



City of Nashua
Conservation Commission
229 Main Street
Nashua NH 03061-2019

Planning & Zoning 589-3090
Fax 589-3119
Web www.nashuanh.gov

NASHUA CONSERVATION COMMISSION

June 2, 2026

A. Call to order

A regular meeting of the Nashua Conservation Commission was called to order on Tuesday, June 2, 2026 at 7:00 PM, 229 Main Street, City Hall.

B. Roll call

Members present:

- Sherry Dutzy, Chair
- Dick Widhu, Vice Chair
- Carol Sarno
- Will Darby (Arrived late)
- Brandon Pierotti
- Dale Carruth
- Amanda Griffith

Gloria McCarthy (Absent)
Megan Cook (Absent)

Also, in Attendance:

- Levent Akinici, Sustainability Planner
- Alderman Paula Johnson, Ward 5

C. Approval of minutes

May 5, 2026

MOTION to approve minutes as amended by Commissioner Dutzy.
Seconded by Commissioner Carruth.

MOTION CARRIED

May 19, 2026 Site Walk-34 Buckmeadow

MOTION to approve minutes as amended by Commissioner Dutzy.
Seconded by Commissioner Widhu.

MOTION CARRIED

D. Old Business:

Clint Licqurish, 19 Vista Way. Proposal to remove 21 trees posing a threat to the applicant's home, within the wetland buffer for a wetland greater than 9000 square feet. Map D. Lot 23. Zone R-40 - Rural Residence. Ward 5.

Commissioners opposed the removal of 21 trees, citing arborist Lee Gilman's assessment that the trees were healthy and did not pose an unusual danger to the house. They emphasized the properties status as a conservation subdivision, requiring a "high bar" for such changes.

Mr. Licqurish disputed Mr. Gilman's report, citing "factual inaccuracies" and the lack of promised tree-by-tree assessment, despite Mr. Gilman's acknowledging a risk of "minor brushing" to the house.

Commissioner Dutzy clarified the NH Department of Fish and Game has no definition of "forestry" in conservation documents and "fall depth is not a criteria for taking down a tree" if the tree is healthy. She also noted that New Hampshire Fish and Game indicated their willingness to offer Mr. Licqurish a second opinion if he contacts them.

Commissioner Dutzy made a motion for an unfavorable recommendation for the application to remove 21 trees. And also recommend that the recommendations of the tree assessment professional be carried out, including pruning and removal of invasive bittersweet affecting tree load-bearing. Without commission approval.

Seconded by Commissioner Darby.

Vote 7-0

MOTION CARRIES

Salt Creek Properties, LLC and Cutter Place Properties, LLC, 34 Buckmeadow Road. Proposal to redevelop the lot into a self-storage facility with 7 self-storage buildings along with associated site improvements, including 3 stormwater management areas, closed drainage system over portions of the site, and a wetland crossing to access the rear of the lot. Total impacts from redevelopment will result in permanent impacts to 992 SF of wetland and 18,101 SF of wetland buffer, as well as temporary impacts to 27,788 SF of wetland buffer. Map C. Lot 350. Zone R-40 Rural Residence. Ward 5

Chuck Ritchie with Fieldstone Land Consultants led a recap of the proposed self-storage facility with 5 new buildings (32,550 sq. ft) plus an existing warehouse on a five-acre property. The revised proposal eliminated a wetland crossing, resulting in zero direct wetland impact. Permanent buffer impact was stated as 9,961 sq. ft and temporary impact as 17,040 sq. ft. Tree clearing within the buffer was reduced to approximately 7,300 sq. ft. Mr. Ritchie stated the project would improve existing untreated runoff into Cold Brook by adding drainage and a wet basin. As well as re-vegetating the area.

Commissioner Sarno thanked the applicant for the changes that were made. And expressed that she still has concerns about water storage in the North-West corner of the property.

DISCUSSION ENSUED ABOUT THE VEGETATION AND THE IMPACT ON THIS AREA OF THE PROPERTY, PROPOSING A SMALL BASIN.

Commissioner Widhu expressed he too has concerns with this same area and the disruption of the wild life corridor.

Alderman Paula Johnson, ward 5, lead a discussion about attending the site walk and commented on the amount of wildlife that is in this area. She described the area as "the last frontier of the southwest quadrant" and that a high priority for conservation is due for the critical wildlife, a high yield aquifer and wetlands crucial for filtering water. She voiced emphasis on this project being way too big for the area and that she has been hearing from many concerned constituents. The property is home to so much wildlife that the habitat destruction and increased traffic would hurt the area.

Commissioner Darby expressed his appreciation that the applicant was not filling in the wetlands that are there. But that the impact to the large amount of wildlife that could be seen on the site walk would hurt the protection of the marsh that is there. He suggested reducing the project scale to 4 buildings or a smaller stormwater treatment. He would not be able to support the project as it is.

Commissioner Sarno agreed with Commissioner Darby and as it stands she would not be able to support the project.

DISCUSSION ENSUED ABOUT THE EXISTING SITE AS IT IS NOW, THE CHANGES PROPOSED TO BENEFIT THE PROPERTY AND FENCING ON THE PROPERTY.

Commissioner Dutzy opened the meeting to the public for discussion.

Heather, 18 Twilight Drive: I'm just concerned, I've lived in the south-west corridor for 21 years now and in last year alone this is the third time, between the dump project for the fire road and then the guy wanting to develop behind the Owl's Nest academy and put in all those condo buildings and now this, I just really don't understand why. What is the need to destroy the last undisturbed area of the region? Now I have to say this particular facility my husband has actually stored his muscle car and we have paid this warehouse that's there, this chicken coop, I don't know if they still do, but they use too. There's open bays and you can just drive in store your boat and vehicles and motorcycles. Everybody comes in the same day and goes out the same day. I don't understand why everything has to be a money grabber, bigger better more and bigger better more. Why can't they build on the foot-print? Yeah, the buildings ugly, its dilapidated, replace it with something on the foot-print, same size, why do we have to make it three, four, five times bigger? I was looking and saw that one of the guys or owners is the oil guy and well oh that's great, like does he want that in his back yard? Well no. Why do people do the right thing, this is a nice area, why do we need to disturb it? Before I even knew about this, I walk my dogs there all the time, and just 2 days ago before I even knew about this meeting I had put a post on Facebook and I'd seen a bobcat there and a massive snake on the

side of the road with the throat ripped out and not even 10 feet from that was a water rat. This was just 2 days ago, so that tells you how much wildlife is in this area.

Jessica Taylor, 33 Gilson Road: I've been a Nashua resident for a few years now and exploring and experiencing what nature has to offer in the Buckmeadow and surrounding conservation areas and trails, is incredible refreshing and rewarding. It reminds me that there is so much to see and appreciate in our own backyard, and is what I truly love about Nashua. Even on a small-scale disrupting part of an area like this sets the precedent that we can continue to pick away at an area that breaks the very industrialized connotation that Nashua has. Conservation is not always on a large scale like with National Parks and region wide protections. I believe it can and should be the city saying no to projects such as what is proposed and protecting your own backyard. I see something new just about every time I visit this area. So, kind of going off of what people saw and stuff, I figured I'd share some of the rarer and more interesting things that I've seen, even just the spring and this past season. Foxes, American woodcock, porcupine stoat, which was really cool. A Virginia rail, little blue heron, green heron, wood ducks, every warbler under the sun. And something I will never forget in that area specifically, as well as all those animals are specific to that area is a white-tailed deer swimming through the water at the boardwalk. So, yeah, it's the same sentiments. I think the idea of standing by your own backyard and protecting it is why someone who lives by there would be opposed to it.

Jenny McLager, ward 5 South Nashua: I wrote a letter the Zoning Board and I'm happy to leave a copy here too. One thing is, this wetland was preserved by the City of Nashua in 2014 or something. And it's an important wetland. And even if you start polluting and destroying one little part of it. It effects the whole wetlands. Its filtering millions of gallons of water. This goes through the whole wetlands. And what I don't understand is why, like you say, why do we need to make it more here? Why do we need to disturb it all? If the owner wants to make some money, conserve it, send it into conservation and get the tax write off and then it doesn't cost the city any money to supply

electricity and emergency services. So, I am just dead set against this. We don't need it. It's just somebody who wants to make a profit at the expense of our wetlands. I think there's a greater good here and I'm completely opposed to doing anything here.

Joshua Zellers, 38 Roy St: I'm also on the agenda. I did not plan on speaking about this. I spent a lot of time on this property as a teenager. My best friend's family owned that property. We played volleyball there 100 times. We know that chicken coop inside and out. And we know that back of that wetland inside and out. For a decade that was our little playground. And the idea that that would replace that is very disheartening. And that's all I have to say.

Denise Muccioli, 9 St James Place: Longtime resident of Nashua New Hampshire, just want to read a little excerpt, in 2006, NCC funded the preparation of a natural resource of inventory and conservation. And this area in the southwest quadrant is rated as a high priority for conservation. The reason for it would be contiguous conserved land known exemplary natural community, highest concentration of diversity or critical wildlife habitat and present supply development complex is presence of high yield stratified drift aquifer. So, let's not stray too much from the hard work the conservation commission has already done. My problem with this project, number one is, I understand the owner has a right to make money. Why not build up? Instead of having multiple buildings, why not build up as many storage facilities that have elevators. 700 trips a week, open 24/7 is a problem for the wildlife in the area. Not far from there their building townhouses, so all that wetland area is annihilated. We got my "friends" at Roby Park destroying 52 acres of wetland. So those animals are migrating. We're not leaving any space for wildlife. I walked down there today and within a matter of 3 minutes I saw a beaver with something trying to build its den. I saw a great blue heron and a monarch butterfly. The area is rich with milk weed. The monarch butterfly is a species of great concern, almost on the verge of being threatened in the state. And the only place they will breed is on these milkweeds. So that's something we need to consider. They're going to plow it in the winter time. Where is all that salt and sand going? I can almost

guarantee you when this place gets built, they're going to be complaining about the beavers. And the next thing you know the beavers are going to have to be annihilated because you can't re-locate beavers. The only other question I have was an ecological review done by NHDES on this project? It's still my understanding that even though you're not going to build that bridge, you're still impacting the wetlands, whether temporary or permanently. And I do believe NHDES needs to be consulting on that. I do believe permits may be required. You also have to make sure you don't have any species in there that are endangered. I am strongly opposed to it. Can you modify it a little better and build up? Thank you.

DISCUSSION ENSUED ABOUT READING AN EMAIL FROM A CONSTITUANT.

Commissioner Dutzy opened the meeting to Mr. Ritchie to address some of these concerns.

Chris Ritchie started by stating they did submit a Fish and Game request to see if there are any species: The Heritage Bureau. And from their sources there were no hits. He reiterated that the impact is to the buffer of the wetlands and not the wetlands for the storm water. And that the trips per week to the site would be a Planning Board issue.

Commissioner Pierotti made a motion for an unfavorable recommendation.

Motion seconded by: Commissioner Sarno

MOTION CARRIES

E. New Business:

Joshua and Elizabeth Zellers, 38 Roy Street. Proposal to replace an existing deck with a new two-tiered deck with temporary and permanent impact to the wetland buffer for a prime wetland. Map 107. Lot 16. Zone R-A - Urban Residence. Ward 6.

Joshua Zellers led a discussion on his project request to replace a dilapidated deck in almost the exact same foot print except 3 feet closer to the wetlands and two-tiered. Mr. Zellers asserted there would be no impact to vegetation, or animals.

A site walk is scheduled for Monday June 8th at 5:30pm

Brock and Barbara Putney, 3 Creek Place. Proposal to replace an existing deck with a new deck of the same footprint with temporary impact to the wetland buffer for a wetland greater than 9000 SF. Map F. Lot 32. Zone R-18 - Suburban Residence. Ward 1.

Brock Putney introduced himself and led a discussion on his request to replace a deck originally built in 1998. NO change to the foot print, adding a new support beam and an extra footing which means digging up the ground within the wetland buffer. HOA approval has been obtained.

Commissioner Dutzy made a motion for a favorable recommendation without a site walk.

Seconded by Commissioner Carruth

MOTION PASSED

F. NCC Correspondence and Communications

Roby Park vernal pool status update from DPW:

The DPW confirmed the presence of vernal pools and modified disc golf course plans to avoid impacts, including no tree cutting in wetland buffers, reduced bridge crossings, and moving a tee box outside the 100-foot vernal pool buffer.

Ongoing concerns:

- Despite claims of "minimal tree loss" observations of wide swatches and "clear cutting" were noted, raising concerns about erosion and habitat destruction.
- Concerns were raised about the adequacy of a 100-foot buffer (research suggests 400 feet is ideal) and the need to potentially close disc golf holes near vernal pools during March-May to protect amphibian breeding.
- An invasive species management plan was part of the stipulations, but tree cutting may promote invasive growth.
- Levent to send the commission's unfavorable recommendation letter to Commissioner Darby.
- The commission will conduct a walk-through of Roby Park on Monday, June 29th at, 5:30pm to assess the situation.

- Discussion included the need for signage at all identified vernal pools in the city to educate the public and potential mitigation for previously removed trees by planting native species.

A SPEAKER STATED SHE DID FILE A REPORT WITH NHDES AGAIN.

Teak Drive:

- Trees have been cut and the site prepped, with pipe work scheduled for summer and fall this year. The vernal pool has been cleaned, and a proposed easement requires the Board of Alderman approval.

DISCUSSION ENSUED ABOUT HOW AND WHO MEASURES THE BUFFER CUT. IT WAS LEFT UNKNOWN HOW TO HANDLE.

G. Commissioners Discussion

Lovewell Pond Sculpture Relocation:

- Initial proposed locations in Mine Falls Park were rejected. The possibility of using the Tannery Superfund site was discussed.
- Levent to research Conservation Commission minutes from 2014-2016 to determine if any sites for sculptures were formally approved.

Flatley Vernal Pool:

- Chris Guida verbally assessed the pool, but formal assessment and the DES endangered species report are still pending.
- The commission plans to schedule a tutorial with Melissa Winters, a "vernal pool guru" from NH Fish and Game, to learn about amphibians and vernal pools.

Trail Map:

- The trail map for the Southwest trails is nearing completion "final draft." With information also available for the Joyce and Northwest properties.
- There is no update on the site on 111A (**Lynch**). They have hired a wetlands scientist.

Bishop Guertin Project:

- Tree cutting for a pathway led to the discovery of a very, very active vernal pool with amphibians. The principle was notified, and Brendan Quigley is expected to assess the pools, with a meeting planned for mid-June to discuss mitigation or pathway connection.
- New discoveries include blue spotted salamanders that were observed migrating, and three additional vernal pools with spotted salamander eggs at Terrell and Yudicky, which will be reported to the state.

DISCUSSION ENSUED ABOUT CREATING A LIST OF VERNAL POOLS.

H. Committee Reports

NONE

I. Public Comment Related to Items on the Agenda -

NONE

J. Nonpublic Session per. RSA 91-A: 3 II (d) lands (Roll call vote required).

NONE

K. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION to adjourn by Commissioner Dutzy at 8:49 PM

SECONDED by Commissioner Carruth

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting notes taken by Nichole Wilkins

Falk, Carter

From: Gloria McCarthy ·
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2026 12:54 PM
To: Wilkins, Nichole; zZoning Board
Subject: Re: Opposition to Proposed 7-Building Commercial Storage Facility at 34 Buckmeadow Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments if the source is unknown.

Gloria McCarthy
65 Musket Drive
Nashua, NH
June 7, 2026

Re: Opposition to Proposed 7-Building Commercial Storage Facility at 34 Buckmeadow Road

Members of the Zoning Board,

I respectfully oppose the proposed six-building commercial storage facility at 34 Buckmeadow Road and urge the Board to deny the requested approvals.

First, the property is located entirely within the R-40 Residential Zone, where a multi-building commercial storage facility is a prohibited use. The applicant must demonstrate a hardship unique to the land itself. A five-acre parcel is not a hardship; it is a viable residential lot consistent with the intent of the zoning regulations and the City's Master Plan.

Second, the historical claim of grandfathered commercial use should not be used to justify this proposal. 34 and 49 Buckmeadow Road were under common ownership and use for decades and shared business-related activities. (by the late owner's own testimony in prior cases) That relationship ended when the property owner passed away, properties were separated and 49 Buckmeadow Road was sold in 2023 for residential development. In my view, the severance ended any basis for expanding nonconforming commercial activity on this site.

Third, the scale of this proposal is dramatically different from anything that previously existed. Expanding from one building to six transforms a limited use into a *substantial* commercial complex. This is not a modest continuation of an existing use; it is a *major intensification* that changes the character of the property and the neighborhood.

Fourth, the project raises serious environmental concerns. This 5-acre lot is completely hemmed in by protected ecosystems and public-school property. The site contains important natural buffers, mature trees, wetlands, and wetland-adjacent areas. Large-scale clearing, as is shown on the site plan, and the addition of multiple buildings, driveways, parking areas and other impervious surfaces will increase stormwater runoff, reduce natural water absorption, and place additional pressure on surrounding wetland resources. Further, 24/7 commercial lighting near wetland areas causes ecological light pollution, profoundly disrupting natural behaviors, food webs, and reproduction for wetland species.

Finally, Buckmeadow Road is a rural residential corridor and designated school safety zone. The proposed facility would introduce additional nonresidential traffic, including trucks and moving vans, near The McCarthy Middle School and along a roadway regularly used by families, pedestrians, cyclists, and school buses. The driveways located approximately 40 feet apart raise concerns about safety and visibility.

This proposal is inconsistent with the intent of the R-40 district, incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood, and raises significant environmental and public safety concerns. Nonconforming uses are detrimental to intentional town planning; they are meant to be restricted and eventually eliminated, not multiplied. I respectfully ask the Board to uphold the City's zoning ordinances and deny this application.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gloria McCarthy

Falk, Carter

From: Carol Yahoo
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2026 10:49 AM
To: zba@nashuanh.gov
Cc: zConservation Commission
Subject: Salt Creek Properties

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments if the source is unknown.

Hello Zoning Board Members,

I am a member of the Nashua Conservation Commission and we recently received the Salt Creek Properties project. I can't attend your meeting on the 9th and wanted to share my reasons for voting to give this project an unfavorable recommendation.

During our site walk we noted 2 wetland buffer areas slated for development that provide valuable wildlife habitat. One contains potential vernal pools and the other is a relatively undisturbed forested area that abuts Cold Brook on the northwest part of the property. We raised concerns about both of these areas at the site walk.

I was pleased that the applicant downsized the project to avoid incursion into the area that contains potential vernal pools. The plan still calls for clearing mature trees and grading the relatively undisturbed buffer on NW side of property to create a drainage pond. This would reduce the buffer on Cold Brook significantly. This part of Cold Brook is home to an active Beaver population and the wetland buffer here serves as a flood control mechanism.

If the applicant removed one of the proposed storage units they could shift the drainage pond out of the wetland buffer thus avoiding incursion.

The Conservation Commission voted unanimously for an unfavorable recommendation. Please do not approve this plan in its current state.

Respectfully,
Carol Sarno
15 Rocky Hill Drive
Nashua NH
Nashua Conservation Commission Member