



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

Case Reference	: CHI/43UB/LDC/2024/0036
Property	: 7-11 White Lion Gate, Cobham, Surrey KT11 1AQ
Applicant	: White Lion Gate Limited
Representative	: HES Estate Management Ltd
Respondent	: Mrs B Fawcett & Others (Flat 7) Ms V Thane-Peters, Ms J C Lowrie & Ms A F Pierce (Flat 8) Mr B & Mrs P Juniper (Flat 9) Mr G & Mrs M W Milner (Flat 10) Mr D Lusher (Flat 11)
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	: 26 February 2024

DECISION

The Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of replacing the PCB board to return the lift to working order.

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

The Applicant must send copies of this determination 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. The application was received on 12 February 2024.
2. The property is described as,

Purpose build residential [sic] building, in an urban location, comprising basement car park, and five self-contained apartments on the ground, first and second floors
3. The Applicant explains that,

Following the failure of a PCB board, the passenger lift which serves this residential building is currently out of action. Residents rely on this lift, and in particular there is one tenant with mobility issues who occupies a flat on the top floor of the building and requires medical treatment [sic].

Communication was issued to all leaseholders on 09/02/2024 advising them of the problem, and that we would be applying to the FTT for dispensation from the usual s.20 consultation requirements. We have also contacted another lift maintenance company and asked them to quote for the replacing this part but they they have declined [sic] to do so because they can't been 100% confident that replacing this part will return [sic] the lift to service. As Arrow have held the maintenance contract on the lift for many years and are familiar [sic] with it's operation they have been asked to order the part as this has a 2-3 week lead time.

The Applicants have provided a copy of a report from Arrow Lift Engineers Ltd dated 3 February 2024.
4. The Tribunal made Directions on 16 February 2024 and sent it to the Lessees together with a form for them to indicate to the Tribunal whether they agreed with or opposed the application and whether they requested an oral hearing. If the Leaseholders agreed with the application or failed to return the form they would be removed as a Respondent although they would remain bound by the Tribunal's Decision.
5. No responses were received from the lessees and no requests for an oral hearing were made. The matter is therefore determined on the papers in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal's Procedural Rules.
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 the application remained unchallenged.

The Law

7. 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.

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 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. The Applicant's case is set out in paragraph 3 above.

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 those requirements. Guidance on how such power may be exercised is provided by the leading case of Daejan v Benson referred to above.
11. No objections have been received from the Respondents identifying the type of prejudice referred to in the Daejan case and in these circumstances I am prepared to grant dispensation.
12. **The Tribunal therefore grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of replacing the PCB board to return the lift to working order.**
13. In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.
14. The Applicant must send copies of this determination to the lessees.

D Banfield FRICS
26 February 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 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.