

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 07, 2026

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 **5:26 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)	✓			Arrived during §IV.A.
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

Robert **Strauss** (RS), HRCA District 116 Delegate (Observer)

Erik **Kolseth** (EK), Homeowner (re: §IV.A.)

Dominic **Anselmo** (DA), Homeowner (re: §V.A)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **December 03, 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 07, 2026

Page 2 of 5

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. Two Tribunals were scheduled for December: 3229 Chandon Ct (ARC Conditional Approval, Fence Relocation Requirement) and 10655 Chandon Place (NOV – Exterior Paint).
- 3229 Chandon Ct. The Homeowner's Appeal was Granted. Tribunal Officer opined that "The ARC's concern that the 'no man's land' between the two structures 'could be difficult to maintain' is nothing more than speculation."
 - 10655 Chandon Place. The Homeowner withdrew their Tribunal Hearing request. HRCA will proceed with enforcement actions for required home painting.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **2025 Chelsea Place** – Privacy Screening.

a. **DISCUSSION**

- Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- The Applicant (EK) presented his project.
- The Committee discussed the following:
 - The proposed decorative wood lattice is not a durable material and shouldn't be used. The Applicant noted that they weren't aware of long-term challenges with the material.
 - One member was very concerned with the Applicant's proposal of installing 48' of parallel fencing to the HRMD fencing along Venneford Rd. This member felt that it was not aesthetically pleasing.
 - The Committee felt that proposed fencing, compliant with RIGs FIGURE 1, should be limited to just around the dog enclosure (offset no more than one-foot from the edge of the enclosure) and should not extend the 48' across the backyard, as proposed. The Applicant was amiable to that suggestion.
 - The Committee felt it would be prudent to stain the installed fencing "Highlands Ranch Fence Brown" to match the existing HRMD TREX fencing. The Applicant was amiable to that suggestion.
 - The Committee asked the applicant if 60 days to complete the project was sufficient and the Applicant agreed.
 - The Applicant requested that the assessed \$200 NOV Fine be refunded. Staff noted that assessments of fines is an enforcement action, not subject to Committee discretion. However, understanding that the Committee is proceeding with a Conditional Approval, Staff would take this under advisement and proceed with a refund.

iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION(S):**

- Fencing shall be installed substantially in accordance with RIGs §2.30 (Fences) and RIGs FIGURE 1, offset less than one (1) foot outside the limits of the existing chain link fence dog enclosure and with a maximum height of seven (7) feet (to ensure the entire chain link fence dog enclosure is screened).
- The fencing shall be stained "Highlands Ranch Fence Brown."
- Work shall be completed within 60 days of this approval.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	1	0

Notes: Dissenting member feels that the interior fencing will not be aesthetically pleasing.

- Motion **PASSES**.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **3104 White Oak St** – Commercial Vehicle.

a. **DISCUSSION**

- Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- The Applicant (DA) was present to answer questions.
- The Committee discussed the following:
 - Members were concerned with the definition of "short-term" and felt that it could become long term.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

January 07, 2026

Page 3 of 5

- b. Several members asked why there was a need to park this vehicle at the home, versus at the business or at a local storage yard. The Applicant noted that the business is located in Broomfield, CO and that some of their work is in the general Highlands Ranch vicinity and that it was more convenient to leave from the house to go to the work site versus driving his personal car from Highlands Ranch to Broomfield, getting the oversized van work truck, driving back down to the Highlands Ranch area for the projects, and then doing the opposite at the end of the day.
- c. The Committee acknowledged that the Applicant suggested the use of "magnetic panels" on the truck but felt those weren't sufficient to mitigate the aesthetic impacts of the logos.
- d. A member asked if a cover, compliant Section 2.15 of the RIGs, could be used for the oversized van. RIGs §2.15 specifically notes that Car Covers do not require approval if they are "...manufactured to the specific cover of the vehicle, shall be neutral color, and [are] always maintained." Staff confirmed that a compliant car cover would be acceptable.
- e. Several members acknowledged that the vehicle isn't parked in the driveway for extended periods of time. The Applicant confirmed that they typically leave before 6:00 AM and don't return until after 6:00 PM.

iv. **APPROVAL CONDITION(S):**

- a. A Car Cover, compliant with RIGs §2.15 (specifically, manufactured for the specific vehicle [i.e., not simply a tarp] and neutral in color) must be used when the vehicle is parked in the driveway. Failure to utilize, maintain, or keep the covers in place shall result in automatic revocation of the conditional approval, and the vehicle shall thereafter be required to be parked off-site.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

B. **2610 Bitterroot PI** – Coloradoscape, Walkway, Deck.

a. **DISCUSSION**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Removal of the small grass area in the front yard and replacement with a Coloradoscape material is more aesthetically pleasing. The Committee suggests that the rock used in this area be different than the rock used elsewhere in the front yard to provide more visual interest.
 - b. The Committee discussed and agreed that a variance to allow encroachment into the typical two-foot vegetative setback requirement for the side yard walkway, in the limited area around the window well, was acceptable.

iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION(S):**

- a. Synthetic turf in the rear yard must maintain a two-foot setback from all property lines. Continuous live landscaping in this setback area is required.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. **3258 Oak Leaf PI** – Privacy Screening.

a. **DISCUSSION**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. The Committee agreed that Option #1 (vinyl lattice privacy screen, California Redwood in color) was specifically designed for exterior use, is double-sided in appearance, and is proposed to be mounted to independent posts, providing greater stability.
 - b. The Committee agreed that Option #3 (artificial green hedge wall) is not supported by the RIGs and inconsistent with established ARC precedent.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 07, 2026

Page 4 of 5

- c. The Committee was concerned with the proximity of the proposed fencing to the existing retaining wall; however, acknowledging a recent Tribunal Ruling, the concern became moot.
- d. The Committee acknowledged that the current abutting neighbor provided writing confirmation of support of the proposal. Staff acknowledged that the Applicant provided this confirmation as part of their application.

iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION(S):**

- a. Only Option #1, as presented, is approved. Options #2 and #2 are expressly not approved.
- b. The privacy screen shall be limited to the side-yard location shown on the submitted site plan and shall not extend into any front-yard area.
- c. The screen shall not exceed four (4) feet in height above the existing property line fence.
- d. The screen shall be supported by independent posts and shall not be attached to the existing fence.
- e. The installation shall maintain a clear space between the retaining wall, screen, and fence sufficient to allow for drainage and ongoing maintenance.
- f. Approval is based in part on documented adjacent neighbor consent and is site-specific, non-transferable, and does not establish precedent for future screening requests

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

D. **8762 Mourning Dove Ln – Trash Enclosure.**

a. **DISCUSSION**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. The Committee discussed RIGs §2.30, specifically that solid fencing is limited to side and rear yards and expressly prohibits solid or privacy fencing in front-yard and street-facing locations. Members were concerned that the proposal introduces solid fencing forward of the front elevation of the home, which then functions as a front-yard fence element and is not permitted under the RIGs.
 - b. The Committee noted that while the applicant characterizes the enclosure as an extension of an existing fence, they found that fence location is determined by its relationship to the front plane of the home, not by proximity to a driveway or garage wall.
 - c. The Committee noted that an alternative configuration terminating the enclosure at, or behind, the front face of the residence may be eligible for consideration, subject to compliance with applicable fencing standards.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: KL) to **DENY, ELIGIBLE FOR RESUBMITTAL** (reference ¶D.A.ii.c. above for resubmittal requirements)

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

E. **9944 Cottoncreek Dr – Permanent Lighting.**

a. **DISCUSSION**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. The Committee noted that the RIGs do not contemplate or support installation of permanent accent lighting around garage door trim. They opined that lighting installed around garage doors introduces outward-facing and vertical illumination in a highly visible, street-facing location and does not meet the intent or orientation standards for approved architectural lighting.
 - b. Although the Committee acknowledges that the applicant indicates that the garage door lighting “can be kept off,” they found that this argument not persuasive, as approval based on

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 07, 2026

Page 5 of 5

discretionary operation creates an ongoing enforcement challenge. If lighting is proposed to be installed but not used, they found there is no basis for approving its installation.

iii. **APPROVAL CONDITION(S):**

- a. **Approved locations:**
 - i. Permanent exterior LED accent lighting may be approved only in soffit or eave locations, where the lighting is concealed from direct view and oriented downward toward the ground.
- b. **Denied locations:**
 - i. Installation of lighting around the trim of the garage doors is not approved and shall not be installed.
- c. **Spacing requirement:**
 - i. Approved lighting shall maintain a minimum spacing of nine (9) inches between individual light modules, consistent with the Residential Improvement Guidelines and the manufacturer's standard installation specifications.
- d. **Directionality requirement:**
 - i. All approved lighting must be installed and configured so that illumination is directed downward toward the ground and does not project outward or toward the street or adjacent properties.
- e. Any lighting installed outside of these conditions shall be considered non-compliant and subject to Association enforcement.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
7	0	1

Notes: The abstaining member has a personal acquaintance with the applicant.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

- A. None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **6:50 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the January 21, 2026 Meeting.

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.**