

State of New Mexico  
House of Representatives  
Santa Fe

**MATTHEW MCQUEEN**

D - Sandoval & Santa Fe  
District 50

7 Avenida Vista Grande B7-120

Santa Fe, NM 87508-9198

E-mail: mcqueenform@gmail.com

**COMMITTEES:**

CHAIR: Energy, Environment & Natural Resources

Judiciary

**INTERIM COMMITTEES:**

VICE CHAIR: Water & Natural Resources

Land Grant

April 17, 2026

Dear Director Beaman,

I am writing regarding the Conditional Use Permit application CU-26-001, which is scheduled to be heard before the Sandoval County Planning and Zoning Commission on the April 21, 2026.

As the state Representative for the Placitas area (District-50), I have received concerns from residents about the proposed 75-foot wireless monopole along the NM-165 corridor.

With the recognition that this is a county land-use matter and therefore wholly within the county's authority, I submit this letter in the shared interest of serving the area and to emphasize these concerns for your careful review.

In particular, I would like to highlight the following concerns as issues worth additional consideration:

- The potential inconsistency of the proposed plans with the Placitas Area Plan, which, although not statutory, should be considered in this process. Particularly, the emphasis on maintaining open spaces and semi-rural character which may be disrupted by the proposed tower and its location.
- The potential visual impacts of the structure on the landscape, especially if it is improperly shielded from view, and whether the proposed shielding measures are sufficient to mitigate these concerns.
- The potential for a disturbance in a highly visible landscape to cause economic impacts for local homeowners and the area in general.

Given our shared interest in serving the community of Placitas and the surrounding area, I thank you for your careful consideration of all arguments relating to the tower's construction and impact.

Sincerely,

**From:** [Annette Davis](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** The Tower  
**Date:** Sunday, April 12, 2026 4:00:36 PM

---

April 12, 2026

Ms. Doraida Arias  
Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning  
Direct: (505) 867-7651  
Office: (505) 867-7628  
[darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov)

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,

Annette Davis  
29 Calle del Arroyo  
Placitas NM 87043  
Phone: 303 638-3884

[davisannette03@gmail.com](mailto:davisannette03@gmail.com)

This message is originated from an external organization

April 10, 2026

Daniel J. Beaman, Planning Director  
Sandoval County Planning & Zoning Department

RE: Comment- CU-26-001, Proposed 75 ft Monopole at 221 NM 165,  
Placitas NM

Dear Director Beaman,

We are writing to state our opposition to the installation of the proposed wireless tower at 221 NM 165. Not only will it ruin our beautiful , serene view, it will decrease our property value. It also will be extremely ugly and conflicts with the Placitas Area Plan.

We respectfully request the Commission deny this as inconsistent with the adopted Placitas Area Pan currently in place.

Respectfully,



Brian and Susanne Dominguez  
20 Tierra Madre CT,  
PLacitas , NM







### AI Overview

Yes, cell phone towers can pose a fire hazard in **Placitas, NM**, particularly given the area's high risk for **wildfires**. While rare, cell towers can catch fire due to electrical malfunctions, causing the potential ignition of surrounding vegetation and endangering nearby structures. [firststreet.org +4](#)

Here are the specific factors regarding cell tower fire risks in the context of Placitas, NM:

- **Fire Hazards in High-Risk Areas:** Placitas is considered a community at high risk for wildfires, with 100% of properties facing some risk over the next 30 years. Cell towers, which combine high-powered electrical equipment, lithium-ion backup batteries, and dense electronics, can serve as ignition sources, especially in dry, arid environments.
- **Electrical Faults:** Cell tower fires often start due to electrical issues, such as **arcing, overheating, or wiring defects** in the equipment cabinets at the base of the tower.
- **Vegetation Risk:** If a tower experiences an electrical malfunction, the resulting fire can ignite dry grass, shrubs, and brush, spreading rapidly in an area prone to wildfires.
- **Infrastructure Vulnerability:** A proposed 75-foot tower near Homesteads Market in Placitas has raised community concern. Similar projects in other rural areas have highlighted the need to consider wildfire mitigation, such as placing tower equipment in non-combustible, prefabricated shelters and maintaining defensible space around the tower site.
- **Emergency Service Disruptions:** While necessary for communication, a tower catching fire during a wildfire can have critical consequences, as it can disable 911 services, which are vital for evacuation alerts. [UW-Madison News +9](#)

### Recommendations for Fire Safety:



**Valerie Wroblewski, DDS**

36 Calle Del Norte  
Placitas, NM 87043

**Date:** April 14, 2026

**To:**

Sandoval County Planning and Zoning Commission  
c/o Planning & Zoning Department  
1500 Idalia Road, Building D  
Bernalillo, NM 87004

**Re:** *Formal Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CU-26-001 – Proposed 75-Foot Communications Tower at 221 NM-165, Placitas, NM*

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing to formally oppose **Conditional Use Permit CU-26-001**, which seeks approval for the construction of a **75-foot wireless communications tower** at or near **221 NM-165 and Tierra Madre Road in Placitas, New Mexico**. I respectfully request that this letter be entered in its entirety into the official record for this case.

My opposition is based on substantial land-use, planning, and community-impact concerns, as outlined below.

**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 community. It explicitly prioritizes **protection of scenic viewsheds, preservation of ridgelines, and maintenance of Placitas’ semi-rural character**. The proposed 75-foot commercial monopole is fundamentally inconsistent with these guiding principles especially since many communities have height restrictions much lower than 75 ft’.

Approval of this Conditional Use Permit would contradict the very planning framework the County established through a public and collaborative process. The Commission has an obligation to give meaningful deference to adopted plans, particularly when a proposed use so clearly undermines their stated goals.

**2. Inadequate and Misleading “Stealth” or Concealment Design**

Although the applicant characterizes the tower as a concealed or stealth installation, the project’s own engineering drawings indicate that **approximately 55 feet of the structure would be an exposed steel monopole**, with concealment limited to only the upper portion of the tower. This means that nearly three-quarters of the structure would remain fully visible from surrounding residences, NM-165, and the broader Placitas landscape.

Such limited concealment does not constitute meaningful visual mitigation in a community defined by open vistas and natural terrain. A design that primarily screens antennas—rather than the structure itself—fails to address the primary source of visual intrusion.

### 3. Documented Concerns Raised by the County's Own Reviewer

It is particularly concerning that the County's designated zoning reviewer previously stated in writing that **the site is "considerably more visible" and questioned whether the proposed stealth design is an appropriate concept.** This professional assessment, already part of the project record, reinforces the community's concerns that the proposed location and design are poorly suited to this setting.

### 4. Adverse Impacts on Property Values and Community Character

Placitas homes derive much of their value from **unobstructed views, low-density development, and the absence of urban-scale infrastructure.** The introduction of a prominent commercial tower in a residential and semi-rural area threatens to erode these qualities.

Numerous studies and appraisal analyses have documented **declines in property values near highly visible wireless towers,** particularly in scenic and rural communities. Beyond financial impacts, many residents—including myself—chose to live in Placitas specifically because its land-use policies limit intrusive development of this nature.

### 5. Failure to Adequately Pursue Alternatives and Co-Location

The record indicates that alternative sites and co-location options, including use of existing structures and less visually sensitive locations, were not fully exhausted. Of particular concern is the abandonment of a previously considered fire station site for reasons that appear commercial rather than technical.

The Conditional Use process requires a genuine demonstration that less intrusive alternatives are not viable. That standard has not been met in this case.

### 6. Lack of Demonstrated Community Need at This Specific Location

While improved cellular service is often cited as a general benefit, many residents report adequate coverage in the surrounding area. Even where service gaps exist, they do not justify placing a large commercial tower in a visually prominent residential corridor when less damaging solutions may be available.

## Conclusion

For the reasons stated above—**inconsistency with the Placitas Area Plan, excessive visual impact, inadequate concealment, documented professional concerns, potential harm to property values, and insufficient exploration of alternatives**—I respectfully urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to **deny Conditional Use Permit CU-26-001.**

At a minimum, the application should be remanded for substantial redesign and relocation to a site that better aligns with Placitas' adopted land-use policies and community values.

Respectfully submitted,

**Valerie Wroblewski, DDS**

**From:** [Daniel Beaman](#)  
**To:** [JUDITH Nakamura](#)  
**Cc:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Cu-26-001 Letter  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 1:55:34 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Received. Thank you.



**Daniel J. Beaman**

Director of Planning & Zoning

Desk: (505) 867-7617

Cell: (505) 934-2142

[www.sandovalcountynm.gov](http://www.sandovalcountynm.gov)

---

**From:** JUDITH Nakamura <bounce1004@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 12:50 PM  
**To:** Daniel Beaman <dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov>  
**Cc:** JUDITH Nakamura <bounce1004@msn.com>  
**Subject:** Cu-26-001 Letter

Good Afternoon Director:

Attached is my letter regarding the proposed monopole in Placitas. Can you please confirm receipt?

If there are any problems opening the document please let me know and I will drop off a copy.

Thank you!!!

Judy Nakamura

Judith K. Nakamura  
Placitas, New Mexico

Sent Via Email: [dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov)

Mr. Daniel J. Beaman  
Director  
Sandoval County Planning and Zoning  
Post Office Box 40  
Bernalillo, NM 87004

RE: CU-26-001

Dear Mr. Beaman:

This letter is sent in opposition to the 75-foot wireless monopole (hereafter referred to as "Tower") proposed for placement at 221 State Highway 165 in Placitas.

I am aware that you have received a number of letters citing the many legal deficiencies upon which the application should be denied including violation of setback requirements established for safety purposes; the location and design; ordinance violations including at the time of this writing the failure to complete the mandatory balloon tests; the documented consequential decline in home values; and overall incompatibility with community characteristics. Any of these issues provides sufficient basis upon which to deny the permit. This letter focuses on the significant adverse impact this tower poses on the character and environment of our community.

First however, let me clearly state that I do not oppose a legally compliant tower in an appropriate location, if needed. I oppose this site and the tower design. We know other appropriate locations exist, such as the Fire Station location that already has a tall structure. The applicant is choosing cheap and easy over what is right for this community. As discussed elsewhere in this letter the selected site is smack dab in the middle of the social heart and soul and beauty of this community and negates for many of us the reasons why we chose the home locations we did.

The character and environment of Placitas which will be adversely impacted is specifically protected by the Sandoval County Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Siting Ordinance, No. 03-10-16-1, the Sandoval County Comprehensive Plan and the Placitas Area Plan. Briefly, a few of the relevant parts of each plan to which I am referring are as follows:

1. The 2003 Siting Ordinance's stated policy includes ensuring that tower placement:

*... protects...the nature and character of the community and neighborhood and other aspects of the quality of life listed elsewhere in this Ordinance....*

Further, goals of the Ordinance include:

*4) Promoting and encouraging, the placement, height and quantity ...to minimize adverse aesthetic and visual impacts on land, property, buildings and facilities*

*adjacent to, surrounding, and in generally the same area as the requested location.....*

2. The Sandoval County Comprehensive Plan reinforces these goals by clearly recommending:

*Sandoval County shall retain a prevailing rural residential character while promoting an orderly development of business and industry in appropriate locations.*

This policy is achieved in part, according to the Plan, by decisions being based on the impact on surrounding land uses particularly in residential areas.

3. Finally the goals and desires of the County and community articulated in the Placitas Area Plan include:

*-protecting the existing semi-rural character of the Placitas region...  
-the protection and preservation of natural views (including setting height standards)...*

The tower threatens all of these goals and policies. First, it negatively impacts views. After originally growing up in Rio Rancho and moving to Albuquerque I chose to return to Sandoval County making Placitas my retirement community! After a lengthy search, like many of my neighbors, I chose a home without views of large power lines and specifically without any impediments to my views of the Sandia Mountains. Others I know, chose their homes for unimpeded views of our magnificent sunsets. All of these will be permanently marred by the the 75-foot tower's chosen site. This is not speculation, it is fact and is contrary to the Plans that one would reasonably expect to protect the home sites we selected.

Beyond the impact on the enjoyment and value of our individual properties there is a greater impact on the rural characteristics of our community. Rural not just refers to lower population numbers and limited infrastructure but also to an areas' identity and sense of community fostered by close-knit social relationships. We primarily have two locations for many of our community events: First there is the Presbyterian Church which hosts many indoor events from yoga classes, to art events to concerts.

Second there is the Homestead Village. I believe most would agree that this is our primary community social nexus location. The proposed tower site abuts the Center to the west. The Center is where our art gallery and only market are located. Additionally our only restaurants are there; both with outdoor seating where many of us go to enjoy sunsets and the expansive unobstructed views to the west. Our community also holds concerts in the parking lot of the Center during the summer as well as other community events such as our annual Placitas Celebration. There really is no other reasonable site for these outdoor gatherings, concerts and celebrations. The impact of a unobstructed 75' tower immediately next door to our community hub should need no further explanation. As a side note it is difficult to fathom the impact of this tower property on the horses to the north. They are only separated from the tower property by a narrow dirt road.

While I understand that some individuals desire the tower for improved communications I knew when I moved to Placitas that my cell phone did not work well. So I kept a landline, switched cell phone providers, and worked with the new provider. Cell phone service is no

⚠ This message is originated from an external organization ⚠

longer an issue. I moved into this area understanding the limitations of location. But the tradeoff was the return to Sandoval County, the beauty of Placitas, the unobstructed views and the true sense of community fostered by our community events.

I urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to deny the conditional use permit and compel the applicant to find a more suitable site for this tower if the applicant wishes to locate it in Placitas.

Sincerely yours,



Judith K. Nakamura

**From:** [Dan Davis](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Cc:** [Annette Davis](#)  
**Subject:** The Tower  
**Date:** Sunday, April 12, 2026 3:57:19 PM

---

April 12, 2026

Ms. Doraida Arias  
Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning  
Direct: (505) 867-7651  
Office: (505) 867-7628  
[darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov)

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,

Dan Davis  
29 Calle del Arroyo  
Placitas NM 87043  
Phone: 720 985-9030  
[dancruise.dd@gmail.com](mailto:dancruise.dd@gmail.com)

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Hansen, Karen](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Letter from Representative McQueen (HD-50) RE: Case number CU-26-001.  
**Date:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:50:28 AM  
**Attachments:** [2026-04-17 Placitas.pdf](#)

---

Good morning, Assistant Director Arias,

Please find a digital letter attached from Representative Matthew McQueen (NM HD-50) regarding case number CU-26-001, the proposed telecommunications monopole in Placitas, for consideration at your April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Kindly

Karen Hansen

District Legislative Aide  
Rep. Matthew McQueen—HD 50  
[Karen.Hansen@nmlegis.gov](mailto:Karen.Hansen@nmlegis.gov)  
(505) 946-5650

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Mark Dankert](#)  
**To:** [Planning and Zoning Main](#)  
**Cc:** [kbruch@sandovalcountyn.m.gov](mailto:kbruch@sandovalcountyn.m.gov); [mmeek@sandovalcountyn.m.gov](mailto:mmeek@sandovalcountyn.m.gov); [jojuarez@sandovaln.m.gov](mailto:jojuarez@sandovaln.m.gov);  
[jjones@sandovaln.m.gov](mailto:jjones@sandovaln.m.gov)  
**Subject:** proposed cell tower  
**Date:** Sunday, April 19, 2026 10:17:07 AM

---

Commissioners, I would like to voice my strong opposition to the proposed cell tower in Placitas on Lot5A-1AW!!  
It would destroy the character of our community, and would be a terrible eye sore.  
Please listen to the wishes of the majority of those living in our community!  
Sincerely C.A.Langfeldt

-----  
This message is originated from an external organization

Doraida Arias

Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning

Direct: (505) 867-7651

Office: (505) 867-7628

[darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov)

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,

Name: *Marta Lucas*

Address, Placitas, NM *4 Puerta del Sol 87043*

Phone / Email

*505/321-9976*

*marta.lucas@comcast.net*

**From:** [Mike Elyea](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Please Oppose Cell Tower Construction (Reference CU-26-001)  
**Date:** Friday, April 17, 2026 8:34:22 AM

---

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mike Elyea** <[melyea99@gmail.com](mailto:melyea99@gmail.com)>  
Date: Fri, Apr 17, 2026 at 08:30  
Subject: Please Oppose Cell Tower Construction (Reference CU-26-001)  
To: <[dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov)>

Director of Planning and Zoning:

I urge you to deny this project in all its forms. If this cell tower is approved, three things are certain to happen:

- 1) Permanent loss of unobstructed views of the mountain, mesa, and high desert for all neighbors within view of this tower. Homeowners in this area have paid premium prices to have these unobstructed views.
- 2) Permanent loss of property values for me and others like me near this tower. That amounts to 7 to 10% of property values. This is backed up by peer reviewed real estate industry studies.
- 3) Continued pressure by cell phone providers to add even more towers in the future. The next towers may be in your front yard, as well as mine. Verizon, according to its own documents, has five towers within 5 miles of this location. Four of them are within 2 1/2 miles. Do we really need a yet another tower?

Please oppose this cell tower construction and continue to uphold the spirit and intent of the Placitas Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely, Michael J. Elyea  
4 Bison Ct. Placitas NM

This message is originated from an external organization

Doraida Arias

Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning

Direct: (505) 867-7651

Office: (505) 867-7628

[darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov)

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, 

Name: PATRICIA H. LEWIS

Address, Placitas, NM #1 SIX RANGE FOUNT RD.

Phone / Email - HARRISONPAT41@GMAIL.COM

**From:** [Michael Eshleman](#)  
**To:** [Daniel Beaman](#); [Doraida Arias](#); [John Butrick](#); [Eric Masterson](#)  
**Subject:** Placitas cell tower CU-26-001 comment by Steven Siegel  
**Date:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:18:33 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI.

Michael



**Michael Eshleman**  
*Sandoval County Attorney*

Legal Department  
County of Sandoval  
Post Office Box 40  
Bernalillo, New Mexico 87004  
(505) 867-7507  
(505) 771-7194 (fax)  
[meshleman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:meshleman@sandovalcountynm.gov)

---

**From:** [noreply@formnotification.email](mailto:noreply@formnotification.email) <[noreply@formnotification.email](mailto:noreply@formnotification.email)>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:06 AM  
**To:** Katherine Bruch <[kbruch@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:kbruch@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Jordan Juarez <[jojuarez@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:jojuarez@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Michael Meek <[mmeek@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:mmeek@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Jon Herr <[jherr@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:jherr@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Joshua Jones <[jjones@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:jjones@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Wayne Johnson <[wjohnson@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:wjohnson@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Eric Masterson <[EMasterson@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:EMasterson@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Michael Eshleman <[Meshleman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:Meshleman@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Michael P. Jaramillo <[mpjaramillo@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:mpjaramillo@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Shawn Perry-Turner <[sperry-turner@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:sperry-turner@sandovalcountynm.gov)>; Web Admins <[webadmins@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:webadmins@sandovalcountynm.gov)>  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Upcoming Commissioner Meeting

#### Boards and Commissions

Public Comment for Upcoming Commission Meeting

#### Name

Steven Siegel

#### Address

34 Placitas Trails Road  
Placitas, New Mexico 87043  
United States

[Map It](#)

**Email**

[oporornis@yahoo.com](mailto:oporornis@yahoo.com)

**Comments:**

Dear Commissioners of Sandoval County and Planning & Zoning:

I am writing about the proposed cell phone tower at Hwy 165 and Tierra Madre in Placitas CU-26-001. I would ask you to read the lease between the owner of the property and Sun State Towers, if you haven't already. It is a public document and Planning and Zoning has it.

You needn't read it all, but after looking at a few parts of it, you will see that Sun State may have a whole lot more in store for the land than just a 75 foot tall cellphone tower. Pay attention to:

Section 1 (m) and 1 (n), the term and price of the lease.

Section 5 (b) where Sun State reserves the right to invite other cell companies as "Collocators" and increase the height of the tower to accommodate them. This is permitted by the FCC (Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012) and Sandoval County has ZERO say in the matter.


Section 5 (a) where Sun State reserves the right to build anything they want to support telecommunication on the leased land and section 5(b) again where the Collocators are permitted to do the same.

Section 7 (b) where Sun State (and presumably Collocators) reserve the right to build outside of the footprint of the tower if intended improvements will not fit in the primary leased area, and to do it on any or all of the Landlord's land for no additional rent!

Section 16 and Exhibit D where, in the event that the Landlord wishes to sell the land, Sun State reserves the right of first refusal to buy "The Site". Exhibit D shows "The Site" to be the complete approx. 4 acre parcel at the corner of 165 and Tierra Madre, not just the tower location.

Since this is a federally regulated communications facility, once it is approved, Sandoval County will retain only limited control over what is built initially or in the future. A much larger and more complex facility may be the ultimate plan. The County's first decision will be an important one.

These observations are only my interpretation of a public document. You may feel otherwise, but thank you for your attention.

 This message is originated from an external organization 

**From:** [Roberta Gabal](#)  
**To:** [Daniel Beaman](#)  
**Cc:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: Fwd: Opposition of Cell Phone Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 9:23:30 AM

---

This is an add on to my previous email in opposition to the cell tower. Thank you so much.

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

From: Roberta Gabal <[rpgabal@comcast.net](mailto:rpgabal@comcast.net)>  
To: "dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov" <[dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov)>  
Date: 04/01/2026 9:17 PM MDT  
Subject: Re: Fwd: Opposition of Cell Phone Tower  
This is an amended email for the ORIGINAL I sent to [darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov) 3/30/26 and to [dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov) 3/31/26. Please disregard these original emails that show my concerns on health and emissions. I just learned these topics are not allowed when opposing the cell phone tower. I stand corrected and I do apologize.

On 04/01/2026 10:42 AM MDT Roberta Gabal <[rpgabal@comcast.net](mailto:rpgabal@comcast.net)> wrote:

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

From: Roberta Gabal <[rpgabal@comcast.net](mailto:rpgabal@comcast.net)>  
To: "dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov" <[dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeamman@sandovalcountynm.gov)>  
Date: 03/30/2026 1:20 PM MDT  
Subject: Fwd: Opposition of Cell Phone Tower

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

From: Roberta Gabal <[rpgabal@comcast.net](mailto:rpgabal@comcast.net)>  
To: [darias@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:darias@sandovalcountynm.gov)  
Date: 03/30/2026 7:44 AM MDT  
Subject: Opposition of Cell Phone Tower  
Hello, I am a home and landowner of 37 years in this exact area, adjacent to the property line, of the acreage, where the proposed 75ft cell phone tower would be on NM 165 and Tierra Madre Road in Placitas.  
My husband and I strongly oppose the construction of this tower. The scale of this structure would negatively impact the area by affecting property values and landscapes, etc. And although we are not the experts and cannot comment on anyone else's possible cell phone

power issues we wonder if more cell phone service is needed here. We ourselves have not had a problem. Doraida, please deny this proposal and consider other alternatives for other locations. Thank you so much, Doraida. Our hope and trust are that you can help us.

Respectfully,  
Roberta and Paul Gabaldon  
Placitas, NM  
[rpgabal@comcast.net](mailto:rpgabal@comcast.net)  
505-980-5099

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Sylvia Lake](#)  
**To:** [Daniel Beaman](#)  
**Cc:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Verizon request for new antenna tower in Placitas  
**Date:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:42:22 PM

---

To Whom It May Concern,

I am against the new Placitas cell phone tower Verizon wishes to install, and here are a few reasons why:

- 1) The placement of this tower is against everything the Placitas Plan promises.
- 2) Views will be ruined since the tower will be right in the money shot for many. This means that all those properties will immediately be devalued. That's two hits we will take. The properties right by the tower will lose the most. Only Verizon and the landlord leasing to them will make any money off this, and they will do that by stealing from us. Doesn't that seem wrong?
- 3) After one tower goes up, Verizon will plan for another, and another, ad nauseam. Verizon already has 5 towers in the area.

Please vote against Verizon's request.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,  
Sylvia Lake  
4 Bison Ct  
Placitas, NM

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Silvia Blum](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Case CU-26-001  
**Date:** Friday, April 17, 2026 10:36:56 AM

---

April 17, 2026

Dear Sandoval County Commission,

We are writing to oppose the proposed 75-foot cell tower at 221 NM-165 in Placitas (Case CU-26-001) based on the following concerns:

First, the proposal conflicts with the Placitas Area Plan. The plan emphasizes protection of view corridors and limits on building heights, and a 75-foot industrial monopole does not align with those standards.

Second, the proposed design is inadequate with 55 feet of bare steel showing below a 20 foot shroud.

Third, co-location requirements do not appear to be fully satisfied. The NM-165 fire station site was previously identified as an alternative but was not used for commercial reasons rather than technical limitations, suggesting other options may still be viable.

Fourth, there are concerns regarding setback and safety. A structure of this height raises legitimate questions about safety in the event of a failure.

Fifth, the documented impact on property values is significant. Research indicates that visible towers can reduce home values, with estimated losses affecting hundreds of homes in this area.

Finally, the burden of proof has not been met. The applicant has not demonstrated that this specific site and design are necessary given the existence of potential alternatives.

For these reasons, we urge the Commission to deny this application.

Sincerely,

Silvia and Michael Martins

15 Tierra Madre Road, Placitas NM 87043

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Friday, April 17, 2026, 10:26 AM, Daniel Beaman <[dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov](mailto:dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov)> wrote:

Hi, I am currently out-of-office, but will return Monday, April 20th. If urgent, please contact Doraida Arias (Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning) at

darias@sandovalcountynm.gov. Thanks, Dan.

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Chavez, George Peter](#)  
**To:** [Daniel Beaman](#); [P&ZComm](#)  
**Cc:** [George Chavez](#)  
**Subject:** TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM OF DENIAL: CASE CU-26-001  
**Date:** Monday, April 13, 2026 11:02:22 AM

---

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM OF DENIAL

**TO:** Daniel J. Beaman, Director of Planning & Zoning, Sandoval County

**FROM:** George, Leslie Chavez, Affected Property Owner

**DATE:** April 13, 2026

**RE:** CASE CU-26-001– Technical Deficiencies and Cumulative Impact Failure

### I. THE "NOT APPARENT" LEGAL STANDARD

The Sandoval County Zoning Ordinance and the governing lease agreement for this site require that noise and vibrations **"shall not be apparent."** \* **The Admission:** The Applicant's Noise Study (Table 4) admits to a **+2.5 dB increase** at the western property line.

- **The Conflict:** In an ambient environment of **31.0 dBA** (Rural Silence), any mathematical increase is, by definition, "apparent." The Applicant's use of "barely noticeable" as a compliance standard is a misinterpretation of the strict "not apparent" legal requirement.

### II. FAILURE TO ACCOUNT FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT (SECTION 6409 RATCHET)

The Project Description explicitly states the site is designed to **"co-locate up to 3 carriers."** \* **The Omission:** The Noise Study only models **one (1) carrier**.

- **The "Ratchet" Risk:** Under **47 U.S.C. § 1455 (Section 6409)**, if the County approves this "Phase 1" build, it loses the legal authority to deny future equipment additions for the other two carriers.
- **The Reality:** Logarithmic modeling shows that three carriers will produce a **+5.3 dB increase** (approx. **36.3 dBA** total). This moves the site from "noticeable" to "intrusive," creating a permanent industrial noise plume over residential land that the County will be powerless to mitigate once the initial permit is granted.

### III. THERMAL LOAD CONTRADICTION (AUGUST 13–14 BASELINE)

The Applicant's baseline was recorded during a peak heat event (**91.9°F**).

- **The Technical Flaw:** High-performance AI-RAN hardware (NVIDIA-based) utilizes "Adaptive Fan Curves." At 92°F, cooling fans operate at **80–100% Duty Cycle**.
- **The Discrepancy:** The Applicant's "Predicted Noise" (30 dBA) reflects "Standard/Idle" equipment performance. It is physically impossible for 200-amp AI-compute hardware to remain at 30 dBA inside a dark "Brandywine" stealth shroud during a New Mexico summer. The study fails to model **Maximum Thermal Load**.

### IV. REQUESTED ACTION

Based on the "Incomplete" nature of the application, we move that the Planning Director:

1. **Stay the Application:** Until a **Cumulative 3-Carrier Noise Model** is provided.
2. **Mandate "Max Load" Testing:** Require the Applicant to provide manufacturer specifications for fan noise at **100% RPM** (Summer Peak).
3. **Condition of Approval:** If the case proceeds, mandate a **post-construction acoustic audit** during a 90°F+ day to ensure the "not apparent" standard is met in reality, not just on paper.

We ask the Commission to protect the acoustic quiet of the Placitas community by **denying this permit** or, at minimum, staying the decision until these baseline protections are met.

Sincerely,

George, Leslie Chavez  
212 Hwy 165, Placitas, NM 87043  
505-217-8738

This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Valerie Wroblewski](#)  
**To:** [Daniel Beaman](#); [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Additional opposition points for CU-26-001  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 11:46:16 AM

---

Hello Mr. Beaman,

I sent my first letter of opposition to CU-26-001 yesterday, April 14, 1936. I would like to add a few additional points of opposition:

1. I strongly oppose the applicant's request for a reduced set back requirement for the required allowance to the west. The applicant has requested less than half of the distance recommended by the county engineers. The requested reduction puts Tierra Madre Road and any potential travelers in grave danger should this tower fall during our very high winds that are quite frequent in Placitas.
2. These towers carry high voltage and increase the fire danger in the areas they are located. Placitas is considered a high fire risk area with expected estimates that most residents will experience an issue in the next 30 years. We do not need to be adding ANYTHING that increases this risk, especially since our firefighting ability is limited as is.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,  
Valerie Wroblewski DDS  
36 Calle del Norte  
Placitas, NM 87043  
Placitas Homesteads Subdivision

Sent from my iPhone

-----  
This message is originated from an external organization

**From:** [Valerie Wroblewski](#)  
**To:** [Doraida Arias](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: CU-26-001 Opposition Letter  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 11:30:04 AM  
**Attachments:** [Cell Tower Opposition Letter.pdf](#)  
[Cell Tower Opposition Letter.docx](#)

---

Hello,  
I am forwarding this to you as well.  
Thank you,  
Valerie Wroblewski DDS

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Valerie Wroblewski <kvwroblewski@gmail.com>  
**Date:** April 14, 2026 at 2:09:13 PM MDT  
**To:** Daniel Beaman <dbeaman@sandovalcountynm.gov>  
**Subject:** CU-26-001 Opposition Letter

Hello Mr. Beaman,

Please find attached my formal letter of opposition to the proposed communications tower project CU-26-001. I would like it entered into the formal record for your and the Planning and Zoning commissions consideration please. I have attached the letter in both pdf and Word formats.

Sincerely,  
Valerie Wroblewski DDS

This message is originated from an external organization