



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

**Case Reference** : **LON/00AG/LDC/2026/0058**

**Property** : **Crabtree Place, 1 - 10 Crabtree Place,  
London, W1T 2AT**

**Applicant** : **Crabtree Freehold Limited**

**Representative** : **Managed Exit Limited**

**Respondents** : **The Leaseholders**

**Representative** : **N/A**

**Type of Application** : **To dispense with the requirement to  
consult lessees about major works  
under section 20ZA of the Landlord  
and Tenant Act 1985**

**Tribunal** : **Tribunal Judge Mohabir**

**Date of Decision** : **28 May 2026**

---

**DECISION**

---

1. The Applicant seeks an order pursuant to s.20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the Act”) for *prospective* dispensation with the consultation requirements in respect of works to replace two water pumps at the property known as Crabtree Place, 1 - 10 Crabtree Place, London, W1T 2AT (“the property”).
2. The property is described as being a residential development of 23 apartments built in approximately 2010. The Applicant is the freeholder of the property, and the Respondents are the long residential leaseholders.
3. It is the Applicant’s case that the works are required because the existing pumps have failed, resulting in a loss of hot water to the whole development. An estimate has been provided showing a total cost for the works of £16,015.78 including VAT.
4. The Applicant contends that the work is urgent because of the need to restore hot water to residents. Apparently, the leaseholders have been informed of the works and that dispensation is being applied for. At the time the application was made, the works were said not to have been commenced, but a works order for them was issued on 13 February 2026.
5. By an application dated 13 February 2026, the Applicant applied seeking prospective dispensation for the works to replace the water pumps. On 9 April 2026, the Tribunal made directions. The Applicant was directed to serve the Respondents with a copy of the application and the directions. This was done on 15 April 2026. The Respondents were directed to respond to the application stating whether they objected to it in any way by 1 May 2026.
6. None of the Respondents have objected to the application.

### ***Relevant Law***

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

### ***Decision***

8. As directed, the Tribunal’s determination “on the papers” took place on 28 May 2026 and was based solely on the documentary evidence filed by the Applicant. As stated earlier, no objections had been received from any of the Respondents, nor had they filed any evidence.
9. The relevant test to be 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.
10. 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 work to replace the water pumps. The Tribunal is not concerned in this application about the actual cost that would or has been incurred.

11. 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 work to replace the water pumps and had been served with the application together with the evidence in support. There has been no objection from any of them. The Tribunal attached significant weight to this.
  - (b) The Tribunal accepted the Applicant's unchallenged evidence of the urgent need to carry out the work to replace the pumps because of the short-term failure of the water supply to the property. The Tribunal also accepted the Applicant's evidence that the water pumps were old and beyond repair. Therefore, complete replacement was necessary.
  - (c) The Tribunal was mindful of the significant loss of amenity to the leaseholders caused by the failure of the water supply to the property and the likelihood of such a failure reoccurring in the near future if the water pumps were not replaced immediately.
  - (d) The Tribunal was satisfied that the delay in the Applicant having to carry out consultation with the Respondents would have undoubtedly resulted in continuing and unnecessary loss of amenity to the affected leaseholder and possibly increased repair costs being incurred in the interim. The Tribunal was, therefore, also satisfied that there was an urgent basis for the water pump replacement to be carried out without delay.
  - (e) Given that the application is unopposed, the Tribunal was also satisfied that the requirement to carry out consultation was in effect academic and meaningless and would merely result in further unnecessary delay for the affected leaseholder.
  - (f) Importantly, the real prejudice to the Respondents would be in the cost of the work and they have not been able to establish any such prejudice. Furthermore, the Respondents have the statutory protection of section 19 of the Act, which preserves their right to challenge the actual costs incurred by making a separate service charge application under section 27A of the Act.
12. The Tribunal, therefore, concluded that the Respondents were not being prejudiced by the Applicant's failure to consult, and the application was granted as sought.

13. 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:** 28 May 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).

## **Appendix of relevant legislation**

### **Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended)**

#### **Section 20**

- (1) Where this section applies to any qualifying works or qualifying long term agreement, the relevant contributions of tenants are limited in accordance with subsection (6) or (7) (or both) unless the consultation requirements have been either—
  - (a) complied with in relation to the works or agreement, or
  - (b) dispensed with in relation to the works or agreement by (or on appeal from) the appropriate tribunal .
- (2) In this section “relevant contribution”, in relation to a tenant and any works or agreement, is the amount, which he may be required under the terms of his lease to contribute (by the payment of service charges) to relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works or under the agreement.
- (3) This section applies to qualifying works if relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works exceed an appropriate amount.
- (4) The Secretary of State may by regulations provide that this section applies to a qualifying long term agreement—
  - (a) if relevant costs incurred under the agreement exceed an appropriate amount, or
  - (b) if relevant costs incurred under the agreement during a period prescribed by the regulations exceed an appropriate amount.
- (5) An appropriate amount is an amount set by regulations made by the Secretary of State; and the regulations may make provision for either or both of the following to be an appropriate amount—
  - (a) an amount prescribed by, or determined in accordance with, the regulations, and
  - (b) an amount which results in the relevant contribution of any one or more tenants being an amount prescribed by, or determined in accordance with, the regulations.
- (6) Where an appropriate amount is set by virtue of paragraph (a) of subsection (5), the amount of the relevant costs incurred on carrying out the works or under the agreement which may be taken into account in determining the relevant contributions of tenants is limited to the appropriate amount.
- (7) Where an appropriate amount is set by virtue of paragraph (b) of that subsection, the amount of the relevant contribution of the tenant, or each of the tenants, whose relevant contribution would otherwise exceed the amount prescribed by, or determined in

accordance with, the regulations is limited to the amount so prescribed or determined.

**Section 20ZA**

- (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.