

# Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 04, 2024

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



HIGHLANDS  
RANCH  
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

## I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was **called to order** at **5:35 p.m.** by **J. Wessling (JW)**

Roll call was taken by JW, and a quorum was established.

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

\* attended via ZOOM

### Also in attendance:

Woody **Bryant** (WB), HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services  
Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Coordinator

## II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

### A. Review of August 21, 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 August 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes **AS PRESENTED** by JR, seconded by JB.  
 **3** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **2** member(s) **Abstain** (KL & DK, not in attendance at 08/21/2024 Meeting).
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 04, 2024

Page 2 of 4

## III. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

### A. 836 RIDDEWOOD LN - Addition.

#### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. WB explained that while the Highlands Ranch Planned Development Guide (HRPDG) allows a 4-foot encroachment into the rear yard setback (§V.L), the Community Declaration (§10.21) grants the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) authority to approve variances for greater encroachments. The homeowner has requested an approximate 12-foot encroachment. Since the rear yard abuts open space, there would be no adverse impacts on immediate neighbors.
- ii. The ARC was concerned with the roof-pitch of the patio cover, specifically where it would attach to the new addition. They were concerned with the various angles and roof pitches that were created with the design. WB suggested that the roof pitch of the entire patio cover be reduced so that the pitch "breaks" at the header of the addition and continues to the proposed height at the outer edge of the patio cover. It was agreed that the revised pitch should continue for the entire length of the patio cover.
- iii. The ARC was not concerned with the homeowner's request to relocate the hot tub to the larger portion of the patio near the addition.

#### b. **Action:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE A VARIANCE FOR REAR YARD ENCROACHMENT.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**
- iii. Motion (by: JB, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- iv. **CONDITION:** Change the roof pitch of the patio cover, holding the header elevation at the edge-of-roof for the addition and the outside elevation of the patio cover, as proposed, creating a "break" in the pitch.
- v. Motion **PASSES.**

## IV. NEW BUSINESS

Architectural Reviews. The Committee Members reviewed the following submittals:

### A. 1208 EUREKA CT - Double-Sided Fence.

#### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. ARC was concerned that the proposed fence didn't match Figure 1 of the RIGs. Proposed fence was missing the top cap and the top trim piece.

#### b. **Action:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. **CONDITION:** Fence must include a 2x6 top cap and 1x4 Trim to match Figure 1 of the RIGs.
- iii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 04, 2024

Page 3 of 4

---

B. **1927 ROSS LN** – Rear Yard Improvements.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. ARC was concerned with the quantity of improvements and the "cluttered" appearance. Insufficient information was presented to render a decision. Submittal was missing detailed plans for the planned deck, patio, and shed.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC 2nd by: JB) to **DENY, WITH OPTION TO REAPPLY.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. **6647 JACKSON LN** – Chicken Coop.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: DK, 2nd by: JR) to **APPROVE.**  
 **4** member(s) **Concur** | **1** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. **DISSENTING OPINION:** The dissenting member felt there was insufficient information provided about the Chicken Coop versus the "Chain-link Chicken Run" to make an informed decision.
- iii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. **9233 ASPEN CREEK WAY** – Pool.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. **9565 CHERRYVALE DR** – Patio Cover.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JB) to **APPROVE.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

F. **9898 BATHURST WAY** – Batting Cage.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC felt that the structure was too tall and was too close to the existing fence along the public right-of-way (no effective screening or noise abatement).
- ii. The cage structure requested did not match any of the "Choice 1" or "Choice 2" options presented

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: DK) to **DENY.**  
 **5** member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain.**
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

## V. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 04, 2024

Page 4 of 4

---

## VI. ADJOURNMENT

- B. With no further business the **meeting was adjourned** at **6:52 p.m.**

## VII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. At the September 18, 2024, Architectural Review Committee Meeting, these minutes were reviewed.
- a. **DISCUSSION:**
- i. None.
- b. **ACTION:**
- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED**.  
 **4** member(s) **Concur** | 0 member(s) **Dissent** | 0 member(s) **Abstain**
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.