

11535



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

**Case reference** : **CHI/45UH/LDC/2016/0006**

**Applicant** : **Plentview Limited**

**Representative** : **J H Watson Property Management Limited**

**Respondents** : **1) Mrs C A Barnes  
2) Mr & Mrs M Irvine  
3) Mrs N Tighe & Mr M Beirne**

**Property** : **12 Thorn Road, Worthing BN11  
3ND**

**Date of decision** : **3 March 2016**

**Summary of decision**

**The Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.**

## Background

1. This is an application for dispensation from the consultation requirements provided by section 20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.
2. The Applicant advises that due to problems with water penetration urgent works are required in respect of covering the roof to the ground floor bay.
3. A Stage 1 S. 20 Notice has been sent and quotes are being sought. One has been received.
4. Following a complaint from a leaseholder the Local Authority is considering enforcement action.
5. Directions were made on 26 January 2016 and sent to the parties together with a form for the respondents to indicate to the Tribunal whether they objected to the application and whether an oral hearing was required.
6. **The only issue for the Tribunal is whether or not it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements. This decision does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs will be reasonable or payable.**

## The Law

7. The relevant section of the Act reads as follows:  
  
20ZA Consultation requirements:  
  
(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.
8. The matter was examined in some detail by the Supreme Court in the case of Daejan Investments Ltd v Benson. In summary the Supreme Court noted the following
  - The main question for the Tribunal when considering how to exercise its jurisdiction in accordance with section 20ZA (1) is the real prejudice to the tenants flowing from the landlord's breach of the consultation requirements.
  - The financial consequence to the landlord of not granting a dispensation is not a relevant factor. The nature of the landlord is not a relevant factor.

- Dispensation should not be refused solely because the landlord seriously breached, or departed from, the consultation requirements.
- The Tribunal has power to grant a dispensation as it thinks fit, provided that any terms are appropriate.
- The Tribunal has power to impose a condition that the landlord pays the tenants' reasonable costs (including surveyor and/or legal fees) incurred in connection with the landlord's application under section 20ZA(1).
- The legal burden of proof in relation to dispensation applications is on the landlord. The factual burden of identifying some "relevant" prejudice that they would or might have suffered is on the tenants.
- The court considered that "relevant" prejudice should be given a narrow definition; it means whether non-compliance with the consultation requirements has led the landlord to incur costs in an unreasonable amount or to incur them in the provision of services, or in the carrying out of works, which fell below a reasonable standard, in other words whether the non-compliance has in that sense caused prejudice to the tenant.
- The more serious and/or deliberate the landlord's failure, the more readily a Tribunal would be likely to accept that the tenants had suffered prejudice.
- Once the tenants had shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.

## **Submissions**

9. From the bundle submitted by the Applicant it appears that the roof has a history of leaks which have been attended to on several occasions. On 23 December 2015 the lessee reported water ingress and the contractor who attended reported that the roof was beyond temporary repair but applied a waterproofing solution as a short term remedy.
10. On 18 January 2016 a Notice of Intention was issued in respect of re-roofing the bay and on 20 January a letter was received from Adur and Worthing Council advising that the issue constituted a statutory nuisance that an enforcement notice was under consideration and whilst they were aware that a S.20 notice had been served the Applicant should consider making a S.20ZA application.
11. A specification has been prepared and tenders sought.

## **Decision**

12. The Tribunal has not received any objections from the lessees and the lessees have been advised of proceedings.
13. Clearly there is a need for works to be done and the Local Authority has recommended an application under S.20ZA.
14. There have been no objections to the application from the lessees or any suggestion that they have suffered the prejudice considered in the Daejan case referred to above.
15. On the basis of the evidence before it the **Tribunal therefore grants Dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.**
16. The Tribunal makes no findings as to whether the sum is in due course payable or indeed reasonable but confines itself solely to the issue of dispensation.

D Banfield FRICS  
3 March 2016

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office, which has been dealing with the case. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.