



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

**Case reference** : CHI/00MS/LDC/2024/0043

**Property** : 140-141 Bevois Street, Southampton SO14 1JD

**Applicant** : Joseph Roger Dorrington

**Representative** : Moore Barlow LLP

**Respondents** : The leaseholders of the Property

**Type of Application** : Application for the dispensation of  
consultation requirements pursuant to S.20ZA  
of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985

**Tribunal Members** : Judge Hugh Lumby

**Venue** : Paper determination

**Date of Decision** : 5 June 2024

---

**DECISION**

---

## **Decision of the Tribunal**

The Tribunal grants the application for the dispensation of all or any of the consultation requirements provided for by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (Section 20ZA of the same Act).

## **The background to the application**

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 23 February 2024.
2. The Property is a building with six flats. The freehold is vested in the Applicant and the Respondents comprise the leaseholders of four of the flats, the other two being vested in the Applicant. Hyde Housing Association (“Hyde”) owns three of the flats.
3. The application relates to emergency repairs at the Property to repair a leaking roof and a collapsed ceiling below. The work was carried out in November 2023. No consultation was carried out with the Respondents in relation to the works, which is why it is now seeking dispensation from the consultation requirements.
4. The Applicant has provided a detailed account of events. He states that the issue was first raised by an employee of Hyde on 13 October 2023, having found a collapsed ceiling and sodden carpet. It was subsequently discovered that the roof was leaking, causing damage to the Property and putting residents at risk of further collapses.
5. SDS Roofing Services Limited (“SDS”) were retained to investigate and a 14 day pavement licence obtained from Southampton City Council to allow the erection of scaffolding. SDS discovered serious failures in the roof and recommended the replacement of the front part and a skylight. As the scaffolding and the pavement licence were in place, it was suggested that the works be done immediately.
6. The Applicant states that it considered whether to obtain further quotes for the works and carry out a consultation. On balance, it considered the risks of further collapse and damage (and attendant health and safety issues) meant that it was better to proceed immediately. Such an approach would also potentially be cheaper by avoiding the costs of further pavement licences and scaffolding hire as well as the additional cost of remediation if there was further deterioration. Finally, Hyde were pushing for the works to be done as soon as possible.
7. The works cost £12,394 in total, together with any legal fees in relation to this application.

8. The Applicant argues that the works were urgent for the various reasons set out above at paragraph 6.
9. As a result of the urgency, no consultation was carried out by the Applicant but the leaseholders informed of the steps being taken, including this application. The Applicant has confirmed that no objections were received from the Respondents.
10. By Directions of the Tribunal dated 24 April 2024 it was decided that the application be determined without a hearing, by way of a paper case.
11. The Tribunal did not inspect the Property as it considered the documentation and information before it in the set of documents prepared by the Applicant enabled the Tribunal to proceed with this determination.
12. This has been a paper determination which has been consented to by the parties. The documents that were referred to are contained in 187 page bundle which included the Applicant's application, specimen leases, emails and letters with the Respondents, a report from SDS, works details and costs plus the Tribunal's Directions dated 24 April 2024, the contents of which has been recorded.

### **The issues**

13. This decision is confined to determination of the issue of dispensation from the consultation requirements in respect of the qualifying long-term agreement. The Tribunal has made no determination on whether the costs are payable or reasonable. If a Lessee wishes to challenge the payability or reasonableness of those costs as service charges, including the possible application or effect of the Building Safety Act 2022, then a separate application under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 would have to be made.

### **Law**

14. Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended) ("the 1985 Act") and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 require a landlord planning to undertake major works, where a leaseholder will be required to contribute over £250 towards those works, to consult the leaseholders in a specified form.
15. Should a landlord not comply with the correct consultation procedure, it is possible to obtain dispensation from compliance with these requirements by an application such as this one before the Tribunal. Essentially the Tribunal must be satisfied that it is reasonable to do so.

16. The Applicant seeks dispensation under section 20ZA of the 1985 Act from all the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by section 20 of the 1985 Act.

17. Section 20ZA relates to consultation requirements and provides as follows:

*“(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.*

*(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.*

....

*(4) In section 20 and this section “the consultation requirements” means requirements prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State.*

*(5) Regulations under subsection (4) may in particular include provision requiring the landlord—*

*(a) to provide details of proposed works or agreements to tenants or the recognised tenants’ association representing them,*

*(b) to obtain estimates for proposed works or agreements,*

*(c) to invite tenants or the recognised tenants’ association to propose the names of persons from whom the landlord should try to obtain other estimates,*

*(d) to have regard to observations made by tenants or the recognised tenants’ association in relation to proposed works or agreements and estimates, and*

*(e) to give reasons in prescribed circumstances for carrying out works or entering into agreements.*

## **Findings**

7. In the case of *Daejan Investments Limited v Benson* [2013] UKSC 14, by a majority decision (3-2), the Supreme Court considered the dispensation provisions and set out guidelines as to how they should be applied.

8. The Supreme Court came to the following conclusions:

a. The correct legal test on an application to the Tribunal for dispensation is: <sup>[11][11]</sup><sub>[SEP][SEP]</sub>“Would the flat owners suffer any relevant

prejudice, and if so, what relevant prejudice, as a result of the landlord's failure to comply with the requirements?"

- b. The purpose of the consultation procedure is to ensure leaseholders are protected from paying for inappropriate works or paying more than would be appropriate.
  - c. In considering applications for dispensation the Tribunal should focus on whether the leaseholders were prejudiced in either respect by the landlord's failure to comply.
  - d. The Tribunal has the power to grant dispensation on appropriate terms and can impose conditions.
  - e. The factual burden of identifying some relevant prejudice is on the leaseholders. Once they have shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.
  - f. The onus is on the leaseholders to establish:
    - i. what steps they would have taken had the breach not happened and
    - ii. in what way their rights under (b) above have been prejudiced as a consequence.
16. Accordingly, the Tribunal had to consider whether there was any prejudice that may have arisen out of the conduct of the Applicant and whether it was reasonable for the Tribunal to grant dispensation following the guidance set out above.

### **Consideration**

- 17. Having read the evidence and submissions from the Applicant and having considered all of the documents and grounds for making the application provided by the applicants, the Tribunal determines the dispensation issues as follows.
- 18. The Tribunal is of the view that, taking into account that there have been no objections from the Respondents and positive encouragement from Hyde to proceed with the works, it could not find prejudice to any of the leaseholders of the Property by the granting of dispensation relating to the urgent works to the Property.
- 19. The Applicant believed that the roof works were urgent to ensure that there was no further water ingress and damage to the Property. It cited health and safety risks and cost increases by delaying.

20. On the evidence before it, the Tribunal agrees with the Applicant's conclusion and believes that it is reasonable to allow dispensation in relation to the subject matter of the application. It notes in particular that the deterioration in the roof and the ongoing issues with leaks meant that immediate action needed to be taken. The fact that Hyde supported this immediate action also supports that decision. The limited window whilst the scaffolding was up and the pavement licence was in place meant it was impractical to get other quotations in the time available and so relying on SDS's estimates was reasonable.
21. Accordingly, the Tribunal grants the Applicant's application for the dispensation of all or any of the consultation requirements provided for by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.
22. The Applicant shall place a copy of the Tribunal's decision on dispensation together with an explanation of the leaseholders' appeal rights on its website (if any) within 7 days of receipt and shall maintain it there for at least 3 months, with a sufficiently prominent link to both on its home page. It should also be posted in a prominent position in the communal areas. In this way, leaseholders who have not returned the reply form may view the Tribunal's eventual decision on dispensation and their appeal rights.

### **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](mailto:rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk)
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.