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 July 17, 2025 at the Eagle Ranch Office, 1143 Capitol Street, Eagle, CO 81631, or via Microsoft Teams video/teleconference*.

Directors Present:

John Neal
Tom McCord
David Burns
James Crine
Rick Messmer
Rick Dominick*

Others Present:

Jason Berghauer, EWH Design Review Board Administrator
Clark Gundlach – Homeowner
Adam Harrison* – Architect
Brett Lehr* - Designer
Pavan Krueger* - Architect
Joshua Walker - Homeowner

The order of business was as follows:

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. MDT. A quorum of members was present.

2. **DRB Business**
   a. **Approval of Minutes.** Upon motion by Jim Crine and second by David Burns, the minutes of the June 19, 2025, meeting were unanimously approved with one correction:

   - Item d. **03-06-11 –259 Robins Egg – Conn Residence – Minor Exterior Alteration: Fencing Variance Request**
   Jim Crine requested that the conditions of approval be corrected and updated. Under the Conditions of Approval, the minutes were updated to read:

   2. Per the newly updated Design Guidelines on this matter, the applicant will need to have the property surveyed to verify the fence location.

3. **Meeting specific topics / New Business:**

   a. **14-00-11 – 18 Poplar Place – Gundlach Residence – Major Exterior Alteration with Addition of Square Footage**

   Clark gave a brief overview of the proposed alterations.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Staff noted that the proposed replacement upper-story windows did not include any muntions. The Board requested that they be included.
2. The Board questioned and discussed whether the roof gable should be extended over the new main level deck/patio area. Rick Messmer noted that since there is massing under the deck, it could be considered a patio. This could mean that the guideline stating that *6 feet of the depth of second story decks must be covered by roof* may not apply in this case.
3. Members felt that the newly proposed connection between the existing decks helped to break up the tall 2 ½ story gable.
4. Board members felt the proposed update was a significant improvement to the existing home.

Motion to approve with conditions:

Motion: Tom McCord
Second: Jim Crine
Vote: 5-0

Conditions :

1. Replacement upper-story, side windows will include muntins (similar to existing conditions).

4. Other Business:

a. 21-00-33 – 213 Harvester Court – Walker Residence – Stone Detail and Divided Lights

Staff gave a brief overview of the situation. During a routine site visit, it was observed there were two elements that did not appear to comply with the Design Guidelines and that varied from the Technical Approval. The first area of concern was that the stone veneer on the gabled element on the rear elevation did not terminate at an inside corner. The second area of concern was the lack of any window muntins on the as-built.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Joshua stated that the Sierra Pacific will be able to add/install the muntins as approved and that those elements were already on order.
2. The Board commented that they have been strict relative to masonry terminating at inside corners.
3. Within the approved drawing set, there was some ambiguity on this particular detail.
4. On other areas of the house that have the stone veneer, the material terminates on inside corners, making the detail in question a unique situation.
5. Options on how to address and remedy this detail were discussed. Tom McCord proposed, as a compromise, that the stone detail be continued around the corner on the right side of the mass and terminate at the nearby inside corner. This right side has a larger exposure and is more visible, especially from the adjacent golf course. Given the difficult conditions and that the left side is less visible, that side could be left as is.

Motion to require the stone located on the South corner of the great room be continued and terminate at the adjacent inside corner and that muntins, as shown on the drawing set of record, be added and included.

Motion: Tom McCord
Second: James Crine
Vote: 5-0

b. Design Guidelines – Use of "Architect"

David Burns expressed concerns that some designers were using the term "Architect" in their professional presentations without being licensed to do so.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. Staff will take note of construction signs and other public presentations to verify that the title is used appropriately.
2. The Board determined that no changes to the Design Guidelines need to be made regarding the issue. Should any situation arise in the future, violations can be reported to the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies.

No Motion Necessary

c. 21-00-26 - 86 Harvester Court – Bartow Residence – Pre-Design

Pavan provided an overview of the current design and site conditions. She requested feedback from the Board on two potential variance requests due to the steep slope of the site adjacent to the street. One being a variance to place the home 25 feet from the front property line, versus adhering to the 35' front setback as outlined in the guidelines, and two, that final grade at the front entry could vary more than 5' from the existing grade.

The DRB provided the following comments:

1. The Board discussed the driveway entry to the site and alternative locations.
2. Rick Messmer referred to the guideline stating that it is preferred that the front facade of the home is parallel to the street with a maximum of 30 degree skew allowed. Whether or not the site conditions are considered a hardship and if a variance could be granted on this item were discussed.
3. Moving the house "back" or "down" on the site was discussed. Views, excessive grade variation with fill, and driveway slope were all taken into consideration.
4. Rick Dominick felt that the current design was somewhat problematic relative to the driveway and that moving the home back on the site would alleviate some of those issues, while also eliminating the need for a front setback variance.
5. Staff was asked to look at minutes regarding a previously proposed design on this site to determine if and how any variances were handled in that situation.
6. The Board agreed that the site presented some unique challenges. In general, they felt they could potentially approve a variance for additional fill and a greater variation from the existing grade. They requested that Pavan look again at the positioning of the home on the lot to see if it would be possible to adhere to the 35' front setback.

No motion was required due to Pre-Design status.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m. MST.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Berghauer, DRB Administrator