

Glastonbury Landowners Association

Compliance Committee Meeting Summary

Date: Thursday, October 8, 2026

Location: Zoom

Time: 6:06–7:04 PM, Mountain Time

1. Call to order and attendance

GLA President Zane Curry chaired the meeting and called it to order at 6:06 PM Mountain Time

Committee members present: Zane Curry, Christine Farrar, and Neil Kremer.

Committee members absent: Holly Gill (with notice); Val O'Connell

Other attendees: GLA VP Lance Rushmeyer; Landowners Jaylyn Jensen, Claudette Dirkers, and Tim Brockett; and invitee-tenant, Mitch Larson.

Note: Jaylyn Jensen is a sitting director and longtime non-resident owner of the property in North Glastonbury (NG); Mitch Larson rents her single-wide mobile home. Joseph Bezotsky, the complainant, was not present with advance notification.

Overall characterization: The October 8 committee meeting was a complaint review that became a broader dispute about covenant enforcement, fairness, and who should have a voice in community governance. It was orderly enough to reach a recommendation, but the discussion became contentious and at times personal.

2. Agenda and Opening Comments

The single substantive agenda item was a formal complaint concerning the Jensen property, identified as North Glastonbury parcel NG-46, located at 27 Aquarius Lane and corner of Capricorn Drive. The committee's purpose was to review the complaint and make a recommendation to the GLA Board.

Zane invited landowners to raise matters not on the agenda. No opening comments were offered. He stated that committee discussion would precede broader attendee comments, which would occur *only* after a motion and before a vote. Mitch was invited as the tenant to answer questions about the rental property.

3. Complaint and information reviewed

Zane read aloud NG Landowner Joseph Bezotsky's formal complaint, sent to the Board on September 15. The complaint documented a sizable accumulation of trucks, cars, horse and

travel trailers, snowmobiles, construction equipment, collapsing framed structures, multiple heaps of scrap-wood piles, and scattered random items clearly visible from the platted road and other parcels. Joe requested that the property be cleaned up and the conspicuous items be appropriately stored out of sight. The Glastonbury Community Forum [published an article with photos last June](#) so readers could decide if the property was an eyesore.

The complaint cited GLA [Covenant 5.05](#) and the [Master Plan](#), Section 2.0, that prohibit and define what constitutes nuisances and eyesores. The complaint also raised concerns about the potential fire hazard associated with multiple gas cans strewn about the front yard and the overall impact of this parcel's condition on community property values.

Zane said the committee had received detailed photographs from Joe; a few were recent and some current. Neil had hastily visited the area around September 29 but stated that he was in a great hurry that day, so his observations were just cursory. Christine Farrar never visited the site and lives in northern Montana. Zane stopped by on October 7, after seeking permission, and shared his own photographs with the committee members *only*. Landowners were not provided with an agenda; advance notice of the meeting or the photos Zane took.

4. Committee Discussion and Owner/Tenant Responses

The discussion addressed the conditions depicted in the photographs, the current state and use of the many assorted vehicles and construction equipment, the appearance and condition of structures and stored materials, and the interpretation and application of the cited governing documents.

Christine Farrar said the recent photographs primarily showed parked vehicles, work equipment, and a trailer. She questioned whether those items constituted a nuisance or eyesore, particularly if they were being used by residents for work. She initially identified one truck that might not be operable.

In response to questions, renter Mitch Larson stated that all the vehicles were operable. He acknowledged that one truck was unregistered, but said he continued to use it anyway. Zane summarized the response as indicating that all vehicles were operable, although one was unregistered. Jaylyn and Mitch both stated that no *new* structure was presently under construction.

Neil Kremer described the conditions he observed as “very, very, subjective” and questioned the relevance of the complainant's proximity to the Jensen property and whether Joe resided nearby. Neil stated that he did not believe the GLA should ‘police’ properties in this manner. He commented that, “... probably about half the properties in NG, if you were putting new subjective complaints, you would find something wrong.” For this reason, he concluded that the Jensen property was not out-of-compliance.

In alliance, Zane acknowledged that determining whether property conditions constitute junk, a nuisance, or an eyesore, does involve subjectivity. He reported contacting four nearby landowners during the preceding 36 hours to this meeting. According to Zane, those contacted did not generally support the complaint's concerns about vehicles, *although two raised questions about structures and project-review procedures. A shed that was built without Project Review or board approval was major reason why Jaylyn Jensen was deemed "out of compliance" in [December 2025 and disqualified as a candidate](#).* Zane indicated that he still had three (3) more neighbors to contact. He expressed a preference for neighbor communication and following suit, questioned whether a complaint from *a nonadjacent property owner warranted the proposed action.*

Claudette questioned whether the complaint's allegations concerning fuel-filled gas cans, numerous types of stationary vehicles, construction equipment, old trailers, dilapidated structures, and all kinds of debris surrounding the single-wide mobile home had been adequately considered. She raised concerns about potential fire hazards, the impact on community property values, and the fiduciary responsibilities of an incumbent director, who is also a property owner, to abide by the governing documents that she was elected to uphold. She also *disputed the notion that the legitimacy of a formal complaint depends on whether the complainant owns an adjacent property. That restriction is **not** found anywhere in **any** of the GLA's governing documents.*

The discussion included differing interpretations of Covenant 5.05, the meaning of the term "**Association**" broadly written in the governing documents, the degree of discretion available in addressing alleged nuisances and eyesores, and the role of landowner complaints in the compliance process. Participants also expressed sharply contrasting views about the appearance of the property and the appropriate scope of committee review.

Zane stated that he had not observed *visible* gas cans during his October 7 visit. He disputed the property-value argument. He read portions of Covenant 5.05, emphasizing the discretion described in its language and the subjective nature of some of its terms. During this discussion, he acknowledged that the unregistered truck *might* require attention.

Claudette disagreed with Zane's individual interpretation that, " 'Association,' as a defined term, is the board at any given time," in GLA's governing documents. She stated unequivocally that throughout the governing documents, the capitalized term "**Association**" is used interchangeably with "**Landowners**." She argued that equating the board exclusively **with** the "Association" *is to simply assume the board has unfettered discretion and unchecked power, without landowner input. This dynamic directly* undermines the community's fundamental purpose. Zane then stated that he agreed with her on that point. Claudette added that

incumbent directors should model compliance with the governing documents as an example to the wider community.

Participants also disagreed about the proper scope of meeting discussions and how to characterize the property's appearance. Speaking on behalf of landowners, Claudette reiterated that other perspectives on the Jensen's property conditions do differ and emphasized the importance of allowing open landowner input.

During the exchange, Zane asked about Claudette's board experience and ownership, Jaylyn's ownership and board service, and Mitch's tenancy and work. Claudette described more than thirteen (13) years of extensive involvement as a GLA Director, along with service as a board officer and committee chair and decades-long property ownership. Jaylyn said she had owned the property for about six years and served on the board for three years, although the property had been in her family for nearly 40 years. Mitch estimated five years renting Jensen's mobile home.

Fact-finding and unresolved allegations: The committee did useful fact-finding. Members reviewed recent photographs, heard directly from Jaylyn Jensen and Mitch Larson, and distinguished allegedly inoperative vehicles from an acknowledged unregistered truck. Claudette Dirkers raised substantive questions about deteriorating structures, fire hazards, and whether complaints must come *only* from adjacent owners. Those questions deserved consideration alongside the owner's and tenant's responses.

The central weakness, in this assessment, was that the committee's reasoning did *not* fully resolve the complaint's specific allegations. Much of the discussion concerned subjectivity, neighbor relations, the complainant's proximity, and comparisons with other Glastonbury properties. Those considerations may provide context, but they *do not by themselves establish whether particular conditions comply with the governing documents*.

5. Motion, Attendee Comments, and Vote.

Zane moved:

"We dismiss the complaint from Mr. Bezotsky related to the Jensen property based on the grounds that the nuisance and eyesore and the requested remedy are beyond the scope of the GLA with no adjacent properties having an interest in supporting the complaint."

The motion remained before the committee during attendee comments. No amendment by the compliance committee to address the unregistered truck was raised.

Claudette responded to the express language of the motion, reiterating that *the governing documents do not limit complaints solely to adjacent property owners*. A motion must match the Covenants to be legitimate. She also cited potential effects on *community* property values,

fire safety, and directors' inherent fiduciary responsibility to uphold the governing documents, all of which deserved further circumspection. Additionally, she voiced that the Master Plan's stated purpose is to "enhance property values," because we have all made significant investments here. She maintained that landowners can freely travel different community roads and should be welcome to participate in substantive discussion of compliance and other community matters, rather than face repeated constraints or risk being muted during monthly board and committee meetings.

Yet again, Zane disputed the property-value argument and the relevance of taking an indirect route past the property. He reread portions of Covenant 5.05, emphasizing that the Association [Board] discretion and the subjective character of some language.

Lance Rushmeyer stated that he lived on Aquarius Lane within approximately one-quarter mile of the Jensen property. He said that he could see only part of the property from his parcel and had driven past without stopping to observe it. Aquarius Lane is flanked by rolling hills and an extended curve preceding the Jensen property that obfuscates his view. He did not find the conditions objectionable.

Jaylyn declined to provide further comment.

Management of disagreement: Zane Curry's management was organized and engaged, but strongly directive and insufficiently neutral during disagreement. He established a discussion sequence, asked direct questions, and invited attendee comments before the vote. He explained that the committee's recommendation required a subsequent Board decision. He also sometimes acknowledged useful input and thanked participants.

His handling of Claudette's objections was more troubling. He frequently restricted further debate while giving lengthy explanations of his own interpretation. He questioned why she would take a route past the property, asked her to apologize for her description of its appearance, and later brought up a separate complaint involving her. Those exchanges shifted attention from the merits of her questions to her conduct and history. Whatever his intention, that could make participation feel uncomfortable or discouraging.

As de facto meeting chair, Zane was entitled to offer a position and keep discussion focused. But effective chairing also requires giving competing interpretations a fair hearing. Here, he appeared to be both managing the discussion and vigorously defending dismissal, which definitely weakened the impression of an impartial review.

Zane called for the committee members' votes on the pending motion.

Vote: The motion carried, with all three committee members present voting in favor. No opposing vote or abstention was heard. No additional motion was made to address the unregistered truck.

Committee recommendation: The Compliance Committee recommended dismissing NG Landowner Joseph Bezotsky's formal complaint concerning the Jensen property complaint.

Result and next steps: This was a **nonbinding committee recommendation**, not final Board action. Zane said the matter would be placed under the Compliance Committee portion of the October 27 Board agenda for a vote, at which time other landowners could offer additional comments. The Board would decide whether the complaint remained active or closed.

Follow-up: Zane will notify Joe of the committee's recommendation and clarify that the Board will make the final decision.

The committee did not establish any cleanup deadline, issue an enforcement notice or make any determination regarding *previous* structure approval that is still in question, or take separate action concerning the unregistered truck.

Meaning of the recommendation: The unregistered truck remained an acknowledged concern without a separate recommendation addressing it. The unanimous vote therefore produced a clear procedural outcome—a recommendation to dismiss—but, in this assessment, a less convincing substantive resolution of the complaint.

6. Adjournment

Zane moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:04 PM Mountain Time. Christine Farrar seconded the motion, and Neil Kremer concurred.

7. Closing assessment

Zane demonstrated preparation and command of the meeting; he showed less patience and balance when participants challenged the reasoning behind the outcome. The meeting's broader significance lies in the unresolved relationship between discretionary covenant enforcement, fair consideration of specific allegations, and landowners' ability to participate without the discussion becoming personal.