



# Howard County

---

*Department of Planning and Zoning*

**Subject:** Council Resolution No. 52-2009, Route 1 Manual

**To:** Lonnie R. Robbins, Chief Administrative Officer

**From:** Marsha S. McLaughlin, Director  
Department of Planning and Zoning

**Date:** May 21, 2009

The County Council adopted the Route 1 Manual by Resolution No. 175-2003 on March 1, 2004. Since the adoption of that resolution, the County Council has adopted several Zoning Regulation amendments affecting the three zoning districts exclusive to the Route 1 corridor. The Council approved CB-56-2008 and CB-03-2009 which affect permitted land uses, setbacks, and open space and amenity area requirements. In addition, the Council approved CB-24-2008 which established a Design Advisory Panel that reviews development areas subject to the requirements of the Route 1 Manual.

In 2008, the Maryland State Highway Administration completed its study of the Route 1 corridor and issued its report, the US 1 Corridor Improvement Strategy. This report recommends a change in the US 1 roadway and its streetscape elements. Howard County and the State Highway Administration signed a letter of agreement in 2008 consenting to abide by the recommendations in the report.

The Department of Planning and Zoning has revised the Route 1 Manual to reflect these changes. The attached table, Summary of Proposed Route 1 Manual Changes, lists the new and substantive changes and identifies the location of relevant text in the Adopted 2004 and Proposed 2009 Manuals.

DPZ recommends approval of the revised Route 1 Manual.

There are no known budgetary considerations.

#### Attachment

cc: Jennifer Sager, Legislative Coordinator  
Jessica Feldmark, Chief of Staff  
William Mackey, Chief, Division of Comprehensive & Community Planning  
Dace Blaumanis, Division of Comprehensive & Community Planning  
Elmina J. Hilsenrath, Chief, Resource Conservation Division

# Summary of Proposed Route 1 Manual Changes

March 2009

The following describes new and substantive changes to the 2004 Route 1 Manual. Minor changes and editing are not included. A version of the text that shows all additions to and deletions from the 2004 Manual is available from DPZ. Some changes may occur in multiple chapters but are listed only once.

Page in 2004 Manual	Page in 2009 Manual	Substantive Change	Comments
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>			
1	1	Adds Foreword explaining purpose of revised Manual	Includes recommendations from SHA's US 1 Corridor Implementation Strategy report (SHA report) and Zoning Regulation Amendment (ZRA) changes approved by the County Council
3	3	Emphasizes pedestrian connectivity and bicycles as an alternative transportation choice	SHA comments
	3-4	Describes new Design Advisory Panel review required of many Route 1 Corridor projects	County Council established the Panel in June 2008
	4	Adds requirement for a vicinity analysis with initial plan submission	Requirement initiated by SHA report
5	6	Specifies on-street parking is parallel and at off-peak hours only	SHA comments
	6	Encourages access from local roads	SHA comments and report
<b>CHAPTER 2: CORRIDOR ZONING DISTRICTS</b>			
12	12	In TOD Districts, increases building setback from 0' to 10' along primary circulation routes	From Council Bill 3-2009
16	16	Allows CAC projects 20 acres or more to have a food store and a commercial use greater than 20,000 sq ft	From Council Bill 56-2008
16	16	Adds 25% MIHU requirement for development that replaces a mobile home park	This may change based on County Council action on a pending ZRA 110
16	16	In CAC Districts, adds 75% property frontage requirement to minor collectors or higher classification	Requirement extends urban style design beyond Route 1 frontages
<b>CHAPTER 3: STREETScape</b>			
	22	Describes change to 6-lane US 1 roadway with median and an increased road network	From SHA report
22	23	Clarifies responsibility for pedestrian lights	DPW comments
	23	Lists responsible parties for maintenance of streetscape	As agreed by County and SHA
23	23-24	Lists and provides illustrations of four required US 1 design right-of-way conditions for the corridor	From SHA report, see cross sections, and Highway Needs Inventory
	25	Recommends street network connections comply with SHA report	From SHA report
	26-27	Lists and provides illustrations for required US 1 streetscape improvements for specific corridor segments	From SHA report, see cross sections
25	27	Eliminates certain recommendations for special	Superseded by recommendations in SHA

Page in 2004 Manual	Page in 2009 Manual	Substantive Change	Comments
		paving and specifies SHA approval for special crosswalks	report and SHA comments
26	28-29	Clarifies compliance with AASHTO standards for planting and provides added guidance for tree locations	SHA comments
26	28-29	Lists required street tree locations	From SHA report, see cross sections
27	28	Recommends the use of native plants as street trees	Consistent with DPZ policies
	28	Lists prohibited trees, including invasive exotic trees	Consistent with DPZ policies
29	31	Clarifies that sidewalk dining is not an allowed use in the right-of-way	Consistent with Department of Public Works (DPW) policy
28-29	31-32	Provides information about new required pedestrian light fixture	Consistent with DPW policy and SHA report
<b>CHAPTER 4: SITE DESIGN</b>			
31	33	In TOD Districts, increases building setback from 0' to 10' along primary circulation routes	From Council Bill 3-2009
31-32	33-34	In CAC Districts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>requires 10' setback for buildings along US 1</li> <li>allows 0'-10' setback from other roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Council Bill 3-2009</li> <li>Needed to be clarified for CAC Districts that are off US 1</li> </ul>
	35	Adds requirement to design access from lower classification public road for properties with multiple frontages	From SHA report
	37	Provides for bicycle parking	SHA comments
	41	Shows urban bioretention stormwater management as a recommended option	Appropriate alternative for CAC and TOD sites
	44-45	Adds open space requirement for CAC projects 20 acres or greater	From Council Bill 56-2008
	44-45	Describes differences between amenity and open space areas	From Council Bill 56-2008
<b>CHAPTER 5: BUILDING DESIGN</b>			
	47-48	Calls for detailed architectural elevations on site development plans and building sections for sites with grade changes	To aid in understanding and evaluating development proposals
	49	Includes recommendations for design of parking structures	Guidance needed given increased use of such structures in the corridor
<b>CHAPTER 6: APPLICATION OF STANDARDS</b>			
	53	Clarifies that properties adjacent to US 1 are subject to Design Advisory Panel review	Reaffirms consistency with Council Bill 24-2008
	56	Specifies use of Alternate Compliance Request form	Clarifies procedure
<b>APPENDIX</b>			
53-54	57-58	Updates Summary Matrix consistent with Manual changes	