

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: May 07, 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 **5:30 p.m.** by J. **Wessling** (JW)

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

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused	Notes
Jeff Buttermore (JB)			✓	
Patricia Callies (PC)	✓			
Russell Clark (RC)	✓			
Patrick Gallagher (PG)	✓			Attended via ZOOM. Congratulations on Appointment to the ARC.
Dawn Keating (DK)			✓	
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			Congratulations on Appointment to the ARC
Jeff Rohr (JR)			✓	

Also in attendance:

Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Improvement Coordinator
Woody **Bryant** (WB), HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services
Chris **Robinson** (CR), Prospective ARC Member

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **April 16, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 2 of 7

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. **8642 Mallard Place** | Synthetic flora on fence (ARC Denial).
 - a. Tribunal Officer AFFIRMED the denial finding no grounds for a variance or to override of the Committee's reasonable aesthetic judgment.
- B. There are three Tribunal Hearings scheduled for May 15, 2025:
 - a. **6342 Yale Drive** | Exterior Permanent Perimeter Lighting (ARC Denial).
 - b. **11081 Valleybrook Circle** | Limited Exterior Permanent Perimeter Lighting (ARC Conditional Approval).
 - c. **5300 Foxborough Court** | Chicken Coop Placement (ARC Denial)

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **10132 Silver Maple Circle** – Sauna & Hot Tub.

Note: The submittal also included landscaping improvements; however, these improvements were vetted by Staff and found to be acceptable. This review is specific to the Sauna & Hot Tub.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The homeowner/applicant (Peter and Vandy Fischer) were in attendance and provided the ARC with a presentation of what they're proposing and additional discussions they've had with the manufacturer about the glass on the Sauna.
 - ii. In response to PC's question on orientation, the Fischer's confirmed that the only door into the sauna would be facing northeast (toward the proposed hot tub).
 - iii. The ARC agreed that the location of the sauna would be well screened from the neighboring property by the large shed that currently exists on the neighbor's property in, generally, the same location.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

- B. **432 English Sparrow Dr** – Paint Colors.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The homeowner/applicant (Ryan and Sarah Day) were in attendance and provided the ARC with a presentation of what they're proposing.
 - ii. The ARC debated the dark color selection; however, the felt that it was somewhat mitigated with the use of light color trim.
 - iii. The ARC advised the Day's that dark colors tend to fade quicker and require repainting more often than "traditional/lighter" colors.

- b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PG 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 3 of 7

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1146 Cherry Blossom Cir – Shed & Deck.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. There are two aspects to this application: Reconstruction of a deck and a constructed (without prior approval) shed.
 - a. Regarding the reconstruction of the deck. The ARC takes no exceptions to the design as it appears to be in the same location as the previous deck.
 - b. Regarding the construction (without approval) shed. The ARC relied on RIGs §2.2 and finds that the shed in its current configuration is too close to the fence; is too tall with a single-pitch roof; included mismatched siding materials; included an oversized unfinished soffit. The ARC found that the shed was not aesthetically pleasing and that it must be removed, or brought into compliance with the RIGs.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PG, 2nd by: JL) to **APPROVE THE DECK, AS SUBMITTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

- iii. Motion (by: RC, 2nd by: KL) to **DENY THE SHED, REMOVAL OR MODIFICATION REQUIRED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- iv. Motion **PASSES.**

B. 3024 White Oak St – Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC found that the incorrect color match (“Commodore”) by the painter is unacceptable and that the approved color (“Night Flight” S520-7) must be applied.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JL) to **DENY, ORIGINALLY APPROVED PAINT COLOR MUST BE USED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. 4930 Fenwood Dr – Lighting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC found that the quantity and type of light, and method of installation, are not in compliance with RIGs §2.44.
- ii. The ARC suggests the applicant consider installation of acceptable under soffit style lighting (e.g., Permanent Eave/Trim Lighting) that is compliant with RIGs §2.44.E.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: KL) to **DENY, INSTALLED LIGHTING MUST BE REMOVED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 4 of 7

D. 9205 Lark Sparrow Dr – Pergola.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. None.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

E. 9309 Sandhill Way – Garage Door Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC considered this application as a variance to RIGs §2.50 that notes that garage doors "...shall be painted to match the base or the trim, unless otherwise approved by the ARC."
- ii. The ARC reviewed the requested color and found that the requested color, which would be in no other location on the house, would introduce a fourth color (not including the color of the brick) to the home. This has traditionally been denied.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: RC, 2nd by: JL) to **DENY, GARAGE DOOR MUST MATCH THE BASE OR THE TRIM.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

F. 9434 Hackberry Ln – Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. None.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: PG, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE AS SUBMITTED**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

G. 9815 Castle Ridge Cir – Expansion of Soffit Lighting.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC is concerned with the location of the planned expansion of the soffit lighting system and the impacts to the neighboring living spaces. When looking at the additional areas requested, on both sides of the home, it appears that the neighboring homes have second story windows at approximately the same level.
- ii. The ARC felt that it was reasonable to anticipate that nuisance glare from this expanded system could adversely impact the neighbors.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 5 of 7

H. 9835 Silver Maple Road – Year-Round Holiday Decoration/Lawn Ornament.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC relied on RIGs §2.44.F: Temporary Holiday Lighting and Decorations and felt that the year-round display of the skeleton, regardless of the dress decoration that was applied to it, was not in the spirit of the RIGs.
- ii. The ARC also relied on RIGs §2.48: Ornaments/Lawn Décor and found that the size of the skeleton exceeds the 12-inch maximum height and its color and design does not integrate into the landscape.
- iii. The ARC requires that the skeleton be removed.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
-

I. 9925 Spring Hill St – Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC debated the use of “Winter Way” for the Base Color and found that it was grey and did not provide enough contrast between it and the Accent Color (“Limousine Leather”).
- ii. The ARC concurs with staff’s suggestion that the Base Color be “Midnight Blue” (Behr N480-7), with “Limousine Leather” (Behr MQ5-05, as requested) as the Accent Color and “Ultra Pure White” (Behr PR-W15, as requested) for the Trim and Garage Door Color.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION: Use of “Midnight Blue” (Behr N480-7) as the Base Color.**

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
-

J. 9935 Blackbird Cir – Playset.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC discussed the size of the playset; however, they opined that the only portion of the playset that exceeded RIGs §2.56 regarding the maximum height restriction (7’ allowed, 11’± proposed) was the roof for the central “Clubhouse.” Most of the play structure was less than 7’ tall to the top of the railing/fall protection.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: KC, 2nd by: RC) to **APPROVE AS SUBMITTED**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 6 of 7

K. ***EMERGENCY REVIEW* 10908 Oakshire Ave** – Under Construction Backyard Excavation Project.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC appreciates your desire to modify the slope of your backyard to make it more usable and appreciates your immediate removal of the earthen spoils that were in the street right-of-way.
- ii. The ARC is concerned about the height of the, at a minimum, lower retaining wall. We have confirmed that retaining walls greater than four (4) feet in height (measured from the bottom of the footing to the top of wall) require engineered plans that must be reviewed, approved, and permitted by Douglas County Building Department. Although the ARC does not have the technical expertise to review construction drawings (the HRCA relies on the professionals at Douglas County for this), the ARC suggests the following two alternatives:

- a. Have your contractor consider reducing the height of the lower retaining wall to a maximum of three (3) feet, measured from the bottom of the footing to the top of wall, adjust the slope between the tiered walls to no more than three horizontal to one vertical (3:1), increase the height of the second tier wall to a maximum of three (3) feet, measured from the bottom of the footing to the top of the wall, and continue this philosophy on until you meet existing grade. This option may make the necessity of obtaining engineered construction drawings and applying to the Douglas County Building Department for permitting moot.
- b. Or, leave the design as currently installed and have your contractor reach out to the Douglas County Building Department to discuss the review/permitting time and costs. The point-of-contact at Douglas County Building is:

Rick Miller, Building Inspector Supervisor
Douglas County Department of Public Works Engineering: Building Division
100 Third St., Castle Rock, CO 80104
303-660-7497 ext 2242 | rsmiller@douglas.co.us

- iii. The ARC is concerned that positive drainage is maintained away from your home after construction, and that the new “flat area” doesn’t become a low point that could collect runoff. Your contractor will need to ensure that positive drainage is maintained away from your home, across your side yards (but not directed to either of your side yard neighbors), and ultimately into the public right-of-way of the street.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. **STAFF COMMENTARY**

- A. A draft version of the proposed modifications to RIGs §2.44.G regarding Café/Bistro Lighting on Front Porches was provided to the ARC for their review. The ARC will discuss adopting those changes at the next meeting.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **8:03 p.m.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

May 07, 2025

Page 7 of 7

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the May 21, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: PG) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES.**