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	Jennifer Wachsmuth, Township Secretary
Harold M. Hallman III, Supervisor	Vince Donohue, Solicitor
Bryan Maher, Supervisor	

July 6, 2026, 7:30 PM
1645 Art School Road, Chester Springs, PA 19425

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman McLewee. An executive session was announced as having been held on June 30, 2026, with the topic of real estate.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Chair.

III. Approval of Agenda

As the capacity of the meeting room (75) was not sufficient to safely house all in attendance, the Board of Supervisors meeting relocated to the SALT Theater next door.

Supervisor Costa moved to amend the agenda by relocating the Phase II Environmental Study (Item VI.d) to either Unfinished Business or to the top of New Business, arguing it was logically prior to the consideration of the Agreement of Sale, as an unfavorable environmental result would affect the property acquisition decision. Chairman McLewee advise against the change, citing past practice against altering published agendas. Supervisor Maher further asserted that the order as written was correct, stating that the outcome of the Agreement of Sale (Item VI.c) would, in fact, inform the environmental study — not the reverse.

A roll call vote was taken on Supervisor Costa's motion to reorder the agenda.

> Motion to move the Phase II Environmental Study to Unfinished Business or the top of New Business was made by Supervisor Costa and seconded by Supervisor Hallman. The motion failed 2–3, with Supervisors Costa and Supervisor Hallman voting yes and Chairman McLewee, Supervisor Maher, and Supervisor Vigilante voting no.

The agenda was then considered as written.

> Motion to approve the agenda as written was made by Supervisor Vigilante and seconded by Supervisor Maher. The motion carried 3–2, with Supervisor Costa and

Supervisor Hallman voting no, Chairman McLewee, Supervisor Vigilante and Supervisor Maher voting yes.

IV. Approval of Minutes

a. Monday, June 15, 2026, Board Of Supervisors

Motion to approve the minutes of Monday, June 15, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting was made by Supervisor Vigilante and seconded by Supervisor Maher. The motion carried 4–1, with Supervisor Costa voting no; Supervisor Hallman, Supervisor Maher, Supervisor Vigilante and Chairman McLewee voting yes.

V. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VI. New Business

a. Welcome New West Pikeland Land Trust Board Member: Ryan George

The Board welcomed Ryan George as the new West Pikeland Land Trust Board Member. Michael Minnich, Chairman of the West Pikeland Land Trust extended an invitation to the public to also get involved and volunteer with the Land Trust.

b. Consideration Of 6-Month Extension For The Anselma Crossing Project

Supervisor Maher moved to approve a 6-month extension for the Anselma Crossing project, seconded by Supervisor Vigilante. Supervisor Hallman raised a procedural concern: the prior extension for the Anselma Land Development application had been approved unanimously by the Board to run through July 1, 2026, and he asserted that it had since expired. He questioned whether the Board could extend something that had already lapsed.

The Township Manager clarified that while informal communications between the Township Manager and the Supervisors conveyed alignment; and township solicitor and the applicant's counsel had aligned on an extension, she was later advised by the solicitor that the matter required formal Board action. The matter was tabled to give the Manager the opportunity to go back to the solicitor on whether the resolution could be extended or if it would need to be brought back as a new resolution.

c. Resolution 2026-17: Resolution Authorizing The Execution Of An Agreement Of Sale For Approximately 7.23 Acres Of Land And The Improvements Located Thereon Known As 1001 Kimberton Road, West Pikeland Township, Chester County

The Township Manager read Resolution 2026-17 into the record.

Board Discussion

Supervisor Costa raised several concerns. He challenged the reference to "open space and recreation lands" in the resolution, arguing that because the Agreement of Sale as presented

contained no contingency for subdividing the property prior to closing, general funds would necessarily be used for the entire purchase. The solicitor clarified that the Township's plan is to pursue a subdivision during the four-month due diligence period. If successfully completed, open space funds could be applied to the vacant parcel based on a separate appraisal. If the subdivision is not completed in time, the Board would face a choice between terminating the agreement or proceeding using general funds only.

Supervisor Costa also had reservations about the appraisal, stating he had independently had that appraisal reviewed by a national firm who disagreed with the methodology and comparable sales used. He noted that when he raised this concern previously, the Board agreed to commission a second appraisal, and argued that under the Second-Class Township Code, if a second appraisal were obtained, the maximum permissible purchase price would be the average of the two. He estimated this could bring the ceiling to approximately $2.5 million. Supervisor Vigilante disputed this, arguing that the $2,000,000 figure for a hypothetical second appraisal was conjecture. Supervisor Vigilante added that the individual who reviewed the appraisal on Supervisor Costa's behalf had a professional relationship with Supervisor Costa, constituting a conflict of interest. Supervisor Costa rejected this characterization, noting the firm operates nationally and internationally, and challenged the Board to formally raise the conflict question if that was a concern.

The solicitor confirmed that the first appraisal was legally sufficient under the statute, as previously confirmed in a written opinion from his firm. He clarified that the second appraiser consulted by Supervisor Costa was advising Supervisor Costa individually, not the Board, and that each supervisor was entitled to use outside research to inform their own vote.

At this time, the solicitor suggested that a member of the board make a motion to approve the resolution, table the resolution or scrap the resolution, followed by a second, before the conversation continues. Supervisor Maher made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-17, seconded by Supervisor Vigilante.

Supervisor Hallman raised the issue of the property being a brownfield, noting that a deed restriction reflecting prior contamination runs with the land and could expose the township to future liability and employees to health concerns. Supervisor Maher responded that the property had undergone extensive remediation under Act II when the current owner acquired it approximately ten years ago, and that the deed restriction pertains to residential use only — the Township's intended use is commercial. Supervisor Costa concurred with Supervisor Hallman but added that the intent of the Phase II study is to verify conditions since the prior remediation, and emphasized that if Phase II results are adverse, the Township has the right to terminate the agreement.

Supervisor Maher addressed the financial framework, reiterating that the proposed funding structure involves selling the current township buildings (estimated at approximately $2,000,000), a loan of approximately $2.5 million, and the Township's existing reserves — which exceed $3,000,000 and are not proposed to be heavily drawn upon. Supervisor Maher argued that the 1001 Kimberton Road property, with the potential for commercial rental revenue, offered a better long-term financial position than remaining at the current location, and cited an estimated reduction in future tax obligations of approximately .25 mil.

Supervisor Vigilante emphasized that inaction is not an option: the police department cannot remain in its current facility, which she described as unsafe on multiple levels, and recalled that 77% of the community voted to retain and expand the police force.

Supervisor Costa and Supervisor Hallman continued to press for a detailed financial analysis modeling all three options before a final decision is made, noting that the numbers presented to date had not been firm. Furthermore, a commitment was made to share the details of the sale agreement publicly before acting, and that also did not happen. Supervisor Maher stated he struggled with that issue, but timing is such that if the vote were to be delayed by 2 weeks the seller of the property may tire and sell the property to one of the other interested parties. The Township Manager acknowledged that the figures provided by the township engineer and architect had been estimates but countered that to obtain firmer numbers it would have come with added expense.

Supervisor Hallman read a letter from resident Sam Acker who is in favor of building the police and administration offices at Walnut Lane Park. The Board had other letters and communications available to share, some in favor of purchasing 1001 Kimberton Road and some against, but they were not read aloud with the interest of keeping the meeting on track.

Supervisor Costa made a motion to table the resolution in favor of assembling the full financial models, but ultimately the discussion returned to the motion on the floor. Chairman McLewee proposed taking Public Comment before proceeding with the vote.

Public Comment

The following residents addressed the Board:

- Ernie Holling, Horseshoe Trail (Chair, Mill at Anselma) urged the Board to consider that dynamiting rock at the Walnut Lane site could destroy the historic water flow supplying the Anselma Mill, built in 1747 and a national historic landmark. He also noted that well water is insufficient for a fire suppression system and described the significant cost of bringing public water to the site.
- Al Switzer, Kimberton Rd countered the comment above regarding a well-fed sprinkler system, as he is constructing a home currently and has a system capable of supporting a three-story property.
- Don Finn, Kimberton Rd noted that 1001 Kimberton Road allows police to access a major roadway shaving critical seconds and minutes from their response time. Furthermore, the current police building is unsafe and needs to be addressed. Lastly the opportunity to connect trails and add a trail head is highly desirable.
- Dan Spaventa, Spring House Rd reviewed the Agreement of Sale document, acknowledging certain sections and clauses as good. He asked if we determine the only way to proceed is to raise taxes that the Board terminate the agreement via section 6D.
- Donna Switzer, Kimberton Rd opined that the 1001 Kimberton Road property still contains contamination, including carcinogens in the on-site potable well, at levels below the residential standard but above the non-residential standard. She argued that a prior Phase II had already documented this contamination and that an additional Phase II study would not yield materially new information, and that the environmental issues should be reflected in the appraisal.
- Bob Watters, Chantilly Ln expressed support for the Kimberton Road property, citing it as consistent with the community's vote to support the police and as an opportunity to generate revenue that could offset future tax increases.

- Dan Iannucci, Parker Hill Ln cited the environmental concerns disclosed by the study, imploring the board not to put the Police and Administrative staff in what he perceived to be a dangerously unhealthy location.
- Jeff Kern, Pikeland Rd agreed that we need a new police station, and asked for the numbers to support. He cautioned against fearmongering when referencing other possible companies for 1001 Kimberton. Suggested that West Pikeland Township refrain from being a landlord.
- Emily Trank, Mooney Ln raised concerns about thy types of companies interested in buying 1001 Kimberton Road, the effect they would have on our traffic and bucolic location. She feels safe spending a few hours on a trail considered ok for commercial use.
- Ara Chalian, Art School Rd expressed concern over the dissent between the supervisors and the varied opinion amongst the residents. Feels that we are making a compromised decision and should be focusing on ensuring the current owners of 1001 Kimberton make it safe before being sold.
- Andrew Vaskas, St. Peter's Way questioned why the meeting had not been scheduled in a larger venue given anticipated attendance. He also renewed his assertion that the Chair has a conflict of interest stemming from a prior acquaintance with the property owner, citing a more recent conversation around acquiring the Just Joe's sign. The solicitor reiterated his prior opinion that no conflict of interest exists.
- Andrea Fiorello, Wildlife Dr requested to get the draft minutes from the Board of Supervisors meeting sooner.
- Bob Boden, Art School Rd questioned that of the 60 acres at Walnut Lane Park, couldn't the township find a location suitable for the Police and Administration office. The Township Manager explained that only 5 acres were set aside for municipal use. He further inquired about the building here at Art School Road, suggesting we repurpose what we already own instead of remaining landlords to the SALT Theater.
- Wayne Freese, Dogwood Ln is in support of 1001 Kimberton Road. Recommends proceeding with the environmental studies because the sale agreement provides an out. Also does not understand the concern over the township being a landlord.
- Margi Watters, Chantilly Ln pointed out the mission and charter of Historic Yellow Springs is to support Arts, History and Environmental studies - not to run a municipal organization. Additionally, any of the many potential purchasers of 1001 Kimberton Road might severely impact our aesthetics and way of life here in Chester Springs.
- Steve Rhoads, Upper Pine Creek Rd recounted being robbed in broad daylight prior to the West Pikeland Police force was established, receiving lackluster assistance after a 4 hour wait for the State Police. He is in support of giving the police and all emergency vehicles direct access to major roadways. Wants 1001 Kimberton to be acquired and refreshed, as it is currently an eyesore. Understands the costs associated with this acquisition and is in support of the purchase, and the completion of the Act II environmental study.
- Michael Riley, Byers Rd stated that he saw no sense in purchasing a polluted brownfield and that in commercial real estate, the appropriate response to such conditions is to walk away.

- Michael Minnich, Art School Rd raised a concern about the cost of open space funds being used for only a small portion of the acquisition and asked for clarification; the solicitor explained the subdivision and appraisal process that would govern any open space fund allocation. Supervisor Costa questioned the solicitor as to why he responded to this public comment and none of the other questions posed this evening, citing procedure for public comment is to listen and refrain from response. The solicitor stated he felt it important to clarify the process and timeline of the question asked.
- Karin Corbett, Parker Hill Ln raised concerns about the terms of the agreement being dangerously quick. Further concerned about the necessary zoning requirements associated with the subdivision plan and doesn't see how it all can be done in the time allotted. Shared that the use of open space funds for any portion of the purchase may not be legal. Strongly recommend securing an opinion letter from the solicitor to ensure the transaction is legal and not a misappropriation of taxpayer dollars.
- Lorraine Houston, Art School Rd asked if the 5-acre parcel at Walnut Lane Park set aside for municipal use was set or if it was moveable. Supervisor Vigilante advised it was fixed.
- Sue McElroy, Messner Rd questioned why the seller would accept the Township's lengthy closing timeline given competing offers, why the Township would not seek a second appraisal to potentially lower the purchase price, and how the debt would ultimately be serviced. She noted the apparent contradiction between prior discussions about an inability to fund the police and the current availability of funds.
- Abriana Heasley, Pikeland Rd cited safety concerns regarding traffic in front of 1001 Kimberton, especially when turning left out of the property.
- Bob Johnson, Hunt Club Ln raised a question about legal requirements for court approval in acquisitions in other municipalities; the solicitor noted that different rules may apply to school districts and that this transaction does not require court approval.
- Charlie Knapp, Yellow Springs Rd noted that access to a major roadway from the Walnut Lane property is equally as good as the 1001 Kimberton property, and we already own it. It was purchased for a municipal complex; we should use it as such.
- Tom Dunn, Art School Rd concerned about establishing our police station on wetlands. Referenced the Horseshoe trail bridge recently rebuilt beautifully, to address wetlands and cited it's close proximity to 1001 Kimberton.
- Neil Jacobson, Yellow Springs Rd suggested if the 5-acre portion of Walnut Lane Park set aside for Municipal use isn't agreeable to what we need, we could appeal and request changes. Recommends a pause in this process. Commends the Board for the job they are doing and implores them to slow down and figure out what they want.
- Diane Dunn, Art School Rd requested clarity regarding the Phase II study and its pending results. Suggests establishing "go/no go" criteria regarding the safety levels and possible additional expenses deemed necessary by the study results. Supervisor Costa outlined what the current owner of 1001 Kimberton did to the property based on the results of previous environmental study completed 10 years ago. We had another Phase I completed to ensure nothing had changed in the last 10 years. Results were mostly favorable, with a few concerns. Board will be voting momentarily to have a Phase II study completed. As for criteria for go/no go, that is not for the board to decide - it will be clearly defined by the results of the study. Supervisor Vigilante

added that any remediation deemed necessary would be the current owner's responsibility.

- Donna McLaughlin, Art School Rd questioned if we are locked into one of the three choices outlined, and whether we are investing equal amounts of time and money on all three.
- Alex Bratic, Drovers Ln supports the purchase of 1001 Kimberton provided that the environmental concerns are addressed. Likes the possible open space options it contains, and the high visibility it would give for the Police station.
- Suzanne Kaplan, Dewees Ln expressed support for the Kimberton Road location, citing its central position relative to the fire station, ambulance corps, and hospital, and describing the move as a logical improvement for police response times. It also allows the Cultural Center to return to its original intended purpose.
- Jean Humphreys, Yellow Springs Rd never felt the Township fit well in Historic Yellow Springs. 1001 Kimberton presents a wonderfully visible, central location in the township for our municipal services.
- Andrew Vaskas returned to note that Board should make time to respond to the community.

Motion to approve Resolution 2026-17 was made by Supervisor Maher and seconded by Supervisor Vigilante. Before voting, Supervisor Costa thanked all the residents these past few weeks for their time and feedback, as well as thanking the Board and the staff for all of the work put into this endeavor so far. The motion carried 3–2, with Supervisor Costa and Supervisor Hallman voting no, and Supervisor Maher, Supervisor Vigilante, and Chairman McLewee voting yes.

d. Phase II Environmental Study - 1001 Kimberton Road

Supervisor Costa moved to approve the proposal from the ARM Group to complete a Phase II environmental study at 1001 Kimberton Road as recommended in their proposal, at a cost not to exceed $25,320, seconded by Supervisor Maher. The motion was subsequently amended at Supervisor Vigilante's suggestion to a not-to-exceed figure of $24,500, bringing the cost closer to the lower end of the proposed range. Supervisor Costa amended his motion to approve to with the cost of the appraisal not to exceed $24,500. Supervisor Maher seconded the motion with the new lower cost.

It was also agreed that the scope of Task No. 3 (stream sampling and parking lot soil sampling) should include explicit specification of the parameters being tested. The Board directed that the ARM Group be asked to reflect this specification in the agreement, and that Township Manager manage the engagement and maintain all project documentation in a centralized location (SharePoint) accessible to supervisors.

Motion to approve the ARM Group proposal to complete the Phase II Environmental Study at 1001 Kimberton Road, at a cost not to exceed $24,500, with Task No. 3 to specify the parameters being tested, was made by Supervisor Costa and seconded by Supervisor Maher. The motion unanimously carried 5–0.

VII. Public Comment

Andrew Vaskas raised concern that members of the Board have displayed disdain towards blue collar workers in the township.

Carin Mifsud, Carolyn Dr requested the record to reflect that she has not observed that behavior by the board. She stated that expressing concern regarding potential use of the 1001 Kimberton by a trucking organization or a manufacturing company and its impact on our township does not constitute disdain for anyone. She thanked the Board and the public for their efforts on this decision so far and encouraged the Board to step away from the purchase if the due diligence efforts support looking elsewhere.

Karin Corbett requested that the Phase I Study be shared via the website.

Neil Jacobson suggested hiring an environmental attorney to assist with this endeavor.

Dan Iannucci cited concerns about rush hour traffic on Kimberton Road.

Supervisor Hallman added that we may need to consult with PennDOT regarding installation of an emergency facility light at 1001 Kimberton, like what is in front of Kimberton Fire House.

VIII. Announcements

The Chair announced that the next Board of Supervisors meeting will be held on Monday, July 20, and Monday, August 3, 2026, at 7:30 PM.

IX. Adjourn

> Motion to adjourn was made by Supervisor Costa and seconded by Supervisor Vigilante. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Wachsmuth
Township Secretary