



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

Case Reference	: HAV/43UF/LDC/2025/0623/JC
Property	: Undercroft, 21 Raglan Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 0DR
Applicant	: Undercroft 21 Raglan Road Management Company Limited
Representative	: In Block Management Limited
Respondent	: The Leaseholders
Representative	: None
Type of Application	: To dispense with the requirement to consult lessees about major works section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985
Tribunal Member	: Regional Surveyor J Coupe FRICS
Date of Decision	: 13 June 2025

DECISION

Summary of the Decision

1. **The Applicant is granted retrospective 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 in relation to roofing works as described at paragraph 4. The Tribunal has made no determination on whether the costs of the works are reasonable or payable.**

Background

2. The Applicant seeks retrospective 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. The application was received on 26 February 2025.
3. The Property is described in the application as a 'converted victorian street property consisting of 8 flats arranged over 4 floors, split over two separate entrances.'
4. The Applicant explains that:

'Urgent works were required to the roof following a roofers attendance (sic) to site. It was advised upon inspection significant works would be required to prevent loose tiles from falling from the roof, posing a significant health and safety hazard for residents. Unfortunately temporary repairs would not be possible therefore the full repairs were instructed.

Leaseholders were notified of the need for these works to take place. They are due to be advised these works have now been completed and the costs incurred from the works carried out. A note will also be made this process has been started.

Whilst on site assessing the roof Rosewell Roofing noted several areas of the roof required works, in particular several loose tiles which would need to be repaired swiftly to avoid the risk of them falling off the building in heavy wind. It was advised significant works would be required including replacing broken plain tiles, an area of redland 29 tiles, installing new ridge tiles on a sand cement mortar and a small number of other repairs. We were notified (sic) of the completion of these works on 22nd January 2025.'
5. The Tribunal gave Directions on 15 May 2025 listing the steps to be taken by the parties in preparation for the determination of the dispute, if any.
6. The Directions stated that Tribunal would determine the application on the papers received unless a party objected in writing to the Tribunal within 14 days of the date of receipt of the Directions. No party has objected to the application being determined on the papers.
7. **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

8. 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.

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

S.20 ZA Consultation requirements:

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.

10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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 lessee(s).
13. 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.

14. 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.
15. 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.
16. If dispensation is granted, that may be on terms.
17. 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

18. 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.
19. No replies were received by the Tribunal.
20. On 2 June 2025, the Applicant's representative confirmed that they had not received any objections to the application from the Respondents.
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 Applicant states that dispensation from consultation requirements was deemed necessary due to the urgent need to re-secure loose roofing tiles and prevent their displacement during high winds.
23. Given the nature of the works required and the fact that it related to failure of the roof, which could lead to water ingress and property damage, I am satisfied that the qualifying works were of an urgent nature.
24. There has been no objection to the dispensation of the consultation requirements from any of the Lessees.
25. 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.

26. The Tribunal finds that the Respondents have not suffered any prejudice by the failure of the Applicant to follow the full consultation process.
27. The Tribunal consequently finds that it is reasonable to retrospectively dispense with all of the formal consultation requirements in respect of the major works to the building as described in this Decision.
28. This Decision is confined to determination of the issue of dispensation from the consultation requirements in respect of roof repairs to prevent water ingress, as outlined at paragraph 4. 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, then a separate application under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 would have to be made.
29. In reaching my decision I have taken account of the fact that no party has objected to the application. The leaseholders have had opportunity to raise any objection and they have not done so.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

30. 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
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.