



**BLOOMINGTON BUILDING DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE MEETING &  
CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

BLOOMINGTON CITY OFFICE  
45 N 1<sup>st</sup> West  
November 2, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

The first portion of this meeting was the BADC regular meeting. Minutes were taken by Shanna Spuhler.

In attendance: Dan Porter, Marilyn Wilkes, Roy Bunderson, Michael Knapp, Cindy Piggott, Jane Simpson, Jerry Thornock, Robert Allred, Wayne Lloyd, David Bee, Debbie Thomas, Shanna Spuhler, Philip Ward came in a little late.

**WELCOME** - Wayne Lloyd

Meeting called to order 19:00

**REVIEW OF MINUTES** from Oct. 5, 2022

Minutes from October 5 – Jane Simpson motioned to approve, Jerry Thornock seconded, motioned passed

**NEW BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS** – None

**Pledge – Cindy**

Time turned over to Mayor Bunderson to hold Work Meeting, Debbie Thomas took the minutes from here to end.

**Building Permit Application**

**LOT REGULATION COMPLIANCE**

- Under agricultural buildings setbacks, Marilyn wondered about adding “roll off sheds and containers” to this part. It was decided to add those words.
- 100 ft of frontage, Marilyn asked why is this not for agricultural buildings?

Roy – if he builds a home and meets all the setbacks, and then he decides that he wants to put in an agricultural building, will that need a building permit? He suggests that is a little restrictive to have someone get a building permit for a chicken coop.

Jane - The ordinance says, any structure built in the city.

Wayne Lloyd said it was nice to know what goes on in the city even if we don't charge a fee.

Marilyn – It's for the setbacks also. The other thing I mentioned about the 100 feet of frontage width applies only to residential buildings. Only residential requires 100 feet of frontage, not agricultural.

Jerry asked about a change of use from an agricultural to a residential building. It was replied that they would not be able to do that without a variance.

Roy - A variance is very hard to get. It isn't for mistakes, it's for property with physical characteristics that make it difficult to meet the standard.

All agreed with Roy.

Mike restated that we should not ask for a building permit for every little building. We do not need to care about every little building.

Jane said it was to make sure they meet the setbacks.

Mike reiterated we just do not need to worry about it under so many square feet.

Jane said we aren't here to vote for the Ordinance, we are here for the building permit. This may need to be discussed in another meeting.

Debbie was asked to make note of this discussion for another meeting.

Philip joined the meeting at this point.

### **Current Fees**

- We have already made the correction to reflect \$250 for homes, barns, sheds...

Roy asked if anyone had any concerns with that cost? We can only charge equal to the cost of providing the service.

Mike – it takes the same amount of work for an ag building as a residential building, so they should be the same cost.

A question arose as to what “any other structure that requires water and/or sewer” would be?

- It was decided to remove this part from the application.

Road cutting fee retainer – \$1500, is this redundant.

On gravel – any questions on fee?

- Dan – suggested that a time limit be within 1 year to get the repair of road fixed.
- The verbiage of “Retainer will be held up to one year” will be added.

Jane – if I fix the road to the best of my ability, I should not have to wait one year to get my money back.

If the councilmember over roads deems the work good then they get their money back.

- “Failure to pay additional fee will result in water shut-off until fee is paid” will be taken out.

Jane has the concern that the contractors talked to do not want to bore as the correct grade is difficult to achieve.

There was some concern that contractors who are willing to bore cannot be found.

Roy – we now have two reputable contractors that are willing to bore.

Roy stated that a road that has been cut into is never returned to its original condition.

Jane said the verbiage is there, we just need to increase the deposit to \$4000.

Cindy said she thought \$4000 was much better.

There was more discussion as to what the appropriate deposit for cutting a road should be and how involved the city would be in the repair.

Roy said let's go \$5000 for cutting the asphalt and we stay out of the bid. The city will retain \$500. He asked if everyone was okay with that? Everyone agreed.

- It was decided that the amount of \$5000.00 will be the deposit to the City prior to cutting into a paved road, \$4500 will be returned after road is repaired to city specifications.
- "Said bid must be completed by a third party chosen by the City of Bloomington" will be taken out.
- 1st page Under Current Fees and Road Cutting Fee – the word "retainer" will be kept.
- The amount will be eliminated under "Current Fees" then "Road Cutting Fee Retainer." Two astricts will remain and refer them to the next page of road cutting fees for this cost, using the verbiage of "See Road Damage Retainer Section."
- On draft presented, verbiage in red will be kept except where noted.

Jane asked if there were any other concerns under the "Current Fees" section of the permit?

Rob suggested that we set a commercial and multi-family unit construction fee.

Jane said we need to address this concern in the ordinance first.

Moving on "**Water**"

- Uncap "Corp Value" and parentheses will be added.

Roy asked about the addition of asking for an as-built from customers? He stated that we have things scattered all over the city that we do not know where they are.

Jane was unsure how to implement this into what has already been done.

Jane suggested that we could get the GPS unit and that would solve all these problems.

We could use google maps and drop a pin, in the meantime.

Marilyn – if we drop a pin, will it give depth? No, but it will give us correct coordinates.

Mike asked if it says water or sewer, does that mean that we need to go out and watch while they put in their lines?

Roy said he is softening his touch. When Shawn checked on Smith's lines, he got down in the trench and checked the connections, then discussed how things were done with the Smith's and found their work adequate.

- The word "oversee" will be taken out of the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under water.
- Contact city clerk to schedule an inspection will be left in.
- 48 hours will remain as the noted time notice they must give the city.
- First and second bullet point wording will remain with the noted change.

Jane stated that a construction flow sheet will be created for each customer. This flowsheet can be accessed showing what has been done and what needs to be done.

Concerning the third bullet point, Roy asked if there is anything that would prevent someone from drilling a well up on the hill?

Mike asked why would we want to prevent them?

- Under “Water” the same exception will be added to water as there is on sewer, with some change in verbiage.

Philip asked if the old ordinance says, if they live in the city limits, you must hook onto city water. Do we want this to remain in the permit?

Dan – if they’re willing to put in the infrastructure, they can get water.

Roy – my point to you, is do you think they should have to hook onto the water or can they drill a well if city water is hard to get? Perhaps we allow them to drill a well. Let’s talk about this in another meeting, but not put it on the back burner.

Jane suggested that anytime you put verbiage in an ordinance that allows exceptions to the rule, it allows for others to do as they please. If you keep it simple and say if you are in the city limits, you have to partake of our services.

- The word “Hydrant” will remain.
- The whole water section will remain as stated.

## **Sewer**

- Take out the word “oversee.”
- Take out the word “be present.”
- Leave “Contact the City Clerk.....”.
- The city “must approve” the location of the lateral connections to the sewer, “be present will be taken out and replaced with “must approve.”
- “Engineering and construction plans which meet” will be added.
- Red verbiage will remain.

## **Application Checklist**

- 4<sup>th</sup> point, (If applicable) will be taken out.

## **Procedures**

- Verbiage in red will remain
- Take “oversite” out from Contact City Clerk...

This building permit will be turned into resolution form and made ready for the next council meeting to be signed.

## **Sewer Ordinance Draft**

Mike proposed that we go through it and talk about a few points and get a good start on this ordinance.

Jane – There are three ordinances that are very critical to this ordinance: 1983-3, 1980-51, and 2000-1. Over the years bits and pieces have been changed, but all the changes have never been conglomerated into a single document.

Jane has broken apart sewer and water and brought stuff from the other three ordinances into this one ordinance.

- Chapter 3 – Mike would like to remove “if the is within 100 ft” will be removed. The word “and” provided the sewer can be serviced will be added.
- Page 4 “The occupant of the property will... “ will be taken out.
- 3.2.2 – strike “within or without the City.”
- 3.2.2 “regardless of whether the cost of, to the period” will be removed.

Ordinance 2000-1 says if you pay for the line, then anyone else hooking onto that line will pay you back a portion based on a calculation.

Mike asked if we want to get into this business of recovering monies for others? Mike stated this treats the person who put in the line fairly, but is so much work for the city.

Roy asked if we have the stomach to facilitate this?

Jane stated that we already have an ordinance that states this. Do we want to keep it?

Mike said he leans to not doing it because it opens a can of worms we probably do not want to deal with.

- The council decided that paragraphs A-F will be taken out.
- Go back to 3.2.2, the verbiage “engineering” may need to be added.
- 3.5.1, take out “approved by the City.”
- 3.5.2, the word “oversight” will be taken out,
- 3.5.3, the wording “City’s main sewer line” will be changed to “sewer main.”

On 3.5.5, sump pumps are not permitted...Roy asked how do you enforce that? But we want to keep it in.

Rob recommends that a RV dump station could be put in and we could require a permit and we could charge them a fee for that station.

Roy question if that will reduce the illegal use or promote it?

Rob said he thinks it will be fair for those who want it.

Shanna shared with the council that the State allows an RV to be dumped but not connected to a sewer line.

Roy asked, “Do we want to really want to promote this?”

It’s 9:00. Let consider this point and meet back to discuss it.

- Motion to adjourn: Mike moves to adjourn, second Dan, vote unanimous

**9:00 P.M. ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 9, 2022**