

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, August 16, 2018 7:00 PM
City Council Chambers, 1001 Bridge Street, Vernonia OR 97064
REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA

Position #1 - (Exp.2020) – Jeff Walton **Position #2** – (Exp. 2021) – Brad Zichterman
Position #3 – (Exp. 2018) – Erika Paleck **Position #4** – (Exp. 2018) – Grant Williams **Position #5** – (Exp. 2019) – Jeff Goodman

Call to Order: Erika Paleck, Chair

Approval or Additions to Agenda

Approval of Planning Commission minutes from July 19, 2018 Pg. 1-4

Topics from the Floor

Continued: Public Hearing of PA 17-02..... Pg. 5-12

- a. Call Hearing to Order**
- b. Order of Hearing**
- c. Exparte**
- d. Conflict of Interest**
- e. Challenge**
- f. Staff Report-City Planner Matt Straite**
- g. Testimony in Favor**
- h. Testimony in Opposition**
- i. Neutral Testimony**
- j. Final Call for Testimony**
- k. Applicant Rebuttal**
- l. Extend the Hearing**
- m. Close the Hearing**

Commission Deliberation of PA 17-02

Commission Motion of Decision

Commissioners Reports

Chairperson Report

Correspondence

Adjournment

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, July 19, 2018 7:00 PM

City Council Chambers, 1001 Bridge Street, Vernonia OR 97064

REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING

MINUTES

Position #1 - (Exp.2020) – Jeff Walton	Position #2 – (Exp. 2021) – Brad Zichterman	
Position #3 – (Exp. 2018) – Erika Paleck	Position #4 – (Exp. 2018) – Grant Williams	Position #5 – (Exp. 2019) – Jeff Goodman

Commissioners in Attendance: Commissioner Paleck, Commissioner Zichterman, Commissioner Williams, and Commissioner Goodman

Absent Commissioners: Commissioner Walton

Staff in Attendance: City Planner Matt Straite and City Recorder Borst

Call to Order: Erika Paleck, Chair

Commissioner Paleck called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm

Approval or Additions to Agenda

Commissioner Zichterman made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Williams.

Votes:

Commissioner Paleck: Yes Commissioner Williams: Yes Commissioner Goodman: Yes

Commissioner Walton: Absent Commissioner Zichterman: Yes

Motion carried.

Approval of Planning Commission minutes from June 7, 2018

City Recorder Borst corrected the minutes to reflect that the meeting was chaired by Commissioner Goodman, not Commissioner Paleck. She also corrected the title to reflect “Minutes” not “Agenda”.

Commissioner Zichterman made a motion to adopt the meeting minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goodman.

Votes:

Commissioner Paleck: Yes Commissioner Williams: Yes Commissioner Goodman: Yes

Commissioner Walton: Absent Commissioner Zichterman: Yes

Motion carried.

Topics from the floor

City Recorder Borst read into the record a letter from Tony Schrader regarding building set backs (See File).

Ben Fousek, Vernonia, would like to address the discussion regarding building over lot lines. His concern is how to address the roughly 250-300 buildings that will be affected by this. He would like to see a review process for staff put in place for when people come in for land actions.

Commissioner Paleck inquired as to if this could be addressed with a variance. Mr. Straite explained that variances are only warranted by a uniqueness to the lot. In this instance, staff would recommend not granting a variance.

Public Hearing of EXT 18-01

a. Call Hearing to Order

Commissioner Paleck called the public hearing to order at 7:17 pm

b. Order of Hearing

Commissioner Paleck explained the order of the hearing.

c. Exparte

There was none to declare

d. Conflict of Interest

There was none to declare

e. Challenge

There was none to declare

f. Staff Report-City Planner Matt Straite

City Planner Straite presented his staff report to the Commission. Commissioner Paleck inquired of Mr. Pihl why the truck with the tree on it is still there. Mr. Pihl explained that the truck and tree serve as a gate as well as a warning to potential trespassers. Commissioner Paleck inquired if the new houses in the area will affect the development. Mr. Straite explained that the wetland study has already been completed. He added that the development will have to follow the current code at the time of final approval.

Commissioner Paleck inquired about the extension limit that is being proposed in the title 9 update. Mr. Straite explained that municipalities like to have limits on extensions so the applicant has to make updates to the proposal. The change in title 9 will not affect this development.

Commissioner Williams inquired as to if Mellinger Road will have to be paved. His concern is dust issues during construction. Mr. Pihl stated that it would be paved. Mr. Straite explained that this application states access will be via Riverside Drive. He suspects that will change during the final approval. He added that dust mitigation would be required during development.

g. Testimony in Favor

There was none

h. Testimony in Opposition

There was none

i. Neutral Testimony

There was none

j. Final Call for Testimony

There was none

k. Applicant Rebuttal

There was none

l. Extend the Hearing

There was none

m. Close the Hearing

Commissioner Paleck closed the public hearing at 7:36 pm

Commission Deliberation of EXT 18-01

Commission Motion of Decision

Commissioner Zichterman made a motion to approve the Nehalem View Preliminary PD and Subdivision Plan Extension (EXT18-01) request until July 19, 2020, subject to the conditions of approval in the original 2008 decision. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goodman.

Votes:

Commissioner Paleck: Yes

Commissioner Williams: Yes Commissioner Goodman: Yes

Commissioner Walton: Absent

Commissioner Zichterman: Yes

Motion carried.

Public Hearing of PA 17-02

a. Call Hearing to Order

Commissioner Paleck called the hearing to order at 7:38pm

b. Order of Hearing

Commissioner Paleck explained the order of the hearing.

c. Exparte

There was none to declare.

d. Conflict of Interest

There was none to declare.

e. Challenge

There was none

f. Staff Report-City Planner Matt Straite

Mr. Straite presented the staff report to the Commissioners. He added that number 4 has been changed to reflect 24' wide by 20' deep driveways. Number 5, detached accessory structure setbacks, is an addition which has not been presented yet but staff felt it was pressing and added it for consideration.

Mr. Straite explained that he reached out to fellow City Planners about building over lot lines and received mixed reviews on what other cities do. The section reflects what the Commissioners requested at the work session but he wanted to make them aware of this. He presented agreements some other cities use for the Commissioners to review (See File).

g. Testimony in Favor

There was none.

h. Testimony in Opposition

There was none.

i. Neutral Testimony

There was none.

j. Final Call for Testimony

There was none.

k. Applicant Rebuttal

There was none.

l. Extend the Hearing

There was no request

m. Close the Hearing

Commissioner Paleck closed the hearing at 8:00 pm

Commission Deliberation of PA 17-02

The Commission discussed scenarios that would be affected by a structure being built over lot lines. City Planner Straite explained that the issue could be mitigated by either requiring the lots be merged, or enter into an agreement with the City that they could never be sold separately.

Commissioner Paleck brought up the cost of doing a lot line adjustment and if it would affect taxes. Mr. Straite stated that the adjustment would not impact taxes. Mrs. Paleck suggested entering into agreements with those that are already built over lot lines and to require any new proposals to complete a lot line adjustment. The Commission then discussed pros and cons of covenants and lot line adjustments. No decision was made. The Commissioners would like to discuss further at the next meeting.

The Commissioners then discussed number 4 regarding driveway dimensions. Mr. Straite reiterated that the requirement is 20' deep by 24' wide. There was discussion on whether or not the requirement is for the entirety of the driveway or just the parking area. City Recorder Borst stated that the requirement is for parking space. Mr. Straite stated that this could be explained in the code. He will also look into what the requirement is for fire access.

The Commissioners then discussed number 5 regarding accessory structure setbacks. There was concern that detached structures are allowed a lessor (5') set back than attached structures (15'). Consensus of the group is to adjust so that both detached and attached accessory structures are allowed the 5' setback.

The Commissioners approved of numbers 1,2,3,6,7,8,9,10, 12, 13, and 14. City Recorder Borst requested that number 11, displaying of vehicles, also prohibit the parking of vehicles for sale on city lots. She clarified for the group that the restriction is only for when the vehicles are parked strictly with the intent of selling.

Commission Motion of Decision

Commissioner Zichterman made a motion to continue deliberation of PA 17-02 on August 16 2018 at 7pm. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goodman.

Votes:

Commissioner Paleck: Yes

Commissioner Walton: Absent

Commissioner Williams: Yes

Commissioner Goodman: Yes

Commissioner Zichterman: Yes

Motion carried.

Commissioners Reports

Chairperson Report

Correspondence

Adjournment

Commissioner Paleck adjourned the meeting at 8:53 pm



CITY OF VERNONIA
1001 Bridge Street Vernonia OR
97064

VERNONIA PLANNING COMMISSION
PROPOSED TITLE 9 AMENDMENT
STAFF REPORT

June 20, 2018

To: Planning Commission & City Council

From: Matt Straite, City Planner

REQUEST: The City proposes a Zoning Code Text Change to revise Chapters 9-01 and 9-07 of Title 9 to address cottage homes, street vacations and several other small code text updates. (File # PA 17-02).

APPLICANT: City of Vernonia

LOCATION: City wide

Initial Public Hearing: July 19, 2018

Exhibits:

- Draft Revised Underline- Strikeout Ordinance Title 9 July 5, 2018

Applicable Title 9 Code Criteria

- Chapter 9-01.09 Text Amendments
- Chapter 9-01.11 Procedures
- Vernonia Comprehensive Plan

I. Background

The Planning Commission has directed staff to prepare code edits to:

- allow for tiny homes (cottage homes) in the City of Vernonia to help address affordability and add the ability to further the City's tourism;
- to add street vacation criteria and processes to the code;
- to make several other small changes comprised by the Planning Commission and staff.

No changes were proposed to Chapter 9-02 through 6 or 8 through 11. Changes are proposed to Chapters 9-01, and 9-07. The full redline/strikeout version of Title 9 is attached; however the highlights of the proposed changes include (staff approach to the change in *italics*):

1. Tiny homes (cottage homes) standards and regulations are added. *Adding standards for tiny homes was the impetus for this entire code revision. After a thorough review and several Planning Commission workshops, it became clear that the current code was actually very accommodating tiny homes. There are no minimum home sizes for stick built homes. The code currently features a 950 sq foot minimum on mobile homes, which has been removed, and a 1,000 sq foot minimum in a 'park' which has remained. The 1,000 square foot minimum from Section 9-01.06-20 has not been changed as that may alter a standard that many in existing parks have come to rely on. The Commission gravitated to the larger conceptual idea of permitting a newer type of housing concept, the Cottage Cluster Home. Popularized in Washington, these permit smaller homes in groups, but require a higher degree of scrutiny in exchange for the right to build several smaller (tiny) homes. Exposed wheels on cottage and tiny homes were discussed, but the agreement was to continue to require their concealment. In the end there were very few changes required outside the addition of the cottage home provisions.*

The following revisions are proposed in this code update to address tiny homes:

- a. *The minimum size for a mobile home has been deleted from section 9-07.02-20.*
 - b. *The Cottage Housing provisions were added to help address larger tiny home village-style projects, largely based largely on samples from Washington.*
2. The Downtown Zone currently permits a Single Family (existing) home but has no standards for single family residential homes. Standards for a single family home have been added, modeled after the Residential R zone. *See Section 9-01.03-50.D, Downtown Zone. A simple one sentence addition was made to require any single family home to use the standards from the R zone.*
3. Porch and patio standards have been added to a new Section 9-01.13-60. *This section has clarified the difference between a porch, patio, covered entry and deck. There has been confusion about setbacks for these outdoor additions, even more confusion when you discuss the difference between attached and detached. Standards have been added to clarify setbacks for attached and detached porches and decks. See 9-01.13-60 for details.*
4. 24' driveways have historically been required, but were not required in the Code. A requirement for such has been added. *See Section 9-01.03.C, 9-01.03-20.C, 9-01.03-30.D.*
5. Clarification has been added regarding setbacks of accessory structures in residential zones. *Standards have been added to clarify that setbacks for a detached accessory structure is 5 feet from any property line except the front where the setback matches the primary use (20 feet). See Section 9-01.03.C, 9-01.03-20.C, 9-01.03-30.D.*
6. The Code currently has no Street Vacation criteria or processing standards. Both have been proposed. *The City has been using criteria that was not from the code. This*

places the same criteria and processes that we have been using into the code. The State has processes as well, and criteria; however the State ORS specifically explains that Cities can create their own. See new Section 9-01.12.

7. The text change proposes to add clarity to parking uses that are not listed in the parking standards. *Currently the Planning Commission is the only body that can approve any parking for uses not specifically listed. This is hard for case types that do not normally go to the Planning Commission, like Type I or II permits. As proposed, the Planning Commission would determine standards for Type III and IV applications, planning staff would be able to determine parking totals for non-listed uses in Type I and II permits. See Section 9-01.04-50 Parking and Loading Requirements.*
8. Section 9-01.11-20 Public Notice and Coordinated Review has deadlines for submission to the Department of Land Conservation and Development featured outdated submittal deadline dates. *This has been updated from 45 days to 35 pursuant to changes in State Code. See Section 9-01.11-20.A.*
9. The text change proposes to remove all minimum lot dimensions in residential zones. This would keep the minimum lot size requirements (5,000 square feet for the Residential Zone) but remove the minimum dimension requirements (50' X 100' for example) as these are difficult to administer in the City of Vernonia. *See Section 9-01.03.C, 9-01.03-20.C, 9-01.03-30.D. As shown they are simply deleted. The Commission should consider possibly stating that there are no dimension requirements to remove any ambiguity.*
10. Section 9-07 Manufactured Homes currently explains that Manufactured homes are permitted to use a 3:12 roof pitch, however, it also says all manufactured homes must follow all zoning rules of the base zone. The residential zones require a roof pitch of 4:12. *Updates are proposed to revise all residential zones to clarify that Section 9-07 should prevail regarding slopes on manufactured homes. See Section 9-07.02-20.A.1.j.*
11. The 'display' of vehicles has been clarified to be not permitted in parking areas. *The display of vehicles means vehicles that are for sale. The parking lots were approved for the use of patrons. The number of spaces required, in theory, is tied to the number of needed for the use. If the spaces are being used for the display of vehicles, that is not only a totally separate use (vehicle sales), but it also takes up spaces intended for patrons of the business. "Storage" of vehicles is already not permitted, but this change adds display to the list. See Section 9-01.04-50.D. The change adds one word.*
12. All [brackets] have been removed from zone headings.
13. The PUD Section has been revised to require a Final PUD to be processed with the Change of Zone after approval of a Tentative PUD and make the City Council the final authority. The current code forced a CC approval to be remanded to the PC. *Most jurisdictions process PUD's in two steps, a preliminary PUD plan, and then a final PUD. This affords a more realistic process as some details can be decided after the*

applicant knows they have approval, but leaves the PC another change to see the final product. The final PUD is tied to a zone change process that was already in the code. The current version of the code was not clear on when or how to process a final PUD plan. The required remand to the Commission was also complicated and not needed. The section has been clarified. See Section 9-01.03-80.

14. The text change proposes to add a maximum of 2 permit extensions (two years each) for all Type 1 and 3 permits in Section 9-01.10-70.E, for PD's in Section 9-01.03-80, for CUP's in Section 9-01.06.50, variances in section 9-01.08-40. Currently there are unlimited extensions permitted.
15. The proposed text change clarifies that buildings are not permitted to be built over lot lines. *Staff previously proposed that a new standard been added to the miscellaneous section to require a document to be signed when building over lot lines (or permitting an accessory structure subordinate to a primary structure on different lots) which explains that the two lots must be sold together when sold, and that the structures are non-conforming unless a lot merger is performed. In a workshop the Commission requested this be changed to clarify that any structure proposed over a lot line require a merger prior the building being built. Staff added the change so that the lot merger is required prior to final occupancy. This affords more flexibility, but it should be noted that a property line adjustment is discretionary and could be denied; thus, the applicant would proceed at risk. The code could require the lot merger prior to issuance of building permit alternatively. See new Sections 9-01.12-40 and 50.*

II. Text Amendment Review Criteria, Procedures and Findings

A. Section 9-01.09.10 Authorization to Initiate Amendments. An amendment to the text of Title 9 Land Development and Zoning Code may be initiated only by the City Council, the Planning Commission, the property owner or an authorized agent of the owner.

FINDING: The City finds that the Ordinance amendment was initiated by the City.

B. Section 9-01-09.20 Public Hearings on Amendments. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment. After receiving the recommendation of the Planning Commission, the City Council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed amendment.

FINDINGS: The City finds that the Planning Commission has scheduled a public hearing for July 19, 2018. The Planning Commission will forward their recommendation to the City Council when they have finalized their decision, and subsequently the Council will hold a public hearing.

C. Section 9-01.09.70.c Decision Criteria for Text Amendments. Amendments to the Development Code text shall be approved if the evidence can substantiate the following:

1. Impact of the proposed amendment on land use and development patterns within the City, as measured by,

a. Traffic generation and circulation patterns in compliance with the Transportation Master Plan;

FINDINGS: The City finds that the nature of the subject amendments are related to new standards for different sized dwellings, small code updates that do not effect traffic, and a new section introducing standards for Street Vacations. While street vacations may have the ability to impact traffic and the Transportation master Plan, the changes proposed will still require each street vacation to go through a public hearing process where the proposed vacation will be reviewed by staff and the Council for compliance with these requirements. This proposed code update will make it clear that these are required, therefore this change will not impact traffic or the Transportation Master Plan in any way. The proposed code modifications will not change the Transportation System Plan (TSP), the functional classification of any existing or planned transportation facility, or increase the level of travel on city streets, or reduce or worsen the performance of a transportation facility.

b. Demand for public facilities and services, in compliance with the City Utility Master Plan;

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed code updates primarily deal with tiny homes and street vacation requirements. The revision only elimination the minimum mobile home size requirement and adding the ability to construct cluster tiny-home developments. However, key to this question is that the density allowance is not proposed to change. This means that any new tiny homes will be built consistent with existing master plans for storm water, flood, water, streets and sewer. Therefore, there the tiny home proposed changes are compliant with all mater plans.

The street vacations, as was previously noted, will require hearings for each independent change. The changes are essentially mirroring the current State requirements. The State requires their standards and criteria if the City has not adopted their own. The proposed text changes will allow these requirements to be within the City code, thus protecting the City against possible State changes in the requirements for street vacations. The proposed criteria and standards will be reviewed on a case by case basis when they are submitted. There is nothing in the criteria or standards that conflicts with the existing master plans.

The other proposed changes are small updates fixing typos or clarifying standards. None will alter density or create any changes that would impact utilities.

c. Level of park and recreation facilities;

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed changes to the sections that permit tiny homes will not permit an increase in the density already used as the basis for parks and recreation facility needs. The level of parks required is determined in the Comprehensive Plan and Parks Master Plan, these are all based on the projected population of the City. That projection will not be changed, this revision would simply allow smaller units on the same lots that exist or were planned. As such, there will be no impacts to parks or recreation facilities.

The street vacation requirements will not result in changes to the park and recreation facilities. Any request to alter streets needed for access to existing parks will be reviewed at the time those changes are proposed.

The other proposed changes are small updates fixing typos or clarifying standards. None will impact the parks or recreation facilities.

d. Economic activities;

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed revisions will have no impact on economic activities in the City. The addition of cottage provisions may allow more small (tiny) homes in the City which may help aid in the tourism goals of the City, having a positive economic outcome. The cottage provisions will not allow homes (cottages or otherwise) where they were not already permitted today. The street vacation changes only clarify what has been the process some time.

e. Protection and use of natural resources;

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed revisions have no impact on identified natural resources in the City. All the current environmental regulations that apply to a standard home will still be required on cottage homes. All other proposed code changes are small clarifications that will not impact the environment.

f. Compliance of the proposal with existing adopted special purpose plans or programs, such as public facilities improvements.

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed revisions have no impact on special purpose plans in the City. The proposed changes are small clarifications and do not result in wholesale changes, including any special programs.

2. A demonstrated need exists for the product of the proposed amendment.

FINDINGS: While processing applications through the City procedures, small code error's, the lack of detail, or inconsistencies, became apparent. Staff maintains a list of these. The need is apparent, as these modifications to the code are identified by staff as needed to rectify the procedural complications that arise without these modifications. Making these needed corrections will help the City process applications and enforce the code requirement more efficiently. Regarding the addition of the cottage home provisions, the Planning Commission requested that staff analyze and review the current code processes and barriers that may be preventing people from using tiny homes in the City. This request was partially based on members of the public asking about the ability to use tiny homes in Vernonia. The proposed code modifications will address a need to facilitate the use of tiny homes in the City.

3. The proposed Amendment complies with all Statewide Planning Goals and administrative rule requirements.

The City Comprehensive Plan is designed to implement the State Goals in the City of Vernonia. Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan shows compliance with the State Goals. The proposed changes are fully consistent with the City Comprehensive Plan, and acts to implement the policies and procedures of the Plan. Having that said, an analysis of the pertinent Goals are discussed below.

FINDINGS:

- a. Goal 1- Citizen Involvement. The City has found that nine advertised workshops were held in front of the Planning Commission and publically noticed the hearings for both Planning Commission and City Council. Adequate public involvement was achieved.
 - b. Goal 2- Land Use Planning. The City finds that the proposed amendments to the Code are intended to improve administration and clarify standards for the public.
 - c. Goal 5- Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Space. The City finds that creating clarification through the proposed code modifications will help assure appropriate City administration of the permits, and allow smaller, more affordable homes that will have less impact to the home sites. The effect will limit the amount of land used for the actual homes. This will benefit the natural and scenic resources.
 - d. Goal 7- Areas subject to Natural Hazards. The City of Vernonia has a long history of flooding. All safety provisions that apply to traditional single family homes will apply to cottage homes as well. The other code modifications will not impact natural hazards.
 - e. Goal 10- Housing. The City finds that allowing the use of smaller residential units (cottage homes or tiny homes) reduces the cost of housing and makes it easier for more people to afford housing. The proposed changes to the code will reduce barriers to more affordable housing while not altering the density of the City. The other changes to the code will not impact the access to housing. Some housing standards are being introduced, and criteria to street vacations. These clarifications should not alter access to housing. The proposed changes are consistent with, and implements Goal 10.
4. The amendment is appropriate as measured by at least one of the following criteria: it corrects an error; it is the logical implementation of a city plan; it is mandated by federal, state or local law, or it is deemed by the City Council to be desirable, appropriate or proper.

FINDINGS: The City finds that the proposed amendments meet many of these requirements. Some address error's in the code, such as incorrect references, or proposes to add standards and requirements where there were none previously. Some, such as the cottage home provisions help implement the Comprehensive Plan, by bring more affordable housing, geared towards promoting tourism, to the City. This criterion is met.

D. Section 9-01.10-50 Type IV Procedures and Findings for Legislative decisions

D. Notice of Hearing

FINDINGS: The proposed ordinance amendment was noticed pursuant to all City rules and requirements.

1. Notice of Hearing.
 - a. There shall be a minimum of two hearings, one before the Planning Commission and one before the City Council.
 - b. For a legislative zone change notice to all property owners affected by the change is required at least 20 days before the initial hearing.
 - c. Newspaper notice is required 10 days prior to the Planning Commission hearing and 14 days prior to the City Council hearing.
 - d. Notice shall be provided to the Department of Land Conservation and Development at least 35 days prior to the initial hearing.
 - e. A vote by a majority of the qualified voting members of the Planning Commission and City Council present at the hearing is required for a decision.

FINDINGS: The City finds that there will be at least one hearing before the Planning Commission on July 19, 2018. Pursuant to a recommendation by the Commission, there will be at least one hearing before City Council.

The City finds subject amendment is not a zone designation change, rather, it is a text change effecting the whole City. Therefore the code does not require individual property notices to be sent.

The City finds that notice was published in the newspaper of general circulation on July 3, 2018 prior to the July 19 Commission hearing.

The City finds that notice was provided to the DLCD on or before June 6, 2018.

The City finds that the recommendation for approval or denial of the amendments will be made by a majority of the members present at the hearing. A decision by City Council must be made in the same manner.

III. RECOMMENDATION (Also a sample motion)

Based on the proposed amendments attached and the findings in this report, Staff recommends approval of File # PA 17-02 Proposed Amendments to revise Chapters 9-01 and 9-07 of Title 9 to address cottage homes, street vacations and several other small code text updates, as may be modified by the Commission and then forwarded as a recommendation to the City Council for adoption.