated with respect to the proposal for redevelopment of 10112 Eagle's Nest Circle remains unchanged – the proposed structure is NOT compatible with Homestake Circle, Eagle's Nest Circle, Vail Valley Drive and the extended neighborhood that surrounds the Vail Golf Course.

The Design Review Board could not have been more clear during its initial meeting on July 18, 2018 to review the proposal for 1012 Eagle's Nest Circle. Fortunately, we do not have to trust memory, as there is a recording of the meeting. Chairman Bill Pierce of the DRB referred to the two newer homes at the west end of Ptarmigan and flatly stated without equivocation, "that's the limit of deviation from compatibility that I would be able to tolerate." When Michael Suman pointed out the Resnick home on Ptarmigan as being of a more contemporary design, Chairman Bill Pierce responded, "It is not composed well. That's a wreck of mixtures of roof shapes and forms and materials." In a final comment, Chairman Pierce observed in reference to the proposed structure, "To my mind, have to dial it back to a level of deviation from the compatibility with the neighborhood that doesn't exceed anything that is there now." When asked a follow-up question by Michael Suman about materials, Chairman Pierce observed, "The [extensive use of] glass has a commercial feeling."

Board member John Rediker commented in the meeting, "There is severity of form, an angular and cubic aspect relative to existing homes - too austere" and further suggested "that these forms were too austere to the context of the neighborhood."

Board member Peter Cope added his comments as follows, “It needs to be less severe. Some neighborhoods can get away with this, but for it to pass the Board, needs to be toned down a bit.”

We left the meeting on July 18, 2018 very encouraged by the comments made by the DRB members and confident that a major overhaul of the proposed design would be undertaken so that it would comply with the direction given by the DRB members. We view the two homes at the west end of Ptarmigan to which Chairman Pierce referred in his remarks as “the limit of deviation from compatibility that I would be able to tolerate” as being very acceptable examples of modern mountain architecture that are compatible with our neighborhood.

We were unable to attend the September 5, 2018 DRB meeting and were astonished to learn that the DRB had approved the project with only minimal material changes to the building’s façade. We viewed these building facade changes as “putting lipstick on the pig.” There were no changes that addressed the fundamental aspects to which we, our neighbors and even the DRB Members objected during the July 18, 2018 meeting. Specifically, there were no changes to address the “severity of form” nor the “angular and cubic aspect relative to existing homes” objected to by DRB member Rediker, nor the requirement for the design to be “less severe” and “toned down a bit” required by DRB Member Cope. The extensive use of glass that leads to a “commercial feeling” objected to by Chairman Pierce has not been changed, nor has the fundamental design of the proposed structure. It is still an extremely contemporary design that fails to meet the key guidance provided by Chairman Pierce – the proposed structure remains well outside the bounds of compatibility with the two newer homes at the west end of Ptarmigan which Chairman Pierce stated were “the limit of deviation from compatibility that I would be able to tolerate”.

We are not quite sure what happened between July 18 and September 5, but it is clear to us that the standards for compatibility and approval that were voiced and imposed on July 18 by the DRB (and with which we agreed) were not applied during the September 5 meeting when the project was approved.

The Town of Vail Code, Title 14 (Development Standards), Chapter 10 (Design Review Standards and Guidelines) – Chapter 10-2 which states, “Structures shall be compatible with existing structures, their surroundings and with Vail’s environment”, could not be clearer. The word “shall” means “must”. Shall does not mean “sort of” or “somewhat” – it is a very absolute word. Vail was founded on the vision of replicating the Alpine village to village skiing experience our

founders observed in Europe during World War II. The Vail Town Code provision we cite must have been written in order to ensure that the original look and feel of Vail would forever influence the evolving architecture of our community. What other purpose could have possibly been intended when this provision was included in our Town Code? We believe the Design Review Board and the Town Council are obligated to pay careful attention to this provision of the Town Code and its obvious original intent when considering the approval of new construction in our community and its neighborhoods. To be clear, we do not believe we must forever adhere to a strict 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century form of Alpine architecture, but we do believe this provision of the Town Code exists to ensure incremental and evolutionary changes and to prevent massive and revolutionary changes to our town's architectural environment.

Although a few changes were made to the proposal between the July 18 and September 5 DRB meetings, they were not meaningful. The proposed structure is still severe in form, has a cubic aspect, has a commercial look about it, is austere in its impression and is not compatible with the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood. The flat roof and stark angles are particularly offensive.

A new home is going to be built on one of Vail's iconic locations - the place where Pete Seibert built his home. Just as the Seibert home set the tone for architecture in and along the Vail Golf Course neighborhood for generations, so will the new structure built on this location. The original vision of Pete Seibert for an Alpine village experience should not be destroyed along with his home. The proposed structure would be the landmark to which anyone could point as the model to justify future ultra-contemporary new construction in and along the Vail Golf Course, forever substantially altering the architecture of our neighborhood. We do not believe that is the vision of our founders and we do believe the Vail Town Code was written to prevent just such an occurrence.

We urge you to remand this project back to the DRB for reconsideration with appropriate guidance from the Town Council that is substantially consistent with the guidance given by the DRB to the applicant during the DRB's July 18, 2018 meeting.

Respectively submitted,

Betti and Michael Tiner  
October 10, 2018