Meeting of the Delegates

1.20.2026
Southridge – Wildcat

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda

I.	Call to Order	6 p.m.
II.	Guest Speaker | *George Brauchler, District Attorney, Dist. 23*	6:02 p.m.
III.	Pledge of Allegiance	6:20 p.m.
IV.	Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum	6:22 p.m.
V.	Proof of Notice of Meeting	6:25 p.m.
VI.	Approval of the Meeting Minutes of Action from the November 18, 2025 Meeting of the Delegates	6:26 p.m.
VII.	Member Forum | *Three-minute time limit*	6:28 p.m.
VIII.	Board of Directors Report | *Monica Wasden*	6:35 p.m.
IX.	Director Comments	6:40 p.m.
X.	General Manager Report | *Mike Bailey*	6:45 p.m.
XI.	Department Updates • Capital Reserves | Mark Gunther • Human Resources | *Cammie Ellis*	6:50 p.m.
XII.	Continued Business	7:00 p.m.
XIII.	New Business	7:05 p.m.
XIV.	Delegate Forum | *Three-minute time limit*	7:10 p.m.
XV.	Adjournment	7:20 p.m.

The Board of Directors Meeting follows immediately upon adjournment of the Delegate Meeting.
The next Delegate and Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 17, 2026.

Meeting of the Delegates Minutes

Minutes from November 18, 2025

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda

Agenda item:	Call to Order	Presenter:	Monica Wasden

President Wasden called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda item:	Pledge of Allegiance	Presenter:	Monica Wasden

President Wasden led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda item:	Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum	Presenter:	Theresa Hill

Conclusions:

A quorum was established; 26,787 of 31,934 lots were present.

Agenda item:	Proof of Notice of Meeting	Presenter:	Jim Allen

Jim Allen confirmed the Proof of Notice of Meeting.

Agenda item:	Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of the Delegates for the October 21, 2025, Meeting	Presenter:	Monica Wasden

Conclusions:

The October 2025 minutes were approved — motioned by Dennis Epperly, District 02 and seconded by Mike Millington, District 108. Motion carried.

Agenda item:	Member Forum	Presenter:	Members

Bob Marshall, 2 Jack Rabbit Place: Shared with Delegates regarding the Board of County Commissioners Meeting that occured today and contracting concerns with the Zebulon project. His concerns are regarding the cost overages and delays happening in the County.

Agenda item: Board of Directors Report | Presenter: Monica Wasden

President Wasden shared regarding the Volunteer Celebration happening on Tuesday, December 9. She encouraged Delegates to attend. She also shared that the Westridge Grand Re-Opening was successful. President Wasden thanked and honored all the Veterans in attendance.

Agenda item: Board of Director Comments | Presenter: Board of Directors

None

Agenda item: General Manager Report | Presenter: Mike Bailey

General Manager Mike Bailey presented a report. With in his report:

- Shared regarding the Employee Relations Committee partnering with the Backpack Society this fall and collecting 706 lbs of food to donate. This food will go to one 72 schools within Douglas County.
- Shared regarding the Westridge Re-Grand Opening and encouraged Delegates to visit the newly renovated facility.
- Shared that HRCA's Aquatics Staff received a third consecutive "Exceeds" rating through Ellis and Associates.
- Provided an update regarding the $28,000 Grant that the Therapeutic Recreation Department received through Douglas County's Developmental Disabilities Mill Levy Grant.

Agenda item: Department Updates – Sports & Fitness | Presenter: Chad Mejia

Chad Mejia, Sports & Fitness Programs Manager, presented a PowerPoint. Within his presentation:

- An update regarding recent fitness offerings and programs that have been offered during the last season.
- Information regarding the Therapeutic Recreation program, and funding for the program. Chad also provided information of recent events and sports offerings.
- Information regarding youth and adult sports and special events and offerings that happened this last season.
- Statistics showing the growth that continues in Tennis and Pickleball. Pickleball has seen a 22% YoY growth. Information about the court resurfacing, which is now under the USTA tennis recommendations.
- Department Metrics, including the 11 full-time staff, 150 regular part-time, 200 volunteers, 20 contractors, and revenue information.

Agenda item: Continued Business

Action: Delegate CIP Vote # 2 for Wildcat Regional Park

- A motion was made by Laura Eicher, District 80, and seconded by Andy Natalie, District 83, to approve the CIP Vote #2 for the Wildcat Regional Park project. Motion Carried.
- Time was allotted for discussion and comments. Commentary provided by Clay Karr, who asked to make an amendment to the current motion to separate the project into two; one project that covers Wildcat Regional Park, and one that covers the trails outside of the allotted regional park area. The amendment to the motion was not approved.

Agenda item: New Business Monica Wasden

None

Agenda item: Delegate Forum **Presenter:** Delegates

Discussion:

Pattie McGuinness: Commented on the Zebulon project and the resolution the Delegate Body requested the Board of Directors write during the October 205 Meeting. General Manager Bailey shared information regarding the recommendation that was received from Legal Counsel to pause sending a resolution until more information is known.

Agenda item: Adjournment **Presenter:** Monica Wasden

Conclusions:

Motioned by Dennis Epperly, representing District 02, and seconded by Mark Dickerson, representing District 110. The Meeting of the Delegates was adjourned to 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Allen, Secretary

DISTRICT DELEGATE ROLL CALL

MEETING DATE : November 18, 2025

RECORD DATE: November 18, 2025

							CIP Vote #2			
Dist No.	DELEGATE NAME	Enter "X" if Present Enter "P" if Proxy	Enter "F" if in Favor Enter "O" if Opposed Enter "A" if Abstained Enter "S" if Split	Total # of Lots	LOTS*	PROXY	F+O+A	TOTAL IN FAVOR	TOTAL OPPOSED	TOTAL ABSENTIONS
1	LESLIE MILLER	P		297	-	297		-	-	-
2	DENNIS EPPERLY	X		266	266	-		-	-	-
3	EDWARD FABIANO	X		184	184	-	-	-	-	-
4	TERESA ISAAK (Stratton Ridge)			153	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	JUDY DYK (Bradford Hills)	X		108	108	-	-	-	-	-
6	JEANNIE HOFFMAN (Sugarmill)	P		126	-	126	-	-	-	-
7	RORY REGAN	X		295	295	-	-	-	-	-
8	VACANT (Chalet)			97	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	DIANA PERKINS (Remington Bluffs)	X		50	50	-	-	-	-	-
10	SAMUEL BENTZ	X		143	143	-	-	-	-	-
11	PATRICIA LONG			251	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	CONNIE ROSEL (Falcon Hills) *	P		113	-	113	-	-	-	-
13	LORRIE VOLKEL	X		199	199	-	-	-	-	-
14	TAMMY KELLY	P		185	-	185	-		-	-
15	ERIC EICHER	X		200	200	-	-	-	-	-
16	ELIZABETH STROCK	X		105	105	-	-	-	-	-
17	GREG HERMAN	P		166	-	166	-	-	-	-
18	CHANAN BRAUNSTEIN	X		318	318	-	-	-	-	-
20	JEAN REHNKE	X		208	208	-	-	-	-	-
21	ANDREW CURRIER			189	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	BRYAN WALSH *	P		132	-	132	-	-	-	-
23	MICHAEL MEEHAN			142	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	CONNIE ROSEL *	P		83	-	83	-	-	-	-
25	ANDY JONES	X		438	438	-	-	-	-	-
26	JOHN MEZGER	P		183	-	183	-	-	-	-
27	KYLE ANHORN			242	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	BRYAN WALSH *	P		48	-	48	-	-	-	-
30	JOE AHLGRIM (Timberline)	X		368	368	-	-	-	-	-
40	FRANK IMPINNA *	P		368	-	368	-	-	-	-
41	FRANK IMPINNA *	P		366	-	366	-	-	-	-
49	BETHANY KOCH	P		291	-	291	-	-	-	-
50	LINDA MALLETTE (Gleneagles)			345	-	-	-	-	-	-
51	SID BASU			253	-	-	-	-	-	-
52	CLINTON CAVE	P		234	-	234	-		-	-
53	SHARYN LANDIS			171	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	PATRICIA CALLIES	X		181	181	-	-	-	-	-
61	JEFF ROHR	X		105	105	-	-	-	-	-
62	KIM HARP	X		197	197	-	-	-	-	-
63	KATHY LANDGRAVE	X		51	51	-	-	-	-	-
64	RUSSELL KING	X		130	130	-	-	-	-	-
65	DON WOODLAND			96	-	-	-	-	-	-
66	JEFF ROHR	X		224	224	-	-	-	-	-
68	LISA ARROYO	X		152	152	-	-	-	-	-
69	FRANK IMPINNA *	P		182	-	182	-	-	-	-
70	TERI HJELMSTAD (The Village)			81	-	-	-	-	-	-
71	CONNIE ROSEL (Falcon Hills South)	P		26	-	26	-	-	-	-
73	STU PARKER	P		1,184	-	1,184	-		-	-
74	BRENT DOUGAL	X		940	940	-	-	-	-	-
75	BRENT DOUGAL	X		74	74	-	-	-	-	-
76	MICHAEL FLOWER	P		223	-	223	-	-	-	-
77	MELISSA SMESSEART	X		420	420	-	-	-	-	-
78	AMIT GUPTA			274	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	CONNIE MANZER (The Retreat)	X		101	101	-	-	-	-	-

							CIP Vote #2			
Dist No.	DELEGATE NAME	Enter "X" if Present Enter "P" if Proxy	Enter "F" if in Favor Enter "O" if Opposed Enter "A" if Abstained Enter "S" if Split	Total # of Lots	LOTS*	PROXY	F+O+A	TOTAL IN FAVOR	TOTAL OPPOSED	TOTAL ABSENTIONS
80	LAURA EICHER	X		1,533	1,533	-	-	-	-	-
81	AL BONNEAU			20	-	-	-	-	-	-
82	KURT HUFFMAN	X		778	778	-	-	-	-	-
83	ANDY NATALIE	X		180	180	-	-	-	-	-
84	JESSICA ALLEN	X		705	705	-	-	-	-	-
85	DEBORAH SPICER	P		784	-	784	-	-	-	-
86	DAWN KEATING	X		1,290	1,290	-	-	-	-	-
87	JENNIFER HARRIS (Indigo Hill)	X		481	481	-	-	-	-	-
88	CAROLYN GROOM (Weatherstone)	X		294	294	-	-	-	-	-
89	MARY KAY COURTNEY (Villages at H.R.)	X		323	323	-	-		-	-
90	BRANDON WHITE (Spaces)			250	-	-	-	-	-	-
91	GINGER NIXT (Settlers Village)			199	-	-	-	-	-	-
92	MICHELLE RATCLIFF (Canyon Ranch)	X		440	440	-	-	-	-	-
93	JENNIFER PARK			260	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	AL PELKOWSKI (Westridge Knolls	X		617	617	-	-	-	-	-
95	TOM HALL (Coventry Ridge)			56	-	-	-	-	-	-
96	VACANT (Highwoods HOA)			104	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	PATRICIA CALLIES	X		336	336	-	-	-	-	-
98	LISA KIRWAN (Sundance @ Indigo Hill)	X		225	225	-	-	-	-	-
99	MICHAEL PETRUCCELLI (Carlyle Park)			213	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	GAIL FRANCES	X		177	177	-	-	-	-	-
101	PATRICIA CALLIES*	X		111	111	-	-	-	-	-
102	VACANT			202	-	-	-	-	-	-
103	JAC LEBBS	X		401	401	-	-	-	-	-
104	CHRIS WICKS	X		532	532	-	-	-	-	-
105	JOSEPH ADEN			353	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	RYAN LEAHY	X		226	226	-	-	-	-	-
107	HENRY HOLLENDER (HR Golf Course)	X		579	579	-	-	-	-	-
108	MIKE MILLINGTON	X		208	208	-	-	-	-	-
109	ANGELA STEGMAN (Backcountry)	X		1,252	1,252	-	-	-	-	-
110	MARK DICKERSON (Stonebury)	X		87	87	-	-	-	-	-
111	BILL FEELY (Firelight)	X		1,863	1,863	-	-	-	-	-
112	PATTIE MCGUINNESS (Highland Walk)	X		298	298	-	-	-	-	-
113	ELIZABETH STULZ	X		517	517	-	-	-	-	-
114	CLAY KARR (The Hearth)	X		1,652	1,652	-	-	-	-	-
115	COLIN CAMPBELL (Brownstones)	X		359	359	-	-	-	-	-
116	ROBERT STRAUSS (Tresana)	X		557	557	-	-	-	-	-
120	MEGAN LUMPKINS (Clock Tower Residences)	P		318	-	318	-	-	-	-
121	ROBERT BLACKINGTON			200	-	-	-	-	-	-
200	VACANT (Commercial District			396	-	-	-	-	-	-
212	VACANT (Stoneybridge)			77	-	-	-	-	-	-
213	KAREN BURCH (Palomino Park)			523	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL			31,934	21,478	5,309	-	-	-	-
	QUORUM 50% +1			*15,968*				*26,787*	*60%*	

s

*If the number of lots column is filled out, it indicates that the delegate was present in person or by proxy for this meeting.

Meeting of the Board

1.20.2026
Southridge - Wildcat

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

III. Proof of Notice of Meeting

IV. Consent Agenda:

- Approval of Board Meeting Minutes of Action from November 2025
- Approval of the Finance Committee Minutes from October 2025
- Approval of the Architectural Review Committee Minutes from November and December 2025.

V. Member Forum

VI. Director Comments

VII. Committee Reports

- Delegate Meeting
- Finance Committee: Review and approve the Nov. and Dec. 2025 Financials

VIII. General Manager Report

IX. Continued Business

X. New Business

XI. Delegate Forum

XII. Adjournment

The Board of Directors Meeting follows immediately upon adjournment of the Delegate Meeting.
The Next Delegate and Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 17, 2026.

Meeting of the Board Minutes

Minutes from November 18, 2025

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda item: Call to Order **Presenter:** Monica Wasden

Conclusions:

The meeting was called to order at 6:38 p.m.

Agenda item: Establishment of Quorum/Roll Call **Presenter:** Jim Allen

Conclusions:

A quorum was established. Directors Monica Wasden, Dan Brown. Jim Allen, Todd Landgrave, and Leo Stegman were present.

Agenda item: Proof of Notice of Meeting **Presenter:** Jim Allen

Conclusions:

Jim Allen confirmed the Proof of Notice of Meeting.

Agenda item: Consent Agenda **Presenter:** Monica Wasden

Action Items:

- Approval of Board Meeting Minutes of Action from October 2025
- Approval of Finance Committee Minutes from September 2025
- Approval of Architectural Review Committee Minutes from October 2025
- Approval of Resolution 25_11_02: Administrative and Recreation Budget Adoption
- Approval of the HRCA Collections Policy Statement

Conclusions:

A motion was made by Dan Brown and seconded by Jim Allen to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda item: Member Forum **Presenter:** Members

Discussions:

None

Agenda item: Director Comments **Presenter:** Board of Directors

Discussions:

Todd Landgrave: Commented on the Wildcat Regional Park Public Meeting and the two concerns brought up, the size of the parking lot and not wanting people to park on any street within the neighboring communities. Todd has concerns about making the parking lot too small.

Leo Stegman: Agreed with what Todd commented on, and congratulated staff for getting the Wildcat Regional Park project across the finish line.

Dan Brown: Thanked everyone for the Westridge renovation and noted that it feels more like a Country Club than a recreation center.

Jim Allen: Commented that it has been a great year for HRCA and he is proud to be a Board member. Jim also commented on the Wildcat Regional Park parking lot and echoed the other board members' commentary.

Monica Wasden: Shared that it has been a busy year, and she is looking forward to December.

Agenda item: Committee Reports **Presenter:** N/A

Discussions:

Delegate Meeting: Delegates voted to approve the CIP #2 Vote for Wildcat Regional Park. The Board of Directors also conducted a vote *(see continued business).*

Finance Committee: Brice Kahler presented the October 2025 Finances. He presented and discussed the HRCA balance sheet, cash flow statements, and income statements. Time was allotted for Q & A with the Board.

Conclusions:

A motion was made by Jim Allen and seconded by Leo Stegman to approve the October 2025 Finances. Motion carried.

Agenda item: General Manager Report **Presenter:** Mike Bailey

Discussions:

General Manager Mike Bailey commented on the following:

- Thanked the Board for the kind words to staff regarding the Westridge renovation and Wildcat Regional Park projects.
- Shared information regarding the process for drafting a resolution and why counsel was involved in/with the resolution Delegates requested in during the October 2025 meeting.

Agenda item: Continued Business

Discussions:

Action: Board CIP Vote # 2 for Wildcat Regional Park

- A motion was made by Todd Landgrave, and seconded by Leo Stegman, to approve the CIP Vote #2 for the Wildcat Regional Park project. Motion Carried,

---

Agenda item: New Business

Discussions:

None

Agenda item: Delegate Forum **Presenter:** Delegates

Discussions:

None

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Agenda item:: Adjournment Monica Wasden

Conclusions:

The Board of Directors Meeting was motioned to adjourn by Dan Brown and seconded by Todd Landgrave. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Allen

Minutes

October 20, 2025, Finance Committee Meeting
Highlands Ranch Community Association, Inc.
Westridge Recreation Center

FC Members Present:

Jennifer Harris
Leighton Stephenson
Erik Vaska
Michael Flower
Ron Welk
Shane Callahan
Doug MacLeod

FC Members Absent:

None

Staff Members Present:

Brice Kahler, CFO
Emily Arnold, Controller
Jake Heerdt, Operations Manager

Board Members and Visitors Present:

Leo Stegman, Board Treasurer

1. The Finance Committee meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum of the Finance Committee was present.

2. Jake Heerdt guided the Finance Committee members on a walking tour of the Westridge renovation project, which is substantially complete.

3. The Finance Committee reviewed the September 15, 2025, Finance Committee meeting minutes.

   A motion was made to accept the September 15, 2025, HRCA Finance Committee meeting minutes as presented. The motion was approved with one abstention.

   Motion: Jennifer Harris   Second: Leighton Stephenson

4. The Finance Committee reviewed and discussed the September 30, 2025, HRCA Financial Statements. The actual to budget favorable/unfavorable variances were identified, explained, and discussed for consolidated financials, each operating fund, and program performance. After three quarters of operations we are running close to budget. Consolidated revenues are ahead of budget YTD by $220K (0.9% to budget); consolidated expenses exceed budget YTD by $189K (0.8% to budget.). Taking out non-cash depreciation and loss on disposal, we are $156K ahead of budget. $6.2M of capital expenditures have been made YTD, predominantly Westridge renovation and the rust mitigation project at Eastridge.

A motion was made that the HRCA Finance Committee accept the September 30, 2025, Highlands Ranch Community Association Financial Statements. The motion was approved unanimously.

Motion: Jennifer Harris Second: Erik Vaska

5. The Finance Committee next reviewed the Q3 2025 Highlands Ranch Community Association 501(c)3 Financial Statements. Actual to budget variances were discussed for Highlands Ranch Cultural Affairs Association, Highlands Ranch Scholarship Fund, and Highlands Ranch Backcountry Conservation and Education Fund. Sources of funds were discussed, including cultural event revenue, anticipated SCFD grants, contributions from HRCA, and backcountry hunting auctions, raffles and drawings.

A motion was made to recommend that the HRCA Finance Committee accept the Q3 2025, 501(c)3 Financial Statements. The motion was approved unanimously.

Motion: Shane Callahan Second: Michael Flower

6. Brice Kahler presented the Q3 2025 investment overview. Once the 2026 budget is approved and capital expenditure timelines are known, we'll be able to ladder more investments. We're ahead of budget on investment income YTD; however, more rate cuts are expected.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emily Arnold, Controller

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**.

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

A. Two Tribunal Hearings were held on October 24, 2025.

a. 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.

b. 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:**

i. 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.

ii. 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:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

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

a. **DISCUSSION:**

i. 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.

ii. 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:**

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

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
8	0	0

Notes: None.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

C. **5298 Clovervale 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**.

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'x**12'x9'-9"** requested, 8'x**10'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**.

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 finals, 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 finals.

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**.

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**.

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**.

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**.

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 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.

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**.

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

HIGHLANDS RANCH
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

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**.

III. REVIEW OF TRIBUNAL HEARINGS

A. Three Tribunals were held in November.
   a. On 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.

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.

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**.

Development Review Committee MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: December 10, 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 5:53 p.m. by W. **Bryant**

☑ Roll call was taken by W. **Bryant**, and a quorum was established.

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused
Greg **Banks**	✓		
Michael **Burmeister**	✓		
Kyle **Matthews**			✓ *
Erik **Okland**	✓		
Jason **Pickett**	✓		
Dawn **Vaughn**	✓		
Vacant			

* Note: Proxy Email Received w/Comments Provided

☑ Also in attendance:
Woody **Bryant**, HRCA: Director of Community Improvement Services
John **Mezger**, HRCA: Commercial Compliance Technician
Todd **Hager**, Galloway (ToddHager@gallowayus.com
Mike **Talcott**, QuikTrip Corp (MTalcott@quiktrip.com
Braxton **Kee**, QuikTrip Corp (BKee@quiktrip.com)

II. PREVIOUS BUSINESS

A. **Review of August 13, 2025 DRC Meeting Minutes**.
   a. **DISCUSSION**:
      i. Nothing of consequence.
   b. **ACTION**:
      i. A motion was made to **Approve as Presented** the August 13, 2025 Meeting Minutes by M. **Burmeister** seconded by D. **Vaughn**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	**0**	**0**

Notes: Proxy email received w/vote to Approve Minutes as Presented.

      ii. Motion **PASSES.**

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **QT #4252 Administrative Replat (SB2025-041)**, 23 Centennial Boulevard (n/f Village Inn).

a. The Subdivision Plan (processed by Douglas County as an Administrative Replat) adjusts and consolidates lot boundaries across three existing parcels: two parcels owned by QuikTrip that comprise the former Village Inn site, and a third parcel owned by Broadridge Investments immediately west of the project area. QuikTrip is under contract to purchase a portion of the Broadridge parcel, and the replat will incorporate this area, vacate obsolete internal lot lines, and create two new legal lots configured to support the overall redevelopment. No easements are proposed for vacation, and Lazy Dog's existing parking supply will remain compliant after the lot-line adjustments.

b. Staff presentation by W. **Bryant**.
   i. Reference Staff Memo to DRC dated December 10, 2025.
   ii. Reference 2025-12-10_StaffPresentation….ppsx.

c. <u>**DISCUSSION**</u>:

   i. A member asked what the net loss was for parking on the Lazy Dog Restaurant Site after Administrative Replat. M. **Talcott** noted that he believed there was a "net zero" impact, but that the excess parking on the new QT development (21 required, 61 provided) is better configured to support Lazy Dog's operations.
      1. B. **Kee** confirmed that there are no patron entrances on the north side of the proposed QT C-Store. He was confident that the excess parking area provided on the north side will be primarily utilized by Lazy Dog patrons.
      2. M. **Talcott** noted that QT continues to work with Lazy Dog on a cross access/cross parking agreement, which will be memorialized before the Administrative Replat will be recorded.
      3. *<u>NOTE</u>: Staff reviewed the parking question after the meeting. The Lazy Dog parcel that will be aggregated into QT property includes 24 existing parking spaces. Post replat and redevelopment, there will be approximately 40 spaces provided with better cross access to Lazy Dog (e.g., elimination of landscaped island and introduction of cross-access access aisles).*

d. <u>**ACTION:**</u>
   i. A motion was made by D. **Vaughn** to <u>**Approve the Administrative Replat as Presented**</u>. Seconded by M. **Burmeister**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	**0**	**0**

Notes: Proxy email received w/vote to Approve the Administrative Replat.

   ii. Motion **PASSES**.

B. **QT #4252 Site Improvement Plan (SP2025-081)**, 23 Centennial Boulevard (n/f Village Inn).

a. Concurrent with the replat, the applicant seeks approval of a comprehensive Site Improvement Plan (SIP) to demolish the existing restaurant and construct a new QuikTrip convenience store (5,029 SF), eight fuel pump islands, 64 parking spaces, site lighting, landscaping, utility connections, and a stormwater detention/water-quality pond located in the northeast corner of the site. The SIP package includes architectural elevations, a materials board, a full civil plan set, drainage studies, and a traffic impact study. Supporting documents indicate that required public services—including water, wastewater, emergency response, transportation access, and utilities—are available to serve the redeveloped site.

b. Staff presentation by W. **Bryant**.
   i. Reference Staff Memo to DRC dated December 10, 2025.
   ii. Reference 2025-12-10_StaffPresentation….ppsx.

c. Applicant presentation by B. **Kee**.
   i. Reference QuikTrip #4252.ppsx.

d. **DISCUSSION**:

   i. Several members noted that the color rendered elevations show the fuel canopy columns clad in brick; however, the materials board notes these columns as painted.
      1. T. **Hager** confirmed that the canopy columns will be clad in brick that matches the main building, as shown on the building elevations and color renderings. M. **Talcott** also confirmed that was QT's design intent.
      2. **The Committee noted this would be a condition of their approval**.

   ii. A member questioned the status of the landscaping at the northwest corner of Broadway and Centennial Boulevard. There is significant landscaping in this area that isn't reflected on the plan set.
      1. It was confirmed that HRMD owns the parcel of land between the QT site and Broadway and that the landscaping in this area is "off-site," so it wasn't surveyed or shown on the plans. There are no plans to modify this landscaping, per T. **Hager**.
      2. The Committee had no further concerns regarding this topic.

   iii. A member questioned the "temperature" (not the intensity) of the lighting. HRCA's preferred color temperature range is 3,000K to 3,500K, versus the 4,000K proposed. The member wants to ensure the lighting "fits in" with the surrounding developments.
      1. M. **Talcott** acknowledged the concern and agrees that fitting in with the surrounding development is important. M. **Talcott** and T. **Hager** will review to see if the lighting color can be softened.
      2. The Committee had no further concerns regarding this topic.

   iv. A member was concerned with the transition between the cobble mulch proposed to the wood mulch that exists on the HRMD parcel. The member confirmed that the proposed cobble mulch is preferred (for durability, long-term maintenance, etc…).
      1. T. **Hager** noted that he would coordinate with the Landscape Architect.
      2. W. **Bryant** to forward HRMD contact information for coordination.
      3. The Committee had no further concerns regarding this topic.

v. The Committee was concerned with the visibility of the proposed monument sign at the location shown.
   1. Several members suggested moving the sign west (either mid-block or to the Centennial Boulevard curb cub) and making to roughly parallel to Centennial Boulevard (similar to the existing Circle K property). T. **Hager** noted that there are several easements that they are working around and that the proposed location isn't encumbered with easements.
   2. The Committee acknowledged the easement challenges and recommended discussing obtaining a license agreement from the easement holders to place the sign within the easement.
   3. The Committee had no further concerns regarding this topic.

vi. The Committee was concerned about the internal lighting near the cross-access to Lazy Dog. The lighting plan implies that this area is dark; however, this area will be used often for patrons of Lazy Dog and additional lighting may be necessary. The Committee had the same concern at the new cross-access curb cut near QT's curb cut to Centennial Boulevard.
   1. A member noted that there are several existing light fixtures serving the Lazy Dog parking area that are not reflected on the lighting plan prepared for QT, which may provide sufficient lighting in the areas of concern. T. **Hager** noted that he would review this with his photometrics designer and update the plan accordingly.
   2. **The Committee noted this would be a condition of their approval**

vii. A member noted there is a discrepancy on whether the existing landscaped parking row end-island at Lazy Dog will remain (as one plan says) or be replaced and reconfigured (as the graphics imply).
   1. M. **Talcott** noted that they would review this and ensure the graphics and text aligned.
   2. **The Committee noted this would be a condition of their approval**

viii. A member questioned the use of "PolyPro 95 Mesh" on the trash enclosure doors. Trash enclosure doors are typically "factory power-coat finished" steel.
   1. M. **Talcott** and B. **Kee** noted that this was done for safety and long-term maintenance purposes. They noted that they have found that the steel doors, particularly in areas prone to high winds, become hazardous for their staff (they noted that they've had cases of employee ankles being broken by the heavy swinging doors) and that the long-term maintenance has become problematic. Over time, the steel doors - with dings, dents, repainting, etc - become unsightly. In contrast, the proposed material is lighter and can be easily replaced when necessary.
   2. M. **Talcott** noted that the material provides 95% opacity to hide the contents of the enclosure.
   3. The Committee had no further concerns regarding this topic.

ix. M. **Talcott** noted that malt beverages would be for sale at this facility and that QT would obtain the necessary state permitting. M. **Talcott** also confirmed that there is no intent at this time to include EV Charging at this facility.

e. **ACTION:**
   i. A motion was made by M. **Burmeister** to **Approve the Site Improvement Plan with Conditions**, Seconded by G. **Banks**.

   APPROVAL CONDITIONS:

   1. Ensure materials sample board matches architectural elevations regarding brick cladding on the canopy columns (resubmittal of materials sample board is not required.
   2. Update lighting plan to incorporate existing lighting fixtures on the Lazy Dog site and review lighting at the two proposed cross-access points to ensure sufficient lighting is provided (resubmittal is not required).

3. Review the discrepancy on whether the existing landscaped parking row end-island at Lazy Dog will remain (as one plan says) or be replaced and reconfigured (as the graphics imply) and update site plan accordingly (resubmittal is not required).

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
6	**0**	**0**

Notes: Proxy email received w/vote to Approve the Site Improvement Plan.

ii. Motion **PASSES**.

IV. NON-AGENDA RESIDENT COMMENTS

A. No "Non-Agenda Resident Comments" were offered.

V. STAFF COMMENTARY

A. No "Staff Commentary" was provided.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A. With no further business, a motion was made by D. **Vaughn** to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by J. **Picket**.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
5	**0**	**0**

Notes: Proxy email not included in adjournment motion.

B. Motion **PASSES**. The **meeting was adjourned** at 7:12 p.m.

VII. APPROVAL OF THESE MEETING MINUTES

A. These minutes were reviewed via electronic means during the week of December 02, 2024.
   a. A motion was made by ________, seconded by __________ to _______________.

VOTE TALLY		
Concur	Dissent	Abstain
??	**??**	**??**

Notes: None.

   b. Motion **PASSES.**