

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: December 03, 2025

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 **5:37 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)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
Russell Clark (RC)	✓			
Patrick Gallagher (PG)	✓			
Kate Landauer (KL)	✓			Attended via ZOOM, Arrived at §V.A
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)	✓			
Jeff Rohr (JR)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
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 **November 19, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. Nothing of consequence.

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 11/19/2025 ARC Meeting; KL was not in attendance during review.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

December 03, 2025

Page 2 of 4

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Three Tribunals were held in November.
 - a. One was for an ARC Denial (Garage Door) and one was for an ARC Conditional Approval (extent of driveway expansion). Both were resolved during the tribunal, and a memorandum of understanding was issued.
 - b. One was regarding an ARC Conditional Approval (length of three-rail fence along side of front yard). A Ruling for this issue has not been issued yet.
- B. Two Tribunals are scheduled for December.
 - a. One is regarding an ARC Conditional Approval (fence v. retaining wall) and one is regarding a Notice of Violation (home painting required).

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. None scheduled.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **9769 Westbury** – Soffit Lighting.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
 - ii. The Committee was concerned if the installation was in zones.
 - a. PC noted that the only way Jellyfish lighting is installed is in zones.
 - iii. Photographic evidence shows that the home, including the illuminated handrails, can have "reduced illumination" (e.g., one out of every four LEDs).

APPROVAL CONDITION. That the handrail must utilize the "reduced illumination" (e.g., one out of every four LEDs) setting at all times.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

-
- B. **10146 Briargrove Way** – Sport Court.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
 - ii. A member questioned if netting behind the backboard was proposed. The Committee agreed that there was existing landscaping between the backboard and the fence/property line and that netting may be more intrusive than the backboard.

- b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

-
- C. **10232 Charissglen Cir** – Paint.

- a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
 - ii. The Committee felt the SW 7069: Iron Ore wasn't that different than the SW 7520: Espresso used on the sample home discussed by the homeowner in their application.
 - a. Staff noted that the difference was the "brown undertones" of the SW 7520: Espresso versus the "black/grey undertones" of the SW 7069: Iron Ore.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

December 03, 2025

Page 3 of 4

- b. Staff also noted that a previous application to use SW 7069: Iron Ore was "pulled" by the homeowner because, based on Staff's comments (heat absorption and reflection, and the possibility of more frequent repainting). The intent of the previous application was to use the house as a "test case," since the SW 7069: Iron Ore had never been approved in the past.
- iii. In reviewing the elevations of the home, the Committee felt that a mitigating factor is that there weren't "large expanses" of wall. The front elevation had a minimal area of wall that would be painted. The rear elevation includes a covered patio, so the wall area is "broken up" by the roof of the patio. The side elevations, although large in area, are "shadowed" by the neighboring homes.
- iv. The Committee felt that this home would be a good "test case" to see if this paint color is something that should be included in future "approval paint color" listing.
 - a. As a condition to the "test case," the Committee directed staff to ensure the homeowner knows that this color may not be approved again and that future requests to paint the home the same color may, at the Committee's discretion, be denied

APPROVAL CONDITION. That this approved is considered a "test case" and that this color may not be approved in the future.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	3	0

Notes: The dissenting opinion was that Iron Ore was too dark and had never been approved in the past.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. **10322 Ravenswood Dr** – Soffit Lighting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. A member of the Committee was concerned that the system could not be painted the color of the soffit, as is required by the RIGs.
 - a. The Committee discussed the appropriate color. The majority agreed that it should be black, feeling that this color would "hide" the system better in the shadows of the soffit, which is the intent of "paint to match." The majority of the Committee also agreed that the equipment must be installed against the backside of the fascia board.
- iii. The Committee was concerned that the information provided by the applicant showed both a style that is like what's approvable (individual LED elements, spaced at least 9" apart) and a "continuous LED rope."
 - b. Staff confirmed that the application is for the system that has individual LED elements, spaced at least 9" apart.

APPROVAL CONDITION. The black track option must be used on the individual LED system, and the system must be installed with the LEDs facing toward the ground (i.e., vertically down) and placed against the backside of the soffit fascia board.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	1	0

Notes: Dissenting opinion is that the RIGs require the track to be painted the same color as the soffit and that allowing a black or white track will make it more visible.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. Staff reminded the ARC about the upcoming Volunteer Appreciation Dinner scheduled for Tuesday, December 9th at 6:00 P.M. in the Wildcat Auditorium at the Southridge Recreation Center.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

December 03, 2025

Page 4 of 4

- B. Staff wished the ARC a Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah, and a Happy New Year and reminded the ARC that the next regularly scheduled meeting will be on Wednesday, January 7, 2026.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:32 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the January 7, 2026 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. None.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: RC, 2nd by: PC) to **Approve as Presented.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**