



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

Case Reference : CHI/24UH/LDC/2018/0041

Property : Annes Court, 11 Seafront, Hayling Island
PO11 0AJ

Applicant : Court Management Limited

Representative : Beals LLP

Respondents : The lessees

Representative :

Type of Application : To dispense with the requirement to
consult lessees about major works

Tribunal Member(s) : Mr D Banfield FRICS

Date of Decision 16 July 2018

DECISION

The Tribunal grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the works to re-instate the lift.

In granting dispensation in respect of part of the Application the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.

1. By an unsigned and undated application received on 8 May 2018 the landlord company made an application for dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. (the 1985 Act)
2. The dispensation was required for works to replace the lift controller unit and associated switchgear.
3. The Tribunal made Directions on 9 May 2018 which required the Applicant to send to each Respondent a copy of the application and the Directions together with a form to be returned to the Tribunal indicating whether the application was agreed with, whether a written statement was to be sent to the applicant and whether an oral hearing was required.
4. Four Lessees replied to the Tribunal, all agreed with the application and none required an oral hearing. The application is therefore determined on the papers received in accordance with Rule 31 of the Tribunal's procedural rules.
5. The only issue for the Tribunal is if 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

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

20ZA Consultation requirements:

- a. (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.
7. 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
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.
 - d. Dispensation should not be refused solely because the landlord seriously breached, or departed from, the consultation requirements.
 - e. The Tribunal has power to grant a dispensation as it thinks fit, provided that any terms are appropriate.
 - f. 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).

- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. 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.
- j. Once the tenants had shown a credible case for prejudice, the Tribunal should look to the landlord to rebut it.

Evidence

8. The Application referred to the need to bring the lift back into operation as there are elderly and partially disabled persons on upper floors who have difficulty using staircases. The second lift in the building is some distance away and accessed along an open walkway. It is also 40 years old and requires regular maintenance.
9. Contractors have provided a quotation lower than one provided by the existing service company some years ago.
10. In an explanatory note it was explained that the lift ceased to operate at the beginning of April 2018 and after attempts to carry out repairs it was declared that the obsolete parts could not be obtained.
11. The work was completed around 15 May 2018 and sometime after a quotation was received from the maintenance contractor in excess of the accepted quotation.

Determination

- 12.** Clearly it was necessary to re-instate the lift as a matter of urgency. No lessee has sent an objection to the Tribunal and no evidence of the type of prejudice referred to in paragraph 7 above has been identified. In these circumstances, I am prepared to grant the dispensation required.
- 13.** **The Tribunal therefore grants dispensation from the consultation requirements of S.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the works to re-instate the lift.**
- 14.** **In granting dispensation in respect of part of the Application the Tribunal makes no determination as to whether any service charge costs are reasonable or payable.**

D Banfield FRICS
16 July 2018

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 appeal is seeking.