



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

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>CAM/34UF/LDC/2024/0606</b>
<b>Property</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>Flats 1-24 Phippsville Court, St Matthews Parade, Northampton NN2 7JW</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>Covent Garden Ltd (Freeholder)</b>
<b>Representative</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>Kingston Real Estate (Property Management) Ltd (Agent)</b>
<b>Respondents</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>Leaseholders who may be liable to contribute at the Property noted in the application</b>
<b>Representative</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Landlords</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>Covent Garden Ltd</b>
<b>Type of Application</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>S20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 - dispensation of consultation requirements</b>
<b>Tribunal</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>N. Martindale FRICS</b>
<b>Hearing Centre</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>First tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) Cambridge County Court, 197 East Road, Cambridge CB1 1BA</b>
<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>11 April 2025</b>

---

**DECISION**

---

## **Decision**

1. The Tribunal grants dispensation from the requirements on the applicant to consult all leaseholders under S.20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, in respect of the qualifying works referred to, only.
2. At the date of application it was stated that construction work had not started. It was understood that the landlord's agent was able to recharge costs under the service charge provisions to all leaseholders in the Property.

## **Background**

3. The freeholder, through its agent, applied to the Tribunal under S20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 ("the Act") for the dispensation from all or any of the consultation requirements contained in S20 of the Act.
4. The application related to the commissioning of works at the Property which appeared to concern urgent works involving removal of water ingress, arising from a flat roof and related defects, into one or more of the flats and communal areas at the Property.

## **Directions**

5. In response to the application dated 18 October 2024, for dispensation from consultation of leaseholders, Directions dated 27 February 2025 were issued without an oral hearing. They identified that the respondents were the leaseholders of some 24No. flats at the Property. The Directions provided for the Tribunal to determine the application on or after 10 April 2025, unless a party applied on or before 20 March 2025 for a hearing.
6. The applicant was to send to each of the leaseholders of the dwellings at the Property; a copy of the application form, brief description of the works, an estimate of the costs of the works including any professional fees and VAT and anything else relied upon, with a copy of the Directions.
7. The applicant was to file with the Tribunal a letter by 6 March 2025, confirming how and when it had been done.
8. Leaseholders who objected to the application were to send a reply form and statement to the Tribunal and applicant, by 20 March 2025. The applicant was to prepare a bundle of documents including the application form, Directions, sample lease and all other documents on which they wanted to rely; all responses from leaseholders, a certificate of compliance referred to above; with two copies to the Tribunal and one to each respondent leaseholder and do so by 27 March 2025.

9. In the event, the Tribunal did not receive any requests for a hearing, nor did it receive any forms in support of or objection to respondents either directly or indirectly via the bundle.
10. The Tribunal determined the case on the application form and of a sample lease of a flat at the Property, received from the applicant only, with copy documents sent to leaseholders.

### **Applicant's Case**

11. The application, at box 4 confirms that: *"Purpose built block of 24 flats."*
12. The application at box 7 confirms that these are to be qualifying works, and had not been started. They are not part of a long term contract.
13. At box 9 the applicant was content for paper determination and applied for it, at box 10, to be dealt with by Fast Track and indicated a 'special reason' for urgency in this case. They explained why: *"The property has a flat roof which has suffered two leaks resulting in water ingress into flats 16 and 23. To prevent further damage to the building these remedial works need completing as soon as possible."*
14. The application at 'Grounds for seeking dispensation', box 1. stated in addition: *"A Contractor has been consulted and has advised that the following works need to be undertaken to the roof: To clear all stones and make good area. To board area with 18mm OSB boarding. To install a torch on underlay system going around and flashing all areas including the wall. To install a grey capping sheet and flash all areas. To clear site of waste. Given the age and poor state of repair of the roof it is the intention renew the entire roof (except the area above flats 24 which was renewed May 2024 in order to prevent damage to other flats contained within the property.)"*
15. The application at box 2. below this, described the consultation that had been carried out or is proposed to be carried out. *"None."*
16. The application at box 3. below this stated: *"The cost of the works are in excess of £250 per leaseholder. The works need to be undertaken urgently to prevent further water ingress to flats 16 and 23 and potentially damage to other flats (or communal areas)."*
17. The applicant did not include a list of the names and addresses for service of all leaseholders of the 24No. flats at the Property.
18. The applicant provided three quotes, each with slightly different specifications:

19. Firstly, reference No.2872, dated 16 October 2024, from Weathershield Roofing & Guttering Services Ltd.. The document set out a basic specification of works for 3No. differing areas of the roof. There was no plan. These were referenced as: 'Pink' (flat No.23 only) £6000; 'Pink and Red' ( larger areas than flat no.23) £22000; 'Pink Red and Green' (larger areas still) £44500. All priced plus VAT. The work in each case was essentially as set out in paragraph 14 of this Decision, above.
20. Secondly, unreferenced, dated 21 October 2024, from Tri-Bond Roofing Ltd.. The document set out a basic specification of works for 3No. area options as above but, with an additional area and price for just flats 16 and 23 only. The prices in the same order as paragraph 19 above were, respectively: £9460 plus, £39355, £76428, £19423. All priced plus VAT.
21. Thirdly, unreferenced, dated 7 November 2024, from Avant-Garde Roofing Ltd. The document set out a basic specification of works for just one area, which appeared to be the entire roof at £62845, plus VAT.
22. The landlord notified all leaseholders on 18 October 2024 that works exceeding the annual £250 cap for each leaseholder and that they would be applying to the Tribunal for dispensation. Repairs were assessed to be required to the main roof. At this stage the landlord's agents had not received all of the prices set out above from the three contractors.

### **Respondent's Case**

23. The applicant had identified 24No. leaseholders but there is no evidence that they provided their identities or contact addresses, to the Tribunal from whom the service charge would eventually be recovered and had been identified as the potential respondents. The applicant did not confirm to the Tribunal as required that the respondent leaseholders had been sent the documents specified by the Tribunal in its earlier Directions. The applicant did not confirm that there were no objections from any leaseholder.
24. The Tribunal did not receive any objections or other representations from the leaseholders, either through the applicant, or directly.

### **The Law**

25. S.18 (1) of the Act provides that a service charge is an amount payable by a tenant of a dwelling as part of or in addition to the rent, which is payable for services, repairs, maintenance, improvements or insurance or landlord's costs of management, and the whole or part of which varies or may vary according to the costs incurred by the landlord. S.20 provides for the limitation of service charges in the event that the statutory

consultation requirements are not met. The consultation requirements apply where the works are qualifying works (as in this case) and only £250 can be recovered from a tenant in respect of such works unless the consultation requirements have either been complied with or dispensed with.

26. Dispensation is dealt with by S.20 ZA of the Act which provides:-  
**“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.”**

27. The consultation requirements for qualifying works under qualifying long term agreements are set out in Schedule 3 of the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 as follows:-

**1(1) The landlord shall give notice in writing of his intention to carry out qualifying works –**

- (a) to each tenant; and**
- (b) where a recognised tenants’ association represents some or all of the tenants, to the association.**

**(2) The notice shall –**

- (a) describe, in general terms, the works proposed to be carried out or specify the place and hours at which a description of the proposed works may be inspected;**
- (b) state the landlord’s reasons for considering it necessary to carry out the proposed works;**
- (c) contain a statement of the total amount of the expenditure estimated by the landlord as likely to be incurred by him on and in connection with the proposed works;**
- (d) invite the making, in writing, of observations in relation to the proposed works or the landlord’s estimated expenditure**
- (e) specify-**
  - (i) the address to which such observations may be sent;**
  - (ii) that they must be delivered within the relevant period; and**
  - (iii) the period on which the relevant period ends.**

**2(1) where a notice under paragraph 1 specifies a place and hours for inspection-**

- (a) the place and hours so specified must be reasonable; and**

**(b) a description of the proposed works must be available for inspection, free of charge, at that place and during those hours.**

**(2) If facilities to enable copies to be taken are not made available at the times at which the description may be inspected, the landlord shall provide to any tenant, on request and free of charge, a copy of the description.**

**3. Where, within the relevant period, observations are made in relation to the proposed works or the landlord's estimated expenditure by any tenant or the recognised tenants' association, the landlord shall have regard to those observations.**

**4. Where the landlord receives observations to which (in accordance with paragraph 3) he is required to have regard, he shall, within 21 days of their receipt, by notice in writing to the person by whom the observations were made state his response to the observations.**

### **Tribunal's Decision**

28. The scheme of the provisions is designed to protect the interests of leaseholders and whether it is reasonable to dispense with any particular requirements in an individual case must be considered in relation to the scheme of the provisions and its purpose.

29. The Tribunal must have a cogent reason for dispensing with the consultation requirements, the purpose of which is that leaseholders who may ultimately pay the bill are fully aware of what works are being proposed, the cost thereof and have the opportunity to nominate contractors where there is no public procurement. The correspondence showed that the applicant complied generally with Directions.

30. The Tribunal saw no evidence that the Directions regarding notification of leaseholders (other than that done prior to the application being made) had been carried out. Nor did the applicant confirm this, nor confirm to the Tribunal of any objections or none, had been received by them.

**31. The terms of this Dispensation from the requirements of Section 20, are:**

32. That this only covers the work set out in the application form. No other documents detailing the extent, quality, or price of the works being carried out and/or to be undertaken in respect of the works to remedy this roof defect at the Property other than the form and the three estimates from the three contractors named, as provided to the Tribunal.

33. No dispensation for any prior report, nor ancillary work before or after whichever quote or estimate is accepted by the applicant, is included in this dispensation. In this case only one estimate was provided specifying the work and the price. This cost still remains subject to potential subsequent challenge by any respondent leaseholder, both of the item itself and/or the amount reasonably payable, in the usual way. Other than this no other items are included given dispensation because they were not specifically sought. Those other costs including any professional fees associated with the work will be subject to the annual cap of £250 per leaseholder for a contract for works rechargeable under a service charge or to a further application for dispensation if required. This is because they do not form part of this application for dispensation.
34. The applicant will meet all of its costs arising from the making and determination of this application. However these costs may be recovered from any leaseholder as service charge and/ or as an administrative charge if the lease of each unit allows for it, subject to the usual scope for leaseholder challenge to its reasonableness and payability.
35. **In making its determination of this application, it does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs are reasonable or indeed payable by the leaseholders. The Tribunal's determination is limited to this application for dispensation of consultation requirements under S20ZA of the Act; in this case, on terms.**

N Martindale FRICS

11 April 2025

### **Rights of appeal**

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.

If either party is dissatisfied with this decision, they may apply for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) on any point of law arising from this Decision.

Prior to making such an appeal, an application must be made, in writing, to this Tribunal for permission to appeal. Any such application must be made within 28 days of the issue of this decision to the person making the application (regulation 52 (2) of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rule 2013).

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.

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.

If the tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).