AI's Analysis of Court Findings Regarding Views and View Corridors

(With Direct Quotations and Citations)

The District Court found that, although the Association relied on preservation of views and alleged view corridors as reasons for denying proposed improvements, **existing trees already blocked the views** in the area at issue at the time the proposals were submitted:

"The Association's decisions to reject Defendant's proposal were predicated in part on preservation of views and view corridors; however, at the time of the proposal's submission in 2015, *pine and aspen trees obstructed all views within the location of the proposed plan*."
— Eagle County District Court, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment, ¶ 34 (April 4, 2023)

The District Court also expressly found that **no established view corridors exist** within the 2001 Beaver Creek Point community. The Court noted that references to view corridors were not defined in the governing documents:

"The May 8, 2018 letter of Mark Payne corroborated that *view corridors are only mentioned in the Rules and Regulations and are not defined*."
— District Court Findings of Fact, ¶ 25

Further, the Court credited testimony from professionals involved in the original development confirming that **view corridors were never surveyed, documented, or recorded**:

"Roger Day and Brent Biggs both corroborated that *they did not locate any established view corridors*. Also, Mr. Biggs indicated that *he would have been the one to document them*, but he was not asked to do so at the time of the original development (for which he was the surveyor)."
— District Court Findings of Fact, ¶ 26

On appeal, the Colorado Court of Appeals accepted and relied on these factual findings when affirming the trial court's ruling that the Association acted arbitrarily and capriciously. The appellate court acknowledged that the proposed improvements would not materially affect views:

"The relevant evidence shows that the proposed addition would *not significantly impact views and privacy of other residents*, yet it was consistently rejected…"
— Colorado Court of Appeals, 2001 Beaver Creek Point Ass'n v. Malahide, LLC, ¶ 17 (July 24, 2025)