



**Decision with Statement of Reasons of the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland
(Housing and Property Chamber) under paragraph 10(1) of Schedule 5 to the
Rent (Scotland) Act 1984**

Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/RR/21/2621

**Re: Property at 2 Craigmyle Cottages, Torphins, Aberdeenshire, AB31 4NJ (“the
Property”)**

Parties:

**Craigmyle Estates Limited, Craigharr House, Keithhall, Inverurie,
Aberdeenshire, AB51 0LN (“the Landlord”)**

**Robert Gallagher, 2 Craigmyle Cottages, Torphins, Aberdeenshire, AB31 4NJ
 (“the Tenant”)**

Tribunal Members:

Ruth O'Hare (Legal Member) and Angus Anderson (Ordinary Member)

Background

- 1 The Tribunal received a request for a determination of a fair rent under the Rent (Scotland) Act 1984 (“the 1984 Act) in respect of the Property. The property is occupied by Mr Robert Gallagher (“the Tenant”) and is a regulated tenancy under the 1984 Act. The rent under the tenancy is registrable under sections 46 to 50 of the Act.
- 2 The previous registered rent was £5100 per annum, being £425 per month, following a decision of the First-tier Tribunal on 22 December 2018. On 11 October 2021 the Rental Valuation Officer registered a rent of £7500 per annum, being £625 per month. The Tenant submitted an objection and the matter was referred to the Tribunal for a determination.
- 3 Following receipt of the application the Tribunal received written representations from the Tenant which consisted of:
 - (i) Tenant’s written submission;

- (ii) Copy Letter from Dr Gordon Drummond to Mr Kenneth Matheson dated 28 September 2021 regarding assessment of rent;
- (iii) Copy Letter from Aberdeenshire Council to Dr Gordon Drummond regarding works required to comply with Repairing Standard dated 11 April 2018;
- (iv) Private Sector Rent Statistics 2010-2021, Scottish Government publication;
- (v) Registers of Scotland Property Market Report 2020-2021; and
- (vi) Photographs of courtyard at the rear of the property.

The Tribunal also received the following documentation from the Landlord:

- (i) Excerpt from Aberdeenshire Council with details of Local Housing Allowance rates for 2021/2022;
- (ii) Excerpt from fair rent register with property details;
- (iii) Copy letter from Alexander Burnett MSP to Aberdeenshire Council regarding repairs at the property;
- (iv) Chronological log of events regarding repair of the property between 2 March 2018 and 21 June 2018;
- (v) Copy Letter from MPM Joinery to Dr Gordon Drummond dated 12 June 2018 regarding electrical works;
- (vi) Copy form of acceptance to Agrical regarding insurance claim dated 16 August 2018;
- (vii) Photographs of the front porch of the property;
- (viii) Key Agreement form unsigned;
- (ix) Copy Letter from Dr Gordon Drummond to the Tenant dated 16 March 2021 requesting key agreement is signed;
- (x) Copy Letter from Dr Gordon Drummond to Mr Kenneth Matheson dated 28 September 2021 regarding assessment of rent;
- (xi) Graph showing Scottish Government Private Rent Statistics between 2010 and 2019;
- (xii) Statement from George Reid;
- (xiii) Copy Letter from Dr Gordon Drummond to the Tenant dated 15 October 2010;
- (xiv) Excerpt from text message conversation;
- (xv) Email dated 9 September 2013 with chronology of leak repairs;
- (xvi) Copy letter from Burnett and Reid to Adam Cochran Solicitors dated 10 September 2013 regarding access;
- (xvii) Initial Writ seeking declarator for access and interdict, undated, together with Record in the case A58/12;
- (xviii) Copy Letter from the First-tier Tribunal to Dr Gordon Drummond dated 16 November 2018;
- (xix) Copy Leaflet titled Regulated Tenancies in Scotland – Your Rents, Rights and Responsibilities;
- (xx) Copy valuation reports from J&G Shepherd dated 27 August 2015 and 10 September 2015 regarding No 1 and No 2 Craigmyle Cottages;

Both parties submitted the previous decisions of the Tribunal in 2012, 2015 and 2018.

The Inspection

- 4 The inspection took place on 17 March 2022. The weather was bright and sunny. The Tenant was in attendance with two supporters. The Landlord was not present nor represented.
- 5 The property is semi detached, forming part of a partially converted farm steading on a country estate. The conversion includes a second bungalow next door to the property (No 1 Craigmyle Cottages) which was extensively refurbished in 2014. The steading dates back to the mid-19th century and appears to have been converted around 1980. Both are stone built and share a slate tiled roof. The roof appeared in good condition, wind and watertight, although some slates were noted to be missing.
- 6 Vehicular access to the steading is from the north by way of an unclassified road and a pot-holed track. To the west of the property is the courtyard of the steading, which has parking facilities. The south side of the courtyard has a gate providing vehicular access into the courtyard and a former stable area which is used as a workshop. The occupier at No 1 uses the parking facilities. No 2 does not have permission to do so. There is no dedicated parking area for No 2 and cars are parked on the gap formed by the wide verge between the boundary wall and track outside the property.
- 7 Both No 1 and No 2 face onto a garden area to the east. At the time of the inspection a vehicle was parked on the grass at the bottom of the garden. Access can be gained from a gap in the stone wall at the eastern end. The garden slopes downhill from the property. There was previously a dispute as to whether the northern part of the garden adjoining the property was part of the tenancy of No 2. Pedestrian access into the Property is from the vehicular access track, with the path leading over the garden and into the entrance porch which adjoins the property.
- 8 The accommodation consists of three bedrooms, living room, kitchen and bathroom. With the exception of the kitchen, it is double glazed and has solid fuel heating. The Landlord installed new light fittings throughout the property in 2018 following a leak along with a new fuse box, and hard wired smoke, heat and carbon monoxide detectors. The property has a gross internal floor area of 87 square metres.
- 9 The entrance porch is wooden framed. There was evidence of previous water ingress however damp readings taken showed it to be dry. There is significant rot to the window and door frames. The porch steps were deteriorating. The living room has wooden-framed double glazed windows facing the garden. There is a stove in the living room which provides heat and hot water to the

radiators. This was installed by the Tenant. The carpet was also supplied by the Tenant. The room has painted woodchip wallpaper.

- 10 The kitchen is accessed from the living room. It is a small room which faces the courtyard. The fitted kitchen units and workspaces were installed by the Landlord in 2018 along with an integrated hob, oven and fan. The kitchen door was installed by the Tenant. There is a radiator and a modern hot water cylinder with immersion heater which was installed by the Landlord. The flooring is laminate, provided by the Landlord.
- 11 The Tenant supplied the second hand bathroom suite and electric shower, which were installed by the Landlord. The Tenant installed the ceramic tile flooring. The bathroom has a window facing on to the courtyard and a radiator. The main bedroom window showed signs of deterioration, with rot evident to timber internally and misted panes. The property previously had a large double bedroom facing south, however this was reconfigured by the Tenant to create a small single bedroom (floor area of 6 square metres) and double bedroom, along with an extension to the hallway. Both rooms have wooden framed double glazed windows and painted woodchip wallpaper. The carpets in the bedrooms were supplied by the Tenant.

The Hearing

- 12 The Hearing took place on 17 March 2022 by conference call, in light of restrictions imposed by the coronavirus pandemic. The Tenant was represented by Mr Steven Pears, The Aberdeen Law Project. The Landlord was represented by Dr Gordon Drummond.
- 13 The Tribunal explained the findings from the inspection. Both parties were then given the opportunity to make submissions.
- 14 On behalf of the Tenant Mr Pears made reference to the written representations submitted to the Tribunal and confirmed his view that a fair rent for the property was £436 per month. The registered rent of £625 per month represented an increase of 47% on the rent agreed by the Tribunal back in 2018. The Tenant considered this to be unjust. Mr Pears stated that the fair rent could be calculated using No 1 Craigmyle Cottages as a comparator. The Landlord had sought to describe No 2 as a three bedroom property, however the third bedroom had resulted from improvements carried out by the Tenant. This should therefore be disregarded from the assessment of the rent.
- 15 Mr Pears made reference to the decision of the Tribunal in 2018. There had been no substantial changes since that decision and no further works of any significance had been undertaken by the Landlord. No 1 was a fully modernised property and No 2 is only partly modernised. No 2 would require further modernisation in order to obtain an equivalent rent to No 1, including a

replacement bathroom, rewiring, a new heating system, new windows and floor coverings, repairs to the porch and insulation. The Tenant was of the view that the deductions made by the Tribunal in 2018 remained applicable as a result. The condition of the porch had deteriorated and the Landlord had implied their desire to remove it, however it was an important storage area for the Tenant. Mr Pears pointed out that the property had no parking space and no fuel storage, unlike No 1 which had access to the courtyard and outbuildings.

- 16 Mr Pears made reference to the rental statistics, which showed a decrease in the average rent in Aberdeenshire from 2018 which was confirmation that the demand for two bedroom properties had decreased as a result of the continued downturn in the oil and gas industry. The average cost of residential property in Aberdeenshire had increased by 2.6% however this was the lowest increase in Scotland. Applying the deductions to the rent for No.1 produced a fair rent of £436 per month. There was no justifiable reason to increase the rent by 47% in line with the Rent Officer's decision. It was excessive. Mr Pears pointed out that No 1 had access to the courtyard and was able to operate a forestry business. This represented a material change, as the property was now adjacent to an industrial site. The Tenant accepted the change but considered it represented an increase in the value of No.1. In response to questions from the Tribunal, Mr Pears confirmed that the Applicant was relatively unaffected by the business operated by No.1 and did not think it should be presented as an issue in terms of nuisance caused.
- 17 Dr Drummond made reference to the previous Tribunal decisions in 2015 and 2018. He explained that he had been unable to attend the 2018 hearing. He stated that a fair rent had been registered by the Rent Officer on two occasions. They had the relevant expertise to make that decision. Dr Drummond noted the Tribunal had previously applied the capital value method, looking at No.1 as a comparable, however this was inconsistent. The deductions made were arbitrary and the methodology was flawed. Dr Drummond pointed out that capital valuations requested by the Tribunal in 2012 described the property as a three bedroom property and it should be treated as such. Dr Drummond further pointed out that No.2 was larger than No.1, being 87.2 square metres and 80 square metres respectively. The two properties were not the same size. No.2 had been valued at £180,000, compared to a value of £170,000 for No.1. Applying a gross yield of 5% to that figure resulted in a rent of £9000 per annum, or £750 per month. This was equivalent to the rent for No.1.
- 18 Dr Drummond advised that the current rent for No.1 was £750 per month, as per the lease, and that figure should be used. He confirmed that the Tenant was prevented following a court action from having pedestrian or vehicular access to the courtyard. He continued to have sole use of the garden ground to the south, but the northern portion of the eastern area was not within the subjects of let. There was a clear delineation between both parts of the garden. He had installed decking outside No1 and an oil tank in the northern portion for the benefit of No1. Dr Drummond went on to discuss the improvements referred

to in previous Tribunal decisions that were disregarded, including the reconfiguration of the bedrooms by the Tenant. He contested and criticised the methodology adopted by the previous tribunals, particularly in relation to the garage cost. He suggested that obversely, the sum expended on the insurance reinstatement works could be amortised to support an increase in rent. He confirmed that the tenant at No.1 was permitted to operate a forestry business. However this was not a material issue. He was aware that the scope of the Tribunal was to assess the property and the behaviours of the tenant and landlord were immaterial.

- 19 Dr Drummond explained that work had been done to the windows in the porch. The Tenant had the opportunity to have outdoor storage, in the form of a shed at the back of the porch, and the opportunity to store logs there. There was a dedicated parking space, adjacent to the gate for the property. Dr Drummond noted that communication with the Tenant had broken down and the Landlord had not been given access to the property to make changes. He had been forced to employ Sheriff Officers to gain access. At that point the Landlord had offered to bring the property up to a higher specification but had been denied the opportunity to do this. He took umbrage at the suggestion that the Landlord had done nothing since 2018. The Tenant had no intention of allowing the property to be modernised.
- 20 Dr Drummond advised that, looking at the rent profile over the years from 2012 to 2019 there had been an increase of 7%. He noted the rent registered by the Rent Officer of £7800 per annum which resulted in an increase to £8346. Applying a discount of 20% would reduce that to £6677 per annum. However he didn't think 20% was a realistic figure given the improvements that had been made. The rent should be assessed on the basis that the Tenant had access to half of the garden and the parking space available.
- 21 In response to questions from the Tribunal Dr Drummond confirmed a number of services were provided by the Landlord including septic tank cleaning, legionella and water tests and road repairs. These were all services the Tenant had the benefit of and did not pay for. He confirmed that No.1 had been let in summer 2019 at a rent of £750 per month. The property no longer had a washing machine but a fridge was included. He confirmed that No.1 had the same kitchen arrangements as No.1 and oil central heating. There were hard floor coverings throughout. No.1 had permission to use the yard, but not any outbuildings for industrial purposes. Dr Drummond conceded that No.1 had deteriorated and needed upgrading. He confirmed that work had been carried out when frozen tanks burst. The majority of the damage was in no.2. The kitchen ceiling had come down.

Relevant Law

- 22 In determining an appeal against a rent registered by the Rent Officer the Tribunal must consider what rent is, or would be a fair rent, under a regulated tenancy of the property. The Tribunal may determine that the rent registered is a fair rent, and confirm it accordingly. If however the Tribunal does not consider the registered rent to be a fair rent it must determine the fair rent for the property. In such circumstances the Tribunal is not bound by the Rent Officer's decision.
- 23 The Tribunal is obliged under section 48(1) of the Rent (Scotland) Act 1984 to have regard to all circumstances, other than personal circumstances, and apply their knowledge and expertise of current rents of comparable property, as well as having regard to the age, character and locality of the property, its state of repair, and the quality, quantity and condition of any furniture provided under the tenancy. In determining the fair rent, the Tribunal is further obliged to assume that the number of persons seeking to become tenants of similar properties in the locality on the terms (other than those relating to rent) of the tenancy is not substantially greater than the number of dwellinghouses in the locality which are available for letting on such terms.
- 24 The Tribunal must disregard personal circumstances, including the tenant's ability to pay the rent and the assets or financial position of the Landlord. The Tribunal must also disregard any improvement or the replacement of any fixtures or fittings carried out, otherwise than in pursuance of the tenancy, by the tenant or any predecessor under the tenancy.
- 25 There are three accepted methods for determining a fair rent, none of which are to be regarded as the primary method. The three accepted methods are:
- (i) Having regard to registered rents of comparable dwellinghouses in the area;
 - (ii) Taking market rents and deducting an amount in respect of improvement and the like which requires to be disregarded and an amount if the market rents did not reflect the assumption as to demand not being substantially greater than supply (the assumption as to absence of scarcity) and
 - (iii) Calculating the appropriate return based on the capital value of the property, taking into account the assumed absence of scarcity.

Reasons for Decision

- 26 The Tribunal was satisfied that it had sufficient information upon which to make a determination of the application, taking into account the application paperwork, the written representations and documentation submitted from the parties, the submissions made at the hearing and the findings of the inspection. The Tribunal also had cognisance of the previous decisions made by the

Housing and Property Chamber in 2012 (Chamber Ref: RAC/AB31/866), 2015 (Chamber Ref: PRHP/RR/15/0204) and 2018 (Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/RR/18/2604).

- 27** The Tribunal considered the arguments put forward on behalf of the Tenant and the Landlord. The first issue was one that had previously been determined by the Tribunal, namely the size and nature of the property. The Landlord continues to assert that the property should be valued as a three bedroom property. However it is not in dispute that the reconfiguration of the second bedroom to create two rooms was undertaken by the Tenant. Similarly there is no suggestion that this was done to conform to the terms of any tenancy agreement. On that basis the Tribunal concluded that section 48(3)(b) of the 1984 Act remains applicable, requiring it to disregard any improvements carried out by the Tenant. The Tribunal therefore valued the property as comprising two bedrooms and three rooms, including the living room.
- 28** The Tribunal then turned to the issue of the outside space. The Tribunal accepted that the courtyard and outbuildings do not form part of the subjects of let, which appeared to be a matter of agreement between the parties. The tenant at No.1 has access to these, as well as use of the decking space to the side of the building. The Tenant at no.2 has access to an expansive garden area. The Tribunal therefore concluded that there was no material difference between the two properties at No.1 and No.2 in terms of the outside space available.
- 29** The Tribunal proceeded to consider the valuation based on market rental evidence. Neither party had sought to put forward any comparable properties in the area, with the exception of No.1 Craigmyle Cottages. Both parties appeared in agreement that No.1 was an appropriate comparator. The Landlord had agreed a rent of £750 per month in 2019, an increase from the previously agreed rent of £600. This was at odds with the Private Sector Rent Statistics which indicated no significant change in market rents over the period from late 2018 up to September 2021. Without full knowledge of the marketing history of No. 1 and complete details of the tenant's requirements, it is not possible to be certain if there was an element of "special purchaser" which was reflected in the agreed rent or if there happened to be high demand generally which resulted in the increase and this serves to highlight the difficulties in relying on a single transaction as a basis for assessment.
- 30** The Landlord asserted that there had been an increase in demand for rural properties due to the effects of the Covid lock-downs and the Tribunal is aware of recent anecdotal evidence to support this trend, which has not yet been reflected in the statistics currently available.

- 31 Accordingly, having regard to the rent achieved for the adjacent property and the Tribunal's own market knowledge, the Tribunal assessed that a property of the size of the No.2 Craigmyle Cottages, recently modernised and with parking or garaging facilities, would currently let for £750 per month, £9000 per annum
- 32 The Tribunal was conscious however that the property would require a level of upgrading and refurbishment in order to secure a rent of £750 per month. From the figures for expenditure the Tribunal allocated a cost to such improvements and deducted the annual cost from the rent of £9000 per annum. The Tribunal exercised its expertise and professional opinion in the calculation of the deductions, taking into account present market conditions and the figures put forward by the Tenant. Any improvements made by the Tenant fell to be disregarded.
- 33 The Tribunal concluded that the majority of the works outlined in the decision of the Housing and Property Chamber in 2018 remained necessary in order for the property to achieve the rent of £750 per month. Taking into account the figures quoted by the Tribunal in 2018, the Tribunal determined it would be reasonable and proportionate to apply an uplift of 10% to the costs of upgrading the property to reflect inflation and increase in supply chain costs.
- 34 Therefore a new heating system at a cost of £5500 with a lifetime of 20 years to replace the old radiators and stove installed by the Tenant would be required. The additional rewiring of the property, following on from the works carried out by the Landlord in 2018 was still outstanding at a cost of £1100 over a period of 20 years. The bathroom would require replacing and updating, at a cost of £3300 and a lifecycle of 15 years. In addition the decoration and floor coverings in the property remain outdated. Redecorating the entire property is estimated at £3300 and a lifecycle of 5 years, whilst replacing the flooring installed by the Tenant, which falls to be disregarded as an improvement, is estimated at £1210 with a lifecycle of 5 years. The costs of replacing the windows were considered to have increased since the Tribunal considered the matter in 2018 and the Tribunal considered a fair sum to be £2750 taking into account market conditions, with a lifecycle of 15 years.
- 35 The Tribunal also took into the account the deterioration of the porch and concurred with the decision of the Housing and Property Chamber in 2018, namely that the porch continued to deteriorate and would require new windows and doors to bring it to the level of No.1 Craigmyle Cottages. The costs of this work were calculated to be £2750 with a lifecycle of 15 years.
- 36 There was no evidence before the Tribunal to suggest that the above works had been prevented through any breach of tenancy on the Tenant's part. Whilst the Landlord had made reference to issues with access, and suggested the Tenant was deliberately blocking their attempts, nothing had been produced to

support this assertion by Dr Drummond at the hearing. Correspondence produced regarding court proceedings for access in 2013 and repairs to the property back in 2018 predated the previous Tribunal decision. It is clear that the relationship between the parties has broken down, but the Tribunal was not satisfied that there was evidence upon which to make a finding that the Tenant's breach had prevented works from being done.

- 37 The Tribunal noted that the absence of a washing machine and refrigerator within the subjects of let had been incorporated into the rent assessment by the previous Tribunal in 2018. It had been confirmed by the Landlord that the property at No.1 no longer has a washing machine, The Tribunal now considered the absence of white goods in the property to be *de minimis* and therefore did not include this within its calculations.
- 38 The Tenant had not sought to put forward any specification as to the scope and cost of any insulation works. In the absence of sufficient information the Tribunal did not deduct any figure for these works.
- 39 With regard to the parking, the Tribunal did note the Landlord's position that parking was available at the gate to the property. Indeed, at the time of the inspection, the tenant's car was parked in the access at the foot of the garden and a visitor's small vehicle was parked at the pedestrian entrance, albeit this does not appear to be a designated parking space. Overall, the Landlord appears to tolerate and the tenant utilises the current arrangement. However, there is a clear difference when compared with the situation at No.1 Craigmyle Cottages, which has access to the courtyard with ample parking space and a garage. The Tribunal concluded that the rent level would be impacted as a result, particularly given the rural nature of the location and likelihood of occupants and visitors having to travel by car, although the impact would be to a lesser extent than understood at the previous Tribunal hearing. The Tribunal agreed that a deduction of £500 per annum would be a reasonable adjustment.
- 40 Having calculated the said deductions, the Tribunal concluded that would give a rent using the market comparable method of £6682 per annum or £556 per month.
- 41 The Tribunal then considered whether the statutory assumption under section 48(2) of the 1984 Act of demand for tenancies of similar properties in the locality on the same terms (other than rent) not being substantially higher than their availability (absence of scarcity) was justified. The Tribunal using its local knowledge and experience concluded that demand for a tenancy of the property could come from the city of Aberdeen as well as Deeside itself. Accordingly it assessed the locality for the purpose of the assumption as the City of Aberdeen and Deeside area of Aberdeenshire. The Tribunal considered that the assumption of absence of scarcity was justified and no discount from the market rents required to be made in order to apply that assumption.

- 42** The capital value method, whereby an appropriate return is calculated based on the capital value of the property taking into account the absence of scarcity was considered by the Tribunal. Whilst this can prove to be a useful method when assessing urban properties the Tribunal considered that the number of variables that could apply in the case of rural properties rendered this method unreliable and therefore discounted it.
- 43** The Tribunal considered registered fair rents for nearby properties. This presented a number of problems. Firstly, the most recent registered rents in the AB31 area date from December, 2020, and could be considered historic. Five out of seven of these were set at identical figures of £6,600pa, another set at £3,150pa and the last, somewhat incredibly at £2,077pa. From the Rent Service website, other than the number of rooms, it was not possible to discern what differences or similarities exist between each of these properties or indeed, how they compare to the subject property, in terms of location, size, condition, standard of finish or presence of garaging. These were set by the Rent Service, none were subject to appeal. Without more detailed information, it is not possible to analyse these Fair Rents in order to usefully apply these to the subject property.
- 44** Finally the Tribunal considered the requirements to incorporate any amount payable by the Tenant to the Landlord for services, whether under the tenancy agreement or separate agreement, which amount is fairly attributable to the provision of those services by the Landlords to the Tenant. It appears there is no written tenancy agreement for the property, albeit Dr Drummond had indicated there were a number of services provided by the Landlord that the Tenant enjoyed. The Tribunal was however unable to make any findings on the incorporation of an amount for services. The Landlord had failed to provide any specification or quantification in order to support such a finding. No service charge had been incorporated in the previous assessments. Furthermore, the principal evidence of the £750 rent paid for No 1 Craigmyle Cottages included the same landlord services provided to the subject property and Dr Drummond confirmed that costs were not recovered from the tenant of that property.
- 45** Taking a fair and equitable view of the matter the Tribunal therefore concluded, having regard to all available evidence and all of the requirements of the 1984 Act, that the rent registered by the Rent Officer was not a fair rent and that a fair rent for 2 Craigmyle Cottages, Torphins, Aberdeenshire was £6600 per annum, being £550 per month.
- 46** The decision of the Tribunal was unanimous.

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.

R O'Hare

2 May 2022

Legal Member/Chair

Date



RENT (SCOTLAND) ACT 1984 - Notification of Decision

REFERENCE NO.	OBJECTION RECEIVED	OBJECTION
FTC/HPC/RR/21/2621	25 October 2021	Tenant

ADDRESS OF PREMISES

2 Craigmyle Cottages, Torphins, Aberdeenshire, AB31 4NJ

TENANT

Mr Robert Gallagher

NAME AND ADDRESS OF LANDLORD

NO AGENT

Craigmyle Estates Limited
Craigharr House,
Keithhall,
Inverurie, Aberdeenshire, AB51 0LN

DESCRIPTION OF PREMISES

Semi-detached bungalow in converted steading in rural Aberdeenshire. Accommodation comprises kitchen, living room, two bedrooms, bathroom with bath and shower and wash hand basin, porch and garden. The gross internal floor area is 87 square metres

SERVICES PROVIDED

None

TRIBUNAL MEMBERS

Chairperson	Ruth O'Hare
Ordinary Member (Surveyor)	Angus Anderson

FAIR RENT	DATE OF DECISION	EFFECTIVE DATE
£6600 p.a	2 May 2022	2 May 2022

Chairperson of the Tribunal

Date: 2 May 2022