



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

Case Reference : HAV/43UF/LDC/2024/0603

Property : 8 Earlswood Road, Redhill, Surrey. RH1 6HE.

Applicant : 8 Earlswood Road RTM Company Ltd.

Representative : Block Management Ltd

Respondents : Mr S Chowdhury (Flat A),
Ms G Walter (Flat B),
Ms L Griffiths (Flat C),
Mr A Fairhurst (Flat D),
Dr N Franklin (Flat E).

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

Tribunal : Judge C A Rai.

Date of Decision : 11 March 2025.

DECISION

This is a formal order of the Tribunal which must be complied with by the parties.

Communications to the Tribunal MUST be made by email to rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk. All communications must clearly state the Case Number and address of the premises.

Summary of the Decision

1. **The Applicant is granted dispensation under Section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the same Act in relation to the works outlined described in the application to the Tribunal. The Tribunal has made no determination on whether the costs of the works are reasonable or payable.**

Background

2. The Applicant seeks dispensation under Section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 and from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the same Act. The application was received on 25 September 2024.

3. The Property is described in the application as a:

A converted property now containing five units. Flat E which is the basement flat has its own street door to the side of the property. The remaining four units are accessed via the original front door and share the internal common parts.

4. The Applicant explains in the application that:

Urgent repairs were required to the roof at 8 Earlswood Road following two leaks into the property. Having attended site (sic) the roofer advised significant roof works would be required to fully rectify these leaks, where temporary repairs were not possible. The works were noted as urgent so as to prevent further damage to the property, therefore it was necessary for them to be completed as swiftly as possible.

Having commenced the repairs, it was noted by the contractor (sic) further works should be completed as there was further damage to the roof than was first thought. This was also urgent as there was a hole in the roof, and several loose tiles which could have blown off the roof. Repairs were therefore instructed urgently so as to avoid any further issues.

And further

Leaseholders were provided with all relevant costs for both works and have been notified both works have been completed as per the original costs provided. Further information is due to be issued to the leaseholders to confirm this process has been commenced.

Due to heavy rainfall, water ingress was present inside the property. Rosewell Roofing attended site and advised significant repairs would be

required to two separate leaks including replacing broken ridge tiles, installing 2 meters of breathable tiling felt, replacing broken slates and several other repairs.

Having attended site to commence these works it was noted further works would be urgently required to the roof, such as replacing further defective ridge tiles, slating back the hole in the roof and putting back up to 12 slates in one area. These works were subsequently instructed as the roofer noted the hole could lead to further water ingress and the tiles could blow off the roof if not swiftly rectified.

The last of the works were completed on 30th July 2024.

5. The Applicant says that the Respondents have been informed of the estimated cost of both sets of works which have been completed as per the original estimates.
6. The Tribunal gave Directions on 28 January 2025 listing the steps to be taken by the parties in preparation for the determination of the dispute, if any.
7. The Directions stated that Tribunal would determine the application on the papers received unless a party objected in writing to the Tribunal within 7 days of the date of receipt of the Directions. No party has objected to the application being determined on the papers.
8. **The only issue for the Tribunal is whether or not it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements. This application is not about the proposed costs of the works, and whether they are recoverable from the leaseholders as service charges or the possible application or effect of the Building Safety Act 2022. The leaseholders have the right to make a separate application to the Tribunal under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 to determine the reasonableness of the costs, and the contribution payable through the service charges.**

The Law

9. Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the Act”) and the related Regulations provide that where the lessor undertakes qualifying works with a cost of more than £250 per lease, the relevant contribution of each lessee (jointly where more than one under any given lease) will be limited to that sum unless the required consultations have been undertaken, or the requirement has been dispensed with by the Tribunal. An application may be made retrospectively.

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

S.20 ZA Consultation requirements:

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.

11. The appropriate approach to be taken by the Tribunal in the exercise of its discretion was considered by the Supreme Court in the case of **Daejan Investment Limited v Benson et al [2013] UKSC 14**.
12. The leading judgment of Lord Neuberger explained that a Tribunal should focus on the question of whether the lessee will be or had been prejudiced in either paying where that was not appropriate or in paying more than appropriate because the failure of the lessor to comply with the regulations. The requirements were held to give practical effect to those two objectives and were a means to an end, not an end in themselves.
13. The factual burden of demonstrating prejudice falls on the **lessee**. The lessee must identify what would have been said if able to engage in a consultation process. If the lessee advances a credible case for having been prejudiced, the lessor must rebut it. The Tribunal should be sympathetic to the lessees.
14. Where the extent, quality and cost of the works were in no way affected by the lessor's failure to comply, Lord Neuberger said as follows:
- I find it hard to see why the dispensation should not be granted (at least in the absence of some very good reason): in such a case the tenants would be in precisely the position that the legislation intended them to be- i.e. as if the requirements had been complied with.
15. The main, indeed normally, the sole question, as described by Lord Neuberger, for the Tribunal to determine is therefore whether, or not, the lessee will be or has been caused relevant prejudice by a failure of the Applicant to undertake the consultation prior to the major works and so whether dispensation in respect of that should be granted.
16. The question is one of the reasonableness of dispensing with the process of consultation provided for in the Act, not one of the reasonableness of the charges of works arising or which have arisen.
17. If dispensation is granted, that may be on terms.
18. There have been subsequent Decisions of the higher Courts and Tribunals of assistance in the application of the Decision in **Daejan**, but none are relied upon or therefore require specific mention in this Decision.

Consideration

19. The Directions attached a reply form for the Respondents to complete to confirm whether they agreed with the application or not and if opposed, to provide a statement setting out why they oppose.
20. The Applicant confirmed in an email dated 17 February 2025 that it has not received any objections.
21. Having considered the application and prior to undertaking this determination, I am satisfied that a determination on the papers remains appropriate, given that the application remains unchallenged.
22. The reason why dispensation from consultation requirements is said to be required is repair significant damage to the roof which was allowing water ingress. Given the nature of the works and the fact that it is stated that there following the initial inspection further defects were identified, I am satisfied that the qualifying works are of an urgent nature.
23. There has been no objection to the dispensation of the consultation requirements from any of the Lessees.
24. None of the Lessees have therefore asserted that any prejudice has been caused to them. The Tribunal finds that nothing different would be done or achieved in the event of a full consultation with the Lessees, except for the potential delay and potential problems.
25. The Tribunal finds that the Respondents have not suffered any prejudice by the failure of the Applicant to follow the full consultation process.
26. The Tribunal consequently finds that it is reasonable to dispense with all of the formal consultation requirements in respect of the major works to the building as described in this Decision. This dispensation is conditional upon the Applicant serving a copy of this Decision on all the Lessees within 14 days of it receiving a copy of this Decision.
27. This Decision is confined to determination of the issue of dispensation from the consultation requirements in respect of the qualifying works outlined at paragraph 4. The Tribunal has made no determination on whether the costs are payable or reasonable. If a Lessee should wish to challenge the payability or reasonableness of those costs, a separate application to this Tribunal under section 27A of the Act may be made.
28. In reaching my decision I have taken account of the fact that no party has hitherto objected to the application. The Lessees have been afforded the opportunity to raise any objection and have not done so.

Judge C A Rai

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 to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case by email at 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.