

Veto HB 23-1068, the Dog Bill

Dog Restrictions in HB 23-1068. General Comments and Letter to the Editor Feb 4, 2023 says it all: "You will allow any dog"

Comment: Here we go again, blaming pet restrictions for the shortage of available housing and telling property owners and landlords how to operate their private housing complexes. We are not talking about violating any Fair Housing or Federal discrimination laws. This was attempted before and vetoed. Landlords under this Bill, and you must read it to believe it, must allow dog of any dog breeds and not be able to collect a damage deposit. This will spill over to HOA condominiums and senior housing. It goes further in creating a damages fund to pay for destruction and damages by dogs in rental units: just where we want our taxes to fund. Insurance premiums can't be based on dogs or dog breeds: the pit bull is treated the same as a basset hound. Your grandma in that senior complex would be sharing the elevator with that pit bull or dodging the Doberman in the hallway: what the @\$% is the thinking? There is more but let us stop here. We think an HOA, rental building or other housing privately owned should be able to ban dogs, ban certain dog breeds and number of dogs. The State can do what they want with State owned property but stay away from private housing. The imposition on landlord rights makes renting difficult as it is but to top it off with forcing dogs into units to soil the property indoor and out and imposing even more costs on landlords that could be otherwise avoided will surely not be an incentive to invest in properties or to maintain high levels of maintenance. This Bill should never have become a Bill and the sponsors surely have more important issues facing them in the state.

Do what you will in your private home but this forcing social and pet policies on the public and private property owners is against basic liberties and rights we are supposed to enjoy. **This Bill should be vetoed.** Please don't pull the "you hate dogs" card in this debate because if that is all you got you've got little justification for this odd Bill. The sponsors of this Bill, if they claim to love dogs as much as they do, should focus on neutering programs, closing down puppy mills, imposing higher fines on animal abusers and developing stronger requirements for pet ownership so the shelters are not so full from those who borrow vs raise a dog in a healthy environment. Oh yea, we have enough dogs in the metro area so stop this importing of dogs from out of state that ensures the shelters are overflowing.

This Bill, if passed, will spill over to HOA housing and take freedom of choice in the type of housing environment away from homeowners. I will affect insurance premiums in HOAs. Those HOA condominiums requiring damage or other related dog deposits will now have to fund damages themselves. The Bill doesn't grandfather in those housing complexes that have pet restrictions thus this Bill could override such policies. If you live in housing complex that allows for only small dogs you could see larger dogs of any breed sharing the hallways with your mini-poodle. Senior complexes should receive a special exemption to develop their own policies. How do some legislators come up with these Bills with empty justification?

Letter to the Editor, Denver Post, Feb 4, 2023 Dogs are not welcome or good reason

So your dog urinates on the carpet, spots the common area grass, jumps at and/or attacks other residence and the area around the apartment or condominium complex where you rent or purchased your home is littered with dog crap and stinks. Too often when the dog owner is outed for their behavior they aggressively defend themselves

and the pet by labeling the complainant as hating dogs and professing they love animals (which means to them you don't). Landlords, HOAs and other housing ban pets for good reason and certain breeds of dogs for safety reasons. (ahh, he wouldn't harm anyone until he does!). These properties are privately owned and a financial investment. Tenant and resident practices with their dogs can be very detrimental to housing quality and financially devastating to owners. Few owners ever recover damages and the damages from pets may never be repaired: feces and urine smell remains long after the pet is gone. Let's also add the issue of dog barking in and outside the unit that doesn't exactly make a fun place to live. Property owners should not have to allow dogs (HB 23-1068) or wait for damage to be done and then sue or evict. Dog restrictions don't preclude access to housing for humans or violate "human" rights. Your dog ownership is not the landlord's or housing projects responsibility: no one forced you to get a dog(s) so don't force property owners to provide housing for them. Do what you like on your property but don't tell me what I have to do with mine. Since when did the "rights" of dogs become more important than our property rights!