

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF  
THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF  
EAGLE RANCH ASSOCIATION

A Meeting of the Design Review Board of the Eagle Ranch Association (the “Association”) was held on April 17, 2025 at the Eagle Ranch Office, 1143 Capitol Street, Eagle, CO 81631, or via Microsoft Teams video/teleconference\*.

Directors Present:

Tom McCord  
David Burns  
John Neal  
Rick Dominick, Alternate  
Rick Messmer, Alternate

Others Present:

Jason Berghauer, EWH Design Review Board Administrator  
Leah Mayer – Architect  
Mark Ludwin – Owner/Developer  
Eric Weis – Owner/Developer  
\*Matt Conn – Owner  
\*Kyle Hoiland - Contractor  
Cheryl Mize – Owner  
Maggie Fitzgerald – Architect  
Brennen Fitzgerald – Architect  
Brooks Wallace – Owner  
Adelia McCord - Owner

The order of business was as follows:

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. MST. A quorum of members was present.
2. DRB Business.
  - a. Approval of Minutes. Upon motion by John Neal and second by David Burns, the minutes of the March 20, 2025 meeting were unanimously approved.
3. Meeting specific topics / New Business.

**a. 03-06-11 – 259 Robins Egg Lane – Conn Residence – Fencing Variance Request**

Matt Conn and staff gave a brief overview of the property and the proposed variance request. The variance request involved two aspects: One, was placement of the fence in the rear and side yard setbacks and two, was to enclose an area greater than the allowable area outlined in the Design Guidelines.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Staff noted the neighbors on either side of the subject property at 231 Robins Egg and 275 Robins Egg both appear to have fences located within the rear 25' setback of the respective lots. Staff also noted to the DRB that no records of approvals could be found for those properties.
2. Per the owner, the need for the fence is to enclose dogs and children. It was discussed that no hardship relative to the variance request appears to be present.
3. The proposed location of the fence within the setback was due to existing plantings, trees and firepit.
4. It was observed by the DRB that the existing firepit appears to be located in the rear setback.
5. A fence location that is fully compliant with the Design Guidelines was discussed. Alternative fence locations were discussed in order to satisfy the total enclosed area guideline and to keep the fence out of the easements.
6. The Board noted that the height of 42" and the wooden white picket design would be approvable.
7. The DRB asked if the applicant was flexible on the fence style and open to a more open style. The applicant stated they were not interested in changing the fence style.
8. The DRB noted they were not likely to approve the design and variance request as submitted.
9. Tabling the item was discussed so the applicant could consider options and resubmit with a design more in line with the Design Guidelines.

Motion to table:

Motion: David Burns

Second: Tom McCord

Vote: 3-0

**b. 25-00-49 – 61 New York Mountain Road – GenX Development – Final Review**

Leah Mayer gave a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Board noted that items from Preliminary Review had been addressed by the applicant, including the termination of materials on inside corners, and the change of the roof pitch from 3:12 to 2:12.
2. The stucco color was noted by the applicant to not be as white as shown in the renderings.
3. The transom windows were discussed. Board members noted that a single, center mullion would meet the intention of the Guidelines.
4. The rear stucco columns and their capping detail were discussed. A metal cap opposed to a stucco top was deemed to be an acceptable detail.
5. The Board asked for additional information regarding the transition between the wood siding and the stucco. Stucco will be proud of siding with metal flashing.
6. The details of the metal corner trim were discussed.
7. The advice from Eagle Valley Wildland concerning no new plantings of Pinion pines and junipers due to wildfire concerns were discussed and clarified to the applicant.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: John Niel

Second: Tom McCord

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Stucco columns will include metal caps. Details will be provided for Technical Review.
2. A center mullion will be added to transom windows.
3. Transition detail between siding and stucco will be provided for Technical Review.
4. Applicant will consider alternative plantings for Pinion Pines and Junipers.
5. Applicant will provide Stucco color LRV for Technical Review.
6. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical Review.

**c. 25-00-13 –55 Avalanche Peak Road – Wynton Homes – Final Review**

Leah Mayer provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Design Guidelines note that deck railings on Ridgeline Lots that face Brush Creek Road are required to be 50% opaque. The question was raised by the applicant if the noted guideline only applies to railings that are strictly direct in facing Brush Creek Road, or if that extends to railings that are also indirectly facing the Road. The Board interprets the Guidelines to mean that deck railings both directly and indirectly facing Brush Creek Road must follow the 50% opacity stipulation. Given that interpretation, the railings as proposed would not be compliant.
2. Various options to meet the intentions of the Guidelines relative to railing opacity were discussed including panels and planters. The applicant can provide updated detailing for Technical Review.
3. The trusses were changed from Preliminary Review due to structural reasons.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: David Burns

Second: John Neal

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Railings facing Brush Creek Road (directly or indirectly) must be 50% opaque. Details to be provided for Technical Review.
2. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical Review.

**d. 24-06-08 –78 Aster Court – Mize Residence – Final Review**

Staff provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Board had no comments or concerns relative to the site or architecture.
2. Staff and Board Members answered homeowner questions regarding remaining review process and expiration timeframes on approvals.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Tom McCord

Second: John Neal

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical Review.

**e. 14-00-07 – 22 Fir Court – Robinson Residence – Preliminary Review**

Maggie Fitzgerald provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. As this particular project is a narrow-fronted cul-de-sac lot, the front setback was increased to 40'. The Board deemed this to be appropriate and approvable.
2. The Board discussed how far the garage was recessed from the front plane of the structure. The Guidelines note a minimum 15' difference, but as proposed the difference measured just under 14'. The Board asked that the building massing be adjusted slightly to be in compliance with the Guidelines.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Tom McCord

Second: John Neal

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Adjust garage recess to be a minimum of 15' from the front plane of the structure.
2. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Final Review.

**f. 25-00-76 – 1446 E. Haystacker – Wallace Residence – Preliminary Review**

Rick Dominick provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Front entry and back patio roof have timbers.
2. The limits of disturbance were discussed. Applicant noted they are adjusting and tweaking the LOD and details will be fine-tuned as the design moves forward. Board Members felt that 8' around the building is tight, but possible.
3. The total impervious area was discussed. The design is significantly below the maximum allowed.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Tom McCord

Second: David Burns

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Final Review.

**g. 01-01-30 – 99 Seven Hermits Drive – Krueger Residence – Final Review**

Staff and Karl Krueger provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Position of the home on the site was discussed. The building was rotated to be parallel to the side property lines (and neighboring homes) and moved backwards slightly compared to Preliminary Review. The Board felt this was appropriate and approvable.
2. The updates to the front porch were discussed. Updated design now shows a 2:12 pitch with asphalt shingles. Porch roof retained beam detail.
3. Column detailing at the front porch was also considered. The Board felt it was an appropriate detail for a modern interpretation of the Prairie style.
4. Window trims were discussed. Differentiation between the sill, jamb and header were shown on the updated design. The Board agreed that these updates looked good.
5. The trellis style sun/shades were discussed.
6. The color palette of the home was discussed in relation to neighboring homes. Applicant paid particular attention to LRV values of colors.
7. In general, concerns from Preliminary Review were addressed for Final Review.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Tom McCord

Second: John Neal

Vote: 3-0

Conditions:

1. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical Review.

**h. 24-00-37 – 2324 East Haystacker – McCord Residence –Preliminary Review**

Tom McCord provided a brief overview of the project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. In general, the Board gave a positive reception to the proposed design and was complementary.
2. While details will be refined for Final Review, the applicant is considering wood window trim in areas of where metal siding is used.
3. The metal siding was discussed. Proposal includes using a metal siding with a simulated wood finish. Specifics of installation and corner trim were considered. The 8” width is compliant with the Guidelines. Applicant provided samples for Board Review.
4. ½” plate steel is proposed to be used for planter boxes and lawn edging. The Board was open to the use of the material as presented.
5. On the two-story elevation with the longest runs of horizontal siding, the applicant proposes using a vertical c-channel in line with the windows to both break up the elevation and eliminate any butt joining of siding.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Rick Messmer  
Second: John Neal  
Vote: 3-0  
Tom McCord recused himself

Conditions:

1. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Final Review.

4. Other Business

**a. 1880 and 1848 East Haystacker – Pennington Residence**

1. Brennen Fitzgerald of Turnipseed Architecture was looking for direction and Board feedback on a project that had previously received Technical Approval. The owners are considering combining two lots. The owners are also considering a separated “casita” style suite for visitors.
2. The Board suggested Brennen speak with the Town of Eagle to see if utilities, including water, sewer, gas or electricity locations would in any way hinder the combination of the lots.
3. Regarding the “casita” design element: The Board felt that if it were moved to a less prominent location on the site and if a minor roof connection was made, the design would be more compliant with the Guidelines.

**b. 24-00-31 – 2532 East Haystacker – Ladd-Barela Residence**

1. Staff asked for DRB direction regarding the 15-month Continuity of Construction as outlined in the Association Declaration as it related to the above property. At the time of the current meeting, the residence is in its 17<sup>th</sup> month of construction.
2. The DRB requested the homeowner attend the next regular meeting to discuss the project timeline and to establish a completion date.

**c. Landscape Architect Requirement for Highlands Ridgeline Lots**

1. Within the Design Guidelines for Ridgeline lots within the Highlands, it states:  
*Landscape plans for each lot applicable shall be prepared by a professional Landscape Architect.*
2. Staff received an inquiry from an Eagle Ranch property owner regarding this guideline and was asked if this is something the Board would potentially grant a variance from. This question was presented to the Board for feedback.
3. In general, the Board agreed that this guideline has been present since the adoption of the Ridgeline Addendum and they would be unlikely to grant a variance from it. There was no interest in changing or removing this statement from the Design Guidelines.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m. MST.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Berghauer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jason" and last name "Berghauer" clearly distinguishable.

Jason Berghauer, DRB Administrator