

July 30, 2026 - Email from owner

Date: July 30, 2026

From: [Owner]

To: Ken Inskeep

Cc: Marie Perez; Noel Hengst; Kat Boswell

Subject: Re: Santa Rita Ranch III Document for [Home address redacted]

Personal identifiers and protected personal details have been removed. This is a text rendering, not the raw email. Statements are the correspondents' positions, not adjudicated findings.

Mr. Inskeep,

I acknowledge your response.

My July 28, 2026 correspondence already contested the Courtesy Notice, requested the statutory information required under A.R.S. § 33-1803, and made a new records request under A.R.S. § 33-1805. Your response acknowledges receipt of that written contest and records request. Please do not treat this reply as replacing or narrowing my prior contest, statutory request, or records request.

To avoid any possible dispute regarding the certified-mail procedure in A.R.S. § 33-1803(C), I am also sending my contest by certified mail. Nothing in that certified mailing should be treated as replacing, narrowing, or delaying the July 28 contest and records request that AAM has already acknowledged receiving.

Your response appears to confirm that AAM intends to keep the Courtesy Notice in my compliance history because AAM believes there is photo evidence that the condition briefly existed. That does not resolve the issue. I am not asking the Association to pretend the materials never existed. I am objecting to the Association maintaining a non-compliance record based on a vague and deficient notice for a temporary condition that was promptly cured.

You stated that withdrawal would be "counter to Association management as well as AAM policies and procedures." Respectfully, AAM's internal policies and procedures do not control over Arizona law, the Association's governing documents, or the Board's statutory obligations. AAM saying the notice should remain in my record does not make that decision correct, compliant, or enforceable.

The provision you previously cited may give the Association a general nuisance or unsightly-condition theory in some circumstances, but it does not cure the defects in the notice as issued. Section 10.16 may address rubbish, debris, nuisance, unsightliness, or offensive conditions depending on the facts, but the Courtesy Notice did not identify Section 10.16 or explain which theory the Association was relying on. It simply labeled the matter "Trash" and referred to wood pallets and pavers.

That matters. Wood pallets and pavers are not inherently trash. If the Association is claiming they were rubbish or debris, Section 10.16 refers to such items being placed or permitted to accumulate “for any unreasonable length of time,” and the Association has not shown that requirement was met. If the Association is instead claiming an unsightly-condition or nuisance theory, then it should say so clearly and identify the facts supporting that theory. Homeowners should not be required to guess which covenant the Association means, infer the Association’s legal theory from a vague category label, or piece together the basis for a violation only after objecting.

A temporary condition corrected promptly after notice does not fit neatly within the language you cited. If the Board disagrees, please identify the factual basis and governing-document theory supporting the Courtesy Notice, including whether the Association is relying on rubbish, debris, nuisance, unsightliness, or some other theory under Section 10.16.

Please forward my July 28, 2026 correspondence and this reply to the Board of Directors and the Association’s legal counsel as needed. I continue to request a response from the Board itself, not merely from the management company.

Once the Association has produced the required statutory explanation and records, I reserve the right to file a superseding appeal addressing the full record, including any additional deficiencies revealed by the Association’s production.

Sincerely,

[Owner] [Home address redacted] [Home locality redacted]

Editorial and provenance notes

Source record: SRC-000269. The complete raw email and original headers are retained privately.

Attachments and inline images are not reproduced in this email rendering; refer to separately listed records in the document library. Attachment filenames are not reproduced.

Repeated quoted thread history omitted; separate messages retain the substantive exchange.