

TOWN OF DURHAM

Connecticut 06422



May 11, 1978

Mrs. Marjorie C. Hatch, CMC
Town Clerk
Durham, CT 06422

Dear Marge:

This letter is to clarify the matter of tennis permits issued by your office.

The Durham Recreation Committee has decided to use tennis permits as the method of regulating the use of the tennis courts. Tennis permits may be issued only to those who are presently residents of Durham, and not to former residents or relatives of residents.

This year we are forced to initiate a fee of one dollar for the issuance of each permit. For this year only, previously issued permits will still be valid. Beginning with the 1979 season (May 1 - Oct. 31) residents will be required to obtain a new permit each year for the current fee (hopefully still only \$1). In order to emphasize the importance of safeguarding one's permit, and, to preclude residents from obtaining permits for out-of-towners, we ask you to advise applicants that a re-issue of a permit to the same individual in the same year will cost five dollars. We certainly hope this situation will not present itself to you, but we feel the policy is necessary.

Thank you for your cooperation in handling these permits.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joe Venuti".

Joe Venuti, Chairman
Durham Recreation Committee

JV:ddw

REC'D	5-11	1978	AT 12:15	AM
ATT:	WCH			P.M.
TOWN CLERK				

Rec'd 5/12/78

TOWN OF DURHAM

Connecticut 06422



BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

May 11, 1978

Called to order at 8:00 P.M.

Minutes of previous meeting approved. 3-0

In attendance: G. Curtis, L. Hinman, B. Wakeman, J. Negrich, W. Moore, M. Kopec, E. Kopec, O. McLaughlin.

J. Negrich expressed a desire to become a member of the Conservation Committee. Board will take his request under advisement.

A petition was presented by Mr. and Mrs. Kopec concerning the Perma Treat Corp. Copy of petition enclosed. They have an appointment with P & Z on May 17th.

Correspondence: Letter from Robert Gourley, Administrative Asst. of Regional School District 13; Copy enclosed was read. Letter from Carl Otte enclosed; letter from Ed Higgins enclosed; letter from Joe Venuti enclosed. Board will set up meeting with Rec. Committee for May 17th or May 23rd to discuss the matter of charging fees for recreational programs.

Appointments - Zoning Board of Appeals - Jack Tinkle was nominated and elected to said board. 3-0 Kai Thomenius was elected as an alternate to the board. 3-0

John Negrich elected to Conservation Commission to replace Wm. Coe. 3-0

Subject of Septic Lagoons - Test holes are to be dug next week under supervision of DEP, Durham's Health Officer, and Conservation Commission. If the reports are favorable, Board will proceed with the project upon the consent of the Conservation Commission.

Expenses of all departments were discussed. Selectmen's budget is going to have an over-run of about \$800.00 Motion made by B. Wakeman, second L. Hinman to request the sum of \$800.00 from Finance Board to cover this over-run.

Request by a group of residents on Higganum Rd. to have the town Zoning Officer check the Camozzi property as to piling of scrap metal and also

having too many unregistered vehicles.

A motion made by L. Hinman, second by B. Wakeman, to have Zoning Officer look into this matter. 3-0

Al Nelson from DMIAB advised Board of a leachate seepage problem at the dump with pollution going into Coginchaug River. Slopes will be seeded and mulched to help slow down the seepage.

Meeting adjourned at 9:58 precisely -

Most respectfully submitted,

Lewis G. Hinman/d

Lewis G. Hinman, Esq.

LGH:ddw

We the undersigned residents and/or taxpayers of the Town of Durham request the Planning and Zoning Commission to revoke its permit issued to Perma Treat Corporation for the operation of their wood treating plant on Route 157, Durham, Connecticut for the following reasons:

1. The operation of the plant creates emissions which pollute the air and this pollution is apparent throughout a wide section of the town. The resulting pungent smell is clearly creosote. Since creosote is the main toxic agent used by Perma Treat it can be without a doubt that these emissions are attributable to the plant.
2. The plant is in continual operation twenty-four hours a day. The noise resulting from the operation is disturbing to the residents in the area. This noise has been apparent for a long time and was noticeable inside residences in periods, where both windows and storm windows were in use. In addition to the operating noise there is considerable train movement during the early morning hours. The noise attendant to the train operation is disturbing the sleep of nearby residents.
3. We believe that the emissions will be characterized by any disinterested qualified observer as being carcinogenic in nature. It is a proven fact that carcinogenic emissions have been linked to cancer.

4. Because of the foregoing factors our homes have suffered substantial depreciation which will be reflected with any future sales. We believe it is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Commission to restore the value that existed in our homes prior to the establishment of the Perma Treat Plant.

We ask that evidence of written approval of the Department of Environmental Protection, State of Connecticut for the establishment of the Perma Treat Plant be produced. We believe that written approval of this State Agency was a pre-requisite to the permit granted by the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Durham.

The above clearly sets forth the reasons why the Perma Treat Plant should be closed down. It constitutes a menace to the health of the residents of the community and presents a formidable barrier to the future growth and development of the Town of Durham as a desirable residential area. We the residents have now suffered adverse financial losses and the Town of Durham will be penalized by a tax base limited by the absence of future residential construction caused by the pungent odor and noise created by the Perma Treat Plant.

We firmly believe that employment and tax receipts provided by the Perma Treat Plant are more than offset by the above mentioned transgressions of the Perma Treat Corporation.

May 11, 1978.