

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 January 16, 2025, at the Eagle Ranch Office, 1143 Capitol Street, Eagle, CO 81631, or via Zoom video/teleconference\*.

Directors Present:

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

Others Present:

Jason Berghauer, EWH Design Review Board Administrator  
Tom and Cheryl Mize - Homeowners  
Maggie Fitzgerald – Architect  
Pavan Krueger – Architect\*  
Dick Garbarino and Martha Cabeen \* - Homeowners  
Walter Eckenhoff – Architect  
Brenton Ross - Homeowner

The order of business was as follows:

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. MST. A quorum of members was present.
2. DRB Business.
  - a. Approval of Minutes. Upon motion and second, the minutes of the December 19, 2024 meeting were approved.
  - b. Appointment of Chairperson. John Martin will act as current Chairperson. There was discussion of potentially rotating the position to other Board members if John’s professional workload gets too great.
3. Meeting specific topics / New Business.

**a. 24-00-08 – 78 Aster Court – Mize Residence – Preliminary Review**

John Martin provided a brief overview of this project.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Continuous 5’ non-flammable border is required to establish wildfire defensible Zone 1.

2. Garage and ADU above it were discussed as appearing to be the more massive component of the design and looks large relative to the home entry.
3. Shed roof over the ADU deck is preferred and acceptable.
4. A comment was made about ADU entries and John noted that per code, ADU's must exit directly to the exterior and cannot exit solely into an interior garage space.
5. The style of the home was discussed. Originally this was designed as a Craftsman style, but due to budget constraints, some of the Craftsman details have been eliminated and the home is being submitted as an Alpine Ranch style.
6. Owner noted the third bay of the garage will be dedicated parking for the ADU.
7. Solar panels are planned to be added in the future, but exact locations are tbd. The Board discussed what recommendations they are allowed to make relative to solar systems and state law. The Board also discussed screening requirements for solar related equipment.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: David Burns  
 Second: Tom McCord  
 Vote: 4-0  
 John Martin Abstained

Conditions:

1. The 5' non-combustible gravel cobble border must be continuous around the home perimeter and any plantings within said border must be fire-wise and less than 1' tall.
2. Solar panels will be added to South facing roof areas in the future.

**b. 04-07-11 – 148 W. Foxglove – Garabarino-Cabeen Residence – Final Review**

Maggie Fitzgerald gave a brief overview of the project and presented some changes made in response to the Preliminary comments.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Per the Design Guidelines, two car garages must have two single doors, as opposed to the one large door as presented. Applicant is willing to adjust detail to meet Guidelines.
2. Maggie noted they will be changing the roof materials so all major sloped roofs will be asphalt shingles and only the minor shed roofs will be metal. The Board felt this was acceptable.
3. The siding material was discussed. A cementitious siding product is proposed for the horizontal and vertical siding.
4. The Guidelines note corner boards should be used with horizontal siding. A metal corner trim piece is proposed. The Board discussed this detail and how the siding integrates. In general, the Board is open to the detail but would require a mockup for approval.
5. The revised entry was discussed. Porch size was increased and roof overhang details had been adjusted since Preliminary Review.
6. DRB noted a concern regarding the location of the mechanical room near the front of the house and potential locations of roof penetrations on the exterior. Said roof penetrations need to be located near the rear of the home.
7. The proposed stucco was noted to be clean and preferred on this design.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: John Martin  
Second: Tom McCord  
Vote: 4-0

Conditions:

1. Roof materials will be consistent with pitches. Higher pitch roofs will be asphalt, lower secondary pitches will be metal.
2. Mechanical venting to be located near the rear of the home.
3. Metal corner detail will be required at mockup for approval.
4. Staff comments will be attended to for Technical Review submittal.

**c. 24-00-18 –2831 East Haystacker – Private Residence – Final Review**

Maggie provided a brief overview of the project. This project had previously received Final approval in August of 2022 and Maggie spoke to some of the adjustments.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. House was mirrored on the site and area was added above the garage.
2. Staff asked the Board to comment on the detail that included a change of materials mid-wall; specifically the termination of stone at a metal panel. The Board determined that the metal panel was an extension of the window header and the stone termination detail was acceptable as shown.
3. An alternate roof with a double pitch over the “mother-in-law suite” was discussed. In general, the Board is open to the alternate option, but there were questions about how the standing seam roofing would work on this. Staff proposed the roof design could be approved as submitted, with the alternate roof option being submitted as a change to approved plans in the future.

Motion to approve:

Motion: John Martin  
Second: Tom McCord  
Vote: 4-0

Conditions:

1. Board is open to the alternate roof design. Should said design be submitted for a change to approved plans, it could be approved administratively.
2. Window/stone detail approved as shown.
3. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical submittal.

**d. 25-00-07 –1069 East Haystacker – Free Residence – Final Review**

Pavan provided a brief overview of the project and noted some of the adjustments made to the home based on the Preliminary Review comments along with some design changes, including: Porcelanosa tiles instead of stucco on site walls, tile flashing cap, reduction of steel columns, revised planter walls, and removal of trapezoidal windows at garage.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Board asked for clarification and then discussed how the roof and steel structure was layered. There was also discussion about the connection detail between the purlin and steel. Overall, the Board liked the look and thought it was unique.
2. Pavan discussed the specifics of the steel structure which was noted by the Board as being “beefy” and substantial.
3. The Board liked the use of exposed structure, but noted the need to keep details consistent throughout the design.
4. The corner trim was discussed. A metal fry reglet is proposed and the Board noted it fits the design of the house. Color of trim will be similar to adjacent siding.
5. Specifics of the exterior stair were discussed. Steel channel with open wood treads.
6. Solar ready locations noted, but the building alignment is not perfect for solar panel application.
7. Use of angled windows in great room was determined to be acceptable and appropriate given the design. No variance required.

Motion to approve:

Motion: John Martin

Second: John Neal

Vote: 4-0

Conditions:

1. Corner mockup showing metal reglet detail will be required for approval.
2. Tiles used on site walls will be required at mockup.
3. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical submittal.

**e. 24-00-04 –47 Aster Court – Rodd-Eckenhoff Residence – Final Review**

Walter Eckenhoff gave a review of the project and noted some of the adjustments made since Preliminary Review: Peaked gable windows were replaced with a square window. The scale of the upper windows were reduced to decrease the overall look of height. Additional bedroom added on North side of house used to break up taller wall. Single garage will be offset 2’ from front garage plane to comply with Guidelines.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Board made note of the overall height of the house, which is 34’-6”.
2. The Board noted the similarities in style to both older Colorado mining structures and buildings found in Telluride. Walt mentioned some historic Colorado mining structures provided inspiration for this home.
3. The Board expressed some concern about the proposed three-story design. Staff noted there was nothing specific within the General Architecture section of the Design Guidelines, nor the Alpine Ranch style specifics that would not allow it.
4. This proposed home is very unique, even unusual, and will be extremely different from any homes currently in the Highlands neighborhood.
5. The overall height makes the home feel somewhat “top-heavy,” but the design works given the attention to detail and the intentionality of the style.
6. Specifics of the typical roof and soffit detail were discussed. The proposed roof will have an overhang of 9”. The roof sheathing, made of plywood, will be stained on the underside, removing the need for a separate soffit material. The plywood edge will have an aluminum cap and the ice shield and roofing material will be applied directly

to the plywood. This creates a thin and somewhat unique profile to the roof edge. Longer cantilevers will have 4x4 structure. Board asked if snow guards will be included, but applicant does not think they will be necessary.

7. Wood siding should have a nominal width of 8" in the Highlands. The Board approved the use of rustic cedar siding with random color application and discussed the potential use of cementitious siding for fire resistance. Windows without trim are acceptable in cases where rustic "barn-siding" is used.
8. If Colorado Buff stone is not available, then New Mexico Buff stone is an acceptable substitute. An ashlar layup is typical.

Motion to approve:

Motion: John Martin

Second: David Burns

Vote: 4-0

Conditions:

1. Mockup showing all final materials and colors will be required for approval by the DRB.
2. Make sure variation in vertical siding colors do not appear too "stripey".
3. Details including roof overhangs and trim-less windows are OK as shown.
4. Single garage will be setback minimum of 2' from double garage per Design Guidelines.
5. Applicant will attend to staff notes for Technical submittal.

4. Other Business.

- a. Staff asked if the Board would like to revisit any Design Guidelines regarding fire-resistant materials given the recent wildfire events in L.A. The Board felt that since the Guidelines updates included wording that allows for fire hardened material substitutions, no additional updates are needed at this time.

The Board in general is open to the use of board formed concrete within home designs which may require some wording updates to the Guidelines. However, given the intention of Eagle Ranch homes to retain the feeling of an open and inviting neighborhood, board formed concrete perimeter fences do not feel in line with said intention.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m. MST.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason Berghauer, DRB Administrator