INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ZONING HEARING EXAMINER OFFICE

TO: Rana Hightower, Committee Director
Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee

FROM: Maurene Epps McNeil
Chief Zoning Hearing Examiner

DATE: July 17, 2026

RE: CB-71-2026 (Proposed Draft 2)

Thank you for the opportunity to review this bill and provide the following comments:

1. Most of the language on pages 3-4 should be added to the specific standards for accessory uses and structures. The prior Zoning Ordinance often included regulations within a definition and the recent rewrite aimed to rectify this mistake. I, therefore, believe that the new language for "Business, trades, offices or enterprises" paragraph on page 2, line 11, should end after "neighborhood", and a reference to Section 27-5203 (b)(6) should be added. The new "Prohibited Home Vehicle" information should similarly end on page 4, line 1, and a reference to Section 27-5203 (b)(6) should be added.
2. The regulations for these two uses should be added on pages 5-6 of the bill. The regulations for "Business, trades …" should be the new (J) on page 5. A new introduction to the language on page 3, lines 13-30, will be necessary. The "Prohibited Home Vehicle…" language on the top of page 4, line1 (starting with "This") to line 8 should then be moved to page 5, line 24, prior to "For purposes of…. This paragraph will be the new (K).
3. The "Property Owner Responsibility" language should be moved to Part 27-8 (Enforcement).
4. On page 8, strike "mandatory" on line 18. I believe the fine would still be in the discretion of the court, as it is for the other fines in the existing portion of this Section. On lines 16-18 switch the prohibited uses to match with my discussion in Number 2, above.
5. The following technical revisions should be made: on page 4 add "(a)" before "General" on line 14; on page 5, line 31 should be "VISIBLE"; On page 6, line 1 should be "inoperability".

Finally, I believe the prohibition on parking on residential streets should be covered by the existing limitation on off-street parking provided on page 5 (“no more than two vehicles associated with the home occupation may be based at the subject property, **or** parked on-site or off-site **or** on a public street within 400 yards from the property”). Barring the parking of personal vehicles on residential property or the surrounding residential streets while employees are away for the day may be subject to challenges of vagueness and overbreadth, and may be difficult to enforce. A home business is only allowed if it does not change the residential character of the neighborhood, and all of the other language in the bill that limits the businesses at issue in the bill should sufficiently assist the County in routing noxious uses.