April 16, 2014

STAFF REPORT ADDENDUM

APPLICATION SE 2013-MV-011

Concurrent with:
Resource Protection Area Encroachment Exception #5203-WRPA-010-2 & Water Quality Impact Assessment #5203-WQ-019-2

MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT

APPLICANTS: Kimberly B. & Kelly P. Campbell

ZONING: R-E: Residential Estate District (0.5 Dwellings Units/Acre)

PARCEL: 122-2 ((2)) 7

LOCATION: 11727 River Drive

SITE ACREAGE: 1.56 acres

PLAN MAP: Residential, 0.1 – 0.2 dwelling units/acre (du/ac)

SPECIAL EXCEPTION CATEGORY: Category 6 – Uses in a Floodplain

PROPOSAL: To retroactively permit the placement of fill in a floodplain and to permit additional fill

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of SE 2013-MV-011, subject to the proposed development conditions contained in Appendix 1.

Staff recommends approval of Resource Protection Area Encroachment Exception #5203-WRPA-010-2 and Water Quality Impact Assessment #5203-WQ-019-2, subject to the proposed development conditions contained in Appendix 2.

Megan Duca

Department of Planning and Zoning
Zoning Evaluation Division
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 801
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509
Phone 703-324-1290 FAX 703-324-3924
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz
It should be noted that it is not the intent of the staff to recommend that the Board, in adopting any conditions proffered by the owner, relieve the applicant/owner from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards.

It should be noted that the content of this report reflects the analysis and recommendation of staff; it does not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors.

The approval of this special exception does not interfere with, abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties, as they may apply to the property subject to this application.

For information, contact the Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, 12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 801, Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5505, (703) 324-1290.
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REASON FOR ADDENDUM

The initial staff report for SE 2013-MV-011 was published on December 26, 2013. The applicants requested the approval of a Special Exception (SE) to allow the deposition of fill material in a floodplain to remain and to allow for additional fill to be placed in the floodplain. The applicants constructed a shoreline revetment on the subject property involving the placement of fill soils and 154 linear feet of rip rap adjacent to the Potomac River in an attempt to stabilize the shoreline and adjacent slope. An additional 70 linear feet of rip rap was also placed on the adjacent property. In total, the applicants have placed approximately 2,309 cubic yards of fill within the floodplain. The placement of fill soils and rip rap was completed without proper approval of a grading plan or valid Special Exception. In addition to the rip rap and fill that was already placed on the property, the applicants intend to add an additional 45 cubic yards of rip rap and 75 cubic yards of fill behind the rip rap for a total of 2,384 cubic yards of fill within the floodplain.

At the time of the initial staff report, the applicants intended to add safety walls, steps, a ground-level porous paver patio, walk, and a deck in areas located within the Resource Protection Area (RPA) but outside of the floodplain. The proposed features within the RPA would require approval of an RPA Encroachment Exception (WRPA) and Water Quality Impact Assessment (WQIA) by the Board of Supervisors.

Staff recommended denial of the Special Exception application in the initial staff report. Staff recognized that the approval of a Special Exception was a necessary step in clearing the existing violation on the property and adhering to the applicants’ Agreed Final Order. However, staff concluded that the application did not satisfy all applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions, including the General Special Exception Standards and the Use Limitations for Uses in a Floodplain, because the applicants did not demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) and the Geotechnical Review Board (GRB) that the slope would be stable. Staff noted that although the applicants could resolve this issue by providing for slope stabilization measures, the applicants were not proposing any such measures to address this comment.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this application at their meeting on January 9, 2014. The Planning Commission recommended denial of the Special Exception on a vote of eight in favor, none opposed, and four abstentions. The Planning Commission did not issue a recommendation on the WRPA or WQIA because that staff report was not yet available due to delays in the submission. Subsequent to the Planning Commission hearing, DPWES issued a staff report recommending denial of the WRPA and WQIA. DPWES staff found that the required findings listed in Sections 118-6-6 and 118-6-9 of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (CBPO) had not been satisfied with these applications. Staff believed the proposed improvements were not the minimum necessary to afford relief and that the disturbance into the 2003 RPA in the rear yard of a house that was built in 2005 would not be in harmony with the
purpose and intent of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (CBPO). Further, staff concluded that the request was based upon conditions or circumstances that were self-created. Subsequent to the Planning Commission public hearing and prior to the Board of Supervisors public hearing, the applicants revised the plans and geotechnical report to address the concerns raised by staff. The changes to the SE Plat, WRPA/WQIA, and Geotechnical Report section of this staff report addendum outlines the extent of the revisions made since the publication of the initial staff report.

A reduced copy of the revised SE Plat is included in the front of this report. The revised proposed development conditions, WRPA/WQIA report and proposed conditions, and affidavit are included in Appendix 1 – 3, respectively.

**CHANGES TO THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION (SE) PLAT, WRPA/WQIA, AND GEOTECHNICAL REPORT**

The applicants submitted a revised SE Plat dated February 28, 2014, a revised RPA Encroachment Application and associated Water Quality Impact Assessment dated February 26, 2014, and a revised Geotechnical Report dated March 3, 2014. The revised submissions include two significant changes. First, the applicants previously proposed to construct safety walls, wooden steps, a ground-level porous paver patio, walk, and a deck in areas located within the RPA. The applicants are now only proposing to construct the wooden steps within the RPA and have removed the other features from the plan. The applicants are still proposing to construct a detached garage with an extended driveway; however, this is located outside of the RPA and floodplain. Secondly, the applicants resubmitted a Geotechnical Report to address the slope stability issues raised in the initial staff report. Staff’s analysis of the amended WRPA/WQIA and Geotechnical Report is summarized below.

**ANALYSIS**

**RPA Encroachment Exception and Water Quality Impact Assessment** *(Appendix 2)*

Subsequent to the Planning Commission hearing, DPWES issued a staff report recommending denial of the WRPA and WQIA. DPWES staff concluded that the required findings in the CBPO had not been satisfied with these applications, the proposed improvements were not the minimum necessary to afford relief, and the request was based on conditions or circumstances that were self-created. As described above, the applicants have since resubmitted the WRPA and WQIA to DPWES. The applicants removed the previously proposed walls, patio, walk, and deck and are now seeking approval of the rip rap revetment, fill, and wooden steps. In addition, the applicants revised the plans to demonstrate how they will satisfy the planting requirements outlined in the CBPO.
Staff from DPWES reviewed the revised plans and is now recommending approval of the WRPA and WQIA applications, subject to development conditions. The DPWES staff report and proposed development conditions are contained in Appendix 2 of this staff report addendum. As described in the staff report, DPWES staff finds that the wooden walk will not increase impervious area within the RPA and is not of substantial detriment to water quality. In addition, the application proposes to stabilize and reseed the disturbed area within and outside of the RPA and to establish 13,786 square feet of buffer area through the planting of trees, shrubs, and groundcover, which improves water quality. The proposed development conditions would require the applicants to preserve indigenous vegetation to the maximum extent possible, establish a vegetated buffer of at least 13,786 square feet in area in the disturbed areas within and outside of the RPA, and utilize adequate erosion and sediment control measures for the duration of the land disturbing activity in the RPA to ensure that the construction activity does not degrade water quality.

**Geotechnical Analysis** (Appendix 4)

Early in the review process, staff requested that the applicants submit a geotechnical report to DPWES to determine whether the slope that was created at the rear of the property was stable. The applicants submitted the geotechnical report to DPWES, which was forwarded to the GRB. As described in the initial staff report, DPWES issued a letter to the applicants stating that the submitted report was disapproved because the applicants were not meeting the minimum recommended Factor of Safety (FS) across the site. Factor of Safety can be described as the ratio of the forces stabilizing the slope over the forces that destabilize the slope, and is calculated by geometrically modeling the slope’s soils, groundwater conditions, surface loads, and various other criteria and calculating the forces in a slope stability analysis. Due to the many variables and unknowns involved in a slope stability analysis, a Factor of Safety of at least 1.25 is recommended for long-term slope stability. The applicants’ previously submitted geotechnical report showed that the area of the slope generally between the dock and the existing deck to the rear of the dwelling had a FS of 1.1, which was not considered sufficiently stable. According to DPWES, the standard of 1.25 has been enforced in the County since the 1990s by both the GRB and County reviewers. Although it is not currently contained within the PFM, it is considered sound engineering practice and a PFM Amendment is currently being considered to formalize this standard within the PFM. This issue remained outstanding in the initial staff report and resulted in staff recommending denial of the SE application. Staff determined that the applicants must either demonstrate that the slope is currently stable to the satisfaction of DPWES and the GRB or perform measures to stabilize the slope.

Subsequent to the publication of the initial staff report and the Planning Commission public hearing, the applicants submitted a revised geotechnical report to DPWES. The resubmitted report states that a 1.26 Factor of Safety will be achieved by driving a series of Slope Reinforcement Technology (SRT™) plate piles to depths beyond the failure plane established by the global stability analysis, which would exceed the 1.25
Factor of Safety recommended by DPWES and the GRB. This method of slope stabilization involves driving vertical rigid steel reinforcements into the slope at certain uniformly spaced intervals to stabilize and reinforce the slope. The applicant’s revised geotechnical report was reviewed by DPWES and the GRB. As stated in the letter contained in Appendix 4 of this addendum, DPWES finds that the revised geotechnical report is acceptable. As a result, the applicants have resolved the slope stability issue that was discussed in the initial staff report. The letter from DPWES notes that the final grading plan will be required to show the approximate horizontal extents of the proposed SRT piles and additional rip-rap being recommended along portions of the slope for slope stabilization. In addition, a note requiring a building permit for the SRT piles should be placed on that plan and the final structural design of the SRT piles will be reviewed during the building permit application.

**Use Limitations for Uses in a Floodplain (Sect. 2-905) and General Special Exception Standards (Sect. 9-006)**

Staff concluded in the initial staff report that the application did not satisfy all of the General Special Exception Standards and the Use Limitations for Uses in a Floodplain because the applicants did not demonstrate to the satisfaction of the DPWES and the GRB that the slope would be stable. Specifically, staff found that as a result of not achieving a stable slope the application did not satisfy Standard 7 of Sect. 2-905 or General Special Exception Standards 1 and 3. Standard 7 of Sect. 2-905 states that the applicants must demonstrate that there are no other feasible options available to achieve the proposed use, the proposal is the least disruptive option to the floodplain, and the proposal meets the environmental goals and objectives of the adopted Comprehensive Plan for the subject property. Standards 1 and 3 of the General Special Exception Standards state that the proposed use shall be in harmony with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and be harmonious with and not adversely affect the use or development of neighboring properties in accordance with the applicable Zoning District regulations and the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Because the applicants have now demonstrated that a stable slope will be achieved, staff believes that the application now satisfies these standards.

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS**

As a result of the revised submissions, staff modified the proposed development conditions from the initial staff report. Staff removed the reference to the deck and patio in development condition 3 because the applicants are no longer proposing these features. Staff also revised previous development condition 5, which required the submission of the WRPA/WQIA, because the applicants have submitted the WRPA/WQIA to be heard by the Board of Supervisors concurrently with the SE application. Because the applicants resubmitted an acceptable Soils Report subsequent to the publication of the initial conditions, staff revised condition 6 to state that the applicants shall incorporate engineering practices to address slope stabilization issues as recommend by the GRB and DPWES prior to grading plan approval. The condition
further states that the applicants shall achieve a Factor of Safety of no less than 1.25 for the entire area of the slope, as determined by DPWES in consultation with the GRB. This will ensure that the applicants still achieve this Factor of Safety in the event that the applicants modify an element of their slope stability measures to the extent that the approval of a new Soils Report is required. Finally, staff deleted previous development condition 13. This condition required the applicants to construct the previously proposed wall using construction techniques that would provide the least amount of disturbance to the root zone of a nearby tree. This condition is no longer applicable because the applicants are no longer proposing to construct the safety walls.

In addition to modifying and deleting some of the conditions contained in the initial staff report, staff also added two additional development conditions. First, proposed condition 15 states that the limits of clearing and grading shall be strictly observed and enforced and that all existing vegetation shown as to be preserved on the SE Plat shall be preserved. The condition further states that any disturbance of the RPA not shown on the approved SE Plat will be considered a violation of the CBPO. In addition, staff added a development condition to ensure that if the application is approved, future purchasers of the property are aware of the Special Exception that has been approved on the property.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Conclusions

Staff recommended denial of the Special Exception in the initial staff report. In the initial report, staff concluded that the application did not satisfy all applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions because the applicants did not demonstrate to the satisfaction of DPWES and the GRB that the slope would be stable. Staff from DPWES also recommended denial of the associated WRPA and WQIA applications in the initial report for these applications because staff concluded that the required findings in the CBPO had not been satisfied. Since the publication of the initial staff report, the applicants have revised the plans and are no longer proposing to construct the walls, patio, walk, and deck in the RPA. As a result of these changes, staff finds that the WRPA and WQIA applications now meet the required findings in the CBPO. In addition, the applicants have provided a revised Soils Report that demonstrates that the applicants will provide for a stable slope that meets the Factor of Safety recommended by DPWES and the GRB. Therefore, staff finds that the applicants have resolved the slope stability issue that resulted in staff’s recommendation of denial in the initial staff report. Staff now finds that the application satisfies the applicable Zoning Ordinance Provisions and is in harmony with the land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.
Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends approval of SE 2013-MV-011, subject to the proposed development conditions contained in Appendix 1.

Staff recommends approval of Resource Protection Area Encroachment Exception #5203 WRPA-010-2 and Water Quality Impact Assessment #5203-WQ-019-2, subject to the proposed development conditions contained in Appendix 2.

It should be noted that it is not the intent of staff to recommend that the Board, in adopting any conditions proffered by the owner, relieve the applicant/owner from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The approval of this application does not interfere with, abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties, as they may apply to the property subject to this application.

It should be further noted that the content of this report reflects the analysis and recommendations of staff; it does not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors.

APPENDICES

1. Proposed Development Conditions
2. Staff Report for #5203-WRPA-010-2 and #5203-WQ-019-2
3. Revised Affidavit
4. Geotechnical Analysis
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

SE 2013-MV-011

April 16, 2014

If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve SE 2013-MV-011, located at 11727 River Drive, Tax Map 122-2 ((2)) 7, for uses in a floodplain pursuant to Sect. 2-904 and 9-606 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance, staff recommends that the Board condition the approval by requiring conformance with the following development conditions:

1. This Special Exception is granted for and runs with the land indicated in this application and is not transferable to other land.

2. This Special Exception is granted only for the purpose(s), structure(s) and/or use(s) indicated on the Special Exception Plat approved with the application, as qualified by these development conditions. Notwithstanding the structures and uses indicated on the Special Exception Plat, the applicants may disturb land, demolish existing structures, and/or construct improvements outside of the 100-year floodplain and Resource Protection Area (RPA) without submitting a Special Exception (SE) application as long as the applicants comply with all applicable local, state and federal ordinances. However, the applicants may not allow any new structures or impervious areas to extend into the RPA without submitting and obtaining the approval of a Special Exception Amendment and an RPA Exception.

3. This Special Exception is subject to the provisions of Article 17, Site Plans as may be determined by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). Any plan submitted pursuant to this Special Exception shall be in substantial conformance with the approved Special Exception Plat entitled “Special Exception Plan Hallowing Point River Estates Lot 7 – Section One” prepared by Harold A. Logan Associates P.C., which is dated December 31, 2012, as revised through February 28, 2014, and these conditions. Minor modifications to the approved Special Exception Amendment may be permitted pursuant to Par. 4 of Sect. 9-004 of the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Prior to the approval of a grading plan, site plan, or minor site plan, a Hold Harmless agreement shall be executed with Fairfax County for any adverse effects resulting from the location of the site within a floodplain area.

5. Notwithstanding the landscaping shown on the Special Exception Plat, the location and species of the proposed plantings shall be subject to the review and approval of the Urban Forest Management Division (UFMD). Landscaping in the RPA shall be installed within 90 days of the SE approval unless the
UFMD determines a later planting date is necessary to ensure the health of the landscaping.

6. The applicants shall incorporate appropriate engineering practices to address slope stabilization issues as recommended by the Geotechnical Review Board (GRB) and DPWES. The applicants shall achieve a factor of safety of not less than 1.25 for the entire area of the slope, as determined by DPWES in consultation with the GRB.

7. Within 60 days of approval of the SE, the applicants shall submit a grading plan to DPWES. The applicants shall obtain grading plan approval within 180 days of approval of the SE.

8. Within 60 days of approval of the SE, the applicants shall obtain all required permits for the existing dock.

9. Prior to grading plan, site plan, or minor site plan approval, the applicants shall demonstrate to UFMD that all landscaping shall be planted within a sufficiently stable slope. The applicants shall incorporate stabilization measures to support the long-term maturity of any new landscaping, subject to the review and approval of UFMD.

10. The applicants must demonstrate to DPWES that all necessary federal, state, and county approvals have been obtained prior to any additional land disturbing activity.

11. Prior to grading plan approval, the applicants shall delineate the limits of the 100-year floodplain and record a floodplain easement, subject to review and approval by DPWES.

12. Concurrent with the first submission of any grading plan, site plan, or minor site plan, the applicants shall submit an additional copy of the plan to the Fairfax County FEMA Floodplain Administrator (Stormwater Planning Division) to determine whether the base flood elevation or limits of the floodplain in any Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) depicted on the County’s Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) would be altered as a result of any new construction, substantial improvements, or other development shown on the plan, including fill. If the County FEMA Floodplain Administrator determines that the base flood elevation or limits of the floodplain would be altered, the applicants shall submit technical or scientific data to FEMA for a Letter of Map Revision. If the projected increase in the base flood elevation is greater than one foot, the applicants shall also obtain approval of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision from the Federal Insurance Administrator prior to the approval of any construction. If the applicants are required to submit either a Letter of Map Revision and/or Conditional Letter of Map Revision as outlined above, the applicants shall submit a copy of the approval letter from FEMA to the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ).
13. The final location of the detached garage shall be subject to review and approval by the Fairfax County Health Department at the time of grading plan review.

14. Within 60 days of approval of the Special Exception the applicants shall provide all necessary information to DPWES in order to determine if the disturbance to the adjacent Hallowing Point Association property (HOA property) requires the approval of a WRPA, WQIA, SE, grading plan or other plans or permits. If it is determined that additional permits are needed for the grading on the HOA property, then the applicants shall work with the HOA to submit the proper applications within 90 days of such determination.

15. The limits of clearing and grading shown on the Plat shall be strictly observed and enforced and all existing vegetation shown as to be preserved on the SE Plat shall be preserved. Any encroachment into, and/or disturbance of, the RPA not shown on the approved Plat will be considered a violation of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (CBPO) and is subject to the penalties of the CBPO Article 9.

16. Within 30 days of the Special Exception’s approval, the applicant shall submit an agreement or suitable documents to the County Attorney’s office for review and approval. The agreement or suitable documents shall be recorded prior to grading plan approval. The agreement shall notify future owners of Tax Map 122-2 ((2)) 7 that the land is subject to an approved Special Exception (SE 2013-MV-011).

The above proposed conditions are staff recommendations and do not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors unless and until adopted by that Board.

This approval, contingent on the above noted conditions, shall not relieve the applicants from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The applicants shall be themselves responsible for obtaining the required Residential Use Permit through established procedures, and this Special Exception shall not be valid until this has been accomplished.

Pursuant to Section 9-015 of the Zoning Ordinance, this special exception shall automatically expire, without notice, twelve (12) months after the date of approval unless, at a minimum, the use has been established or construction has commenced and been diligently prosecuted as evidenced by the issuance of an approval for a grading plan, site plan, or minor site plan concurrent with a water quality impact assessment. The Board of Supervisors may grant additional time to establish the use or to commence construction if a written request for additional time is filed with the Zoning Administrator prior to the date of expiration of the special exception. The request must specify the amount of additional time requested, the basis for the amount of time requested and an explanation of why additional time is required.
March 5, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

SITE REVIEW AND INSPECTION DIVISION

STAFF REPORT

RESOURCE PROTECTION AREA
ENCROACHMENT EXCEPTION #5203-WRPA-010-2 &
WATER QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT #5203-WQ-019-2

In conjunction with Rezoning Application # SE 2013-MV-011

APPLICANTS: Kimberly B. & Kelly P. Campbell

ZONING: R-E: Residential Estate District
(0.5 Dwellings Units/Acre)

PARCEL: 122-2 ((2)) 7

LOCATION: 11727 River Drive

SITE ACREAGE: 1.56 acres

PLAN MAP: Residential, 0.1 – 0.2 dwelling units/acre (du/ac)

PROPOSAL: Exception to allow encroachment into the 1993 RPA for installation of a rip-rap bulkhead along a deteriorating shoreline located on the Potomac River within established RPA as indicated on the plan as well as underground geotechnical stabilization and wooden walks.
SITE AREA OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: 1.56 acres

ENCROACHMENT AREA REQUESTED: 0.31 acres

PUBLIC HEARING: General RPA Encroachment Requests under CBPO Section 118-6-9 associated with a Rezoning Application (RZ) require approval by the Board of Supervisors through a public hearing held conjunction with the public hearing for the RZ per procedures of CBPO Section 118-6-3(d).

DESCRIPTION: The applicant proposes installation of a rip-rap bulkhead along a deteriorating shoreline located on the Potomac River within established RPA as indicated on the plan as well as underground geotechnical stabilization and wooden walks.

BACKGROUND: The property is located in Hallowing Point River Estates Lot 7 section 1. The property address is 11727 River Drive Lorton VA, 22079. The lot has an existing single family house that was built in 2005. Please be noted that the house was built in 2005 after the establishment of 2003 RPA.

DOCUMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE: In addition to Rezoning Application # SE 2013-MV-011, following information is part of this application:

1. RPA Encroachment Exception Application and RPA Encroachment Exception Justification Statement dated February 26, 2014.
ANALYSIS: The proposed impervious surface within the site is 16.8% so no BMP is required per CBPO 118-3-2. The applicant proposes grading, installation of riprap and wooden walk which will disturb 13,786 square feet of 1993 RPA.

REQUIRED FINDINGS: General RPA Encroachment Exceptions may be granted only upon the findings listed in CBPO Section 118-6-6 and the additional finding in CBPO Section 118-6-9. It is the opinion of County staff that the required findings, as discussed below (118-6-6 (a) through (f) of CBPO), have been satisfied with this application.

a) *The exception to the criteria is the minimum necessary to afford relief.*

The proposed walk will not increase the amount of impervious surface within the RPA and is a minimum necessary to afford relief.

b) *Granting the exception will not confer upon the applicant any special privileges that are denied by this part other property owners who are subject to its provisions and who are similarly situated.*

Installation of wooden walks to have access to the dock will not be a special privilege to the applicant.

c) *The exception is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the CBPO and is not of substantial detriment to water quality.*

Wooden walk will not increase impervious area within the RPA and is not of substantial detriment to water quality.

d) *The exception request is not based upon conditions or circumstances that are self-created or self-imposed.*
The grade between the house and the dock is very steep approx. 60% and wooden walk will increase safety to the pedestrians.

e) Reasonable and appropriate conditions are imposed, as warranted, that will prevent the allowed activity from causing a degradation of water quality.

The proposed Development Conditions are included in Attachment A that will prevent the allowed activity from causing a degradation of water quality.

f) General RPA Encroachment Exception requests pursuant to CBPO 118-6-9 are subject to the additional finding that the water quality benefits resulting from the proposed facility or improvement exceed the associated water quality detriments.

The application proposes to stabilize, and reseed the disturbed area within and outside of the RPA. Furthermore, the applicant intends to establish 13,786 square feet of buffer area by planting 7 overstory trees, 16 under story trees, and 348 shrubs and groundcovers, which improves water quality

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of RPA Exception (#5203-WRPA-010-2) and Water Quality Impact Assessment (#5203-WQ-019-2). If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve RPA Exception (#5203-WRPA-010-2) and Water Quality Impact Assessment (#5203-WQ-019-2), staff recommends that the approval be subject to the Development Conditions contained in that the approval be subject to the Development Conditions listed in Appendix A dated 3/5/2014.

It should be noted that it is not the intent of staff to recommend that the Board, in adopting any conditions, relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any other applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards.

It should be further noted that the content of this report reflects the analysis and recommendations of the staff; it does not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors. For further information, contact the Site Development and Inspections Division, Office of Land Development
Mark D. Crain
ENCROACHMENT EXCEPTION #5203-WRPA-010-2 &
WATER QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT #5203-WQ-019-2

Services, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, 12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 535, Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5505, 703-324-1720.
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

RPA Exception (#5203-WRPA-010-2) and Water Quality Impact Assessment (#5203-WQ-019-2).

If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve RPA Exception (#5203-WRPA-010-2) and Water Quality Impact Assessment (#5203-WQ-019-2) for the property located at Tax Map 122-2 ((2)) 7 to allow encroachment in the RPA pursuant to Section 118-6-9 of the Fairfax County Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (CBPO), staff recommends the following development conditions:

1. This RPA Encroachment Exception is granted for and runs with the land indicated in this application and is not transferable to other land.

2. This RPA Encroachment Exception is granted only for the purposes, structures or uses indicated on the plat approved with the application, as qualified by these development conditions.

3. Any plan submitted pursuant to this RPA Exception shall be in substantial conformance with the Hallowing point River Estates lot 7 Section 1 prepared by Harold A. Logan Associates P.C. dated 02/28/2014.

4. In order that the land disturbed within the RPA can be considered to be the minimum necessary to afford relief for the proposed construction, indigenous vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent possible, the limits of clearing and grading must be clearly shown on any development plan, and adequate access and areas for stockpiles must be included. Any development plan will be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). The limits of clearing and grading must be strictly observed and enforced. Any encroachment into, and/or disturbance of, the RPA not shown on the approved plan will be considered a violation of the CBPO and is subject to the penalties of CBPO Article 9.

5. In order that the project is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the CBPO, does not have a substantial detriment to water quality, and meets the additional performance criteria for RPAs, vegetated buffer area(s) shall be established in the disturbed areas.
within and outside of the RPA on the property and shall be of a total area of at least 13,786 square feet (0.32 acre). The size, species, density and locations shall be consistent with the planting requirements of CBPO Section 118-3-3(f), or a vegetation plan that is equally effective in retarding runoff, preventing erosion, and filtering non-point source pollution from runoff, as determined by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). The vegetation shall be randomly placed to achieve a relatively even spacing throughout the buffer. Notwithstanding any statements on the Plat and in the Water Quality Impact Assessment (WQIA), the size, species, density, and locations of the trees, shrubs, and groundcover will be subject to approval of the Director of the DPWES. In the absence of sufficient area required for the vegetative buffer within the RPA, the applicant may choose to place some buffer outside the RPA.

6. In order that the proposed construction activity does not degrade water quality, adequate erosion and sediment control measures, including, but not limited to, a super-silt fence shall be employed during construction within the RPA, and shall remain in place, and be properly maintained, for the duration of the land disturbing activity within the RPA until such time that the disturbed area is completely stabilized.

This approval, contingent on the above noted conditions, does not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any applicable Federal, State, or County ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the approval of any required plans and permits through established procedures, and this RPA Exception shall not be valid until this has been accomplished.
SPECIAL EXCEPTION AFFIDAVIT

DATE: 1/27/2014
(enter date affidavit is notarized)

I, Mark D. Crain, do hereby state that I am an applicant's authorized agent listed in Par. 1(a) below

(check one) [ ] applicant
[ √ ] applicant’s authorized agent listed in Par. 1(a) below

in Application No.(s): SE 2013-MV-011
(enter County-assigned application number(s), e.g. SE 88-V-001)

and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the following information is true:

1(a). The following constitutes a listing of the names and addresses of all APPLICANTS, TITLE OWNERS, CONTRACT PURCHASERS, and LESSEES of the land described in the application,* and, if any of the foregoing is a TRUSTEE,** each BENEFICIARY of such trust, and all ATTORNEYS and REAL ESTATE BROKERS, and all AGENTS who have acted on behalf of any of the foregoing with respect to the application:

(NOTE: All relationships to the application listed above in BOLD print are to be disclosed. Multiple relationships may be listed together, e.g., Attorney/Agent, Contract Purchaser/Lessee, Applicant/Title Owner, etc. For a multiparcel application, list the Tax Map Number(s) of the parcel(s) for each owner(s) in the Relationship column.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly B. Campbell</td>
<td>11727 River Drive  Lorton, VA 22079 11727 River Drive  Lorton, VA 22079</td>
<td>Applicant/Title Owner  Applicant/Title Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly P. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold A. Logan Associates, PC</td>
<td>9114 Industry Drive  Manassas Park, VA 20111 9114 Industry Drive  Manassas Park, VA 20111</td>
<td>Agent and Attorney-in-Fact for Kimberly B. and Kelly P. Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold A. Logan</td>
<td>9114 Industry Drive  Manassas Park, VA 20111 9114 Industry Drive  Manassas Park, VA 20111</td>
<td>Agent and Attorney-in-Fact for Kimberly B. and Kelly P. Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark D. Crain</td>
<td>12701 Marblestone Drive #350  Prince William, VA 22192 12701 Marblestone Drive #350  Prince William, VA 22192</td>
<td>Agent and Attorney-in-Fact for Kimberly B. and Kelly P. Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton &amp; Duling, LC</td>
<td>10381 Main Street, 3rd Floor,  Fairfax, VA 22030 10381 Main Street, 3rd Floor,  Fairfax, VA 22030</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason E. Hickman, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI, Inc.</td>
<td>1889 Preston White Drive #104  Reston, VA 20191 1889 Preston White Drive #104  Reston, VA 20191</td>
<td>Agent  Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark J. Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Structure Consulting, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent  Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth G. Fraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(check if applicable) [ ] There are more relationships to be listed and Par. 1(a) is continued on a “Special Exception Attachment to Par. 1(a)” form.

* In the case of a condominium, the title owner, contract purchaser, or lessee of 10% or more of the units in the condominium.

** List as follows: Name of trustee, Trustee for (name of trust, if applicable), for the benefit of: (state name of each beneficiary).

FORM SEA-1 Updated (7/1/06)

* Added since the printing of the 12/26/13 Staff Report.
SPECIAL EXCEPTION AFFIDAVIT

DATE: 1/27/2014
(enter date affidavit is notarized)

for Application No. (s): SE 2013-MV-011
(enter County-assigned application number(s))

1(b). The following constitutes a listing*** of the SHAREHOLDERS of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 10 or less shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders:

(NOTE: Include SOLE PROPRIETORSHIPS, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES, and REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS herein.)

CORPORATION INFORMATION

NAME & ADDRESS OF CORPORATION: (enter complete name and number, street, city, state, and zip code)  Harold A. Logan Associates, PC  9114 Industry Drive Manassas Park, VA 20111

DESCRIPTION OF CORPORATION: (check one statement)

[✓] There are 10 or less shareholders, and all of the shareholders are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, and all of the shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

NAMES OF SHAREHOLDERS: (enter first name, middle initial and last name)

Harold A. Logan

(check if applicable) [✓] There is more corporation information and Par. 1(b) is continued on a “Special Exception Affidavit Attachment 1(b)” form.

*** All listings which include partnerships, corporations, or trusts, to include the names of beneficiaries, must be broken down successively until: (a) only individual persons are listed or (b) the listing for a corporation having more than 10 shareholders has no shareholder owning 10% or more of any class of stock. In the case of an APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land that is a partnership, corporation, or trust, such successive breakdown must include a listing and further breakdown of all of its partners, of its shareholders as required above, and of beneficiaries of any trusts. Such successive breakdown must also include breakdowns of any partnership, corporation, or trust owning 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land. Limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts and their equivalents are treated as corporations, with members being deemed the equivalent of shareholders; managing members shall also be listed. Use footnote numbers to designate partnerships or corporations, which have further listings on an attachment page, and reference the same footnote numbers on the attachment page.

FORM SEA-1 Updated (7/1/06)
Special Exception Attachment to Par. 1(b)

DATE: 1/27/2014
(enter date affidavit is notarized)

for Application No. (s): SE 2013-MV-011
(enter County-assigned application number (s))

NAME & ADDRESS OF CORPORATION: (enter complete name, number, street, city, state, and zip code)
- Compton & Duling, LC 12701 Marblestone Drive #350 Prince William, VA 22192

DESCRIPTION OF CORPORATION: (check one statement)
[ ] There are 10 or less shareholders, and all of the shareholders are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, and all of the shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

NAMES OF THE SHAREHOLDERS: (enter first name, middle initial, and last name)
- Jason E. Hickman
- Geary H. Rogers
- Thomas D. Duling
- Marye C. Allen

NAME & ADDRESS OF CORPORATION: (enter complete name, number, street, city, state, and zip code)
- MJCI, Inc. 10381 Main Street, 3rd Floor, Fairfax, VA 22030

DESCRIPTION OF CORPORATION: (check one statement)
[ ] There are 10 or less shareholders, and all of the shareholders are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, and all of the shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.
[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

NAMES OF THE SHAREHOLDERS: (enter first name, middle initial, and last name)
- Mark J. Cross
- Kimberly F. Cross

(check if applicable) ☑ There is more corporation information and Par. 1(b) is continued further on a “Special Exception Attachment to Par. 1(b)” form.
Special Exception Attachment to Par. 1(b)

DATE: 1/27/2014

for Application No. (s): SE 2013-MV-011

NAME & ADDRESS OF CORPORATION: (enter complete name, number, street, city, state, and zip code)

Soil & Structure, Inc. 1889 Preston White Drive #104 Reston, VA 20191

DESCRIPTION OF CORPORATION: (check one statement)

[ ] There are 10 or less shareholders, and all of the shareholders are listed below.

[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, and all of the shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

NAMES OF THE SHAREHOLDERS: (enter first name, middle initial, and last name)

Kenneth G. Frinine
Amol Fulambarkar

NAME & ADDRESS OF CORPORATION: (enter complete name, number, street, city, state, and zip code)

DESCRIPTION OF CORPORATION: (check one statement)

[ ] There are 10 or less shareholders, and all of the shareholders are listed below.

[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, and all of the shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

[ ] There are more than 10 shareholders, but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

NAMES OF THE SHAREHOLDERS: (enter first name, middle initial, and last name)

(continued on a separate form)

There is more corporation information and Par. 1(b) is continued further on a "Special Exception Attachment to Par. 1(b)" form.

FORM SEA-1 Updated (7/1/06)

Added since the printing of the 12/26/13 Staff Report.
SPECIAL EXCEPTION AFFIDAVIT

DATE: 1/27/2014
(enter date affidavit is notarized)

for Application No. (s): SE 2013-MV-011
(enter County-assigned application number(s))

1(c). The following constitutes a listing*** of all of the PARTNERS, both GENERAL and LIMITED, in any partnership disclosed in this affidavit:

PARTNERSHIP INFORMATION

PARTNERSHIP NAME & ADDRESS: (enter complete name, and number, street, city, state, and zip code)

(check if applicable) [ ] The above-listed partnership has no limited partners.

NAMES AND TITLE OF THE PARTNERS (enter first name, middle initial, last name, and title, e.g. General Partner, Limited Partner, or General and Limited Partner)

(check if applicable) [ ] There is more partnership information and Par. 1(c) is continued on a “Special Exception Affidavit Attachment to Par. 1(c)” form.

*** All listings which include partnerships, corporations, or trusts, to include the names of beneficiaries, must be broken down successively until: (a) only individual persons are listed or (b) the listing for a corporation having more than 10 shareholders has no shareholder owning 10% or more of any class of stock. In the case of an APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land that is a partnership, corporation, or trust, such successive breakdown must include a listing and further breakdown of all of its partners, of its shareholders as required above, and of beneficiaries of any trusts. Such successive breakdown must also include breakdowns of any partnership, corporation, or trust owning 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land. Limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts and their equivalents are treated as corporations, with members being deemed the equivalent of shareholders; managing members shall also be listed. Use footnote numbers to designate partnerships or corporations, which have further listings on an attachment page, and reference the same footnote numbers on the attachment page.

FORM SEA-1 Updated (7/1/06)
SPECIAL EXCEPTION AFFIDAVIT

DATE: 1/27/2014
(enter date affidavit is notarized)

for Application No. (s): SE 2013-MV-011
(enter County-assigned application number(s))

1(d). One of the following boxes must be checked:

[ ] In addition to the names listed in Paragraphs 1(a), 1(b), and 1(c) above, the following is a listing of any and all other individuals who own in the aggregate (directly and as a shareholder, partner, and beneficiary of a trust) 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land:

[✓] Other than the names listed in Paragraphs 1(a), 1(b), and 1(c) above, no individual owns in the aggregate (directly and as a shareholder, partner, and beneficiary of a trust) 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land.

2. That no member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, or any member of his or her immediate household owns or has any financial interest in the subject land either individually, by ownership of stock in a corporation owning such land, or through an interest in a partnership owning such land.

EXCEPT AS FOLLOWS: (NOTE: If answer is none, enter “NONE” on the line below.)
NONE

(check if applicable) [ ] There are more interests to be listed and Par. 2 is continued on a “Special Exception Attachment to Par. 2” form.
SPECIAL EXCEPTION AFFIDAVIT

DATE: 1/27/2014

(enter date affidavit is notarized)

3. That within the twelve-month period prior to the public hearing of this application, no member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, or any member of his or her immediate household, either directly or by way of partnership in which any of them is a partner, employee, agent, or attorney, or through a partner of any of them, or through a corporation in which any of them is an officer, director, employee, agent, or attorney or holds 10% or more of the outstanding bonds or shares of stock of a particular class, has, or has had any business or financial relationship, other than any ordinary depositor or customer relationship with or by a retail establishment, public utility, or bank, including any gift or donation having a value of more than $100, singularly or in the aggregate, with any of those listed in Par. 1 above.

EXCEPT AS FOLLOWS: (NOTE: If answer is none, enter "NONE" on line below.)

NONE

NOTE: Business or financial relationships of the type described in this paragraph that arise after the filing of this application and before each public hearing must be disclosed prior to the public hearings. See Par. 4 below.)

(check if applicable) [ ] There are more disclosures to be listed and Par. 3 is continued on a "Special Exception Attachment to Par. 3" form.

4. That the information contained in this affidavit is complete, that all partnerships, corporations, and trusts owning 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE* of the land have been listed and broken down, and that prior to each and every public hearing on this matter, I will reexamine this affidavit and provide any changed or supplemental information, including business or financial relationships of the type described in Paragraph 3 above, that arise on or after the date of this application.

WITNESS the following signature:

[ ] Applicant

[ ] Applicant's Authorized Agent

Mark D. Crain (Agent and Attorney-in-Fact)
(type or print first name, middle initial, last name, and & title of signee)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of January 2014, in the State/Comm. of Virginia, County/City of Manassas.

Andrea P. Madden, Notary Public

My commission expires: 9-30-2016

AGRM SEA-1 Updated (7/1/06)
Kenneth Fraine, P.E.
Soil & Structure Consulting, Inc.
1889 Preston White Drive, Suite 104
Reston, Virginia 20191

Reference: Geotechnical Report for Hallowing Point River Estates Lot 7 (aka 11727 River Drive), Project #5203-SR-009-6, Tax Map #112-2 ((2)) 0007, Mount Vernon District, Type: Residential

Dear Mr. Fraine:

The supplementary report dated March 3, 2014 and the previous geotechnical report dated October 4, 2013 and response dated November 15, 2013, all prepared on behalf of Kelly & Kimberly Campbell with your previous Project Number 101.000-13, have been reviewed. The report was resubmitted to satisfy development condition #8 of Special Exception Application number SE 2004-MV-038 and to partially support the site construction plan prepared by Harold A. Logan Associates, P.C. (submission number 5203-INF-006-3). The supplemented report is determined to be generally acceptable as-noted below:

1. The final grading plan shall show the approximate horizontal extents of the SRT piles and additional rip-rap being recommended along portions of the slope and shoreline being recommended for slope-stabilization. In addition, a note requiring building permit for the SRT piles should be placed on the plan. The final structural design of the SRT piles (including final depth, plate size, spacing, lateral pile capacity, etc.) will be reviewed during the building permit application.

The recommendations and details of the approved report shall be shown as requirements on the final construction plan/s (Fairfax County Public Facilities Manual [PFM], Section 4-0401). Per the PFM, the geotechnical engineer shall review the final (revised) construction (site) plan/s, and state his opinion as to whether or not the plan/s have been prepared in accordance with the approved recommendations of the approved report and revision/s.

The following requirements of Section 4-0502 of the PFM and Section 107-1-6 of The Code of the County of Fairfax, Virginia, shall be shown as a note on the approved plans:

1. All construction involving problem soil must be performed under the full-time inspection of the geotechnical engineer.
2. The geotechnical engineer shall furnish a written opinion to the County as to whether or not work has been performed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the issuance of any occupancy or use permit.

3. Review and approval of plans, specifications and reports by the County, with or without recommendations by the Geotechnical Review Board, shall in no way relieve the developer of the responsibility for the design, construction and performance of the structures, pavement and slopes on the project and damage to surrounding properties.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 703-324-1720 or at email Umakanthan.Sivapalarasah@fairfaxcounty.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Umakanthan Sivapalarasah, P.E.
Chief Geotechnical Engineer
Site Development and Inspections Division (SDID)
Herrity Building, Suite 535

Attachments:  Review comments from GRB Member 1
               Review comments from GRB Member 2
               Review comments from GRB Member 3

cc:  Mark Crain, L.S., Harold A. Logan Associates, P.C.
     Kelly & Kim Campbell
     Bijan Sistani, P.E., Chief, South Branch, SDID, LDS, DPWES
     Geotechnical File
March 10, 2014

Mr. Kanthan Siva, PE  
Chief Geotechnical Engineer  
Department of Public Works and Environmental Services  
Land Development Services, Site Development and Inspection Division  
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 535  
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5503

Reference: HALLLOWING POINT RIVER ESTATES Sec 1 Lot 7  
(Campbell Residence)  
COUNTY SUBMISSION NO. 5203-SR-009-6

Dear Mr. Siva:

I have received the geotechnical letter report titled "Slope Stability Analysis and Design of Section 1Slope, 11727 River Drive, Alexandria, Virginia", dated March 3, 2014, prepared by Soil & Structure Consulting and a grading plan, dated February 28, 2014, prepared by Harold A. Logan. As a result of my review, I agree with use of SRT piles or plate pile to enhance the global stability of the slope up to an acceptable factor of safety of 1.25. I recommend approving this report after the following comments are adequately addressed:

1- The lateral capacity of an SRT pile, 13 feet long, spaced at a 4'x4' grid, which is used in the stability analysis, was assigned a value of 2,250 lbs/pile. Was the SRT lateral capacity based on an Lpile analysis? If so the Lpile output should be submitted to the County.

2- It should be noted that SRT piles in the first three rows are embedded in different soil layers (Soils 1 and 2) while the rest of the pile are embedded in Soil 1 only. Accordingly, they should have different lateral capacities.
March 25, 2014

County of Fairfax
Dept of Public Works & Environmental Services
Land Development Services
Attn: Mr. Kanthan Siva, P.E.
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite No. 444
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5503

Re: Hallowing Point River Estates Sec 1 Lot 7
   5203-SR-009-6
   Lorton, Virginia

Dear Mr. Siva:

In accordance with your request, I read the Soil & Structure Consulting, Inc. (SSC) letter report dated March 3, 2014, which provides an alternate stabilization plan for the "undisturbed" section of the slope. The consultant has proposed to use SRT piles, and has provided stability analyses indicating that a satisfactory factor of safety (greater than 1.25) is achievable with this system.

I have no objection to the revised plan as proposed by SSC, and recommend approval of the amended report. If you have any questions regarding the above, please call.
March 15, 2014

Mr. Kanthan Siva, P.E.
Chief Geotechnical Engineer
Environmental and Facilities Review Division
Office of Site Development Services
Department of Public Works and Environmental Management
Fairfax County, VA

Project # 5203-SR-009-6

Dear Siva:

In accordance with your memorandum dated March 5, 2014, I have reviewed the referenced geotechnical engineering report and civil drawing. Specifically, I have reviewed the following documents:

1.) Slope Stability Analysis and Design of “Section 1” Slope, 11727 River Drive, Alexandria, VA, prepared by Soil & Structure Consulting, dated October 4, 2013


3.) Fairfax County memo dated March 5, 2014.

The special exception plans do not include the slope stabilization measures recommended in the letter report by Soil & Structure Consulting. The drawings should be updated to reflect Soil & Structure Consulting’s recommendation prior to issuing a permit.

If you have any questions concerning the above information please do not hesitate to contact me.