CONSENT CALENDAR

February 3, 2026

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The Committee on Housing to which was referred HB 1553,

AN ACT relative to pet-related fees and rent in residential tenancies. Having considered the same, report the same with the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that it is INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.

Rep. Sherri Reinfurt

FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee:	**Housing**
Bill Number:	**HB 1553**
Title:	**relative to pet-related fees and rent in residential tenancies.**
Date:	**February 3, 2026**
Consent Calendar:	**CONSENT**
Recommendation:	**INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE**

STATEMENT OF INTENT

The majority recommends against advancing legislation that limits pet rent to one percent of a tenant's base rent. While well-intentioned, this proposal would create unintended consequences that outweigh its potential benefits. First, the bill interferes with private lease agreements and replaces flexible, market-based decision-making with a rigid statutory cap. Pet-related costs vary widely by property type, unit condition, and location. A one-size-fits-all limit fails to reflect these differences. Second, pets create real and recurring costs for housing providers, including increased maintenance, cleaning, property damage, and insurance risk. In many lower-rent units, a one percent cap would amount to only a few dollars per month, insufficient to offset these expenses. Third, the proposal is likely to reduce, not expand, pet-friendly housing. Faced with capped pet rent, housing providers may prohibit pets altogether, impose stricter restrictions, or raise base rent for all tenants to recover costs—penalizing renters without pets. Finally, small property owners would be disproportionately impacted. Unlike large operators, they often lack the financial capacity to absorb additional costs and may respond by tightening leasing policies or exiting the rental market. Existing landlord-tenant laws already provide safeguards against unfair practices. The majority finds no compelling evidence that pet rent constitutes a widespread abuse requiring legislative intervention. For these reasons, the majority concludes that this legislation would undermine housing choice, reduce pet-friendly units, and increase costs for renters overall.

Vote 17-1.

Rep. Sherri Reinfurt
FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File

CONSENT CALENDAR

Housing

HB 1553, relative to pet-related fees and rent in residential tenancies. **INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

Rep. Sherri Reinfurt for Housing. The majority recommends against advancing legislation that limits pet rent to one percent of a tenant's base rent. While well-intentioned, this proposal would create unintended consequences that outweigh its potential benefits. First, the bill interferes with private lease agreements and replaces flexible, market-based decision-making with a rigid statutory cap. Pet-related costs vary widely by property type, unit condition, and location. A one-size-fits-all limit fails to reflect these differences. Second, pets create real and recurring costs for housing providers, including increased maintenance, cleaning, property damage, and insurance risk. In many lower-rent units, a one percent cap would amount to only a few dollars per month, insufficient to offset these expenses. Third, the proposal is likely to reduce, not expand, pet-friendly housing. Faced with capped pet rent, housing providers may prohibit pets altogether, impose stricter restrictions, or raise base rent for all tenants to recover costs—penalizing renters without pets. Finally, small property owners would be disproportionately impacted. Unlike large operators, they often lack the financial capacity to absorb additional costs and may respond by tightening leasing policies or exiting the rental market. Existing landlord-tenant laws already provide safeguards against unfair practices. The majority finds no compelling evidence that pet rent constitutes a widespread abuse requiring legislative intervention. For these reasons, the majority concludes that this legislation would undermine housing choice, reduce pet-friendly units, and increase costs for renters overall. **Vote 17-1.**

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File