

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 15, 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)	✓			
Kate Landauer (KL)			✓	
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)	✓			
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓			Attended via ZOOM, arrived prior to §I.
Open				
	6	0	2	

Also in attendance:

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

Jayma **Wessling** (JW), HRCA: Residential Improvement Coordinator

Ginnie **Larson** (GL), Resident (6255 Cornell Ct)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **October 01, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2025

Page 2 of 5

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Two Tribunals are scheduled for Thursday – October 16th. One is for an ARC Denial of Elevated (above roof line) deck.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **6255 Cornell Ct** – Decorative Fence.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The homeowner (GL) presented the following to the Committee:
 - a. The request is to install a 5-foot split-rail privacy fence with wire mesh along the southern edge of the front yard, following the alignment shown in the submittal. The proposed design would utilize steel postmasters disguised as wood with 2×6 rails and 2×4 wire.
 - b. GL explained that the intent is to establish a visual and sound barrier between her front porch and the adjacent property, where the neighbors have installed a seating area in the gravel side-yard, directly along the shared property line.
 - c. GL described ongoing privacy, noise, and property-maintenance concerns, noting that conversations and children's play from the neighboring seating area are audible inside their home and that guests frequently gather within feet of their front porch.
 - d. GL further reported trampling and damage to landscaping along the property line caused by recreational activity.
 - e. The proposed fence, GL explained, would provide screening, noise mitigation, and protection for the small front yard space while maintaining as much open grass area as possible within her cul-de-sac lot.
- i. The Committee discussed the use of 3-rail (and requested) versus 2-rail (typical for front/side yard applications) fence. The Committee considered allowing 3-rail for a portion of the fenceline (closest to the neighbor's improvement) and then transitioning to 2-rail. It was agreed that, unlike solid screen fencing, transition split-rail fence may be impractical.
- ii. The Committee was concerned about the 3-rail fence (5' height) extending all the way to the back of walk, as proposed.
- iii. During the meeting, and relying on a Google Maps aerial image, the Committee determined that the distance from the existing shared fence corner near the home to the back of walk was approximately 45'.
- iv. The Committee discussed the potential for a limited privacy fence consistent with the RIGs. Members agreed that a 3-rail design, constructed in accordance with RIGs Figure 3 (substituting 6×6 rough-sawn cedar posts with steel postmasters disguised as wood) could provide an appropriate balance between screening and visual openness. The Committee further noted that the fence should extend no more than 30 feet from the existing shared fence corner or no closer than 15 feet from the back of walk, whichever results in the shorter extension, to maintain conformity with front-yard sight-line and setback principles.
- ii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Fence shall be a 3-rail design per RIGs Figure 3, with 6×6 cedar posts substituted by steel postmasters disguised as wood. Alignment may follow the shared property line and extend a maximum of 30 feet from the existing shared fence corner or terminate no closer than 15 feet from the back of walk, whichever results in the shorter extension

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2025

Page 3 of 5

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1105 Mulberry Ln – Shed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

B. 3155 Windridge Cir – Little Bakery.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their research to the Committee, as follows:

- a. While the applicant's proposal is conceptually similar to a "Little Free Library," it differs in purpose and function, as it involves sharing home-baked goods with neighbors—potentially constituting the public distribution of food—and therefore raises health, wildlife, and regulatory considerations.
 - a. Under Colorado's Cottage Foods Act, non-potentially hazardous baked goods (breads, cookies, fruit pies without cream fillings) may be prepared and shared from a home kitchen if properly labeled and handled.
 - b. Douglas County Environmental Health generally regulates any public food distribution, even if no money changes hands. There is no known precedent for an unmonitored "free bakery" within a residential neighborhood.
- b. Placement of a semi-permanent box visible from the street may fall under RIG §2. 2 (Accessory Structures) and CommDec §9.2 or §9.3 (Nuisance) if the structure or its contents generate odor, pest, or visual impacts.
- c. While it is possible to frame an "approve with conditions" option, the enforcement practicality is limited—for example, verifying that food is removed the same day or that labeling and packaging remain compliant would require continual monitoring beyond HRCA's scope.

- ii. The Committee expressed significant concern regarding the public distribution of baked goods without confirmation of required permitting from the appropriate regulatory agency (e.g., Douglas County Environmental Health). Members also noted potential issues related to attracting wildlife and the overall practicality of enforcement by HRCA. The Committee further observed that the applicant had not provided any research or permitting documentation to support the proposal.
- iii. The Committee requested that Staff coordinate with the applicant to obtain and submit findings of fact or written determinations from the applicable governmental entities (e.g., Douglas County Environmental Health) regarding any permitting or regulatory requirements associated with the intended use.
- iv. The Committee agreed to table the item pending receipt and review of the requested information. If sufficient information is not received within 29 days of the date of the submittal (by October 29, 2025), Staff is required to deny the application.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: CR, 2nd by: PC) to **TABLE DECISION, RESUBMITTAL REQUIRED**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2025

Page 4 of 5

C. 3644 Seramonte Dr – Screening.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee, citing RIGs §2.30.F.4, expressed strong opposition to the current installation of the two synthetic foliage screening panels affixed to and extending above the existing fence. The Committee directed that these elements be removed within a reasonable timeframe, as determined by Staff.
- ii. The Committee noted that the alternative presented by the applicant—Outdoor Cedar Privacy Screen, 38.5 in. W x 72.8 in. H Natural Wood Fence Panel by Esiloo—would generally be acceptable; however, members were not in favor of the proposed two-foot lattice extension above the screen. As referenced in RIGs §2.30.F.4, lattice is not considered a durable material, weathers poorly, and often becomes a maintenance nuisance.
- iii. The Committee indicated it would support a similar privacy screen product extending to the full requested height (a maximum of 24 in. above the existing privacy fence, or 96 in. above ground level, whichever is less) and deferred to Staff for review and approval of a substitute submittal consistent with these parameters.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. 8555 Meadow Creek Dr – Swimming Pool.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The Committee discussed the location of the proposed pool equipment, which is currently shown in the northwest corner of the property, and expressed concern regarding its proximity to the neighboring home. Members agreed that relocating the equipment along the rear (northern) property line, near the northeast corner of the proposed pool, would help mitigate operational sound.
- ii. A Member was concerned with the placement of the pool itself and recommended that it be shifted slightly to the south and east to increase separation from the neighboring property at the northwest corner. Other members did not agree with this concern.
- iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Pool equipment and any associated enclosure shall be relocated along the rear (northern) property line near the northeast corner of the proposed pool, consistent with the Committee's discussion.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	1	0

Notes: Dissenting opinion was that the location of the pool too close to the neighboring property.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2025

Page 5 of 5

E. **9108 Fox Fire Way** – Patio Railing.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. The applicant explained to Staff that the proposed fencing around the front patio is intended to create an enclosed and secure outdoor area for an aging parent who suffers from dementia, allowing them to safely enjoy time outside. Although a formal request for reasonable accommodation was not submitted, Staff recommended that the Committee consider the application under that context.
- ii. The Committee discussed the proposed two-rail split-rail fence with welded mesh infill and 2×6 top rail, noting that it would be installed atop the newly approved front patio. One member expressed concern regarding the use of welded mesh, preferring a design featuring vertical metal spindles for a more traditional appearance. Other members, however, felt that the mesh was compatible with the home's architectural style and echoed the grid pattern of the existing window mullions.
- iii. The Committee agreed that the proposed materials and design were generally appropriate given the stated purpose and the limited height and location of the enclosure.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	1	0

Notes: Dissenting opinion was not in support of the use of welded mesh, citing concerns that the material was inconsistent with the community's architectural character and less visually compatible than a vertical spindle design.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:30 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the November 05, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Noting of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.