

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 01, 2024

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 **5:29 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)	✓			
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)	✓			
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓			
Open				
	8	0	0	

Also in attendance:

Woody **Bryant** (WB), HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services
Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Improvement Coordinator
Caleb **Cameron** (CC), HRCA: CIS Specialist

NOTE: An individual attempted to connect via ZOOM; however, connection was unsuccessful and not reattempted.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **September 17, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	0	1

Notes: CR was not in attendance at the 09/17/2025 ARC Meeting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 01, 2025

Page 2 of 4

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. ARC Denial (08/06/2025) of miscellaneous back yard and side yard concrete areas. Memorandum of Resolution issued by Tribunal Officer.
- a. The homeowner and the Association came to an agreement that the concrete areas would be modified to be compliant with the RIGs. A variance to allow the concrete to encroach into the 2' setback requirement was allowed specifically around the existing air conditioning unit.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None scheduled.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **651 Emberglow** – Addition.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The Committee was pleased that the proposed home materials matched and were consistent with the existing home materials.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

-
- B. **2667 Foothills Canyon Ct** – Driveway Expansion and Walkway.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the driveway expansion was based on an ADA request. Although that doesn't dictate that an approval of the request must be granted in full, reasonable accommodation must be granted.
- ii. The Committee was concerned about the extent of the driveway expansion on the left side. The proposal has a driveway extending (approximately 6.5') to the property line. The RIGs (§2.28) note that driveways "...may not extend closer than two-feet to adjacent property line."
- a. The Committee agreed that an expansion four feet (4') from the edge of the existing driveway would provide a reasonable ADA expansion.
- iii. The Committee was very concerned about the extent of the driveway expansion on the right side of the driveway. The proposal has the driveway extending from the edge of the walkway path (leading to the front of the home) down to the public sidewalk.
- a. The Committee agreed that an expansion of the driveway on the right side that lines up with the expansion joint in the sidewalk (approximately six feet (6') from the edge of the existing driveway) and runs parallel to the right side of the driveway to the point of connection with the walkway along the front of the home would provide a reasonable ADA expansion.
- iv. The Committee acknowledges that RIGs §2.28 allows up to a maximum additional driveway width of nine feet (9'), and that this accommodation may exceed that allowance slightly.
- v. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Driveway (Left) Expansion may extend 4' from edge of existing driveway; Driveway (Right) Expansion may extend ±6' from edge of existing driveway (align expansion with existing expansion joint in public sidewalk).

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 01, 2025

Page 3 of 4

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. **3016 Greensborough** – Enclosure and Updates.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the building envelope did not extend into any setbacks.
- ii. The reason the project was brought in before the Committee was due to the scope of the proposed work.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. **9661 Mountain Daisy Way** – Retaining Walls.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted the following to the Committee:
- The homeowner initially stated that they contacted Douglas County and were informed that a permit was not required.
 - Staff feels the homeowner may not have accurately described their construction intent when seeking that “no permit required” response from the Douglas County Building Department.
 - Based on how the retaining wall appears to be constructed, staff believes a permit would be required. This belief is based on the following:
 - Although each individual tier may be less than four feet in height (as noted in the homeowner’s submittal), when tiers are spaced horizontally less than twice the height of the lower wall (as appears to be the case here), the multi-tier retaining wall is structurally considered a single wall.
 - Under those conditions, engineered construction drawings and a building permit from Douglas County are typically required.
 - Staff contacted the Douglas County Building Department to share our findings and concerns. The Building Department confirmed that this type of construction would require a permit, and Rick Miller, Building Supervisor, indicated that an inspector would be dispatched to review the work.
 - A review of the Douglas County Building Division’s Online Services confirms that no permit application has been submitted, and no permit has been issued for this construction.
- ii. The Committee was concerned about the home’s foundation stem wall being exposed (stem wall no longer extending below frost line) and the surcharge loading of the garage of the wall system.
- iii. The Committee was concerned about the placement of the proposed walkway along the fenceline. The existing walkway (prior to removal) was approximately 12” to 18” from the fenceline. RIG’s §2.28 require a two-foot offset.
- iv. The Committee directed staff to continue following up with Douglas County to determine appropriate County level review and permitting actions.
- a. **10/02/2025 UPDATE:** WB discussed this address with Mr. Miller of the Douglas County Building Department. Mr. Miller confirmed that his team did observe the improvement (09/30/2025) and is requiring the homeowner to provide engineered construction drawings for the retaining wall. Douglas County is also concerned with the exposed home foundation wall and the surcharge created by the existing garage. Mr. Miller’s team will be returning to the site today (10/02/2025) to get an update from the homeowner on the status of the design. DougCo may require the removal of the newly installed retaining wall(s) and a return of the ground slope to pre-construction conditions. To be determined.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 01, 2025

Page 4 of 4

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. **9960 Heatherwood Ln – Shed Addition.**

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted that the length of the current shed exceeded what was allowed; however, the Committee had previously approved a variance to allow the overage primarily based on the "sunken" location of the shed, in comparison to the public rights-of-way (walk-out basement with shed located on lower-level of property next to multi-tier retaining wall).
- ii. The Committee was concerned that the expansion of the shed would require a variance modification; however, the expansion design (not a full-height expansion, lean-to style) mitigated those concerns.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. Staff noted that Dawn **Keating** resigned from the ARC, effective today. Staff asked if any of the current members knew someone that would be a good fit for the Committee and, if so, that they encourage that person to apply.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:12 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the October 15, 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
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**