



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/24/2149

Re: Property at 148 Burleigh Street, Coatbridge, ML5 4JJ (“the Property”)

Parties:

Mr Hugh Connor, Mrs Marie Connor, 36 Mount Vernon Avenue, Coatbridge, ML5 1NW (“the Applicant”)

Ms Trudi Ayers, 148 Burleigh Street, Coatbridge, ML5 4JJ (“the Respondent”)

Tribunal Members:

Ms H Forbes (Legal Member) and Mrs M Lyden (Ordinary Member)

Decision

The First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) (“the Tribunal”) determined that an eviction order should not be granted.

Background

1. This is a Rule 109 application. The Applicants are seeking an eviction order under grounds 11 and 12. The Applicants lodged a copy of a private residential tenancy agreement that commenced on 14th January 2020, a notice to leave with evidence of service, a section 11 notice with evidence of service, rent arrears correspondence, a rent statement, and photographs.
2. A Case Management Discussion (“CMD”) took place by telephone conference on 15th October 2024. The Tribunal decided to continue matters to a further CMD, as it was not persuaded on the evidence before it that it was reasonable to grant an eviction order. The Tribunal considered it required more recent and detailed evidence to substantiate the grounds of eviction.
3. By email dated 23rd January 2025, the Applicant lodged productions, including inspection reports, a rent statement, photographs and correspondence between the parties.
4. By email dated 5th February 2025, the Respondent’s representative lodged written representations seeking an evidential hearing.

5. A CMD took place by telephone conference on 12th February 2025. The application was continued to an evidential hearing.
6. A hearing set down for 27th August 2025 was adjourned to determine a preliminary issue raised by the Respondent's representative regarding a previous joint assured tenancy which commenced on 26th February 2018. The Tribunal issued a Direction to the Applicant seeking details of the joint tenancy and whether it had been formally brought to an end. The Tribunal sought a response to the Applicant's submission from the Respondent and an updated note of defence.
7. By email dated 27th August 2025, the Applicant lodged evidence of the Respondent requesting a sole tenancy agreement on 7th January 2020.
8. By email dated 28th August 2025, the Applicant lodged evidence of the Respondent's ex-husband requesting to be removed from the joint tenancy on 8th January 2020.
9. By email dated 8th September 2025, the Respondent's representative lodged a response to the Direction and notification that the Respondent accepted the previous tenancy had been properly brought to an end by agreement between the parties.
10. By email dated 17th September 2025, the Applicant lodged further submissions in response to the Direction.
11. The Tribunal agreed to postpone a hearing set down for 6th January 2026 at the request of the Applicant.
12. By email dated 13th February 2026, the Applicant lodged a rental inspection report and photographs.
13. By email dated 19th February 2026, the Respondent representative lodged photographs.

The Hearing

14. A hearing took place by telephone conference on 25th February 2026. The Applicant, Mr Connor, was in attendance and representing Mrs Connor. The Respondent was in attendance and was represented by Ms Anne McStravick, Adviser, Coatbridge CAB.

The Applicant's evidence

15. The Applicant confirmed that an eviction order was sought. The Applicant said the rent arrears had now reduced to £924.41. Rent had not been paid

regularly over a period of four years, but the situation had now improved, as shown in the recent rent statement lodged on 13th February 2026. The statement showed rent is being paid in full, and a further £120.01 is being paid monthly to arrears. The Applicant has served a rent increase notice dated 10th February 2026, increasing the monthly rent from £644 to £745. The Applicant said this was not a high rent, and questioned whether the Respondent could pay the increased rent. The Applicant said a rent officer had stated last year that the market rent was £850. At that time, an increase from £575 to £644 was permitted. The Applicant said a three-bedroom property in the area could secure up to £950 in monthly rent.

16. The Applicant referred to the recent inspection of the Property, which was carried out on 10th February 2026. The inspection report had been lodged together with photographs. The Applicant said the living room had been decorated, and some plaster had been applied. The downstairs doors had not been hung. The doors throughout the Property had all been damaged three years ago, with holes evident. There is a broken door handle, and a pane of glass at the front door is cracked. The garden is a mess with dog fouling. The lower hallway, stair and upper hallway, and the bedrooms had deteriorated further. This has been going on for over three years. The Respondent has been promising to have the doors hung for three years. The Applicant said inspections are sometimes cancelled by the Respondent. The Respondent always promises to attend to problems, but every time there is an inspection, there are new issues in the Property. The Applicant said this was likely to continue if no order was granted, and there was a possibility of further damage. The Applicant said one would think it was a derelict building from the state of it. The Applicant said there was no evidence of structural damage. The Applicant said he thought the living room had been decorated because of the impending hearing.

17. Responding to questions from the Tribunal regarding the damp issues previously mentioned, the Applicant said it was condensation dampness. He had attended to it. He had installed double glazing at the Respondent's request. The Applicant said the Property was the joint-Applicant's family home, and it was quite emotional for the Applicants to see the deterioration in the Property. It had been brought up to a good standard for the start of the tenancy. The Applicant said there had been no decision as to whether to sell the Property or rent it again if an order was granted. The Applicants need to draw breath before making a decision. The Applicant said he did not enjoy having to go to a Tribunal, and it made him feel like a failure, but he had tried everything before resorting to this.

18. Responding to questions from the Tribunal, the Applicant said there were two dogs in the Property. He initially described them as large, and then as medium dogs. Asked whether he had considered carrying out any works to the Property to repair the damage, the Applicant said he might have considered this if asked, but it was the responsibility of the Respondent. The Applicant said he has another seven properties to let. It is his usual practice to communicate with tenants if there is an issue and to draw up a plan. The

Applicant said this was the first time he had raised a Tribunal application, and he did not take it lightly.

19. There was no cross-examination of the Applicant.

The Respondent's evidence

20. The Respondent said she accepted both grounds of eviction were met.

21. The Respondent said she suffers from fibromyalgia, arthritis, ADHD and slipped discs. The damage to the doors was carried out by her son, who had anger management issues in the past. The Respondent said all doors had been hung by a friend, but she had removed the downstairs doors to decorate the living room, and was unable to re-hang them herself. The Respondent disputed that the Property was in a pristine condition at the start of the tenancy. She said the décor in the Property looked pristine, but the paint began to peel off within months. The Respondent said she does not have a lot of money and cannot afford a decorator. She decorated the living room herself, and it took her months to complete. She had to remove decades of paint and wallpaper, and the situation in the hallway is the same.

22. The Respondent said she was offended by the Applicant's comment that the Property looked like a derelict building, and she disputed this. The Respondent said she is often in pain, and this can last for two weeks at a time. The Respondent said there are no good days in terms of her health. She keeps the house clean and tidy. The condition of the house upsets her, but she cannot afford to have it attended to. The Respondent said there has been damp in the back bedroom for four years. It has been decorated once, but the damp now means it cannot be decorated. There is damp in the bathroom, which has to be treated with a spray every six months. There was damp in the front bedroom, but the Applicant applied something which helped. The Respondent said the front bedroom has been stripped, but the walls are in poor condition and need to be skimmed. She has to wait for someone to do that. The Respondent said she was unsure if there was a broken handle. The garden has been cleaned up. She tries to keep it clean, but had been ill for a couple of weeks, which affected her ability to do this. The Respondent said she has a medium dog and a small dog. The garden is waterlogged, and the fence requires repair.

23. The Respondent said she was diagnosed with Fibromyalgia last year. She has constant body pain and migraines. The condition has worsened the arthritis in her hands. She is on medication for ADHD. She is allergic to some painkillers and lives in constant pain. She can be in bed for two weeks at a time. The Respondent said this is mentally hard for her. The Respondent said she would be on top of everything if she could be. She feels the Applicant does not understand, and no one can imagine the pain she is in. The Applicant referred to serious historical matters that meant she had to rebuild her life and that of her children. The Respondent said she had not decorated the living room because of the Tribunal application, but because she wanted

to better her situation. The Respondent said it would previously have taken her about a week to decorate the room, instead of three months. The Respondent said she is trying.

24. The Respondent said there is no structural damage to the Property. It was her position that the windowpane cracked due to the weather. She said a pane was already cracked when she moved in, and the seals were now disintegrating.
25. Responding to questions from the Tribunal, the Respondent said she has been on the social housing list for a long time. She last spoke to the local authority last year. They are aware of her circumstances and needs. She is seeking a two-bedroom property. The local authority has nothing for the Respondent at present. The Respondent said she would be happy to move if a suitable house became available. The Respondent said this was because the Applicant is unhappy with her, and the situation is causing too much stress. The Respondent said she had been told she would be taken on by the local authority if she was homeless. The Respondent said her dogs were her emotional support, and she would be able to keep them in social housing. No one had indicated to her that the dogs could not be kept in temporary social housing. The Respondent said she understood the rent would be lower in social housing, but she has amazing neighbours and a support network around the Property. The Respondent said she has security in the Property. She has been there for almost nine years. She would be devastated if she was moved to an area where people were not friendly, and it would be detrimental to her health if she was moved out of the area. The Respondent said she knows the Applicant will put the rent up again and again and she cannot keep up with it. The Respondent said she is looking at applying for a discretionary payment to help with the increased rent.
26. The Respondent said her sons are 18 and 20, and both are working long hours. They help with cleaning and tidying, but are not good at decorating and could not fit the doors, though they had tried.
27. Responding to questions put to her by her representative, the Respondent said she was keen to stay in the Property because of the support system, which she requires for health reasons. The Respondent said she had carried out work at the Property by chipping away decades of paint and using anti-mould paint in the bathroom. The Respondent said there is no rail on the stairs and she has to lean on the wall coming down, which has affected the décor. The Respondent said she will do further work but would not be keen to apply the required expensive paint if she is not to stay in the Property, but would apply cheap paint. The Respondent said her brain is muddled by ADHD.
28. Responding to questions from the Tribunal, the Respondent said she has reported the damp to the Applicant several times, and that he can see it when he inspects the Property. It was her position that the Applicant should be doing something about it when he can see the mould for himself. The

Respondent said she had not considered making an application to determine whether the repairing standard was met, as she found the Tribunal procedure too stressful.

29. Responding to questions from the Tribunal as to an issue that had been raised by the Applicant regarding a failure to report electrical issues, the Respondent said an electrician friend had taken a look at her cooker because it was not working properly. He said the main cable was not at the correct grade, but he did not carry out any work. The Applicant arranged for the cable to be fixed, and there were no further problems.
30. Responding to questions from the Tribunal regarding her support network and whether she could have the same kind of support from neighbours elsewhere, the Respondent said it took her years to get to her current position. It takes time to get to know people, and this is particularly the case given serious issues suffered in the past. Currently, her friends and neighbours will come and help her, for instance, if she falls. The Respondent said it would not help her mental state if she was to lose this network. The Respondent said if she was allocated a house close to her network, they would continue to support her. Asked whether she had been offered any support through her medical surgery, the Respondent said she had not been offered this. She said she was aware that services are struggling and many people are worse off than she is. The Respondent said there are genuine reasons why she requires a property with a back and front door, and a garden. She would not be able to live in a flat, and the local authority are aware of this.
31. There was no cross-examination of the Respondent.

Response and summing up for the Applicants

32. The Applicant apologised for commenting that the Property was like a derelict building and said he was out of order in saying that.
33. The Applicant said repairs are always attended to promptly. In respect of the dampness in the back bedroom, he had arranged a roofer and the gutters were cleaned. He described the problem again as one of condensation and said he had told the Respondent it would need to be wiped. New extractor fans had been installed in the bathroom. The Applicant accepted it was difficult to walk about in the garden, but said he would attend to the fence.
34. The Applicant said the house is in very poor condition, and the situation is quite shocking. In three years, it has deteriorated further. The Applicant said he understands the Respondent's stressful situation, and said that, if an order was granted, the Applicants would allow slightly longer than the usual period before enforcing the order if that would be of help. The Applicant said he has worked hard with the Respondent to try to understand her situation. The Applicants have given her time to attend to the issues. The Applicant said the Respondent sounds quite unhappy in the Property, and a new house in a better condition with lower rent may suit her circumstances better.

Summing up for the Respondent

35. Ms McStravick said the Respondent has been in the Property for eight years. She has a close network of friends and neighbours. She has made some inroads into sorting out the Property and plans to do more work. Parties may need to work on the back bedroom together.
36. The chances of the Respondent being placed in local social housing are very slim due to the current housing crisis. Ms McStravick said it would be detrimental to the Respondent's health if she was not placed locally. The CAB will assist with the evidence required for a health and housing needs assessment. The Respondent would not want to be placed in temporary accommodation. There will be some consideration as to whether the Respondent is intentionally homeless. If she is not deemed intentionally homeless, she may be given a permanent offer of housing. Ms McStravick said it was hoped the Respondent would have enough points after assessment for an offer from the common housing register to be made before going down the route of homelessness. The CAB would assist in investigating every avenue.
37. Ms McStravick said the CAB will assist the Respondent in claiming a discretionary payment and discuss the recent rent increase notice. They will assist in seeking sources of support.

Further discussion

38. The Applicant said he understood the difficult circumstances of the Respondent, and that, if an order was granted, the Applicants would assist the Respondent to move matters on as far as they could.
39. The Tribunal asked parties for their representations on a delay in respect of enforcing an eviction order. Ms McStravick said an extra two months would be helpful, as time was required to collate and build the Respondent's case. The Applicant said they would accommodate whatever delay was granted and would assist as far as possible.

Findings in Fact

- 40.
- (i) The Applicants are the heritable proprietors of the Property.
 - (ii) An assured joint tenancy was entered into between the Applicants, the Respondent and the Respondent's ex-husband in respect of the Property on or around 26th February 2018.
 - (iii) In January 2020, the assured joint tenancy was brought to an end by agreement of all parties.

- (iv) Parties entered into a private residential tenancy that commenced on 14th January 2020.
- (v) The Applicant has served a Notice to Leave upon the Respondent.
- (vi) The Respondent has accrued rent arrears.
- (vii) The Respondent has been in rent arrears for three or more consecutive months.
- (viii) The Respondent being in rent arrears is not as a result of a delay or failure in the payment of a relevant benefit.
- (ix) The Applicant has complied with the pre-action protocol.
- (x) The Respondent has failed to comply with an obligation under the tenancy agreement by failing to take reasonable care of the Property, allowing damage to be caused to the Property and failing to keep the Property in good order and repair.
- (xi) The Respondent has replaced damaged interior doors throughout the Property.
- (xii) The Respondent has redecorated the living room and bathroom.
- (xiii) Some of the interior walls require to be skimmed before decorating.
- (xiv) The Respondent has replaced carpets with hardwood flooring.
- (xv) The Respondent removed two interior downstairs doors to carry out decorating works. The Respondent has been unable to reinstate the downstairs doors,
- (xvi) The Respondent has limited means.
- (xvii) The Respondent has diagnoses of ADHD, fibromyalgia and arthritis.
- (xviii) The Property has been affected by mould over a period. The problem continues in the back bedroom of the Property.

Reasons for Decision

41. The Tribunal found both parties to be credible in giving their evidence.

Ground 12

42. Ground 12 of Schedule 3 of the Act provides that it is an eviction ground if the tenant has been in rent arrears for three or more consecutive months. The

Tribunal may find that this applies if for three or more consecutive months the tenant has been in rent arrears and the Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable on account of that fact to issue an eviction order. The Tribunal is satisfied that Ground 12 has been established.

43. In deciding whether it is reasonable to issue an eviction order, the Tribunal is to consider whether the tenant's being in arrears of rent over that period is wholly or partly a consequence of a delay or failure in the payment of a relevant benefit. There was no evidence before the Tribunal that the Respondent was in rent arrears as a result of a delay or failure in the payment of a relevant benefit.
44. In deciding whether it is reasonable to issue an eviction order, the Tribunal is to consider the extent to which the landlord has complied with the pre-action protocol prescribed by the Scottish Ministers in regulations. Pre-action correspondence was lodged, and the Tribunal was satisfied that the Applicant had complied with the pre-action protocol.
45. The Tribunal noted that the arrears at the time of serving the notice to leave were £1823.43. In January 2025, the arrears were £1384. In August 2025, the arrears were £1245.47. On the day of the hearing, the arrears are £924.41. The Respondent is paying £120.01 per month towards the arrears, comprised of £80 paid directly by the Respondent and £40.01 received by the Applicant directly from the Respondent's benefits. The full monthly rent is covered by the Respondent's housing benefit. The Tribunal noted that the arrears have reduced significantly since the notice to leave was served, and payment towards the arrears is ongoing. If the current level of payment continues, the arrears are likely to clear within eight months. The position of the Applicants is protected going forward as the rent is being paid in full. The rent increase notice which has been served may affect the position, however, it has not yet come into force and may yet be challenged. Given the significant inroads made into the debt, and the fact that the rent is currently being paid in full, the Tribunal considered it would not be reasonable to grant an eviction order under ground 12.

Ground 11

46. Ground 11 of Schedule 3 of the Act provides that it is an eviction ground that the tenant has failed to comply with an obligation under the tenancy. The Tribunal may find that the ground applies if the tenant has failed to comply with a term of the tenancy and the Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable on account of that fact to issue an eviction order. The Tribunal is satisfied that Ground 11 has been established, in that the Respondent has failed to comply with an obligation under the tenancy agreement. The Respondent has failed to comply with clauses 17, 21 and 25 of the tenancy agreement by failing to take reasonable care of the Property, allowing damage to be caused to the interior doors and walls of the Property by her son, failing to keep the garden clean and free from excessive dog fouling, and delaying in repairing damage to the interior doors.

47. In considering the reasonableness of granting an order under ground 11, the Tribunal considered the seriousness of the Respondent's failures to comply with her obligations. Although neither party referred to their respective photographs during the hearing, the Tribunal had regard to this evidence. The photographs lodged by the Applicants on 28th January 2025 (pp21-28/119) indicate the condition of the Property at the start of the tenancy. The photographs appear to show the Property as clean and in good tenable order. The photographs and inspection reports from 13th June 2023 onwards show damage to doors, walls and door handles, and stripped walls that require decoration. The photographs were not numbered, so it was not possible to identify when they were taken. They also show discolouration on the internal walls, mould in several rooms, with photographs also showing the room after mould has been cleared, damaged internal doors, and patched and unpatched holes in internal walls. It was not clear whether any of the discolouration of the walls could be attributed to the problem with mould in the Property. The Respondent lodged photographs showing the decorated living room and some photographs of the hallway and doorways.
48. The Tribunal considered the damage to every door in the Property and the holes in the walls to be a serious issue, which was caused by a person living with the Respondent. The Respondent delayed in rectifying this damage. She has now rectified the damage to the doors and walls by fitting new doors and having holes filled. The Respondent has cleared the garden of dog fouling. The remaining works that require to be carried out are mostly decorative. The Respondent has decorated the bathroom and the living room. The Respondent has also stripped back other areas, including the hallway, with the intention of decorating, only to find skimming is required before further decoration can be carried out. Two doors require to be re-hung when decorating is completed. There is no structural damage to the Property. There was insufficient evidence before the Tribunal to determine the cause of the cracked pane at the front door, and whether this could be attributed to the Respondent.
49. There was unchallenged evidence that the walls are in a poor condition following what was described as decades of paint and wallpaper previously applied before the current tenancy, and that the paint on the walls began to peel shortly after commencement of the tenancy. The correspondence between the parties shows that on 5th December 2023 (p108/119), the Respondent stated that a decorator had been round and that he would not touch the walls in a bedroom, as they required to be skimmed, and that other people had filled in holes in the walls over the wallpaper. The Tribunal noted that there was a considerable problem with mould over a sustained period, and that the problem is ongoing in one bedroom. The Applicant said this was caused by condensation. The Respondent denied in her evidence and in correspondence with the Applicant that her actions were responsible for this problem. There is mention in the correspondence from the Applicant dated 11th August 2022 (p105/119) of someone coming to check the dampness. There is mention of someone coming to check the roof more than two years

later, on 12th December 2024 and gutters being cleaned on 17th December 2024 (p109/119). There is no mention in the correspondence as to whether the roof required or has been repaired, and what, if any, effect this is having on the condition of the Property.

50. The Tribunal considered the Respondent's mitigating circumstances for the delay in rectifying matters. Although there was no medical evidence to support the Respondent's reported conditions, her evidence in this regard was not challenged, and her oral evidence was accepted by the Tribunal. It is also noted that she refers to her conditions in correspondence between the parties. On 17th February 2024 (p109/119), the Respondent informed the Applicant that she was experiencing flare-ups of her fibromyalgia, citing this as a reason for a lack of progress in rectifying matters. On 17th December 2024 (p109/119), the Respondent mentions postponing a visit by the Applicant due to a flare-up and having to wear braces on both wrists due to swelling and pain. The Respondent is suffering from chronic pain that impacts her ability to carry out work such as decorating. The Respondent does not have the financial means to easily employ a painter and decorator to carry out the work, but she has shown willing by carrying out decorating work herself, albeit slowly, and stating that she intends to get the further work completed. The Tribunal accepted the evidence of the Respondent that she intends to continue to carry out works as and when she can. The Tribunal was not persuaded that the Respondent had carried out works only because of the application to the Tribunal. The Tribunal accepted that the delay in carrying out works was caused by the Respondent's ill-health and financial circumstances.
51. In deciding whether it was reasonable to grant an order, the Tribunal considered the effect of granting and not granting an order on both parties.
52. If an order is granted, the Applicants would be able to recover possession of the Property, after which, it was stated, they would take some time to consider its condition and whether to re-let or sell the Property. The Applicants would have peace of mind that, for the time being, no further disrepair would be caused at the hands of the Respondent.
53. If an order is not granted, the Applicants would likely continue to be concerned about the state of the Property and the possibility of further damage; however, the Applicants' position in terms of rental income appears to be covered, with the rent being paid in full, and the arrears reducing at an acceptable rate. If the tenancy comes to an end before the work has been completed, the Applicants will have the opportunity to make a claim against the tenancy deposit in the usual way.
54. If an order is granted, the Respondent may be rendered homeless. She may or may not be considered intentionally homeless, and it would be incorrect for the Tribunal to speculate in that regard. It is clear that the Respondent would be seeking social housing if the order was granted. The Tribunal is aware that

there is a current housing emergency, and that the homeless are often accommodated in temporary accommodation for considerable periods before being allocated permanent social housing. There was evidence from the Respondent's representative that, while the Respondent may be able to be accommodated under the general housing list, without going down the road of homelessness, it was the position of the Respondent and her representative that it is extremely unlikely that she would be offered a property within the area where she currently resides and where she has a support network of neighbours and friends. The Tribunal considered the Respondent's evidence regarding her support network to be compelling. The Respondent suffers from physical and mental ill-health. The Respondent became emotional during the hearing when discussing her health and her future. The Respondent requires assistance from her support network when she suffers ill-health, including falls. The Respondent gave evidence that she would find it difficult to build this type of support network in a new place, particularly given her ADHD.

55. If an order is not granted, it is likely that there will continue to be a delay in carrying out decorating works to the Property, but the Respondent appears willing to continue with the works as and when she can.
56. Weighing up all the relevant factors, the Tribunal finds that the severity of the consequences to the Respondent if an order is granted, particularly in losing her support network, outweighs the consequences for the Applicants if an order is not granted. While the Respondent is likely to be accommodated in one way or another by the local authority or another social housing provider, there is no guarantee, and there may be little likelihood, that she will be given a property in the area in which she has her support network. The Tribunal considered the loss of the Respondent's support network to be a considerable risk to her health and well-being. The Tribunal considered that the Respondent has rectified the damage caused to the Property, and the remaining works are mainly decorative and would not justify the granting of an eviction order. The Tribunal finds it is not reasonable to grant an eviction order.
57. The Tribunal noted the comment by the Applicant that the Respondent may be better off with social housing and a new start. That may well be the case; however, it would be speculation for the Tribunal to reach that conclusion, particularly given the Respondent's concerns regarding the loss of her support network and the unlikelihood of being allocated a property in the same area. It is open to the Respondent to continue working with the CAB to be assessed and attempt to secure suitable social housing if she so wishes.
58. The Tribunal observed that the Applicants have been patient, helpful and sympathetic in their dealings with the Respondent; however, it is clear that some of the delay by the Respondent is due to the underlying state of the walls, having been stripped, and that this may be a consequence of decades of redecoration at the hands of others.

Decision

59. The application for an eviction order is refused.

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.

Helen Forbes (Legal)

Legal Member/Chair

3rd March 2026
Date