

-----Original Message-----

From: Aaron <aaronyoung01@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 9:19 AM

To: Daniel Beaman <dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov>

Subject: Cell Phone Tower in Placitas

Hi Daniel,

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: Misty Hillin <mistyhillin@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 12:34 PM
To: Daniel Beaman <dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov>
Subject: dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov

Hello Mr. Beaman

I am writing to express my opposition to the 75-foot tower going in by the Merc on Tierra Madre and 165 in Placitas. I know there are multiple reasons why this tower is unpopular - views, property values, and height restrictions. I also agree with those concerns.

My concern has more to do with the health of the residents around this area, including my own, as we live in Homesteads.

There is growing scientific evidence of health effects linked to cell tower and wireless infrastructure radiation, including immune function, cancer risks, and biochemical changes. As a healthcare provider, I do not believe this is good for the population in this area, including my own.

We moved here for the dark skies and the beautiful views. But we also moved here because we wanted to be more remote. We wished to be away from the frenetic energy of the city. If that tower had been there when we were looking at this community, we would not have purchased a home here.

And from what I understand, there are several legal reasons why this should not go in, including setback requirements and height restrictions.

I am extremely disappointed that this is being considered. I hope another solution can be reached; perhaps more provider antennas or something less intrusive. But I am definitely opposed to the cell tower option.

Thank you for allowing public comment and for having a hearing on April 21. I hope to attend, or at least log onto the meeting link.

Respectfully,

Misty Hillin, DPT, LMT

From: John Branum <johnrbranum@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 2:18 PM

To: Daniel Beaman <dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov>

Subject: Proposed 75-foot Cell Tower in Placitas, NM

Dear Mr. Beaman,

As a Verizon customer, I object to Verizon's proposed cell tower near Homesteads Market in Placitas. While cell service may improve for me with this addition, it's not worth the visual offense it would create in a community that has deliberately curtailed erecting structures (exception to powerlines) higher than the residential structures that surround it.

Thank you,

John Branum

From: [Stacie Laktasic](#)
To: [Doraida Arias](#)
Subject: Proposed 75 foot tower in Placitas off of Hwy 165 and Tierra Madre Rd.
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2026 2:34:45 PM

To Ms. Arias and the Sandoval County Planning & Zoning Commission,

I am writing in formal opposition to the Conditional Use Permit application for the proposed 75-foot wireless monopole at 221 NM-165, Placitas (Project NM01-148 / ABQ Tierra Madre, APN 102-307-302-8180). The public hearing is scheduled for April 14, 2026. Please include this letter in the written record.

I oppose this application for the following reasons:

1. **INCONSISTENCY WITH THE PLACITAS AREA PLAN.** The adopted Placitas Area Plan explicitly requires protection of viewsheds and the semi-rural character of the community. A 75-foot commercial monopole on NM-165 directly violates these goals.
2. **INADEQUATE STEALTH DESIGN.** The applicant's own engineering drawings show that the concealment shroud begins at 55 feet above ground. The lower 55 feet — nearly three-quarters of the tower — is a bare, unscreened steel pole. This does not constitute meaningful concealment.
3. **THE COUNTY'S OWN REVIEWER RAISED CONCERNS.** Sandoval County's designated zoning reviewer, Robert Naumann, stated in the project record on May 31, 2024: "This site is considerably more visible and I am not sure the stealth design proposed is a good concept." I agree, and urge the Commission to act on that assessment.
4. **ALTERNATIVES WERE NOT EXHAUSTED.** The applicant's original preferred site — the Sandoval County Fire Station at 463 NM-165 — was abandoned solely because lease negotiations failed, not because the site was technically infeasible. An existing structure on public land should have been fully pursued before a new freestanding tower was proposed.
5. **PROPERTY VALUE HARM.** Peer-reviewed research and professional appraisal studies consistently document that visible cell towers reduce residential property values by 7–10% within the visual impact zone. Placitas homes command significant premiums precisely because of the landscape. This tower would damage that value permanently.

I respectfully request that the Commission deny this application, or at minimum require the applicant to address the documented deficiencies — including the missing setback reduction approval, the boilerplate alternatives analysis referencing 'Madera County Code' (a California county, not Sandoval County), and the failure to provide photo simulations of the full three-carrier build-out this tower is designed to accommodate.

Thank you for including this comment in the public record.

Respectfully,
Stacie Ferguson
16 Tierra Madre Ct.
Placitas, NM 87043

Stebobaroo@gmail.com

This message is originated from an external organization