Submission regarding the changes to tenancy laws to make it easier for renters to keep pets.

## <u>Pet form</u>

I agree that there should be a standard pet form. The Real Estate Agents will also need to acknowledge the landlord's response and get acknowledgement from the tenant that they have received a denial for their request to keep a pet on the property within that 21 day timeframe to avoid any disputes over meeting that timeframe.

## **Refusing permission**

I would like to note the statistic regarding supporting change to tenants' rights to keep pets that Real estate agents were the group least supporting change, with 72% against and only 23% in favour. The fact they are the frontline of dealing with tenants & pets & they are resoundingly against the change should be reason enough to give landlords more control over how their asset is being managed not taking that control away.

7. Other reasons to refuse an animal to be added to Appendix A.

The property backs onto a reserve, National Park or an area of natural significance.

Landlord is highly sensitive to animal fur & faeces. (especially if the property is the landlords primary residence and only rented for fixed terms.)

Consideration to be given to neighbouring properties (especially if they are all pet free because it was a conscious decision as to why they chose to live there.)

**<u>8.</u>** Yes the Tribunal should be able to allow a landlord to refuse the keeping of animals at a specific rental property on an ongoing basis.

Unless there was a major change to the property and surrounds or a change of landlord then the reasons for allowing the refusal should still be current & binding into the future.

<u>9.</u> Not everyone likes pets. Some people find pets comforting others find pets stressful & a threat to nature. Being forced to accommodate someone else's life choice does not seem fair when it impacts on your investment for your retirement & future. If a landlord does not want pets, they should have the right to say no. Each property's conditions should be assessed individually not just a blanket ruling.