1444



# FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

**Case Reference** 

: CHI/21UD/LDC/2015/0019

**Property** 

: Lion Court, 109 Marina, St Leonards on

Sea, Essex TN38 oBP

**Applicant** 

: PLCP Estates Limited

Representative

: Mainland

Respondents

The lessees listed on the application

Representative

:

Type of Application

To dispense with the requirement to

consult lessees about major works.

**Tribunal Member** 

: Mr D Banfield FRICS

**Date of Decision** 

28 May 2015

DECISION

## **Summary of Decision**

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

### **Background**

- 1. The Applicant seeks dispensation under Section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (The Act) from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the Act.
- 2. The application concerns the need to carry out works to the roof to prevent further water ingress.
- 3. Directions were made on 28April 2015 setting out a timetable for the resolution of the matter and requiring the Respondents to complete a form stating whether they supported the application, whether they wished to make representations to the Tribunal and whether a hearing was required.
- 4. No replies have been received by the Tribunal and the matter has therefore been determined on the written submissions received

#### The Law

5. 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 longterm agreement, the Tribunal may make the determination if satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with the requirements.
- 6. 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 consequences 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.

### The Evidence and Decision

- 7. In their bundle of documents the Applicants include correspondence from the lessees of Flats 4, 7 and 8 referring to the damage being caused to their flats from water leaks; Quotations from SAW Building Contractor dated 9 April 2015 and Parbium Construction dated 18 April 2015 and a report from C J Norman Construction Consultant dated 19 April 2015 advising that works should commence as soon as possible.
- 8. The Tribunal applying the legal principles cited above, notes that nothing has been received from the Respondents that purport to identify any prejudice.
- 9. The Tribunal is satisfied that this is an uncontested application in respect of the factual burden of identifying prejudice. However the Tribunal have still applied the relevant legal principles to the evidence before it, mindful that Parliament has intended dispensation to be an exception to consultation.
- 10. The Tribunal is satisfied that the water ingress to Flats 4, 7 and 8 requires urgent attention and that this urgency precludes the Applicant from following the S20 consultation. They further determine that the Lessees are unlikely to suffer prejudice from the lack of consultation.
- 11. On the basis of the evidence before it the Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

12. Tribunal makes no findings as to whether the cost of the works will in due course be payable or indeed reasonable but confines itself solely to the issue of dispensation.

D Banfield FRICS

28 May 2015

- 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