



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL  
PROPERTY CHAMBER  
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

**Case Reference** : CHI/ 21UD/LDC/2019/0101

**Property** : 10 Kenilworth Road, St Leonards, East  
Sussex TN38 0JD

**Applicant** : 10 Kenilworth Road Limited

**Representative** : Warwick Estates

**Respondent** : -

**Representative** :

**Type of Application** : To dispense with the requirement to  
consult lessees about major works

**Tribunal Member** : Mr D Banfield FRICS

**Date of Decision** : 27 February 2020

---

**DECISION**

---

**The Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the replacement of the flat roof as detailed in the quotations received.**

**In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.**

## Background

1. The Applicant seeks dispensation under Section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the 1985 Act.
2. The Applicant explains that urgent repairs were required to the roof at the property.
3. The Tribunal made Directions on 2 January 2020 indicating that the application would be determined on the papers in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal Procedure Rules 2013 unless a party objected. Attached to the directions was a form for the Respondents to indicate whether they agreed with or objected to the application. It was further indicated that if the application was agreed to or no response was received the lessees would be removed as Respondents and that unless the hearing bundle was received by 6 February 2020 the application would be struck out.
4. No bundle was received and on 11 February 2020 Judge Barber served a Notice indicating that the Tribunal was minded to strike out the application. On 18 February 2020 a bundle was received.
5. Although it initially appeared that objections were raised it has subsequently been clarified that these were in error. In the absence of any objections therefore in accordance with the above paragraph the lessees have been removed as Respondents.
6. The only issue for the Tribunal is whether it is reasonable to dispense with any statutory consultation requirements. **This decision does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs will be reasonable or payable.**

## The Law

7. The relevant section of the Act reads as follows:

20ZA Consultation requirements:

(1) Where an application is made to a Leasehold Valuation Tribunal for a determination to dispense with all or any of the consultation requirements in relation to any qualifying works or qualifying long-term agreement, the Tribunal may make the determination if satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with the requirements.

8. The matter was examined in some detail by the Supreme Court in the case of *Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson*. In summary the Supreme Court noted the following
  - a. The main question for the Tribunal when considering how to exercise its jurisdiction in accordance with section 20ZA (1) is

- the real prejudice to the tenants flowing from the landlord's breach of the consultation requirements.
- b. The financial consequence to the landlord of not granting a dispensation is not a relevant factor. The nature of the landlord is not a relevant factor.
  - c. Dispensation should not be refused solely because the landlord seriously breached, or departed from, the consultation requirements.
  - d. The Tribunal has power to grant a dispensation as it thinks fit, provided that any terms are appropriate.
  - e. The Tribunal has power to impose a condition that the landlord pays the tenants' reasonable costs (including surveyor and/or legal fees) incurred in connection with the landlord's application under section 20ZA (1).
  - f. The legal burden of proof in relation to dispensation applications is on the landlord. The factual burden of identifying some "relevant" prejudice that they would or might have suffered is on the tenants.
  - g. The court considered that "relevant" prejudice should be given a narrow definition; it means whether non-compliance with the consultation requirements has led the landlord to incur costs in an unreasonable amount or to incur them in the provision of services, or in the carrying out of works, which fell below a reasonable standard, in other words whether the non-compliance has in that sense caused prejudice to the tenant.
  - h. The more serious and/or deliberate the landlord's failure, the more readily a Tribunal would be likely to accept that the tenants had suffered prejudice.
  - i. Once the tenants had shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.

### **Evidence**

9. In the application it was stated that the first floor flat was affected by water penetration. Two quotations for replacement of the flat roof have been obtained.

### **Determination**

10. Dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 of the Act may be given where the Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with the requirements.
11. It is clear that such repairs should be carried out as quickly as possible and that it was unreasonable to incur the delay by carrying out a S.20 consultation.
12. No Lessee has objected to the application and no evidence of prejudice as considered in the Daejan case referred to above has been identified.

**13. In view of the above the Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the replacement of the flat roof as detailed in the quotations received.**

**14. In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.**

D Banfield FRICS  
27 February 2020

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office, which has been dealing with the case. The application must arrive at the Tribunal within 28 days after the Tribunal sends to the person making the application written reasons for the decision.
2. If the person wishing to appeal does not comply with the 28-day time limit, the person shall include with the application for permission to appeal a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28-day time limit; the Tribunal will then decide whether to extend time or not to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed.
3. The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates, state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the appeal is seeking.