



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

Case reference : **LON/00AK/LDC/2020/0249**

HMCTS Code : **P:Paper remote**

Property : **194a Fore Street, London, N18 2JB**

Applicant : **Avosdeal Securities Ltd**

Representative : **In person**

Respondents : **(1) Matthew Thomas
(2) Michael Ryan
(3) Hua Gao Ryan**

Representative : **In person**

Type of application : **For dispensation under section
20ZA of the Landlord & Tenant Act
1985**

Tribunal member : **Tribunal Judge I Mohabir**

Date of determination : **8 March 2021**

Date of decision : **8 March 2021**

DECISION

Covid-19 pandemic: description of hearing

This has been a remote hearing on the papers, which has been consented to by the Applicant and not objected to by the Respondents. The form of remote hearing was P: PAPER REMOTE. A face-to-face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and no one requested the same.

Introduction

1. The Applicant makes an application in this matter under section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended) (“the Act”) for dispensation from the consultation requirements imposed by section 20 of the Act.
2. 194a Fore Street, London, N18 2JB (“the property”) is a four bedroom flat situated above ground floor commercial premises.
3. On or about 7 June 2020 the roof of the building developed a leak causing water ingress to take place into the commercial premises and presented a trip hazard in the communal hallway entrance.
4. On the same day the Respondents were made aware of the leak and water ingress.
5. On or about 8 June 2020, the Applicant instructed Elite Constructions UK Limited to inspect and repair the roof. In a report dated the same day, the following urgent works were identified to prevent further water ingress:

Temporary cement top of parapet walls to stop water penetration.
Replace new flashings and edging strips to rear single story roof over where leak is happening and clear.
Repairs to communal hallway roof with felt.
6. The estimated cost of the emergency works was £795 plus VAT, although the reasonableness of the cost does not fall within the ambit of this application. As the Tribunal understands it, these emergency works were carried out and it is only in respect of these works that retrospective dispensation is sought. The Tribunal’s decision does not extend the recommended additional works identified by the contractor.
7. The Tribunal is told that an arbitrator has confirmed that the works, which were carried out, were reasonable. The arbitrator has confirmed that the leaseholders are required to pay their share of the works subject to the requisite dispensation being obtained from the Tribunal.
8. Subsequently, the Applicant made this application seeking retrospective dispensation from the requirement to carry statutory consultation in relation to the urgent works. On 12 January 2021, the Tribunal issued Directions and directed the lessees to respond to the

application stating whether they objected to it in any way. The Tribunal also directed that this application be determined on the basis of written representations only.

9. None of the Respondents have objected to the application.

Relevant Law

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

Decision

11. The determination of the application took place on 8 March 2021 without an oral hearing. It was based solely on the statements of case and other documentary evidence filed by the Applicant.
12. 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.
13. The issue before the Tribunal was whether retrospective dispensation should be granted in relation to requirement to carry out statutory consultation with the leaseholders regarding the drain works. As stated earlier, the Tribunal is not concerned about the actual cost that has been incurred.
14. The Tribunal granted the application the following reasons:
 - (a) the Tribunal was satisfied that the water ingress into the commercial premises and the communal hallway entrance as shown in the photographic evidence was significant and posed a health and safety hazard to the occupiers and were, therefore urgent in nature. This was confirmed in the inspection report prepared by Elite Constructions UK Limited.
 - (b) the Tribunal was satisfied that the Respondents were informed of the leak and water ingress on the same day that it was discovered.
 - (c) the Tribunal was satisfied that the Respondents have been served with the application and the evidence in support and there has been no objection from any of them.
 - (d) importantly, the real prejudice to the Respondents would be in the cost of the works and they have the statutory protection of section 19 of the Act, which preserves their right to challenge the actual costs incurred and they have done so by making the

parallel service charge application under section 27A of the Act. it is in that application the arguments in relation to historic neglect may be pursued by the Respondents.

15. The Tribunal, therefore, concluded that the Respondents were not prejudiced by the Applicant's failure to consult and the application was granted as sought.
16. It should be noted that in granting this part of the application, the Tribunal makes no finding that the scope and estimated cost of the repairs are reasonable.

Name: Tribunal Judge I
Mohabir

Date: 8 March 2021

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.

(2) In section 20 and this section—

"qualifying works" means works on a building or any other premises.