House Bill 1460

Committee: Economic Matters
Bill: House Bill 1460 - Landlord and Tenant - Investor-Owned Single-Family Rental Property - Landlord Requirements
Date: March 12th, 2026
Position: Unfavorable

The Maryland Multi-Housing Association (MMHA) is a professional trade association established in 1996, whose members consist of owners and managers of more than 214,000 rental housing homes in over 1015 apartment communities. Our members house over 571,000 residents of the State of Maryland. MMHA also represents over 270 associate member companies who supply goods and services to the multi-housing industry.

House Bill 1460 ("HB 1460") prohibits a landlord of an "investor-owned single-family rental property" from charging a tenant more than a certain amount in rent, utilities, and additional mandatory fees, and disclosing said allowable rent to a tenant or prospective tenant. Additionally, HB 1460 requires the creation of a publicly accessible registry of these defined landlords and authorizing the OAG to enforce the provisions of the bill.

MMHA requests for an unfavorable report to HB 1460 for the following reasons:

I. HB 1460's broad scope will impact build-to-rent communities in Maryland.

While the sponsor may only be intending to cover institutional investor properties within the legislation, HB 1460's definition for "INVESTOR-OWNED SINGLE-FAMILY RENTAL PROPERTY" is broad:

> **(E) "INVESTOR–OWNED SINGLE–FAMILY RENTAL PROPERTY" MEANS A SINGLE–FAMILY RENTAL PROPERTY OWNED BY A PERSON THAT OWNS TWO OR MORE RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROPERTIES IN THE STATE.**

Aside from impacting a significant number of small landlords who are far from institutional investors, relevant to MMHA, this will cover and have an impact on build-to-rent communities owned and operated by professionally managed property management companies. These build-to-rent communities are purpose-built residential developments, often consisting of single-family homes and townhomes and constructed for leasing rather than owning. To lump these large scale build-to-rent communities together with small family landlords and institutional investor properties alike under this bill is nonsensical. **More importantly for these build-to-rent communities, there may not a previously recorded sale price, forcing the community to rely on the "FAIR MARKET RENT" for the zip code.** Depending on a number of circumstances surrounding the community and where it is built, this figure may be far from what should be offered in a lease.

II. HB 1460's vague provisions would be a legal/administrative nightmare for housing providers to interpret and for the State to enact and enforce.

The enforcement and penalty provisions under HB 1460 **are unreasonable and should be alarming for any housing provider looking to do business in Maryland that would be defined under the bill.** For simply failing to provide notice to a tenant or prospective tenant of "THE FAIR MARKET RENT AT THE TIME OF THE AGREEMENT OR RENEWAL; THE LAST SALE PRICE OF THE RESIDENTIAL DWELLING; AND THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE RENT", the harmed party may seek injunctive relief, attorney's fees, and treble damages while the Office of the Attorney General simultaneously may fine up to $10,000 and suspend the rental license. Additionally, if the housing provider submits incorrect information for the proposed statewide registry, the provider could get a civil fine of up to $10,000, suspension of any rental license held, and a prohibition of renting a property for up to three years. **These penalty provisions are punitive and will deter housing providers from doing business in the State.**

Additional questions from the housing providers in complying with this bill:

- What damages would a tenant have if they did not receive the required notice the landlord, but the landlord is charging an amount for rent that is under the maximum allowable rent?
- What are the damages if the landlord changes more than the maximum allowable rent? The difference between the actual rent charged and the maximum allowable rent?
- For build-to-rent properties, what would the housing provider put as the last sale price of the residential dwelling if it was built and managed by the same entity?

Without seeing the fiscal note prior to the submission of this testimony, it can be safely assumed that both the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Office of the Attorney General would require a significant amount of new staff and funding to adequately and equitably enforce the provisions of the legislation – funding that the State can ill afford at this time.

III. HB 1460 is a statewide rent control bill.

All the logistical flaws of the legislation as outlined aside, **HB 1460 is fundamentally at its core one thing – a statewide rent control bill.** In a time when housing affordability is a forefront priority for Marylanders, it would run counter to the goals of the Maryland General Assembly to pass legislation that may jeopardize investment of housing in the State. As we have seen in counties with local rent control regimes[1], rent control is deterring the production of new housing, likely prolonging our affordability crisis as the housing supply atrophies. It is safe to presume that the enactment of HB 1460 would result in further disinvestment in housing across the state.

For all these reasons, MMHA would request an unfavorable report on HB 1460.

Please contact Matthew Pipkin, Jr. at (443) 995-4342 or mpipkin@mmhaonline.org with any questions.

[1]Pagnucco, A. (2026, January 6). *MoCo multifamily permits drop 96 percent with rent control*. Montgomery Perspective. https://montgomeryperspective.com/2026/01/06/moco-multifamily-permits-drop-96-percent-with-rent-control/