



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

Case Reference	:	MAN/00EQ/LDC/2025/0673
Property	:	Oak Lawn, 1 Daveylands, Wilmslow, SK9 2AS
Applicant	:	Oaklawn Management Company Limited
Representative	:	Cheryl Ashbrook - HML Limited
Respondents	:	Various Residential Long Leaseholders of the Property
Type of Application	:	Application for the dispensation of consultation requirements pursuant to S.20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985
Tribunal Members	:	Tribunal Judge L. White Tribunal Member J. Jacobs
Venue	:	Paper determination
Date of Determination	:	14 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 (“the 1985 Act”) (Section 20ZA of the 1985 Act).

The reasons for this decision are set out below.

The background to the application

1. The Applicant seeks dispensation under Section 20ZA of 1985 Act from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the 1985 Act. Those requirements (“the Consultation Requirements”) are set out in the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 (“the Regulations”).
2. The application is dated 17 July 2025.
3. The Tribunal did not inspect the Property but we understand the Property consists of four floors being basement, ground floor, first floor and second floor containing a total of 12 self contained apartments. The Applicant is the Management Company for the Property. The Respondents comprise the leaseholders of the 12 apartments.
4. The only issue for the Tribunal to determine is whether it is reasonable to dispense with the Consultation Requirements.
5. A directions order dated 16 December 2025 (“the Directions Order”) set out that the Applicant should send to each Respondent a copy of the application form, the Directions Order, full statement of case, any correspondence sent to the leaseholders in relation to the works, detailed reasons for the urgency of works, any quotes or estimates and any other document to be relied on. The Respondents then had 21 days to oppose the application including any documents they sought to rely upon with the Applicant having the opportunity to provide a final statement in reply within 7 days thereafter.
6. The Applicant provided a bundle of documents, which included the application form, a statement of case, reasons for urgency of works, pictures, quote and invoice from Forest Stump Tree Surgeons and correspondence sent to leaseholders advising of the urgent works and that an application had been made to the Tribunal for dispensation.
7. On 31 August 2025 a large branch fell from an Oak tree located within the grounds of the Property which partially blocked the public road (Macclesfield Road) adjacent to the Property and the communal gardens of the Property. Following an urgent assessment of the Oak tree by a tree surgeon further works

to the Oak tree were required including structural pollarding of the tree. Due to the Oak tree overhanging the road a full road closure was required. The works carried out were:

- (a) Structural pollard of mature Oak tree;
- (b) Road closure of Macclesfield Road to allow for the pollarding; and
- (c) Cherry picker hire.

Collectively (“the Works”)

- 8. A quote of £5,163.00 from Forest Stump Tree Surgeons was obtained for the Works.
- 9. The Applicant states the Works were undertaken on 26 January 2026 and Macclesfield Road was closed from 9.00 am to 3.00 pm on that day.
- 10. The Applicant states the Works were urgently required to protect leaseholders, property and passers-by from the unsafe Oak tree.
- 11. The Applicant has advised that the Respondents have been provided with the documents required by the Directions Order. No responses from the Respondents have been received.
- 12. The Directions Order set out that the matter would be dealt with by way of a determination on the papers received unless any of the parties made representations within 49 days of the date of those directions. No representations have been made.
- 13. The Tribunal did not inspect the Property and it considered the documentation and information before it as set out above.

Grounds for the application

- 14. The Applicant set out in its application that the Works were urgently required to protect leaseholders, property and passers-by from the unsafe Oak tree.
- 15. The Applicant states the Works were undertaken on 26 January 2026 and Macclesfield Road was closed from 9.00 am to 3.00 pm on that day. The invoice for the Works from Forest Stump Tree Surgeons is for £5,163.00 including Vat.

The Issues

- 16. This decision is confined to determination of the issue of dispensation from the statutory consultation requirements in respect of the Works. The Tribunal has

made no determination on whether the costs for the Works are payable or reasonable. If a Lessee wishes to challenge the payability or reasonableness of the costs for the Works as service charges then a separate application under section 27A of the 1985 Act would have to be made.

Law

17. Section 18 of the 1985 Act defines what is meant by “service charge”. It also defines the expression “relevant costs” as:

the costs or estimated costs incurred or to be incurred by or on behalf of the landlord, or a superior landlord, in connection with the matters for which the service charge is payable.

18. Section 19 of the 1985 Act limits the amount of any relevant costs which may be included in a service charge to costs which are reasonably incurred, and section 20(1) provides:

Where this section applies to any qualifying works ... the relevant contributions of tenants are limited ... unless the consultation requirements have been either—

- (a) complied with in relation to the works ... or*
- (b) dispensed with in relation to the works ... by the appropriate tribunal.*

19. “Qualifying works” for this purpose are works on a building or any other premises (section 20ZA(2) of the Act), and section 20 applies to qualifying works if relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works exceed an amount which results in the relevant contribution of any tenant being more than £250.00 (section 20(3) of the 1985 Act and regulation 6 of the Regulations).

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. Section 20ZA (1) of the 1985 Act relates to Consultation Requirements and provides as follows:

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.

23. Reference should be made to the Regulations themselves for full details of the applicable Consultation Requirements. In outline, however, they require a landlord (or management company) to:

- give written notice of its intention to carry out qualifying works, inviting leaseholders to make observations and to nominate contractors from whom an estimate for carrying out the works should be sought;
- obtain estimates for carrying out the works, and supply leaseholders with a statement setting out, as regards at least two of those estimates, the amount specified as the estimated cost of the proposed works, together with a summary of any initial observations made by leaseholders;
- make all the estimates available for inspection; invite leaseholders to make observations about them; and then to have regard to those observations;
- give written notice to the leaseholders within 21 days of entering into a contract for the works explaining why the contract was awarded to the preferred bidder if that is not the person who submitted the lowest estimate.

24. 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.

25. 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) 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.
26. Accordingly, the exercise of the Tribunal's power to dispense is governed by a determination of whether "it is reasonable" to dispense. Lord Neuberger explained in *Daejan* at [67]: "*while the legal burden of proof would be, and would remain throughout, on the landlord, the factual burden of identifying some relevant prejudice that they would or might have suffered would be on the tenants*".
27. *Daejan* gives a direction of travel for the exercise of the Tribunal's discretion and a clear steer that where the Tribunal is unable to identify relevant prejudice, dispensation should be granted. The Tribunal has to consider whether any prejudice has arisen out of the conduct of the Applicant and whether it is reasonable for the Tribunal to grant dispensation following the guidance set out above in *Daejan*, and if so, whether any conditions should be applied to that dispensation.

Consideration and Findings

28. The Consultation Requirements are intended to ensure a degree of transparency and accountability when a landlord (or a management company) decides to undertake qualifying works – the requirements ensure that leaseholders have the opportunity to know about, and to comment on, decisions about major works before those decisions are taken.
29. In deciding whether to dispense with the Consultation Requirements in a case where qualifying works have been commenced or completed before the Tribunal makes its determination, the Tribunal must focus on whether the leaseholders were prejudiced by the failure to comply with the Consultation Requirements. If there is no such prejudice, dispensation should be granted. 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 accepts the urgency of the need to carry out the Works to ensure the Oak tree was made safe. The Tribunal finds that, taking into account that there have been no objections from the Respondents and there is no indication that the leaseholders in this case have suffered any prejudice as a consequence of the failure to comply with the Consultation

Requirements, there is no prejudice to any of the leaseholders of the Property by the granting of dispensation relating to the Works.

30. On the evidence before it, the Tribunal finds that it is reasonable to allow dispensation in relation to the subject matter of the application.
31. Nevertheless, the fact that the Tribunal has granted dispensation from the Consultation Requirements for the Works should not be taken as an indication that any service charge costs resulting from the Works are reasonable; or, indeed, that such charges will be payable by the Respondents. We make no findings in that regard – but we do consider it appropriate to make the following general observation in the particular circumstances of this case being that as with any claim for service charges, leaseholders of the Property will only be liable to contribute towards the costs of remediating the Property if and to the extent that such costs (i) are contractually payable under the terms of their leases; and (ii) are reasonably incurred.

Rights of appeal

1. 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.
2. If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission to appeal must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the regional office which has been dealing with the case.
3. 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.
4. If the application is not made within the 28 day time limit, such applications 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.
5. 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 rounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.
6. If the Tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).