



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

**Case Reference** : CHI/00HN/LDC/2023/0164

**Property** : 7 McKinley Road, Bournemouth, Dorset,  
BH4 8AG

**Applicant** : 7 McKinley Road Bournemouth Ltd

**Representative** : Owen Jones

**Respondent** : Marie Hopp

**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** : 23 January 2024

---

**DECISION**

---

**The Tribunal therefore grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the outside decoration of the building during 2018.**

**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. This retrospective application was received on 3 December 2023.
2. The property is described as a “Residential property converted into 3 flats, one on each floor”.
3. The Applicant explains that it is making a retrospective application on the need to consult with regard to major works.
4. The major works are described as,  
  
“Outside decoration of building during 2018  
27/6/18 Quote received from S&D (aka SDDM) at £10,415+VAT  
23/8/18 Letter sent to Miss Hopp, recommending SDDM as the cheapest quote of three  
10/9/18 SDDM instructed to proceed  
8/11/18 Final invoice received, after additional works including roof and timber repair £24,117.36 inc. VAT”
5. It is further confirmed that,  
  
“Miss Hopp was informed by letter dated 23/8/18 of the proposed works and recommended contractor. Several verbal discussions were engaged in with Miss Hopp before and after that date. Miss Hopp expressed her support for SDDM on the basis that they had performed satisfactory work several times for a neighbour.”
6. The Tribunal made Directions on 13 December 2023 which it sent to the Lessee together with a form for her to indicate to the Tribunal whether she agreed with or opposed the application and whether she requested an oral hearing. If the Leaseholder agreed with the application or failed to return the form she would be removed as a Respondent although she would remain bound by the Tribunal’s Decision.
7. No response was received and no request for an oral hearing was made. The matter is therefore determined on the papers in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal’s Procedural Rules.
8. 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 the application remained unchallenged.

## **The Law**

9. 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.

10. 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 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**

11. The Applicant's case is set out in paragraphs 2 to 5 above.

## Determination

12. 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.
13. No objections have been received from the lessee and in these circumstances I am prepared to grant conditional dispensation.
14. **The Tribunal therefore grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the outside decoration of the building during 2018.**
15. In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.
16. The Tribunal will send a copy of this determination to the lessee.

D Banfield FRICS  
23 January 2024

## 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 [rpcsouthern@justice.gov.uk](mailto:rpcsouthern@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.