PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE REPORT

2026 Legislative Session

Reference No.:	CB-071-2026
Draft No.:	2
Committee:	PLANNING, HOUSING, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Date:	7/21/2026
Action:	FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS

REPORT: Committee Vote: Favorable with Amendments, 4-0 (In favor: Committee Vice Chair Oriadha, Council Members Adams-Stafford, Dernoga, and Olson)

The Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee met on July 21, 2026, to consider CB-71-2026. On Tuesday, June 29, 2026, the County Council presented and referred Draft-1 of the bill to the PHED Committee. The purpose of this bill is to revise the definition of "home occupation," introduce a definition for "prohibited home vehicle business," and establish criteria for presumptive evidence of such prohibited businesses. It outlines the responsibilities of property owners, specifies certain enforcement procedures, and sets forth enhanced penalties for operating prohibited home businesses. The bill aims to improve the regulation and enforcement of home occupations and home businesses.

The PHED Committee Director, Rana Hightower, provided a summary of the proposed legislation, including public comments and feedback from various agencies within Prince George's County. Ms. Hightower also explained that there was a proposed Draft 2 of the bill.

Council Member Dernoga, the bill sponsor, explained that there is the proposed legislation that has a companion bill CB-048-2026 will be discussed by the Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment (TIEE) Committee in September. The proposed legislation is a zoning enforcement bill, which includes provisions for civil citations and fines in the county code. There was a need to create two separate bills. The focus of this bill addresses two main issues that have been problematic for many residential neighborhoods: people operating contractor home businesses which brings a lot of trucks into the neighborhood parking on the property around the property and in front of the property causing problem in safer older neighborhoods for parking and safe passage for emergency vehicles. The bill also addresses people who conduct auto repairs and auto sales out of their homes. The bill amended the home occupations section of the Zoning Ordinance and moved language out of the definition into the criteria and standards section of the code. There were discussions with Planning Department staff, the Zoning Hearing Examiner and the Finance Department and there were many revisions to the bill. The bill added a new use “business use vehicle” which is broader than the commercial vehicle definition.

PHED Committee Vice Chair Oriadha asked what the enforcement difference for a labeled and a non-labelled van if the vehicle is tied to a homebased business.

Council Member Dernoga explained that the legislation makes it easier to allow DPIE to enforce and increase the fines for these sorts of businesses.

Council Member Olson explained that the legislation says two or more vehicles so if a person has one van, they are not included in this bill.

Ms. McNeil, the Chief Zoning Hearing Examiner, submitted comments on CB-071-2026 (Proposed DR-2). The comments were as follows:

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. Therefore, it is believed 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. It is believed 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, it is believed 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.

The Planning Board voted to take no position on LDR-111-2026. The Planning Board also offered amendments to the bill. The Board concluded that the proposed provisions regulate business activities rather than land use or development matters and, therefore, may not be appropriately addressed through the Zoning Ordinance. The Board recommended that consideration be given to relocating the proposed language to another subtitle of the Prince George's County Code that more directly governs such activities.

The recommended amendments are as follows:

SUBTITLE 27. ZONING. PART 27-2. INTERPRETATION AND DEFINITIONS.
SECTION 27-2500. DEFINITIONS.

Business use Vehicle Any vehicle with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) of 10,000 pounds or more, any vehicle bearing commercial registration plates, or any vehicle displaying signage, markings, or equipment (e.g., ladder racks, toolboxes) that indicates a primary use for business purposes.

Prohibited Home Vehicle Business

Vehicle Repair, Servicing, or Maintenance and Wholesale Dealers' Display. This includes, but is not limited to automotive, truck, motorcycle, ATV, recreational vehicle, small engine, or boat repair; body work; painting; detailing for commercial gain; oil changes; brake work; transmission work; or electrical system work. The storage of vehicles, vessels, or major components thereof awaiting repair, servicing, or as a result of dismantling is prohibited. The possession or use of commercial-grade repair equipment (including but not limited to vehicle lifts, paint booths, alignment machines, heavy-duty compressors, or tire changers) intended for such purposes is also prohibited.

Mr. David Warner, Principal Counsel, explained Planning Board position on the proposed legislation. He explained there was not a lot of discussion on the policy, the Planning Board understood the intent was to regulate home business. The Planning Board was more focused on whether the Zoning Ordinance was the appropriate code. The Planning Board felt that most of the concerns the legislation is trying to address are not zoning but enforcement concerns that should be addressed through other sections of the Prince George's County Code. Mr. Warner explained that he reviewed proposed Draft 2 and there are certain sections within the bill that are appropriate for the Zoning Ordinance. He said defined the term "business use vehicle" is appropriate. Her further explained that there remain number of provisions that will create conflict with existing Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Council Member Dernoga explained that language was relocated and explained the problems with existing law. He also mentioned that the Regional District Act and existing zoning ordinances provide for enforcement, while also pointing out the overlap with other county codes concerning property standards.

Mr. Warner supported Dernoga's views on zoning enforcement and highlighted the need to avoid introducing new penalties for specific business types that could complicate enforcement further. He also noted that home occupations have historically posed challenges under past zoning ordinances.

On motion of Council Member Dernoga, seconded by Council Member Olson, the PHED Committee voted 4-0 in favor of CB-71-2026 (DR-2).