Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 18, 2024

Aspen/Vail Conference Room: Eastridge Recreation Center 9568 S University Blvd – Highlands Ranch, CO 80130



I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by W. Bryant (WB)

☑ Roll call was taken by WB, and a <u>quorum was established</u>.

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓		
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓		
Patricia Callies (PC)	✓		
Jeff Buttermore (JB)			✓
Dawn Keating (DK)	√ *		
Jenna Nygren (JN)			✓

^{*} attended via ZOOM

Also in attendance:

Woody Bryant (WB), HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

- A. Review of September 04, 2024 ARC Meeting Minutes.
 - a. **DISCUSSION**:
 - i. There was no discussion.
 - ii. No corrections or revisions to the Meeting Minutes are necessary.
 - b. **ACTION**:
 - i. A motion was made to **APPROVE** the September 04, 2024 Meeting Minutes **AS PRESENTED** by JR, seconded by JB.
 - ☑ 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion PASSES.

III. TRIBUNAL RULINGS REVIEW

- A. There were no Tribunal Rulings to review.
- B. WB noted there were two Tribunal Hearings scheduled for Thursday, September 19th.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

A. There were no residential appointments.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Architectural Reviews. The Committee Members reviewed the following submittals:



Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 18, 2024 Page 2 of 3

- A. **424 Spring Grove Ave** Grading & Drainage.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. Insufficient information was presented on what the final condition will be like. Need more information on what's proposed.
 - ii. ARC is concerned with the condition of the existing wall; appears to be failing. Is the intent to rebuild the wall?
 - iii. Resubmit with final design. ARC delegates the review of the final design to staff.
 - b. Action:
 - i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JR) to **DENY WITH OPTION TO REAPPLY**.
 - **CONDITION**: No additional fee to be assessed with reapplication.
 - ☑ 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- B. 1123 SHADOW MOUNTAIN DR Patio.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. None.
 - b. **ACTION:**
 - i. Motion (by: JR 2nd by: KL) to **APPROVE**.
 - ☑ 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- C. 2936 CLAIRTON Patio Cover (Revised Design).
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. None.
 - b. **ACTION**:
 - Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: DK) to <u>APPROVE</u>.
 - ☑ 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- D. **8573 WOODY WAY** Garden Boxes along Driveway.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. None.
 - b. **ACTION:**
 - i. Motion (by: DK, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE**.
 - \square 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- E. 9655 LAMERIA Jellyfish Lighting.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. Staff and several members of the ARC were initially concerned with lighting along the edges of garage door; however, after further discussion the concerns were addressed.
 - b. **ACTION**:
 - i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: DL) to **APPROVE**.
 - ☑ 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
 - ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- F. **10234 BENTWOOD CIR** Pergola/Fence.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. The ARC was initially concerned with the extent of the proposed element; however, the empathized with the applicant's current challenge (neighbor's aggressive dog).
 - ii. The ARC was concerned with a "double fence" application. WB noted that there was an existing sidewalk along the side of the house, with the edge of walk eight inches from the fence line (narrow side yard). The applicant provided two options for the

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 18, 2024 Page 3 of 3

location of the pergola/fence columns: at the edge of the existing walk, or setback six inches from the edge of the walk (14" from the existing fence). WB recommend the ARC opt for the setback design.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: DK, 2nd by: JR) to APPROVE WITH CONDITION.
 - CONDITION: The pergola/fence posts be setback from the edge of the existing concrete by six inches (minimum) to provide greater distance from the existing fence (preventing a "double fence" application) and to allow additional space for the pergola "roof" elements to ensure they do not encroach into the neighbor's property.
 - \square 4 member(s) Concur | 0 member(s) Dissent | 0 member(s) Abstain.
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
- G. **10622 RIDGECREST** Sports Court w/Lighting.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. The ARC was initially concerned with the lighting element. Further discussion about the location of light and how the existing garage and landscaping and distance from adjoining property addressed the concern.
 - ii. The ARC was also concerned with the illumination level (12,000 lumens) of the fixture. Research by the ARC shows that there are similar style lights with less lumens. Further discussion determined that the existing screening elements were sufficient to abate potential light pollution concerns.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: KL, 2nd by: PC) to <u>APPROVE</u>.
 ☑ <u>4</u> member(s) Concur | <u>0</u> member(s) Dissent | <u>0</u> member(s) Abstain.
- ii. Motion PASSES.

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

A. WB discussed updated language to §2.30 of the RIG's to more clearly define what a "wing fence" was. The ARC reviewed the language and approved the change. WB to update the RIGs.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

A. With no further business the **meeting was adjourned** at **6:22 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. At the October 02, 2024, Architectural Review Committee Meeting, these minutes were reviewed.
 - a. **DISCUSSION**:
 - i. None.
 - b. **ACTION**:
 - i. Motion (by: <u>JR</u>, 2nd by: <u>PC</u>) to <u>APPROVE AS PRESENTED</u>.
 <u>4</u> member(s) Concur | <u>0</u> member(s) Dissent | <u>0</u> member(s) Abstain
 - ii. Motion PASSES.