LAYHILL ROAD (BONIFANT TO ICC)

EXISTING CONDITIONS: Major highway (M-16), four-lanes divided from Bonifant Road to Longmead Crossing Drive, two lanes approaching the ICC. 150-foot right-of-way master planned, but only 120’ exists in short segments. Closed section roadway with open section approaching the ICC north of Longmead Crossing. The four to five-foot sidewalks along both sides are in good condition. Bike lanes from Bonifant Road to just north of Longmead Crossing Drive.

MASTER PLAN GUIDANCE: The 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan recommends Layhill Road as four-lanes divided from MD 28 to southern plan boundary (south of Bonifant Road). Both the Aspen Hill Master Plan and CBFMP recommend bike lanes.

DISCUSSION: The existing bike lanes accommodate experienced cyclists and the sidewalks accommodate pedestrians, but they don’t accommodate child or intermediate bicyclists. Within the planned 150-foot right-of-way, widening the sidewalk to shared use path standards would be relatively easy. The east side has fewer obstructions and would improve bicycle and pedestrian access to Layhill Local Park. In addition, SHA will be constructing 2,000 linear feet of shared use path along the east side near Park Vista Drive north to the entrance of Layhill Local Park as an ICC highway community stewardship project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
- Designate the roadway as a dual bikeway to include a shared use path along the east side.
- Add the shared use path (widened sidewalk) as a CIP facility planning study to connect Bonifant Road with the community stewardship project.

Study Area D: Upper Paint Branch Stream Valley Park and Vicinity (Figure 7)

ISSUES
- Deciding whether to remove from County master plans the CBP through the park between Old Columbia Pike and New Hampshire Avenue.
- Deciding whether to accept the State Bike Plan recommendation to route the trail along parallel roads.
- Recommending road improvements that accommodate all potential trail user groups and ability levels.

DISCUSSION
The ROD didn’t include the master planned trail along this highway segment. SHA’s Plan instead routes the trail along parallel roads to bypass the park’s environmentally sensitive resources. Likewise, the Department of Parks doesn’t support putting the CBP through the park due to environmental concerns, including impervious cover impacts in the Upper Paint Branch Special Protection Area. Efforts to reduce the highway’s footprint make it unlikely the CBP could be built within the highway right-of-way. Therefore, the path would need to be constructed parallel to the highway through parkland to maintain the off-road connection.

In their first worksession, the Board decided—after considerable testimony in favor—that the hard surface park trail through Paint Branch SVP recommended in the Countywide Park Trails Plan could serve as a suitable alternative to the current master planned CBP. Staff proposed a possible alignment for this park trail during the worksession (the green dotted line on figure 7) that connects Cape May Road and Countryside Lane/Park, and to the existing
bike lanes along Briggs Chaney Road that lead to the US 29 Corridor and beyond. The ultimate location and design for this future park trail would be studied by the Department of Parks as part of a Trail Corridor Study.

PRIOR DECISIONS
The Planning Board supported the SHA route during its review of the highway’s FEIS and suggested removing SP-40 through the park from County master plans. The County Council did not support the SHA route and recommended the parallel trail CBP along the highway but within the right-of-way. The Council did not comment on routing the trail through the park and parallel to the highway.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Remove the CBP through the park from County master plans.
- Identify Fairland Road, Randolph Road, and New Hampshire Avenue as the bikeway/trail connector between US 29 Corridor and the ICC trail heading west.
- Pursue the CPTP recommendation to identify a park trail connection through the park parallel to the ICC.
- Request the Department of Parks study this park trail connector as a high priority Trail Corridor Study, and evaluate the general alignment shown on figure 7 of this plan to determine feasibility, detailed alignment, and surface type.

FAIRLAND ROAD (US 29 TO EAST RANDOLPH ROAD)
EXISTING CONDITIONS: Two-lane arterial (A-75), eight-foot shoulder both sides that function as bike lanes. Master planned right-of-way is 80 feet, existing right-of-way varies. Sidewalk along south side largely exists between East Randolph Road and just west of US 29 in fair to poor condition. Pavement is mostly four-foot asphalt, sometimes three feet changing to five-foot concrete about 900 feet west of Old Columbia Pike. Pathway merges with shoulder briefly where road crosses Paint Branch, and then disappears heading west; pedestrians can use the Paint Branch Trail extension along the road, but the two facilities aren’t connected.
Master Plan Guidance: CBFMP identifies existing bike lanes (BL-13), 1997 Fairland Master Plan identifies existing sidewalk along segment as well as existing bike lanes (EB-6).

Discussion: Only one major destination exists along the road—the Paint Branch Trail—and widening the path to a dual bikeway is difficult to justify given the anticipated low demand.

Recommendations:
• Modify master plans to support widening the existing south side sidewalk to shared use path standards, thus making the road a dual bikeway.
• If the road is widened or reconstructed, include a shared use path and a bridge over the Paint Branch in the roadway design.
• If road is not widened, add this project to the CIP as a facility planning study to widen the sidewalk to shared use path standards.

East Randolph Road (Fairland Road to New Hampshire Avenue)

Existing Conditions: Major highway (M-75), six-lanes divided. Eight-foot concrete shared use path on the north side, narrowed in places due to overgrowth, but generally in fair to good condition. Four-foot landscape buffer between the McDonalds property and Fairland Road. No buffer from the McDonalds property to New Hampshire Avenue.

Master Plan Guidance: The 1997 White Oak Master Plan calls for a Class I bikeway (EB-5). The CBFMP recommends a shared use path (SP-17).

Discussion: Generally, this segment meets the needs of all user groups. However, several small changes would greatly enhance safety, aesthetics, and mobility. A landscape buffer is recommended between the McDonalds property and New Hampshire Avenue.

Recommendations:
• Implement improvements when the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue/East Randolph Road is reconstructed.
• Relocate the path closer to property lines and where appropriate, install a landscape buffer with street trees between the trail and roadway.
Upper Paint Branch Stream Valley Park/US 29 and Vicinity

1. New Hampshire Avenue/Colesville Road south view
2. New Hampshire Avenue/Orchard Way north view
3. East Randolph Road east view
4. East Randolph Road west view
5. Fairland Road looking west near Old Columbia Pike
6. Fairland Road looking west from near US 29
7. Fairland Road/Partridge Road west view
NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE (RANDOLPH ROAD TO ICC)

EXISTING CONDITIONS: Major highway (M-12), six-lanes divided, 120-foot right-of-way. Existing sidewalk both sides in generally fair to good condition with no landscape buffer and adjacent to the curb. Bike lanes exist north of Midland Road.

MASTER PLAN GUIDANCE: The 1997 White Oak Master Plan calls for a Class II bikeway (PB-23) CBFMP recommends bike lanes (BL-11).

DISCUSSION: Except for the bike lane gap between Midland Road and Randolph Road, this road segment serves all user groups. It’s not ideal, however. A shared use path or wider sidewalk along one side would be desirable to better accommodate novice cyclists. But within the constrained right-of-way a wider sidewalk is unlikely unless the median is unlikely unless the roadway is shifted, or additional right-of-way is acquired. Many buildings are located close to the right-of-way line, making land acquisition difficult.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
• When the New Hampshire Avenue/Randolph Road intersection is reconstructed, ensure the bike lanes along both sides of MD 650 up to Midland Road and the northern MD 650 crosswalk are improved for bicycle travel (eight-foot ramps at both the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection).
• Designate the road’s west side as a shared use path to widen the sidewalk to eight feet, recognizing that additional right-of-way would be required and that the improvement is a low priority and may take a decade or longer to realize.
• Maintain existing sidewalk along east side.

Study Area E: US 29 and Vicinity (Figure 7)

ISSUES
• Whether to retain the CBP through the US 29 interchange in County master plans.
• Whether to retain the segment of CBP between US 29 and Briggs Chaney Road in County master plans

DISCUSSION
The ROD didn’t include the CBP through either area. SHA’s Bike Plan instead routes the path along US 29 (part of the US 29 commuter bikeway) and then along a shared use path on Briggs Chaney Road heading east into Prince George’s County. Weaving the trail east-west through the US 29 interchange (going over US 29) was cost prohibitive, while the segment between US 29 and Briggs Chaney Road was a simple cost saving measure since the path along Briggs Chaney Road exists.
Staff agrees with the State’s decision not to pursue the path through the interchange. Because the segment of CBP through Paint Branch Stream Valley Park is unlikely to happen, weaving a grade-separated trail-bridge through the interchange cannot be economically justified. Likewise, the segment of master planned path between Briggs Chaney Road and US 29 would be redundant and offer few benefits to justify its cost. But there is no reason to remove it from County master plans now and the County shouldn’t preclude options for bicycle and pedestrian connections in this area, including a possible connection to or along the ICC right-of-way through the Tanglewood community and the new parkland adjoining Tanglewood Park acquired by the County as part of the ICC highway project.

SHA’s design for the path along the east side of US 29 is adequate and the shared use path along Briggs Chaney Road is a suitable connection to the Prince George’s County bikeways and trails network. The only question is ensuring a safe connection with a future path along Fairland Road. This should be studied in detail when SHA designs the Fairland Road/US 29 interchange project.

PRIOR DECISIONS
The Planning Board supported the SHA Bike Plan during its review of the highway’s FEIS but stopped short of recommending its removal from County master plans. The County Council did not support the SHA Bike Plan and recommended the CBP along the highway, within the right-of-way, and through the US 29 interchange to the Prince George’s County line.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Remove the CBP through the interchange from County master plans.
- Retain the segment of the CBP between Briggs Chaney Road and US 29 in County master plans.
- Examine the connection between the future shared use path along the south side of Fairland Road with the path along the east side of US 29 as part of the proposed Fairland/US 29 interchange study.

County Bike Path—Before and After
This master plan amendment can be summarized by describing what happens to the CBP (SP-40) as a result of the various recommendations. All prior master plans, including the CBFMP, envisioned a pathway or trail within the highway right-of-way from Shady Grove Road to the Prince George’s County Line. This amendment recommends retaining the previously master planned alignment in two areas and routing it along major roads in others, generally consistent with the SHA’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The table below describes how SP-40 would function end to end under this amendment, from west to east (see figure 8).