

1008 Springvale Road Great Falls, Virginia

RPA ENCROACHMENT EXCEPTION #7996-WRPA-002 & WATER QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT #7996-WQ-001

SECTION 118-6-9, GENERAL RESOURCE PROTECTION AREA ENCROACHMENT REQUEST

APPLICANT REPRESENTED BY TNT ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.



Project Discussion

- ▶ Request to resolve NOV 202003667
 - ▶ 1,323 square feet (sq. ft.) of impervious surface in RPA;
 - ▶ No disturbance within the seaward 50-foot of RPA;
 - ▶ Net increase of 1.4% impervious area
- ▶ Proposed RPA encroachment shall be mitigated per CBPO 118-3-3(f)



View of the existing sport court facing west

Project History

- Lot Created June 7, 2004
- The existing primary structure were approved to be built in 2011 by Fairfax County (#7996-INF-002-1)
- The existing RPA boundary was determined by the approval of 7996-INF-002-1.



Staff Report Discussion

118-6-6.a – Is the Minimum Necessary to Afford Relief

- Staff Comment: The sport court could be located outside the RPA.
 - Contrary to what's shown in Attachment C5-3A, there are no viable alternative locations for the sport court outside the RPA.
 - The two locations shown proximate to the existing well do not adhere to the state mandated setback requirements (Section 12 VAC 5-630-380).
 - The existing slope of the front yard is not conducive do locating the sport court in this location. See photograph to the right.

118-6-6.c – The application is a detriment to water quality

- Staff Comments: 1)The applicant proposed to restore the HOA property with turf grass instead of appropriate riparian species. 2) The applicant's water quality computations are incorrect and inconsistent.
 - As shown on Sheet 2 of the WQIA, the applicant is proposing to re-vegetated the HOA property at the approved ratios based on the proposed encroachment into the RPA. Locations of plantings were discussed with and agreed upon by staff.
 - Staff's VRRM calculations do not appear to be correct. The applicant's calculations are based on the proposed planting area, not only on the disturbed area, which result in additional water quality benefits as a larger area is being planted.



Staff Report Discussion

118-6-6.d – The request is self-created and self-imposed

- As this is a violation, this section is moot.
- The size of the house has no bearing on the NOV or the current proposal. Three lots to the north is a 10,000+ square foot home, which is nearly 50% larger than the existing house on this lot.

118-6-6.e and 118-6-9 – The applicant’s water quality computations are inconsistent with the plan and do not demonstrate that there will be a water quality benefit.

- The water quality calculations addressed on previous slide.
- Contrary to staff’s constant assertions that there is no water quality benefit, the regulation does not require a benefit, but rather no detriment. As demonstrated by the submitted, discussed and agreed upon VRRM information, there is “no degradation of water quality” as currently proposed. This was discussed with staff in detail in January 2023.



Staff Report Discussion (cont.)

118-6-6.c – Planting Locations

- Through several meetings with staff, the applicant was INSTRUCTED to propose plantings within the depicted floodplain easement. Staff noted that plantings in the storm drainage easement could be discussed during their review.
- ▶ The applicant has proposed several planting locations which would be more beneficial to water quality, but these were rejected by staff.

118-6-6.e – Water Quality

- ▶ As noted above, by virtue of planting a larger area, the applicant has demonstrated an increase in water quality.

