

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: November 05, 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)	✓			Attended via ZOOM, Arrived @ §I
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

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **October 15, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	2

Notes: JB and KL were not present at the 10/15/2025 Meeting and Abstained from Voting.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 05, 2025

Page 2 of 5

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Two Tribunal Hearings were held on October 24, 2025.
- 9776 Burberry. This was an Appeal regarding a Notice of Violation (NOV) for painting aspects of the home that were not in compliance with the Approval. The NOV was upheld, and the homeowner was ordered to paint the home in accordance with the approval.
 - 793 Walden Ct. This was an Appeal regarding an ARC Denial (August 21, 2025) to replace an existing ground-level patio and pergola with an elevated deck structure. We are awaiting the ruling, expected by November 10, 2025.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. Nothing Scheduled.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **2044 Chesapeake Ln** – Paint Brick.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- The ARC was concerned with the elimination of the large expanse of multi-dimension/color brick on the garage face. They felt that the detailing and "depth" of the existing brick would be lost when painted.
- The ARC was not concerned with the requested colors (SW 6075 Garnet Grey for the base, SW 7503 Sticks and Stones for the trim, and SW 7048 Urban Bronze for the front door and fine trim).

APPROVAL CONDITION. Painting of the brick (SW 7031 Mega Greige) is denied.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- Motion **PASSES**.

- B. **3229 Chandon Ct** – Retaining Wall (NOTE: Shed shown on graphics is not part of this application)

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- The ARC expressed concern that constructing a 3.5-foot retaining wall behind the existing 6-foot cedar fence would diminish the fence's intended screening effect. The Committee also noted that the proposed wall would create a narrow space between the two structures that could be difficult to maintain.
- The ARC was concerned that the existing masonry block ("smooth face") retaining wall would not match the proposed block (Regal Stone Pro® Rockface), which is a "fractured face" block. The ARC appreciates the use of the proposed block.

APPROVAL CONDITION. Remove and replace the entire existing masonry block retaining wall with the proposed block (Regal Stone Pro® Rockface) block. Remove the existing 6' cedar side-yard privacy fence or relocate it to the top back edge of the retaining wall.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 05, 2025

Page 3 of 5

C. 5298 Cloverdale Cir – Patio and Walkway.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC noted that although the information provided was sufficient for a two-dimensional review, the three-dimensional aspects of the property were not addressed by the applicant. The Committee was specifically concerned with the following:
 - a. Elevation of the proposed patio in comparison to the stepped walkway. At what level is the proposed patio connecting to the two sets of steps that will be along the eastern edge?
 - b. How is the ground slope of the west side of the home addressed with the walkway, while maintaining the necessary two-foot separation to the property line/fence line?
 - c. Understanding that there is approximately 8.5' from the edge of the home to the property line and that there are three window wells (approximately 24" in width) along the western wall of the home, what is the intent for the proposed walk and window well conflict? Maintaining a 5' width around the 24" window wells will cause conflict in the required two-foot setback requirement.
- ii. The ARC expressed concern that the proposed 208± square-foot patio, occupying roughly 61% of the 340± square-foot front yard, would significantly reduce green space and detract from neighborhood aesthetics. The Committee indicated it may consider a smaller patio impacting less than 50% of the yard area.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. 6172 Willowmore Ct – Pergola.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff noted the following to the ARC:
 - a. The proposed covered pergola extends into the required rear-yard building setback by approximately 8 feet, 9 inches, resulting in an 11-foot, 3-inch setback where 20 feet is required by Plat. Douglas County Zoning Resolution (DCZR) §713.02 allows a covered or uncovered deck or porch to extend up to 6 feet into a required setback (Amended March 8, 2022). The Committee noted that a mitigating factor is the location of the encroachment along the rear setback, where the yard abuts open space rather than another residence.
 - b. Residential Improvement Guidelines (RIGs) §§2.23, 2.35, and 2.51 address roofing materials. The Committee discussed the proposed use of polycarbonate sheets in contrast to the requirement that roofing materials generally match the residence. However, §2.35 permits fabric coverings for gazebos, and notes that for pergolas, a determining factor is "whether the structure is complimentary to the exterior of the residence and how it fits into the home's elevations." The home's roof is a gray multi-dimensional asphalt shingle, and the applicant proposes a similar "solar gray" color for the polycarbonate feature."
- ii. The ARC expressed concern regarding the setback encroachment. The Committee agreed that if the applicant provides documentation from Douglas County confirming the encroachment is acceptable to Planning/Zoning, staff is authorized to amend the Committee's decision accordingly.
- iii. The Committee discussed the proposed polycarbonate roofing material at length. Some members questioned its long-term durability and preferred a traditional shingled roof matching the home, while others supported the applicant's intent to allow more light into the space. The Committee ultimately accepted the proposed material.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 05, 2025

Page 4 of 5

E. 9755 Dunning Cir – Fence.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff noted the following to the ARC:
 - a. This property is encumbered with a part of an 30' wide access easement (for the alley access, along the south and east sides) and a utility easement (8' wide, also along the south and east sides).
 - b. The proposed location of the fence conflicts with existing easements – the fence would be located within the 8' utility easement.
- ii. The ARC acknowledged Staff's concerns.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
-

F. 9863 Florence Pl – Storage Shed.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff noted the following to the ARC:
 - a. Size request exceeds RIGs §2.2 (8'x12'x9'-9" requested, 8'x10'x8'-6" allowed). Requires variance. As a mitigating point, the photographs provided shows mature landscaping as "screening" however, this landscaping exists in the neighbor's yard.
- ii. The ARC noted that the property abutting the rear yard appeared to be open space with some kind of small utility structure (property is owned by the Highlands Ranch Metro District).
- iii. The ARC **approved a variance** to allow the requested shed dimensions.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.
-

G. 9954 Hawthorne St – Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. The ARC expressed concern with the brightness and contrast of the proposed accent color, SW 9005 Coral Clay, for the shutters. The Committee agreed that this color would be acceptable for limited use on the front door, as proposed.
- ii. The ARC had no concerns with SW 2832 Colonial Revival Gray for the base or SW 6258 Tricorn Black for the trim.

APPROVAL CONDITION. SW 9005 Coral Clay is denied for the shutters and trim. SW 6258 Tricorn Black may be used for the trim.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 05, 2025

Page 5 of 5

H. **10559 Ridgecrest** – Wrought Iron Fence.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff noted the following to the ARC:
 - a. RIGs §2.30.E.3 allows wrought iron fencing; however, "highly ornamental wrought iron fence will not be approved." In the proposal, the wrought iron fence includes vertical pickets terminating in pressed spear finials.
- ii. The ARC was concerned with the vertical pickets terminate in pressed spear finials, as shown in several of the photographs provided by the applicant. The Committee noted that either a flat-top (or flush-top) style, or possibly a double-top rail, would be acceptable in lieu of the pressed spear finials.

APPROVAL CONDITION. Modification of design to utilize either a flat-top (or flush-top) style or a double-top rail, applicant's choice.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:43 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the November 19, 2025 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**