Companion Animal Renters and Pet-Friendly Housing in the U.S.

Pamela Carlisle-Frank Ph.D.
Joshua M. Frank Ph.D.
Lindsey Nielsen

Copyright 2005 Anthrozoos, Volume/Issue forthcoming

The Foundation for Interdisciplinary Research and Education Promoting Animal Welfare
FIREPAW, Inc. 228 Main Street, #436, Williamstown, MA 01267
Telephone: 518-462-5939; FAX: 518-658-0979
Email: Info@firepaw.org/ firepaw@earthlink.net / www.firepaw.org

Special thanks go out to The Toby Fund for funding the present study.

Companion Animal Renters and Pet-Friendly Housing in the U.S.

Abstract-A nationwide empirical study was conducted to determine the factors influencing the availability of pet-friendly rental housing throughout the U.S. Factors examined included an assessment of a variety of financial and economic factors, rental rates, deposits, turnover and damage histories, rental tendencies and trends, and the types and sources of concerns landlords have about permitting companion animals in rental property. The results of the study statistically demonstrated that for the majority of landlords, offering pet-friendly rentals is not only economically viable, but can actually increase their bottom-line profits.

Key words: pet-friendly; rental housing; landlords; pets; tenants

A recent estimate of companion animals euthanized at U.S. shelters indicates that 4.2 million dogs and cats or 14.8 animals per 1,000 Americans are euthanized each year (Clifton 2003). Although some of these animals have untreatable health or behavioral issues, the majority of these animals could be adopted if there were homes available. Research indicates that one common reason for companion animals to be relinquished to shelters is housing issues. Though not all necessarily due to rental housing restrictions, Salman *et al* (1998) found that 29% of relinquishments were for "housing issues". According to the National Council on Pet Population Study and Policy's Regional Shelter Survey, the top reason for dog relinquishment to shelters in the United States is moving. For cat relinquishment to shelters it is the third most frequently cited reason. Landlord refusal to allow pets was the most common additional reason given for relinquishment (New et al1999).

Another U.S. study found that the primary reason for relinquishing cats and the third most common reason for relinquishing dogs is moving (Miller *et al* 1996). A recent study found that one of the most frequently given reasons for relinquishing companion animals to shelters was 'moving'. The majority of respondents interviewed had relinquished their pets solely because they were moving, most of these respondents were renters. The authors found that 'landlord

restrictions' were an important factor in the decision to relinquish a companion animal (Shore, Petersen and Douglas 2003).

Background

The lack of available pet-friendly rental housing is puzzling when one considers the high numbers of U.S. households with companion animals. According to the American Veterinary Association nearly one out of every two renters in the U.S., for instance, has pets (Anon 1996) and 35% of people without pets have stated they would own a pet if their rental units permitted them (Hart and Kidd 1994).

With such a sizeable potential tenant pool it would seem that there would be enough pet-friendly housing available to meet the current demand. In fact, according to economic theory, in perfectly functioning markets (i.e., markets with people making rational, profit-maximizing decisions, with full information, and no significant transaction costs), rental housing should be available for renters with animals if those renters are willing to pay a premium to cover any extra cost of permitting animals to landlords (Carlisle-Frank, Frank and Nielsen 2003). Yet, anecdotally, there is evidence that renters with animals frequently have trouble finding housing at any price. If housing is scarce despite a willingness on the part of tenants with animals to pay a higher price, then it raises the question, 'Are landlords overlooking opportunities to increase profitability by not adding to the pool of pet-friendly housing?'

A thorough search of the literature offered no previous empirical research directly testing the conditions surrounding the shortage of pet-friendly rental housing. Such research could lend important insights for rectifying the problem of pet-friendly rental housing shortages thereby reducing the amount of animals unnecessarily euthanized. The present study sought to investigate this under-researched area. The variables investigated included the availability of pet-friendly housing, pet deposits, and rent differentials, length of tenancy, vacancy rates, and

marketing requirements for pet-friendly versus no-pets-allowed rental housing. Common concerns of landlords regarding permitting pets was also investigated, as well as whether the concerns about pets were rooted in *actual* experiences. Also investigated was the average costs of pet-related damages to rental properties, the amount of time landlords must spend on pet-related issues in pet-friendly rental housing, the frequency of the use of screening tools when renting to tenants with pets, and the frequency of tenants who keep pets illegally in "no-pets-allowed" rental housing.

Methods

The data collection phase of the study began in March 2003 and continued through November 2003. Data collection was comprised of two levels: Level I of the study consisted of the collection of rental norms for "pet-friendly" and "no-pets-allowed" rentals across the U.S. The sources used included rental listings of area newspapers for the selected regions[1], real estate and apartment listings on major newspaper and real estate web sites for each region, and rental association data. A total of 10 U.S. cities, suburbs, and towns were selected for examination from the following states: California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Minnesota, New York Texas, and Washington.

Level II consisted of collecting data derived from surveys sampling responses from both randomly selected tenants and landlords voluntarily responding from randomly selected rental property associations across the U.S. Surveys included inquiries as to pets/no-pets -allowed status, a variety of financial and economic factors, rental, deposit,

[1] Major newspapers included: Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle; Chicago Tribune; Chicago Sun-Times; Sun Sentinel; New York Times; Albany Times-Union, Lubbock Avalanche, Pensacola News

turnover and damage histories, rental tendencies and trends, and concerns about allowing companion animal renters. Data were collected nationwide for both phases of research with a total of 14 cities chosen to obtain a geographic and demographic cross-section of the nation. The cities included: Los Angeles, California, San Francisco, California, San Mateo, California, Denver, Colorado, Pensacola, Florida, Atlanta, Georgia, Chicago, Illinois, St. Paul, Minnesota, Albany, New York, Cortland, New York, New York City, New York, Rome, New York, Lubbock, Texas and Vancouver, Washington.

Questionnaire

There were two versions of the questionnaire—a version for tenants and a separate version designed for rental property owners. The tenant's version had a total of 17 forced-choice questions and two open-ended questions (See Table 1). The rental property owner version of the questionnaire was comprised of 28 forced-choice questions (several of them multi-part questions) and two open-ended questions (See Table 2).

Procedure

A total of 250 tenant-version surveys were mailed to randomly selected renters residing in the previously mentioned regions. Tenant study participants received a cover letter via postal mail stating that the purpose of the study was to collect data about rental housing and that participation was voluntary and confidential. For landlord study participants, a total of 250 landlord-version surveys, along with cover letters stating that the purpose of the study was to collect data about

---

Journal, Gulf Herald, Albany Herald, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Denver Post, Rocky Mountain News, Daily Earth, Abilene Reporter, Houston-Chronicle, American-Statesman, Star Tribune, Sun Post, Pioneer Press, The Columbian and the Post-Intelligencer.

rental housing conditions were mailed to randomly-selected rental property associations who had previously agreed to take part in the study. Association presidents were instructed to make the surveys available to their members and that participation must be voluntary and confidential. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope was provided for return of all completed surveys.

Participants

The response rate for randomly selected tenants was 48% and for participating landlords from randomly selected rental property associations the response rate was 41%. A total of 103 rental property owners and 120 tenants took part in Level II of the study. Participants responded from a mixture of 14 different urban, suburban and semi-rural areas representing a cross-section of regions within the United States. The percentage of participants by region included 26.8% East coast, 21.8% West coast, 22.1% South, 14.5% Southwest, 15.4% Midwest (See Table 3).

Analysis

The primary focus for analysis involved comparing pet-friendly rental housing to other rental housing in terms of costs and benefits. Also analyzed were the experiences and concerns of landlords and tenants with regard to pets in rental housing. For category comparisons, a chi-squared test was used. For quantitative variables that did not deviate significantly from a normal distribution, comparisons were made using two-tailed unpaired t-tests. The distribution on survey results of some quantitative variables was found to deviate significantly from a normal distribution. In these cases only, a non-parametric Wilcoxon two-sample rank sum test was used (these results can be distinguished by use of a "Z" statistic). More complex analysis was required for examining rental price differences. Rental prices were compared using multiple regressions to

control for location, size, and other variables. Level I of the study rendered 1,302 data points of rental norms across the U.S. The Level I information was used specifically for statistical analysis of rent and deposit differentials. Level II data, which were richer in content but contained fewer data points, were used for multiple comparisons in addition to rent and deposit differentials.

Results

Availability of Pet-Friendly Housing

According to the information reported in the landlords' surveys, approximately one-half of the housing is pet-friendly (See Table 4). However, most of the pet-friendly housing had some limitations regarding animal size or type (See Table 5). Only 9% of housing allowed companion animals without any significant limitations on size or type. Cats were allowed in 52.6% of rental housing, making cats the easiest type of animal to obtain housing for. Large dogs were the most difficult, with only 11% of housing allowing these animals. Most tenants (82%) with animals reported having trouble finding a rental unit that would take their pet(s). This number was even higher for tenants with dogs, with 100% of tenants with multiple dogs reporting having trouble.

Large complexes were found to more commonly allow pets than landlords with only a few units or a single rental unit ($\chi 2 = 20.01$; $df = 2$; $p < .0001$). However, large complexes were also more likely to require conditions in terms of size or type of pet, with very few large complexes allowing "any type" of pet.

Of those tenants allowed to have pets in their rental units, 47.4% did in fact have pets, with 37.8% having dogs and 55.6% having cats.

Pet Deposits and Rent Differentials

Most pet-friendly housing was found to charge a separate pet deposit. Using Level I data, 62% of housing that was pet-friendly required a pet deposit (See Table 6). Using landlord survey data, 73% of pet-friendly housing required a pet deposit. The average pet deposit was between 40% and 85% of the rent, depending on what data were used. In general, it should be noted that in addition to a separate pet deposit the average total deposit was larger for pet-friendly housing. The prevalence of pet deposits varied by location. The spread in deposit usage between locations was sizeable, suggesting that in the U.S. the concept of what constitutes acceptable pet deposits may be an institution that evolves according to the region.

The data indicate there was a clear rent differential between housing that allowed pets and housing that did not, with pet-friendly housing charging more in rent. This difference was found consistently using three different sets of data (Level I data, Level II landlord data, and Level II tenant data), with the rent premium being statistically significant in all cases. Several different regression equation specifications were also tested. A positive rent premium was found to be robust to the regression specification. Factors such as housing size and location were controlled for in the analysis[2]. The rent premium found was between 20% and 30% of the average rent. Using tenant data, housing that was pet-friendly charged $222.00 USD *more* on average than housing that was not pet-friendly ($t = 2.45$; $p = .0158$). (The average rent overall for tenants in the study group was $1,070.00 USD.)

Housing with limitations on the type and/or size of pets permitted (e.g. allowing cats only, weight limitations, limiting the animal size) was also found to be slightly cheaper (by an average of $100.00 USD) than other pet-friendly housing. This finding was also significant using Level I data ($t = -2.53$; $p = 0.012$).

[2] In the field of Economics, statistical pricing models such as the current one that control for various factors in order to identify the effect of individual traits on price are known as *hedonic pricing models*. For example, some complex housing models isolate dozens of factors including number of bathrooms, location, size, presence of amenities such as a pool, and so on, and statistically price each factor. Data limitations did not allow identifying all of these factors in the

Length of Tenancy

In addition to significant premium in rent gains, several other benefits were also found for landlords who allow pets. Using landlord surveys, tenants with pets were found to stay significantly longer (See Table 7), by an average of 23 months compared to 15 months (t = -2.25; df = 76; p = 0.028). This difference was found to be even greater using tenant surveys, with tenants with pets in pet-friendly housing staying an average of 46 months compared to 18 months for tenants residing in rentals prohibiting pets (t = -8.20; df = 166; p < 0.0001). Both differences were statistically significant. In general, the tenant data are believed to be more reliable for this particular variable, since landlords were expected to make a judgment as to an average across tenants based on memory, while tenants were thought to more reliably and precisely remember their own personal experience.

It should be noted that the increased length of tenancy did not occur for tenants who illegally kept pets (that is, tenants who kept animals in rental units that prohibit animals). Tenants who illegally kept pets were closer in their length of tenancy to people who do not keep pets at all. In short, tenants who kept pets illegally remained significantly less time in their rental units than tenants who legally kept pets. For comparison of tenants with illegal pets to tenants keeping pets legally, the mean length of tenancy for keeping pets illegally was 26.5 months; df = 55; t = 2.30; p = 0.0253. The increased tenancy duration for people who keep pets legally may be out of loyalty or a desire not to have to search again for pet-friendly housing, rather than due to any physical hardship of moving with animals.

---

current model. Other hedonic pricing models have been used by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to break computer prices down into factors such as processing speed, hard drive size, input/output devices, modem, etc.

Vacancy Rates and Marketing Units

The vacancy rate for pet-friendly housing was also significantly lower than "no pets allowed" rentals at 10% for pet-friendly housing compared to 14% for other housing ($Z = 2.05$; $p = 0.02$)[3]. The amount landlords had to spend on advertising their units was lower for pet-friendly housing at $15.00 USD per unit compared to $32.00 USD per unit for other housing ($Z = 2.87$; $p = 0.002$). Landlords needed to spend less than half the amount of time marketing pet-friendly housing ($Z = 3.54$; $p = 0.0002$). Pet-friendly housing also received about twice as many applicants for a vacant unit as other housing ($Z = 2.99$; $p = 0.0014$). The average time it took to rent out a pet-friendly unit was 19 days compared to 29 days for non-pet-friendly units ($Z = -2.48$; $p = 0.0066$). Approximately 25% of applicants inquiring about rentals of non-pet-friendly housing were specifically seeking pet-friendly rentals. This also suggests that a significant market segment may be lost by not allowing pets.

Common Concerns Regarding Permitting Pets

Among the landlords who did not allow pets, damage was the greatest concern by far, with approximately two-thirds of landlords citing damage as a major concern (64.7%). Noise was the second largest concern (52.9%), followed by complaints/tenant conflicts (41.2%) and insurance issues (41.2%). Concerns about people leaving their pet behind or not cleaning common areas were rarely cited as reasons for not allowing pets (5.9%).

[3] Vacancy rates, advertising, marketing time, number of applicants and time to rent data were found not to be normally distributed therefore a Wilcox rank sum test was used for all analyses of these variables.

Source of Landlord Concerns

Forty percent of the landlords participating in the study prohibited pets. However, only 37.1% of these landlords reported having had actual prior experience renting to with tenants with pets. Sixty-three percent of the landlords who cited concerns reported they have never permitted pets in their rental units and had never actually experienced the pet-related problems they stated as concerns. Therefore the source of their concerns was most likely indirect information rather than first-hand experience.

Actual Experience with Problems in Pet-Friendly Rentals

Damage

Pet-friendly housing did have some costs for landlords. For example, landlords reported an average annual insurance premium of $150.00 USD more for pet-friendly housing. However, this annual cost is less than the premium received in rent from pet-friendly housing in just one month.

Of the potential problems pets could cause to housing, damage was the most commonly reported (51.8%). However, even this was not that common, with just under one-half (48.2%) of landlords allowing pets stating that they have never experienced damage from companion animals allowed in their units. Slightly less than half of landlords had experienced complaints from tenants or neighbors regarding animals (48.1%), one-third of landlords had experienced noise problems (33.3%), and 15% reported they had experienced other types of problems from allowing pets.

Although 85% of landlords permitting pets reported having had some amount of pet-related damage at some time, the worst damage reported by each landlord averaged only $430.00 USD. This amount is far less than the average rent or the average pet deposit. In most cases, landlords

could simply subtract the damage from a required pet deposit and experience no real loss. In fact, for half of landlords who allow pets, the worst case of pet-related damage they ever had was still fully covered by the deposit. The findings appear to demonstrate that landlords do not experience any substantive loss. The majority of the time the damage is covered by the deposit, leaving the rent premium landlords receive from renting pet-friendly units untouched. Using the survey data, the worst-case scenario of pet-related damage was a loss of roughly 2.5 months rent. (It should be noted that this was the worst loss experienced for a particular landlord, not the average loss for that landlord). Although this is a significant loss, for this unusual type of situation when all costs and benefits are taken into consideration (rent premiums, higher deposit, longer tenancy, less marketing and advertising costs, reduced chance of loss from an illegal pet with no pet deposit to compensate), in the long run the benefit of permitting animals is likely to compensate for the loss.

Not surprisingly, tenants surveyed reported less damage than landlords, with the average damage from the tenants' reports being $200.00 USD and the worst pet-related damage being only 115% of one month's rent, or not more than a typical deposit plus pet deposit.

While landlords reported some damage from pets, a more important issue is whether overall damage is different for tenants with pets than without pets. Even if pets cause some damage to units, tenants with pets may cause less damage in other ways for a number of reasons. First, as described above, there are twice as many applicants for units, so landlords have more choices of potential tenants to carefully screen. Second, there is reason to believe that tenants with pets may be more loyal and have a harder time finding alternate housing, therefore they may be more careful to avoid causing problems.

The data suggest there is little, if any, difference in damage between tenants with and without pets. Several different statistical analyses were performed in an effort to find a difference in damage. Both landlord and tenant data were tested. Number of pets and type of pets were taken into account in some variations. Unweighted tests with landlord data were performed as well as a test weighted by number of units for each respondent. No significant differences were found. The

biggest difference between damage from tenants with pets and those without was under $40.00 USD, with an average of $323.00 USD in damage for tenants without pets and an average of $362.00 USD for tenants with pets. This was not a statistically significant difference using a one-tail t-test (t = -0.40; p = 0.35). The data suggest there is no statistically significant difference in damage--at worst tenants with pets cause 10%-15% more damage or about $40.00 USD worth of extra damage. This amount is very small when compared to the extra deposit, rent, and other benefits received from renting pet-friendly housing.

Interestingly, the $40.00 USD difference in damages for tenants with pets was much smaller than the difference found for tenants with children. Tenants with children on average had $150.00 USD more damage than tenants without children. In addition, this difference was statistically significant while the difference for pets was not statistically significant. When housing was divided into four categories based on whether children and/or pets were present, for housing with children the people with pets caused on average $4.USD less damage. For housing with no children, the people with pets caused on average $25.USD less damage. In other words, when having children is accounted for, people with pets did not cause any more damage on average than people without pets.

Problem-solving

Other pet-related issues were reported by 14.8% of landlords offering pet-friendly rental housing. These pet-related issues (e.g., tenant conflicts concerning animals or the common area and increased upkeep) required some extra time for landlords to resolve problems. However, the reported time only amounted to slightly less than one hour per year. In addition, this amount of time was less than the amount landlords had to spend for child-related problems or other issues. It should also be noted that as discussed above, property managers/landlords spent less time marketing units when renting pet-friendly housing. This time savings was greater than the time

cost of resolving pet issues with pet-friendly housing spending an average of 8.7 hours less marketing per unit, but only 1.0 hours per unit extra on pet issues.

Use of Screening Tools

According to respondents, potentially useful tools for screening tenants with animals or limiting landlord exposure to problems were rarely used. Only 18.5% of landlords required a pet agreement/policy. No landlords surveyed required training certificates, only 11.0% required health certificates such as proof of rabies vaccinations or proof the animal had been spayed/neutered. (According to Gershman, Sacks and Wright (1994) unneutered male dogs were 3.5 times as likely to have biting incidents as neutered males. Additional evidence that spay/neuter procedures may have some tendency to reduce aggression in male and female dogs can be found in Borchelt 1983, Wright and Nesselrote 1987, and O'Farrell and Peachey 1990.) Only 3.7% of landlords required pet references, and only 7.4% required a "pet resume." Tenants offered some of these documents more frequently than they were actually required—18% of tenants offered a pet resume, 22% offered pet references, and 4% offered certifications of obedience training.

Keeping Pets Illegally

Landlord respondents who prohibit pets estimated that 7% of their tenants keep pets in their rental units anyway. However, the tenant data (which are probably more reliable in this particular case) suggests a much higher number. Over 20% of tenants surveyed reported that they were keeping pets illegally. Landlords with tenants harboring pets illegally receive none of the benefits of keeping pets legally (such as more control over the outcomes by controlling the

screening and requiring a pet agreement/contract and separate pet deposit) yet suffer all of the potential costs of having animals.

Discussion

With few exceptions there is sparse research that specifically examines the factors behind the shortage of pet-friendly rentals (Hart and Mader 1986; Hart, Fox and Rogers 1992; Hart and Kidd 1994). Despite the scarcity in scientific journals on this topic however, there are ample reports in mainstream American media. These anecdotal reports and those of national animal welfare organizations in the U.S. indicate that the issue of landlords' refusal to permit companion animals is a serious one for the general public and their companion animals (Watts 1998; Peterson 1999; Anon 2000; Brecher 2001; Wilson 2001; Anon 2002a; Rich 2003). According to these reports people in all major regions of the U.S. are having difficulty finding rental housing that accepts companion animals. Research on shelter statistics and reasons for relinquishment supports this conclusion (Miller *et al* 1996; New *et al* 1999; Salman *et al* 1998; Shore, Petersen and Douglas 2003).

With only 9% of the overall rental housing being open to all pets, the availability and limitations on pet-friendly housing reveal the length renters must go through to keep their companion animals living with them. With nearly half of American households having companion animals and over one-half of renters in the present study who did not have pets reporting they would probably have one or more pets if they were allowed to do so, this begs the question, 'Why are there so few pet-friendly rental units available?' According to the present study, the answer may lie with the concerns many landlords have about permitting pets. Among the landlords who prohibited pets, concerns about damage was cited by nearly two-thirds of those

surveyed. Concerns about noise, complaints/tenant conflicts, insurance issues, people leaving their pets behind, and not cleaning common areas were also cited.

These concerns were mostly from landlords who had never offered pet-friendly rental housing. However, the results of the present study suggest that while problems do arise for landlords offering pet-friendly rental housing, the benefits frequently outweigh the problems. Among the problems reported by landlords who have actually offered pet-friendly rental options were damage to property, tenant complaints about noise and conflicts between animals, and compliance issues concerning common areas. The results of the present study indicate these problems are frequently minimal, however. For instance, costs from damage to the property was found to be far less than the amount of the average monthly rent or the average pet deposit. Additionally, the results indicate that there is no significant overall difference in damage between tenants with and without pets. Likewise, problems with pets are frequently relatively minimal, as the time required to deal with pet-related issues (tenant conflicts and complaints, and getting tenants to comply with keeping common areas clean) averaged less than one hour a year. This time was more than compensated for by the time-savings landlords experienced marketing their pet-friendly rentals.

Despite the potential for problems, the findings of this study support the idea that rental property owners stand to gain from turning these limitations and restrictions around. With the majority of pet-friendly rentals charging separate pet deposits, larger on average regular deposits, and higher on average monthly rents, two issues are of note: (1) on average, tenants with companion animals are willing and able to pay more for the ability to live with their pets and (2) rental property owners who offer pet-friendly housing not only have the potential to more than cover any potential risks but to actually increase their bottom-line profits.

The present study also rendered statistical support for long-standing anecdotal reports about other advantages to permitting tenants with pets. Included were findings that tenants in pet-friendly rentals tend to stay significantly longer than tenants in rentals prohibiting pets, creating

less turnover and less costs, time and hassle for landlords to find new tenants. Vacancy rates were also significantly lower for pet-friendly rentals, and there were more applicants per vacant unit. Additionally, the time spent to market and rent out available units, and the money spent for advertising were all less for pet-friendly units than rentals prohibiting animals. Even when taking potential problems in to account, therefore, the results of the present study appear to indicate that pet-friendly rental units can offer landlords multiple advantages, including increasing their bottom line profits.

Conclusion

Landlords are beginning to hear the message from their own colleagues and professional journals that permitting pets makes good business sense (Rooney 1996; Anzenberg 2001; Brecher 2001; Anon 2002b). Nonetheless, the lack of available pet-friendly rentals revealed in the present study suggests there is a long way to go to meet current demand. To help redress this shortage of rentals welcoming pets at least one animal welfare organization offers a free 7-step program to assist landlords in making the transition toward offering pet-friendly housing (Lewis, 2003). Additionally, organizations such as the Humane Society of the United States (Anon 2001), the Delta Society (Watts 1998) and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Anon 2002a) have developed and actively promote programs designed to provide tips and strategies for landlords considering converting their properties to pet-friendly rentals. The present study offers statistical evidence of previous anecdotal testimonials often cited by these and other animal welfare organizations. Such scientific evidence may serve to enhance the efforts of those in the animal welfare arena working to stop animal suffering by increasing the options for animal guardians who rent. As Wilson (2001) has said, "One of the simplest and most important things

the humane community can do to boost adoptions and keep animals in homes they have is to work with landlords and tenants to increase the number of rental units that allow companion animals."

In conclusion, there appears to be an overlooked opportunity for many landlords to gain income revenue in rent and increase tenant pools/market size by allowing pets. From a landlord's perspective, while there are some costs to allowing pets, these costs are relatively low and the benefits appear to be even greater. One reason is that the amount landlords can charge for rent is higher, and, where legally permitted, an extra deposit can also be charged. Additionally, tenants tend to stay longer in pet-friendly rental units. When tenants do leave, new tenants seeking pet-friendly rentals are usually plentiful. This requires less advertising and therefore requires less effort and money to find a new tenant. Rental units also stay vacant for less time, and there are more applicants in the pool, giving the landlord more options to choose from. In short, although individual landlord situations will vary, pet-friendly housing appears to be a "win-win-win" situation for landlords, tenants, and companion animals alike.

References

Anon 1996. The Veterinary Service Market for Companion Animals. Schaumburg, IL: American Veterinary Medical Association.

Anon 2000. No pets allowed: Fighting for pets in rental housing.
SPCA British Columbia Publication. Animal Sense, Summer issue: 1-3.

Anon 2001. Renting with pets: How a pets-allowed policy can work for you. Washington, D.C.: The Humane Society of the United States.

Anon 2002a. In search of pet-friendly landlords. American Society for the Prevention of Animal Cruelty. NY: ASPCA.

Anon 2002b. Landlords and pets. Capital District Association of Rental Property Owners. Albany, NY: CDARPO.

Anzenberg, W. 2001. Pet owners as responsible tenants. CA: San Francisco Apartment Magazine, April issue.

Borchelt, P.L. 1983. Aggressive behavior of dogs kept as companion animals: classification and influence of sex, reproductive status and breed. Applied Animal Ethology, 10:45-61.

Brecher, N. 2001. Profitable pets: Making friends with Fido and Fluffy. Journal of Property Management, March-April issue 66 (2): 108-110.

Carlisle-Frank, P., Frank, J., and Nielsen, L. 2003. The Housing Market for Renters with Companion Animals: Are Markets Efficient? United States Society for Ecological Economic Conference. Saratoga Springs, NY: USSEE.

Clifton, M. 2003. Latest U.S. data show shelter killing down to 4.2 million/year. Animal People 12(6): 17.

Gershman, K.A., Sacks, J.J., and Wright, J.C. 1994. Which Dogs Bite? A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors. Pediatrics, 93(6):913-917.

Hart, L., Fox, S., and Rogers, J. 1992. Acceptance of dogs and cats in mobile home parks.
Canine Practice 17(1): 24-28.

Hart, L. and Kidd, A. 1994. Potential pet ownership in U.S. rental housing. Canine Practice 19(3): 24-28.

Hart, L. and Mader, B. 1986. The successful introduction of pets in to California public housing for the elderly. California Veterinarian 40(5): 17-27.

Lewis, S. 2003. Convincing landlords to welcome animals. Action Line, Friends of Animals Magazine, 121: 18-19.

Miller, D., Staats, S., Partlo, C. and Rada, K. 1996. Factors associated with the decision to surrender a pet to an animal shelter. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association 209: 738-742.

New, J., Salman, M., Scarlett, J., Kass, P., Vaughn, J., Scherr, S. and Kelch, W. 1999. Moving: Characteristics of those relinquishing companion animals to U.S. animal shelters. Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science 2(2): 83-96.

O'Farrell, V. and Peachey, E. 1990. Behavioral effects of ovariohysterectomy on bitches. Journal of Small Animal Practice, 12:571-585.

Peterson, N. 1999. A new lease on life. Sheltering Magazine. Jan-Feb issue. Washington, D.C.: Humane Society of the United States.

Rich, M. 2003. Pet therapy sets landlords howling. NY: New York Times.

Rooney, C. 1996. Good dog! Effective pet policies. Journal of Property Management 61(1): 68-72.

Salman, M., New, J., Scarlett, J., Kass, P., Ruch-Gallie, R. and Hetts, S. 1998. Human and animal factors related to the relinquishment of dogs and cats in 12 selected animal shelter in the U.S. Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science 1(3): 207-226.

Shore, E., Petersen, C., and Douglas, D. 2003. Moving as a reason for pet relinquishment: A closer look. Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science 6(1): 39-52.

Watts, R. 1998. The legal ins and outs of pet ownership and housing. CA: The Delta Society.

Wilson, L. 2001. Creating a 'Pets in Rental Housing Program' in your community. Maddie's Fund Newsletter.

Wright, J.C. and Nesselrote, M.S. 1987. Classification of behavior problems in dogs: distributions of age, breed, sex and reproductive status. Applied Animal Behavioral Science, 19:169-178.