

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: July 16, 2025

Aspen/Vail Conference Room: Eastridge Recreation Center
9568 S University Blvd – Highlands Ranch, CO 80126



I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was **called to order** at **5:33 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)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
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
Daniel **Gregorich** (DG), Resident (9545 Painted Canyon Circle)
Jacob **Lebbs** (JL), Resident (10305 Bentwood Ct), via ZOOM

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **July 02, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- There were several members in attendance at this 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:**

- 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 07/02 Meeting at abstained.

- Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2025

Page 2 of 4

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three Tribunal Hearings were held on June 19, 2025 and the rulings were recently received.
 - a. May 7th ARC denial of paint colors (incorrect color match by painter, must use the approved color). Appeal DENIED.
 - b. May 27th ARC denial of soffit lighting due to a reasonable expectation to impacts to neighboring living spaces, nuisance glare. Appeal GRANTED.
 - i. HO provided written documentation from neighbors to the Tribunal Officer noting their support of this installation.
 - c. February 19th ARC denial for backyard artwork per RIGs §2.48. Appeal GRANTED.
- B. One Tribunal Hearing is scheduled for July 17, 2025.
 - a. June 4th ARC Conditional Approval regarding location of bee hives and June 18th ARC denial of Front Yard Trellis/Gazebo.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **9545 Painted Canyon Cir** – Front Patio & Retaining Wall.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. The homeowner (DG) was in attendance and provided a brief overview of what they would like to do:
 - a. Install an 8' deep by 6' wide concrete patio extension from the edge of their walkway; level the current rock landscape area by increasing the height of the timber retaining wall (approximately 12" to 18"); install several vertical live vegetation (e.g., Thuja occidentalis 'American Pillar' or Thuja standish x plicata) 'Green Giant' between the edge of the patio and the back edge of the extended retaining wall to provide screening.
 - ii. The ARC was concerned with increasing the height of the retaining wall where it parallels the return fence of the neighbor and the existing wing fence.
 - iii. The ARC was concerned with the structural stability of adding to the existing timber retaining wall, which appears to have existing lateral support (e.g., "deadmen") already installed. It was recommended to the homeowner that he ensure his contractor is aware the additional lateral support may be necessary to ensure stability.
 - iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** From the "plan north" edge of the patio to the existing return fence, the retaining wall and landscape rocked area must transition back to existing elevations.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

- B. **10305 Bentwood Ct** – Deck Replacements.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The homeowner (JL) was in attendance (via ZOOM) and provided a brief overview of what they would like to do:
 - a. Remove existing rear deck and side yard deck (including existing concrete cylinder foundations) and replace them with two new decks. Rear deck to be slightly different than that is shown on the plans: it will run the entire length of the back of the home and will no longer include the "bump in" at the one end. Further, the area will no longer include the exterior heating elements shown. This deck will be covered. The side deck will be like what exists; however, the ramping will be eliminated.
 - ii. WB noted that the modification to the rear deck (elimination of the "bump in") does not adversely affect setback and that the deck is still compliant.
 - iii. The ARC appreciated that the proposed materials and colors were complimentary to the home.
 - iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Homeowner to provide updated plans to HRCA reflecting the current design proposal.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2025

Page 3 of 4

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. **722 English Sparrow** – Addition.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Although the ARC had no concerns with the planned Kitchen Expansion, they found that the drawings provided were inadequate to review the patio(s). They had questions on the proposed materials, details, etc...
- ii. For example, the ARC questioned the "South Elevation" shown on Sheet A3 noting that it doesn't appear to reflect the patio cover shown on the elevation view on the bottom of the same page. The ARC was also concerned with the minimal slope (no information provided on drawings that defines the slope, in contrast, there is rise/run information provided for the kitchen expansion roof slope) proposed for the patio cover roof in this area, although they do acknowledge the two existing windows that may be the limiting factor to the roof slope (Section on Sheet A4).
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Submittal of additional information regarding the design, materials, details, etc. of the patios and how they will interact with the home.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

B. **2725 Greensborough Dr** – Fence Variance.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was not in favor of the "C" channel steel post on the outside surface of the fence, even though the homeowner noted that they would powder coat it "Highlands Ranch Fence Brown." This installation is contrary to Figure 1 in the RIGs.
- ii. The ARC has no concerns with the use of the proposed metal posts on the inside (hidden) side of the fence, understanding that an eight- or nine-foot metal post driven into the ground two or three feet may be necessary to provide the stability sought.
- iii. Several members noted that the existing 4"x4" post may have rotted just below the ground surface elevation and needs to be replaced with a new post.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2025

Page 4 of 4

C. 3193 Deer Creek – ColoradoScape.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The ARC was disappointed that no "live plant materials" were proposed, which is an instrumental part of ColoradoScape.
- ii. The ARC was concerned with the quantity of "Brown Wood Shredded Mulch" that was proposed, noting that the first significant wind would displace this material.
- iii. The proposal is not compliant with variance sections of the RIGs (e.g., §2.42: Landscaping, §2.94: ColoradoScape, and §3: Landscaping Requirements).

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

D. 3201 Spearwood Dr – Artificial Turf.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. The ARC requested that Staff review 6995 Peregrine Way – it appears that there is significant work occurring. Staff noted that a formal submittal was received; however, it was incomplete and that there have been conversations with the contractor about what is needed for a submittal. The contractor has been resistant to providing adequate information. Staff will elevate conversations to homeowner and will report back to the ARC.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:42 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the August 06, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	3

Notes: JB, PC, and CR abstained, not present at 07/16/2025 Meeting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.