FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case reference	**:**	**LON/00AH/LDC/2025/0900**
Applicant	**:**	**Executors of Allan Mattey Deceased c/o Property Fusion**
Respondent	**:**	**The leaseholders of Trent and Sherwood Court**
Property	**:**	**Trent and Sherwood Court,2/4 Nottingham Road, Croydon, CR2 6LN**
Tribunal	**:**	**Tribunal Judge Mohabir**
Date of directions	**:**	**20 January 2026**

DECISION

© CROWN COPYRIGHT

1. The Applicant is the freeholder of the property known as Trent and Sherwood Court,2/4 Nottingham Road, Croydon, CR2 6LN ("the property"). It is described as being two purpose built blocks of flats comprised of 12 flats over 3 storeys. The Respondents are the long leaseholders of the flats in the property.

2. The Applicant had carried out statutory consultation under section 20ZA with the Respondents in relation to works to the internal common parts, which included the front doors to the flats and the porches to enable them to comply with address any fire hazards identified in a health, fire and safety report undertaken by the Applicant.

3. The contractor appointed to carry out the works was Property Facilities Group. However, it seems that the works carried out in relation to the front doors of the flats was to the required standard and the contractor has not been paid for this part of the overall works.

4. The Applicant has managed to locate another contractor, Metrix Contractors Limited, who has agreed to supply and install fire front doors to the flats at the same cost quoted by Property Facilities Group.

5. By an application dated 8 October 2025, the Applicant seeks an order pursuant to s.20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 ("the Act") for dispensation with the consultation requirements to enable it to appoint Metrix Contractors Limited to complete the work to the front doors of the flats.

6. On 18 November 2025, the Tribunal issued Directions requiring the Applicant to serve the Respondents with a copy of the application by 25 November 2025, which was done on 24 November 2025. The Respondents were directed to respond to the application stating whether they objected to it in any way.

7. The only objection received was from Gemma Peach who is the leaseholder of Flat 11 in the property. Her general complaints are in relation to the overall works including the quality of the work and the changes in the specification such as changing the floor covering from hard wearing flooring to carpet. In addition, Ms Peach wanted further details about Metrix Contractors Limited and clarification about what steps have been taken by the managing agent to obtain alternative estimates from other contractors to complete the work to the front doors of the flats. She is of the view that the cost to supply and install the front doors is excessive.

8. The clarification was provided in an email from the managing agent on 12 December 2025.

Relevant Law

9. This is set out in the Appendix annexed hereto.

Decision

10. As directed, the Tribunal's determination "on the papers" took place on 20 January 2026 and was based solely on the documentary evidence filed by the Applicant.

11. The relevant test to the applied in an application such as this has been set out in the Supreme Court decision in ***Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson & Ors*** [2013] UKSC 14 where it was held that the purpose of the consultation requirements imposed by section 20 of the Act was to ensure that tenants were protected from paying for inappropriate works or paying more than was appropriate. In other words, a tenant should suffer no prejudice in this way.

12. The issue before the Tribunal was whether dispensation should be granted in relation to the requirement to carry out statutory consultation with the leaseholders regarding the appointment of Metrix Contractors Limited to carry out the work to the front doors of the flats in the property. The Tribunal is not concerned about the actual cost that has or will be incurred.

13. The Tribunal granted the application for the following main reasons:

    (a) The Tribunal was satisfied that the Respondents had, at all material times, been kept informed of the need for the supply and installation of the fire front doors for the flats and had been served with the application together the evidence in support. Save for Ms Peach, there has been no objection from any of them. The Tribunal attached significant weight to this.

    (b) The Tribunal was satisfied that the Applicant had carried out statutory consultation in relation to the overall works, which included the works to the front doors of the flats. Arguably, therefore, it is not necessary for the Applicant to need dispensation to appoint another contractor to complete the supply and installation of the front doors of the flats. However, to the extent that it may be required, it is granted.

    (c) The Tribunal was mindful of the fact that Metrix Contractors Limited is prepared to meet the estimated cost provided by Property Facilities Group for the supply and installation of the fire front doors of the flats. Moreover, Property Facilities Group had not been paid for the work carried out to the front doors. The Tribunal was, therefore, satisfied that the Respondents had not suffered any financial prejudice in this way.

    (d) Importantly, the real prejudice to the Respondents would be in the cost of the work and they have not been able to establish, at this stage, any such prejudice. The Tribunal noted the concerns of Ms Peach, which are generally about the standard and cost of the overall works. However, the Tribunal is satisfied that those concerns can properly be met by her making a separate service

charge application under section 27A of the Act if she is minded to do so.

14. The Tribunal, therefore, concluded that the Respondents are not prejudiced by the Applicant's failure to consult regarding the appointment of Metrix Contractors Limited, and the application was granted as sought.

15. It should be noted that in granting this part of the application, the Tribunal makes no finding that the scope and cost of the repairs are reasonable.

Name: Tribunal Judge Mohabir **Date:** 20 January 2026

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 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).