



FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference : MAN/00CB/LDC/2026/0044

Property : 53-59 South Parade (odd numbers), West Kirby CH48 0QQ

Applicant : Maxiunit Property Management Limited

Representative : Key Residential Limited

Respondents : The Residential Long Leaseholders of the Property, as set out in the Annex

Type of Application : Landlord & Tenant Act 1985 – Section 20ZA

Tribunal : Tribunal Judge L Brown
Tribunal Member Mr J Fraser

Date Decision Issued : 15/09/2026

DECISION

Dispensation for the Works described in paragraph 3 is granted pursuant to section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, subject to the Applicant serving each Respondent with a copy of this Decision.

The Application

1. Application dated 30 July 2026 was made by the Applicant, freehold proprietor of the Property, to seek dispensation pursuant to section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the Act”) in respect of consultation requirements in relation to certain qualifying works, within the meaning of the Act.
2. The Tribunal was informed that the Property is a converted residential building which comprises two blocks of 16 apartments.

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2026

3. The qualifying works as identified in the Application consist of repair to the roof of the Property, to prevent water ingress.
4. The only issue is whether it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements.

Paper Determination

5. The Tribunal's Directions dated 30 July 2026 provided, amongst other things, that the Applicant must within 28 days of the date of the directions, send to the Tribunal, with a copy to each Respondent, a bundle of documents consisting of:
 - a. a copy of the Tribunal application form;
 - b. a copy of the directions;
 - c. a statement of case explaining why the application had been made;
 - d. any correspondence sent to the leaseholders in relation to the works
 - e. detailed reasons for the urgency of the works and the consequences upon the leaseholders of any delay
 - f. any quotes or estimates for the proposed works and relevant reports (including full details of attempts made by the Applicant to obtain quotes or estimates); and
 - g. copies of any other documents the Applicant sought to rely on in evidence.
6. The directions also provided that any leaseholder who opposed the Application must within 21 days of receipt of the documents referred to in paragraph 5 complete and return the reply form attached to the directions and send it to the applicant and Tribunal together with a statement in response to the Application and any documents and witness statements which they sought to rely on in evidence.
7. No responses from any Respondent were provided to the documents the Applicant proposed to rely upon in support of the Application and no objections to the Application were submitted to the Tribunal by any Respondent, none of whom have taken any part in the proceedings.
8. The directions provided that the tribunal considered the matter to be one that could be resolved by way of submission of written evidence and stated that, if any party wished to make oral representations, that party should request a hearing.
9. No such request has been made, and the Application has been determined by the Tribunal on the papers submitted by the Applicant.
10. The directions expressly state that the Application concerns only whether or not it is reasonable to dispense with the consultation requirements and does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs resulting from any such works are reasonable or payable and that it will be open to the leaseholders to challenge any such costs charged by the Applicant.

The Law

11. Section 20ZA(1) of the Act provides that:

‘Where an application is made to a 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.’

12. The Supreme Court in the case of *Daejan Investments v Benson and others* [2013] UKSC 14 set out certain principles relevant to section 20ZA. Lord Neuberger, having clarified that the purpose of sections 19 to 20ZA of the act was to ensure that tenants are protected from paying for inappropriate works and paying more than would be appropriate, went on to state:

‘it seems to me that the issue on which the [Tribunal] should focus when entertaining an application by a landlord under section 20ZA(1) must be the extent, if any, to which the tenants were prejudiced in either respect by the failure of the landlord to comply with the requirements’.

Evidence and Findings of Fact

13. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Application was properly brought and is in proper form.

14. The Applicant seeks dispensation from the consultation requirements as the works, which are qualifying works, were required urgently to maintain essential safety precautions and to protect the interests of leaseholders. The Applicant set out its Statement of Case

“The Applicant seeks dispensation for the following reasons:

- *Urgency of Works: The required works relate to matters that, if left unaddressed, may pose a risk to the structure, safety, or integrity of the building. Delaying the works to complete the full consultation process would be unreasonable and potentially detrimental to the property and its occupants.*
- *Practical Impossibility of Full Consultation: Due to the nature and timing of the issues identified, it has not been possible to complete the full statutory consultation process within the necessary period. The Applicant has acted promptly upon discovering the issues and has taken steps to notify leaseholders of the situation.*
- *Leaseholder Benefit: The works are necessary to preserve the building and ensure compliance with statutory obligations. Dispensation will allow the works to proceed without delay, which is in the interests of all leaseholders.*
- *No Prejudice to Leaseholders: The Applicant submits that leaseholders will not suffer any relevant prejudice as a result of dispensation being granted. Leaseholders will retain the ability to challenge the reasonableness of the costs under section 19 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 once the works have been completed.”*

15. The Applicant provided a certificate of service dated 3 August 2026 recording that its agent had dispatched that day to the Respondents the paperwork as required by the Tribunal, making the effective date of service 4 August 2026.

16. The Applicant set out that it had

*“• Informed leaseholders of the issues requiring urgent attention;
• Sought professional advice regarding the nature and urgency of the works;
• Prepared and submitted the application to the Tribunal promptly;
• Provided all supporting documentation, including contractor reports, quotations, and relevant correspondence.”*

17. Despite not fully engaging in the consultation process, the Applicant notified the leaseholders of the intended works and progress, by emails in March and April 2026.

18. The Applicant presented that the cost of the works was £23,988.00, which would be a charge of £1,499.25 per unit.

19. The Tribunal found from the above uncontradicted evidence that the works were urgent to prevent water ingress and damage to the Property and for protection of the occupiers.

20. In the absence of any submissions from any Respondent objecting to the works, or to the Application, or contending that granting the Application would result in prejudice, the Tribunal found no evidence that the Respondents would suffer prejudice in the event that the Application for dispensation from the consultation requirements was granted.

Determination

21. In the circumstances set out above, the Tribunal considers it reasonable to dispense with the consultation requirements. Dispensation for the works identified in paragraph 3 is granted pursuant to section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. To facilitate the efficient and timely issuing of this decision to all parties, the Tribunal considers it appropriate to make it a condition of granting dispensation that the Applicant serves every Respondent with this Decision, as it is not for the Tribunal to undertake such a significant administrative burden.

22. This decision does not affect the Tribunal's jurisdiction upon any future application to make a determination under section 27A of the Act as to the reasonableness and standard of the work and/or whether any service charge costs are reasonable and payable.

Tribunal Judge L Brown

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).