



Decision with Statement of Reasons of the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) under Section 51(1) of the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016

Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/EV/23/4010

Re: Property at 119 Gelnclova Terrace, Forfar, DD8 1NT (“the Property”)

Parties:

Mr Tomasz Flis, 2 Andson Street, Friockheim, Arbroath, DD11 4TY (“the Applicant”)

Mr Grzegorz Urbanski, Mrs Wioletta Urbanska, 119 Gelnclova Terrace, Forfar, DD8 1NT (“the Respondents”)

Tribunal Members:

Graham Harding (Legal Member) and Helen Barclay (Ordinary Member)

Decision

The First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) (“the Tribunal”) determined that the Applicant was entitled to an order for the eviction of the Respondents from the property.

Background

1. By application dated 5 November 2023 the Applicant’s representatives, Bowman Solicitors, Dundee applied to the Tribunal for an order for the eviction of the Respondent from the property in terms of Ground 4 of Schedule 3 of the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016 (“the 2016 Act”). The Applicant submitted a copy of a tenancy agreement, Notice to Leave, Section 11 Notice and an Affidavit by the Applicant together with other documents in support of the application.
2. By Notice of Acceptance dated 19 January 2024 a legal member of the Tribunal with delegated powers accepted the application and a Case Management Discussion (“CMD”) was assigned.

3. Intimation of the CMD was served on the Respondent by Sheriff Officers on 1 March 2024.
4. A CMD was held by teleconference on 8 April 2024. The Applicant was represented by Mr Gray of Gilson Gray, Solicitors. The Respondents represented themselves and had the services of a Polish interpreter. After hearing from the parties, the Tribunal adjourned the proceedings to a hearing on whether it was reasonable to grant an order for eviction.
5. By emails dated 30 July 2024 the Respondents submitted written representations to the Tribunal.
6. By emails dated 5 and 6 August 2024 the Applicant's representatives, Gilson Gray, Solicitors, submitted written representations to the Tribunal.

The Hearing

7. A hearing was held at Endeavour House Dundee on 14 August 2024. The Applicant attended in person and was represented by Mr Scott Runciman of Gilson Gray, Solicitors. The Respondents also attended in person and represented themselves and had the services of a Polish interpreter.
8. By way of a preliminary matter the Tribunal noted that the Respondents wished to record the proceedings. Mr Urbanski explained that this was because of his lack of understanding of English. The Tribunal explained that as the Respondents had the services of a Polish interpreter it did not consider that it was necessary for the Respondents to also record the proceedings and refused the request in terms of Rule 35 of the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland Housing and Property Chamber (Procedure Regulations) 2017.
9. There then followed a discussion on the purpose of the hearing as Mr Urbanski raised issues with regards to the lack of a written tenancy agreement and also whether it was genuinely the Applicant's intention to live in the property when he had previously expressed an intention to sell it. Mr Urbanski also made reference to inaccuracies in the Applicant's affidavit.
10. For the Applicant Mr Runciman referred the Tribunal to Section 1 of the 2016 Act and also confirmed that it was the Applicant's intention to live in the property. He went on to say that at the CMD the Respondents had confirmed they did not wish to continue to live in the property and had admitted they had applied to the council for housing. Mr Runciman submitted that the Respondents would be on the priority list for being rehoused and asked whether they would withdraw their defences so that they could be rehoused.
11. For the Respondents, Mr Urbanski said that from the information he had received, if an order for eviction was granted it would increase the band

by one level but that would still leave others in bands above with higher priority. Mr Urbanski went on to say that he had not been given any confirmation that the Council would provide the family with a suitable property and he was aware that they did not have enough properties available. Mr Urbanski said that he had spoken to Scottish Shelter who had told him that he may not get Council accommodation and nobody had confirmed that council accommodation would be available and most councils did not have enough properties. Mr Urbanski did agree that he definitely did not want to remain in the property particularly with threats of no heating. Mr Urbanski went on to say that from the beginning when he had been told that the Applicant had no right to rent the property, he had been looking to find another property.

12. For the Applicant, Mr Runciman said that if all the Respondents needed was time the Applicant would agree to some additional time being allowed for the Respondents to find another property.
13. For the Respondents Mr Urbanski said that he could not guarantee he would be able to find a suitable property for the family and was not sure that the Applicant would honour such an agreement given what had happened in the past. Mr Urbanski spoke of the Applicant referring the family to the social work department without good cause. He said he would not agree to withdrawing his defence.

Evidence of Applicant

14. The Applicant provided his date of birth and said his occupation was a physical instructor. He explained he started work at about 5.00 a.m. to see his regular clients. The Applicant went on to say he was single and had no dependents. He said he had owned the property which was subject to two standard securities. He confirmed it was the only property he owned and that it was a two-bedroom flat. The Applicant said he had lived in the property for seven years before leaving in 2021 to move in with his now ex-girlfriend.
15. The Applicant said that he had decided to let people in to the property in order to pay the bills and thus be able to provide financial support for his girlfriend. He also said he had been concerned about winter coming on and the flat being left empty. The Applicant said he had been introduced to the Respondents through a mutual contact and had tried to help the Respondents. He said he had been told they were looking for temporary accommodation and that they had three children so the flat would be too small and they would be looking for somewhere else.
16. The Applicant went on to say that he was in receipt of minimum wage and as the Respondents had already said that the flat was too small, he had thought that he might put the property on the market. He said he could not afford to re-mortgage the property. He said that there had just been

an informal arrangement with the Respondents, they had just shaken hands. As he had known nothing about being a landlord.

17. The Applicant said that the Respondents had moved from England and that he had been told that they had experienced some problems there. He said that he had been told that they had two children but that when they arrived there were three children and that Mrs Urbanska was pregnant.
18. The Applicant explained he and his girlfriend had fallen out about two years ago and that since then had stayed first in a friend's cottage and with other friends, sofa surfing. The Applicant said he had no proper address for two years and that this had badly impacted on his mental health making him unable to work. The Applicant also said he was only earning about £10000.00. per year and could not afford to rent his own property as well as pay his mortgage and insurance and other outgoings on the property but he could afford to live in his own property.
19. The Applicant said he had asked to get the property back in 2022 and the Respondents said they would look for somewhere else and when they did not leave, he had written to the Council. The Applicant confirmed it was his intention to live in the property permanently.
20. The Applicant confirmed the rent for the property was £500.00 per month and that the Respondents had paid the rent for most of the duration of the tenancy but that there was a period of six or seven months when no rent had been paid but was then paid in a single payment of £3500.00. The Applicant confirmed the rent was paid up to date and there were no arrears.
21. The Applicant went on to say that in terms of his mortgage he was not permitted to rent the property and so it could be re-possessed for breaking the terms of the mortgage agreement. He also said he could not afford to re-mortgage the property. The Applicant also said that he did not think the property was in a good condition as there had been a burst pipe which was the subject of an insurance claim and there was mould on a wall and the property was overcrowded. He said he had been told that two other people were living in the property so there might be eight people staying in the property. He also said there had been reports of antisocial behaviour.
22. The Applicant said he arranged an inspection of the property and had gone with two friends Donna and Colin Smith. The Applicant said that Donna Smith was a former police officer. He went on to say that during the inspection he never raised his voice. He said he noted the fire alarm had been removed. He also said that he had struggled to get beyond the hall and had been stopped from proceeding further as he was told the children were sleeping. The Applicant said he was not impressed with

what he had seen and that the Respondent had been aggressive towards him and was setting up cameras.

23. The Applicant said he had gone to the Respondent's work and explained the situation to his manager and had been told that the Respondent was hard to co-ordinate.
24. The Applicant said that about 18 months ago a neighbour at the property had phoned the police to complain about noise coming from the property and the police had visited them.
25. The Applicant said he was not a professional landlord and would never be one again. He had tried to help the Respondents as best as he could but now he urgently needed the property back. He said he could not help other people through his work if he could not help himself and sleeping on sofas was not giving him a decent sleep and he was suffering from stress and could not cope and was worrying about losing his job. He said if he lost his job, he would lose his house as it would be repossessed.

Applicant Cross-examination

26. The Applicant confirmed that he had advertised the property to let on Facebook. He said it had only been on a short time before he was introduced to the Respondent by a mutual friend.
27. The Applicant said that initially he had not removed himself from being registered for Council Tax at the property but after the Respondents contacted the Council, he was told that he had to become a landlord and be registered.
28. The Applicant said that it was costing him £200.00 a month to rent the property to the Respondents and that he could not rent a flat for £500.00 per month. He said he had done the Respondents a favour for a short time.
29. The Applicant said he had been happy to be paid the rent in cash.
30. With regards to what number of children the Applicant had been told the Respondents had the Applicant said he could not answer more than he had said.
31. With regards to not being able to afford to rent his own property the Applicant said that the cost of going to solicitors to make the application had ruined him. He also said that he was unable to answer a question about changing his job and that he needed his flat back.

Applicant Re-examination

32. The Applicant confirmed he had been homeless for the past two years and that he did not want to sell the property as he wished to have security. He said that with rent of £500.00 per month he was not making any profit from the property by the time he paid the mortgage and the insurance on the property. He confirmed he had served a previous Notice to Leave before he had obtained legal advice.

Evidence of Donna Smith

33. Mrs Smith said she was retired police officer having served in the police for 18 years. She said she knew the Applicant as a friend and personal trainer. She said he would go out of his way to help anyone and described him as being larger than life. Mrs Smith said that the Applicant rose early to see his clients. She said that he had rented out his property to tenants and had helped them relocate but that he was not a professional landlord.
34. Mrs Smith said that she had visited the property prior to the tenants moving in and the place was immaculate. She said that there was no clutter. She said that she visited the property again in September 2023 for a prearranged inspection. She said the tenant was obstructive and not happy and quite intimidating. Mrs Smith went on to say that she was quite gobsmacked at the clutter in the property. She said she was concerned when she looked in the bathroom to see candles burning on a shelf given there were small children in the property and was worried that in the event of a fire they would not get out alive given the number of people in the property and the clutter.
35. Mrs Smith said that the tenant wouldn't let the inspection continue and asked them to leave although he had been asked properly for the inspection to take place.
36. Mrs Smith said that the Applicant was currently staying at her home and was basically sofa surfing living from week to week. She was aware the Applicant was not sleeping and that he could not afford to live anywhere else and was effectively homeless. She explained that the Applicant could not stay with her permanently as she was going through a separation. Mrs Smith said the Applicant's situation had impacted on him dramatically over the past year and she was frightened he might take his own life. She said he was worried he could lose his clients and his job and was extremely stressed.

Donna Smith Cross-examination

37. Mrs Smith said that she had attended at the inspection in September 2023 as a witness for the Applicant. She said that she had found the Respondent obstructive but not threatening as he would not let the inspection go ahead. Mrs Smith said she had not thought it fair for the

Applicant to go to the inspection on his own as there could be more people there.

38. When asked if she had recorded the inspection Mrs Smith said she had not but then said that she had started to record it but had then stopped when asked by the Respondent.
39. When asked about the clutter in the property Mrs Smith spoke of there being many items in the hall and when in the bathroom, she said there were many items such as nappies and toilet rolls along with lit candles and that the first thing she had said was how would a child get out of the house in a fire.

Evidence of Gregorz Urbanski

40. Mr Urbanski said that if they were made homeless there was no guarantee that they would be given a property by the Council. He said they had been told they would only go up one band. The Respondent spoke of the stress he was under because of the threat of eviction and that his wife had needed medical help when she found out she could be homeless.
41. Mr Urbanski spoke of the rental property market being unstable and that it was not easy to find property and that the stress and anxiety of this was affecting his children who were scared to go outside. He said that the family had no social life because of the Applicant's threats. He said that the Applicant had other people taking certain actions and reporting him to the police. Mr Urbanski went on to say that he had contacted the CAB, Shelter the Council, a solicitor, MP and local Councillor. He said that when reported that there was danger inside the property and had been visited by a social worker, the social worker had not agreed and had said that the danger was from the landlord. Mr Urbanski said that the police had come on one occasion and there had not been any loud music playing. He also said that a neighbour had suggested putting down a carpet on the laminate floor to dampen the noise and had also said he had no problem with the family. Mr Urbanski said there had been one occasion when he had put the washing machine on after 10.00p.m. and the neighbour had an issue with that but he had explained that he had come from the hospital and the neighbour had been quite understanding.
42. Mr Urbanski confirmed that he had paid rent to the Applicant in cash.
43. Mr Urbanski said there were four children in the family aged 2, 4, 10 and 12. He said the youngest were attending nursery the 10-year-old was in P6 and the oldest was just starting High School. He said all the children were very settled and he could not imagine having to have them accommodated in temporary accommodation. He said he had been looking for property in the area to avoid stressing the children too much. Mr Urbanski spoke of being a victim in the situation and even extending

the period before eviction by a month or two would not really help. He spoke of the children offering to give him all their things if that would help to let them stay.

44. Mr Urbanski said that the Applicant had not provided him with a reference and that was needed by any new landlord. He also said that he felt accused of doing things that he had not done.

Gregorz Urbanski Cross-examination

45. Mr Urbanski confirmed that there were two adults and four children living in the two-bedroom property but denied that the Respondent's brother and father were living there as well. He said that they could visit. He said that the two smallest children slept in the parents' bedroom and the two oldest children slept in the other bedroom and that according to the Council the property was not overcrowded.

46. Mr Urbanski said that his duty was to provide for his family and that he was looking for a property and had approached the Council and made a housing application. He confirmed that if an eviction order was granted he would go up a band and agreed he would have a better chance of being rehoused. Mr Urbanski denied he had been told by the Council to oppose the application so as not to make themselves voluntarily homeless.

47. Mr Urbanski disputed that he had since July 2022 to look for another property as the first Notice to Leave was not legal. He also said that he had been looking for another property but it was difficult to prove.

Evidence of Mark Litwin

48. Mr Litwin confirmed he was a deputy store manager. He said he had seen the Applicant's advert on Facebook and had contacted him about the property and told him about the Respondents and their three children. He said the applicant did not see anything wrong with that. Mr Litwin went on to say that he had been given a key to the property to have a look at it and had thought it needed some work.

49. Mr Litwin spoke of the Respondents and their children only going to work and school and little else because of the actions of the Applicant. He confirmed that the Respondent had been looking online for another property. He also said that the Council would not help the Respondent because there was no tenancy agreement.

50. Mr Litwin spoke of the Respondent and his family suffering from stress from the beginning when the Applicant wanted the property back. He said that there were no additional persons staying at the property but that the Respondents can have people to visit. Mr Litwin recalled an occasion when he was visiting the Respondent and the police attended because

there had been a report of loud music being played but the police were satisfied and surprised they had been called out.

Mark Litwin Cross-examination

51. Mr Litwin confirmed he was not an expert in property letting and also that he had not been present at the inspection in September 2023.

Applicant's Representatives' Submissions

52. The Tribunal at the CMD on 8 April 2024 determined that there were competing interests between the parties and the only purpose of the hearing is to determine if it is reasonable to grant the order sought. The impact on the Applicant if the application was refused would be far greater than the impact on the Respondents if the application was granted. The property is not suitable for the Respondents and the Council will rehouse them. The Applicant is the sole owner of the property and earns £10000.00 a year as a personal trainer. From that he is paying £300.00 a month for his mortgage plus running a car and other outgoings. The Applicant tried to help the Respondents relocate and did not intend to become a proper landlord and had thought the Respondents would be in the property in the short term. And he had not agreed to a long term let. Since splitting from his girlfriend in 2022 the Applicant has had no permanent home and is unable to rent a property himself. There is an urgent need for the return of his property and a real and substantial risk to the Applicant if it is not. He would be low on the list for council housing and cannot afford to rent privately. There was a real and substantial risk of suicide and the Applicant had changed as a person and was on the brink of desperation. This was impacting on his work and could lead to a loss of clients and income. The Applicant's mortgage does not allow him to rent out the property and the lender could call up the standard security. There is no guarantee in that situation that the lender would sell the property with a tenant in situ. The Applicant was a credible witness. On the Respondents evidence there were two adults and four children living in a two-bedroom property. In the Applicant's view the property was bursting at the seams and dangerously overcrowded. There was a duty in terms of Section 25 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 for the Council to provide assistance to the Respondents' family. In terms of Part 7 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987. The property consisted of two bedrooms and one living room. The maximum number of persons it could accommodate is five. The children's ages are 2, 4, 10 and 13. The property is overcrowded. The Respondents will receive priority for being rehoused by the local authority.
53. At this point in the proceedings the Tribunal had to adjourn as the Polish interpreter could not continue and the Tribunal directed the Applicant's representative to submit the remainder of his closing submission in writing and also directed the Respondents to submit their closing

submissions in writing. These were subsequently translated for the benefit of the parties and are attached as appendices to this decision.

Findings in Fact

54. The parties entered into a Private Residential Tenancy that commenced on 1 October 2021 at a rent of £500.00 per calendar month.
55. There is no written tenancy agreement.
56. At the commencement of the tenancy the Respondents had three children.
57. They had a fourth child in July 2022.
58. The children are now ages 2, 4, 10 and 12.
59. The property consists of a living room, two bedrooms, a kitchen and a bathroom.
60. The Applicant advertised the property to let on Facebook after deciding to move in with his then girlfriend.
61. In June 2022 the Applicant intimated to the Respondents his intention to sell the property.
62. The Applicant's relationship with his girlfriend broke down in the summer of 2022.
63. The Applicant continued to reside in the same property as his former girlfriend until at least June 2023.
64. Since that time the Applicant has resided with various friends and has had no permanent home.
65. The Respondents were served with a Notice to Leave on 4 July 2023.
66. Angus Council was given notice of the proceedings by way of a Section 11 Notice.
67. The Applicant has granted two standard securities over the property.
68. The Applicant is in breach of the terms of his mortgage by renting out the property.
69. The Applicant cannot afford to re-mortgage the property.

70. The Applicant has a limited income and cannot afford to rent a property himself.
71. The Applicant's mental health has suffered since he has been unable to recover the property.
72. The Applicant is concerned he might lose his job and income as a result of stress and poor mental health.
73. The Respondents and their family are settled in the property which is convenient for the Respondents' employment and the older children's school and younger children's nursery.
74. The Respondents do not wish to remain in the property but are concerned they may not be rehoused by the local authority.

Reasons for Decision

75. The Tribunal was satisfied from the documents submitted and the oral submissions of both parties that the parties entered into a Private Residential tenancy that commenced on 1 October 2021. The Tribunal was also satisfied that a valid Notice to Leave had been served on the Respondent under Ground 4 of Schedule 3 of the 2016 Act and that proper intimation of the proceedings had been given to Angus Council by way of a Section 11 Notice. The Tribunal was also satisfied from the documents produced and the Applicant's oral submissions that it was his intention to live in the property.
76. The Tribunal was therefore satisfied that procedurally the criteria for granting an order for the eviction of the Respondent from the property had been met subject to it being reasonable for such an order to be made. In reaching a decision on reasonableness the Tribunal had to assess the credibility and reliability of the Applicant and his witness and the Respondents and their witness. On the whole the Tribunal found that all those who gave evidence did so to the best of their ability and although the parties had differing accounts with regards to some material facts the Tribunal did not consider that this necessarily meant that one or other party was deliberately telling lies or trying to mislead but that they were more likely mistaken or not accurately recalling events that were some time in the past.
77. The Tribunal also considered that it was the current circumstances of the parties that should decide whether it was reasonable to grant the order sought rather than any issues that had occurred between the parties in the past. To put that in some greater context, the quality of the Applicant as a landlord and whether he ought to have done more to repair the Respondents' boiler or whether or not he has placed the Respondents deposit in an approved tenancy deposit scheme are not matters that are

relevant to the Tribunal's consideration as to whether or not it should grant the order sought.

78. Matters that might be relevant would be whether or not the Respondents occupation of the property results in overcrowding. Mr Runciman submitted that it did and referred the Tribunal to Part 7 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987. Section 137 of that Act provides that a 3-roomed property (as the property is) can accommodate 5 persons. Children aged 10 and over count as a person and children under 10 and over 1 count as half a person. Therefore, if only the Respondents and their four children live in the property there would be deemed to be five persons living there and the property would not be overcrowded. The situation would be different if the Tribunal had been satisfied from the evidence that the Respondent's disabled brother and father were also living in the property on a permanent basis but it could not be satisfied that this was the case.
79. The Tribunal was satisfied that the Respondents children were established in the area and happy at their schools and nursery and would find a move difficult if they were rehoused in another town outwith the catchment area. However, the Tribunal did not consider that this would necessarily be the outcome of the granting of the order or that it should automatically prevent the order being granted.
80. The Tribunal had some sympathy for the Respondents in that it is difficult to prove a negative however it would have expected the Respondents to have produced at the very least confirmation from local letting agents that they had registered with them and possibly email correspondence advising them their application for any particular property had been unsuccessful. In the absence of some corroborative documentation, it is difficult for the Tribunal to assess how actively the Respondents have been in looking for alternative accommodation. The Tribunal took account of Mr Litwin's evidence in this regard and accepted that the Respondents had looked online for other property but again that did not really provide the Tribunal with much more information as to how active the Respondents had been in trying to find other accommodation. The Tribunal did not accept that the Applicant's failure to provide a reference in advance of the Respondents being offered a property would have prevented them from applying for or obtaining another property. It would have been different if the Respondents had been offered a property subject to a reference and the Applicant had then refused but that was not the case.
81. The Tribunal found Mrs Donna Smith to be a credible witness when describing the impact the proceedings had upon the Applicant and the Tribunal was satisfied that her concerns as regards his mental health and suicidal thoughts were genuine. Although Mrs Smith expressed concerns about the condition of the property and a fire risk at the property, the

Tribunal did not consider that these were of any real significance when reaching its decision.

82. The Tribunal was in no doubt that the Applicant had totally failed to appreciate the legal significance of renting out his property and becoming a landlord. In so doing he left himself open to being in breach of a condition of his mortgage and he was also obliged to enter into a Private Residential tenancy that gave the Respondents security of tenure for an indefinite period. However, a lack of knowledge of the law is not an excuse and therefore the Applicant has to live with the consequences of his actions. The Tribunal does not consider that the Applicant might previously have thought to sell the property to be of any material significance. At that time in June 2022 the Applicant's relationship had not ended but his costs were rising. By the time of service of the Notice to Leave in July 2023 the Applicant's circumstances had changed and he wished to return to live in the property.

83. The Tribunal has not been provided with any documentary evidence to support the Applicant's claim that his income is around £10000.00 per year. The Tribunal noted that the Applicant is not claiming any additional benefits such as Universal Credit and the Respondents have suggested that the Applicant's income may be greater than he has said. However as indicated above the Tribunal considered that the Applicant gave his evidence as truthfully as he remembered and explained that he had used almost all his savings pursuing the application. The Applicant's evidence of being unable to afford to rent a property of his own and being reliant on sofa-surfing in friends' homes was accepted by the Tribunal as genuine. The Tribunal also accepted the Applicant's evidence that having no proper address had impacted on his mental health and that he was concerned about losing his job. As indicated above the Tribunal was satisfied that Mrs Smith's concerns about the Applicant's mental health and worries that he might take his own life were genuine.

84. The Tribunal noted that the Applicant had been prepared to agree to suspend enforcement of the order if granted for a period of two months beyond the usual thirty-day period.

85. After carefully considering the circumstances of both parties the Tribunal was persuaded that the needs of the Applicant in this application were such that although there would undoubtedly be an adverse impact on the Respondents and their family it was reasonable to grant the order sought. In reaching its decision the Tribunal took account of the duties imposed on the Local Authority under Section 25 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995. It considered that on granting the order the Respondents would be given priority for housing by the Local Authority that would not be readily available to the Applicant. The Tribunal also took account of the impact the proceedings have had upon the mental health of the Applicant and the risks that the property could ultimately be repossessed by his lenders again leaving the Respondents with an uncertain future. However, in

order to give both the Local Authority and the Respondents more time to find suitable alternative accommodation the order will not come into effect for a period of three months from the date of the decision.

Decision

86. The Tribunal being satisfied it had sufficient information before it to make a decision without the need for a hearing, finds the Applicant entitled to an order for the eviction of the Respondent from the property suspended for a period of three months.

Right of Appeal

In terms of Section 46 of the Tribunal (Scotland) Act 2014, a party aggrieved by the decision of the Tribunal may appeal to the Upper Tribunal for Scotland on a point of law only. Before an appeal can be made to the Upper Tribunal, the party must first seek permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal. That party must seek permission to appeal within 30 days of the date the decision was sent to them.

Graham Harding

Graham Harding
Legal Member/Chair

14 September 2024
Date