

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 02, 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 J. **Wessling** (JW)

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

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

Also in attendance:

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

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. Review of September 18, 2024 ARC Meeting Minutes.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- There was no discussion.
- No corrections or revisions to the Meeting Minutes are necessary.

b. **ACTION:**

- A motion was made to **APPROVE** the September 18, 2024 Meeting Minutes **AS PRESENTED** by JR, seconded by PC.
 4 member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain**.
- Motion **PASSES**.

III. TRIBUNAL RULINGS REVIEW

- There were no Tribunal Rulings to review.
- WB noted there were two Tribunal Hearings held on September 19th; however, the Rulings were not expected to be released by the Tribunal Officer until October 10th.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- There were no residential appointments.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 02, 2024

Page 2 of 4

V. NEW BUSINESS

Architectural Reviews. The Committee Members reviewed the following submittals:

A. **5453 GLENSTONE LANE** - Deck.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC noted that they appreciated that the applicant revised the design so that the bridge/stairs would be five-feet from the property line/fence line versus the original two-feet proposed.
- ii. Discussion around requiring landscaping screening between bride/stairs and fence; however, it was decided that because the existing height of the deck (above the fence line by approximately four-feet), a landscaping screen wouldn't be effective. The ARC considered the distance from the deck/bridge/stairs to the abutting neighbor in their decision

b. **Action:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: KL) to **APPROVE**.
 3 member(s) **Concur** | **1** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain**.
Dissenting Opinion: The deck/bridge/stairs are too high and too close to the fence.
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

B. **9222 CAMELBACK STREET** - Paint (Main Pedestrian Door Only).

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was adamant that the selected paint color is not used elsewhere on the house, but was okay with it used on the main pedestrian (e.g., front) door.

b. **ACTION:**

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

C. **763 EMBERLOW LANE** - Addition.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was concerned about the quantity of metal roofing proposed on the addition; however, the ARC did appreciate the color selection of the metal roofing.
- ii. The ARC acknowledged that the project would require review and approval by the Backcountry HOA as well.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: DK, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE**.
 3 member(s) **Concur** | **1** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain**.
Dissenting Opinion: The addition creates roof peaks that are off balance and there is too much metal roof.
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

D. **8921 STONECREST** - Pool.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 02, 2024

Page 3 of 4

E. 9830 GOLDFINCH LANE - Xeriscaping.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was concerned that the design had nominal visual interest. The design needs more "undulation" in materials versus the "linear" approach presented.
- ii. The ARC is opposed to the installation of a tall juniper "wall" surrounding the mulch and is specifically opposed to them being utilized along the public sidewalk.
- iii. The ARC encourages the applicant to review the Pre-Approved Xeriscape plans available within the RIGs and either use one of those or present a plan that utilizes the recommended plant species.
- iv. The ARC delegates further review of a revised submittal to Staff.

b. **ACTION:**

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

F. 10338 BLUE HERON CT - Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC felt the selected color has too much "purple" in it to be used as the main body color. The ARC noted that the manufacturer's information for this color included a statement that states: "violet undertones."
- ii. JW noted that she has provided the applicant with alternative colors that are in the same family of "blues," but do not have "purple/violet" undertones. The ARC reviewed these colors and agreed they would be acceptable.
- iii. The ARC delegates further review of a revised submittal to Staff.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. WB discussed updated language to §2.44 of the RIG's to more clearly define what is acceptable for use for Backyard Café/Bistro String Lighting.
 - a. Several members were concerned about "over regulation" while other members felt backyard lighting should continue to be prohibited. It was agreed that ARC Approval for this style of lighting would not be required; however, it was also agreed that the language would provide guidance to homeowners that wished to install this type of lighting as well as giving Staff guidance on how to address complaints when received.
 - b. There was concern about the discussion about the height of lighting versus "upper-level decks" and it was agreed that the reference to "upper-level decks" was redundant and should be removed. It was agreed that WB to update the RIGs.
 - c. There was a concern about the distance the lights could be installed from property lines. It was agreed that lighting should be limited to areas greater than five (5) feet from property lines.
 - d. There was a concern about the hours of operation. It was agreed, for consistency, that the hours of operation (e.g., turned off) should match what Holiday Lights (11:00pm).

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the **meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 02, 2024

Page 4 of 4

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. At the November 06, 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**.
 5 member(s) **Concur** | **0** member(s) **Dissent** | **0** member(s) **Abstain**
- ii. Motion **PASSES**.