RPA ADMINISTRATIVE WAIVER APPLICATION
Expansion of principal nonconforming structure

This application is for permitting encroachments into the Resource Protection Area 100-foot buffer area that must be administratively approved as outlined in Section 9 VAC 10-20-130 4, Section 9 VAC 10-20-150 A (1), and Section 9 VAC 10-20-150 C (4) of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulation.

RESPONSIBLE LAND DISTURBER (Required if over 2,500 SF of land disturbance)

Name: _____ RLD Number:_____
Phone:_____ Fax:_____

PROJECT INFORMATION

Parcel Number: _____ E911/Street Address:_____
Magisterial District:_____ _____
Lot Size (in acres):_____ Zoning District:_____
Lot Recordation Date: _____

Existing land use: ☐ Single Family Residential ☐ Multifamily Residential ☐ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☐ Office/Mixed

I. REASON FOR ADMINISTRATIVE WAIVER REQUEST (check one)

- ☐ Expansion of nonconforming principal structure (ex. house)
- ☐ Other _____

II. SITE INFORMATION: In box below, please describe proposed project:

III. SUBMITTAL INFORMATION

The following elements should be submitted with this *Request for an RPA Administrative Waiver*

A. Site Drawing

A site drawing, which shows the following, must be attached to this application.

1. Location of the Resource Protection Area, including the 100-foot buffer area.
2. Location proposed structure(s) including all existing and proposed impervious cover such as buildings, patios, walkways, driveways, etc.
3. Location of utilities easements, drainfield and reserve area.
4. Location and nature of existing vegetation onsite, including the number and type of trees and other vegetation to be removed in the RPA buffer area as indicated above.
5. Type and location of replacement vegetation.
6. Water Quality Best Management Practice (BMP) if part of the proposed mitigation, including
   a. Design details

b. BMP Maintenance agreement

B. Water Quality Impact Assessment

Preservation of Indigenous Vegetation/ Land Disturbance:

Area of site _____ft.^{2}

Area of disturbance for proposed expansion activity _____ ft.^{2}
If applicable, area of woody vegetation proposed to be disturbed for:
impervious area _____ft.^{2}
access/grading area _____ ft.^{2}
total woody vegetation disturbance _____ ft.^{2}

Mitigation plantings proposed:

Vegetation to be planted: _____ ft.^{2}
_____ plants/acre

Types and numbers of proposed vegetation to be replanted:_____
_____

(Vegetation proposed for mitigation should work towards satisfying all buffer functions described in 9 VAC 10-20-130.3, including retarding runoff, preventing erosion and filtering non-point source pollution from runoff. Mitigation species should be native to the local environment and reference sites should be consulted where possible.) Please refer to the Buffer Guidance Manual for assistance. Lawn grass is not appropriate as a replacement planting.

Erosion and Sediment Control:

Has applicant demonstrated compliance with the local E&S control regulations or indicated that compliance will be required prior to issuance of any land-disturbing permits?

□ Yes □ No

Stormwater Management:

Has applicant demonstrated compliance with the requirements for stormwater management including the required no net increase between pre-development and post-development conditions or proposed to install the required BMP based on the percentage of imperviousness as outlined under the technology option of the Virginia Stormwater Management Handbook?

□ Yes □ No

Review Notes for proposed expansion of a PRINCIPAL nonconforming structure

1.	The proposed expansion is for a PRINCIPAL nonconforming structure.	YES	NO
2.	There will be no net increase in nonpoint source pollutant load as a result of the proposed expansion.	YES	NO
3.	The proposed expansion is the minimum necessary to afford relief.	YES	NO
4.	Granting the administrative waiver will NOT confer any special privileges upon the applicant that are otherwise denied to property owners similarly situation.	YES	NO
5.	The proposed expansion is in harmony with purpose and intent of the Bay Act.	YES	NO
6.	The proposed expansion is NOT of substantial detriment to water quality.	YES	NO
7.	The administrative waiver is NOT based upon conditions/circumstances that are self-created or self-imposed.	YES	NO
8.	The proposed mitigation plan will prevent the allowed activity from degrading water quality.	YES	NO
9.	Required mitigation is REASONABLE and APPROPRIATE.	YES	NO

If the response to any of the nine questions is NO, the proposed development project does not meet the required criteria of the Bay Act Regulations, and should not be granted. Applicant should be contacted for further discussion of proposed project.

Additional Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____