



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

Case Reference : CHI/21UG/LDC/2021/0116

Property : Collington Mansions, Collington Avenue,
Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex, TN39 3PU

Applicant : Stable Holdings Limited (Mr G Collins)

Representative : Melissa Kirby
Hunt Property Management Limited

Respondent :

Representative :

Type of Application : To dispense with the requirement to
consult lessees about major works section
20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985

Tribunal Member : D Banfield FRICS
Regional Surveyor

Date of Decision : 27 January 2022 without a hearing (rule
6A of the Tribunal Procedure Rules 2013 as
amended by The Tribunal Procedure
(Coronavirus) Amendment Rules 2020 SI
2020 No 406 L11.

DECISION

The Tribunal grants dispensation from the remaining consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of emergency works to a flat roof at the rear of Collington Mansions.

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

The Applicant is to send a copy of this decision to the lessees

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 emergency works are required to a flat roof at the rear of Collington Mansions. The works are considered to be an emergency as there is recent and ongoing water ingress into Flat 7a Collington Mansions due to the deteriorated condition of the roof. The works are, therefore, urgent to prevent further interior damage. The Applicant states that the leaseholders with repairing obligations for the roof: Flat 7a (Ms Batkin) and Flat 8a (Mr and Mrs Richard) have both been notified of the nature and urgency of works required, initial estimates received and their liability for costs as per their lease terms.
3. The Tribunal made Directions on 30 December 2021 indicating that the Tribunal is satisfied that the matter is urgent, it is not practicable for there to be a hearing and it is in the interests of justice to make a decision disposing of the proceedings without a hearing (rule 6A of the Tribunal Procedure Rules 2013 as amended by The Tribunal Procedure (Coronavirus) Amendment Rules 2020 SI 2020 No 406 L11).
4. The Tribunal sent its Directions to the Lessees together with a copy of the Application and a form for the Lessees to complete indicating whether they agreed with or objected to the application. It was indicated that those Lessees who agreed with the application or failed to respond would be removed as Respondents.
5. No responses were received and the lessees are therefore removed as respondents as indicated above.
6. Before making this determination, the papers received were examined to determine whether the issues remained capable of determination without an oral hearing and it was decided that they were given that no objections had been received.
7. 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

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

S.20 ZA Consultation requirements:

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.

9. 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;
 - i. The main question for the Tribunal when considering how to exercise its jurisdiction in accordance with section 20ZA is the real prejudice to the tenants flowing from the landlord's breach of the consultation requirements.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. Dispensation should not be refused solely because the landlord seriously breached, or departed from, the consultation requirements.
 - iv. The Tribunal has power to grant a dispensation as it thinks fit, provided that any terms are appropriate.
 - v. 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).
 - vi. 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.
 - vii. 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.
 - viii. 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.

- ix. Once the tenants had shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.

Evidence

10. There being no objections no further information was required of the Applicant above that already submitted with the application.

Decision

11. 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 those requirements. Guidance on how such power may be exercised is provided by the leading case of Daejan v Benson referred to above.
12. Clearly these works are urgent and should not be unduly delayed by the time taken to follow the consultation procedures laid down.
13. No lessee has objected to the application and no prejudice of the type referred to in the Daejan case has been identified.
14. In view of the above **the Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of emergency works to a flat roof at the rear of Collington Mansions.**
15. **In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.**
16. **The Applicant is to send a copy of this decision to the lessees**

D Banfield FRICS
27 January 2022

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application by email to rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 application is seeking.