



**TOWNSHIP OF FALLS
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
AUGUST 25, 2026**

Meeting commenced: 7:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned: 11:00 p.m..

Members present: Daniel Everett, Mary Leszczuk, Jesse O'Brien, Colin Henderson, Paul Hartzell (alt), Lanie Striluk (alt – non-voting member)

Members absent: John J. Haney, III

Also Present:

Representing:

Flagship Pennsylvania OPCO, LLC – Julie VonSpreckelsen, Esq (Eastburn & Gray), Kesta Kelly, P.E (BL Companies), Alex Meitzler, P.E. (Traffic, Planning and Design)

KPK Development & Nuuly – Chelsey Jackman, Esq./ Michael Meginniss, Esq. (Begley, Carlin & Mandio), Heath Dumack, P.E. / John Richardson, P.E. (Dumack Engineering), Mark Roth (Bowman Consulting), David Zeal (Nuuly, Chief Developer)

Item #1: Flagship Pennsylvania OPCO, LLC, 547 W. Trenton Avenue, Morrisville, PA 19067; TMP #13-028-028-002; Zoned: HC; Owner: Morrisville Realty LLC. Conditional Use – to allow a car wash

Julie VonSpreckelsen, Esquire, presents the application and states the applicant plans to repurpose the existing shuttered Rite Aid building at this location into a Spotless Flagship car wash facility. There will be no change to the building footprint. There will be interior changes as well as some site renovations. The site is fronted on two streets with two signalized access driveways – one on West Trenton Ave. and one on Pine Grove Rd. The use is permitted by conditional use, which is why we are before the Planning Commission. In July 2026, we appeared before the Zoning Hearing Board for several variances (which were granted). Those variances included reduced stacking lengths, vehicle tunnel at front, accessory structures in front yard, car wash activities outside enclosed building, no loading area for car wash, and extended time (2 years) to obtain building permit. There was one condition to the approval -- to install 6–8 ft sound barrier along Pine Grove Road to shield noise from the vacuums.

Kelly Kestra, P.E. states the site will include three pay-station lanes (one for monthly members), wet tunnel wash and interior dry belts for interior cleaning, 13 vacuum spaces, mat cleaner, and 11 employee spaces (no customer parking). There will also be an “escape” lane to exit without going through the car wash. The hours proposed are 8:00 AM–8:00 PM daily (may shorten in winter/rain). The projected utilization of the site will be up to 400 cars per day by the third year, although this may take a bit longer to reach this level. Most of the noisy equipment will be inside the building. The vacuums outside will be shielded by the required sound barrier per the zoning hearing board condition of approval. The projected noise from the vacuums is less than the ambient roadway noise. Regarding wastewater, the car wash water is captured on-site, treated through underground reclaim tanks and oil/water separator, and discharged to the sanitary sewer system (not storm sewer). There are sanitary sewer applications underway with Bucks County Water & Sewer and the DEP approval process is ongoing. Spotless uses biodegradable detergent; they have received prior effluent testing and DEP approvals obtained at other sites. We would work with DEP for all approvals.

Alex Meitzler (Traffic, Planning & Design) presented a trip-generation analysis comparing prior Rite Aid use versus the proposed car wash. The results show the PM peak trips are slightly lower than Rite Aid; the Saturday peak trips are slightly higher but not significant. The trip assumptions are based on real-world data from comparable Spotless sites rather than using the ITE trip generation manual.

Member O'Brien asks the anticipated noise volumes along Sweetbriar Road where there are residences and procedures to mitigate them.

Ms. Kestra says that other than the vacuums, all the other car wash components will be inside the building and that any projected noise is less than the ambient roadway noise.

Public Comment

Jennifer Metzger, Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the traffic impact entering and exiting the site, and access for disabled persons and pedestrians, length of time for the construction of the underground tanks, and how often the tanks are cleaned.

Jessica Speedy, Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the projected number of vehicles which will be serviced each day, detergent and water runoff being added to the water table, quotas of other car washes, and if the business fails if there are any long-term plans for the site, like the tanks.

Debbie Diaz, Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the number of car washes already in this area and its impact adding another one.

Amanda Westerman, Falls Township resident, expresses concern about comparing this car wash with others in the area.

Member O'Brien makes a motion to recommend approval for the Conditional Use for Flagship Pennsylvania OPCO, LLC, 547 W. Trenton Avenue, Morrisville, PA 19067; TMP #13-028-028-002 based on Jones Engineering Associates' review letter dated August 19, 2026, and the Traffic Planning & Design letter dated June 11, 2026.

Member Hartzell seconds the motion.

All in favor 4-1 (Henderson dissenting)

Item #2: KPK Development Company, LP, Penn Valley Road, Fairless Hills, PA 19030; TMP # 13-013-010 / #13-013-011; Owner: KPK Development Company LP. Amendment to Re-zone parcels #13-013-010 and #13-013-011 from FM (Farming)/ HI-A (Heavy Industrial-A) to MPM (Materials Processing and Manufacturing)

Chelsey Jackman, Esquire, introduces the professionals and applicants for this project. She asks if both Item #2 and #3 can be heard together as they are intertwined. She states they are requesting the zoning change in conjunction with the proposed land development so if one does not get approved, it will negate the zoning change. The applicant proposes to build a 994,257 sq. ft. warehouse which would include a 2,400 sq. ft. maintenance shed, a 2,500 sq. ft. pump house and water tank and 3 smoker sheds equaling 252 sq. ft. on the lot. The applicant is seeking to subdivide this parcel into two separate lots – one about 67 acres and one about 98 acres. The applicant is also seeking to have the zoning changed. There are two separate zoning districts on one parcel (HI-A and FM). The applicant is proposing to change to MPM for the entire parcel. Use for a warehouse is allowed currently under the HI-A and FM zoning districts. Going to MPM zoning district allows for more impervious surface coverage that helps Nuuly design the best product possible.

Nuuly is a subsidiary company of Urban Outfitters. They are a rental subscription service which means you pay a subscription each month and you get to pick out a certain number of clothes you want to try on and return if not. When the clothes go back, they get washed or dry-cleaned using non-hazardous detergents and Green Earth dry-cleaning materials (perc/TCE-free). They use energy and water-efficiency practices and use a corporate environmental scorecard (materials placed on tables and offered to the public). Once cleaned, the clothes can be re-rented or sold. They are an environmentally conscience company and a slide presentation is shown depicting Urban Outfitters mission statement, processes and social commitment.

Heath Dumack, P.E. says the KPK Development parcels contain approximately 67 acres. He describes the improvements which will front along Penn Valley Road (the warehouse, tractor trailer loading docks and trailer storage areas in the rear). There are approximately 64 loading bays in the rear of the building. There are four different rain gardens. The applicant will plant 400 trees and 2,000 shrubs, all of which is part of the reclaiming of the site from the original quarry design from the late 1960s. The current owner has been under DEP permitting and has been reclaiming the quarry pond for the last 20-25 years. It is at a point now that the area where the building is going has been filled in. The applicant is looking to pull that area from the mining permit and move forward with the redevelopment of the site.

Atty. Jackman shows a slide on what Nuuly is not (data center). She stresses again that they will put a restrictive covenant which will attach to the property. Nuuly is already in Bristol and wants to move here. The rest of the slide deals with concerns expressed through media outlets. The applicant is not rushing through approvals (many steps before final approval), not harming Martin's Creek and Mill Creek (no dumping will occur), and there will be road improvements to Penn Valley Road. The applicant is available for any questions on the project.

Member O'Brien asks about the restrictive covenant – is Nuuly a lease holder on the property (equitable owner – plan is to close in February pending the approvals), and building height (50 ft.)

Member Henderson asks number of employees.

Mr. Zeal from Nuuly says in Bristol there are 1,000; at this location we would staff 2,000 employees in two staggered shifts. It will not be operating 24/7. There are specialty trades in the building – seamstresses, technicians, maintenance technicians, chemical engineers – a very different facility than a warehouse.

Member Henderson expresses concern about the traffic with 2,000 employees.

Mark Roth, the traffic engineer, states the maximum full operation with two shifts is 2,000 employees. All 2,000 employees will not arrive at 9:00 a.m. because of shift work. It will be half of that. What we studied was actually the maximum in two different shifts. There will be employees in the morning for the day shift and some coming for the second shift. It will be the overlap period that is the critical piece. The access will be along Penn Valley Road. Penn Valley Road and the interchange with Rte. 13 are state highways. It is all controlled and maintained by the State with the Township handling the traffic signals. PennDOT involvement is required for ramp/interchange improvements; applicant committed to design and construct required roadway improvements to PennDOT standards (auxiliary lanes/turn lanes, signal upgrades, pedestrian accommodations) and to coordinate with township and PennDOT. Applicant's engineer stated improvements would be constructed by the developer as part of land development (not PennDOT-funded).

Acting Chair Leszczuk asks why the need to re-zone if the use is permitted already (impervious coverage allowance is higher in MPM and it fixes the dual zoning in one parcel).

Acting Chair Leszczuk states she believes most people's concern is that the restrictive covenant will not be upheld once the property zoning changes to MPM so that a data center could go into the building if Nuuly leaves somewhere in the future.

Atty. Jackman says she understands the concern, and explains the restrictive covenant is a legal document tied to the land. It is recorded against the property just like a deed. Both lots are owned by KPK Development; both lots would be rezoned to MPM with the restrictive covenant in place. The restricted covenant would be a condition of approval.

Member O'Brien asks if the owner would be willing to put a deed restriction on both properties (yes).

Alt. Member Striluk asks about the current business on the smaller parcel (continue to be a mining reclamation business) and her concern that changing the zoning could allow future uses. She says it is not just a data center use that concerns her.

Acting Chair Leszczuk says the restrictive covenant or deed restriction should be for the warehouse and current use so somewhere in the future the site could not be a scrap yard, etc.

Atty. Jackman says that the zoning districts HI-A and FM uses remain permissible because that is what is intended by the ordinance.

Member Everett asks if these two parcels were always zoned HI-A and FM or did they re-zone it to allow the quarry use?

Mr. Dumack says the mining operation has been in place since 1950s. The mining reclamation permit goes back to 1968.

Alt. Chair Leszczuk states before any public comment is given, any questions or comments are for application #2 only (the amendment to rezone). We will get to the actual development of the site (Nuuly warehouse) after we make a motion on the rezoning.

Public Comment

Jennifer Metzger, a Falls Township resident, expresses flood plain concerns, questions the need for the rezoning, why is it not before the Zoning Hearing Board, resources being used and contaminants in the groundwater, asks if both parcels are being rezoned and combined, and opposes the rezoning.

Bob Thornton, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the retention basin and increase in mosquitos as a result, is the area considered wetlands, flood plain concerns and flooding in general.

(John Richardson explains briefly the rain garden stormwater management system and how it does not promote mosquitos and how they are addressing the flood plain).

Amanda Westerman, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern about trees not being on the Falls Township logo any longer, how this is open space and should be maintained as open land, and too much development in Falls Township. Also questioned why this was on the BOS agenda the previous night.

(Mr. Jones, Twp. Engineer, explained the agenda item was for authorization to advertise the re-zoning of these parcels so if tonight was successful, it was timely process moving forward).

Elaine Rafferty, a Falls Township resident, suggests a parking garage instead of a parking lot (will be discussed under #3).

John Tadlock, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern that Nuuly is buying one lot but both lots are seeking to be re-zoned. If the use is allowed under the current zoning, why is the re-zoning necessary? He also expresses concern about the increased impervious surface under MPM and flooding to the surrounding roads.

(Mr. Jones responds there are measures in the Township's stormwater management ordinances that ensure a review by the Township should they increase the impervious coverage. They would not be allowed to build up to 80% if they could not manage the stormwater properly in accordance with Township and state regulations.).

Jessica Speedy, a Falls Township resident, asks about the Bristol employees coming here (to be discussed under #3), expresses her concern about too much impervious, flooding on Fallsington-Tullytown Road, and why this area was chosen for this warehouse.

(Atty. Jackman responds the flooding occurs because there are no stormwater management controls in place; Mr. Richardson explains the rain gardens)

Toni Battiste, a Falls Township resident, asks why the re-zoning is not before zoning instead of planning (needs an ordinance change by the Board of Supervisors to change the zoning and this is the process), concerns about the wetland margins and setbacks (Mr. Jones clarified), materials for the lake which is being filled in (not contaminated and under the supervision of the DEP and the Conservation District), and gets clarification on the deed restriction (this deed restriction would explicitly name the Township as the grantee of the deed restriction).

Conner Schmeigle, a Falls Township resident, asks if the deed restriction gives the Township more control over the development of the parcel in the future (yes).

Jerry Michael, a Fall township resident, seeks clarification on the rezoning in terms of whether by approving the re-zoning, application #3 is automatically approved (Mr. Jones says if the applicant is denied the land development but gets approved for the zoning change, the applicant would walk away and the re-zoning would not occur).

Jennifer Metzger, a Falls Township resident, questions the MPM and 50% impervious coverage (Mr. Jones says MPM has a footnote which states that based on the size of your lot you can increase the percentage of impervious which is not part of the HI-A and FM), has concerns with Martin Creek and development draining into Martins Creek.

Elaine Rafferty, a Falls Township resident, asks about the quarry being filled in (50 yr operation).

Connor Schmeigle, a Falls Township resident, asks if Nuuly is only going to use one parcel of the two that are requesting to be re-zoned (yes the larger parcel that will be subdivided). Discussion occurs on this point.

Member Henderson makes a motion to recommend approval for KPK Development for the Amendment to Re-zone parcels #13-013-010 and #13-013-011 from FM (Farming)/ HI-A (Heavy Industrial-A) to MPM (Materials Processing and Manufacturing) conditioned on a restrictive deed to be recorded against the MPM zoned parcels that the current use and the warehouse use for Nuuly only can be developed on the parcels. Also conditioned that should the Nuuly warehouse not be approved, this recommendation for approval to re-zone will be void.

Member Everett seconds the motion.

All in favor 4-1, O'Brien dissenting. Motion carries

Item #3: Nuuly, 700 Penn Valley Road, Fairless Hills, PA 19030; TMP #13-013-010; Zoned: MPM (proposed); Owner: KPK Development Company. Preliminary / Final Land Development – Subdivision of one lot; development of said lot with a one million sq. ft. warehouse, parking and stormwater facilities

Chelsey Jackman, Esquire presents the application and incorporates all the previous information discussed in item #2. Atty. Jackman goes through the waiver requests:

- 191-8.B to allow preliminary- final together
- 191-31.A & to allow cartway widths at Cedar Lane / allow cartway width and ROW to remain for Penn Valley Rd /
- 191-62 not require curbs along Rte. 13, Penn Valley Road, Cedar Land and Tyburn Road
- 191-36.D to allow eastern driveway less than 12 ft. from new property line
- 191-37.E to allow less than 5 ft. radius along the curb for the lane center divided islands
- 191-43.F to allow lots 1 and 2 to be irregularly shaped
- 191-48 to allow no street trees along Rte. 13, Tyburn Road, Cedar Lane or Penn Valley Road
- 191-52.1.B(1) to allow 50% disturbance of floodplain instead of 0%
- 191-52.1.B(8)(a) to allow 3% disturbance of wetland margin instead of 20%
- 191-78.A(6) &
- 191-80.A(2) to allow plans to be 36 by 48 inches
- 191-78.C(2) to not require existing features within 200 ft. of site

Member Henderson asks if there will be trained people on site regarding the chemicals and use of any hazmat equipment.

Mr. Dumack says yes, chemicals for the cleaning solvents are stored in two rooms inside the building; they will not be stored outside. There is double haul containment of the containers. There are flaps for any liquid spills.

Mr. Zeal says there is wet wash (60%) and dry clean (40%). He goes into specifics. Nuuly has partnered with a company called Green Earth. All chemicals for the wet wash materials are biodegradable, non-hazardous chemicals by classification, consisting of mild detergent and fabric conditioning agents. It is not harmful to the environment or the people handling it. For the dry-cleaning chemicals, it is solvent based. What Nuuly uses is the first 100% environmentally, non-toxic dry-cleaning process. They go back to their base chemicals (unlike other dry cleaning solvents) and can go into the sewer system (working with sewer authority on the flows),

Member O'Brien asks about the 48 tractor trailer spaces in the rear – will there be tractor trailers / vans – are there dock doors on the back of this building – what is coming into the site?

Mr. Dumack says there are 64 loading docks and 49 trailer storage spots in the rear. This is what the 5-year projection of this building indicates.

Mr. Zeal says the trucks arrive; they unload and then leave. However, there is not a constant flow of traffic. They were using UPS, but they are now using Amazon. There will be a minimum of truck traffic.

Member Striluk asks about the Missouri plant which is similar in size and scope to this development and how it operates.

Mr. Zeal responds the same as this one will. The reason for the size of the building is primarily for the storage of the garments (similar to a dry cleaners with the rotating carousels. Nuuly has many of these types of carousels. You need a lot of inventory to meet the subscribers' needs. At the end of a garment's rental life, it is retired and goes to Nuuly's other concept which is large storage for the retired rentals. Those garments are then sold. As a subscriber, you can also buy the product, priced according to the age of the garment. The laundry section of the building is about 30,000 sq. ft. of the entire footprint. There are seamstresses, people who remove stains from clothing, so we are employing a lot of technical people who repair those garments and put them back into circulation.

Member Striluk asks if the Missouri plant is in an industrial area or a community.

Mr. Zeal says it is in an industrial area adjacent to a residential community, similar to this site.

Member Hartzell asks questions about the drainage. Will there be algae or moss buildup because it will be wet?

Mr. Dumack says the basin is designed to drain completely within 24-72 hours. The target is to meet the requirements of Township ordinances as well as DEP for containment of stormwater as well as discharge downstream.

Member Hartzell asks how deep the rain gardens are.

Mr. Dumack says 5 feet maximum.

Public Comment

Elaine Rafferty, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern/ questions about the smoke stacks, shift times, consider a parking garage instead of a parking lot, intersection improvements (professionals respond accordingly).

Jessica Speedy, a Falls Township resident, expresses concerns / questions about the type of trucks either diesel, electric or driverless, cost of electric and if it's on the grid, and baseline salary is \$17.00 / hr. and will that be upgraded (professionals respond accordingly).

Connor Schmeigel, a Falls Township resident, expresses concerns / questions about if there are roadway expansion plans here to review, who has authority over the roadway expansion, and can the Township put contingencies in place regarding the roadway expansion, and will there be any smells emitting from the warehouse. (professionals respond accordingly).

Debbie Diaz, a Falls Township resident, questions why the entrance is not going to be on Tyburn Road (Mr. Dumack shows a plan where there are two driveways), expresses concern about the school buses in this area, questions the smoke shacks (they are for employees who smoke), the water tank (required by their insurance to store water on the property for the sprinkler system because the water supplied by the township is not enough to suppress a fire within the building), chemical and air pollution concerns as well.

John Tadlock, a Falls Township resident, wants assurances that the PennDOT improvements to the intersection, Rte. 13 off ramps will be done before the improvements are completed (yes), parking spaces for employees (Mr. Richardson explains), and if the access to the park will be impeded when PennDOT makes its road improvements (Mr. Groth explains that PennDOT approves the road improvements; the applicant pays for the improvements and does the construction).

Kelly Kirkpatrick, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the amount of loading docks and the tractor trailers coming to the site, the process after this meeting, delivery schedules and amount of truck transit (Mr. Zeal says he will have the numbers when they appear before the supervisors).

Wayne Bell, a Falls Township resident, expresses concern about the chemicals at the site and its impact on the surrounding community.

Jennifer Metzger, a Falls Township resident, hands out information on the chemicals, expresses concern about waivers requested (preliminary and final being requested together, size of the trees, setbacks, buffering, floodplain, building dimensions).

Toni Battiste, a Falls Township resident, asks about getting copies of waivers, possible solar panels instead of natural gas (Bloom Energy), and electric usage.

Atty. Jackman states that if anyone has further questions or wants information, please provide an email address.

Member Henderson makes a motion to recommend Preliminary only on the Nuuly development subdivision with waiver requests for Sections 191-31-A, 191-62, 191-36.D, 191-37.E, 191-43.F, 191-48, 191-52.1.B(1), 191-52.1.B(8)(a), 191-78.A(6), 191-80.A(2), and 191-78.C(2), based on the Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated August 24, 2026, Remington Vernick's letter dated July 27, 2026 (traffic engineer), and Jones Engineering Associates' letter dated August 21, 2026, conditioned on the use for HI-A and FM only if the property is rezoned to MPM with a deed restriction to just the Nuuly use.

Member Everett seconds the motion.

All in favor 4-1, O'Brien dissenting. Motion carries. APPROVED FOR PRELIMINARY ONLY

Item #4: Approval of minutes

Minutes from February 24, 2026 approved.

All in favor 5-0. Motion carries.

11:00 p.m. Meeting adjourned