

Board of Supervisors Meeting

ATTENDING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	ATTENDING TOWNSHIP PERSONNEL
Thomas J. McLewee Jr., Chairman	Joan Blatcher, Township Manager
Noreen Vigilante, Vice-Chairman	Tom Goggin, Chief of Police
Steven F. Costa, Supervisor	Dorene Guistwhite, Township Treasurer
Harold M. Hallman III, Supervisor	Jennifer Wachsmuth, Township Secretary
Bryan Maher, Supervisor	Vince Dougherty, Solicitor

June 1, 2026, 7:30 PM

1645 Art School Road, Chester Springs, PA 19425

I. Call to Order

Chairman McLewee called the meeting to order. It was noted that an Executive Session had been held earlier that evening on the topic of real estate.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. Prior to the vote, Supervisor Maher requested that a Q&A period focused on the real estate topic be added to the agenda. After brief discussion, it was agreed that the Q&A segment would be placed immediately before Public Comment, and that it would be limited in scope to questions regarding the real estate options under consideration. The agenda was amended accordingly.

Motion to approve the amended agenda was made by Supervisor Vigilante and seconded by Supervisor Costa. The motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote (Costa – Yes, Hallman – Aye, Maher – Yes, Vigilante – Yes, McLewee – Yes).

IV. Approval of Minutes

a. Monday, May 18, 2026, Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Maher commended the Township Secretary for the quality of the prior meeting's minutes. Supervisor Hallman raised the question of preserving the audio recording from that meeting, which prompted broader discussion about the township's recording retention practices.

It was noted that a resolution was passed at the May 4th meeting establishing a policy under which recordings are only preserved until meeting minutes are approved at the subsequent meeting. Several supervisors expressed a desire to revisit that policy, with Supervisor Maher advocating for retaining all recordings going forward as a backup to the written minutes and

as a step toward eventual public live-streaming of meetings. Supervisor Vigilante expressed reservations about establishing a new precedent inconsistent with the recently passed resolution.

After discussion, the board agreed to approve the minutes and then separately vote to retain all recordings beginning with the May 18th meeting, pending a formal amendment to the resolution at the next meeting.

Motion to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting was made by Supervisor Vigilante and seconded by Supervisor Maher. The motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote (Costa – Yes, Hallman – Aye, Maher – Yes, Vigilante – Yes, McLewee – Yes).

Motion to retain all recordings of Board of Supervisors meetings beginning with the May 18, 2026 meeting, until such time as the resolution passed on May 4, 2026 is amended to address the retention of recordings, was made by Supervisor Maher and seconded by Supervisor Costa. The motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote (Costa – Yes, Hallman – Aye, Maher – Yes, Vigilante – Yes, McLewee – Yes).

V. Unfinished Business

a. Resolution 2026-15 Formation of a Strategic Advisory Committee

Supervisor Vigilante expressed concern that the resolution, as written, did not reflect what was originally agreed upon at the prior meeting. She stated that the language read as an oversight committee of the office staff, rather than the focused real estate and financial advisory body that had been discussed, and that it was too broadly written to be effective.

Supervisor Costa defended the resolution's intent, explaining that he and Supervisor Maher had worked with the solicitor's office to develop a more comprehensive name to allow for future flexibility. He characterized the committee's role as fostering collaboration and providing the board and staff with additional resources and expertise from residents across various disciplines, explicitly stating that it was not intended as oversight of staff.

Supervisor Maher raised an alternative approach: rather than creating a new committee, the board could assign relevant tasks to the township's existing committees — the Planning Commission, Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC), and Open Space Committee — which are already populated with qualified residents and are not currently engaged on substantial projects. He argued this would allow the township to move faster and avoid the difficulty of recruiting members for yet another committee.

Supervisor Costa responded that a dedicated committee of specific disciplines would provide more focused and structured collaboration than one-off engagement with existing committees.

Supervisor Hallman reminded everyone that 15 years ago there was a Financial Review committee made up of township residents. Supervisor McLewee confirmed he was a member of that committee until it was disbanded by the Supervisors.

Supervisor Maher added that some residents attend committee meetings monthly who are not members of the committee. They attend, contribute, and participate, and all interested residents are encouraged to do the same. Supervisor Vigilante noted that the Open Space and Land Trust committees are actively looking for new members.

Supervisor Vigilante, when pressed for specific language corrections, indicated she did not have written comments ready but would provide them before the next meeting. It was agreed that her comments, along with Supervisor Maher's suggestion to first assess what existing committees could absorb before defining the new committee's scope, would inform a revised draft. The Township Manager indicated she would place a working session on the next agenda to address the intent of the committee formation in detail.

The original motion to approve Resolution 2026-15 was called to a vote and failed.

Motion to approve Resolution 2026-15, Formation of a Strategic Advisory Committee, was made by Supervisor Hallman and seconded by Supervisor Costa. The motion failed 2-3 on a roll call vote (Costa – Yes, Hallman – Aye, Maher – No, Vigilante – No, McLewee – No).

Supervisor Maher made a motion to revisit a modified version of the resolution at the June 15th Board of Supervisors meeting. Supervisor Costa suggested that we hold a working session to agree line by line on the resolution language. The Township Manager confirmed a working session on the potential formation of the Strategic Advisory Committee would be added to the next meeting's agenda.

Supervisor Maher revisited the suggestion of engaging the existing committees with specific tasks immediately as to not lose any time on this issue.

The Township Manager suggested that she provide her update, and if there is anything not included to please advise.

b. Police Station Renovation Options Update

The Township Manager provided an update on the due diligence activities underway regarding the three police station renovation and relocation options.

Kimberton Road Property (1001 Kimberton Road): A Phase 1 environmental study has been initiated on this site to confirm that no new contamination has occurred since the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's prior remediation report from 2019. The study was initiated at the request of Supervisor Costa. The Township Manager also reported that she has been authorized to open conversations with the property's seller to explore a good-faith understanding whereby the seller would notify the township before entering into any agreement with a third party, in exchange for the township continuing to invest in due diligence. No binding agreement of any kind has been entered into.

Existing Township Committees: The Township Manager reported that she has been authorized to engage the Planning Commission, EAC, and Open Space Committee in the due diligence process. The Planning Commission would review all three sites from a planning perspective, while the EAC and Open Space Committee would focus on the Kimberton Road site due to its environmental history and open space characteristics.

VI. New Business

No new business was presented.

VII. Question and Answer & Public Comment

The board conducted the newly added Q&A period on the real estate topic prior to public comment, as agreed during the agenda approval.

Q&A — Real Estate Topic

Terri Wilson of Spring House Road asked what the due diligence process was, because it appears we have moved forward with the 1001 Kimberton Road property. The Township Manager replied that no agreement, verbal or written, has been entered into by the township, and that nothing binding would be executed without full public disclosure and a board vote. Supervisor Vigilante added that due diligence is not needed for the Walnut Lane or Art School Road locations because we own those properties.

Eileen Paul of Pikeland Road asked why the Kimberton Road property is off the market. The Township Manager was unable to answer the question asked but reiterated that we have not entered into any agreement with the seller.

Sue McElroy of Messner Road asked to expand on this question. She stated that she sent a letter to Supervisor Costa immediately prior to the meeting. (*See Letter in full attached at the end of this document per the approval of amended minutes in the 6/15/26 Board of Supervisor's meeting*) Ms. McElroy proceeded to read the document referenced above in which she stated that she contacted a representative affiliated with the marketing of 1001 Kimberton Road and was told the property was "not available". She opined that she had concerns about whether certain board members had already acted without full transparency or the knowledge of the entire board. The Township Manager responded that no agreement exists and that she is not aware of any such communication.

Ms. McElroy then asked why the township would initiate a Phase One environmental study on a property not under contract. The Township Manager replied that the Board agreed to initiate the study at the request of Supervisor Costa. Supervisor Costa confirmed that the expense for the study was approved because of the potential for changes in the environment since the last complete study.

Next Ms. McElroy returned to her assertion that the property listing had been removed from the internet. Realtor Scott Williams, representative for the 1001 Kimberton Road property, who was also in attendance stated that the property remains on the market and has not been taken down at any time since it was first listed. It is currently listed on 2 commercial based real estate websites, Costar and Loopnet. Both sites continue to show the property is available for purchase and solicit offers.

Andrew Vaskas of St. Peters Way asked whether a letter of intent had been signed. The Township Manager confirmed no letter of intent, or any other signed instrument exists, and that the township is still in the early stages of diligence. Mr. Vaskas raised the question of whether Chairman McLewee would recuse himself from discussions regarding the Kimberton Road property given a past professional connection to the property's owner. Chairman McLewee reiterated his prior disclosure that he and the property owner worked for the same company in 1989, in different departments with no reporting relationship, and that he has had

no contact with the individual. Mr. Vaskas asked the solicitor to speak on the matter, in sighting the possible need for a forced recusal. The township solicitor, Vince Dougherty of Lamb McErlane, stated that this situation does not come close to meeting the standard for a conflict of interest under the Pennsylvania Ethics Act, and that a forced recusal would need to be based on an actual conflict. Mr. Vaskas polled the Supervisors to see if any had concerns about this possible conflict. No board member expressed concern sufficiently to make a motion for recusal.

Karin Corbitt of Parker Hill Lane shared that the Kimberton Road property is owned by a limited partnership entity who has not filed their state registration annual reports disclosing who the owners are. She asked what due diligence has been initiated in who has interest in the property. The Township Manager said that we are in the early stages of due diligence, spending funds carefully so that we are not deeply financially tied to a property we do not own. We have not entered an Letter Of Intent, and until such time as we do, if we do, we will continue to carefully proceed. When asked who represents the board in the conversations with the seller and the seller's agent, the Township Manager replied that she was caveating that she has no authority to enter into an agreement on the township's behalf - that would require the solicitor and a full quorum of the board.

Sandy Knapp of Yellow Springs Road asked who would occupy the building at 1001 Kimberton. The Township Manager replied the Township Administration and the Police Force and there is space available for a possible tenant who has not yet been identified. Supervisor Costa reviewed the high-level plans on how space would be divided. Ms. Knapp inquired if similarly high levels plans have begun for the Walnut Lane location or the Art School Road location. The Township Manager confirmed they have. Supervisor Maher advised that the schematics are available on the township website.

Ms. Paul stated that if we only need an additional 1500 square feet of space for the police station, why is the Kimberton Road option even on the table - it's far too costly and exceeds our needs. Supervisor Vigilante addressed the financial considerations in more detail, stating that the long-term strategic value of the Kimberton Road site must be weighed alongside the raw cost figures, including potential proceeds from selling the current township buildings on Art School Road.

Supervisor Costa suggested in advance of the next meeting a source and uses outline should be prepared, spelling out where and when funding for each option would come from. This would help all interested parties see the difference between the price and the cost.

Ms. Paul asked if 1001 Kimberton Road is in a Flood zone. Supervisor Vigilante replied that the open space behind the building is considered a Flood zone because of the 3 streams that run through it. There was remediation completed to direct the flood zone away from the building as per the FEMA documents we've been given.

Mr. Vaskas posed a question to Supervisor Vigilante directly, challenging the hypocrisy of her position last year regarding the funding to keep the West Pikeland Police force. Mr. Vaskas recalled her opposition to grant funding for the police and doesn't understand her new perspective regarding grants for this expense. Supervisor Vigilante clarified that her prior statements regarding grants pertained specifically to personnel costs and that there is no inconsistency in recognizing grant eligibility for capital expenditures and open space improvements.

Mr. Vaskas raised the case of a neighboring township (Upper Pottsgrove) in which open space funds were used to purchase land, and supervisors later attempted to use a portion of

that land for a municipal complex, resulting in significant litigation and cost to the township. He urged the board to proceed cautiously with respect to any use of open space funds or grant money and questioned whether the financial picture for the Kimberton Road option was being presented too optimistically. He has experience in parks and recreation advocacy and stated that while he supports trails, he did not share the view that the wetland areas associated with the Kimberton Road property constitute ideal open space.

Rob Kocher of Hunt Club Lane referenced the financial numbers presented at the last meeting, recalling that each had a low- and high-end estimate, and the property at 1001 Kimberton was by far the most expensive. The Township Manager reminded all that the figures in the presentation were high level estimates - the best estimates based on current research. Regarding potential grant funding, the properties "open space" scores very high in respect towards potential grant acquisition. It is not a guarantee we would be awarded grant money, but based on the experts we've engaged, the possibility is very good.

Supervisor Vigilante stated that in addition to the financial aspect of this project, we need to consider the long-term strategic goals for the township and what we want to see and be in 5, 10, 15 years. Alternatively, we must consider what might become of the location if not purchased by the township - something less desirable adding to the already busy Route 113 traffic that might add strain to our police force.

Mr. Kocher referenced the comprehensive plan that outlines our trajectory. Supervisor Maher confirmed that the Comprehensive Plan is available on the township website.

Reagan Sarmiento of Fairfield Lane also raised concerns about other possible buyers for the 1001 Kimberton Road property. Additionally, she inquired about the environmental impact of adding a municipal complex to Walnut Lane, and subsequently the neighboring Anselma Mill. Supervisor Hallman stated that 5 acres have been carved out at Walnut Lane Park for the township to use. Supervisor Maher disclosed that he is a trustee at Anselma Mill and very sensitive to what we would do around that space - ensuring that whatever we do does not negatively impact Anselma Mill. Funneling additional traffic to Anselma Mill may be a positive benefit to building at Walnut Lane Park, but we need to be strategic in doing so.

Ms. McElroy asked how long 1001 Kimberton Road will wait for the township to do their due diligence. The Township Manager replied that she was given authority earlier tonight to engage in the next level non-binding conversations with the seller to request they not sell it out from underneath us as we complete our investigation.

Richard Woodfield of Spring House Rd shared that the artwork on the walls of the meeting room are examples of us - the picturesque beauty of Chester Springs. The building at 1001 Kimberton doesn't fit who we are as a township.

Dan Spaventa of Spring House Road opined incorrectly that this would be the single largest transaction since at least 2007. He stated that Supervisor Costa's expertise and business sense should be leveraged to benefit this process. Additionally, the Supervisors should consider using a third party to complete the due diligence to negate any bias or prejudice towards the possible transaction.

Tom Oates of Kimberton Road pointed out that the property/home behind the commercial facility was also for sale and that may have caused some confusion about the real estate listing. He also pointed out that the plans for the Police and Administration office to be built at Walnut Lane date back many years and questioned why that was still not the plan. The Township Manager reviewed the timeline regarding the 3 current options - all motivated by

the decision last year to keep the West Pikeland Police force. The township is investigating all three options to ensure we make the best decision.

Dan Iannucci of Parker Hill Lane reviewed some of the cost figures provided at the previous meeting, questioning the very low estimate for the Administration offices at 1001 Kimberton. The Township Manager replied that the proposed Administration office requires very little to become the new township office.

Ed Meltzer of Crimson Place asked where the money would come from. Supervisor Maher replied that was a complicated question. He acknowledged that expenses are outpacing revenue, that the police contract will increase the police budget by approximately \$100,000 per year for the next four years, and that without new revenue streams, the township will draw down its reserves. He stated that the financial analysis to be presented at a future meeting would address all three options not just in terms of raw cost, but also in terms of their impact on the township's long-term revenue picture.

Ms. Vaskas asked for caution against "mortgaging the future" of the younger earning residents and families of West Pikeland township for any building decision and questioned whether the board had made up its mind on one option despite presenting three.

The Township Manager emphasized that no decision has been made, that all three options remain under active consideration, and that binding commitments require full public disclosure and a board vote.

Supervisor Hallman requested that Mr. Williams, representative of 1001 Kimberton, investigate the claims made by resident and realtor Sue McElroy about the listing of the property and the insinuation that the township has entered into an agreement for the property. The Township Manager suggested that Ms. McElroy speak to Mr. Williams after the meeting to determine the source of misinformation.

Supervisor Costa proposed getting the names of the seller once and for all to put to bed any potential conflict between them and Chairman McLewee. The Township Manager confirmed that the owner details would be known after a title search. Supervisor McLewee emphasized again that he has no ties to the building or the ownership whatsoever.

General Public Comment

Mr. Kocher suggested that the formation of a committee to assist with due diligence — as discussed earlier in the meeting — could help reduce professional costs and leverage the skills of resident volunteers and encourage clearer language in any future resolution to that effect.

Gordon McElroy of Messner Road suggested the board consider holding a public referendum on the decision, given its magnitude and the level of public interest.

Mr. Iannucci suggested choosing the lowest cost option for the Police Station.

VIII. Announcements

Chairman McLewee announced that the next Board of Supervisors meetings are scheduled for:

- Monday, June 15, 2026 at 7:30 PM
- Monday, July 6, 2026 at 7:30 PM

IX. Adjourn

Supervisor Hallman made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Supervisor Costa. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Wachsmuth
Township Secretary

June 1, 2026

RE: Concerns Regarding Potential Negotiations for 1001 Kimberton Road

Mr. Costa,

In light of tonight's township meeting, as a concerned resident of West Pikeland Township, I feel compelled to share information with you regarding 1001 Kimberton Road, particularly because I understand that you have expressed reservations about the Township pursuing this property.

On Friday, May 22, I contacted an individual affiliated with the marketing and sale of 1001 Kimberton Road. As a Realtor, I have a prospective buyer/client who has interest in the property. When I attempted to access the listing information, I discovered that the property was no longer actively listed.

My purpose for calling was simply to determine whether the property was under contract and whether showings were still being permitted.

During the conversation, I spoke with someone whom I consider to be a reliable source. I was informed that the property was "not available." Naturally, I inquired whether they could share who the purchaser might be or, out of curiosity, what the intended use of the property would be. I was told they could not disclose that information, but the individual commented that it was something "really good."

We continued discussing my client's needs, and the individual mentioned another property that might be of interest. I explained that my buyer was particularly interested in the Kimberton Road location. At that point, I mentioned that I was aware West Pikeland Township had expressed interest in the property.

The individual responded, "Oh, you already know?" I paused and replied, "Yes."

The individual then stated that West Pikeland Township had submitted an offer approximately two weeks earlier. I asked whether they believed the transaction would proceed, noting that contingencies sometimes affect these matters and my client could potentially still have an opportunity. The response I received was "100 percent."

As a real estate professional, I understand that listings are not typically removed from the market unless there is a strong expectation that a transaction will move forward, often because significant contingencies have already been addressed or there is a firm commitment between the parties.

This situation raises serious concerns for me as both a resident and taxpayer. I am troubled by the possibility that the Board of Supervisors — or certain members of the Board — may have already negotiated or acted upon terms involving this property without full transparency to the public and potentially without the knowledge or agreement of the entire Board. If there is already a negotiated agreement, whether verbal or written, I believe the public deserves transparency, particularly after attending the recent Township meeting where residents were presented with multiple options for a potential police station location. If discussions or commitments regarding 1001 Kimberton Road had already substantially progressed at that time, I believe residents may not have been given the full picture during those presentations. I felt it was important to bring this information directly to your attention. You have my permission to share this privately with the BOS and/or publicly at a meeting.

Respectfully,

Sue McElroy 942 Messner Road Chester Springs PA 19425