



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

Case reference : **MAN/00FF/LDC/2024/0009**

Property : **Flats 1 to 7, 22a Huntington Road, York
YO31 8RD**

Applicant : **22a Huntington Road Management
Company Limited**

Representative : **Mulberry PM Ltd**

Respondent : **The Residential Long Leaseholders
(see Annex A)**

Representative : **(None)**

Type of application : **Landlord & Tenant Act 1985 – Section
20ZA**

Tribunal member(s) : **Tribunal Judge L. F. McLean**

Date of decision : **24th May 2024 on the papers without a
hearing in accordance with rule 31 of
the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier
Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules
2013**

DECISION

Decisions of the Tribunal

- (1) The Tribunal grants unconditional dispensation from the consultation requirements imposed by Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 (together, “the Consultation Requirements”) in relation to the works at Flats 1 to 7, 22a Huntington Road, York YO31 8RD (“the Property”) which are described in the Applicant’s application dated 19th January 2024 as being repairs to the flat roof, replacement of slates above the dormer, and associated works undertaken between November 2023 and January 2024.**

The application

1. The Applicant applies to the Tribunal for unconditional retrospective dispensation from the consultation requirements imposed by Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 (together, “the Consultation Requirements”) in relation to qualifying works.
2. The application is not opposed by any of the Respondents.

Background

3. The Applicant is the registered proprietor of the Property.
4. The Respondents are the various residential long leaseholders of the Property, and the Applicant is their landlord.
5. According to the Applicant’s statement of case, the Property comprises a converted property containing 7 flats.
6. The application stated that the Applicant had been required to carry out urgent works to stem water ingress into the roof void of the Property, which was causing a leak into Flat 7. The Applicant’s statement of case and supplementary evidence also explained that additional works were then needed to address further issues which were identified during the initial repairs. Collectively, these shall be referred to as “the Works”.
7. The cost of the Works, as remitted through the Respondents’ leasehold service charge demands, was due to exceed the statutory limit of £250 per leaseholder imposed by Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003, meaning

that the Respondent had been required to comply with the Consultation Requirements set out therein unless the Tribunal grants dispensation in relation to the same.

8. The Applicant submitted an application dated 19th January 2024.
9. On 18th April 2024, the Tribunal issued directions to the parties for the filing and serving of the Applicant's bundle within 14 days, with the filing and serving of any Respondent's statement of case within 14 days thereafter; and the Applicant was given permission to file and serve a final reply within 7 days after that. The Tribunal notified the parties that it considered that the application was suitable for determination on the papers provided by the parties and without a hearing.
10. None of the Respondents submitted any written responses in accordance with the above directions.
11. The Applicant submitted a bundle comprising 14 pages which the Tribunal has read. The Tribunal considered the Applicant's written submissions and documents filed in support on 24th May 2024.

Grounds of the application

12. The Applicant's grounds of its application were set out very briefly in its statement of case. In summary, the Applicant asserted that the Works were required to be undertaken urgently to ensure the health and safety of residents at the Property and prevention of further damage to the fabric of the Property, and should not be delayed by the timescales set out in the Consultation Requirements.

Issues

13. The only issue the Tribunal needed to consider was whether or not it is reasonable to dispense with the Consultation Requirements in relation to the Works. The application does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs resulting from any such works are reasonable or indeed payable and it will be open to lessees to challenge any such costs charged by the Applicant in due course (under Section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985).

Relevant Law

14. The relevant sections of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 read as follows:-

20 Limitation of service charges: consultation requirements

(1) Where this section applies to any qualifying works or qualifying long term agreement, the relevant contributions of tenants are limited in accordance with subsection (6) or (7) (or both) unless the consultation requirements have been either—

(a) complied with in relation to the works or agreement, or

(b) dispensed with in relation to the works or agreement by (or on appeal from) the appropriate tribunal.

(2) In this section “relevant contribution”, in relation to a tenant and any works or agreement, is the amount which he may be required under the terms of his lease to contribute (by the payment of service charges) to relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works or under the agreement.

(3) This section applies to qualifying works if relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works exceed an appropriate amount.

(4) The Secretary of State may by regulations provide that this section applies to a qualifying long term agreement—

(a) if relevant costs incurred under the agreement exceed an appropriate amount, or

(b) if relevant costs incurred under the agreement during a period prescribed by the regulations exceed an appropriate amount.

(5) An appropriate amount is an amount set by regulations made by the Secretary of State; and the regulations may make provision for either or both of the following to be an appropriate amount—

(a) an amount prescribed by, or determined in accordance with, the regulations, and

(b) an amount which results in the relevant contribution of any one or more tenants being an amount prescribed by, or determined in accordance with, the regulations.

(6) Where an appropriate amount is set by virtue of paragraph (a) of subsection (5), the amount of the relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works or under the agreement which may be taken into account in determining the relevant contributions of tenants is limited to the appropriate amount.

(7) Where an appropriate amount is set by virtue of paragraph (b) of that subsection, the amount of the relevant contribution of the tenant, or each of the tenants, whose relevant contribution would otherwise exceed the amount prescribed by, or determined in accordance with, the regulations is limited to the amount so prescribed or determined.

20ZA Consultation requirements: supplementary

(1) Where an application is made to the appropriate 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.

(2) In section 20 and this section—

“qualifying works” means works on a building or any other premises, and

“qualifying long term agreement” means (subject to subsection (3)) an agreement entered into, by or on behalf of the landlord or a superior landlord, for a term of more than twelve months.

15. The decision in the binding legal authority of *Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson* [2013] UKSC 14 confirms that the Tribunal, in considering dispensation requests, should focus on whether leaseholders are prejudiced by the failure to comply with consultation requirements.

Evidence and Submissions

16. The Applicant relied on evidence which was included in the bundle of documents and which accompanied its statement of case.
17. The Applicant's Statement of Case indicates that the Works were required to the Property due to ongoing water ingress into the Property, which was damaging the fabric of the Property and in particular Flat 7. This also posed a risk to health and safety.
18. The Applicant enclosed copies of correspondence internally between its directors and also with leaseholders. The Tribunal notes that despite the urgency of the situation, the Applicant appropriately challenged and negotiated with an available contractor regarding its fee quote, following internal feedback which had been received. The Tribunal considers that the Applicant thereby endeavoured to act in the best interests of the Respondents. The Tribunal also notes that the Property consists of just 7 dwellings, and presumes that the Applicant is a residents' management company, such that it is typically the landlord's obligation to act in the residents' best interests in such situations.

Determination

19. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Applicant appears to have had good reason to undertake the Works and to do so urgently, and this is a primary consideration.
20. The Tribunal is satisfied by the Applicant's evidence and submissions that had it complied with the Consultation Requirements in full, there would have been an unacceptable risk to the health and safety of the residents of the Property and further damage would have been caused to the fabric of the Property (which would likely have increased the costs involved).
21. The Tribunal also takes into account that no Respondent has challenged the Applicant's assertions in any regard.
22. Against that, the Tribunal is mindful that there will always be some inherent prejudice to leaseholders whenever consultation requirements are not complied with – if for no other reason than that the requirements are put in place for a specific purpose intended by Parliament. The main purpose of the Consultation Requirements is to reduce the risk of works being carried out needlessly or at greater cost than is reasonable (*Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson* [2013] UKSC 14). However, the Respondents are required to at least raise an outline basis of how they would be (or have been) prejudiced by non-compliance, and to set out what they would have done differently if the

Consultation Requirements had been fully complied with (*Aster Communities v Chapman* [2021] 4 WLR 74; *Wynne v Yates* [2021] UKUT 278 (LC)), which they have not done in this instance as no objections were received.

23. Accordingly, the Tribunal determines that it is reasonable to grant dispensation from the Consultation Requirements in respect of the Works.
24. The Tribunal considered whether there would be merit in attaching conditions to the grant of dispensation. However, it decided not to do this, as the Works had already been completed, and the Tribunal did not want to set conditions for dispensation which the Applicant might be incapable of complying with after the fact.
25. In reaching this decision, the Tribunal reiterates that it remains open to the Respondents to apply to the Tribunal for a determination as to whether the costs of the Works were reasonably incurred and/or whether the Works were of a reasonable standard.

Name:
Tribunal Judge L. F. McLean

Date: 24th May 2024

Rights of appeal

1. By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the Tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.
2. If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the regional office which has been dealing with the case.
3. The application for permission to appeal must arrive at the regional office within 28 days after the Tribunal sends written reasons for the decision to the person making the application.
4. If the application is not made within the 28-day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28-day time limit; the Tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed, despite not being within the time limit.
5. The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates (i.e. give the date, the property and the case number), state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.
6. If the Tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

Mr Harry J Pashby & Georgia R Allison
Mr Simon Jones & Mark Balaam
Mr AJ Brandreth & Ms N Abdo
Ms Julie Palframan
Mr N Hewson & Miss C Danahay
Ms SA Ahye