



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

**Case reference** : **LON/OOBE/LSC/2024/0358**

**Property** : **Flats 14, 15 and 16 ,214 Bermondsey  
Street, London, SE1 3TQ**

**Applicant** : **214 Bermondsey Street Ltd**

**Representative** : **Colman Coyle Ltd, solicitors**

**Respondent** : **Mr Corfe (Flat 14)  
Mr Compton -Platt (Flat 15)  
Mr Nazeri and Ms Nicol ( Flat 16)**

**Representative** : **In person**

**Type of application** : **An application under section 20C of the  
Landlord and Tenant Act 1985**

**Tribunal** : **Judge Adrian Jack, Tribunal Member  
Sue Coughlin MCIEH**

**Date of decision** : **13<sup>th</sup> November 2025**

---

**DECISION ON THE SECTION 20C APPLICATION**

---

1. At the conclusion of our substantive decision in this matter dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2025, we gave directions for determination of the tenants' application under section 20C of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. Subsequent directions were given and the parties have provided (a) the landlord's submissions as to why such an order should not be made, (b) the tenants' answer and (c) the landlord's reply.
2. Unfortunately, due to an internal email going missing, the three documents were not sent to the members of the Tribunal timeously. This has caused a delay in determining this issue, for which we apologise.
3. Section 20C, so far as material, provides:

“(1) A tenant may make an application for an order that all or any of the costs incurred, or to be incurred, by the landlord in connection with proceedings before... the First-tier Tribunal... are not to be regarded as relevant costs to be taken into account in determining the amount of any service charge payable by the tenant or any other person or persons specified in the application.

(2) The application shall be made—...

(ba) in the case of proceedings before the First-tier Tribunal, to the tribunal;...

(3) The... tribunal to which the application is made may make such order on the application as it considers just and equitable in the circumstances.”
4. It will be recalled that there were four invoices in dispute before us. We allowed the first invoice for £1,500, but disallowed the other three invoices for £2,700 (the VAT on this was not claimed), £3,240 and £6,000. The tenants have thus won to a substantial extent. Indeed, because of technical issues as to service of the service charge demands, the liability in respect of the first invoice was only established after proceedings had begun.
5. The main point made by the landlord is that the tenants adopted an unreasonable position in relation to the first invoice. They were unreasonable in not accepting the recoverability of this invoice. Thus the cost of coming to the Tribunal would have been incurred in any event. The fact that the landlord lost on the other three invoices should not mean that the Tribunal should interfere with the landlord's contractual right to recover its costs.
6. The tenants (understandably) emphasise their overall success, but they also now submit that they always accepted that they were liable for one or other of the reports obtained by the landlord. That was not, however, their position before us. As can be seen from para 16 of our substantive determination, they were arguing that they were not liable for the first report at all.

7. In our judgment, there is some force in the landlord's submission that it would have had to come to the Tribunal in any event. However, there is also force in the tenants' submission that they are the overall winners.
8. The most just and equitable outcome in our judgment is that a section 20C order should be made but limited to half of the landlord's costs.

### **DECISION**

Half of the costs incurred, by the landlord in connection with proceedings before this Tribunal are not to be regarded as relevant costs to be taken into account in determining the amount of any service charge payable by the tenants or any of them.

**Signed: Judge Adrian Jack**

**Dated: 13<sup>th</sup> November 2025**