6630 Holland Street McLean, Virginia

RESOURCE PROTECTION AREA (RPA) ENCROACHMENT EXCEPTION #129-WRPA-005-1 & WATER QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT #129-WQ-001-3

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

APPLICANT REPRESENTED BY TNT ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.



Project Discussion

- Notice of Violation (# 201803030) issued on 3/6/2019 for 1,042 SF of RPA disturbance associated with an unpermitted patio and masonry grill.
- This application proposes to remove approximately 331 SF of patio and install 2 planter boxes to increase water quality leaving the site.
 - Approximately 750 SF of the patio are proposed to remain.
- ► The fire pit will also be removed.





Project History

- The existing primary structure, asphalt driveway, and wood deck located within the RPA was approved to be built in 2004 by Fairfax County (129-INF-004-3).
 - An associated RPA plan was approved with the 2004 grading plan (129-WRPA-001-1).
- Construction of the existing two-story house and deck was completed in 2006. The associated plantings and mitigation proposed for the approved 2004 RPA encroachment can be seen in the 2007 aerial photograph.
 - The approved 2004 plans came off bond on May 18, 2007, according to Fairfax County's LDS Net.



Project History (2007 v 2009)

Per historic aerial imagery, vegetation removal (~3,444 SF) in the RPA occurred on the property between 2007 and 2009. This vegetation removal was completed by the previous owner(s) of the property, Stuart and Regina Solomon who purchased the property in 2006.









Project History (2017 v 2019)

- Mr. and Mrs. Bergoglio (the applicants) purchased the property in January 2016.
- Additional vegetation (2,684 SF) removal and the construction of the existing patio and grill in the RPA occurred between 2017 and 2019 associated with the Notice of Violation received by the applicants







2017 Aerial Per Fairfax County JADE

Project History (Impervious Area)

Summary: Impervious Area Analysis Tabulation											
	2002 Conditions* (RPA	2004 Conditions (Approved	2019 Conditions	Proposed	Change in Impact (2019 vs.	Change in Impact (2002 vs.					
Description	Establishment)	Plans)	(Existing)	Conditions	Proposed)	Proposed)					
Total Lot Impervious Area (S.F.)	2,450	7,825	10,248	9,917	-331	7,467					
Total Impervious Area in RPA (S.F.)	2,120	3,842	5,398	5,067	-331	2,947					
Impervious Area within Seaward 50 ft RPA (S.F.)	_	-	100 (Portion of Patio)	0	-100	-					

*These totals are approximate and were calculated using the 2002 aerial. There is no available 2003 aerial when the RPA was established onsite. The driveway was not visible in the available aerial and has not been included.



Project History (Impervious Area cont'd)

Detailed Breakdown: Impervious Area Analysis Tabulation										
	2002	2004			Change in	Change in				
	Conditions*	Conditions	2019		Impact	Impact				
	(RPA	(Approved	Conditions	Proposed	(2019 vs.	(2002 ∨s.				
Description	Establishment)	Plans)	(Existing)	Conditions	Proposed)	Proposed)				
Primary Structure Footprint (S.F.)	2,070	4,252	4,252	4,252	0	2,182				
Primary Structure Footprint in RPA										
(S.F.)	1,740	3,303	3,303	3,303	0	1,563				
Total Deck (S.F.)	380	0	475	475	0	95				
Total Deck in RPA (S.F.)	380	0	475	475	0	95				
Total Paver Patio (S.F.)	0	0	1,081	750	-331	750				
Total Paver Patio in RPA (S.F.)	0	0	1,081	750	-331	750				
Total Driveway (S.F.)	-	3,420	4,287	4,287	0	-				
Total Driveway in RPA (S.F.)	-	490	490	490	0	-				
Total Wall & Walkway (S.F.)	0	153	153	153	0	153				
Total Wall & Walkway in RPA										
(S.F.)	0	49	49	49	0	49				

*These totals are approximate and were calculated using the 2002 aerial. There is no available 2003 aerial when the RPA was established onsite. The driveway was not visible in the available aerial and has not been included.



Staff Report Discussion

- The potential wetland noted on the adjacent property is not a wetland. There is no dominance of hydrophytic vegetation. American beech (Facultative Upland Plants (FACU)), white oak (FACU) and Japanese honeysuckle (FACU) are shown to dominate this area. No hydric soils were observed (10YR 4/4 from 0-14").
 - The applicant has no issue providing the requisite data demonstrating the lack of wetlands in this location.







Staff Report Discussion (cont.)

TNT agrees with staff's discussion regarding the required findings per Section 118-6-6 and the additional findings in Section 118-6-9.



View of portion of patio to be removed



View of portion of patio to be removed