



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

Case Reference : HAV/43UB/LDC/2026/0006

Property : 1-12 Yew Place, 50 Oatlands Chase, Weybridge,
Surrey, KT13 9ZD

Applicant : Yew Place Management Company (Weybridge)
Limited

Representative : HES Estate Management Limited

Respondents : The leaseholders of the Property

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(s)** : Tribunal Judge H Lumby

Date of Decision : 5 March 2026

DECISION

Decision of the Tribunal

The Tribunal grants the application for the dispensation of all or any of the consultation requirements provided for by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (Section 20ZA of the same Act) in relation to works to replace the intercom and fob entry system at the Property.

The background to the application

1. 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. This application was received on 16 January 2026.
2. The Property is described as a three storey purpose built block in a residential gated development, comprising twelve flats and one lift.
3. The Applicant is the management company of the Property with responsibility to the leaseholders for the provision of services. The Respondents comprise its leaseholders.
4. The application relates to works to replace the intercom and fob entry system at the Property; these operate the vehicle gates and the communal front door. At present, the vehicle gates are not secured and the communal front door cannot be opened remotely.
5. The Applicant has confirmed that section 20 notices were sent out but dispensation from consultation is sought to enable the works to be carried out without delay. The works were due to commence at the beginning of February 2026.
6. The works were said to be urgent as having the vehicle gates unsecured presents a security risk whilst the lack of remote opening to the communal front door may cause access issues for emergency services in an emergency.
7. The Applicant has not provided any indication of the cost of the works.
8. A full statutorily compliant consultation has not been carried out and the Applicant has applied for dispensation instead.
9. The Applicant has confirmed that no objections have been received from the Respondents.
10. By Directions of the Tribunal dated 2 February 2026 it was decided that the application be determined without a hearing, by way of a paper case. No objections have been received to this approach. The Tribunal has reviewed the documentation provided and is satisfied that it remains suitable for a paper determination.

11. The Tribunal did not inspect the Property as it considered the documentation and information before it in the set of documents prepared by the Applicant enabled the Tribunal to proceed with this determination.
12. This has been a paper determination which has not been objected to by the parties. The documents that were referred to are the Applicant's application, a specimen lease, a list of the Respondents and the Tribunal's Directions dated 2 February 2026, the contents of which have been recorded.

The issues

13. This decision is confined to determination of the issue of dispensation from the consultation requirements in respect of the qualifying works. 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 as service charges, including the possible application or effect of the Building Safety Act 2022, then a separate application under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 would have to be made.

Law

14. Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended) ("the 1985 Act") and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 require a landlord planning to undertake major works, where a leaseholder will be required to contribute over £250 towards those works, to consult the leaseholders in a specified form.
15. Should a landlord not comply with the correct consultation procedure, it is possible to obtain dispensation from compliance with these requirements by an application such as this one before the Tribunal. Essentially the Tribunal must be satisfied that it is reasonable to do so.
16. The Applicant seeks dispensation under section 20ZA of the 1985 Act from all the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by section 20 of the 1985 Act.
17. Section 20ZA relates to consultation requirements and provides as follows:

"(1) 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.

(2) In section 20 and this section—

“qualifying works” means works on a building or any other premises, and “qualifying long term agreement” means (subject to subsection (3)) an agreement entered into, by or on behalf of the landlord or a superior landlord, for a term of more than twelve months.

....

(4) In section 20 and this section “the consultation requirements” means requirements prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State.

(5) Regulations under subsection (4) may in particular include provision requiring the landlord—

(a) to provide details of proposed works or agreements to tenants or the recognised tenants’ association representing them,

(b) to obtain estimates for proposed works or agreements,

(c) to invite tenants or the recognised tenants’ association to propose the names of persons from whom the landlord should try to obtain other estimates,

(d) to have regard to observations made by tenants or the recognised tenants’ association in relation to proposed works or agreements and estimates, and

(e) to give reasons in prescribed circumstances for carrying out works or entering into agreements.

Applicable test

18. In the case of *Daejan Investments Limited v Benson* [2013] UKSC 14, by a majority decision (3-2), the Supreme Court considered the dispensation provisions and set out guidelines as to how they should be applied.
19. The Supreme Court came to the following conclusions:
 - a. The correct legal test on an application to the Tribunal for dispensation is: “Would the flat owners suffer any relevant prejudice, and if so, what relevant prejudice, as a result of the landlord’s failure to comply with the requirements?”
 - b. The purpose of the consultation procedure is to ensure leaseholders are protected from paying for inappropriate works or paying more than would be appropriate.
 - c. In considering applications for dispensation the Tribunal should focus on whether the leaseholders were prejudiced in either respect by the landlord’s failure to comply.
 - d. The Tribunal has the power to grant dispensation on appropriate terms and can impose conditions.

- e. The factual burden of identifying some “relevant prejudice” is on the leaseholders. Once they have shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.
- f. The onus is on the leaseholders to establish:
 - i. what steps they would have taken had the breach not happened and
 - ii in what way their rights under (b) above have been prejudiced as a consequence
- 20. Accordingly, the Tribunal had to consider whether there was any “relevant prejudice” that may have arisen out of the conduct of the Applicant and whether it was reasonable for the Tribunal to grant dispensation following the guidance set out above.

Consideration

- 21. Having read the evidence and submissions from the Applicant and having considered all of the documents and grounds for making the application provided by the Applicant, the Tribunal determines the dispensation issues as follows.
- 22. It is evident that a statutorily compliant consultation has not been carried out by the Applicant. Applying *Daejan*, the test for it was whether the Respondents have suffered any relevant prejudice, and if so, what relevant prejudice, as a result of that lack of consultation by the landlord or the management company. In doing so, it needed to focus on whether the leaseholders have been prejudiced by paying for inappropriate works or paying an inappropriate amount as a result of the lack of consultation.
- 23. The Applicant believes that works to replace the intercom and fob entry system at the Property needed to be completed urgently as having the vehicle gates unsecured presents a security risk whilst the lack of remote opening to the communal front door may cause access issues for emergency services in an emergency. On the evidence before it, the Tribunal agrees with the Applicant’s conclusions.
- 24. The Tribunal is of the view that, taking into account that there have been no objections to this application from the Respondents, it could not find prejudice to any of the leaseholders by the granting of dispensation relating to works to replace the intercom and fob entry system at the Property.
- 25. As a result, the Tribunal believes that it is reasonable to allow dispensation in relation to the subject matter of the application.

26. Accordingly, the Tribunal grants the Applicant's application for the dispensation of all or any of the consultation requirements provided for by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in relation to works to replace the intercom and fob entry system at the Property.
27. The Applicant shall place a copy of the Tribunal's decision on dispensation together with an explanation of the leaseholders' appeal rights on its website (if any) within 7 days of receipt and shall maintain it there for at least 3 months, with a sufficiently prominent link to both on its home page. It should also be posted in a prominent position in the communal areas. In this way, any Respondents who have not returned the reply form may view the Tribunal's eventual decision on dispensation and their appeal rights.

Rights of appeal

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application by email to rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.