

Architectural Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 21, 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 **5:32 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)	✓			Attended via ZOOM
Joe Levin (JL)	✓			
Chris Robinson (CR)			✓	
Jeff Rohr (JR)			✓	
Open				
	6	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

Luis **Gonzalez**, Homeowner (re: §IV.A)

John **Eads**, Homeowner (re: §IV.B)

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A. The **January 07, 2026 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed.

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**.

9568 University Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Eastridge Rec Center: Admin Wing

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2026

Page 2 of 5

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

- A. One Tribunal is scheduled for January: 9834 Clifton Ct (ARC Denial, Paint Color). Tribunal scheduled for January 22, 2026.

IV. RESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

- A. **10345 HUNTERWOOD WAY** – Addition.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Applicant presented their project.
- iii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. The Committee noted that the proposed connector addition maintains required setbacks and height limitations and that size alone is not a basis for denial under the Guidelines.
 - b. The Committee questioned the treatment of an apparent existing connector or “bump-out” visible in aerial imagery and emphasized the need for clarification of the final post-construction condition of the site to ensure the approval accurately reflects what will exist.
 - i. The Homeowner noted that the existing “bump-out” will be demolished as part of their new addition.
 - c. The Committee also noted that the inward-facing, subordinate lean-to roof form was acceptable in this specific context but should remain limited to the approved connector volume.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES**.

- B. **9878 AFTONWOOD ST** – Covered Driveway / Carport Waiver Request.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Applicant presented their project.
- iii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Whether the proposed roofed structure functions as a carport regardless of architectural integration or homeowner intent and noted that the RIG's § 2.16 prohibit carports.
 - b. Concerned that granting a waiver in this case could establish undesirable precedent and alter the character of residential streetscapes.
 - c. Concerns regarding encroachment into the front-yard setback.
 - d. Noted that, as a mitigating factor to some of their concerns, the proposed structure is custom designed and architecturally integrated with the home, utilizing materials and forms intended to match the residence, and that it is not a prefabricated or utilitarian structure such as a typical backyard gazebo or similar accessory improvement.
 - e. Discussed alternatives with the homeowner, including installation of a snow-melt system within the existing concrete driveway.
 - i. The homeowner noted that he investigated this option but was concerned that melting snow would drain toward the street and refreeze, potentially creating an ice hazard within the public right-of-way.
 - f. Questioned the accuracy and representational reliability of the AI-generated graphic provided by the homeowner when compared to the street-view imagery. The Committee noted that the AI graphic appeared to visually “stretch” the front plane of the home, creating the impression of greater separation between the front door and the garage than actually exists.
 - g. Noted concerns regarding the differing roof pitch between the proposed covered structure and the main residence and questioned whether the deviation would be architecturally compatible and visually subordinate to the primary roof form.
 - h. Acknowledged that the driveway widening component of the application meets the dimensional and functional requirements of the RIGs.
 - i. A majority of the Committee (though not unanimous) were generally amenable to the concept of a covered driveway in this instance due to the custom architectural styling and material compatibility; however, the Committee further noted that members were not comfortable approving the proposal without additional information and technical review.

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2026

Page 3 of 5

- j. Questioned the adequacy of the information provided to date and noted the need for additional clarification and documentation, including but not limited to:
 - i. Confirmation of front-yard setback compliance and encroachment limitations in coordination with Douglas County.
 - ii. Preparation of a Site Plan with dimensions of structure and dimensions to property lines.
 - iii. Verification and evaluation of the proposed roof pitch relative to the primary structure.
 - iv. Confirmation of actual front plane dimensions of the home.
 - v. Detailed Architectural Construction Drawings, including construction details and materials specifications (note: materials/colors must match existing home) and construction details.
- k. Decided to table further discussion and consideration of the application until the homeowner provides the additional information necessary to allow for a complete architectural, dimensional, and regulatory review.

iv. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED:**

- a. Confirmation of front-yard setback compliance and encroachment limitations in coordination with Douglas County.
- b. Site Plan with dimensions of structure and dimensions to property lines.
- c. Verification and evaluation of the proposed roof pitch relative to the primary structure.
- d. Confirmation of actual front plane dimensions of the home.
- e. Detailed Architectural Construction Drawings, including construction details and materials specifications (note: materials/colors must match existing home) and construction details.

b. **ACTION:**

- i. Motion (by: PC, 2nd by: JB) to **TABLED FOR FURTHER REVIEW, RESUBMITTAL REQUIRED.**

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	1	0

Notes: Dissenting member did not feel that a hardship was presented warranting a waiver of RIGs.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

C. ~~9503 COVE CREEK DR~~ – Exterior Paint Color. *The Homeowner withdrew their application before the Meeting.*

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. **687 HUNTINGTON DR** – Rear Yard Storage Structure (Attached Shed).

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Noted that the structure functions as an attached accessory structure rather than a detached shed and therefore must meet standards for architectural integration and material consistency.
 - b. Questioned the treatment and continued function of the existing garage man door and emphasized the need for clarification. The Committee believes that the proposed structure utilizes the existing exterior rear wall of the garage and exterior side wall of the home as the side wall and rear wall of the structure, respectively. The Committee asked that staff clarify this detail with the homeowner.
 - c. Noted that roofing, siding, and trim materials and colors must match the existing home to maintain architectural consistency.

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

- a. Provide clarification on the intent for the side and rear wall of the structure with Staff.
- b. Roofing, siding, and trim materials and colors must match the existing home.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2026

Page 4 of 5

B. 8932 JIMSON WEED WAY – Rear Addition/Deck Replacement.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Noted that the proposed addition complies with applicable setback requirements and that the massing, scale, and roof pitch appear consistent with the existing residence.
 - b. Noted that the project is straightforward and does not raise concerns related to scale, massing, or neighborhood compatibility, provided exterior materials are confirmed to match the existing home.
 - c. Noted that roofing, siding, and trim materials and colors must match the existing home to maintain architectural consistency.

iii. APPROVAL CONDITION(S):

- a. Roofing, siding, and trim materials and colors must match the existing home.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion PASSES.

C. 9694 KALAMERE CT – Rear Patio Cover (Post-Improvement Installation).

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Questioned the completeness of the submittal and noted that the absence of basic construction details, roofing information, attachment methods, and dimensional data prevents a meaningful architectural review.
 - b. Emphasized the need for as-built drawings, a site plan, and the same plans submitted to Douglas County to evaluate compatibility, scale, and setback compliance for the already-constructed improvement.

iii. APPROVAL CONDITION(S):

- a. Provide complete construction drawings and plans (recommend providing the plans submitted to Douglas County in support of Building Permit No. 25-12700).
- b. Provide a site plan showing the location, footprint, and dimensions of the patio cover relative to the home and property lines.
- c. Provide roofing details, including material type, color, and roof slope.
- d. Provide construction details sufficient to understand how the cover is supported and attached to the residence.
- e. Provide photographs clearly documenting the complete improvement.

b. ACTION:

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion PASSES.

D. 10257 DOWLING WAY – In-Ground Pool, Pool Equipment, and Automatic Cover.

a. DISCUSSION:

- i. Staff presented their Submittal Review and Findings Report.
- ii. The Committee discussed the following:
 - a. Noted that the proposed pool location complies with setback requirements and is appropriate in scale and placement.
 - b. Questioned the absence of a physical enclosure for pool equipment and noted that landscaping alone does not satisfy the screening requirements of the RIGs. The Committee further noted that

Architectural Review Committee Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2026

Page 5 of 5

a permanent pool-equipment screening treatment that fully screens the equipment from view and includes noise-abatement measures for pumps, heaters, and related equipment, consistent with the intent of RIGs § 2.60, is necessary.

- c. Acknowledged that pool fencing and safety barriers are governed by building code and permitting, not ARC approval criteria, and that the proposed automatic pool cover system does not raise concerns related to glare or reflectivity if muted finishes are used.

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

- a. Provide permanent pool-equipment screening treatment that fully screens the equipment from view and provides reasonable noise-abatement measures for pumps, heaters, and related equipment, consistent with the intent of RIGs § 2.60. Examples of acceptable screening treatments may include architecturally integrated screen walls or a fully enclosed structure constructed of materials compatible with the residence and designed to attenuate operational noise.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	0	0

Notes: None.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**

VI. STAFF COMMENTARY

A. Future Review of Commercial Vehicles. ARC Standards for Administrative Approval.

- i. The Committee discussed whether all Commercial Vehicle Applications should continue to require full Committee review and approval prior to a vehicle being permitted to park in a driveway, or whether objective screening criteria could be established to allow limited administrative approval by staff in appropriate cases. Potential criteria discussed included factors such as vehicle type, size, color, and the presence, size, or visibility of commercial logos or markings.
- ii. The Committee agreed that all Commercial Vehicle Applications should continue to be submitted for Committee vetting and that ARC should retain final authority over approval determinations.
- iii. Staff noted that, as an initial screening step, staff would inquire whether an applicant is willing to use a custom vehicle cover manufactured specifically for the vehicle in question and in a neutral color, as a potential method of visually mitigating the appearance of a Commercial Vehicle. Staff further noted that if an applicant is unwilling to utilize such a cover, the application would be referred to the Committee for formal consideration. The Committee expressed general agreement with this preliminary staff screening approach, subject to ARC's retained authority to review and decide each application.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- A. With no further business the meeting was **adjourned** at **7:30 p.m.**

VIII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

- A. These minutes were reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee at the February 04, 2026 Meeting.

a. **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Nothing of consequence.

b. **ACTION:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	0	1

Notes: JR Abstained, excused from January 21, 2026 Meeting.

- ii. Motion **PASSES.**