

# Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 05, 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 **5:34 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

Caleb **Cameron** (CC), HRCA: Community Improvement Services Specialist

John **Mezger** (JM), HRCA: Community Improvement Services Technician

## II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **February 19, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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**.



# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

March 05, 2025

Page 2 of 5

## III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. One Tribunal was held in February (two were scheduled; however, one settled and withdrew).
  - a. ARC Denial re: Improper installation of eave lighting. Awaiting Ruling.
- B. Three Tribunals are scheduled for March
  - a. Two for improper installation of eave lighting.
  - b. One for improper installation of fencing, use of horizontal pickets.

## IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **1001 Riddlewood Lane** – Accessory Building.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the submittal reflects that the accessory building will be located one foot from the fence line/property line.
  - a. §2.2.E of the RIGs require an offset of two feet from fence line/property line.
  - b. JW noted, per conversations with the Applicant, that they have agreed to adhere to the setback requirement.
- ii. Staff noted that the submittal didn't include information about the architectural style (e.g., roofing materials/color and paint colors).
  - a. §2.2.C of the RIGs requires that the accessory building's architectural style and materials, including roofing and paint colors for siding/trim must match the existing house.
  - b. JW noted, per conversations with the Applicant, that they have agreed to adhere to the requirement that the structure be painted the same color as the home and that the roof of the structure match the materials and color of the home.
- iii. The ARC felt the tall columnar vegetative screen proposed by the applicant would not be necessary. However, the ARC noted that if the applicant wants to include it, they may include on the inside of the fence with no further approval, or on the outside of the fence (as currently proposed) with Douglas County approval (since the gravel area along the back of walk appears to be within the right-of-way that is under the jurisdiction control of Douglas County).
- iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Accessory building must be located a minimum of two (2) feet from any fence line / property line. Roofing materials and colors must match the home. Paint colors must match the home.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

- 
- B. **1051 Laurenwood Ln** – Painting Brick.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. RC questioned if painting brick was detrimental to durability of the material.
  - a. Staff noted that painting brick, in general, was vetted by the Design Review Committee (DRC) regarding durability, additional maintenance, etc. The consensus of the DRC was that painting/staining was acceptable, with Committee Approval.
  - i. Staff research found that paint provides an added layer of protection against weather elements, particularly moisture, which can help prevent issues such as cracking and spalling, though the arid climate of Highlands Ranch and Colorado in general already mitigate many moisture-related concerns. Even though occasional wet seasons or snowfall could pose minor risks, the benefits of painting (such as protecting the masonry for other weather-related wear) outweigh these concerns.

# Architectural Review Committee

## Meeting Minutes

March 05, 2025

Page 3 of 5

- ii. Staff did note that, on the other hand, painting masonry does introduce a need for regular maintenance. Over time, the paint may peel, chip, or fade, necessitating periodic repainting to maintain an aesthetically pleasing appearance. However, this is no different than the periodic maintenance necessary for the remainder of the painted home.
      - iii. Staff noted that one downside to painting masonry is that once the masonry is painted, it can be difficult and costly to reverse the decision. The removal process can damage the masonry, leading to additional repair costs.
    - b. Historically the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) has allowed masonry (e.g., brick, stone, etc.) to be treated with various techniques (e.g., limewash, staining, solid painting, etc.).
  - ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** The proposed color for the brick is acceptable. The application technique must be "solid color."
  - b. **ACTION:**
    - i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS.**
- | VOTE TALLY |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Concur     | Dissent | Abstain |
| 6          | 0       | 0       |
- Notes: None.
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

### C. 2757 Golden Eagle Ct – Accessory Building / Chicken Coop-Run.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**
    - i. There was general concern regarding the location and orientation of the Chicken Run.
  - b. **ACTION:**
    - i. Motion (by: JB, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: JB) to **APPROVE.**
- | VOTE TALLY |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Concur     | Dissent | Abstain |
| 4          | 2       | 0       |
- Notes: Dissenting views included the orientation and proximity to the abutting neighbor and the personal experience with the sounds that chickens produce. Concerned that the "peace and enjoyment" of the backyard for the abutting neighbor will be adversely impacted.
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

### D. 3870 White Bay Dr – Lawn Ornament.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**
    - i. There was extensive discussion about whether this application should be reviewed based on the RIG criteria in §2.48: Ornaments/Lawn Décor (as applied for), or the more lenient RIG criteria in §2.71: Signs and/or Advertising Devices. It was decided that §2.71 would be more appropriate, specifically §2.71.D that discusses "Dimensions."
      - a. Staff reminded the ARC that they may not prohibit or regulate the display based on the subject matter, message, or content.
      - b. Staff also noted that the installed element was noticed during a routine observation by HRCA CIS Field Technicians, and a Notice of Non-Compliance was issued to submit.
      - c. Staff also noted that two resident complaints about the size of the display have been logged.
      - d. Finally, Staff noted that there is precedent in Highlands Ranch requiring the removal of a similar element that was of a similar size. The decision was based on the size of the element.
    - ii. The ARC reviewed the allowances for both yard signs (maximum of 18" tall x 24" wide) and flags (maximum of 36" tall x 60" wide) and found that the proposed element exceeded both maximum allowances.
    - iii. The ARC relied on the size of the element, vis-à-vis the allowances described in RIGs §2.71.D, as the basis for their decision.
  - b. **ACTION:**
    - i. Motion (by: DK, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: KL) to **DENY.**
- | VOTE TALLY |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Concur     | Dissent | Abstain |
| 5          | 0       | 1       |
- Notes: None.
- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee

## Meeting Minutes

March 05, 2025

Page 4 of 5

---

### E. 3990 White Bay Dr – Batting Cage.

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

- i. There was general concern regarding the location of the batting cage vis-à-vis the abutting neighbor.
  - a. The ARC felt that a more palatable location would be on the opposite side of the yard, parallel to Colorado Boulevard, where existing vegetation will provide screening, and the location is the furthest point from any abutting residence.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Install the batting cage parallel to the fence line/property line along Colorado Boulevard. Batting cage to be on the yard side of the mature landscaping that exists in this area.

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

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

### F. 8642 Mallard Dr – Fence Flora Décor.

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

- i. The ARC relied on RIG §2.30.F.4 in their discussion that notes: “Nothing may be attached to a fence to increase the...screening capability...” The faux flora décor would fall under the “etc...” category of elements prohibited.
- ii. The ARC also relied on RIG §2.30.E.1 that discusses the staining requirement for fences that “...face or abut a street, another front yard.... This includes wing fences which are between the front of the homeowner homes.” The ARC interpreted this requirement as being necessary to maintain consistency throughout the community.

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

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

### G. 9574 Painted Canyon – Security Cameras.

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

- i. The ARC was nominally concerned with the camera lights on the upper story of the backyard camera; however, the concurred that the lights were low wattage and may never be activated because of the distance to the ground plane for the motion-sensor activation.

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

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

March 05, 2025

Page 5 of 5

## H. **10839 Red Sun** – Patio and Basketball Hoop.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was nominally concerned with the use of pavers in the patio/basketball area; however, they acknowledged that this was the homeowner's choice, and that this area appeared to be "dual tasked" as a patio and a small sports court.

### b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: None.

- ii. 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 19, 2025 Meeting.

### a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

### b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC 2nd by: DK) to **Approve as Presented**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: Quorum of Members Present at Meeting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.