
From: Residential Tenancies Regulation 2010
Subject: FW: Pet reforms Residential Tenancies Regulation.

From: D Molloy
Sent: Monday, 29 July 2019 1:28 PM
To: Residential Tenancies Regulation 2010 <rtreg@finance.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Pet reforms Residential Tenancies Regulation.

To whom it may concern,

I support a positive approach to pets in rented homes that places responsibility for the decision to keep pets with tenants, gives access to the health and wellbeing benefits of pet ownership to tenants and reduces the number of animals abandoned each year. The Residential Tenancies Regulation should prohibit blanket 'no pets' terms from tenancy agreements except where another law prevents the keeping of pets (for instance a strata by-law) and additional terms in the standard form agreement should encourage responsible pet ownership.

1. A prohibition on 'no pets' clauses

Too many landlords issue blanket 'no pets' clauses in their tenancy contracts. These blanket terms are unfair and contribute to abandonment and loss of pets. The Residential Tenancies Regulation has the ability to restrict the kinds of additional terms from being placed into an agreement. Blanket 'no pets' clauses should be made a prohibited term unless pets are restricted by another law.

2. An additional term on the standard form agreement which lays out a responsible pet ownership model

Currently the standard form agreement starts with a negative default additional term against pets. This is not required by the Act and is not in keeping with modern community standards. I support a default additional term which encourages responsible pet ownership and makes clear to both tenants and landlords the responsibilities tenants have around keeping pets. This will avoid the majority of property care issue and nuisance to neighbours.

Very often, the dwelling is suitable for pets yet the tenants application is refused because they have a pet – or they don't even get to apply due to a blanket ban. Also regarding bond, 4 weeks rent is surely more than enough to cover pet damage in case it did occur. Pet bonds are unnecessary. Pet restrictions contributes to housing instability and homelessness for people who have pets, or people who want pets. Most of all it's an equality issue – why should renters be treated like second-class citizens? All of this has affected me directly as I've been renting in NSW for 11 years – and I'm considering leaving because I'm tired of being treated like a second-class citizen, with no tenure, no pictures on the walls and no pets

Regards

Deirdre Molloy