



Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes

Hybrid Meeting Via 801 Burrows Run Road & Zoom

March 18, 2026

7:00 p.m.

Attending Board of Supervisors: M. Patricia Muller, Chair; Geoffrey Gamble, Esq., Vice-Chair; Michael J. Bailey, Supervisor

Township Personnel: Alison S. Dobbins, Township Manager; Amy Heinrich, Director of Finance; Katelynn Morgenstern, Director of Planning & Zoning; Ted Otteni, Director of Public Works; Matt Gordon, Chief of Police; Dave Sander, Solicitor.

Excused:

1. Call to Order

Ms. Muller called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Muller led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Executive Session Announcements

Solicitor Sander announced that there were not any executive sessions to announce.

4. Meeting Minutes

a. March 4, Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the March 4, 2026, Meeting Minutes was made by Mr. Gamble and seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Motion passed 3-0.

b. **Police Facility Design Workshop Recap**

Alison Dobbins, Township Manager, announced that there were 16 residents that participated in the workshop.

Katelynn Morgenstern, Director of Planning & Zoning gave an overview of some of the data that was collected from a questionnaire that was given at the workshop. Many comments were focused around more information and additional workshops having it be a collaboration with the community and Township administration.

Ms. Muller asked if there was additional feedback that was given after the workshop concluded. She also commented that the workshop was beneficial to have and that those residents at her table felt heard.

Mr. Bailey commented on the workshop structure and that it could be beneficial in other areas within the township.

Mr. Gamble gave remarks on the size of the police force and that he has advocated for a dedicated police facility. He further commented on the size of the facility, elevation questions that arose at the workshop and how the exterior of the building should look. Full remarks are attached.

5. Business Items

a. March 18, 2026, Bill Voucher

Motion to approve the March 18, 2026, bill voucher in the amount of \$199,702.31 and to approve the total transfers in the amount of \$46,379.07 was made by Mr. Bailey and seconded by Mr. Gamble.

Motion passed 3-0.

b. Consider new HR, Payroll, and Training System

Motion to authorize Amy Heinrich to execute the contracts associated with implementing the Payroll, Human Resources, and Learning Management System modules with Evolution Payroll Services and the Learning Content Provider, OpenSesame was made by Mr. Gamble and seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Amy Heinrich, Director of Finance & HR, gave an update on the current manual timesheets, the payroll system and implementing cybersecurity. This is one system that has payroll and human resource features while also sending out compliance training to staff. There is a conversion process, ideally the Township is planning on June for implementation. The service also has a bulk price for onboarding new staff.

Motion passed 3-0.

c. Consider adding financial technology solution to Accounts Payable

Motion to authorize Amy Heinrich to execute the contract associated with implementing an Accounts Payable and Payment Automation application was made by Mr. Bailey and seconded by Mr. Gamble.

Amy Heinrich, Director of Finance & HR, gave an overview of the software and the two-year research process on how the automation system can accommodate the accounts payable. There was a flow chart that was shown to help streamline the payment process. This system does not replace SAGE.

Mr. Gamble asked if this would reduce someone in the workforce, which Amy Heinrich stated that the Finance Department is inundated and it will only be reduced by about 50 hours a month over the course of the staff.

Mr. Bailey commented that he is very excited about this project for the Finance Department as he has worked on this in the last 5 years of his career. He gave some advice to give timelines instead of doing everything all at once.

Alison Dobbins, Township Manager, stated that the policy briefing summary that is online states that the Township is between two companies that will be a maximum of \$13,000.00 which has been budgeted.

Motion passed 3-0.

d. Consider Escrow Release No. 1: Rosedale Walk Land Development Project (Formerly the Smith Property)

Motion to approve Escrow Release No. 1 for Rosedale Walk in the amount of \$5,571,093.79 was made by Mr. Bailey and seconded by Mr. Gamble.

Katelynn Morgenstern, Director of Planning & Zoning, gave a brief overview of the property project. The Township would still retain over \$1.0 million in a surety bond.

Motion passed 3-0.

e. Consider the authorization of the “Kennett Area Shared Open Spaces Partnership Pilot” maintenance agreement

Motion to authorize the Township Manager to sign the Kennett Area Shared Open Spaces Partnership Agreement – Parrish Property was made by Mr. Gamble and seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Ted Otteni, Director of Public Works, gave an overview of the Open Space and parks management pilot agreement. There are (5) entities: Kennett Township, Kennett Borough, Brandywine Red Clay and Kennett Trails Alliance and Kennett Area Park Authority (KAPA) will work together to maintain the Parrish Trail. The goal is to hopefully have this grow further into other Open Spaces.

Motion passed 3-0.

6. Department Head Reports

- a. Administration
- b. Finance & HR
- c. Planning & Zoning
- d. KTPD
- e. Public Works

7. Discussion Topic: Chandler Mill Bridge

Ms. Muller announced that after Ted’s update on Kaolin Road and the paving, the Board is considering reopening the Chandler Mill Bridge while the paving is being done on Kaolin Road to see how much traffic impacts the area.

Mr. Gamble commented that the reason he wanted the bridge open was because of the Chandler Mill trail to get to the parking lot. It would only be open for a month with a public announcement and whether it impacts the residents in any adverse way.

Beth Thomas (126 W. Hillendale Rd.) commented in support of opening the bridge.

Landon Kelly (103 Friends Way) commented in support of opening the bridge and suggested a longer period of opening to get complete data.

Amy Heinrich (Oriole Dr.) commented with concerns regarding the opening of the bridge.

8. Board of Supervisors Comments

Ms. Muller commented on the Police Facility Workshop. For full remarks see attached.

Mr. Gamble commented about ways to make the meetings more welcoming and comfortable.

9. Public Comment

Lee Weersing (568 Huntsman Path) gave some observations around the Chandler Mill Bridge being reopened and saw both sides of the discussion.

Beth Thomas (126 W. Hillendale Road) commented on a different bridge such as the Whittle bridge that could be used.

10. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:51pm.

DRAFT

Comments on Proposed Police Building
G. Gamble
2026-03-23

My thanks to Ted Otteni for taking the time to go through the proposed schematic in a thorough way and for walking the grounds with me and to Katelynn who stuck her head in and made some very sage comments. In addition, I want to thank the Architects and the Design Team for all the work they have done on this project to date.

For the record, I support an independent building to house our police force and believe that the best place for it to be located is adjacent to our Township Building in a campus-like arrangement.

My focus and concern is on the internal layout as currently proposed and, to a lesser extent, on the external design. I have approached this as if it were my own money being spent - as indeed it is, along with all other Kennett Township Taxpayers. There may be very valid reasons for everything that has been proposed to date on the schematic, but I think that the public and I need to know more fully what those reasons are. More dialogue is necessary.

The countervailing argument to many of the things I have questioned or suggested eliminating below is that 'we have to build for the future'. This is undeniably true and prudent, but I think it has to be for the reasonably foreseeable future. Also the term 'state of the art' and the observation 'everybody is doing it' are discomfoting concepts, because most of us lay people don't know what the 'art' is or who 'everybody' else is. Nevertheless, we each have to employ our common sense and take a critical look at what is being proposed.

My overall take-away from the interior schematic is that it does not take into account sufficiently the advantages of the campus setting, and that the building is so self-contained that it could go most anywhere. I also get a sense of almost luxurious indulgence with some of the rooms that seem designed to address contingencies that are very remote. Just because we can afford do something doesn't necessarily mean that we should.

My comments will be difficult to understand without having the current schematic or layout in front of you, but I'll do my best to describe them. I am starting from the right and going left on the schematic.

INTERIOR

1. Police Chief Conference Room- Why does a police chief need his own conference room? The Township Manager doesn't even have this. A table and some chairs in

his office should be enough for small meetings. For larger meetings there is the Conference Room in the Township Building.

2. Front Desk - Why does there need to be a front desk in a 11'X16' area when the police department doesn't have a receptionist?
3. Detective Suite- We have a detective office and a 'Hotel-ing Office' whatever that means. Do we really need have a guest office for visiting detectives? How often is that going to happen? Can't they use the Interview Room?
4. Juvenile Holding Room - Why can't a juvenile be held in the Interview Room where there is access to a bathroom?
5. Quartermaster Storage Room - What is this for? We already have a proposed Armory, a large Storage Room, a large Evidence Room , and a large File Room.
6. Interview Suite - What is the need for a'Hard Interview Room" and also a 'Soft Interview Room' -and these are both in addition to an 'Interview Suite' with chairs a desk and an ADA-compliant bathroom? Seems to me that one Interview Room is sufficient and could also double as a small conference room when not in use otherwise.
7. Roll Call Room - This room is enormous (30.5'X18.5'). I am advised that it is for 'training'. Why couldn't training be done in the Township Building Public Room? The whole reason for the campus approach is not to have expensive redundancies. If it does need to be here, why cannot the toilet room (T2) be used by both the Interview Suite and this room and eliminate toilet room (T4)?
8. Toilets - Speaking of toilets, by my count the proposed building contains no less than a total of 13 toilets. That is more toilets than we have personnel in the total force! If there is a toilet room (T4) next to the Break Room, why does there need to be another toilet across the corridor only 8' away?
9. Quiet Room - Seriously? A room with a bed? I am told that this is for officers who experience some sort of mental trauma in the course of their duties. Not to be too harsh, but if an officer experiences mental trauma, he/she needs to go see the police chaplain or a shrink and then go home to rest.
10. Locker Rooms - By my count, the Male Locker Room contains total of 26 lockers and the Female Room contains 10 - and these lockers are what? two feet wide apiece? If we ever get to the point that this Township has 36 police officers, I believe that the County will have long since taken over policing, in addition to Fire and EMS. Planning for future expansion is one thing, but this is over the top!
11. Toilets in Locker Rooms - I am advised that the toilets in the two Locker Rooms must be ADA-compliant. If this is so, then why do we need three toilets in the Female Locker Room? There is no law that says that an ADA-compliant toilet room cannot be used by officers who are not disabled. It seems to me that one ADA-compliant toilet room in each locker room is enough.
12. Holding Area - Why do we need two Holding Cells? The schematic seems to indicate that one is ADA-compliant. Do we use a holding cell that often that we need two? Couldn't we just have one that is ADA-compliant?
13. Holding Cell Interrogation Room - This seems redundant. Why can't the person in custody be interrogated in the Holding Cell or in the Soft/Hard Interview Room?
14. Canine Unit and Dog Run - This seems little extravagant. We told the public, when we decided to take advantage of the canine opportunity offered us, that the costs

would be limited. (e.g. Vet bills, etc.). It strikes me that this looks like we are going back on our word.

EXTERNAL

- A. Building's External Doors - By my count, there are no less than 9 external entry and exit points to the building - including two for the dog runs. Presumably these all have to be keyed, alarmed, and maybe even closed-circuit watched. This strikes me as an excessive number of doors for a building designed to be secure.
- B. Sally Port - The Garage Bay and Sally Port should be turned and realigned to face the rear of the building, and not the side as currently proposed. This addresses the concerns of some who think the garage doors do not present a good aspect entering from Burrows Run Road. This shouldn't be difficult to do with the Sally Port contiguous the Holding Area.
- C. Footprint of Building - Ted's schematic moving the building back to be congruent with the Township Building's set-back from the circular driveway is very good. It also puts the police building at a lower elevation so it does not look so overwhelming in relation to the Township Building.
- D. Parking Spaces and Offset Requirements -Katelynn points out that the current footprint schematic has 10 parking spaces in the offset space (close Burrows Run Road). They will have to be relocated. I am advised by her that there is a mandated ratio of parking spaces to building square footage but that the spaces do not have to be contiguous to the building. I know Ted is working on some alternative placement for them. Moving them also means that more shrubbery can be planted to minimize seeing the side of the building as one enters the circular driveway.
- E. Township Seal - The logo on the new building should be the Township Seal and not the black-background police seal. The police version was authorized because they thought the black background looked better for the shoulder patches on their uniforms. It was not meant to be an alternative seal. They are not a sister branch of government, but are subordinate to the Township. Inside they can put the black seal up.
- F. Building Exterior Design - In my opinion - and that is all it is - the building should have a cupola and three or four small dormers to give the look of a pony barn. The roof should be ribbed metal. The fake chimneys are inappropriate. The front exterior should feature some kind of stone facade. The sides and back could be white parged (stucco) to match the side of the township building wing.

CONCLUSION

If all of the suggestions and recommendations that I have made above were followed, it would lead to a reduction of 1,386 square feet, resulting in a new total of 9,114 square feet.

Statement BOS 03-18-2026

M. Patricia Muller

Last week Township staff, residents and Supervisors attended and participated in the municipal expansion building design workshop.

My thanks go out to everyone who participated. There were many thoughtful discussions, a few heated ones and many helpful suggestions expressed during the course of the evening.

As I reflect upon the evening in general there are a few salient points that come to mind.

1. The participants all expressed a deep love and concern for Kennett Township
2. Participants were generally open minded and willing to listen to the presentations by the architectural firm GKO.
3. There were many areas of consensus as relates to design and many areas of creativity as it relates to design integration to better fit into the community.

The need for optimal community integration was a recurring theme in many discussions. My comments tonight focus on that expressed wish.

Kennett Township currently has a police force of 11 officers. There are NO plans to increase that number. The need for a dedicated structure to house our police department stems from the need to:

1. Provide adequate facilities to support and execute professional, accredited police practices.
2. Relieve overcrowded conditions in the Administration building that was designed in 2003 to accommodate under 10 people and now houses over 20 plus visiting consultants.
3. Create a better more focused resident experience in obtaining police and administrative services.

It occurred to me that one of the factors that has been lost in all of the discussions is what Kennett Township looks like today vs the year 2003 when the Administration building was originally constructed.

When I moved to this area in 1989, it was indeed a rural, farming community. Kennett Square Borough was not the major destination that it is now with multiple regional festivals and events. Longwood Gardens was not attracting 2 million visitors a year from all over the world as it now does.

Our community and our surrounding communities have changed. Chester County Planning Commission lists most of Kennett Township as urban/suburban. As larger land parcels and

farms are sold for development we will be left with an increasingly smaller swath of rural area. In fact, later this year two large developments in Kennett Township near the Borough will be completed adding hundreds of new residents to our community.

Our proximity to Wilmington, I-95, RT 1 and Philadelphia makes us a desirable community to live in as well as a target for potential bad actors. How much the presence of a robust police department serves as a crime deterrent can only be speculated upon. But based on the call logs we know our officers are already busy.

It may surprise some to know that Kennett Township Police officers practice a “community” policing model. That is, our officers integrate into the community as a proactive presence at community events. They visit schools and provide community wide educational opportunities on a variety of topics such as elder fraud prevention and other topics.

Much of their active police work requires ongoing investigations to resolve a resident complaint or response to a call for help. Issuing a ticket or breaking up an altercation is only a part of what they do.

Thanks to the police proximity to the Administration offices, I feel we have been able to build relationships with each of the officers and work together as a team dedicated to providing integrated services for the benefit of our residents. Their presence on campus provides a level of safety to all who attend evening public meetings or work long hours as well as the local neighborhoods.

I understand the viewpoint that any building near the existing Administration building will overwhelm the location. It is difficult to envision the physical impact of a new building on the proposed site.

But the fact remains that much will not change. Police will be entering and exiting - responding to calls as they have always done at the rate that they have always done. The open space behind the administration building will remain as open space.

Any new construction will always initially be disruptive. It may be “barn like” or “stable like” but it is disingenuous to think that it can ever be constructed to look like an actual barn or stable. It is being built to serve a purpose. But landscaping and design tricks can “blend” a building into belonging.

On a positive note; currently visible parked police cars will be less visible housed in a dedicated area. And residents will be able to obtain the services they need at one dedicated location.

I urge everyone to let the process play out. The public meetings are a vital part of this process. Please attend the meetings, check the Township website for new information. Get your information from the source – not social media.