

From: nmbackwoods@comcast.net
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Against Cell phone tower on Rt165
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2026 5:17:37 PM

Please, please re-consider putting a tower on the Tierra Madre Rd/ Rt 165 corner. It is unnecessary as well as highly negatively impactful to our precious mountain views in both directions. There is no need for another tower in the middle of Placitas. It contradicts the PLAN for Placitas for development here. If there must a new another tower it should be located close to the Interstate, not in the midst of residential areas.

Thank you -
Barbara Reeback
Del Packwood

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Tricia George](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Against the Cell Tower in Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 2:46:04 PM

Hi there,
I am voicing my opinion regarding the 75 foot cell tower to be placed on 165. It goes against the Plan for Placitas that was set ages ago. Who is deciding this? And how come height restrictions are limited to homeowners but not a cell company.

Thank you,
Tricia George
415-577-5595

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Barbara Burzillo](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Cell Tower 165 & Tierra Madre
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 12:44:34 PM

Dear Sandoval County,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed 75' cell tower located at 165 & Tierra Madre Rd in Placitas.

As a resident of the area, I have several concerns regarding this development, including:

- Concern 1: e.g., The visual impact on the neighborhood landscape
- Concern 2: e.g., Potential effects on local property value
- Concern 3: e.g., Proximity to residential homes.

I request that you please take these concerns into consideration and explore alternative locations or solutions that would have a lesser impact on our community.

Thank you for your time and for considering my feedback on this matter.

Sincerely,

Barbara Burzillo
46 Camino Barranca, Placitas, NM 87043

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [dave newman](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: cell tower in Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 11:50:04 AM

We live in Placitas and strongly oppose the cell tower that is proposed at Tierra Madre & 165.

Thank you,
Dave & Donna Newman

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Amanda Pecora-Sutphen](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Cell Tower on 165 & Tierra Madre Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 4:02:25 PM

As a Placitas resident, I strongly oppose this eyesore.

Amanda Pecora-Sutphen

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Aaron](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Communications Tower in Placitas
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2026 12:07:27 PM

Dear Doriada,

As the Assistant Director of Planning and Zonig, I would encourage you to oppose the building of a new communications tower on NM 165 and Tierra Madre Rd in Placitas. This tower would greatly impede the serenity of this neighborhood. I appreciate your time and concern.

With respect,

Aaron Young
11 Tierra Madre Rd

This message is originated from an external organization

From: cathylandmarkd@gmail.com
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Communications Tower
Date: Sunday, February 15, 2026 6:46:49 AM

I would like to register my strong opposition to the proposal for a communications tower to be built at Tierra Madre an 165.

Mark Dankert
32 Placitas West Rd
Placitas

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [C. Edwin Garner](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: FORMAL PUBLIC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION — CUP Application NM01-148, Proposed 75" Monopole at 221 NM-165, Placitas — April 14, 2026 Hearing
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 3:36:05 PM

Subject: FORMAL PUBLIC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION — CUP Application NM01-148, Proposed 75' Monopole at 221 NM-165, Placitas — April 14, 2026 Hearing

Doraida Arias
Sandoval County Planning & Zoning Department
darias@sandovalcountynm.gov

Re: Formal Public Comment in Opposition
Project: NM01-148 SPIKE / ABQ Tierra Madre
Address: 221 NM-165 (State Highway 165), Placitas, NM 87043
APN: 102-307-302-8180
Applicant: Pinnacle Consulting / Verizon Wireless / Sun State Towers
Public Hearing: April 14, 2026

Dear Ms. Arias and Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

I am a property owner and resident of Placitas, New Mexico. I write to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit application for a proposed 75-foot wireless monopole at 221 NM-165. Please include this letter, in its entirety, in the official written record for the April 14, 2026 public hearing.

Our pristine landscape vistas are the reason that Placitas is the nationally recognized area that it is. The proposed structure will mar the single most significant driver of real estate value in the area, thus reducing county revenue potential.

There are numerous specific grounds for rejecting this application.

--- GROUND 1: DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE ADOPTED PLACITAS AREA PLAN ---
--

The Placitas Area Plan — adopted by the Sandoval County Board of Commissioners — is the controlling land-use policy document for this area. It explicitly requires protection of viewsheds, the semi-rural character of the community, and adequate height and setback standards to preserve views (pp. 38, 44, 54, 64). A 75-foot commercial monopole on NM-165 directly and materially conflicts with these adopted goals. The Commission is legally obligated to honor the Plan it created through a public community process.

--- GROUND 2: THE STEALTH DESIGN IS INADEQUATE — 55 FEET OF BARE POLE ---

Local residents are restricted to single and two story construction yet there is a proposal to install a giant plunger in our community. The applicant describes this as a "concealed" installation with a "rustic NM architecture" design. The engineering drawings tell a different story. Sheets Z-5 and Z-6 of the application's own plans clearly show the concealment shroud begins at 55 feet above ground level. This means 55 feet of bare, unscreened steel monopole — nearly three-quarters of the entire structure — will be fully visible from surrounding residential properties, from NM-165, and from the broader Placitas landscape. A shroud that covers only the antenna cluster at the very top does not constitute meaningful stealth design for a semi-rural community defined by its natural piñon-juniper landscape.

--- GROUND 3: THE COUNTY'S OWN REVIEWER ALREADY QUESTIONED THIS SITE AND DESIGN ---

Robert Naumann, Sandoval County's designated zoning reviewer, stated the following in writing on May 31, 2024 — a statement that is already part of the application file:

"This site is considerably more visible and I am not sure the stealth design proposed is a good concept."

This assessment came not from a neighbor or opponent, but from the County's own contracted expert reviewer. I urge the Commission to take this professional opinion seriously.

--- GROUND 4: CO-LOCATION AND ALTERNATIVES REQUIREMENTS NOT SATISFIED ---

The applicant's first candidate for this project was the Sandoval County Fire Station at 463 NM-165 (APN 1025073080120). That site was abandoned — by the applicant's own written admission — solely because "we were not able to finalize a lease agreement." The site was never found to be technically infeasible. An existing tall structure on public land is precisely what the County's co-location preference requirements are designed to protect. Commercial inconvenience is not a substitute for demonstrating technical infeasibility.

Additionally, the applicant's Alternatives Analysis guidelines as submitted reference "Madera County Code" — a county in California's San Joaquin Valley that has no relevance to Sandoval County, New Mexico. This boilerplate template error raises serious questions about whether a genuine, site-specific alternatives analysis was conducted at all. I request the Commission find the application incomplete until a proper Sandoval County-specific analysis is provided.

--- GROUND 5: SETBACK DEFICIENCY REQUIRES SEPARATE APPROVAL NOT YET GRANTED ---

The applicant's own site documents acknowledge that the northwest setback of 46

feet 9 inches requires a separate setback reduction zoning approval. The standard fall-zone requirement for a 75-foot tower is 82.5 feet (110% of tower height). The proposed northwest setback meets only 57% of that standard. This separate approval has not been granted. The CUP process should not proceed until this is resolved.

--- GROUND 6: FULL BUILD-OUT VISUAL IMPACT HAS NOT BEEN DISCLOSED ---

-

The tower is engineered to accommodate two additional future carriers at 50 and 60 feet AGL, each with pre-designed future concealment shrouds. The photo simulations submitted with this application show only Verizon's initial installation. The public and the Commission have never been shown the full three-carrier build-out that this commercial tower infrastructure is designed to become. I request that the applicant be required to submit photo simulations of the completed, full-capacity tower before any decision is made.

--- GROUND 7: PERMANENT DAMAGE TO PROPERTY VALUES ---

Published, peer-reviewed research in the Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics and Empirical Economics Letters documents 7–10% reductions in residential property values within the visual impact zone of wireless towers. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development classifies cell towers as "hazards and nuisances" requiring appraisal adjustments. Placitas properties command significant market premiums precisely because of the undisturbed natural landscape. A permanent 75-foot industrial structure on NM-165 would cause lasting, measurable harm to property values throughout the community — directly undermining the Sandoval County Zoning Ordinance's stated purpose of "conserving the value of property."

--- FORMAL REQUEST ---

I respectfully request that the Commission:

(1) DENY the Conditional Use Permit as inconsistent with the adopted Placitas Area Plan;

OR, in the alternative:

(2) Find the application INCOMPLETE and require the applicant to provide: a Sandoval County-specific alternatives analysis (not a Madera County, CA template); corrected engineering drawings with consistent shroud dimensions; photo simulations of the full three-carrier build-out; and a formal setback reduction application resolving the 46'9" northwest setback deficiency;

AND in any event:

(3) Require the applicant to demonstrate — with technical evidence, not conclusory statements — that the Sandoval County Fire Station site at 463 NM-165 was

technically infeasible for this project, not merely commercially inconvenient.

Thank you for including this formal opposition in the official written record.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Edwin Garner, Ph.D
46 Camino Barranca
Placitas, NM 87043

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Dana Roth](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Formal public comment NM01-148 SPIKE
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 8:21:00 PM

Dear Ms Doraida Arias and members of the Sandoval County Planning and Zoning Commission,

Below are my many concerns about the new cell tower to be erected in Placitas. Please consider the concerns of me and so many other residents of Placitas. This location is especially bad for numerous reasons and will mar the beautiful landscape.

APN: 102-307-302-8180

Applicant: Pinnacle Consulting / Verizon Wireless / Sun State Towers

Public Hearing: April 14, 2026

Dear Ms. Arias and Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

I am a property owner and resident of Placitas, New Mexico. I write to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit application for a proposed 75-foot wireless monopole at 221 NM-165. Please include this letter, in its entirety, in the official written record for the April 14, 2026 public hearing.

--- GROUND 1: DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE ADOPTED PLACITAS AREA PLAN ---

The Placitas Area Plan — adopted by the Sandoval County Board of Commissioners — is the controlling land-use policy document for this area. It explicitly requires protection of viewsheds, the semi-rural character of the community, and adequate height and setback standards to preserve views (pp. 38, 44, 54, 64). A 75-foot commercial monopole on NM-165 directly and materially conflicts with these adopted goals. The Commission is legally obligated to honor the Plan it created through a public community process.

--- GROUND 2: THE STEALTH DESIGN IS INADEQUATE — 55 FEET OF BARE POLE ---

The applicant describes this as a "concealed" installation with a "rustic NM architecture" design. The engineering drawings tell a different story. Sheets Z-5 and Z-6 of the application's own plans clearly show the concealment shroud begins at 55 feet above ground level. This means 55 feet of bare, unscreened steel monopole — nearly three-quarters of the entire structure — will be fully visible from surrounding residential properties, from NM-165, and from the broader Placitas landscape. A shroud that covers only the antenna cluster at the very top does not constitute meaningful stealth design for a semi-rural community defined by its natural piñon-juniper landscape.

--- GROUND 3: THE COUNTY'S OWN REVIEWER ALREADY QUESTIONED THIS SITE AND DESIGN ---

Robert Naumann, Sandoval County's designated zoning reviewer, stated the following in writing on May 31, 2024 — a statement that is already part of the application file:

"This site is considerably more visible and I am not sure the stealth design proposed is a good concept."

This assessment came not from a neighbor or opponent, but from the County's own contracted expert reviewer. I urge the Commission to take this professional opinion seriously.

--- GROUND 4: CO-LOCATION AND ALTERNATIVES REQUIREMENTS NOT SATISFIED ---

The applicant's first candidate for this project was the Sandoval County Fire Station at 463 NM-165 (APN 1025073080120). That site was abandoned — by the applicant's own written admission — solely because "we were not able to finalize a lease agreement." The site was never found to be technically infeasible. An existing tall structure on public land is precisely what the County's co-location preference requirements are designed to protect. Commercial inconvenience is not a substitute for demonstrating technical infeasibility.

Additionally, the applicant's Alternatives Analysis guidelines as submitted reference "Madera County Code" — a county in California's San Joaquin Valley that has no relevance to Sandoval County, New Mexico. This boilerplate template error raises serious questions about whether a genuine, site-specific alternatives analysis was conducted at all. I request the Commission find the application incomplete until a proper Sandoval County-specific analysis is provided.

--- GROUND 5: SETBACK DEFICIENCY REQUIRES SEPARATE APPROVAL NOT YET GRANTED ---

The applicant's own site documents acknowledge that the northwest setback of 46 feet 9 inches requires a separate setback reduction zoning approval. The standard fall-zone requirement for a 75-foot tower is 82.5 feet (110% of tower height). The proposed northwest setback meets only 57% of that standard. This separate approval has not been granted. The CUP process should not proceed until this is resolved.

--- GROUND 6: FULL BUILD-OUT VISUAL IMPACT HAS NOT BEEN DISCLOSED ---

The tower is engineered to accommodate two additional future carriers at 50 and 60 feet AGL, each with pre-designed future concealment shrouds. The photo simulations submitted with this application show only Verizon's initial installation. The public and the Commission have never been shown the full three-carrier build-out that this commercial tower infrastructure is designed to become. I request that the applicant be required to submit photo simulations of the completed, full-capacity tower before any decision is made.

--- GROUND 7: PERMANENT DAMAGE TO PROPERTY VALUES ---

Published, peer-reviewed research in the Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics and Empirical Economics Letters documents 7–10% reductions in residential property values within the visual impact zone of wireless towers. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban

Development classifies cell towers as "hazards and nuisances" requiring appraisal adjustments. Placitas properties command significant market premiums precisely because of the undisturbed natural landscape. A permanent 75-foot industrial structure on NM-165 would cause lasting, measurable harm to property values throughout the community — directly undermining the Sandoval County Zoning Ordinance's stated purpose of "conserving the value of property."

--- FORMAL REQUEST ---

I respectfully request that the Commission:

(1) DENY the Conditional Use Permit as inconsistent with the adopted Placitas Area Plan;

OR, in the alternative:

(2) Find the application INCOMPLETE and require the applicant to provide: a Sandoval County-specific alternatives analysis (not a Madera County, CA template); corrected engineering drawings with consistent shroud dimensions; photo simulations of the full three-carrier build-out; and a formal setback reduction application resolving the 46'9" northwest setback deficiency;

AND in any event:

(3) Require the applicant to demonstrate — with technical evidence, not conclusory statements — that the Sandoval County Fire Station site at 463 NM-165 was technically infeasible for this project, not merely commercially inconvenient.

Thank you for including this formal opposition in the official written record.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Roth
14 Perdiz canyon rd
Placitas, NM 87043

5058673651

Pattersonroth@comcast.net

March 4, 2026

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Greg Bauer, Ph.D.](#)
To: [Daniel Beaman](#)
Subject: item CU-26-001
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 11:01:58 AM

Hello Mr. Beaman.

This is Gregory Bauer @ 43 Dusty Trails, Placitas, NM. i received a legal notice regarding a march 10th meeting on the Sandoval cnty Planning and Zoning commission. one of the itema to be discussed in CU-26-001 (communications tower). 43 Dusty Trails is second home for us and it is unlikely we will be able to attend this meeting. plese know however we are definitely against a tower in our area and would ask that htis re

--

Dr. Gregory Bauer
Sandy-Valley Farms
3300 Soo Marie Avenue
Stevens Point, WI 54481
Ph. 715.345.2921

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Deena J. Gonzalez](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: letter on the proposed Placitas tower from Deena Gonzalez, resident Placitas West
Date: Saturday, March 7, 2026 11:55:08 AM

To: Doraida Arias
Sandoval County Planning & Zoning Department
darias@sandovalcountynm.gov
Re: Formal Public Comment in Opposition from Deena J. González, 38 Anasazi Trails Rd, Placitas NM 87043

Project: NM01-148 SPIKE / ABQ Tierra Madre
Address: 221 NM-165 (State Highway 165), Placitas, NM 87043
APN: 102-307-302-8180
Applicant: Pinnacle Consulting / Verizon Wireless / Sun State Towers
Public Hearing: April 14, 2026

Dear Ms. Arias and Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,
I am a property owner and resident of Placitas, New Mexico. I write to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit application for a proposed 75-foot wireless monopole at 221 NM-165. Please include this letter, in its entirety, in the official written record for the April 14, 2026 public hearing.

--- GROUND 1: DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE ADOPTED PLACITAS AREA PLAN ---

The Placitas Area Plan — adopted by the Sandoval County Board of Commissioners — is the controlling land-use policy document for this area. It explicitly requires protection of viewsheds, the semi-rural character of the community, and adequate height and setback standards to preserve views (pp. 38, 44, 54, 64). A 75-foot commercial monopole on NM-165 directly and materially conflicts with these adopted goals. The Commission is legally obligated to honor the Plan it created through a public community process.

--- GROUND 2: THE STEALTH DESIGN IS INADEQUATE — 55 FEET OF BARE POLE ---

The applicant describes this as a "concealed" installation with a "rustic NM architecture" design. The engineering drawings tell a different story. Sheets Z-5 and Z-6 of the application's own plans clearly show the concealment shroud begins at 55 feet above ground level. This means 55 feet of bare, unscreened steel monopole — nearly three-quarters of the entire structure — will be fully visible from surrounding residential properties, from NM-165, and from the broader Placitas landscape. A shroud that covers only the antenna cluster at the very top does not constitute meaningful stealth design for a semi-rural community defined by its natural piñon-juniper landscape.

--- GROUND 3: THE COUNTY'S OWN REVIEWER ALREADY QUESTIONED THIS SITE AND DESIGN ---

Robert Naumann, Sandoval County's designated zoning reviewer, stated the following in writing on May 31, 2024 — a statement that is already part of the application file:

"This site is considerably more visible and I am not sure the stealth design proposed is a good concept."

This assessment came not from a neighbor or opponent, but from the County's own contracted expert reviewer. I urge the Commission to take this professional opinion seriously.

--- GROUND 4: CO-LOCATION AND ALTERNATIVES REQUIREMENTS NOT SATISFIED ---

The applicant's first candidate for this project was the Sandoval County Fire Station at 463 NM-165

(APN 1025073080120). That site was abandoned — by the applicant's own written admission — solely because "we were not able to finalize a lease agreement." The site was never found to be technically infeasible. An existing tall structure on public land is precisely what the County's co-location preference requirements are designed to protect. Commercial inconvenience is not a substitute for demonstrating technical infeasibility.

Additionally, the applicant's Alternatives Analysis guidelines as submitted reference "Madera County Code" — a county in California's San Joaquin Valley that has no relevance to Sandoval County, New Mexico. This boilerplate template error raises serious questions about whether a genuine, site-specific alternatives analysis was conducted at all. I request the Commission find the application incomplete until a proper Sandoval County-specific analysis is provided.

--- GROUND 5: SETBACK DEFICIENCY REQUIRES SEPARATE APPROVAL NOT YET GRANTED ---

The applicant's own site documents acknowledge that the northwest setback of 46 feet 9 inches requires a separate setback reduction zoning approval. The standard fall-zone requirement for a 75-foot tower is 82.5 feet (110% of tower height). The proposed northwest setback meets only 57% of that standard. This separate approval has not been granted. The CUP process should not proceed until this is resolved.

--- GROUND 6: FULL BUILD-OUT VISUAL IMPACT HAS NOT BEEN DISCLOSED ---

The tower is engineered to accommodate two additional future carriers at 50 and 60 feet AGL, each with pre-designed future concealment shrouds. The photo simulations submitted with this application show only Verizon's initial installation. The public and the Commission have never been shown the full three-carrier build-out that this commercial tower infrastructure is designed to become. I request that the applicant be required to submit photo simulations of the completed, full-capacity tower before any decision is made.

--- GROUND 7: PERMANENT DAMAGE TO PROPERTY VALUES ---

Published, peer-reviewed research in the Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics and Empirical Economics Letters documents 7–10% reductions in residential property values within the visual impact zone of wireless towers. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development classifies cell towers as "hazards and nuisances" requiring appraisal adjustments. Placitas properties command significant market premiums precisely because of the undisturbed natural landscape. A permanent 75-foot industrial structure on NM-165 would cause lasting, measurable harm to property values throughout the community — directly undermining the Sandoval County Zoning Ordinance's stated purpose of "conserving the value of property."

--- FORMAL REQUEST ---

I respectfully request that the Commission:

(1) DENY the Conditional Use Permit as inconsistent with the adopted Placitas Area Plan;

OR, in the alternative:

(2) Find the application INCOMPLETE and require the applicant to provide: a Sandoval County-specific alternatives analysis (not a Madera County, CA template); corrected engineering drawings with consistent shroud dimensions; photo simulations of the full three-carrier build-out; and a formal setback reduction application resolving the 46'9" northwest setback deficiency;

AND in any event:

(3) Require the applicant to demonstrate — with technical evidence, not conclusory statements — that the Sandoval County Fire Station site at 463 NM-165 was technically infeasible for this project, not merely commercially inconvenient.

Thank you for including this formal opposition in the official written record.

Respectfully submitted,
Deena J. González
38 Anasazi Trails Rd
Placitas, NM 87043
deenajgonzalez@gmail.com
(310) 350-5400

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [ERICA WENDEL-OGLESBY](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 7:35:54 PM

Dear Mr. Darius:

I'm writing to let you know I'm against the cell tower unless it will be decently camouflaged to fit into our high desert community. I know a cell tower is needed, but it shouldn't have to be ugly and distracting from the surrounding beauty

Thank you.

Erica Wendel-Oglesby
Placitas resident

Thank you

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Dawn Bagley](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: new Communications Tower for parcel number 1023073028180 (Tierra Madre Road and NMSR 165)
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2026 1:18:51 PM

As residents of Placitas NM We are completely and totally AGAINST the construction of the new communications tower near the Homesteads Shopping Center!!!

Please note our disapproval.

Respectfully,

The Bagleys

Petroglyph Trails Placitas

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Tom Frouge](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: NO to new Communications Tower for parcel number 1023073028180 in Placitas
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2026 4:33:05 PM

Dear Doraida Arias,

As a resident of and property owner in Placitas, and as a registered voter, I am writing to you to voice my strong opposition to a new Communications Tower for parcel number 1023073028180 on Tierra Madre Road and NMSR 165 in Placitas.

This tower goes against the Plan for Placitas which limits the height of structures. The tower would be in clear violation of the Plan.

Respectfully submitted

Tom Frouge
Placitas, NM

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Lauren Harris](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: No to the Cell tower in Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 11:59:38 AM

you cannot build a cell tower in beautiful Placitas. It would stick out like a sore thumb and would also increase the risk for many other health problems. We vote no thank you.

.Lauren Harris

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Daniel Powers](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 3:37:07 PM

Hi,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Thanks,
Dan Powers

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Michelle Dugan](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 3:30:36 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to the proposed 75-foot cell tower at the intersection of Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

The proposed height is inconsistent with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was thoughtfully developed to preserve the community's rural character, scenic viewsheds, and overall aesthetic integrity. Introducing a structure of this scale would represent a significant departure from those guiding principles and would materially alter the visual landscape of the area.

In addition to the visual impact, a tower of this magnitude may have unintended consequences for surrounding property values and the character of the neighborhood that residents have intentionally invested in and worked to protect.

I respectfully urge you to deny this proposal in its current form and to encourage exploration of alternative solutions that better align with Placitas' established community standards and long-term vision.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Michelle Dugan

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Amanda Estremera](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 3:13:47 PM

Hi,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Best,

Amanda Estremera and Dan Bornholdt

Placitas Residents

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Jason Cross](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 7:18:38 PM

Hello,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

I am a home owner in Placitas and do not support this tower being built.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Shalom Salaam,

Jake Cross

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Rita Oliveira](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 5:55:42 PM

Hello to whom it may concern,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values. Not to mention the numerous health concerns that something like this brings to everyone living in this beautiful area.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Thank you.
Rita T.

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Maria Jose Goycoolea](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 5:52:30 PM

To Whom it May Concern –

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values as well as impact the health and wellbeing of our community.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Thank you.

Maria Goycoolea
Placitas resident and home owner

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Andrea Lohse](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 5:20:13 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Hi,

As a homeowner in the Homesteads subdivision off 165 for 15 years, I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165. I am joined by my husband and neighbors in opposing this plan. The height of the proposed tower conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. In Homesteads, just behind the proposed site, every effort is made to keep a natural New Mexico environment. We do not even have gates over 8 feet high. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area, could affect nearby property values, and would jeopardize the character of our community.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Sincerely,
Andrea Lohse (773.578.5889)

Andrea Lohse
Program Manager, Communications
505.343.0010
alohse@nmhsc.com



nmhospitals.org
[@NMHospitals](#)

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Sue Roujansky](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft Cell Tower – Tierra Madre & 165
Date: Saturday, February 28, 2026 1:06:35 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

While I have previously sent an email with opposition to the proposed cell tower project, I now need to communicate with more concerns as follows:

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed 75' cell tower located at 165 & Tierra Madre Rd in Placitas.

As a nearby resident to the proposed tower site, I have MANY concerns regarding this development, including:

1. The proposed cell tower project is NOT compatible with the general character of the area and the existing zoning. This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values
2. The visual impact and proximity to surrounding neighborhood and Placitas landscape. The tower will be visible 24/7 from my home in Placitas West neighborhood and at best will be a huge eyesore. In addition I have concerns that there will be lighting (probably flashing) at night on the proposed tower, which will create light pollution and will most likely shine in my windows at night. Placitas has a dark skies rule and this will directly be in opposition to that.
3. The proposed cell tower WILL have an adverse effect on nearby properties in terms of noise, traffic, aesthetics, or other negative impacts
4. The proposed cell tower will emit strong EMFs (Electromagnetic Frequencies) which is a huge safety concern for myself, having had several occurrences of illness due to proximity to such high EMF emissions.
5. The location of the proposed cell tower suggests that its placement is to benefit residents much further up 165, not those who live in the neighborhood where it is proposed to be erected.

I moved to Placitas for the quiet, the beauty, and the dark skies. This proposed cell tower will ruin much of that.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Sue Roujansky
Placitas resident

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Jules Nyquist](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75 ft cell tower at Tierra Madre & Hwy 165
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 3:43:07 PM

Hi,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

As a Placitas resident a block away from this proposed site, I strongly oppose a new tower. I have perfectly fine cell service already.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

I suggest something along I25 and not near a residential area.

Respectfully,
Jules Nyquist, homeowner

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Aaron](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75-foot Cell Phone Tower in Placitas
Date: Friday, February 27, 2026 10:51:27 AM

Hi,

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron Young
11 Tierra Madre Rd

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Kim Downing](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Opposition to 75ft Cell Tower-Placitas
Date: Friday, February 27, 2026 8:06:46 AM

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed 75' cell tower located at 165 & Tierra Madre Rd in Placitas.

As a resident of the area, I have several concerns regarding this development, including:

- Concern 1: e.g., The visual impact on the neighborhood landscape
- Concern 2: e.g., Potential effects on local property value
- Concern 3: e.g., Proximity to residential homes.

I request that you please take these concerns into consideration and explore alternative locations or solutions that would have a lesser impact on our community.

Thank you for your time and for considering my feedback on this matter.

Thank You,

Kim Downing

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Cindy Chavez](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: opposition to cell tower Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 12:53:45 PM

We are in opposition to the 75 ft. proposed cell tower at Tierra Madre and 165.

A 75 ft cell tower will lower property values.

There also numerous health concerns and data to back them.

This also goes against the Plan for Placitas set forth decades ago limiting height.

The owner of the property is in Texas and an Arizona company would build it. They dont give a hoot about our beautiful Placitas.

Cindy and Jeremy Chavez
12 Placitas Trails Rd

Sent from my iPhone
(apologies for any typos or obscure autocorrects)

This message is originated from an external organization

From: nchholley47@gmail.com
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Cc: "[Nancy Holley](#)"
Subject: Placitas Cell Tower - NO!
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 12:11:46 PM

- A 75 ft cell tower will lower property values as much as 40% within a 1/2 mile radius !
- There also numerous health concerns and data to back them.
- This also goes against the Plan for Placitas set forth decades ago limiting height.
- The owner of the property is in Texas and an Arizona company would build it. They don't give a hoot about our beautiful Placitas.
- Placitas is a cash cow for Sandoval County. Lowering our property values for a cell tower makes ZERO sense.
- Pick another location, the recycling center, or just west of La Puerta Real Estate to protect the community and our property values.
- We will fight this location!

Please hear us when we say, NO!!!!

Thank you,
Nancy Holley

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Cristina Shelby](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Placitas Cell Tower
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 1:52:27 PM

Here's another:

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed 75' cell tower located at 165 & Tierra Madre Rd in Placitas.

As a resident of the area, I have several concerns regarding this development, including:

- Concern 1: e.g., The visual impact on the neighborhood landscape
- Concern 2: e.g., Potential effects on local property value
- Concern 3: e.g., Proximity to residential homes.

I request that you please take these concerns into consideration and explore alternative locations or solutions that would have a lesser impact on our community.

Thank you for your time and for considering my feedback on this matter.

Thank you!
Cristina Shelby, resident of Placitas
Sent from my iPhone

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Winnie Maggiore](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Placitas Cell tower
Date: Friday, February 27, 2026 11:45:59 AM

I'm writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at Tierra Madre and Highway 165.

This height conflicts with the long-standing Plan for Placitas, which was created to protect our rural character and viewsheds. A structure of this scale would negatively impact the area and could affect nearby property values.

Please deny this proposal and consider alternatives that better align with Placitas' community standards.

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Daniel Powers](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Placitas tower opposition/formal public comment
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:41:15 PM

Dear Ms. Arias and Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

I am a property owner in Placitas, New Mexico. I write to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit application for a proposed 75-foot wireless monopole at 221 NM-165. Please include this letter, in its entirety, in the official written record for the April 14, 2026 public hearing.

--- GROUND 1: DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE ADOPTED PLACITAS AREA PLAN ---

The Placitas Area Plan — adopted by the Sandoval County Board of Commissioners — is the controlling land-use policy document for this area. It explicitly requires protection of viewsheds, the semi-rural character of the community, and adequate height and setback standards to preserve views (pp. 38, 44, 54, 64). A 75-foot commercial monopole on NM-165 directly and materially conflicts with these adopted goals. The Commission is legally obligated to honor the Plan it created through a public community process.

--- GROUND 2: THE STEALTH DESIGN IS INADEQUATE — 55 FEET OF BARE POLE ---

The applicant describes this as a "concealed" installation with a "rustic NM architecture" design. The engineering drawings tell a different story. Sheets Z-5 and Z-6 of the application's own plans clearly show the concealment shroud begins at 55 feet above ground level. This means 55 feet of bare, unscreened steel monopole — nearly three-quarters of the entire structure — will be fully visible from surrounding residential properties, from NM-165, and from the broader Placitas landscape. A shroud that covers only the antenna cluster at the very top does not constitute meaningful stealth design for a semi-rural community defined by its natural piñon-juniper landscape.

--- GROUND 3: THE COUNTY'S OWN REVIEWER ALREADY QUESTIONED THIS SITE AND DESIGN ---

Robert Naumann, Sandoval County's designated zoning reviewer, stated the following in writing on May 31, 2024 — a statement that is already part of the application file:

"This site is considerably more visible and I am not sure the stealth design proposed is a good concept."

This assessment came not from a neighbor or opponent, but from the County's own contracted expert reviewer. I urge the Commission to take this professional opinion seriously.

--- GROUND 4: CO-LOCATION AND ALTERNATIVES REQUIREMENTS NOT SATISFIED ---

The applicant's first candidate for this project was the Sandoval County Fire Station at 463 NM-165 (APN 1025073080120). That site was abandoned — by the applicant's own written admission — solely because "we were not able to finalize a lease agreement." The site was never found to be technically infeasible. An existing tall structure on public land is precisely what the County's co-location preference requirements are designed to protect. Commercial inconvenience is not a substitute for demonstrating technical infeasibility.

Additionally, the applicant's Alternatives Analysis guidelines as submitted reference "Madera County Code" — a county in California's San Joaquin Valley that has no relevance to Sandoval County, New Mexico. This boilerplate template error raises serious questions about whether a genuine, site-specific alternatives analysis was conducted at all. I request the Commission find the application incomplete until a proper Sandoval County-specific analysis is provided.

--- GROUND 5: SETBACK DEFICIENCY REQUIRES SEPARATE APPROVAL NOT YET GRANTED ---

The applicant's own site documents acknowledge that the northwest setback of 46 feet 9 inches requires a separate setback reduction zoning approval. The standard fall-zone requirement for a 75-foot tower is 82.5 feet (110% of tower height). The proposed northwest setback meets only 57% of that standard. This separate approval has not been granted. The CUP process should not proceed until this is resolved.

--- GROUND 6: FULL BUILD-OUT VISUAL IMPACT HAS NOT BEEN DISCLOSED ---

The tower is engineered to accommodate two additional future carriers at 50 and 60 feet AGL, each with pre-designed future concealment shrouds. The photo simulations submitted with this application show only Verizon's initial installation. The public and the Commission have never been shown the full three-carrier build-out that this commercial tower infrastructure is designed to become. I request that the applicant be required to submit photo simulations of the completed, full-capacity tower before any decision is made.

--- GROUND 7: PERMANENT DAMAGE TO PROPERTY VALUES ---

Published, peer-reviewed research in the Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics and Empirical Economics Letters documents 7–10% reductions in residential property values within the visual impact zone of wireless towers. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development classifies cell towers as "hazards and nuisances" requiring appraisal adjustments. Placitas properties command significant market premiums precisely because of the undisturbed natural landscape. A permanent 75-foot industrial structure on NM-165 would cause lasting, measurable harm to property values throughout the community — directly undermining the Sandoval County Zoning Ordinance's stated purpose of "conserving the value of property."

--- FORMAL REQUEST ---

I respectfully request that the Commission:

(1) DENY the Conditional Use Permit as inconsistent with the adopted Placitas Area Plan;

OR, in the alternative:

(2) Find the application INCOMPLETE and require the applicant to provide: a Sandoval County-specific alternatives analysis (not a Madera County, CA template); corrected engineering drawings with consistent shroud dimensions; photo simulations of the full three-carrier build-out; and a formal setback reduction application resolving the 46'9" northwest setback deficiency;

AND in any event:

(3) Require the applicant to demonstrate — with technical evidence, not conclusory statements — that the Sandoval County Fire Station site at 463 NM-165 was technically infeasible for this project, not merely commercially inconvenient.

Thank you for including this formal opposition in the official written record.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Powers

52 Camino de las Brisas, Placitas, NM 87043

312-805-7120

Danielpowers86@gmail.com

3/26/2026

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Elizabeth Ingram](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Planning Commission
Date: Saturday, February 21, 2026 11:19:03 AM

I am strongly against a communication tower being built at 165 and Tierra Madre in Placitas. It goes against the Plan for Placitas as well as the radiation emitted being so detrimental to humans. Please go else where.

Elizabeth Ingram

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Caroline Alexander](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Planning Commission/Placitas
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2026 5:11:49 PM

I'm not for the tower right in Placitas. I don't think it's good fit for any town this size where most homes and businesses are designed to blend into the environment. Can it be next to a line that is in open space? I use T Mobile for cell service without troubles. Thank you for reading this.
Caroline Alexander
Placitas West

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Susanne](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed 5G tower
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 8:07:56 PM

Hello,

We believe the proposed unsightly tower will not only reduce our property values and ruin the beauty of our neighborhood, but also will affect the health of our residents :

Electromagnetic radiation (EMR) exposure from electrical power grids, cell towers and wireless devices is likely a driver of the global increase in diabetes, according to a new report by Paul Héroux, Ph.D. Studies compiled by Héroux show that very low levels of EMR can affect how cells function, including how they handle glucose.

Other countries have “much more restrictive” wireless radiation limits, the U.S. allows 10 to 100 times more radiation from cell towers than several countries, “including China and Russia, which have active research programs on the issue. Belgium, Italy and Switzerland also have far stricter limits.

Susanne and Brian Dominguez
20 Tierra Madre Courts

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Donna](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed cell tower in Placitas
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 12:18:53 PM

This is to advise you that I am opposed to the 75 ft. proposed cell tower at Tierra Madre and 165 in Placitas.

Your support for this position would be appreciated.

Thank you.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Mark McConnell](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed comm tower in Placitas
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 1:46:24 PM

Hello,
I am a resident of Placitas with a view of the area in question.
I want to voice my strong opposition to the construction of any tower in the area.
Thank you,
Mark McConnell

This message is originated from an external organization

From: tricia.douglas@mail.com
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed Communications Tower in Placitas
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 6:26:03 AM

Ms. Doraida Arias,

I am writing to you in advance of the planning meeting in March to let you know that my husband and I are against the communications tower. As we live on Tierra Madre Road and transverse the proposed intersection daily, we have no desire to add a communications tower to our landscape.

Regards,

Tricia Douglas and Trenton Scott

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Sue Roujansky](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed tower in Placitas
Date: Saturday, February 14, 2026 2:52:46 PM

Hello

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed communications tower at 165 and Tierra Madre.

I live very close to this location and do not want it in our neighborhood.

It will be an eyesore and will be a detriment to the beauty of Placitas which is why most of us live here.

Please do not approve this construction

Respectfully,

Sue Roujansky

Placitas NM

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [Charles Osburn](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: the proposed tower.
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2026 10:11:23 AM

Thank you for the update.

I know there is money to be made but do we really need to become rio rancho?

Kind Regards,
Charles Osburn, Artist At Large

This message is originated from an external organization

From: [pamela.peterson](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Tower across from Homesteads in Placitas
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 11:26:20 AM

I am opposed to building it! Thank you!

This message is originated from an external organization