





























































































































































































As a property owner, Carr was competent to give his opinion as to the property's rental value and his damages. See Seaboard Coast Line R.R. v. Harrelson, 262 S.C. 43, 46, 202 S.E.2d 4, 5 (1974) (“[A] landowner, who is familiar with his property and its value, is allowed to give his estimate as to the value of the land and damages thereto, even though he is not an expert.”). Here, the master accepted Carr's estimate regarding his damages for lost rent. We give deference to the master's factual findings because he had a better vantage point from which to judge the witnesses' credibility. See McDuffie v. O'Neal, 324 S.C. 297, 306, 476 S.E.2d 702, 706 (Ct. App. 1996). “[T]he conclusions of the master who observed the demeanor and appearance of the witnesses have peculiar value on questions of credibility of witnesses.” Patterson v. Goldsmith, 292 S.C. 619, 626, 358 S.E.2d 163, 167 (Ct. App. 1987). Accordingly, we affirm the master's award as an appropriate measure of Carjow's damages for lost rent.

**AFFIRMED.**

**GOOLSBY and HOWARD, JJ., concur.**



















