

The Friends of Squaw Valley has recently run a survey of community members asking the question about heights vs number of buildings in the VC-C area.

Here is the crux of the question

Assuming for this question that the number of bedrooms in the VC-C is fixed, limiting the height could result in more, lower buildings, and perhaps less day-skier parking. Your preference therefore would be:

1. Fewer, taller buildings totally acceptable
2. Fewer, taller buildings acceptable
3. Neutral
4. More, "same height" buildings acceptable
5. More, "same height" buildings totally acceptable

By a 2:1 margin, the responses were in favor of options 4 or 5, versus 1 or 2. Very few voted for option 3.

We are well aware that the actual situation is quite complicated, and we do not believe that the intent of the responders was that the entire parking lot be populated with 4 story building. But we strongly believe that the implication of their response is that there is major concern about a mass of tall, featureless buildings, blocking the views, blotting the sky, and throwing huge shadows. This is in concert with the 1985 Guidelines which state that "*Building design should complement and harmonize with neighboring buildings.*" Height and scale are listed as 2 ways to achieve compatibility.

As a result of this survey, our recommendation on heights for VC-C is to keep the heights in VC-C no more than the average height of the current IntraWest Village. And we ask the County and SVSH to diligently explore the ramifications of such a design guideline, and how this design guideline might be accommodated.

=====

Here are some comments that some chose to add to their responses. We think they fairly express the wide range of opinions held by the community on this subject.

stay within the set height parameters of the existing village
density should be determined by other factors, including impacts to transportation infrastructure
Both the parking lot and the views are important to me.

additional height up to 108 feet is ok
I don't like either option. Less is more. Less height, less buildings
Taller buildings, even fewer of them, would overshadow the existing development and look out of place in an environment that is attractive because of its harmony with nature. Tall buildings will make it look like an extraterrestrial development has just been plunked down without regard to local conditions
Most cities of villages have building of similar heights ...
The less obtrusive, the better. Definitely NOT higher.
Tall buildings will block views and sunlight and diminish the value of our existing units. Same height buildings was the original plan when we purchased our properties.
Continuity in height is important to the overall look-n-feel / aesthetic of the village as a whole.
We must fight to preserve our views. The VC-C should be built as far as possible from the current village
I think a smaller, taller footprint would be less intrusive overall. Less than a much larger mass of buildings.
limit impact on those who currently have views of the mountain.
Density with more Open Space makes sense to me. It was most European Resorts have.
I believe this will lead for better views for more in the village.
Rather less than 30 feet higher to minimize view blockage but at the end of the day need to let the land owners invest their money as they see fit since they take all the risk.
This is a really hard question without seeing the whole site plan. Where the buildings are placed is a big factor.
As long as the Mountain is the Mountain!!! Will go along with the real old timers! poulsens, wilds, halls, briners, Kelly's, McNeils, etc,etc
A few tall towers and the rest same height as present
Use what you have before you overbuild again.
Actually Fewer, same height buildings
do not want anything like a Whistler SOUTH period. one exception Tram upper station period or Gold Coast on the Mtn
Need to provide space between the buildings so people from the buildings can have a connection with each other.
Actually, fewer buildings of any height strongly preferred.
Have space to walk between, so it's not a wall of buildings.
depends on location of buildings. Taller along the south side would leave the view and parking.
buildings near existing village should be same height. OK to go taller farther away and on north side of creek
cannot exceed existing heights without blocking views of mountains. Parking can be added at east end of valley with a shuttle, like Alpine
It would dramatically change the character of Squaw and I do not think that the developer has a right to do this. Another way to state this: it would ruin the character & atmosphere of our mountain setting
I would not object to one or two hotels with one or at most, two additional stories.
The new buildings should be the same height as the existing village.