

# Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 15, 2025

Aspen/Vail Conference Room: Eastridge Recreation Center  
9568 S University Blvd – Highlands Ranch, CO 80126



## I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was **called to order** at **5:42 p.m.** by **J. Wessling (JW)**

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

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused	Notes
Jeff <b>Rohr</b> (JR)	✓			
Kate <b>Landauer</b> (KL)	✓ *			Attended via ZOOM
Patricia <b>Callies</b> (PC)	✓			
Jeff <b>Buttermore</b> (JB)	✓			
Dawn <b>Keating</b> (DK)			✓ *	Contacted <u>PC</u> , Sick
Jenna <b>Nygren</b> (JN)			✓ *	Email Rcv'd, Out of Town, New Job. <b>Tendered Resignation via Email to WB</b>
Russell <b>Clark</b> (RC)	✓ *			Prospective Member, Non-Voting, Obs Only. Board Approval of App expected 01/21/2025.

### Also in attendance:

Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Improvement Coordinator

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

## II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. There were **no Meeting Minutes to review**. No meetings were held in December, 2024.

## III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

A. No Tribunals were held.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

Page 2 of 6

## IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

### A. 3383 WHITE OAK STREET – Paint and Garage Door.

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

- i. NOTE: The HO was scheduled to attend; however, he was a “no show.”
- ii. The current DIY paint to create a “wood tone” on the garage door (no submittal received for review) is not acceptable.
- iii. The proposed colors for the body and trim are acceptable.
- iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** The garage door must be repainted the proposed body color of the home.

#### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **CONDITIONALLY APPROVE.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

## V. NEW BUSINESS

### A. 254 FEATHERWALK CT – Patio & Cover.

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

- i. JW noted that this property is in the Backcountry Sub-Association. Backcountry has a very active Architectural Review Committee that will scrutinize this submittal.

#### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JB) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

### B. 1143 LAURENWOOD – Security Camera on Pole.

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

- i. Submittal implies multiple cameras; however, only one was noted.
- ii. No information was provided regarding camera(s), e.g., manufacturer, power source, ability to Pan/Tilt/Zoom.
- iii. No information was provided regarding mounting – implies “on a pole with bird feeder.” Additional information is necessary.
- iv. Applicant may resubmit addressing these concerns.

#### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

Page 3 of 6

---

## C. 2025 CHELSEA ST – Dog Run Enclosure.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Concerned with durability of decorative panels (e.g., wind resistance). No information was provided on how those would be installed. Recommend either tall vertical live vegetation, or a combination of tall vertical live vegetation and decorative panels.
- ii. Concerned with the expansive use of “pea gravel” through the entire enclosure. Concerned with how animal waste can be efficiently and effectively cleaned using this type of ground surface. Recommend small/short thatch artificial turf, or a combination of turf with “islands” of “pea gravel.”
- iii. Applicant to work with staff to address these concerns.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## D. 9111 WEATHERSTONE CT – Permanent Lighting.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Installation of the lighting was not completed in compliance with §2.44.E of the Residential Improvement Guidelines and must be revised. Specifically, “Lighting must be installed to be downward facing....” Further, “Lighting must be installed so there is a limited view of the components...when lights are not on. No exposed wires may be visible.”
- ii. Installed lighting must be removed or reinstalled in compliance with §2.44.E.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **DENY**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## E. 9361 LARK SPARROW DR – Painting Garage Door.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Okay with the proposed color for the garage door.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION:** Must also paint the decorative grill above the two-car garage to tie the elements together.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **CONDITIONALLY APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

Page 4 of 6

---

## F. 9489 CHESAPEAKE ST – Accessory Building.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The applicant was present at the meeting (spouse was online) to discuss the project and answer questions.
- ii. The proposed shed (already owned) dimensionally exceeds (length, width, and height) what is allowed in §2.2. Allowed: 8'x10'x8.5'. Proposed: 10'x16'10'.
- iii. Home is a walk-out with a grade change along side of house, controlled with multiple dry-stack block retaining walls. Intent is to level the area at the lowest ground level at the home by cutting the ground and extending the height of the retaining wall closest to the fence. No changes to the 6' privacy fence are proposed. Once completed, the peak of the shed will extend above the top of the 6' privacy fence by approximately 18".
- iv. Discussed the height of a standard shed above a 6' privacy fence (2.5') versus what was proposed (1.5'). Proposal is less intrusive.
- v. **VARIANCE APPROVED:** To allow an oversized shed 10' deep, 16' wide, 10' tall.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## G. 9931 COTTONWOOD DRIVE – Paint.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. In the approval, Staff is to define that "Iron Ore" must be used at the first floor on all sides (elevations) of the home, not just the front elevation.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JR) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## H. 10045 RIDGEFIELD – Swimming Pool.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff to provide a Cautionary Note that alerts the applicant that a fence enclosure around the pool deck may be required for safety, since their backyard fence is only a split rail fence abutting a residential property.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JB) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

Page 5 of 6

---

I. **9863 VENNEFORD RANCH** – Sport Court.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

i. Motion (by: PC, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JB) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

J. **9893 AFTONWOOD CIR** – Coloradoscape.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. Excessive use of “Grey Granite Landscape Rock” in both areas; however, predominately within the larger landscape area. Recommend this be mitigated with additional “on grade” Coloradoscape plant material to soften the appearance. Other possibilities are placement of large boulders, placement of different color river-run rock to provide visual interest (e.g., creating a dry riverbed).

ii. Applicant to work with staff to address these concerns.

b. **ACTION:**

i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

K. **10210 WOODROSE CT** – Commercial Vehicle.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. The vehicle appears too long for the driveway. From photographs provided, it appears that the work van extends beyond the end of the driveway, encroaching onto the sidewalk, with the front of the van nearly touching the garage.

ii. Unlike recently approved commercial vehicles that have limited graphics and/or business logos, this vehicle includes excessive branding on all sides.

b. **ACTION:**

i. Motion (by: PC, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JR) to **DENY**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. General discussion regarding the possibility of combining the Development Review Committee (commercial projects) with the Architectural Review Committee (residential improvement projects) to create the singular Architectural Committee, compliant with the Community Declarations. Discussed that this was in the “discussion” stage and requires further review and discussion with the Board of Directors.

---

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:41 p.m.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

Page 6 of 6

## VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the February 05, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

i. Motion (by: JB, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: Although there were six members at the 02/05 Meeting, RC did not vote on these minutes because he was a non-voting participant at the 01/15 meeting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.