

# Architectural Review Committee

## MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: June 04, 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 <b>Buttermore</b> (JB)	✓			
Patricia <b>Callies</b> (PC)	✓			
Russell <b>Clark</b> (RC)			✓	
Patrick <b>Gallagher</b> (PG)	✓			
Dawn <b>Keating</b> (DK)	✓			
Kate <b>Landauer</b> (KL)	✓			
Joe <b>Levin</b> (JL)	✓			
Chris <b>Robinson</b> (CR)	✓			
Jeff <b>Rohr</b> (JR)	✓			

#### Also in attendance:

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

Caleb **Cameron** (CC), HRCA: Residential Specialist

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

### II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **May 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:** Not Applicable.

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

Notes: CR abstained (not a voting member at the 05/21 meeting); JR abstained (not present at 05/21 meeting).

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing



HRCAonline.org

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

June 04, 2025

Page 2 of 6

## III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three Tribunal Hearings were held on May 15, 2025:
- a. ARC Conditional Approval (Restriction) of Perimeter Lighting. **Appeal Granted.**
  - b. ARC Denial of Chicken Coop Placement. **Appeal Granted.**
  - c. Are Denial of Perimeter Lighting Installed with Approval & Improperly. **Appeal Denied.**

## IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **1943 Chesapeake Lane** – Bee Hives.
- a. **DISCUSSION:**
- i. Homeowner was a “No Show” at the meeting.
  - ii. CIS Received a complaint (complainant is abutting neighbor to applicant) regarding excessive bees coming from their neighbor’s (applicant’s) recently installed (without prior approval) bee hives.
    - a. Notice was issued to applicant requiring submittal. Submittal was received.
    - b. Applicant proposes the two (compliant) bee hives in a location that is compliant with RIGs §2.10 (at back yard, at least five feet from side lot line and eight feet from rear lot line).
    - c. Although the quantity and location are compliant, Staff suggested an alternative location so that it is further from the complainant’s home (the complainant’s have a compliant trampoline within close proximity to the current location of the bee hives).
    - d. Applicant declined suggestion and asked that the submittal be reviewed by the ARC.
  - iii. There was considerable discussion amongst the ARC regarding the application being compliant versus conditioning an approval to address a complaint received.
    - a. A motion was made to approve as presented; however, that motion failed by a vote of three concur, four dissent, one abstention.
    - b. A second motion was made for a conditional approval, as detailed below.
  - iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Relocate the two (compliant quantity) to the location suggested by Staff.
- b. **ACTION:**
- i. Motion (by: PG, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: CR) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITION.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	3	1

Notes: KL abstained for personal reasons.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **103 Morning Dew Place** – Pool.
- a. **DISCUSSION:**
- i. None.
- b. **ACTION:**
- i. Motion (by: CR, 2<sup>nd</sup> by: PC) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	2

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

June 04, 2025

Page 3 of 6

---

## B. 926 Brttany Way – Paint.

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff noted that multiple alternative colors—along with corresponding addresses where each had been previously approved—were provided to the applicant for consideration.
- ii. The applicant subsequently submitted a list of alternative colors; however, none were eligible for administrative approval.
- iii. The ARC reviewed both the staff-suggested colors and the applicant’s proposed alternatives and determined that the applicant’s selections were not acceptable.
- iv. The ARC affirmed that the staff-suggested colors are acceptable and authorized staff to reverse the denial if the applicant selects one of those options.

### b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## C. 1515 Hermosa Dr – Paint.

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The applicant is requesting “Dress Blues” for the main body of the home. Staff noted that this color has historically not been approved because of the “purple undertones.”
- ii. Staff noted that multiple alternative colors—along with corresponding addresses where each had been previously approved—were provided to the applicant for consideration.
- iii. The ARC affirmed that the staff-suggested colors are acceptable and authorized staff to reverse the denial if the applicant selects one of those options.

### b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

## D. 1972 Hyacinth – Composite Shed.

### a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The applicant installed a composite shed in their backyard, incorrectly relying on §2.20 of the RIGs, which states that “approval is not required for composite storage units.” However, this section also outlines specific conditions—such as maximum height, required screening, and placement—that must be met in order for approval to be unnecessary.
- ii. Staff observed that the shed does not comply with §2.20, as the structure exceeds the maximum allowable height of 5'. The shed features a single-sloped roof with a peak height of 7.5', installed atop an approximately 4" foundation.

# Architectural Review Committee

## Meeting Minutes

June 04, 2025

Page 4 of 6

- iii. Staff further noted that the shed does not comply with §2.02, which requires that the architectural style, materials (including roofing), and paint colors match the home. The shed is finished in “composite grey with black trim,” whereas the home features beige horizontal siding.
- iv. The ARC concurred with staff’s findings and determined that the shed must be removed.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

E. **9030 Bermuda Run Circle** – Tiled Exterior Stairs at Front Entry.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. While the ARC appreciates the selected tile, they noted that, despite its “Antislip Porcelain Tile” designation, the surface may become slippery when wet.
- ii. The ARC advises that the homeowner remain mindful of potential slip hazards.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

F. **9191 Round Tree** – Pool House.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

---

G. **9451 Desert Willow Tr** – Gazebo & Privacy Screening.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC discussed the need for privacy screening. Staff explained that the property’s topography, as shown in the submitted photographs, places the home and proposed improvements at nearly the same elevation as the top of the perimeter fencing—due to a grade drop of approximately six feet from the house to the fence line.
- ii. As the property is a corner lot, one of the proposed privacy screens is intended to provide visual separation from the public right-of-way. The second screen would provide privacy from a neighboring backyard situated at a lower elevation.

# Architectural Review Committee

## Meeting Minutes

June 04, 2025

Page 5 of 6

- iii. The ARC briefly discussed potential challenges in maintaining the 36" space between the privacy screen and the existing fence; however, as the area consists primarily of rock (rather than turf), mowing or routine landscape maintenance was not deemed a concern.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

H. **10747 Featherwalk Way** – Vaulted Deck Cover & Expansion.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

---

I. **5025 Montvale Dr** – Concrete Flatwork, Shed, and Gazebo.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the proposed 14' x 14' driveway expansion does not comply with §2.28 of the RIGs, which states that "the maximum additional width [may] be 9 feet."
- ii. Staff also noted that the proposed removal and replacement of the existing herringbone brick sidewalk (located along the side of the home) with a concrete sidewalk does not comply with §2.54 of the RIGs, which requires all paving to remain a minimum of two feet from property lines. While the proposed walk maintains compliance near the front of the home, it narrows to approximately 6" from the property line at the rear corner. Staff noted that the ARC may consider a variance in this case, as the new walk replaces existing paving in kind and the limited space between the home's corner and the property line presents a practical hardship.
- iii. The ARC noted inconsistencies in the shed dimensions provided within the application. The "Plan Summary" identifies the shed as a "Yardline Crestwood," 8' x 14' x 10', while the Design Plan depicts it as 8' x 10' x 8.5'.
- iv. **APPROVAL CONDITIONS:**
  - a. Driveway expansion must be reduced to 14' in length (parallel to the existing driveway) by 9' in depth (perpendicular to the driveway).
  - b. The 8' x 10' x 8.5' shed, set on a 10' x 12' concrete pad, is acceptable.
  - c. The 10' x 14' gazebo is acceptable as proposed.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	2

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

# Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

June 04, 2025

Page 6 of 6

## VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. WB presented the final draft of the proposed modification to RIGs §2.44.G regarding “Decorative String (e.g., Café/Bistro Style) Lighting. The ARC approved the draft and directed staff to move forward with incorporating the modification into the RIGs.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:36 p.m.**

## VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the **June 18, 2025** Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

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

Notes: DK arrived to meeting after minutes were reviewed, did not vote.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**