Land Development Code Update
Phase 1: Development Regulations Assessment
Summary

• Project Background and Update

• Discussion Topics related to Columbia
PROJECT BACKGROUND AND UPDATE
Phase 1:

- An assessment of the current land development regulation
- Including zoning, subdivision, and manuals
- Including New Town zoning (but not covenants)
- Not including revisions to Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)
- Results in an Assessment (of the current regulations) and an Annotated Outline (of how they could be restructured and improved)
- To be released in late 2017 or early 2018 following staff review

Phase 2: A separate contract to update the Development Regulations (2018-2019)
Draft Document – Part 2

• Annotated Outline

ZONING REGULATIONS
100.0: General Provisions
101.0: Rules of Construction
102.0: Violations, Enforcement, and Penalties
103.0: Definitions
104.0: RC Rural Conservation
105.0: RR Rural Residential
106.0: DEO Density Exchange Option Overlay
106.1: County Preservation Easements
107.0: R-ED Residential: Environmental Development
108.0: R-20 Residential: Single
109.0: R-12 Residential: Single
110.0: R-SC Residential: Single Cluster
111.0: R-SA-8 Residential Single Attached
111.1: R-H-ED Residential: Historic – Environmental
112.0: R-A-15 Residential: Apartments
112.1: R-APT Residential: Apartments
113.0: R-MM Residential: Mobile Home
113.2: R-SI Residential: Senior Institutional
113.3: I Institutional Overlay
114.0: Historic District
114.1: R-VH Residential: Village Housing
114.2: HO Historic: Office
114.3: HC Historic: Commercial
115.0: POR Planned Office Research
116.0: PEC Planned Employment Center
117.0: BRX Business Rural Crossroads
117.1: BR Business Rural
117.3: OT Office Transition
117.4: CCT Community Center Transition
118.0: B-1 Business: Local
119.0: B-2 Business: General
120.0: SC Shopping Center
121.0: CE Community Enhancement Floating
121.1: CR Commercial Redevelopment
122.0: M-1 Manufacturing: Light
123.0: M-2 Manufacturing: Heavy
124.0: SW Solid Waste Overlay
125.0: NT New Town
126.0: PGCC Planned Golf Course Community
127.0: MXD Mixed Use Districts
127.1: PSC Planned Senior Community
127.2: CE Corridor Employment District
127.3: CLI Continuing Light Industrial Overlay
127.4: TOD Transit Oriented Development
127.5: CAC Corridor Activity Center
127.6: TNC Traditional Neighborhood Center
128.0: Supplementary Zoning District Regulations
129.0: Nonconforming Uses
130.0: Hearing Authority
131.0: Conditional Uses
132.0: Temporary Uses
133.0: Off-Street Parking and Loading Facilities
134.0: Outdoor Lighting

TITLE 16: PLANNING, ZONING AND SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
Subtitle 1: Subdivision and Land Development Regulations
Subtitle 2: Zoning
Subtitle 3: Board of Appeals
Subtitle 4: Street Names and House Numbers
Subtitle 5: Mobile Home Development
Subtitle 6: Historic Preservation Commission
Subtitle 7: Floodplain
Subtitle 8: Department of Planning and Zoning
Subtitle 9: Planning Board
Subtitle 10: Zoning Counsel
Subtitle 11: Adequate Public Facilities
Subtitle 12: Forest Conservation
Subtitle 13: Cemetery Preservation
Subtitle 14: Scenic Roads
Subtitle 15: Design Advisory Panel
Subtitle 16: Enforcement of the Howard County Subdivision and Land Development Regulations and the Zoning Regulations
Subtitle 17: Development Rights and Responsibilities Agreements

2. Zone Districts
3. Land Use Regulations
4. Development Standards
5. Zoning & Subdivision Procedures
6. Definitions and Rules of Construction
Project Timeline

1. Stakeholder Interviews and Public Meetings: March 2017
2. Online Survey and Comments: June 2017
3. Emerging Issues and Trade-Offs Public Meetings: July 2017
4. Diagnosis and Annotated Outline Draft: Fall 2017
5. Presentation of Draft Public Meetings: Winter 2018
Project Status

- Initial kickoff meetings with staff and administration (February)
- Two rounds of meetings with stakeholders to receive initial comments about needed changes (March & July)
- Research on existing development approvals (including all SDP/FDPs)
- Research on current zone district use and acreages
- Collected 691 comments so far
- Posted monthly summaries of comments received at https://www.howardcountymd.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=L5k0ktUPNUk%3d&portalid=0
- Prepare staff draft of Assessment and Annotated Outline
Key Topics Emerging

- Desires to stop or limit growth
- Concerns about the scale and character of infill development
- Confusing structure makes it difficult to find answers
- Continuing tensions between residential development and agricultural operations in western Howard County
- Frustration with current Conditional Uses and approval process
- Desires for higher development quality
- Frustration with development on key corridors, including Route 1, Route 40 and other corridors
- Complexity of current New Town zoning and related covenants (particularly for Downtown and Village Center redevelopment)
NEW TOWN ZONING
The current system was created to achieve the Columbia vision and to ensure that developer retained control of project through completion

- Succeeded in implementing the Columbia vision
- Partially succeeded in implementing the second goal – but some areas (i.e. Gateway and residential outparcels) were developed outside the New Town framework
Initial successes were achieved through:

– Site specific use and layout approvals (268 of them)

– Strict use controls (sometimes limited to only one or a few uses) in some cases

– Very vague standards and decision criteria in other cases

– An overlapping system of design controls imposed largely by covenants (not zoning)
The SDP/FDP/PDP system does not work well in the long run for citizens, staff, or builders

- Minimum/maximum numbers/percentages of acreages and dwelling units do not provide flexibility to respond to changes in the economy (open space minimum an exception)
- Staff must interpret very vague criteria and standards – which leads to unpredictable results
- Citizens and builders are subject to those unpredictable results
- The complex Village Center and Downtown redevelopment procedures were created in part to reduce unpredictability
The original land use control system is not well suited to current commercial and mixed-use (i.e. residential and commercial) development markets:

- Property owners need more flexible commercial and retail options, and the ability to move between them – without the need to update a site-specific use approval
- Otherwise, mixed use and commercial builders find locations outside Columbia more attractive – which weakens Village Centers
To encourage reinvestment in mixed-use and commercial areas, the national trends are to:

- Create zone districts designed for Downtown and Village Center-scale areas with strong controls over form, scale of and quality
- Define broader and more flexible categories of retail, service and commercial uses
- Allow property owners to make changes subject to approval of a site plan

More objective standards and criteria could be more closely tied to Jim Rouse’s vision.
Industrial Areas

Current system may not meet the needs of industrial areas very well

– The original vision was for industrial uses as fabrication/assembly uses, but the number of those uses has declined dramatically
– Changing technology and delivery methods have made some industrial lands uncompetitive for those uses
– Most newer ordinances define a broader range of light industrial/business park/research and development/institutional uses to reflect current markets
– Snowden River Parkway is an example of these pressures
Current system may not meet the needs of some residential areas

- Much of the residential stock is aging and will need to be rehabilitated, replaced, and improved over time
- Some neighborhoods may want to retain the current architectural style and scale in ways that are not addressed by current covenants -- others will not want that added level of control
- Others may want to allow a wider range of residential homes than are allowed by current covenants
- Consistency with outparcels could be improved
Communities that have numerous site-specific, negotiated development approvals that inhibit reinvestment often replace those with fewer, more general, and more consistent zoning districts.

New districts can be drafted to better preserve the character and scale of the area through embedded development and design standards, while allowing more flexibility to responding to changing uses and internal site layouts.

That can be done in several ways.

Options for FDP conversion:
- Leave current system in place
- Partial conversion of FDPs into NT zone districts
- Full conversion of FDPs into NT zone districts
• Concerns with retaining the current system
  – FDPs would continue to guide all future changes in New Town
  – Complex redevelopment processes would remain in place
  – Future redevelopment and amendments would continue to be unpredictable, requiring significant interpretation as markets change
  – Reinvestment would be discouraged by complexity and lack of predictability
  – Administration of the system would continue to require very significant amounts of staff, board, and elected official time
  – The system would still be designed for a relatively static vision instead of a mature city that needs to encourage and allow context-sensitive reinvestment
268 New Town FDPs

Categorized by Intended Scale and Character

New NT Residential Districts
New NT Mixed-Use Districts
New NT Non-Residential Districts
Many Options for Change

268
New Town FDPs

Categorized by Permitted Uses and Development Scale

New Standard Residential Districts
New NT Mixed-Use Districts
New Standard Non-Residential Districts

Different Filter
Different Menu of Zone Districts
Overall goals in revisiting New Town zoning

– Ensure that redevelopment is consistent with the Columbia plan and vision
– Ensure that single-family redevelopment reinforces the scale and character of existing neighborhoods
– Allow mixed use and commercial development flexibility to respond to changing markets
– Recognize the changing nature of industrial development and employment
– Simplify the redevelopment approval procedures
– Ensure retention of Columbia’s open space
QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION