



**Zoning Evaluation Division**  
*Department of Planning & Zoning*

---

**M E M O**

**To:** Chairman Murphy, Springfield District and members of the Planning Commission

**Date:** February 8, 2012

**From:** Brent Krasner, AICP   
Senior Staff Coordinator  
Zoning Evaluation Division, DPZ

**RE:** RZ 2011-SU-024 / SE 2011-SU-009 - Pohanka Stonecroft, LLC

**PC Date:** February 9, 2012

The staff report for RZ 2011-SU-024 / SE 2011-SU-009 was published on January 13, 2012, with a recommendation for denial based on staff's evaluation that the application was not in harmony with the green building policy in the Comprehensive Plan.

Subsequent to the publication of the staff report, staff has continued to work with the applicant to discuss their "green" building commitments. The applicant has submitted new proffers that include additional definitions and guarantees to incorporate energy efficient technologies, building practices, and materials into the design and construction of the proposed auto dealership and auto body repair shop. Attached, please find a copy of the revised proffers now dated February 7, 2012, for the above referenced application. The revisions are indicated in "blackline" format to aid in your review of the changes from the version published in the staff report. The applicant has made numerous revisions, some of the more substantive of which include:

- The applicant has completely revised Proffer 13 - "Green Building Construction Practices" to require that a LEED accredited professional, hired by the applicant, review and certify that all green elements listed in the newly added Exhibit A (Sustainability Checklist) have been incorporated or installed into the design of the building, and, further, are sufficient to meet the energy savings targets committed to in Exhibit A.

- Proffer 13 now includes a commitment from the applicant to post a “green building escrow” equal to \$2.00 per square foot of gross floor area to guarantee that all items in Exhibit A have been properly incorporated and installed. Release of the escrow is subject to sign-off from Department of Planning and Zoning staff.
- Proffer 18 has been revised so that the applicant is now fully committing to the installation of the wind turbine, subject only to approval of any other relevant governmental or public agencies.
- Exhibit A - A Green Building Construction Practices Checklist has been added to the proffers which lists energy efficient technologies, building practices, and materials that the applicant is specifically committing to install.

A “Green Operating Practices” list is included at the end of Exhibit A which details numerous ongoing green activities, such as the use of recycled paper; green cleaning products; and vegetable oil in the service lifts; which the applicant is committing to undertake, but for which certification or proof will not be required in order to release the green building escrow.

Staff acknowledges that the applicant has made a concerted and genuine effort to strengthen their green building commitments in order to better achieve consistency with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, two of the items represent a departure above and beyond what any other automobile dealership in Fairfax County has committed to: the green building escrow (proffer 13) and the wind turbine (proffer 18).

A third commitment, energy savings (Exhibit A-item 1), has the potential to be another significant green element. The applicant has proffered to achieve a 15% energy savings (natural gas and electricity) beyond the applicant’s other dealerships in Fairfax County. However, these structures are older and are inherently less efficient than a new building constructed to today’s codes. In looking for a standard for energy savings, and since no use-specific industry-wide benchmarks exist (as with office buildings), County staff recommended that the applicant utilize their recently constructed Honda dealership in Fredericksburg, VA (Stafford County) as a more appropriate benchmark. To date, the applicant has declined that suggestion, but Staff continues to recommend it as an alternative that would better guarantee real energy savings over and above what would be achieved simply by building according to current codes.