

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: November 19, 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)			✓	
Patricia Callies (PC)	✓			
Russell Clark (RC)	✓			
Patrick Gallagher (PG)		✓		
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)	✓			
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓			
Open				
	6	1	1	

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 **November 05, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing



HRCAonline.org

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2025

Page 2 of 6

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. 793 Walden Court (Replacement of Ground Level Patio & Pergola with Elevated Deck Structure).
 - a. Appeal was denied. ARC denial upheld.
- B. Upcoming Hearings (Scheduled for Thursday, November 20th):
 - a. 9222 Sugarstone Circle: ARC Denial for replacement of garage door & front pedestrian door that are not consistent with the aesthetic and design standards of the community.
 - b. 2667 Foothills Canon Court: ARC Conditional Approval of a proposed driveway expansion.
 - c. 6255 Cornell Court: ARC Conditional Approval of the length of three-rail fence in side/front yard.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None scheduled.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **9151 Roadrunner St** – Artificial Turf.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff Comments.
 - a. The homeowner proposes to replace the entire front yard (applicant notes 70% of the front yard area) with synthetic turf bordered by approximately 24-inches of river rock. While the photos show a neat installation, the design consists solely of artificial turf and decorative rock with no living plant material. Under the Residential Improvement Guidelines, front-yard landscaping must include a balance of living vegetation (§2.42 Landscaping), and ColoradoScape standards (§2.94) require that artificial turf—when used—be integrated into a broader landscape plan that includes live plants. The Guidelines do not permit full-yard front-lawn replacement with synthetic turf. A variance from the ARC will be necessary for the quantity of synthetic turf requested.
 - b. In addition, the wide 24-inch rock border exceeds the ARC's typical allowance unless tied to planting beds. The resulting design creates a "floating carpet" appearance that is inconsistent with ARC precedent for both landscaping and ColoradoScape applications.
 - c. Staff recommends Denial as Submitted, based on the absence of required living plant material (§2.42, §2.94) and the ARC's longstanding position that full-yard synthetic turf installations are not permitted in the front yard. A revised plan incorporating live vegetation, reduced turf area, and complete specifications may be resubmitted for further review.
- ii. The Committee felt that the right side (when looking at the house), with the existing large tree, was acceptable; however, the left side (when looking at the house) required some low maintenance/low water Coloradoscape plantings within the river rock border to provide the necessary "living plant material."
 - a. The Committee recommends that the homeowner review the "Rock Garden Xeriscape Design Solutions" within the RIGs for suitable plantings.
 - b. The Committee suggests installing a minimum of five (5) Colorado Blue Grama Grass or 'Boulder Blue' Blue Fescue in the river rock border parallel to the sidewalk and a minimum of five (5) Stipa Feather Grass or Blue Oat Grass within the river rock border that separates this homeowner's front yard from the neighbors.
 - c. The Committee agreed that not requiring live plantings in the rock border adjacent to the driveway was acceptable.
- iii. The Committee felt a variance to allow the excess (70% sought v. 50% allowed) synthetic turf would be acceptable if the recommended live materials were added.
- i. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** Installation of "living plant material" within the river rock border on the left (as you look at the home) side by no later than May 15, 2026.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
4	1	1

Notes: Dissenter felt there was too much turf (70% area versus 50% area and disagreed with providing a variance. Abstainer was personally familiar with the applicant.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2025

Page 3 of 6

B. 9232 Crestmore Way – Fence "Dog Window."

a. DISCUSSION:

i. Staff Comments.

- a. The homeowner requests permission to install a clear acrylic "dog window" (a domed viewing port) into the existing wood fence panel located on the return fence separating the rear/side yard from the front yard. While this type of product is not specifically referenced in the Residential Improvement Guidelines, several relevant provisions apply. Section 2.30 Fencing restricts any modification that alters the appearance, uniformity, or finished side of a fence without ARC approval, and explicitly prohibits attaching items to fencing that increase height, screening, or visual prominence—examples include lattice, wire mesh, and similar materials (§2.30.F.4–5). The proposed dome would require cutting a circular opening into a structural fence board and permanently affixing an exterior protrusion, altering both the structural integrity and aesthetic character of the fence.
- b. Section 2.42 Landscaping and the general aesthetic standards (Introduction §1.9) require improvements to be compatible with the established neighborhood appearance. ARC precedent has consistently treated non-standard ornamentation or novelty accessories mounted to fencing as inconsistent with the intended uniform look of wood fencing throughout Highlands Ranch. Additionally, the return fence is highly visible from the front yard and street, which elevates the aesthetic impact compared to interior-facing improvements. No submittal information was provided showing how the installation would maintain fence stability, avoid future maintenance issues, or conform to the finished-side requirement referenced in §2.30.F.1.
- c. Staff recommends Denial as Submitted, based on the modification's inconsistency with the fencing standards and prohibitions under §2.30 (particularly F.1, F.4, and F.5), the lack of structural and compatibility information required under §1.11, and the ARC's requirement that visible fencing maintain a uniform, finished appearance. A revised submittal is not recommended, as this type of fence alteration is incompatible with ARC standards.

ii. The Committee agreed with Staff's review comments.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	1

Notes: Abstainer was personally familiar with the applicant.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

C. 9834 Clifton St – Paint.

a. DISCUSSION:

i. Staff comments:

- a. The proposed base color, Sherwin-Williams SW 6439 Greenfield, is described by the manufacturer as an "intense dill green." The color's high saturation and strong chromatic presence make it significantly more vivid than the neutral and earth-toned palettes typically found within the surrounding neighborhood. Under §2.50, the ARC is directed to consider a color's compatibility with the home's architectural style, existing masonry or stone accents, roof color, and the overall visual context of the street. Staff notes that Greenfield's bold hue may result in the home appearing substantially more prominent within the streetscape, potentially disrupting the balanced and harmonious visual environment the Guidelines seek to maintain.
- b. Staff also noted that the trim and accent selections must work in concert with the base color to avoid exaggerated contrast or unintended visual harshness.

ii. The Committee agreed with Staff's review. The Committee also noted that had this color been originally submitted before being applied to the home, that it would have been denied. Submittal of revised colors is required by December 31, 2025 with the repainting completed not later than June 15, 2026.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2025

Page 4 of 6

D. 10111 Astorbrook Ln – Commercial Vehicle.

a. DISCUSSION:

i. Staff Comments.

- a. The homeowner requests permission for a tenant to park a fully marked commercial service van in the driveway. Section 2.19 (Commercial Vehicle(s)/Trailers) allows one commercial vehicle to be parked at a residence only if it meets the criteria for an “everyday drive” and only after ARC review. While the vehicle itself is a standard cargo van that could qualify as an everyday driver, the RIGs require commercial vehicles parked outside to have all work-related equipment removed, except for one standard toolbox (§2.19.A). This van carries a full ladder rack and extension ladder mounted on top, which exceeds the permitted level of attached equipment for driveway parking. In addition, the vehicle displays large, full-coverage commercial graphics on all sides. Under §2.19, vehicles with significant commercial logos or paint schemes require ARC approval and are considered based on curb-appeal impacts. This van’s graphics cover the majority of the side and rear panels and include reflective emergency-style striping on the back, making the visual impact more pronounced.
- b. Section 2.19 also prohibits trailers, buckets, booms, and work racks that materially alter the residential appearance of the vehicle or cannot be removed for daily use. The roof-mounted ladder rack is a permanent fixture and exceeds what the ARC has historically considered compatible with residential visibility standards. The combination of the ladder rack, highly visible equipment, and full-graphic commercial branding places the vehicle outside the allowances typically granted for an everyday driver under ARC precedent.
- c. Staff recommends Denial as Submitted, as the vehicle does not meet the requirements for parking a commercial vehicle at the property due to the mounted ladder/equipment and extensive commercial graphics (§2.19). If the ARC finds that the graphics are not extensive, Staff recommends an Approval with Conditions that all exterior work equipment (e.g., ladders) be removed daily.

ii. The Committee agreed that the graphics on the truck were not egregious.

iii. The Committee concluded that this vehicle was not considered an “emergency response vehicle” that had 24/7 response requirement and they agreed that they would prefer the vehicle to be parked in the driveway (versus the street), with the condition that the ladder (or any other equipment that was placed on the roof-rack) be removed when the vehicle was parked.

iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION.** All equipment that was placed on the roof-rack (e.g., ladders, etc.) be removed when the vehicle is parked.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	1	0

Notes: Dissenter felt the commercial vehicle should not be allowed to park in the driveway.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. 10235 Joseph Dr – Lighting.

a. DISCUSSION:

i. Staff Comments.

- a. The homeowner proposes installing a permanent lighting system beneath the front soffit. While §2.44 permits architectural downlighting installed within or under the soffit, the Guidelines require that permanent eave/trim lighting be designed so that components are minimally visible from the street, are downward-facing, have a minimum LED spacing of nine inches, do not appear as a continuous strip of light points, and present as traditional warm-white architectural lighting outside the holiday lighting period (§2.44.E). Based on the manufacturer’s cut sheet, the submitted system uses 12mm RGB diodes spaced every six inches in a continuous track. This design does not meet the required spacing, visibility, and appearance standards, and would result in a visible line of light nodes rather than the low-profile architectural illumination intended by the RIGs.
- b. Although the system can produce a warm-white appearance, the physical design of the product prevents it from operating as compliant architectural lighting for the majority of the year. The Guidelines also limit holiday lighting to the October 1–January 31 period and require that holiday lighting be temporary in nature (§2.44.G). While the system could be programmed to display holiday colors only during the allowed period, its permanent installation and visible pixel structure

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2025

Page 5 of 6

classify it as a decorative lighting system throughout the year rather than architectural downlighting. Current ARC precedent distinguishes low-visibility soffit downlighting from pixel-based linear systems, and the submitted design falls into the latter category.

- c. Staff recommends Denial as Submitted, as the product's physical design does not meet the appearance, spacing, or visibility standards for permanent eave/soffit lighting under §2.44.E and cannot be brought into compliance through programming or operating mode. A revised submittal using fixed warm-white architectural downlighting with concealed or minimally visible components may be reconsidered.

- ii. The Committee reviewed the sample equipment provided by the applicant and concluded that it was not compliant with the RIGs regarding minimum LED spacing (6" proposed v. 9" required) and that the LED's were exposed ("bubble type" v. "flat"), which would tend to direct the light in all directions versus down.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

F. **10277 Astorbrook Ln – Pool.**

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff Comments.

- a. The homeowner submitted a complete plan set for an in-ground pool installation. The submittal includes site plan, setbacks, equipment location, deck materials details, and cover details. Based on the materials provided, the proposed pool meets the requirements of §2.60 (Swimming Pools), including location within the rear yard, compliance with required setbacks, and placement of equipment behind the fence line. Staff found no conflicts with easements or drainage patterns based on the drawings submitted.
- b. Staff recommends Approval as Submitted, as the submittal meets the requirements of §2.60 and includes the necessary drawings and information for ARC review.

- ii. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. Last meeting of 2025 will be on December 3, 2025.
- B. HRCA Volunteer Appreciation Dinner on December 9, 2025 starting at 6:00 P.M. in the Wildcat Auditorium (Southridge Recreation Center, 4800 McArthur Ranch Rd).

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:23 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the December 03, 2025 Meeting.
 - a. **DISCUSSION:**
 - i. Nothing of consequence.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2025

Page 6 of 6

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	2

Notes: JB and PG abstained, not present at the 11/19/2025 Meeting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**