

I support the proposed Part B Section 5 clauses 1 & 2 of the *Residential Tenancies Act 1997*:

1. introducing a mechanism for addressing pet-related costs and encouraging landlords to accept pets, either by way of a pet bond or by optional additional pet consent and cleaning clauses in the tenancy agreement, and
2. providing that a 'no pets' clause is unenforceable if it is unreasonable."

However, I think these clauses need to be strengthened further; there seems to be a lot of room for maneuver by landlords. For example, they can still impose unreasonable or unattainable cleaning clauses and consent requirements to tenancy agreements as a way of discouraging tenants with pets to rent from them, and there needs to be a cap on the "pet bond" payable, in order to discourage landlords imposing unreasonable or unattainable bonds. It should be ensured that the a "pet bond" is a reasonable amount, attainable by all members of the renting community, not just the most affluent.

Pets are an important part of people's lives. Also, an animal should not have to lose it's home and family because a landlord will not accept pets for whatever reason. It is unjust that landlords can discriminate against pet owners by refusing to offer accommodation for rent to tenants with pets.

Pet owners and animals need to be supported under the law.

Carmen Harbour