

Weighed and Found Wanting: Canine Weight Limits at Hotels

Who Sets Them, What They Cost, and What the Evidence Says

Author: Guise Bule, CEO of Roch Dog

Document Reference: RDWP-WL-01

Version: 1.3

Date: 24th October 2026

Publisher: Roch Dog Inc

CONTENTS

Executive Summary 3

The Most Common Rule in the Book 4

Who Sets the Limit 5

Why Hotels Say They Do It 6

Damage and Cleaning 8

Noise, Nerves and the Small Dog 9

Bites and Safety 10

Allergies and Space 11

The Law Already Has a Better Test 12

The Insurer Did Not Ask For It 13

The Dogs a Limit Turns Away 14

What Works Instead 15

Conclusion 16

Methodology and Limitations 17

Sources 18

Executive Summary

Every dog owner who has tried to book a hotel knows the moment. The room looks right, the hotel says it is dog friendly, and then, halfway down the pet policy, there is a number: 25 pounds, 40 pounds, 20 kilograms. Above it, the dog is not coming, and neither is the family. This paper is, as far as we can find, the first study of that number. We measured it across the hotels Roch Dog has assessed and ranked, more than 3,000 of them in 56 countries, and in the 236 published pet policies we read for The Fine Print, and then took every reason hotels give for it to the research.

The first finding is how common the rule is and how low it is set. Roughly two hotels in five cap the dogs they accept by weight, and the typical cap is about 20 kilograms, or 44 pounds. That is below the weight of every adult Labrador and golden retriever, which means one hotel in three in our directory would turn away the most popular family dog in the world. The habit is above all American: about half of American hotels set a limit, against one in five in Britain and not one of the German or Austrian hotels we rank. And it is rarely a brand rule. Outside a handful of brands that set a generous figure for every property, the limit is chosen hotel by hotel, usually by someone who could not tell you where the number came from.

The second finding is that the reasons do not hold. Nobody has ever measured hotel damage or complaints by the size of the dog, and the nearest research, from rental housing in three countries, finds pet damage uncommon, modest and covered by an ordinary deposit. The behavioural research runs the other way from the rule: study after study finds that smaller dogs are, on average, more fearful, more excitable and quicker to snap at people than larger ones. No study links allergen to weight, no law requires a limit, and no liability insurer we could find asks for one; the exclusions insurers do use name breeds, not weights.

The third finding is that the law already has the better test. A large dog can do more harm when a bite goes badly wrong, and this paper says so plainly. But the research into the worst cases finds them driven by an unsupervised dog, an uncontrolled dog and a dog that has never lived as a family pet, which is exactly what a conduct rule manages and a weight limit ignores. The most protected dogs in any hotel, the guide dogs and service dogs, most of them Labradors and golden retrievers, already stay in any room at no charge under a single test: is the dog under control?

So the weight limit is a number that feels safe and is not. It turns away more than half of American dogs before anyone has seen how they behave, the research finds it reassures nobody, and it can be changed by the hotel that set it, this week, at no cost. The paper closes with the alternative, the Friendly Dog Policy, which judges every dog by its behaviour rather than its weight, and which the law has been running in hotel lobbies for decades.

SECTION 1

The Most Common Rule in the Book

Our earlier papers looked at what hotels charge for dogs, in [The Hotel Pet Fee](#), and at the rules written into their pet policies, in [The Fine Print](#). One rule came up more often than any other: a weight above which the dog is not a guest. This paper is about that rule.

1.1 Two in five hotels set one

We measured the weight limit in two ways. The first is the hotels Roch Dog has assessed and ranked, more than 3,000 of them in 56 countries, where each hotel tells us whether it limits dogs by weight and at what figure. More than a third of them do, and among those that gave a clear answer, nearly two in five. The second is the 236 published hotel pet policies we read for [The Fine Print](#), where two in five state a limit.

Two independent measures agree: roughly two hotels in five cap the dogs they accept by weight, which makes it the most common restriction in the hotel pet policy.

1.2 The typical limit is 20 kilograms

Among the hotels we rank that set a limit, the median is 44 pounds. Half of all limits sit between 25 and 50 pounds, and the policy study found a median of 40. The favourite figure in North America is 50 pounds; elsewhere it is a round number of kilograms, usually 10, 15 or 20, which is why 22, 33 and 44 pounds come up so often. More than three in four limits sit at 50 pounds or below.

The typical hotel weight limit is about 20 kilograms, a figure that sounds generous on a policy page and turns out to exclude most of the dogs people actually own.

1.3 An American habit, unevenly copied

About half of the American hotels we rank set a weight limit. In Britain it is about one in five, in Canada and the rest of Europe about three in ten, and in Asia-Pacific more than half, led by Japan. Not one of the German or Austrian hotels we rank sets a limit at all.

Bigger and grander hotels are more likely to set one. Five star hotels do so more often than four star hotels, 45% against 29%, and half of hotels with 200 rooms or more set a limit, against one in six with fewer than 50. If the rule were about small rooms, the small independent would be the strictest. It is the least strict.

The weight limit is set most often by the hotels with the biggest rooms, which tells us it is rarely about space and usually about habit.

SECTION 2

Who Sets the Limit

It is natural to assume a weight limit comes down from head office, written once by a brand and applied to every hotel that flies its flag. For most of the big chains it does not. We read the chains' own pet pages and set them beside what their hotels told us, and the two sources tell the same story.

2.1 Most brands leave it to the hotel

Only three of the chains we read set a size rule for every hotel, and all three are generous. Kimpton welcomes a pet "no matter their size, weight, or breed". Red Roof allows each pet up to 80 pounds. Motel 6 allows two pets up to 150 pounds combined and says it "does not enforce strict breed or size restrictions".

Everyone else leaves it to the property. Within Four Seasons the limit runs from 7 kilograms in Lisbon to 30 pounds at the Beverly Wilshire. Within Fairmont it runs from 20 pounds in Maui to no limit at all in Boston, Dallas and Pittsburgh. Marriott hotels run from 12 kilograms to 40.

Outside three generous brands, the weight limit is not a brand standard. It is a choice made by an owner or a general manager, one hotel at a time.

2.2 Our data shows the same thing

Almost every Kimpton we rank reports no weight limit, which is what a brand rule looks like in the data. Inside Fairmont, Four Seasons, InterContinental and the big Marriott, Hilton and Hyatt families, limits run from none to 25 pounds within the same brand, which is what the absence of a rule looks like. [Dog Friendly Performance Across Luxury Hotel Portfolios](#) found the same spread in everything else a dog is offered.

If your limit is not a brand rule, it is your rule, and you can change it without a committee, a brand review or a budget.

2.3 A number that felt safe

One source of the habit is in plain view. A widely syndicated 2004 article by a hospitality lawyer told hotels to "Create a limit on size by allowing only those pets of no more than 35 pounds", with no data or incident behind the figure. That is the shape of the rule in most hotels today: a number chosen because it felt safe, repeated because it was there, and never tested against what a dog of that size actually does.

Most weight limits trace back to advice that never gave a reason, which is why so few hotels can explain their own figure when a guest asks.

SECTION 3

Why Hotels Say They Do It

Hotels give the same reasons everywhere: a big dog does more damage, sheds more, barks louder, bites harder, worries other guests, worries the insurer and does not fit in the room. This section looks at the two that are really about people: other guests, and the fear of a claim.

3.1 The guest without a dog is real

A hotel is right to think about guests who do not travel with a dog. A 2024 study from the University of the Aegean surveyed 144 guests without pets, recruited through the authors' own contacts: 45% had no problem with a hotel that took pets, but 34% would choose another hotel to avoid meeting an animal. It is one small survey, but it describes a three-way balance between the hotel and both kinds of guest, kept steady by clear policy.

Some guests without dogs would rather not meet one, and a hotel is right to care about them. The useful question is what actually puts their mind at rest.

3.2 What reassures them is a clear policy

A study published this year answers that directly. In two experiments, researchers changed how a hotel described its pet policy, which rooms and areas take dogs and what cleaning is charged, and measured who would book. A detailed, visible policy raised booking intentions because it signalled higher cleanliness standards, and it worked best on guests who do not own pets. The rest of the recent hotel research agrees: guests want clear rules, cleaner rooms and good safety measures, and nothing in any of it suggests a guest is reassured by a number of pounds.

A global study published in October 2026 puts the point beyond argument. [Koufodontis \(2026\)](#), in the International Journal of Hospitality Management, asked 1,041 travellers in 66 countries what a hotel must do before they will believe its pet friendly claim. Clear and transparent rules came second only to the right facilities, named by 76 per cent, and nine in ten endorsed a hotel that admits the dog, publishes its rules and provides the basics. A hotel that accepts some kinds of pet and turns others away was endorsed by 12 per cent, the second lowest score of any arrangement tested. The study's own distinction is the useful one. Rules govern how a dog behaves inside the welcome; restrictions decide who is welcome at all; and limits on size, breed or number are defensible only when they manage a shared space rather than exclude from it. A weight limit set before anyone has seen the dog is the second kind. The regional split is worth a hotel's attention too. Europeans and Asians accepted a restricted arrangement about a fifth of the time and Americans more than half, so the weight limit, the American habit section 1 found unevenly copied elsewhere, is also the rule that

guests from the rest of the world are least willing to forgive.

The guest without a dog is won over by clear rules on rooms and cleaning, which a hotel can write in an afternoon. No study finds a weight limit does the same.

3.3 The fear of a claim

Behind several of these reasons sits the fear of liability, and it is not foolish. American homeowners' insurers paid about \$1.86 billion on dog-related injury claims in 2025, on more than 28,000 claims averaging over \$65,000 each. Those figures are for homes, not hotels, and are not broken down by size, but they explain why a risk manager reaches for a rule.

The fear of a claim is reasonable. What this paper asks is whether a weight limit does anything to reduce it, and the evidence that follows says it does not.

SECTION 4

Damage and Cleaning

The commonest reason for a weight limit is the room. A big dog, the argument goes, scratches more, chews more and leaves more hair, and the hotel pays for it in housekeeping time and repairs. It is the reason hotels give most often, so it is the one we tested first.

4.1 Nobody has measured it in hotels

There is no published study of hotel damage or housekeeping time by the size of the dog, and hotels do not publish their damage records. So the nearest evidence comes from rental housing, where a dog lives for years rather than nights. If size drove damage anywhere, it would show there.

The most common reason for a weight limit is the one nobody has ever measured in a hotel, which means every limit set to protect the rooms rests on assumption.

4.2 Rental housing finds damage small

In the United States, the first major study, from 2005, found that tenants with pets caused no more damage on average than tenants without. Among landlords who allowed pets, almost half had never had any pet damage, and the worst cases averaged about \$430, less than a typical deposit. A 2025 survey of more than 500 renters found almost three-quarters said their pets had never damaged their home.

In Britain, a 2026 study of 2,115 landlords found fewer than one in four had any pet damage, with a median cost of £300. Over twelve years, renting to pet owners left the landlord about £3,800 better off. In Australia, the national housing research institute found little evidence that pets cause more damage at all.

Across three countries, pet damage turns out to be uncommon, modest and covered by an ordinary deposit, and not one study ties it to the size of the dog.

4.3 The law is moving to judge the animal

Two Australian jurisdictions, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory, now require a landlord not to refuse a tenant's pet unreasonably. A refusal has to rest on evidence about that animal, not a blanket rule about animals in general. That is the shift this paper argues for in hotels: from the category to the individual dog, and from what a dog of that size might do to what this dog has actually done.

Housing law is already moving from blanket rules to the individual animal, and the hotel that judges each dog on its behaviour is simply ahead of it.

SECTION 5

Noise, Nerves and the Small Dog

The second claim is that a big dog is a loud dog, the one that barks through the night or frets when its owner goes down to dinner. No study measures hotel noise by the size of the dog, but there is a large body of research on how dogs of different sizes behave, and it points away from the big dog.

5.1 Problems rise as dogs get smaller

The largest study of size and behaviour, published in 2013, looked at 8,301 dogs of 49 breeds through a standard owner questionnaire. Of 36 behaviours, 33 were linked to height, weight or head shape, and the authors summed it up plainly: "behavior becomes more problematic as height decreases". Shorter dogs scored higher for separation problems, fear, touch sensitivity and attention seeking, and lighter dogs scored higher for excitability. Those are exactly the behaviours a hotel worries about when a dog is left in a room.

The behaviours a weight limit is meant to keep out of the hotel are the ones the research finds more often in the small dogs it lets in.

5.2 Observers found the same

A 2016 study avoided relying on owners. Trained observers scored 67,368 dogs of 45 breeds in a fixed set of tests in Sweden. Shorter dogs reacted more defensively. Taller dogs were more affectionate, cooperative and playful with people. Lighter dogs were more cautious and more fearful of a sudden noise.

Measured by independent observers rather than owners, the same pattern holds: bigger dogs were calmer and friendlier with strangers, smaller dogs more fearful.

5.3 Big dog owners train harder

A 2010 Vienna study of 1,276 owners split dogs at 20 kilograms, which happens to be the typical hotel limit. Smaller dogs were less obedient and more anxious, and their owners trained them less and were less consistent. A 2026 analysis of 18,416 American dogs adds that bad behaviour hurts the owner's relationship more when the dog is medium or large. The owner of a big dog feels it sooner and trains against it harder.

The owner of a big dog has every reason to train it well, and the dog that arrives at your front desk usually shows it.

SECTION 6

Bites and Safety

The bite deserves the most care, because here the evidence cuts both ways. Small dogs bite more often, and large dogs can do more harm when a bite goes badly wrong. This section takes both seriously, then looks at what the research says drives the worst cases.

6.1 Small dogs snap more often

Studies agree that smaller dogs are more likely to show aggression toward people. A 2021 study of 9,270 Finnish dogs found that small body size raised the odds. A 2008 study of more than 30 breeds found the most snapping and biting in Dachshunds, Chihuahuas and Jack Russell terriers, and the least in golden retrievers, Labradors, Bernese mountain dogs and greyhounds, several of the breeds a 44 pound limit turns away. These rest largely on owners' reports, and a 2022 genetic study found breed explains only 9% of behaviour between individual dogs, so they are averages, not a verdict on any one dog.

The dogs most likely to snap at a guest or a housekeeper are, on average, the small ones a weight limit welcomes, not the large ones it refuses.

6.2 Big dogs can do more harm

On how much damage a bite does, size matters, and this paper says so plainly. Bite force rises with the size of the skull, and in a major study of 256 fatal dog attacks in the United States, most of the dogs weighed between 23 and 45 kilograms. The everyday picture is more mixed: in one Australian hospital study, bites from small dogs were six times more likely to be to the head.

A big dog can do more harm in the worst case, and the hotel is right to take that seriously. The question is what actually leads to the worst case.

6.3 What drives the worst cases

The same fatality study shows what did. In 87% of deaths there was no capable adult to step in. In 85% the victim had little or no relationship with the dog. In 76% the dog was kept isolated rather than living as a family pet. Four or more such factors were present in four deaths in five, and weight alone was not the story. Its authors, it is fair to note, campaign against breed bans. A dog travelling with its owner, on a lead in the lobby, is the opposite of that profile.

Serious incidents are driven by supervision and control, which a conduct rule manages for every dog and a weight limit ignores for all of them.

SECTION 7

Allergies and Space

Two reasons remain. One is that a big dog leaves more allergen for the next guest. The other is that a big dog does not fit. The first has no evidence behind it. The second is the one reason this paper accepts, within limits.

7.1 Allergen does not track size

No study links the amount of allergen a dog sheds to its weight. The research that exists looks at breed, and a 2012 study of 356 dogs found differences between breeds were "small, relative to the variability within a breed". Airborne levels in the home did not differ by breed at all. Even the breeds sold as hypoallergenic carried no less.

No research supports the idea that a bigger dog leaves more allergen behind, and no study has ever measured dog allergen in a hotel room.

7.2 Allergen travels with people

What the research does show is that dog allergen moves on clothes. A survey of 831 American homes found it in every one, though only half had had a pet in the previous six months. In Swedish shops it built up on display mattresses within three weeks, carried in by customers.

Every hotel room receives dog allergen from guests who own dogs and left them at home. The guest with a severe allergy is protected by cleaning and by rooms that never take a dog, as [The Canine Hospitality Playbook](#) recommends, not by the weight of the last dog to stay.

A guest with an allergy is protected by a dog free floor and a good clean, not by the size of the dog that slept in the room before them.

7.3 Space is a fair reason, for some rooms

A small city room may not hold a large dog, its bed and two guests in comfort. A hotel that says a particular room type is too small for a dog over a certain size, and says why, is stating a fact about its building, and our standard has no quarrel with that. The [family dog](#) it describes is a Labrador sized dog of up to about 35 kilograms. What the standard does quarrel with is one figure applied to every room, from the smallest to the largest suite, with no reason given.

A limit tied to a small room type, with the reason stated, is honest. A single cap across every room in the hotel is not about space at all.

SECTION 8

The Law Already Has a Better Test

No law requires a hotel to set a weight limit, and none forbids it for an ordinary pet. The legal review behind The Fine Print found no statute or health code setting one in the United States, Britain, Canada or Australia. But the law has already shown what a better rule looks like.

8.1 Two grounds, and size is not one

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the regulation gives a hotel two grounds for asking a service animal to leave: "The animal is out of control and the animal's handler does not take effective action to control it", or "The animal is not housebroken". It may not charge a fee or refuse a breed.

The rules mention size and weight once, for miniature horses, and never for dogs. In housing, the US government puts it bluntly: "Breed, size, and weight limitations may not be applied to an assistance animal." In Britain, refusing an assistance dog is unlawful except in the most exceptional of circumstances, and size is not one of them.

The law manages the most protected dogs in any hotel with a test of behaviour alone, and it has never needed a weight limit to do it.

8.2 The biggest dogs are already in your hotel

The dogs that do this work are large. Guide Dogs in Britain says its most common guide dog is a Labrador crossed with a golden retriever, and an adult Labrador weighs 55 to 80 pounds. So every hotel in America and Britain is already obliged to take dogs well above its own pet limit, in any room, at no charge, under a conduct test alone.

Your hotel already welcomes the largest dogs it will ever see, under a behaviour test alone, and has done so safely for as long as it has been open.

8.3 The Friendly Dog Policy

That is the whole idea behind the Friendly Dog Policy, set out in The Fine Print and free for any hotel to use. Every dog is judged by its behaviour, not its breed, size or weight, and the test is the same for every dog. If a dog behaves badly, the hotel warns the owner, helps where it can, and if it carries on, ends the stay on its normal terms.

The Friendly Dog Policy asks a hotel to apply to every dog the test the law already applies to the largest dogs in the building.

SECTION 9

The Insurer Did Not Ask For It

Ask a hotel why it caps dogs at 50 pounds and, sooner or later, the answer is the insurer. It is the reason given most confidently, and the hardest for a guest to argue with. We went looking for the insurance rule behind it, and could not find one.

9.1 Insurers name breeds, not weights

Insurers do shape what hotels do about dogs, but through breeds. The exclusion endorsements attached to commercial liability policies list the animals and breeds an insurer will not cover. One standard form names the pit bull terrier, Doberman, German shepherd, Rottweiler and wolf hybrids, and carves out guide and assistance dogs. A hotel with one of those has a real reason for a breed list.

We found no commercial policy, endorsement or underwriting guide that sets a weight limit for a hotel. Weight does appear in the personal dog liability cover sold to owners and renters, which may be where the belief began.

A breed list may have an insurer behind it. A weight limit, on everything we could find, has only the hotel that wrote it.

9.2 What an underwriter actually cares about

The things that drive a serious incident are a dog out of control, a dog nobody is watching and a dog that is not a family pet. A hotel that requires a lead in public areas, does not let dogs be left alone unless crated or agreed, tells housekeeping which rooms hold a dog, and reserves the right to end a stay, is managing all of that for every dog. A hotel that caps weight at 50 pounds and does none of those things is managing nothing, and has a Chihuahua in room 212 to prove it.

None of these measures costs much. A lead rule is a line in the pet policy, a housekeeping flag is a note on the room list, and the right to end a stay is already in most hotels' terms of business. Together they answer the question an underwriter actually asks, which is not how big the dog is but who is in charge of it.

Ask your broker what a weight limit does for your cover. Then ask what a lead rule, a housekeeping flag and a clear right to end a stay would do.

The Dogs a Limit Turns Away

The cost of a weight limit is the share of dogs it refuses, and for the first time that can be measured. Set the typical hotel limit against what dogs actually weigh, and the answer is not a few large dogs at the margin but most of the dogs people own.

10.1 More than half of American dogs

The best American figures come from the Dog Aging Project, which enrolled 27,541 companion dogs in its 2020 release. Of those, 22.5% weigh under 10 kilograms, 20.4% weigh 10 to 20 kilograms, and 57% weigh 20 kilograms or more. So the typical hotel limit of 44 pounds turns away more than half of American dogs, and a 25 pound limit turns away about three in four. In Britain, nearly half of the 12.6 million dogs are medium or large breeds.

The typical hotel weight limit turns away more than half of American dogs before anyone has looked at how a single one of them behaves.

10.2 The Labrador test

More than nine in ten weight limits in our directory sit below our family dog benchmark of 77 pounds, so one hotel in three would refuse a Labrador sized dog. The American Kennel Club puts an adult Labrador at 55 to 80 pounds and ranks the Labrador and golden retriever second and third in America. About four in five limits in our directory are below 55 pounds, so they refuse even the smallest adult Labrador. A hotel that calls itself dog friendly and will not take a Labrador is the clearest case of the gap [Nobody Trusts Pet Friendly](#) measured.

Four weight limits in five would refuse even the smallest adult Labrador, the dog most families picture when they hear the words dog friendly.

10.3 What dog owners pay for, and the bookings lost

A Kyung Hee University choice experiment with 491 dog owners, explained in [What Dog Owners Will Pay For in a Hotel](#), found that what owners actually pay for is service and shared space, not rules. No study counts the bookings a limit loses, because the hotel never sees the guest who did not call. But research in China, Turkey and Australia finds that constraints like this stop people travelling with their dogs at all, and [The Economics of Dog Friendly Hospitality](#) sets out what that guest is worth.

The weight limit is the rule that decides the trip before it is planned, and it turns away the owners of more than half of American dogs before they ever call.

What Works Instead

The alternative to a weight limit does not need inventing. It is already written into disability law, it is set out in the Roch Dog Friendly Standard, and it is running every day in hotels that have never had a limit. What it asks of a hotel is to manage the dog in front of it.

11.1 The rules that do the work

The Friendly Dog Policy judges every dog by its behaviour. Around it sit the tools most hotels already have. A dog is on a lead in public areas. A dog is not left alone in a room unless it is crated or the hotel has agreed. Housekeeping knows which rooms hold a dog. Damage is charged at cost. A floor or two never takes a dog, for guests with allergies, and every other room type is open. Where a room really is too small, the limit is tied to that room, with the reason stated.

Every rule that actually manages the risk of a dog in a hotel is already in the toolkit. The weight limit is the only one that manages nothing.

11.2 Hotels already run this way

The strongest proof is Kimpton. It has welcomed pets since 1992, and today runs more than 75 hotels across the United States, Europe, Asia and the Caribbean on one rule: pets are welcome "no matter their size, weight, or breed, all at no extra charge". That is more than three decades, on several continents, without a weight limit. Red Roof and Motel 6 do much the same at the budget end, and Fairmont hotels in Boston, Dallas and Pittsburgh take dogs of any size.

The hotel that drops its limit gains the Labrador, the golden retriever and the shepherd, the dogs whose owners train hardest. It gains a rule its staff can actually enforce, because nobody weighs a dog at the front desk, and a policy it can explain to any guest who asks, which a number of pounds has never been.

One brand has welcomed dogs of any size, in hotels around the world, for more than thirty years. Any general manager can make the same choice tomorrow.

Conclusion

The weight limit hotels set for dogs is a rule with a long history and no evidence. It appears in two policies out of five, is set at about 20 kilograms, and is chosen hotel by hotel by people who, in most cases, could not say where the figure came from.

We took every reason for it to the research. Damage is uncommon, modest and unrelated to size in every study that has looked. Fear, excitement and snapping are more common in the small dogs the limit admits than in the large dogs it refuses. Allergen does not track breed and has never been linked to weight. No law requires the limit, no insurer we found asks for it, and no brand requires a low one.

The one point the evidence grants is that a big dog can do more harm when something goes badly wrong. What goes wrong is supervision and control, which a conduct rule manages and a weight limit ignores.

The law reached this conclusion first. The guide dogs and service dogs in every hotel, mostly Labradors and golden retrievers, stay in any room, at no charge, under one test: is the dog under control? The Friendly Dog Policy asks hotels to use that test for every dog.

The cost of not doing so is counted in dogs turned away: more than half of American dogs, and the Labrador at one hotel in three. The guests those hotels think they are protecting are reassured by a clear policy on rooms and cleaning, not by a number of pounds nobody at the desk can check.

A hotel is free to set whatever rules it likes. But a hotel that calls itself dog friendly and will not take the most popular family dog in the world has a rule its own evidence cannot defend, and the better rule is already in the building. It applies to the guide dog in the lobby. It can apply to the Labrador in the car park.

Methodology and Limitations

The prevalence, size and geography of hotel weight limits come from two Roch Dog datasets. The first is the hotels Roch Dog has assessed and ranked against the Roch Dog Friendly Standard (RDFS-02) as of 13 October 2026, out of more than 3,000 hotels assessed in 56 countries since 2023. Each hotel is asked whether it limits dogs by weight and at what figure; the answer is the hotel's own, given to an anonymous guest enquiry or by self assessment, and every answer is subject to independent verification through the year with housekeeping, the front desk, reservations and the concierge, and with guests through their reviews. A hotel is counted as having a limit only where it stated a figure and did not also state it had no limit; the few records where the answers conflict or are missing are left out of the clean denominator. Figures are given as shares and fractions. The second dataset is the 236 published pet policies read for The Fine Print, whose method is set out there. Chain policies were read on the chains' own pages on 13 October 2026 and may since have changed; Hilton's and Best Western's brand pages could not be read and are not relied on.

Kilograms were converted at 2.20462 pounds to the kilogram. A small number of older records appear to hold kilograms recorded as pounds, and some hotels' answers came from an earlier dataset not yet confirmed by assessment; neither moves any quoted figure by more than a point, and suspect records are excluded. The dataset covers hotels that accept dogs and that we have assessed, not a random sample of the world's hotels, and it has not been externally audited. Hotels are not compared by grade, because the absence of a weight limit is itself something the standard credits.

The behavioural, medical, housing and legal evidence is cited to its primary source in the list below. The text says where a finding rests on owners' reports, a volunteer group of dogs or a summary rather than the full paper, and where a source carries an interest. The legal section describes the law as published as of October 2026; it is not legal advice. Hotels and brands are described from their own published policies and their own answers to our assessment; where a policy has changed, the live listing at rochdog.com is the current record.

SOURCES

Roch Dog Research

1. Roch Dog Assessment Dataset, 2023 to October 2026: more than 3,000 hotels in 56 countries assessed against the Roch Dog Friendly Standard. Weight limit, fee and deposit figures in this paper are from the ranked hotels published at rochdog.com as of 13 October 2026.
2. Roch Dog Friendly Standard (RDFS-02) and the family dog definition.
3. RDWP-HPP-01: The Fine Print. 236 pet policies, the legal review in four countries, and the Friendly Dog Policy.
4. RDWP-HPF-01: The Hotel Pet Fee.
5. RDWP-03: The Economics of Dog Friendly Hospitality.
6. RDWP-IHG-02: Dog Friendly Performance Across Luxury Hotel Portfolios.
7. RDWP-PB-01: The Canine Hospitality Playbook.
8. RDWP-WTP-01: What Dog Owners Will Pay For in a Hotel.
9. RDWP-02: Nobody Trusts Pet Friendly.

Dog Behaviour and Size

10. McGreevy, P. D., Georgevsky, D., Carrasco, J., Valenzuela, M., Duffy, D. L. and Serpell, J. A. (2013). Dog behavior co-varies with height, bodyweight and skull shape. PLoS ONE 8(12): e80529
11. Stone, H. R., McGreevy, P. D., Starling, M. J. and Forkman, B. (2016). Associations between domestic-dog morphology and behaviour scores in the Dog Mentality Assessment. PLoS ONE 11(2): e0149403
12. Mikkola, S., Salonen, M., Puurunen, J., Hakanen, E., Sulkama, S., Araujo, C. and Lohi, H. (2021). Aggressive behaviour is affected by demographic, environmental and behavioural factors in purebred dogs. Scientific Reports 11: 9433
13. Duffy, D. L., Hsu, Y. and Serpell, J. A. (2008). Breed differences in canine aggression. Applied Animal Behaviour Science 114: 441-460
14. Arhant, C., Bubna-Littitz, H., Bartels, A., Futschik, A. and Troxler, J. (2010). Behaviour of smaller and larger dogs: effects of training methods, inconsistency of owner behaviour and level of engagement in activities with the dog. Applied Animal Behaviour Science 123: 131-142
15. Sckocheva, M. J. and Pinzone, A. G. (2026). Behavioral factors influencing dog-owner relationships: differential associations by dog size. Pet Behaviour Science 20
16. Morrill, K. and colleagues (2022). Ancestry-inclusive dog genomics challenges popular breed stereotypes. Science 376: eabk0639

Bites and Injury

17. Patronek, G. J., Sacks, J. J., Delise, K. M., Cleary, D. V. and Marder, A. R. (2013). Co-occurrence of potentially preventable factors in 256 dog bite-related fatalities in the United States (2000-2009). Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association 243(12): 1726-1736
18. Ellis, J. L., Thomason, J., Kebreab, E., Zubair, K. and France, J. (2009). Cranial dimensions and forces of biting in the domestic dog. Journal of Anatomy 214: 362-373
19. Pekin, A., Rynhoud, H., Brennan, B. and Soares Magalhães, R. J. (2021). Dog bite emergency department presentations in Brisbane metro south. One Health 12: 100204
20. Insurance Information Institute and State Farm (2026). Dog-related injury claims, 2025

Damage in Housing

21. Carlisle-Frank, P., Frank, J. M. and Nielsen, L. (2005). Companion animal renters and pet-friendly housing in the US. Anthrozoös 18(1): 59-77
22. Simcock, T., Alper, K. and McCarthy, L. (2026). Renting to pet owners in the private rental sector: a cost-benefit analysis. International Journal of Housing Policy
23. Pet-Inclusive Housing Initiative (2025). 2025 Pet-Inclusive Housing Report, as reported by Multifamily Executive, 4 August 2025
24. Stone, W. and colleagues (2021). Housing and housing assistance pathways with companion animals. AHURI Final Report 350

Allergens

25. Vredegoor, D. W., Willemse, T., Chapman, M. D., Heederik, D. J. and Krop, E. J. (2012). Can f 1 levels in hair and homes of different dog breeds. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 130: 904-909

26. Nicholas, C. E. and colleagues (2011). Dog allergen levels in homes with hypoallergenic compared with nonhypoallergenic dogs. *American Journal of Rhinology and Allergy* 25: 252-256
27. Arbes, S. J., Cohn, R. D., Yin, M., Muilenberg, M. L., Friedman, W. and Zeldin, D. C. (2004). Dog allergen (Can f 1) and cat allergen (Fel d 1) in US homes. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*
28. Egmar, A. C., Almqvist, C., Emenius, G., Lilja, G. and Wickman, M. (1998). Deposition of cat (Fel d 1), dog (Can f 1), and horse allergen over time in public environments. *Allergy*

Dog Populations

29. Nam, Y., White, M., Karlsson, E. K., Creevy, K. E., Promislow, D. E. L., McClelland, R. L. and colleagues (2024). Dog size and patterns of disease history across the canine age spectrum: results from the Dog Aging Project. *PLoS ONE* 19(1): e0295840
30. McMillan, K. M., Harrison, X. A., Wong, D. C., Upjohn, M. M., Christley, R. M. and Casey, R. A. (2024). Estimation of the size, density, and demographic distribution of the UK pet dog population in 2019. *Scientific Reports* 14: 31746
31. American Kennel Club. Official standard for the Labrador Retriever
32. American Kennel Club (2026). The most popular dog breeds of 2025
33. Guide Dogs (UK). Guide dog facts and breeds

Hotels and Guests

34. Koufodontis, N. I. and Melissourgou, P. (2024). Improving travel experience for hotel guests: policy recommendations for pet-friendly hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 122: 103828
35. Koufodontis, N. I. (2026). Pet-friendliness in hospitality and tourism: Definition, scope, and governance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 141: 104929
36. Lee, Fan, Park and Mattila (2026). Investigating the effects of pet policy communication on customers' hotel experience across different customer groups. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*
37. Kim and colleagues (2025). Pet-friendly hotels: distinctive attributes and their influence on customer behavior. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights* 8: 2359-2380
38. Çıkkı and colleagues (2025). Staying in pet-friendly hotels: examining the experiences of pet-friendly hotel customers in Turkey. *Consumer Behavior in Tourism and Hospitality* 20: 359-373
39. Buhalis, D. and Chan, J. (2023). Traveling with pets: designing hospitality services for pet owners/parents and hotel guests. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 35(12): 4217-4237
40. Joo, Y.-J., Jo, Y., Jo, H., Choi, H.-e. and Yoon, Y.-s. (2023). How much are you willing to pay when you travel with a pet? Evidence from a choice experiment. *Current Issues in Tourism* 27(13): 2118-2133
41. Ying, T., Tang, J., Wen, J., Ye, S., Zhou, Y. and Li, F. (2021). Traveling with pets: constraints, negotiation, and learned helplessness. *Tourism Management* 82: 104183
42. Carr, N. and Cohen, S. (2009). Holidaying with the family pet: no dogs allowed! *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 9: 290-304
43. Barber, D. S. (2004). Is a pet policy enough? Best practices for inviting pets into your hotel and avoiding litigation. *Hospitality Net*, 1 December 2004

Chain Policies (read 13 October 2026)

44. Kimpton Hotels and Restaurants, pet friendly hotels and IHG news releases of 26 October 2022 and 4 May 2025
45. Red Roof, pet policy
46. Motel 6, pets stay free and reservation policies
47. Beverly Wilshire, a Four Seasons Hotel, pet friendly stays and Four Seasons Hotel Ritz Lisbon, pet friendly stays

Law and Regulation

48. Americans with Disabilities Act, Title III regulation, 28 CFR 36.302(c), service animals
49. US Department of Justice, Frequently asked questions about service animals and the ADA (updated 28 February 2020)
50. US Department of Housing and Urban Development, FHEO Notice FHEO-2013-01, service animals and assistance animals for people with disabilities in housing
51. Equality Act 2010, section 20, duty to make adjustments and Equality and Human Rights Commission, Assistance dogs: a guide for all businesses
52. SES Insurance, animal liability exclusion endorsement form



Published by Roch Dog

Roch Dog is the dog friendly standards and certification body. We define what dog friendly means, then assess, certify and rank hotels, workplaces, and residences against the Roch Dog Friendly Standard.

ONLINE

[Directory](#) | [Standards](#) | [Certification](#) | [Society](#)

CONTACT

E: research@rochdog.com

US: 626 88 44 007

UK: +44 1992 364 007

FOLLOW

[LinkedIn](#) · [Facebook](#) · [Instagram](#) · [X \(Twitter\)](#)

Roch Dog is an independent certification body. We assess, certify, and verify hotels against the Roch Dog Friendly Standard (RDFS-02). The standard, framework, and supporting reference documents are published at rochstandard.com.

© 2026 Roch Dog Inc. All rights reserved.

Licensed under CC BY 4.0. You are free to share and adapt this material for any purpose, including commercial use, provided appropriate credit is given to Roch Dog. Attribution must include: "Source: Roch Dog Standards" with a link to the original publication. Implying endorsement or certification by Roch Dog requires explicit written consent. If changes are made, they must be clearly indicated. Version 3.0, March 2026.