**Architectural Review Committee - Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, November 25, 2025**

**Members Present**: Bethany Frost (Chair), Jordan Adams (Vice Chair), Tom Strayer, Josh Smith, Dr. Bryan Burney (virtual attendance)

**Members Absent**:

**Staff Present**: Ryan Crum, Hollie Kinker

**Time of Meeting**: 5:30 PM

**Introduction & Oath of Office**:

1. Josh Smith

**Approval of Minutes**:

1. Minutes from September 16, 2025, meeting was presented for approval. Mr. Strayer noted that he was not present at the September 2025 meeting.

Ms. Adams made a motion to approve, as edited. Dr. Burney seconded. The vote was made by voice vote due to the remote participation of Dr. Burney. The vote was recorded as follows:

**Dr.** **Burney: Aye**

**Mr. Smith: Abstained**

**Ms. Frost: Aye**

**Ms. Adams: Aye**

**Mr. Strayer: Abstained**

**Motion passed: 3-0-2**

**Old Business**:

1. N/A

**New Business**:

1. **Integrity Designs request for approval of architectural design**

The petitioner seeks approval of the architectural design for Lot 3 of the Shoppes at Brookside (Villages at Brookside PUD) for a multi-tenant building. The building will feature a pick-up window on the north elevation and a drive-thru window on the south elevation.

**Department Report: Ryan Crum, AICP, CPM**

Rob Bennett with Integrity Design presented on behalf of the petitioner. He stated that the north building will have two tenants. The 3,200 square foot building will use the same brick as the other buildings, with slightly brighter stone and updated EIFS colors. The front elevation will be primarily stone, wrapping around almost half of the sides, with brick on the remainder. Canopies are planned over the pick-up windows on the north and south sides. The aluminum storefront and light fixtures will match the other buildings.

Director Crum asked Mr. Bennett to summarize the articulation on the north and south elevations. Mr. Bennett noted an 11” bump-out, which does not meet the PUD’s 3-foot articulation requirement; however, a raised architectural feature approximately 4-feet deep has been added at the upper elevation, consistent with the other buildings. The petitioner requested ARC approval of this alternative articulation.

Director Crum noted that one of the drive-thru canopies is shown as optional and asked if the petitioner would commit to it being included. Mr. Bennett stated both canopies are anticipated, though tenant preferences may affect installation.

Director Crum advised the ARC that the proposed articulation does not meet the PUD’s technical standards, so a vote is required. The PUD grants the ARC authority to approve alternative articulation or fenestration, and similar allowances were granted for the other buildings. Mr. Strayer asked whether BZA approval was required, and Director Crum clarified it was not. Mr. Strayer stated that deeper articulation would make a noticeable visual difference. Mr. Bennett added that increasing the articulation would impact parking on both sides. Ms. Frost agreed, noting that similar articulation had been approved on the other buildings.

Director Crum stated that any motion should include the articulation language and indicate whether the ARC has a preference on awnings; otherwise, installation would be tenant-driven. Mr. Smith asked what type of tenant might choose not to install an awning. Mr. Bennett replied that it varies. Director Crum noted the drive-thru awning on the south elevation is shown as optional. Mr. Strayer commented that a simple canvas awning would not significantly affect the building’s appearance. Mr. Bennett confirmed it would be a 1-inch aluminum frame with canvas covering. Ms. Frost asked about the lack of front-elevation awnings. Director Crum noted that, unlike the other buildings, this one does not include them, but they are not required. He added that the storefront glass is recessed over three feet, creating built-in articulation, and that the building’s frontage width does not trigger the PUD’s fenestration or articulation standards.

Director Crum stated that staff is pleased with the architectural scheme. The brick is consistent across all three buildings, with some variation in stone and EIFS colors. The buildings will blend well while maintaining uniformity, which is appropriate for commercial uses. Mr. Smith stated he is generally in favor of the building.

Director Crum reminded the ARC that any motion should include a statement to the effect that the articulation on the north and south facades would be approved as presented, assuming that’s what the Board wants to do. Mr. Strayer indicated agreement and stated so moved. Ms. Adams seconded. The vote, made by voice, was recorded as follows:

**Dr.** **Burney: Aye**

**Mr. Smith: Aye**

**Ms. Frost: Aye**

**Ms. Adams: Aye**

**Mr. Strayer: Aye**

**Motion passed: 5-0**

1. **Drees Homes’ request for approval of floor plan**

The petitioner seeks approval to add the Elevations A-E of the Marshall floor plan to the Vintner’s Park Estates PUD.

**Department Report: Hollie Kinker**

Caitlin Dopher with Drees Homes presented on behalf of the petitioner. She explained that Drees is adding the Marshall floor plan to the community. The floor plan ranges from approximately 2,900 to 3,400 square feet, with four to six bedrooms and 3.5 to 4.5 bathrooms. It is a two-story plan with a first-floor primary suite, which is one of the reasons Drees is introducing it into Vintner’s Park, as there are not many plans in the community with a primary-down option.

Ms. Dopher stated that Drees has a base floor plan for the Marshall, with options that buyers can customize. Because Vintner’s Park has specific architectural requirements, Drees has adjusted portions of the base plan to meet the PUD standards. One of those requirements is a three-car garage. The base Marshall plan includes a two-car garage, so Drees will be incorporating the third-car sideload garage option. This will bump out the garage to create the required third bay, and the entire garage will function as a sideload configuration. She noted that the third bay is an integrated garage space; although it is shown as a front-load element on the base plan, the Vintner’s Park version will add windows as depicted in the sideload option. From the front elevation, the garage will read as a sideload three-car layout. The additional bay will remain unfinished unless the buyer chooses to add the optional carriage garage.

She added that the five elevations included in the packet depict the required three-car sideload configuration. Some of the standard renderings do not show the sideload detail, as not all marketing elevations reflect it, but the construction drawings provided illustrate how the compliant elevations will appear.

The Marshall A-E floor plans were shown.

Ms. Dopher verified that all architectural standards of the PUD will be met, including those noted in the staff report.

Dr. Burney expressed appreciation for the placement of the third garage bay and product type.

Staff advised the ARC that the motion can be to approve the Marshall A-E as presented, or individually. Ms. Adams motioned to accept the Marshall elevations A-E from Drees as presented. Mr. Strayer seconded. The vote, made by voice, was recorded as follows:

**Dr.** **Burney: Aye**

**Mr. Smith: Aye**

**Ms. Frost: Aye**

**Ms. Adams: Aye**

**Mr. Strayer: Aye**

**Motion passed: 5-0**

Ms. Kinker presented one slide of anti-monotony to the board. The Marshall D and the Crestwood D. Staff requested a “yay” vote for too similar and “nay” vote for dissimilar. The vote, made by voice, was recorded as follows:

**Dr.** **Burney: Yay**

**Mr. Smith: Yay**

**Ms. Frost: Yay**

**Ms. Adams: Nay**

**Mr. Strayer: Yay**

**Motion passed: 4-1**

The Marshall D and Crestwood D were recorded as too similar during anti-monotony review.

1. **2026 Calendar of Meetings**

Staff presented the draft 2026 Calendar of Meetings to the ARC and noted that Town Council is considering adjustments to the broader 2026 meeting schedule, which may result in revisions to the ARC calendar. Staff requested ARC approval of the 2026 calendar, as is, with the understanding that it may change. Mr. Strayer moved to approve the calendar as presented. Ms. Adams seconded. The vote, made by voice, was recorded as follows:

**Dr.** **Burney: Aye**

**Mr. Smith: Aye**

**Ms. Frost: Aye**

**Ms. Adams: Aye**

**Mr. Strayer: Aye**

**Motion passed: 5-0**

Next meeting: December 16, 2025 (if needed)

**Motion to adjourn: Mr. Strayer**

**Seconded: Mr. Smith**

**Meeting adjourned at 5:56 PM**