

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: August 06, 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)	✓			
Dawn Keating (DK)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)	✓			
Jeff Rohr (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
Mr. & Mrs. Gregory **Woodward**, Homeowners (736 Huntington Dr)
Mr. Matthew **Lovejoy**, Homeowner (722 English Sparrow Tr)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

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

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: The abstaining members were not present at 07/16/2025 Meeting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 06, 2025

Page 2 of 6

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Two tribunals were held on July 7, 2025. Rulings were received on August 1, 2025.
 - a. ARC Conditional Approval re: Bee Hives (location). Appeal Granted.
 - b. ARC Denial of Front Yard Trellis/Gazebo. Appeal Denied.
- B. Three tribunals are scheduled for August 21, 2025. None are based on ARC Decisions, all are Covenant Control appeals.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **736 HUNTINGTON DRIVE** – Siding, Window, and Roof Replacement. Painting of Brick.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. The Committee was concerned with the quantity of standing seam metal roof proposed.
 - a. RIGs §2.63 notes "...limited applications only." Staff explained that the intent of §2.63 was to allow "accent areas" (e.g., over bay windows) to use this material, versus a primary roofing material.
 - ii. The Committee debated and agreed that limiting the standing seam metal roof to just the front patio roof, which could be considered an "accent area" with a "limited application," would be acceptable. The Committee also agreed that the roof over the garage must remain asphalt shingles.
 - iii. The Committee appreciated that the garage doors would be replaced with a wood tone version and painted to mimic wood tone. The Committee also appreciated that the various wood elements (e.g., garage doors, cladding on front porch columns, and accent strip above second floor window) all matched.
 - iv. The Committee was somewhat concerned with the dark scheme vis-à-vis other homes in the general vicinity; however, they felt the color palette was aesthetically pleasing. The Committee agrees that Rock Bottom (SW7062) is a suitable color for the brick paint.
 - v. The Committee was not concerned with the installation of vertical siding (as opposed to the horizontal siding currently used on the home).
 - vi. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Only the roof above the front patio may be converted to the standing seam metal material, the roof over the garage must remain asphalt shingle. All other proposed elements are approved as presented.
 - b. **ACTION:**
 - i. Motion (by: JL, 2nd by: PC) to **APPROVE, WITH CONDITIONS.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	1	0

Notes: The dissenting member found that the standing seam metal roof, as proposed, was acceptable.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

- B. **722 ENGLISH SPARROW TRAIL** – Re-Review of Patio Cover with Additional Information.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. The Committee was concerned with the nominal slope of the patio cover roof (shown as 0.25"/12" or 2%).
 - a. Typically, roofs over patios are at least 3"/12" slope; however, the Committee acknowledges that the nominal slope is necessary to maintain the existing "upper windows."
 - ii. The Committee was concerned about snow load on the nearly flat roof.
 - a. Staff noted a Building Permit from Douglas County was required for these improvements, and that the Building Department may look into this concern and require modifications to the design.
- b. **ACTION:**
 - i. Motion (by: JB, 2nd by: DK) to **APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 06, 2025

Page 3 of 6

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. 121 GROUSE PLACE – Decorative Fence Color.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee discussed the classification of this fence versus Board of Directors Resolution 18-06-02 and RIGs §2.30.D.3. Staff noted that Resolution 18-06-02 pertains "...to the staining of any homeowner's fencing or part of a fence facing a street...."
- ii. The Committee agreed that the fence must be stained in accordance with §2.30.D.3.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

B. 415 BEXLEY LANE – Removal and Replacement of Upper Deck.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee noted that the existing deck extends along the side of the home. Per §2.23, which requires consideration on a "case-by-case" basis.
 - a. Staff noted that there were easily accessible records to determine if the original decking was approved; however, it appears that this may have been an original build within the home since there is a sliding glass door leading to the upper deck on the side of the home.
- ii. The deck will be enlarged nominally (approximately 2"). It is believed this increase in width is due to the proposed materials being used. The intent is to remove and replace "in situ."

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	2	0

Notes: The dissenting members felt that the deck should not be allowed to be expanded and that it should not have been allowed on the side of the home.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

C. 1241 RIDDLEWOOD RD – Accessory Building/Shed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Two shed sizes were presented: 6'Wx12'Lx8'H and 6'Wx14'Lx8'H. The width and height are compliant with §2.2.B; however, both alternative lengths exceed the maximum of 10'.
 - a. The Committee noted that an 8'Wx10'L shed is allowed, which equates to 80 square-feet. A 6'Wx12'L shed equates to 72 square-feet (less than the allowable) and a 6'Wx14'L shed equates to 84 square-feet (more than the allowable).
- ii. The Committee was concerned with the 14' length because of potential conflicts with the existing basement window well and A/C Unit, but felt the 6'Wx12'L option would be acceptable.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION**. Installation of 6'Wx12'Lx8'H Shed.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

August 06, 2025

Page 4 of 6

D. 1854 GLENWOOD LANE – Lawn Ornament.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was very concerned with the use of what appears to be a dead tree of significant height as the "base" for the ornament.
- ii. The Committee recommends that the dead tree be removed to ensure safety and community aesthetics.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

E. 2276 GOLD DUST TRAIL – Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. After reviewing a "paint chip," the Committee felt that "Veiled Violet SW6268" had too much of a "lavender/light purple" undertone, which is not appropriate.
- ii. In contrast, the Committee felt that "Truly Taupe SW6038" or "Flexible Gray SW6010," as suggested by Staff, would be acceptable.
- iii. The Committee directed Staff to continue working with the homeowner to find a mutually acceptable color palette.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

F. 6995 PEREGRINE WAY – Landscaping and Home Improvement.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee is concerned with quantity of impervious materials proposed causing stormwater runoff on to adjoining properties (reference RIGs §3.3).
- ii. The Committee is very concerned with the lack of turf in the back yard – the nominal plan presented only shows a very small area of turf, the remainder being rock with nominal areas of wood mulch.
- iii. The Committee is concerned with the location of the sports court (proximity to neighbor) and, from the photographs provided, its use as a pickleball court. Sound mitigation will be necessary.
 - a. The Committee suggests Thuja occidentalis 'American Pillar' or Thuja (standish x plicata) 'Green Giant' (both available in major home improvement retailers such as Home Depot and Lowe's) in a minimum 3-gallon container, spaced approximately 4.5 feet on center, and centered in line between the existing fence/property line and sports court.
- iv. The Committee understands that there may also be improvements being made to the home under the deck in the backyard.
 - a. The Committee takes this opportunity to remind the homeowner that all improvements must be made for review and approval and looks forward to receiving a supplemental submittal addressing these improvements soon.
- v. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Installation of sound mitigating measures between the now existing sports court and the fence/property line. Suggested measure provided above. No lighting fixture(s) may be attached to the basketball backboard.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 06, 2025

Page 5 of 6

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	1

Notes: The dissenting member is the District Delegate for this address.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

G. **8642 MALLARD PLACE** – Deck Cover.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was unable to discern the design intent from the graphics provided. Questions arose about how the various roof elements on the sides will interact. More details are required.
- ii. The Committee is not in favor of the use of "peel and stick granulated rolled roofing." Asphalt shingles, matching the color and pattern of the home, will be required.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JL) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL** (no additional fee to be assessed).

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

H. **10579 WAGON BOX CIRCLE** – Decorative Front Yard Fencing.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that per §2.30.E.1, only two-rail fences are allowed in the front yard. Additionally, per §2.30.E.3, decorative wrought iron fence is not allowed.
- ii. The Committee discussed that often these small fences (18" tall) are installed to protect new lawns on a temporary basis; however, temporary often becomes permanent and the fencing falls into disrepair.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

I. **10665 CLIFFROSE WAY** – Over Garage Arbor.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned with the conflict the over-garage arbor may have with the address placard and the light sconces.
- ii. Several members were concerned with the improvement being "out of place" on the home – not matching or aesthetically pleasing to the remainder of the architecture.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	3	0

Notes: The dissenting members felt the improvement was not appropriate for the home.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 06, 2025

Page 6 of 6

J. 10833 HEATHERTON CIRCLE – Backyard Concrete.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was very concerned with the extent of concrete planned, virtually the entire side yards and most of the rear yard.
- ii. The Committee was very concerned with the additional stormwater runoff caused by the excessive concrete and the elimination of mitigating impervious (e.g., landscaped) area.
- iii. The Committee suggests that instead of concrete pavement on the side yards, that steppingstones (either flagstone or faux concrete or similar) be used.
- iv. Based on the "Priority Listing" provided by the applicant, the Committee provides the following approval conditions:
 - a. Area Priority 1:
 - i. **DENIED** for concrete – consider steppingstones.
 - b. Area Priority 2:
 - i. **PARTIAL APPROVAL**. The 4'x8' landing at the bottom of the stairs may be concrete as proposed; however, the area to the right and left of the landing may not be concrete. Consider steppingstones or other landscape materials in these areas.
 - c. Area Priority 3:
 - i. **DENIED** for concrete – consider steppingstones.
 - d. Area Priority 4:
 - i. **APPROVED** for concrete from the home's entryway patio to the gate only. Ensure stormwater runoff is not directed onto your neighbor's property.
 - e. Area Priority 5:
 - i. **APPROVED** for concrete under the limits of the deck above only.
- v. **APPROVAL CONDITION**. Reference ¶J.A.4.a through ¶J.A.4.e, above.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
9	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:09 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the August 20, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.