

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes– August 13, 2018 6:30 PM**

---

**I. Call to Order**

**Chair Fred Ruby** called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

**II. Chair’s Remarks**

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

**III. Roll Call**

Present for roll call were: Fred Ruby, James Frinell, Joann Linville, Jennifer Willard, and Shanti Villarreal

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Zach Weigel, and Dominique Huffman

**IV. Citizens’ Input** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**V. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of May 14, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting

**Joann Linville moved to approve the May 14, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Jennifer Willard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

B. Approval of minutes of June 11, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting

*Note: Due to a lack of quorum to approve minutes from the June 11, 2018 minutes in the normal fashion, staff has attained signatures of approval from all attendees. The Board was asked to recognize those signatures as valid and therefore, adopt those minutes as approved.*

**James Frinell moved to recognize the attained signatures and adopt the June 11, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as approved. Jennifer Willard seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Joann Linville abstaining.**

**VI. Public Hearing:**

A. **Resolution No. 356. Family Fun Center Expansion and Renovation: Darren Harmon, General Manager – Applicant for Wilsonville Land Partnership – Owner.**

The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Master Plan Modification, Stage II Final Plan Modification, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan and Class 3 Sign Permit for expansion and remodel of the Family Fun Center. The site is located at 29111 SW Town Center Loop West on Tax Lot 100 of Section 14D, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Jennifer Scola. Presented by Daniel Pauly

Case Files: DB18-0034 Stage I Master Plan Modification  
DB18-0035 Stage II Final Plan Modification

DB18-0036 Site Design Review  
DB18-0037 Type C Tree Plan  
DB18-0038 Class 3 Sign Permit

**Chair Ruby** called the public hearing to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Fred Ruby, Joann Linville, Jennifer Willard, and Shanti Villarreal declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history, location and surrounding features, and highlighting the proposed applications and key issues with these additional comments:

- The Fun Center first opened in Wilsonville in 1994, when many of the amenities present today, including Autotopia, mini golf, and the bumper boats, were built. The Applicant had returned to the DRB several times with proposed changes, as amenities were changed or added over the years in order to adapt and offer new things as needed in the industry. The last approval, in 2012 for the Screaming Eagle Zip Line, included discussion about the Applicant's future plans to add the building expansion with a 16-lane bowling alley as currently proposed. The proposed expansion would look significantly different in design and less like the 1990s.
- The City had utilized mail, various newspaper postings, a sign on the site, and the City's website to send the standard required land use notices.
- The Stage I Master Plan, which detailed the location of certain uses, needed to be modified because the Fun Center was in the Planned Development Commercial Zone.
  - The Applicant had proposed replacing the existing batting cages with parking and stormwater facilities. The building addition would extend on the east side into what was currently parking.
- Stage II Final Plan Modification delved more into the functional details of the site, including traffic, parking, utilities, and the overall design. He described the proposed changes to the site, noting additional parking and rain garden in the former batting cage area, pedestrian sidewalks surrounding the building, and a new, broader pedestrian area at the main entrance. (Slide 11)
  - Parking lot circulation would continue to meet City standards and allow for appropriate circulation, including fire access.
  - Traffic. According to the ITE Manual, batting cages generate quite a bit of traffic, but the removal of the eight batting cages and the addition of the bowling alley would only net three additional trips, which represented a minimal change. The Traffic Report did not anticipate that the added building would contribute to congestion or violate any levels of service (LOS) at any intersections throughout the city.
  - Parking. There were many unique uses on the site, not all of which were defined in Table 5, Section 4.155. Per the Code, if a use was not defined, the DRB could define the parking ratio, which had occurred a number of times over the years. For items identified in Table 5 of the Parking Code, that standard that was used. For situations not identified in the table, the analysis relied on previous approvals.

- The Applicant proposed four parking spaces per bowling alley lane, which was reflective of the bowling league era where all four people were anticipated to drive separate vehicles. A total of 64 spaces were proposed, which was more than the minimum, and Staff recommended that there would be adequate parking with the proposed new layout and uses.

**Joann Linville** observed that individuals would come and go to use the batting cages, but with a bowling league, traffic would increase at certain times. She asked if the Traffic Study gave any consideration to traffic patterns during bowling league games versus the traffic patterns of random people coming and going to the batting cages.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that because of the number of activities available at the entertainment campus, it was anticipated that the typical user would be someone who would bowl and then enjoy other activities, as opposed to an all night league event typical of a traditional bowling alley.

**Dominique Huffman, Civil Engineer, Engineering Group**, explained the intent for the proposed bowling alley was not necessarily for league play but as a facility for families and other activities. However, the Traffic Study did account for typical traffic for a standard bowling alley and those types of trips were added to the site. The typical trips generated by batting cage use, as outlined in the ITE Manual, were removed, which resulted in a net increase of three trips. The intent of the proposed additional facility was to spread out use of the site year-round rather than most of the trips being generated in the summer. She believed August being peak use for the site. She also noted most traffic would not occur during the Peak Hour, but during weekends.

**Shanti Villarreal** asked if parking for school buses had been taken into consideration.

**Mr. Pauly** responded it had been brought up in discussions with the Applicant, but he was unaware if anything in the Traffic Report specifically addressed that issue.

**Ms. Huffman** clarified nothing in the Traffic Report specifically addressed school bus parking but she noted that the drive aisle provided sufficient access for buses and to her knowledge no specific bus parking was identified.

**Mr. Pauly** stated most of the parking lot would stay the same. As designed, the tree requirements would aggregate the trees along the edges, rather than having planting islands every few spaces, which would leave the middle of the lot pretty open and allow a bus to pull in and use a number of spaces. School buses would typically use the lot during school hours, not during peak times for other users. He noted the City had never received any complaints from Fun Center guests of the stating they could not park due to buses taking up the spaces.

**Mr. Pauly** continued with the Staff report presentation as follows:

- Site Design Review addressed architectural details. The building brought in many natural elements and natural colors using a variety of materials with the intention of creating visual interest and also tying in with materials used elsewhere in the Town Center. He described the materials and architectural features of the proposed building addition, as well as that added to the existing building to break up the façade, and add interest. Key elements included retaining the large glass wall, a flowing water themed corner element, a new gateway entrance with a concrete-look metal panel and concrete inlays, as well as a large area of stone veneer with glass and red metal panels topped with a kinetic wall. (Slide 14) He circulated the color materials board.

- The kinetic wall was a very interesting feature with connected panels that would move in the wind.
- As far as architectural context, the movie theater across the street was a concrete block style building with a lot of glass and interesting architectural elements. The Eye Health building, which would start construction soon, would also feature glass, natural elements, and interesting lines. Red brick was used often in the Town Center, despite polling unfavorably in surveys. There was also a lot of glass and different accents with corporate colors.
- Looking at the variety of natural elements, Staff believed the proposed design represented the use in a tasteful way that also blended with the surrounding materials and architecture used in the immediate area as well as Town Center. As presented, Staff recommended approval because the proposal met the City standards with regard to compatibility with the surrounding area, quality materials, and professional design.
- The proposed landscaping was used to incorporate nature, especially with the rainwater features within the racetrack, as well as in the former batting cage area, around the buildings, and in the parking lot.
- Type C Tree Plan. Several parking lot and landscape trees planted with the original building in the 1990s were being removed. No native or pre-development trees would be affected. All tree removal seemed reasonable and necessary to facilitate the proposed changes work and was being mitigated onsite.
- Class 3 Sign Permit. The Applicant had not figured out the exact copy, but had identified an area close to the entrance and had decided on the style and type of sign that worked with the architecture and met the area allowance for the building. Staff recommended approval, as the proposal met all of the standards.
  - The application did not involve the freeway sign. If the Applicant wanted to change that sign in the future, it would be under a separate application.
- The Applicant had worked with Staff, listened to feedback and sought to understand and comply with the Code while meeting their needs for continuing to provide an interesting product for the community. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

**Ms. Villarreal** asked if any impact was anticipated on other businesses in the area, such as the bowling alley.

**Mr. Pauly** replied he anticipated that it would, but regardless of any personal feelings, that was something that could not be controlled by the City. The Applicant had done their research on the marketplace and felt it would be profitable. Wilsonville Lanes had contacted him about their concerns, but he confirmed no applicable criteria ~~that~~ could be applied.

**Jennifer Willard** noted Ms. Scola stated in her staff report that significant long-term changes to the area where the site was located were envisioned as a part of the Town Center Plan. She asked if the proposed application was grossly in conflict with the envisioned Town Center Plan even though it was not adopted yet.

**Mr. Pauly** responded there was a vision of density potentially towards the freeway and some higher buildings. However, during the planning process, it had been acknowledged that the area was to be an entertainment cluster for some time. However, from a legal standpoint, nothing had been adopted and although there were significant, ongoing planning efforts for the area that would become a part of the Town Center Master Plan towards the end of 2018, Staff and the DRB had to apply the standards on the books at the time of application.

**Ms. Linville** asked what the timeline was for construction and if any future changes to the Town Center Master Plan would impact the project if the DRB already approved it.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that once approval was granted, it was good for two years. If the original approval was to expire, and there were new standards on the books, the Applicant would need to make changes to meet the new standards. The Applicant had already submitted the preliminary building plans, which were under review. He understood the Applicant wanted to pursue construction as soon as possible.

**Ms. Linville** noted Condition PDC 9 on Page 9 of the Staff report stated the lighting was to be reduced one hour after close, but in no case later than 10:00 pm, to 50 percent of the requirements; however, the application stated the Fun Center would be open until 11:00 pm on Fridays and Saturdays, and that lighting intensity would be reduced one hour after close or the curfew time, which meant full lighting until midnight. She asked how that would be resolved, if it had been already within the conditions of approval.

**Mr. Pauly** replied he might need to reread the Code and the finding, and if necessary, that condition could be revised. There could be further discussion because the Fun Center was next to a residential area. That said, any lighting requirements would only apply to new lighting, not any lighting that exists under the current Code. The Outdoor Lighting Ordinance specifically stated that more than 50 percent of the luminaires on a site had to be replaced before it was considered a major modification that would require the whole site to be upgraded to meet current Outdoor Lighting Standards. He did not believe that was the case with this application; it would only be the lights on the new portion of the building. Any lights on the zip line, golf course, bumper boats, or Autotopia fell under the old standards. He agreed there appeared to be a conflict and offered to look over the Code during the Applicant's presentation.

**Chair Ruby** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group, 9020 SW Washington Square Rd, Suite 170, Portland, OR, 97223** introduced the members of the ownership group and presented the Applicant's proposal, noting Staff had given a very good summary of the Staff report and the Code compliance. His comments were as follows:

- The Applicant's focus on the design had been one representing the form and function of the facility as a family-oriented entertainment center, which was distinctly different from other activities within Town Center; the closest function being the movie theater. The focus on the design element had to do with the distinction of the site being a fun center, and it was intentionally designed to represent that function and not conflict, but not blend in, with the typical Class A office buildings in the area.
- With regard to the questions asked, he noted that batting cages were utilized by individuals, as well as teams, for batting practice.
  - In contrast with other bowling alleys, the Fun Center was not a league-oriented facility like Wilsonville Bowl that had organized leagues that played on a regular basis. It was more family-oriented, and it was anticipated that families going there for the other activities would simply add bowling to the activities that they do while at the facility.
- With regard to lighting, he reiterated that compliance with the new Code was not triggered unless over 50 percent of the lighting was replaced, and the proposed new lighting was less than 50 percent, so the effect of the entire Code would not be applicable in this case. Over time, because the Code had a cumulative effect, future changes that crossed the 50 percent threshold would trigger full compliance with any updated Code standards. He agreed the condition needed to be clarified.

**Shawn Butler, Brunswick Bowling**, stated he had 30 years of experience with Brunswick Bowling and was in charge of design construction. He was helping the owners' group design and construct the center. He builds approximately ten centers every year in the United States and internationally.

- He noted current trends in bowling showed league bowling on the decline with traditional bowling alleys going out of business at a rapid rate. In the last couple of years, what was known as open play recreational bowling had exceeded league bowling.
- Many cities had four to eight parking spaces dictated per bowling lane, however, that was league-based with four to six people on a team coming in with their own cars. Recreational bowling required fewer parking spaces, approximately two cars per lane. Brunswick was building approximately 50 new centers per year in the United States, and the trend was toward so-called bowling entertainment facilities, such as the Family Fun Center, that included other amenities like food and beverage, arcades, mini golf, etc. As such, the Applicant based their parking space calculation on the whole center, which was one space per every 150 sq ft to 200 sq ft of entertainment facility.
- These entertainment centers featured activities for all ages, from 4 to 84 years old, which facilitated the rise in popularity of recreational bowling. Conversely, traditional centers and league bowling were declining due to people not wanting to make a set, weekly commitment for up to 36 weeks out of the year.

**Mr. Altman** noted that with regard to bus access, buses in this type of facility usually pull up and park in the drive aisle to offload at the front door. If no parking was available onsite, the bus would pull offsite and wait elsewhere until passengers were ready to reload and leave, so there was plenty of room for that type of activity.

- The Applicant had reviewed the Staff report and concurred with all conditions of approval other than clarifying the lighting, which was one element to touch base on.

**Mr. Pauly** reported that, having looked at the application again, the Family Fun Center was in Lighting Zone 3, not Lighting Zone 2, which was a typical condition throughout the city, thus changing the curfew time from 10:00 pm to midnight, which was typically an hour after close in this condition.

- He recommended changing the language in PDC 9 to "but in no case later than ~~10 pm~~ **midnight**." PDC 10 would still apply, and the Applicant would still need special permission, as they currently did for noise, for an all-night activity because the all-night-activity permission dated back to a previous approval in 2012 for the zip line.

**Ms. Linville** understood the goal of expansion was to increase the use of the facility with the hope that it would be busier than it was currently.

**Mr. Altman** agreed, but added that the Family Fun Center was adding indoor activities in an effort to spread usage throughout the year as opposed to having a peak summer usage season.

**Ms. Linville** stated that the exterior and the plan were great and a really nice addition to the community, but she was concerned that there was no way to quantify the number of parking spaces that would be necessary for this kind of facility. She believed Big Al's was the only place that was comparable and similar in magnitude. The worst thing for the Applicant would be if guests could not find a parking space and then leave. She wondered if guests might park at the movie theater if they could not find parking at the Fun Center.

**Mr. Altman** replied there were a few cases where guests parked across the street or at Les Schwab when Les Schwab was not open, as there were informal agreements about that occurring. Most of the businesses across the street, except the movie theater, closed after 5:00 pm, so there was plenty of parking in the immediate area. Since 1994, there had never been an instance of a parking problem.

**Ms. Villarreal** noted another analysis would be triggered on traffic, if it reached a certain point, and asked if there was a similar process for parking because as Wilsonville continued to grow, it could become a problem.

**Mr. Altman** believed it would be self correcting because if the Fun Center began to run out of parking, they would look for options to fix that as maintaining access for the customer was obviously an operating issue.

**Chair Ruby** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he noted no rebuttal was necessary.

**Ms. Linville** noted a potential typo regarding the estimated water use on the landscape design document, Page LC-1. It appeared that the estimated water use in gallons per year for Zone 7 and Zone 5 would be added together, which would still under the maximum water allowance, however, the actual number appeared incorrect.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that he was not an expert on irrigation, but typically, Planning Staff did not look at it that carefully. Certainly, people wanted to minimize use, and during the building plan review, any necessary plumbing permits would ensure that anything required by Code was calculated correctly.

**Ms. Linville** said it appeared that Hydra Zone 7 estimated 59,159 gallons and Hydra Zone 5 estimated 55,024.43, but those two numbers added together would not total 59,159 gallons. It was well within the maximum, but the numbers looked strange.

**Mr. Pauly** replied it was a good question, adding that as the Applicant came in with the final design plans for construction, he would tag that and see if the number changed when it was reviewed more carefully in the design.

**Chair Ruby** closed the public hearing at 7:24 pm.

**James Frinell moved to approve Resolution No. 356 amending the language in Condition PDC 9 so that lighting shall be reduced one hour after close but no later than midnight. Jennifer Willard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Chair Ruby** read the rules of appeal into the record.

## **VII. Board Member Communications**

### **A. Results of the June 25, 2018 DRB Panel B meeting**

**Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner**, noted that the two-acre lots on Canyon Creek Rd South had gradually subdivided over time primarily into about 14 or 15 more subdivided lots, most of which were Renaissance at Canyon Creek. Panel B worked on another subdivision last month that was only five additional lots, but it went through the whole process and City Council had since

adopted that zone change. It was an interesting place for infill because it was close to Town Center and employment.

B. Recent City Council Action Minutes

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney**, noted City Council had adopted the Basalt Creek Concept Plan, a big land-use deal that had been ongoing for several years, so it was a milestone. Basalt Creek was an unincorporated area in Washington County located between Wilsonville and Tualatin. The two cities were supposed to plan it out together and but the decision regarding where the boundary line would be between both cities went back and forth several times. After coming to what everyone believed was an agreement, Tualatin decided to switch a piece of land that Wilsonville felt was critical from industrial development to residential use. Both cities went through a protracted negotiations period with no result, and finally both sides agreed to let Metro arbitrate the dispute. Both sides briefed it, presented it, and Metro came down on Wilsonville's side. Tualatin was not happy, but they had agreed to the process so both sides passed the Concept Plan. Two landowners in the Central Sub Area have appealed it to LUBA, so everyone would have to wait to see what would happen.

**VIII. Staff Communications**

**Dominique Hoffman, Civil Engineer**, introduced herself to the Board, noting she had begun working for the City in May and this was her first DRB meeting. She had worked for the City of Tualatin for three years and prior to that was with Washington State DOT working on projects from Vancouver to Centralia. She currently lived in Tualatin and thus far, Wilsonville had been a great place to work and a great community to work for.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for  
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant