

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 03, 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 **5:32 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)	✓			Arrived during §V.A.
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

Caleb **Cameron** (CC), HRCA: Residential Improvement Specialist

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

Jim **Creaser**, Homeowner/Observer (9462 Pendleton Drive), via: ZOOM

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **August 20, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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 after the review of the minutes. Member noted that they took no exceptions to the minutes as presented (6-0-0).

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 03, 2025

Page 2 of 4

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three tribunals were held on August 21, 2025. None are based on ARC Decisions, all are Covenant Compliance appeals.
- a. One included a negotiated agreement during the Tribunal. Rulings on the other two are expected this week.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **10754 Middlebury Way** – Paint.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Venkata Raghavan Durgempudi (homeowner) was expected to present but later called JW and noted that he could not attend.
- ii. JW noted that the requested trim and accent colors were common and acceptable; however, the requested base color is not one she'd seen before. She noted that she presented alternative, but similar colors to the homeowner; however, the homeowner wouldn't engage. The homeowner requested that their preferred color be brought before the Committee for review.
- iii. The Committee agreed with JW that the preferred trim and accent colors were acceptable.
- iv. The Committee reviewed an 18"+ square paint sample prepared by JW. There was extensive discussion on the brightness of the preferred color, with the consensus being that the preferred color was too bright.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	1	0

Notes: Dissenting member felt the preferred body color was acceptable.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **107 Falcon Hills Drive** – Landscaping and Exterior Improvements.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. JW noted that she brought this application to the Committee because of the extent of improvements proposed. She noted that the submittal included painting of the home and extensive landscaping, with the colors proposed being common and acceptable and the landscaping palette of materials being professionally selected and acceptable. The Committee agreed.
- ii. The Committee questioned the solid-strip LED lighting above the garage door "eyebrow;" however, the consensus was that the lighting in this nominal area met the intent of RIGs §2.44.E (downward facing, under soffit, in a track).

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

September 03, 2025

Page 3 of 4

B. 500 Emberglow Lane – Pool (Home Not Yet Built)

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was concerned that this is currently an undeveloped lot with no primary (e.g., house) structure. Without the primary structure, this improvement would be a non-compliant accessory use.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Primary structure (e.g., house) must be constructed before or at the same time as this proposed improvement.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. 8963 Round Rock – Pergola.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- iii. The Committee was concerned with the quantity of lattice proposed, and its durability and longevity. The Committee was also concerned with the use of the shade sail for a roof, especially for snow loads. Lastly, the Committee was concerned with the minimal height of the structure.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. 9271 Camelback St – Xeriscape (ColoradoScape)/Artificial Turf.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. JW explained that this submittal was made based on a Covenant Compliance Action ("Submittal Required") because the artificial turf was observed on the driveway. This review is for a "post installation" approval since much of the work in the backyard is already complete.
- ii. The Committee was concerned with the extent of mulch area in the backyard (plans provided show 63% of coverage, RIGs §3.15 notes a maximum of 50% is allowed in rear yards). The Committee was discouraged that there were no plantings proposed within this large mulched area to provide greater visual interest. To offset the overage in mulch area, several four-season plantings (e.g., mugo pines, etc...) need to be included. Options also include installation of large boulders to provide visual interest.
- iii. The Committee noted that the photographs provided of the work completed to date don't match the nominal plans provided. The Committee understood that the plans were conceptual; however, more detail is required on the plans for the Committee's review.
- iv. The Committee was concerned with the large sand area at the rear corner of the home. The Committee acknowledged that this may be a "works in progress;" however, the plans don't clearly delineate what's proposed for this area.
- v. The Committee took no exceptions to the artificial turf (type or quantity) that was installed.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

September 03, 2025

Page 4 of 4

- vi. The Committee is requesting the submittal of a more detailed and substantial plan that shows what is proposed, including plantings within the large mulch area.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:06 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the September 17, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	3

Notes: Abstentions are from members that were not present at the meeting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**