



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

Case Reference : HAV/00HH/LDC/2025/0676

Property : Queen's Quay, 3 Victoria Parade, Torquay,
Devon, TQ1 2BB

Applicant : M.Abram Limited

Representative : Larchfield Asset Management Limited

Respondent : The Leaseholders

Representative :

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 Judge Whitney

Date of Decision : 28 October 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 1985 Act in relation to the roof repairs and renewal following water ingress and flooding into various apartments and communal areas. 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 from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the 1985 Act. The application was received on 2 July 2025.

3. The Property is described in the application as:

Queens Quay is a residential block of apartments [sic] that was originally constructed as a hotel in the 1920s, the property following renovation [sic] is now made up of 16, 1 to 2 bed apartments over the 1st to 5th floors, two commercial units over the ground and lower ground floors, and one penthouse apartment [sic] with 5 bedrooms on top of the whole building.

8 of the apartments have balconies that offer views of the marina and Torbay. The apartments are accessed via two separate [sic] communal entrances, one to the front of the property and one to the rear, both communal staircases connect via an internal corridor on the 2nd floor.

All of the apartments [sic] are subject to long leases and all pay by percentage [sic] rate to different areas of the property, this reduces the Section 20 threshold considerably [sic] as some properties pay a higher percentage[sic] rate than others

4. The Applicant explains in the application that:

Main building roof repairs and renewal following water ingress/flooding into various apartments and communal areas. The works comprise of lifting all decking belonging to the penthouse apartment, assessment of the roof areas to the main building, complete water testing, complete various repairs to the roof membrane, complete repairs to uncapped parapet walls, application of waterproofing materials to all areas of the roof and parapet upstands including the structure of the penthouse that sits on top of the roof structure.

Ph1 is complete leaving Ph2&3 to be done.

The freeholder was required to start investigations & ph1 works following flooding into apt 8 which led to the owners filling a claim against the freeholder to complete works to remedy straight away and for losses incurred.

Section 20 consultation notice has been served on all leaseholders, this was issued 11.04.25. However, the freeholder has already appointed Clerk of Works surveyors [sic] to complete investigations to identify works needed and complete [sic] of ph1 works following the claim issued against them from apt 8. We are looking to have all three phases completed by the same competent contractor and surveyor without further delay.

The freeholder requests dispensation from all three phases and any associated works to the roof repairs to allow them to recover their costs expended to date to remedy the ingress and mitigate the damage caused to the apartments directly impacted. Also to allow them to progress with the remaining two phases of the roof repairs without delaying the works until the new service charge year commences in Jan 26, as the lease does not allow for issue of additional demands part way through [sic] the year.

5. The works are described as urgent by the Applicant because:

The freeholder is not in the position to be able to fund any further repairs without contribution from leaseholders and the works are required as an immediate action to stop water from entering and damaging property further.

6. The Tribunal gave Directions on 30 July 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 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.
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 lessee(s).
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 Tribunal has not received any reply forms from any of the Respondents.
21. The Applicant's representative emailed the Tribunal on 8 September 2025 confirming that they have received no objections in relation to the application.
22. 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.
23. The reason why dispensation from consultation requirements is said to be required is to allow the Applicant to recover its costs expended to date and to enable the remaining phases of the roof repairs to take place. Given the nature of the works, the potential ongoing damage caused by the water ingress and the fact that it was directly impacting occupants of various apartments, 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 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 the qualifying works

for the roof repairs 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. I do however **Direct** that the dispensation is conditional upon the Applicant or their agent sending a copy of this Decision to all the leaseholders so that they are aware of the same.

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.