

# Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: February 19, 2025

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



HIGHLANDS  
RANCH  
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

## I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was **called to order** at **5:32 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)	✓			
Patricia <b>Callies</b> (PC)	✓			
Jeff <b>Buttermore</b> (JB)			✓	
Dawn <b>Keating</b> (DK)			✓	
Russell <b>Clark</b> (RC)	✓			

### Also in attendance:

Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Improvement Coordinator  
Woody **Bryant** (WB), HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services  
Sheri **Gaskill** (SG), Resident/Applicant (10236 Woodrose Lane)

## II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **February 05, 2025** Meeting Minutes were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: RC Abstained since he was a non-voting observer/participant at the 01/15/2025 Meeting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

## III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

A. No Tribunals were held prior to meeting. One Tribunal is scheduled for February 20, 2025:

a. Appeal of ARC Denial of Lighting (01/15) for 9111 Weatherstone

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2025

Page 2 of 5

## IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None scheduled.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **10236 Woodrose Lane** – Rebuild (Fire).

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The home was severely damaged due to a fire and will be reconstructed. No change to the footprint of the home.
- ii. The Homeowner was present at the meeting and noted that she would like to replace the brick accent elements with stone (photographic material sample provided in ARC packet) and that she would like to include glass in the upper panel of the garage door (ARC packet did not reflect this). The Homeowner noted that she was open to discussions regarding her preferred colors (Base: Dress Blues, Trim: Pure White, Front Door: Caviar or Crabby Apple).
  - a. JW noted to the ARC that Naval (SW 6244) was similar to Dress Blues and is a commonly approved color.
- iii. The ARC deliberated and concluded that the stone accent was acceptable and that the use of glass in the upper panel of the garage door was acceptable. They conditioned the approval regarding the Base Color and Front Pedestrian Door color.
- iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION:** The Base Color must be Naval (SW6244) and the Front Pedestrian Door must be Caviar (SW6990).

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JC) to **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**. Conditions as noted above.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

- 
- B. **9 Falcon Hill Drive** – Lawn Ornament.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Section 2.48 of the RIGs implies that ARC approval is required for ornaments that are installed in the “rear” yard that are greater than 3’ in height. The application is for an art statue (considered a lawn ornament) that is approximately 6’-6” tall.
  - a. JW noted that the application was made by the Homeowner in response to a complaint the Sub-Association Management Team received from an abutting neighbor.
  - b. WB noted the backyard abuts University Boulevard and that the location of the statue is approximately 130’ from the closest drive lane and that the ground elevation at the location of the statue is approximately 22’ higher than the closest drive lane.
- ii. The ARC deliberated and relied on a strict interpretation of §2.48 that the installed art statue (lawn ornament) exceeded the allowable (without approval) height limitation. Since application was made in response to a complaint received from an abutting neighbor, allowing the oversized art statue (lawn ornament) in the current location was not approvable.

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**.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2025

Page 3 of 5

---

## C. 107 Falcon Hills Dr – Deck Expansion.

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The proposal includes the expansion of an existing deck that extends beyond the back of the home, primarily for installation of stairs to ground level.
  - a. JW noted that the proposal expands the deck to the side of the house. Section 2.22.B.1 of the RIGs state that the “...standard location is directly behind the house. Alternative locations (e.g., master-level, side yard, etc.) may be considered on a case-by-case basis.”
- ii. The ARC deliberated and determined that the rear expansion was minor and noted that the home’s large pie-shaped lot, positioned on the outer curve of the road, sets it farther back than adjacent side-yard neighbors, minimizing impact.

### b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## D. 5235 Weeping Willow Circle – Sauna/Pergolas/Fence.

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC was concerned with the extensive improvements that were made without approval. Their concerns include:
  - a. The sauna is considered an Accessory Building because of its size (RIGs §2.2.B). Accordingly, the roof must match the color and materials of the main home (RIGs §2.2.C). Currently, the roof of the sauna is “black, corrugated metal,” which is not acceptable.
  - b. Double-Fencing is not allowed (RIGs §2.30).
  - c. New fencing must transition in height to match existing fencing (RIGs §2.30.F.2). The existing damaged wing fence (defined in RIGs §2.30.A) must be immediately repaired and stained “Highlands Ranch Fence Brown (RIGs §2.30.D.3).
  - d. The ARC is concerned that the “Zen” area, which appears to include a stem wall surround with electrical, that may adversely affect drainage (RIGs §2.27).
- ii. The ARC directed Staff to consult with both Douglas County Planning/Zoning and Douglas County Building to ensure appropriate building (and/or electrical) permits were obtained.

### b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## E. 8680 Forest Drive – Window Variance (Elimination of Grid).

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC deliberated and agreed that this window is considered a clerestory (high, non-operable window placed above eye level to primarily bring in light or for aesthetics rather than ventilation). Accordingly, the ARC determined that the request to not include gridding is reasonable and does not impact uniformity.

### b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2025

Page 4 of 5

---

## F. 9182 Princeton St – Paint.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was okay with the Base (Labradorite, SW 7619) and Trim (Snowbound, SW 7004) colors; however, the preferred the trim color suggested by JW (Tiole Red, SW 0006) over the homeowner's color choice (Coral Clay SW 9005) because it didn't provide sufficient contrast to the base color.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION:** The Accent Color must be Toile Red (SW 0006).

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: DK, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**. Conditions as noted above.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## G. 9541 Painted Canyon Circle – Under Soffit Lights.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC noted that the installation was not in compliance with RIGs §2.44.E. Their concerns include:
  - a. No exposed wires may be visible (photographic evidence provided as part of the application shows exposed wires).
  - b. Govee lights are prohibited from the front of the house (photographic evidence provided as part of the application shows lighting in the front of the house and that Govee was used).
  - c. Lighting must be installed in a professional manner (Govee relies on VHB glue and clips, which as show to fail due to the climate in Colorado).
- ii. The ARC has instructed Staff to have the homeowner remove the lights within 30 days.
  - a. WB noted that Staff's authority is limited to issuing a Notice of Violation, which provides the homeowner with two consecutive 30-day cure periods.

### 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**.

---

## H. 9916 Foxhill Circle – Paint.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC noted that this was a unique case, because, as a corner lot, more than just the front face of the home would be visible. Because of this, The ARC was concerned about the expanse of wall area that would have the preferred base color (Wild Currant, SW 7583) applied.
  - a. JW recommended Red Barn (SW 7591) for the Base and Beach House (SW 7518) for the Trim as alternates. Both colors have been approved before.
  - b. JW noted that Red Barn (SW 7591) is a more muted, earthy red with brown undertones, giving it a traditional and natural look. The strong undertones in Wild Currant can make it overwhelming on large surfaces, whereas Red Barn provides a more balanced appearance. Additionally, darker reds with purple tones tend to fade unevenly under Colorado's intense sunlight, shifting to pink or dull maroon over time, while earthy reds like Red Barn are more fade-resistant and maintain their integrity longer.

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2025

Page 5 of 5

- ii. The ARC instructed Staff to offer the suggested colors to the homeowner. If the suggested colors are acceptable to the homeowner, Staff is instructed to update the denial to an approval with conditions signifying the colors.
- b. **ACTION:**
  - i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.
  - ii. Motion **PASSES.**

## I. 10239 Royal Eagle Lane – Under Soffit Lights.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**
  - i. The ARC noted that the installation was not in compliance with RIGs §2.44.E. Their concerns include:
    - a. No exposed wires may be visible (photographic evidence provided as part of the application shows exposed wires).
    - b. Govee lights are prohibited from the front of the house (photographic evidence provided as part of the application shows lighting in the front of the house and that Govee was used).
    - c. Lighting must be installed in a professional manner (Govee relies on VHB glue and clips, which as show to fail due to the climate in Colorado).
  - ii. The ARC has instructed Staff to have the homeowner remove the lights within 30 days.
    - a. WB noted that Staff's authority is limited to issuing a Notice of Violation, which provides the homeowner with two consecutive 30-day cure periods.
- b. **ACTION:**
  - iii. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **DENY.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.
  - iv. Motion **PASSES.**

## VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:02 p.m.**

## VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the March 05, 2025 Meeting.
  - a. **DISCUSSION:**
    - i. None.
  - b. **ACTION:**
    - i. Motion (by: JR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.
    - ii. Motion **PASSES.**