



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

Case Reference	:	LON/00AX/LDC/2025/0832
Property	:	Avante Court, The Bittoms, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2AN
Applicant	:	Avante Management Company (Kingston) Limited
Respondents	:	The Lessees of Avante Court
Type of application	:	Dispensation from statutory consultant requirements
Tribunal Member	:	Mrs S Phillips MRICS Ms C Barton MRICS
Date of Decision	:	5 March 2026

DECISION

The Tribunal grants the application for dispensation from statutory consultation in respect of the subject works, namely the installation of wayfinding and signage in relation to fire safety that the London Fire Brigade have identified as being required for the Property.

The applicant should place a copy of this decision together with an explanation of the leaseholders' appeal rights on its website (if any) within seven days of receipt and maintain it there for at least three months, with a sufficiently prominent link to both on its home page. It should also display copies in a prominent position in the common parts of the Property.

This decision does not affect the Tribunal’s jurisdiction upon any future application to make a determination under section 27A of the Act in respect of the reasonableness and/or the cost of the work.

The Application

- 1) The Applicant seeks a determination pursuant to section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the **Act**”) for dispensation from consultation in respect of installing emergency signage at the Property. This included:
 - a) Wayfinding signage that needs to be changed / improved according to current regulations.
 - b) New wayfinding signage to be installed in staircases and on all floors.
- 2) The Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) Regulations 2003 provide that consultation requirements are triggered if the landlord plans to carry out qualifying works which would result in the contribution of any tenant being more than £250. The cost of the works the subject of the application exceed this threshold and the Applicant has submitted the total quote for the works is £15,102.68 including VAT.
- 3) By directions dated 12 September 2025 and amended directions dated 28 October 2025 (the “**directions**”) issued by the tribunal, they directed the Applicant to prepare a statement of case, provide reasoning for the application and provide any documentation the Applicant wished to rely upon for the application. The tribunal also directed that the Applicant send each of the leaseholders the application, the tribunal’s directions, the Applicant’s statement of case and display the same in the common parts of the Property, confirming to the tribunal that it had done so. The Applicant confirmed to the tribunal on 17 November 2025 that it had complied with this direction.
- 4) The directions required any leaseholder who opposed, or positively supported, the application that they should tell the tribunal. If they opposed the application, they should send the tribunal and the applicant’s representative a statement responding to the application together with any documents they wished to rely on. The tribunal received no responses from the leaseholders.
- 5) The directions provided that the tribunal would decide the matter on the basis of written submissions unless any party requested a hearing. No such request has been made.

The applicant's case

- 6) The Applicant is the resident management company of the Property. The Applicant's Representative (Ringley Law) submitted an application, within which it explained that the London Fire Brigade had visited the Property and determined that the signage was inadequate and not fit for purpose / regulations. The London Fire Brigade advised the Applicant that this required changing urgently.
- 7) The Applicant advised in their application that the main concern was a health and safety related issue given that the signage had been highlighted as being inadequate in the event of an emergency / fire.
- 8) The Applicant provided a witness statement from Anastacia Theophanous of Ringley Law LLP. She confirmed that the works have now been completed. No responses had been received by them from other leaseholders regarding the application.

The Respondents' case

- 9) There were no responses from the Respondents for the Tribunal to consider.

Determination and Reasons

- 10) Section 20ZA(1) of the Act provides:

“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 whole purpose of section 20ZA is to permit a landlord to dispense with the consultation requirements of section 20 of the Act if the tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable for them to be dispensed with.
- 12) The Tribunal has taken account the decision in *Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson and others* [2013] UKSC 14 in reaching its decision.
- 13) There is no evidence before the tribunal that the respondents were prejudiced by the failure of the Applicant to comply with the consultation requirements. Furthermore, the Tribunal is satisfied that the nature of the works was urgently required.

- 14) The tribunal is therefore satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with all or any of the consultation requirements in relation to the installation / upgrading of signage at the Property.
- 15) Whether the works are payable under the terms of the lease, or if the works have been carried out to a reasonable standard or at a reasonable cost are not matters which fall within the jurisdiction of the tribunal in relation to this present application. This decision does not affect the tribunal's jurisdiction upon any future application to make a determination under section 27A of the Act in respect of the reasonableness, payability and /or cost of the works.

Chairman: Mrs S Phillips MRICS

Date: 5 March 2026

APPEAL PROVISIONS

These summary reasons are provided to give the parties an indication as to how the Tribunal made its decision. If either party wishes to appeal this decision, they should first make a request for full reasons and the details of how to appeal will be set out in the full reasons. Any request for full reasons should be made within a month. Any subsequent application for permission to appeal should be made on Form RP PTA.