

FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case reference : LON/00AH/LDC/2024/0665

Property : 73 Norbury Crescent, London,

SW16 4JT

Applicant : Foxglade Properties Limited

Representative : Michael Richards & Co

(managing agents)

Respondents : The 4 leaseholders at 73 Norbury

Crescent

Type of application : Dispensation with Consultation Requirements under section 20ZA

Landlord and Tenant Act 1985

Tribunal member : Judge Robert Latham

Venue : 10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR

Date of decision : 14 April 2025

DECISION

The Tribunal grants this application to dispense with the consultation requirements imposed by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 without condition in respect of urgent repairs to the dormer roof.

The Application

- 1. By an application, dated 18 November 2024, the Applicant's managing agent applies for dispensation from the statutory duty to consult in respect of urgent works to address water ingress. The cost of the works exceeds the statutory threshold of £250 per flat. On 23 December 2024, the tribunal sent a copy of the application to the Respondents.
- 2. 73 Norbury Crescent is a residential property comprising a converted block of four self-contained flats believed to have been constructed around 1930. The premises were converted to create the four flats in the 1970s.
- 3. On 28 November 2022, the Applicant notified the Respondents that repairs were required to the dormer roof to prevent water penetration. On 17 May 2023, the Applicant sent the Respondents a Notice of Intention in respect of the proposed works. On 9 August 2023, the Applicant provided an update. Three estimates had been obtained. It was proposed to instruct Ed Brock who had provided the lowest estimate in the sum of £2,250 + VAT. The leaseholders were not given the statutory period in which to respond as the Applicant had decided to bring the works forward due to the unexpected rainfall in July and August. On 28 September 2023, the Applicant sent to Respondents demands for payment. The works were completed in September 2023. The Applicant has not explained the delay in making this application.
- 4. On 3 February 2025, the Tribunal issued Directions. The Directions stated that the Tribunal would determine the application on the papers, unless any party requested an oral hearing. No party has done so.
- By 17 February 2025, the Applicant was directed to send to the 5. leaseholders by email, hand delivery or first-class post: (i) copies of the application form (excluding any list of respondents' names and addresses) unless already sent by the applicant leaseholder/sublessee; (ii) a brief statement to explain the reasons for the application; and (iii) the directions. The Applicant was further directed to display a copy of these in a prominent place in the common parts of the property. On 27 February, the Applicant confirmed that it had complied with this Direction.
- 6. By 10 March 2025, any leaseholder who opposed the application was directed to complete a Reply Form which was attached to the Directions and send it both to the Tribunal and to the Applicant. The leaseholder was further directed to send the Applicant a statement in response to the application. No leaseholder has returned a completed Reply Form opposing the application.

- 7. The Applicant has provided a Bundle of Documents (47 pages) in support of the application. It has also provided a copy of the lease for the second floor flat.
- 8. Section 20ZA (1) of the Act provides:

"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."

- 9. The only issue which this Tribunal has been required to determine is whether or not it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements. This application does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs will be reasonable or payable.
- 10. The Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable to grant retrospective dispensation from the statutory consultation requirements. This is justified by the urgent need for the works. There is no suggestion that any prejudice has arisen. In the circumstances, it is appropriate to grant dispensation without any conditions.
- 11. The Directions make provision for the service of the Tribunal's decision. The Tribunal will email a copy of its decision to the Applicant. The Applicant is responsible for serving a copy of the Tribunal's decision on the Respondents.

Judge Robert Latham 14 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 a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission must be made **by e-mail** to the First-tier Tribunal at the regional office which has been dealing with the case.

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.

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).