



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

Case references	:	BIR/47UD/LSC/2024/0626 BIR/47UD/LDC/2025/0008
Subject properties	:	(1) 17 Woodfield Close (2) 20 Woodfield Close Abbeydale Redditch B98 8JE
Applicant	:	Redditch Borough Council (Sue Solomon)
Respondents	:	(1) Mr Ramesh and Mrs Rama Ladwa (2) Mr Bhupendra Ladwa
Type of application	:	Application under section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 for dispensation of the consultation requirements in respect of a qualifying works
Tribunal member	:	Deputy Regional Judge Gravells
Date of decision	:	29 January 2026

DECISION

1. By application dated 26 November 2024, the Applicant applied under section 20ZA for dispensation from the consultation requirements imposed by section 20 of the 1985 Act in respect of (i) a qualifying long term agreement between the Applicant and Hardyman and Co Limited for a period of three years from 1 November 2022 and (ii) qualifying works carried out pursuant to that agreement.
2. The qualifying works comprised the replacement of the felt roof covering on the building comprising the two subject properties in order to address and eliminate water ingress issues and the dilapidation of the building/properties. The total cost of the works was £10,171.32 (inclusive of VAT).
3. The factual background to the carrying out of the works was set out in the application form and other documentation sent to the Respondents. In essence, the Applicant asserted that it was appropriate to address the actual and potential damage to the subject properties without the delay inherent in full compliance with the statutory consultation requirements.
4. On 23 September 2025 the Tribunal issued Directions requiring the Applicant to send to each of the Respondents a copy of the Directions, a copy of the application form and accompanying documents, a statement explaining the purpose of the application and the reason why dispensation was sought and any other relevant documents.
5. The Respondents were required to complete a reply form, indicating (i) whether they consented to, or opposed (in whole or in part), the application and (ii) whether they wished the Tribunal to hold a hearing on the issue of dispensation.
6. Neither Respondent completed a reply form by the specified date.
7. The Directions stated that, if a Respondent failed to return the reply form, the Tribunal would assume that they did not oppose the dispensation application.
8. However, given the cost of the qualifying works and the potential liability of the Respondents to contribute to those costs through the service charge, on 27 November 2025 the Tribunal wrote to the Respondents, requesting that they complete and return the reply forms.
9. On 2 December 2025 both Respondents emailed the Tribunal with their completed reply forms attached.
10. Both Respondents indicated (i) that they consented to the dispensation application and (ii) that they did not wish the Tribunal to hold a hearing on the application.
11. In the circumstances the Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements in relation to the proposed long-term qualifying agreement and qualifying works.
12. The Tribunal therefore grants the dispensation.

13. This application and the determination of the Tribunal do not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs incurred in carrying out the qualifying works are payable by the Respondents or are reasonable.

29 January 2026

Professor Nigel Gravells
Deputy Regional Judge