

Housing and Property Chamber

First-tier Tribunal for Scotland



First-tier tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber)

**Repairing Standard Enforcement Order (RSEO): Housing (Scotland) Act 2006
Section 24**

Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/RP/17/0182

Land Register Title No: GLA198096

10, Parkmeadow Way, Glasgow G53 7ZF ("The House ")

The Parties:-

**Mr Kenneth MacDonald residing at 10 Parkmeadow Way, Glasgow G53 7ZF
("The Tenant")**

Per his agent, Ms Linsey Rogers, 28 Bain Street, Glasgow G40 2LA

**Dr Tanveer Bhayana, 2 Tom Blower Close, Nottingham NG8 1JQ ("The
Landlord")**

NOTICE TO: Dr Tanveer Bhayana ("the Landlord ")

Whereas in terms of their decision dated 25th August 2017, The First-tier tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) ('the tribunal') determined that the landlord has failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1)(b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 ("The Act") and in particular that the landlord has failed to ensure that :-

- (a) The installations in the house for the supply of water, gas and electricity for sanitation, space heating and heating water are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order ;
- (b) Any fixtures, fittings and appliances provided by the Landlord under the tenancy are in a reasonable state of repair and proper working order ;
- (c) The house has satisfactory provision for detecting fires and for giving warning in the event of fire or suspected fire ;
- (d) The house has satisfactory provision for giving warnings if carbon monoxide is present in a concentration that is hazardous to health; and

the tribunal now requires the landlord to carry out such work as is necessary for the purposes of ensuring that the House concerned meets the repairing standard and that any damage caused by the carrying out of any work in terms of this Order is made good.

In particular the tribunal requires the landlord to :-

- (a) commission a certified Electrical Installation Condition Report (EICR) and Portable Appliance Test (PAT) which report should be carried out by a suitably qualified and registered SELECT or NICEIC electrical contractor, and carry out such works as are necessary to rectify any identified issue in the EICR and provide the Tribunal with a report from a suitably qualified and registered SELECT or NICEIC electrical contractor confirming that the works are completed;
- (b) carry out such works as are necessary to ensure that there is an acceptable provision for detecting fires and for giving warning in the event of fire or suspected fire, all as required in terms of the Scottish Government Guidance for the satisfactory provision for the detection and warning of fires and current building regulations;
- (c) carry out such works as are necessary to obtain a gas safety record in respect of the house by a Gas Safe registered engineer ;
- (d) carry out such works as are necessary to ensure the house has satisfactory provision for giving warnings if carbon monoxide is present in a concentration that is hazardous to health , all as required in terms of the Scottish Government Guidance for the provision of Carbon Monoxide alarms in Private Rented Housing; and
- (e) commission suitably qualified contractor(s) to provide reports on the extractor fan, dishwasher and fridge freezer located in the kitchen of the house and to repair or replace each appliance as required in terms of said reports

The tribunal order that the works specified in this Order must be carried out and completed within the period of eight weeks from the date of service of this Notice.

A landlord, tenant or third party applicant 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.

Where such an appeal is made, the effect of the decision and of any order is suspended until the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by the Upper Tribunal, and where the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by upholding the decision, the decision and any order will be treated as having effect from the day on which the appeal is abandoned or so determined.

Please note that in terms of section 28(1) of the Act, a landlord who, without reasonable excuse, fails to comply with a RSEO commits an offence liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale. A landlord (and that includes any landlord's successor in title) also commits an offence if he or she enters into a tenancy or occupancy arrangement in relation to a house at any time during which a RSEO has effect in relation to the house. This is in terms of Section 28(5) of the Act.

In witness whereof these presents type written on this and the preceding page (are executed by Morag Leck , solicitor, chairperson of the tribunal at glasgow on 25/8/17 before this witness:-

A Spooner

witness

M Leck

chairperson

ABIGAIL SPOONER name in full

Address

Housing and Property Chamber

First-tier Tribunal for Scotland



First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber)

STATEMENT OF DECISION: Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 Section 24 (1)

Reference number: FTS/HPC/RP/17/0182

Re: Property at 10 Parkmeadow Way, Glasgow G53 7ZF ("The House")

The Parties:-

**Mr Kenneth MacDonald residing at 10 Parkmeadow Way, Glasgow G53 7ZF
("The Tenant")**

Per his agent, Ms Linsey Rogers, 28 Bain Street, Glasgow G40 2LA

and

**Dr Tanveer Bhayana, 2 Tom Blower Close, Nottingham NG8 1JQ
("The Landlord")**

Decision

The First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) ('the Tribunal'), having made such enquiries as it saw fit for the purposes of determining whether the Landlord has complied with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1)(b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 (the Act ") in relation to the House concerned, and taking account of all the available evidence, determines that the Landlord has failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1)(b) of the Act. The Tribunal therefore issues a Repairing Standard Enforcement Order.

The Tribunal consisted of-

**Morag Leck – Chairperson
Mike Links – Ordinary member**

Background

1. By application received on 5th May 2017, the Tenant applied to the Tribunal for a determination of whether the Landlord had failed to comply with the duties imposed by Section 14(1) (b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 ("the Act").
2. The application stated that the Tenant considered that the Landlord had failed to comply with her duty to ensure that the house meets the repairing standard and in particular that the Landlord had failed to ensure that:-
 - (a) The structure and exterior of the house (including drains, gutters and external pipes) are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order (as required by section 13(1)(b) of the Act)
 - (b) The installations in the house for the supply of water, gas and electricity and for sanitation, space heating and heating water are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order (as required by section 13(1)(c) of the Act)
 - (c) Any fixtures, fittings and appliances provided by the landlord under the tenancy are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order (as required by section 13 (1)(d) of the Act)
 - (d) The house has satisfactory provision for detecting fires and for giving warning in the event of fire or suspected fire (as required by section 13(1)(f) of the Act)
 - (e) The house has satisfactory provision for giving warning if carbon monoxide is present in a concentration that is hazardous to health (as required by section 13(1)(g) of the Act)
3. The Tenant set out the following complaints in his application :-
 - (a) The driveway and garden works have been completed and I have paid the cost of £2080. I understand that the Landlord may not be liable to make payments for this as I did agree that this would be the case however since then I have been advised of the repairing standard act and that this should have been the Landlord's responsibility and therefore would request that you consider the enclosed invoice.
 - (b) Gas Safeties have not been carried out at the property
 - (c) Electrical Safeties have not been carried out at the property
 - (d) Hard wired and interlinked smoke alarms and heat detectors have not been installed at the property
 - (e) There is no carbon monoxide alarm in the property
 - (f) Extractor fan in kitchen repair
 - (g) Dishwasher repair
 - (h) Fridge freezer leaking
4. By Minute dated 22nd May 2017, the Convener of the Tribunal with delegated powers under section 23A of the Act, intimated a decision to refer the application under Section 23(1) of the Act to a Tribunal for a determination.
5. The Tribunal served a Notice of Referral under and in terms of Schedule 2, Paragraph 1 of the Act upon both the Landlord and the Tenant on 8th June 2017.

An inspection of the house and a hearing were fixed for 10th July 2017. Written representations were requested by 29th June 2017.

6. Following service of the Notice of Referral, the Tenant's agent Ms Rogers submitted a written representation dated 26th June 2017. No further representations were received prior to 29th June 2017.
7. Thereafter a written representation requesting that the hearing be postponed was submitted by email to the Tribunal on 5th July by the Landlord. Her written representation explained that she had been out of the country for some time. She had not received the Tribunal's Notice of Referral and was aware of the application through a solicitor instructed by her in respect of eviction proceedings against the tenant. She wished time to fully prepare her own response to the application and to attend the hearing. In all the circumstances the Tribunal considered the Landlord's request to be reasonable and agreed to postpone the inspection and hearing fixed for 10th July 2017. A further inspection and hearing were fixed for 11th August 2017 and these dates intimated to the parties on 11th July 2017. An email had been received on the same date from the Connect Property Management Ltd advising that they no longer acted for the Landlord.
8. On 18th July 2017 the Tribunal issued a Direction to the Landlord requiring her to provide the Tribunal by 4th August 2017 with the following :-
 - (a) A current gas safety record, certifying that the gas installations are in satisfactory working order, from a Gas Safe registered engineer in relation to the property;
 - (b) A certified Electrical Installation Condition Report (EICR) and a Portable Appliance Test (PAT) from a suitably qualified and registered SELECT or NICEIC electrical contractor in relation to the property
9. Further written representations were received by email from the tenant's agent Ms Rogers on 14th, 20th and 24th July 2017, by letter and enclosures dated 25th July 2017 (also sent by email on 26th July 2017) and by further emails on 31st July 2017, 4th and 9th August 2017.
10. Further written representations were received by email from the Landlord on 18th July 2017 and also by recorded delivery letter of even date, by email sent 20th July 2017 and recorded delivery letter of even date, by emails sent on 21st and 27th July 2017 and further emails sent on 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 9th August 2017.
11. The Tribunal inspected the house on the morning of 11th August 2017 accompanied by a Tribunal Clerk, Ms Rebecca Forbes. A further Tribunal member, Mr Ewan Miller, was in attendance as an observer. The Tenant was present along with his wife and his agent Ms Rogers. The Landlord was present along with her husband Dr Rohit Bhayana (hereinafter referred to as "Mr Bhayana"). She confirmed her husband was authorised to act on her behalf. The Tribunal explained that the inspection would cover all repair issues set out in the Tenant's application and each issue would be considered by the Tribunal separately. The Tribunal noted the following during the inspection :-

- i) The garden and driveway was in a reasonable state of repair
- ii) A Gas Safety Certificate and an EICR had been provided to the Tribunal and would be considered further at the Hearing
- iii) The smoke and heat detectors in the kitchen, downstairs hall, lounge and upper landing were checked. The detector on the upstairs landing was found not to activate. Mr Bhayana asked for a second test and again the detector was not activated. During the inspection he called an electrician and asked the Tribunal to speak to him. The Tribunal advised that this was not appropriate during an inspection and all submissions could be made at the hearing.
- iv) Carbon monoxide detectors were placed in the utility room and in the kitchen but had not been securely fitted in appropriate positions.
- v) The extractor fan in the kitchen was not working
- vi) The dishwasher was inspected. The Tenant's wife explained that the dishwasher would start but not complete a cycle.
- vii) The fridge freezer was inspected. The tenant's wife pointed out pools of water which collected in the base of the fridge unit. It was noted that the light in the fridge was not working but the fridge was operating

Photographs were taken during the inspection and these are attached as a schedule to this decision.

12. Following the inspection of the house the Tribunal held a hearing at Wellington House, Glasgow. The Tenant was present and represented by Ms Rogers at the hearing. The Landlord was also in attendance and represented by her husband Mr Bhayana at the hearing. Mr Miller also attended the hearing as an observer.

13. The Tribunal dealt with a number of preliminary issues at the start of the Hearing :-

- a) The Tribunal noted that the Direction had been complied with in so far as the two certificates had been received and these would be considered further during the hearing. .
- b) The Tribunal noted the number and length of the written representations that had been submitted by both parties up to the date prior to the hearing. The Tribunal confirmed that, in terms of the Tribunal's Regulations, representations could be submitted up to five working days prior to a hearing and thereafter with the Tribunal's consent. The Tribunal in this case were agreed that it would be appropriate and equitable to consider all representations including those received out with the statutory timescale. However the Tribunal set out that the representations received also related to many issues between the parties which were not relevant to the Tribunal's consideration. The Tribunal required to determine whether the repairing standard had been met in relation to the property. Accordingly irrelevant issues would not be considered by the Tribunal. The Tribunal advised that any evidence given during the hearing should be in relation to the specific issues before the Tribunal.
- c) The Tribunal noted that in her written representations, the Landlord had suggested that the Tenant's application was frivolous and vexatious. The Tribunal confirmed that there was a duty on the Tribunal to consider this issue when an application was first received and before a Notice of Referral had been

made. Accordingly the Tribunal was satisfied that the application was not frivolous or vexatious.

- d) The Tribunal also noted that an application for a right of entry had been made by the Landlord to the Tribunal as referred to in a number of her representations. However the Landlord had already been advised by the Tribunal prior to the hearing that this was a separate issue and would not be considered in relation to the determination of the Repairing Standard application.
- e) The Tribunal also referred to further written representations made by the Landlord which suggested that the Tribunal did not have a locus to consider the application. The Tribunal confirmed that a copy lease had been submitted with the application and from this and the other written representations relating to rent, the Tribunal were satisfied that a tenancy was in place and that the Tribunal had jurisdiction to consider the application.

14. It was thereafter agreed that in respect of the procedure to be adopted at the hearing, the Tribunal would look at each issue set out in the application in turn and each party give evidence thereon if they wished. Each party would also have an opportunity to sum up at the end of the hearing.

15. Mr Bhayana advised that the Landlord's position remained that she had not been given an adequate opportunity to address the issues set out in the application and they considered this relevant to the validity of the application. He referred to the requirement for reports on the property.

16. Thereafter the Tribunal considered the issues in the following order-

Repairs to the driveway and garden works

Ms Rogers confirmed there were no outstanding issues for the tenant, The Landlord agreed with this. The Tribunal confirmed that it could not award compensation for works undertaken.

Gas Safeties have not been carried out at the property

Ms Rogers advised that she had no comment as the Gas Safety Certificate had been submitted.

The Tribunal advised that the terms of the Gas Safety Certificate received by the Tribunal in response to the Direction had been noted and pointed out that the Certificate dated 12th July 2027 from RG Gibb Plumbing and Heating referred to this firm as CORGI registered. However in terms of statutory requirements all installations and appliances required to be checked by a Gas Safe registered engineer. CORGI registration had not been active since 2010 and the Certificate in its present form was not acceptable to the Tribunal. The certification from the firm would require to be changed if the engineer was in fact Gas Safety registered or another Certificate obtained from a Gas Safe registered engineer.

In response Mr Bhayana submitted that the Landlord had made attempts to arrange for a Gas Safety Certificate on at least five occasions and all their efforts to do so had

been stymied by the tenants. He referred to the terms of the written representations of 18th July 2017 referring to a Gas Safety Certificate.

The Tribunal confirmed the relevant certificate was that submitted in connection with today's hearing and as advised a certificate was required from a Gas Safety Engineer.

Electrical Safeties not carried out at the property

Ms Rogers acknowledged an EICR had also been submitted.

The Tribunal advised that the terms of the Electrical Installation Condition Report (EICR) received by the Tribunal in response to the Direction had been noted and pointed out that the EICR dated 1st August 2017 from GL Contractors Limited did not comply with requirements of the Scottish Government Statutory Guidance on Electrical Installations and Appliances in Private Rented Property. In particular the EICR did not set out that the report had been completed by a suitably qualified and registered SELECT or NICEIC electrical contractor. The Ordinary Member of the Tribunal advised that he had contacted the company to check if they were a member of either of these organisations and they had advised they were not. The Tribunal confirmed that the EICR would require to be submitted in the correct form or another report obtained.

In response Mr Bhayana submitted that they were not aware this company was not registered as required. They had contacted three different companies to carry out the electrical and PAT testing. A previous company were refused entry by the tenant on 22nd July and the Landlord had required to approach another firm.

The Tribunal sought clarification from both parties during the hearing that if further inspections were needed for either gas or electrical inspections then this access would be given by the tenant with reasonable notice provided by the Landlord. This was agreed by both parties.

Hard wired and interlinked smoke alarms and heat detectors have not been installed at the property

Ms Rogers submitted that during the inspection Mr Bhayana had suggested that the smoke detectors were not working because the tenant had tampered with them. She said the Landlord had wanted the tenant to provide access that morning after the inspection for an electrician which was not suitable given they were attending the hearing. The tenant was willing to arrange a time in a couple of days if required.

Mr Bhayana stated that he had sent a further email representation to the Tribunal after the inspection with comments from the electrician who had carried out the EICR. The Tribunal pointed out that the issue of written representations had been addressed at the start of the hearing and advised that no further written representations would be considered at this stage of the hearing.

Mr Bhayana then stated that after the Tribunal's findings at the inspection he had recorded a video of the smoke detectors on the upper landing and emailed it to his electrician. He referred to the email response from the electrician which he had then forwarded to the Tribunal. He quoted from this. The electrician suggested that the testing had not been done properly. Mr Bhayana added that the email stated that the smoke detectors were hard wired and interconnected. The heat sensor had to be held down for 10/15 seconds. The electrician stated that the detectors had all sounded in front of the tenant and were working fine. The electrician would be happy to demonstrate this when he could gain access to the property. Mr Bhayana suggested that during the inspection the Ordinary Member required to hold the sensor longer for all of the detectors to work.

The Tribunal advised it was satisfied that the testing had been carried out appropriately during the inspection and Mr Bhayana suggested that if so, the system must have been tampered with before the inspection.

The Tribunal again advised that a decision would be made based on the findings from the inspection carried out today. The tenant confirmed he was willing to provide access for a further inspection. Ms Rogers referred to the Tribunal's earlier comments regarding a suitably qualified electrical contractor and the Tribunal confirmed that if a further inspection was required in this regard then the smoke alarm and heat detection system could also be checked.

No Carbon Monoxide alarm in the property

Ms Rogers confirmed that two carbon monoxide alarms had been received. The Tenant stated that he had required to purchase batteries which he had fitted and placed one in the utility room and the other in the kitchen. Both alarms were working.

Mr Bhayana referred to the terms of the Landlord's representation of 18th July 2017 and pointed out that a new carbon monoxide alarm had been provided in 2015 and evidence of purchase supplied. He stated that the carbon monoxide alarms would have been installed on 22nd July but, as previously stated, they were refused entry. He suggested, as set out in their representations, that this was a conspiracy on the part of the Tenant. He referred again to the terms of the Landlord's letter of 18th July 2017 and the number of times where the Landlord stated that they had been refused access to the property despite adequate notice being given. He referred to the report of an inspection by the Landlord's former agent Connect Lettings on 13th January 2016 which stated the property was in good order and referred again to the allegations set out in the written representations regarding the nature of the relationship between the tenant and Connect Lettings. Dr Bhayana added that Connect Lettings had received a 10% fee plus VAT from the rent of the property.

Ms Rogers stated that the tenant had fully responded in their written representations. She disputed the receipt for a Carbon Monoxide alarm in 2015 and stated that the tenant had never got that. She pointed out that the tenant had responded to the

allegations regarding inspections in their written representations. She noted that the Landlord had come up to Scotland only after involvement of the Tribunal. She referred again to the accusations which had been made by the Landlord which were of a personal nature. She referred also to the Landlord's position regarding an inspection to take place on 22nd July 2017 and her response. She suggested if a Gas Safe engineer were to attend then it would be ideal if he fitted the alarms.

Extractor Fan in kitchen

Ms Rogers stated this had first been reported in 2014 and was still outstanding.

Mr Bhayana pointed out that the extractor fan had not been mentioned in the reports of October 2015 or 13th January 2016.

Dishwasher repair and Fridge Freezer leaking

Ms Rogers had nothing to add to the Tenant's position.

Mr Bhayana referred to the Landlord's proposed purchase of new appliances. They had instructed an appliance engineer to see if one or three appliances needed replaced. The tenant's response had been the same as with the smoke detectors and the carbon monoxide alarm and they had not obtained access.

The Tribunal confirmed that the appliances had been observed during their inspection. The appliances would require to be seen working correctly and accordingly a repair or replacement may be necessary.

Thereafter the parties were asked if they wished to sum up their positions.

Ms Rogers stated they had responded to all of the Landlord's representations in writing.

Mr Bhayana referred to the Landlord's written representations and stated they were committed to complying with Scottish law.

Summary of the issues

17. Thereafter the issue to be determined is whether the House meets the repairing standard as laid down in section 13 of the Act and whether the Landlord has complied with the duty imposed on her by section 14(1) (b).

Findings of fact

18. The Tribunal finds the following facts to be established:-

- (a) The Tenant entered into a Short Assured Tenancy Agreement with the Landlord on 24th November 2010. The Tenant was still resident at the house as at the date of the Tribunal's inspection.
- (b) The Landlord is recorded on the lease as Dr Tanveer Bhayana.

(c) Dr Tanveer Bhayana is the registered owner of the house.

Reasons for the decision

19. There was clearly a conflict in both the written evidence of the Landlord and the tenant and in the oral evidence at the hearing as to previous interactions regarding the property and the history of access in relation to any work required. The Landlord clearly stated that access had been denied whilst the tenant refuted that position. Various other allegations had been made by both parties including the landlord suggesting the possibility of tampering with devices by the tenant. Given the conflicting positions, the Tribunal was unable to reach a determination regarding the position on access and considered it appropriate to base its decision on the factual condition of the property observed during its inspection on 11th August 2017. The Tribunal noted no physical evidence of tampering during this inspection. The Tribunal considered each of the issues set out in the Tenant's application.

20. The Tenant had complained that he had required to pay for works to the garden and driveway which were now complete. The Tribunal noted from the inspection on 11th August 2017 that the garden and driveway were in a state of reasonable repair.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was not a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (b)) in this respect

21. The Tenant had complained that Gas Safeties had not been carried out in the property. A Gas Safety Certificate was provided to the Tribunal dated 12th July 2017. The Certificate was not completed by a Gas Safe registered engineer in accordance with statutory requirements.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (c)) in this respect.

22. The Tenant had complained that Electrical Safeties had not been carried out at the property. An EICR was provided to the Tribunal dated 1st August 2017. The EICR was not completed by a suitably qualified and registered SELECT or NICEIC electrical contractor in accordance with Guidance from Scottish Government.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (c)) in this respect.

23. The Tenant had complained that there was no hard wired and inter connected smoke alarms and heat detectors installed in the property. At the Tribunal's inspection on 11th August the detector on the upper landing did not activate when tested. The Landlord disputed that the system was not working properly and referred to contact that same day with the electrical engineer who had provided the EICR dated 1st August 2017. The Tribunal was satisfied that the testing had been carried out correctly and the system was not functioning properly at the time of the inspection.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (f)) in this respect.

24. The Tenant had complained that there was no carbon monoxide alarm in the property. The Tribunal noted from the inspection that there were two carbon monoxide alarms in the property but they were not fitted as required in line with Scottish Government Guidance.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (g)) in this respect.

25. The Tenant had complained that the extractor fan in the kitchen needed repaired, the dishwasher needed repaired and the fridge freezer was leaking. The Tribunal noted at its inspection that the extractor fan was not working and the fridge freezer had pools of water formed at the base of the fridge. The Tribunal accepted the evidence of the Tenant that the dishwasher although operating was not completing a wash cycle.

The Tribunal accordingly determined that there was a failure to comply with the repairing standard (section 13(1) (d)) in respect of each of the three appliances.

26. Decision

- a) The Tribunal accordingly determined that the Landlord had failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1) (b) of the Act.
- b) The Tribunal proceeded to make a Repairing Standard Enforcement Order as required by section 24(1).
- c) The decision of the Tribunal was unanimous.

27. Right of Appeal

A Landlord, Tenant or third party applicant aggrieved by the decision of the Tribunal may seek permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal on a point of law only within 30 days of the date the decision was sent to them.

Effect of section 63

Where such an appeal is made, the effect of the decision and of the order is suspended until the appeal is abandoned or finally determined, and where the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by confirming the decision, the decision and the order will be treated as having effect from the day on which the appeal is abandoned or so determined.

M Leck

Signed
Date 25. 8.17
Chairperson

25/8/17
This is the
Schedule
referred to
in the
foregoing
decision

Housing and Property Chamber First-tier Tribunal for Scotland



First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber)

Schedule of Photographs

10 Parkmeadow Way, Glasgow G53 7 ZF

Ref: FTS/HPC/RP/17/0182

11th August 2017



Front elevation



Heat detector – kitchen



Smoke detector-Hall



Smoke detector—Living Room



Smoke detector-upper landing



CO detector—Utility Room



CO detector—Kitchen



Extractor Fan—Kitchen



Dishwasher-Kitchen



Refrigerator—Kitchen



Front garden