



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

**Case Reference** : CHI/43UD/LDC/2022/0031

**Property** : 14 Springfield Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1  
4DP

**Applicant** : Southern Land Securities Limited

**Representative** : Together Property Management  
[maintenance@togetherproperty.co.uk](mailto:maintenance@togetherproperty.co.uk)

**Respondents** : -

**Representative** :

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

**Tribunal Member(s)** : W H Gater FRICS MCI Arb

**Date and Venue of  
Hearing** : Determination on Papers

**Date of Decision** : 28 April 2022

---

DECISION

---

## **The Application**

1. The Applicant seeks dispensation under Section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 from the consultation requirements imposed on the landlord by Section 20 of the 1985 Act. This application was received on 17 March 2022.
2. The property was “previously a detached house constructed circa 1920 and originally consisted of a cellar area and living accommodation over ground and first floor but has since been converted into seven self-contained flats and extended partly to a second floor level with two studios in the basement (flats 6 & 7) and five one bedroomed flats over the ground and two upper floors. The second floor extension is made up of Mansards to both front and rear elevations that cover nearly the entire original pitched roof area.”
3. The Applicant explains that this application is retrospective as it had “received a report from the pump contractor that the pipework has corroded and there is a possibility that the pipe can split and therefore the works had to commence as soon as possible.”
4. Dispensation is requested “due to the health and safety aspects if the pump pipework was to split which would have caused a lot of damage to the property and the surrounding areas.”
5. The Tribunal made Directions on 25 March 2022 indicating that it considered that the application was suitable to be determined on the papers without a hearing in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal Procedure Rules 2013 unless a party objected.
6. No requests for an oral hearing were made and the matter is therefore determined on the papers in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal’s Procedural Rules
7. The Tribunal required the Applicant to send its Directions to the parties together with a form for the Leaseholders to indicate to the Tribunal whether they agreed with or opposed the application and whether they requested an oral hearing. Those Leaseholders who agreed with the application or failed to return the form would be removed as Respondents.
8. One lessee responded agreeing with the application. No other responses were received. In accordance with the above the lessees are therefore removed as Respondents.
9. Before making this determination, the papers received were examined to determine whether the issues remained capable of determination without an oral hearing and it was decided that they were, given that the application remained unchallenged.

10. The only issue for the Tribunal is whether it is reasonable to dispense with any statutory consultation requirements. This decision does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs will be reasonable or payable.

#### The Law

11. The relevant section of the Act reads as follows:

S.20 ZA Consultation requirements:

*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.*

12. 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
  - i. The main question for the Tribunal when considering how to exercise its jurisdiction in accordance with section 20ZA is the real prejudice to the tenants flowing from the landlord's breach of the consultation requirements.
  - ii. 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.
  - iii. Dispensation should not be refused solely because the landlord seriously breached, or departed from, the consultation requirements.
  - iv. The Tribunal has power to grant a dispensation as it thinks fit, provided that any terms are appropriate.
  - v. 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).
  - vi. 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.
  - vii. 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.

viii. 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.

ix. Once the tenants had shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.

### Evidence

The Applicant's case is set out in paragraphs 2 to 4 above and in the hearing bundle provided in accordance with directions.

### Determination

13. Dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 of the Act may be given where the Tribunal is satisfied that it is reasonable to dispense with those requirements. Guidance on how such power may be exercised is provided by the leading case of Daejan v Benson referred to above.
14. In this case I am satisfied that the works were urgent and as no objections have been received the type of prejudice referred to in the Daejan case has not been identified.
15. In view of the above I am not satisfied that the failure to consult the lessees prior to works being carried out has resulted in prejudice to the lessees being occasioned and as such I grant the dispensation sought.
16. The Tribunal therefore grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the works to the pump pipework.
17. In granting dispensation, the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.
18. The Applicant is to send a copy of this determination to all of the lessees liable to contribute to service charges.

W H Gater FRICS MCI Arb  
Regional Surveyor  
28 April 2022

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application by email to [rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk](mailto:rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk) to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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