

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: August 20, 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 **5:31 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
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

Mr. Aaron **Rhodes**, Homeowner (9741 Adelaide Ct) via ZOOM

Ms. Alexandra **Sabin** & Mr. Christopher **Williams**, Homeowners (9581 Painted Canyon Cir)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **August 06, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:** Not Applicable.

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 2 of 7

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three tribunals are scheduled for August 21, 2025. None are based on ARC Decisions, all are Covenant Control appeals.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **9741 ADELAIDE CT** (Rhodes) – Side Yard Concrete.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned that the provided plans show an offset from the side yard fences of only 6", versus the 2' that is typically provided to ensure stormwater runoff is controlled and doesn't adversely affect neighboring properties.
- ii. The Committee suggested that the homeowner either add a curb head along the edge of the concrete parallel to the fence line/property line to direct runoff to the front or rear yard, depending on which way the grade fell (the homeowner noted that the natural grade was from front to rear), or that the edge of the concrete maintain a 2' separation from the fence line/property line. The homeowner was amenable to both options.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Homeowner to review the two options (6" separation with installation of curb head or 2' separation) and determine which works best for him.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

-
- B. **9581 PAINTED CANYON CIR** (Williams) – Pergola and Dog Run.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned with the "floating corner" of the pergola at the inside corner defined by the home and the extended width garage. The homeowner noted that a column couldn't be added in this area because of the existing concrete ground surface and the proximity to the existing "doggy door." The Committee suggested that a joist hanger, at a minimum, be installed on the garage wall face to provide support for the pergola joist in this corner. The homeowner was amenable to that suggestion.
- ii. The Committee discussed the extent of the pergola and decided that it should stop at the rear wall plane of the garage instead of continuing to the front fence. This was to ensure the improvement was screened from visibility from the front yard. The homeowner was amenable to this restriction.
- iii. The Committee recommended that the homeowner discuss this improvement with their neighbor; however, an "approval" from the neighbor was not required as part of the Committee's decision.
- iv. The Committee reminded the homeowner to be cognizant of the location of the vertical support columns along the fence line / property line to ensure the pergola roof support and structure does not encroach onto the neighbor's property.
- v. **APPROVAL CONDITIONS.** The homeowner should consider including a joist hanger (or similar) support for the corner of the pergola defined by the home and the extended width garage. The homeowner will revise their design (no resubmittal is required) to end the pergola at the rear wall of the garage.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 3 of 7

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. **751 CHADWICK CT** – ColoradoScape.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned with the large amount of rock (reference RIGs §2.44.C, §2.94.B and §3.9). The Committee was also concerned with the lack of visual interest (minimal plantings, lacks four-season colors).
- ii. The Committee recommends that the homeowner review the six "pre-approved" ColoradoScape Design Solutions provided in the RIGs and reach out to Staff for suggestions on appropriate planting species, etcetera.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

B. **793 WALDEN CT** – Deck & Turf.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee took no exceptions to the planned artificial turf or concrete expansion.
- ii. The Committee acknowledges that the "split-level" architectural design of the home creates a unique challenge for appropriate decking; however, they were very concerned with the "upper deck." Although the deck appears to be a replacement of the pergola for the lower level, it extends vertically and horizontally beyond the roof of the home and appears to extend into an existing utility easement, which may be prohibited by the easement holder.
- iii. The Committee was also concerned that there are no stairs from either the "mid-level deck" at the existing sliding door, or the new "upper deck," down to ground level. The stairs shown on the drawings only provide access from the proposed "mid-level deck" to the "upper deck."
- iv. The Committee would consider a resubmittal that does not include the "upper deck," but does include an expansion of the "mid-level deck," including stairs to the existing ground level.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 4 of 7

C. 1822 MOUNTAIN MAPLE AVE – Birdhouse Camera.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee was very concerned with the proposed location of this improvement, in the front yard (reference RIGs 2.11).
- ii. The Committee noted that if this improvement was proposed in the back yard, and that the camera was pointed away from adjoining properties (e.g., into the middle of the backyard or towards the homeowner's house), that it would be acceptable.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

D. 2721 CACTUS BLUFF – Privacy Screen.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee noticed that there is an existing 5' wide (side yard) and 8' wide (rear yard) utility easement that encumber this lot. The homeowner's proposal is to add a privacy screen within these easements. The Committee was concerned that no proof of acceptance of the improvement by the easement holder was provided.
- ii. The Committee was concerned with the use of latticework at the screening element above the existing fence line (reference: RIGs §2.43). The Committee recommends that either vertical or horizontal wooden slats be used in lieu of the latticework.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION**. In re: Location. Either the homeowner provide proof of location acceptance by the easement holder, or the privacy screen be located outside the limits of the easement. In re: Materials. Latticework may not be used, consider either vertical or horizontal wood slats that are complimentary to the privacy screen materials.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

E. 4742 BLUEGATE DR – Garage Door Color.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 5 of 7

F. 9002 MARIBOU CT – Decorative Fence.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Proposed fence design is compliant with RIGs §2.30.E.1.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** The fence will need to be stained Highlands Ranch Fence Brown per §2.30.D.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

G. 9222 SUGARSTONE CIR – Garage Door & Pedestrian Door.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned with the visual cohesion between the proposed garage door and proposed front door – the window patterns were different, with the front door having too much conflicting glass patterns.
- ii. The Committee was concerned with the color "mismatch" between the proposed garage door/proposed front door and other elements of the home.
- iii. The Committee found that the proposal was not aesthetically pleasing nor fitting with the surrounds.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

H. 9226 IRONWOOD – Fence.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the existing double-fencing is an existing non-compliant condition, of no fault of the applicant.
 - a. When the original privacy fence was installed, the existing two-rail fence was supposed to be removed by the neighbor; however, the neighbor did not participate.
 - b. At the time, there was a "fence ownership" dispute between the two neighbors that was not resolved.
- ii. The Committee felt that the homeowner was entitled to ensuring their privacy that the installation of the proposed privacy fence, butted up against the existing two-rail fence, wouldn't create the "no man's land" that is a concern with "double fencing."
 - a. The Committee acknowledge that approving this fence conflicts with RIGs §2.30.B.3.f, which notes "no more than one fence may be constructed on a property line."
 - b. The Committee, as authorized by §10.21 of the Community Declaration, waives this requirement of the RIGs.
- iii. The Committee was concerned with the existing transitional fence piece that was installed (as required) between the 6' privacy fence and the 3' two-rail fence. The Committee suggested the fence panel used for the transition be removed and replaced with full height privacy fence so there isn't a "dip" in the fence line.
- iv. The Committee acknowledges that the "finished side" of the fence will be internal to the applicant's property.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 6 of 7

- v. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Remove the existing "height transitional fence panel" and replace with full height privacy fence matching the proposed fence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

I. **10070 KINGSTON CT** – Fence Screen.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned with the design creating a double-fence along the property line, which is not allowed per RIGs §2.30.B.3.f, because of the proposed "gap" between the two fence, because the proposed fencing closed (with a gate) at the front yard and connected to the rear yard fence. This creates a "strip of land" along the property line that may fall into disrepair.
- ii. In lieu of the proposed fencing, 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 the patio area. As the landscaping matures, it will provide screening

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

J. **10087 CHARISSGLEN CT** – Deck & Cover.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

K. **10209 LAUREN CT** – ColoradoScape.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee appreciates the use of larger boulders; however, they were concerned with the monotonic use of smaller stones (reference RIGs §2.44.C, §2.94.B and §3.9).
- ii. The Committee was also concerned with the lack of visual interest (minimal plantings, lacks four-season colors).
- iii. The Committee recommends that the homeowner review the six "pre-approved" ColoradoScape Design Solutions provided in the RIGs and reach out to Staff for suggestions on appropriate planting species, etcetera.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2025

Page 7 of 7

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	0	1

Notes: Abstainer noted that they will be assisting the homeowner with the design.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:15 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the September 03, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	0

Notes: One member arrived at the 09/03/2025 meeting after the review of the minutes. Member noted they took no exceptions to the minutes (6-0-0).

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**