

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: July 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 **5:27 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)	✓			
Dawn Keating (DK)			✓	
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)			✓	
Jeff Rohr (JR)			✓	

Also in attendance:

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

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

Shelley **Stolk** (SS), Resident

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **June 18, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:** Not Applicable.

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

July 02, 2025

Page 2 of 6

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three Tribunals were held on June 18, 2025. Awaiting Rulings.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Stolk addressed the ARC to express disappointment over a recent unanimous decision approving a paint color she felt was inconsistent with the neighborhood's traditional character.

As a 26-year resident of Hackberry Lane, Ms. Stolk provided an unedited photo of the newly painted home and noted that the approved color—PPG's "Heavenly Blue"—was unusually bright and visually out of place. She observed that the color had drawn attention from residents on adjacent streets and humorously pointed out that several ARC members were wearing shirts in a similar shade.

Ms. Stolk's primary concern was the precedent set by approving such a saturated color. She questioned whether this might open the door to other vivid hues—such as Bright Coral Pink, Lime Green, or Bright Emerald Ice—potentially undermining the architectural cohesion that defines the Westridge neighborhood. She referenced an AI-generated sheet comparing similar PPG tones to support her point.

Ms. Stolk concluded by respectfully asking the ARC to:

1. Revisit the guidelines used to evaluate the submittal, and
2. Consider reversing the approval to require a more contextually appropriate color.

Ms. Stolk's remarks were delivered within the three-minute time limit and received without response, in accordance with committee policy.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **1557 Mountain Maple** – Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee opined that the color of the roof (Terracotta Red) conflicts with the requested base color, Palace Green (CW-520).
 - a. The Committee directed staff to work with the applicant to select a more appropriate color combination.
- ii. The ARC appreciates the trim color, Swiss Coffee (OC-45) and accent color, Mocha Brown (2107-20).

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

-
- B. **2321 Terraridge Cir** – Addition.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 02, 2025

Page 3 of 6

C. 3258 Oak Leaf PI – Stairwell & Lighting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee noted that "MaxDetect 240° White Motion Sensing Wired Outdoor 2-Head LED Security Flood Light 1400 Lumens" is not compliant with RIGs §2.44.C (may not exceed 1000 lumens total per fixture).
- ii. The Committee is concerned with drainage in the lower-level steps.
 - a. Drawing C1.1 of 1 appears to show an inlet in a landing, not the lowest level of the stairwell, as reflected on Drawing CD-1, Section 2.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Revise the Security Flood Light Fixture to be compliant with RIGs §2.44.C

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. 4460 Kethwood – Paint Brick.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Two alternatives were provided by the Applicant: One with "faux white trim" (Alabaster White) on the brick, one with the brick as a "solid" color (Peppercorn).
 - a. The Committee approves the option with the "solid" color (Peppercorn) used as the brick treatment.
- ii. Alabaster White on existing trim elements (but not on the brick) is acceptable.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. 9544 Golden Eagle PI – Patio.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

July 02, 2025

Page 4 of 6

F. 9560 Castle Ridge Cir – Paint Brick.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The discussion occurred as part of the dissenting opinion to the initial motion to approve as presented. See "Notes" in ACTION item.

b. FIRST ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
2	3	0

Notes: Dissenting opinion was that the addition of Warm Onyx (HDC-CL-14A) was too "brown" with no contrast. The Warm Onyx would be overly dark color on the brick. Painting both the trim and the brick in Warm Onyx may be acceptable.

- ii. Motion **FAILS**.

c. SECOND ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
3	1	1

Notes: The dissenting and abstaining votes were made by the individuals that motioned/seconded the First Action.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

G. 9664 Dunning Cir – Trellis.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee agrees that the installation of the screening trellis does not constitute "double fencing."
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION**. The horizontal slats must be provided on both sides of the structure (so the "finished side" is visible from outside the property), at least above the elevation of the existing fence. In inside of the fence may extend the horizontal slats to ground level, as shown in the submitted graphic.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

H. 10004 Oak Leaf Way – Greenhouse.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The applicant noted in their application that the structure is a "Pop Up Greenhouse" that will "only be used five months of the year, then taken down."
- ii. Per RIGs §2.37, greenhouses are considered accessory buildings; however, the ARC relied on RIGs §2.82 "Temporary Structures" based on the applicant's description.
- iii. RIGs §2.82 references ComDec §9.7, which prohibits temporary structures.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	1	0

Notes: Dissenting opinion was that this was a temporary structure not a camping tent, which is specifically noted in RIGs §2.82 as not permitted. Use for a Greenhouse should be acceptable.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 02, 2025

Page 5 of 6

I. 10011 Wyeclyffe – Decks.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Noting of consequence.

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**.
-

J. 10115 Briargrove Way – Paint Brick / Garage Doors.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee opined that there was a significant amount of high-quality, multi-color brick on the front elevation of the home, including the entryway. The brick installation includes vertical/arced soldier rows over the garage doors and main entry.
- ii. The Committee also noted that there are two minor stone columns at the entryway, as well as a brick retaining/landscaping wall (including vertical soldier row to match the architectural feature of the home) on, at least, the front/right side of the home. No information was provided on the treatment of these brick elements.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
-

K. 10246 Cherryhurst Lane – Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee opined that the proposal was for the "heavy/darker" color to be on the upper elements, which doesn't provide an architectural balance. To "anchor" the structure, the "heavy/darker" color must be on the lower elements.
- ii. Although the Committee understands the applicant's intent to provide a "faux wood detail," they felt the "Rockwood Terracotta" second accent color did not provide this element and would not be aesthetically pleasing.

b. ACTION:

- i. Motion (by: JL, 2nd by: PC). **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

July 02, 2025

Page 6 of 6

L. 10755 Huntwick Cir – Trellis/Arbor.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

M. 10815 Wintersong – Pool.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

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.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. WB passed out the updated (June, 2025) Residential Improvement Guidelines and highlighted the clarifications that were made.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:44 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

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

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. There were several members in attendance at the July 16, 2025 meeting that were not in attendance at the July 2, 2025 meeting; however, there was a quorum (3 of 5) members present at both meetings to proceed with the approval of these Minutes.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
3	0	3

Notes: JR, RC, and DK were not present at the July 2, 2025 meeting and abstained from voting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**