

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: April 02, 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 **5:35 p.m.** by J. **Wessling** (JW)

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

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused	Notes
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓			
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
Patricia Callies (PC)	✓			
Jeff Buttermore (JB)			✓	
Dawn Keating (DK)			✓	
Russell Clark (RC)	✓			

Also in attendance:

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

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

Patrick **Gallagher** (PB), Prospective ARC Member (Observer)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

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

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:** Not Applicable.

i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: KL) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
3	0	1

Notes: RC abstained because he was not present at the 03/19/2025 ARC Meeting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.



Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

April 02, 2025

Page 2 of 6

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three tribunals were held on Thursday, March 27th: Two for Eave/Permitter Lighting, One for Horizontal Fencing.
- One Eave/Permitter Lighting case (ARC Denial, Exposed wiring) was remanded back to Staff with the direction to provide the homeowner with samples of tracks that would be acceptable to hide the wiring. Samples were provided; however, homeowner found that the samples would not work for his specific application. Homeowner provided an alternative that Staff reviewed and found met the intent of the RIGs. Homeowner will continue with retrofit with an expected completion date of not later than 06/30/2025.
 - Awaiting Tribunal Ruling for the other two cases (ARC Denial, Exposed Wiring | Staff Denial, Horizontal Fence Pickets on Return Fence).

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **1411 Beacon Hill Ct** – Deck & Slide.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- The ARC was concerned about the selected color of the proposed enclosed slide. In the materials provided, there was a grey option that would be more aesthetically appropriate with the home.
- APPROVAL CONDITION.** Enclosed Slide color must be grey.

b. **ACTION:**

- Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- Motion **PASSES.**

- B. **1696 Hermosa Dr** – Patio Cover.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- The ARC noted that the information provided by the applicant was difficult to understand. The 3D renderings did not accurately portray the existing home.
- Although the ARC felt the concept would be acceptable, they require the following additional information before completing their review and issuing a decision:
 - Architectural Elevation Drawing of the REAR of the home, with the improvements shown and detailed (e.g., dimensions, proposed roof slopes, proposed materials, etc.).
 - Architectural Elevation Drawing of the SIDE of the home, with the improvement shown and details (e.g., dimensions, proposed roof slopes, proposed materials, etc.).
 - Additional information regarding the outside fireplace is necessary (e.g., materials, support to ground, etc.).
 - Additional information regarding the exposed vertical element on the back of the patio cover that extends beyond the rear of the home (e.g., materials, colors, etc.). For this element, the ARC will require the exterior finishing to match the home (e.g., painted Hardie-plank siding).

b. **ACTION:**

- Motion (by: RC, 2nd by: JR) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

April 02, 2025

Page 3 of 6

C. 1972 Hyacinth Rd – Gazebo.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC was very concerned with the location of the proposed gazebo, for the following reasons:
 - a. Gazebo is proposed on an existing elevated deck, which is approximately six feet above ground level in the requested location. At this location, the deck floor is approximately level with the privacy side yard fence between the applicant and the applicant's neighbor. The distance between the existing deck and the privacy side yard fence is nominal.
 - b. Placing the gazebo on the elevated deck in this location (east corner) is too high and too close to the abutting property, which may adversely impact the abutting neighbor's ability to enjoy their back yard space.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** The ARC would accept a revised submittal with the gazebo located at the opposite (south) corner of the existing deck.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JR) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. 2722 Cactus Bluff Pl – Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. JW noted that during her discussions with the homeowner, she recommended changing the accent color from Lemon Chiffon (SW 6686) to Naples Yellow (SW 9021).
- ii. The ARC reviewed paint chips and decided that the originally requested Lemon Chiffon (SW 6686) would be more appropriate for just the front door accent.
 - a. The ARC directed Staff to revert to the original requested color (Lemon Chiffon, SW 6686), as shown on the application).
- iii. The ARC appreciated that the shutters would be Greenblack (SW 6994).

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. 6342 Yale Dr – Lighting.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC found that the lighting, as currently installed, is not compliant with §2.44.E of the RIGs. Specifically:
 - a. The lighting system is not installed with the soffit.
 - b. The method of installation does not limit the view of the components from the street when the lights are not on. Wires (and light elements) are visible.
 - c. Lighting is not installed downward facing.
- ii. The ARC requires that the installed system be brought into compliance with §2.44.E of the RIGs or removed within 30 days.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

April 02, 2025

Page 4 of 6

F. 6434 Dutch Creek St – Lights.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC found that the lighting, as currently installed, is not compliant with §2.44.E of the RIGs. Specifically:
 - a. Café/Bistro string lights are prohibited from the front of the home.
 - b. The installation includes exposed wires (including an extension cord that appears to extend from the second-floor balcony to ground level), which is not permitted.
- ii. The ARC requires that the installed system be brought into compliance with §2.44.E of the RIGs or removed within 30 days.
- iii. The ARC requires that the extension cord be removed immediately, as it may pose a life/safety/fire hazard.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

G. 8666 Meadowlark Cir – Deck.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC appreciated the detailed information provided.
- ii. The ARC discussed the deck extension along the side of the home since, per Section 2.22.B.1 of the RIGs notes that the "...standard location [for decks] is directly behind the home." Section 2.22.B.1 also notes that "Alternative locations (...side-yard, etc.) may be considered on a case-by-case basis."
- iii. The ARC agreed that since this was a remove-and-replace project, with no increase to the existing footprint of the deck (which currently includes decking on the side of the home), that the side yard deck continued to be acceptable.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: RC) to **APPROVE**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

H. 9758 Isabel Ct – Accessory Building.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC is concerned with drainage around the proposed structure. In the pictures provided, there is a retaining wall drainage discharge (weep hole) pipe in the vicinity of the proposed accessory structure. Further, overland runoff from above the retaining wall may get trapped behind the accessory structure.
- ii. The ARC recommends that the homeowner take these concerns into consideration to ensure the long-term viability of the structure.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

April 02, 2025

Page 5 of 6

I. 9946 Wycliff Dr – Paint & Cedar Accents.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC takes no exceptions to the paint colors proposed, or the painting of the brick with Behr Ultra #75 (Polar Bear).
- ii. The ARC understands the intent of introducing cedar as an accent material; however, limiting it to just the areas near the front windows on the second floor will present too many materials and colors (multi-beige brick, “standard” siding with new color, cedar siding with natural color) to the front of the home.
- iii. The ARC would accept the removal of all Hardie-plank siding on the front elevation of the home above the garage and replacing it with cedar siding (with a semi-transparent stain or clear sealer).
- iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Eliminate the cedar siding option in the limited area proposed or expand the cedar siding option to include the entire front elevation of the home above the garage.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

J. 10076 Kingston Ct – Greenhouse & Dog Kennel.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC agreed that the size and configuration of the lot was suitable to accommodate the two structures.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

K. 10715 Timberdash – Sports Court/Patio Expansion and Fence Gate.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff noted that the application includes a fence gate that would provide direct access from the applicant's property to other private property.
 - a. Staff noted that the ARC may not approve access from one private property to another private property, without express written permission from the other property owner acknowledging and allowing access. To approve would be to allow a potential illegal trespass condition.
 - b. The private property the proposed gate would afford access to is owned by the Backcountry Association, Inc. This is not a public space (e.g., public right-of-way, etc.).
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Removal of the gate from the application. The ARC will reconsider the installation of a gate with written confirmation from the Backcountry Open Space Property Owner that you may have private access to their property.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: JR, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

April 02, 2025

Page 6 of 6

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:49 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the April 16, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**