



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

Case Reference : **LON/00AW/LDC/2021/0185**
P: PAPERREMOTE

Property : **Oakwood Court, Abbotsbury Road,
Holland Park, London W14 8JY**

Applicant : **Brickfield Properties Limited**

Representative : **Memery Crystal Limited**

Respondents : **The leaseholders listed in the
schedule to the application**

Representative : **Unrepresented**

Type of Application : **Section 20ZA Landlord and Tenant
Act 1985 - Dispensation with
consultation requirements**

Tribunal member(s) : **Judge Donegan
Mr K Ridgeway MRICS (Valuer
Member)**

**Date of Paper
Determination** : **12 October 2021**

Date of Decision : **13 October 2021**

DECISION

This has been a remote hearing on the papers which has not been objected to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was P: PAPERREMOTE. A face-to-face hearing was not held because it was not practicable, and all issues could be determined on paper. The documents that I was referred to are in a bundle of 346 pages, the contents of which I have noted.

Decision of the Tribunal

- (a) The Tribunal grants dispensation under section 20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 ('the 1985 Act') for the modernisation of the passenger lift in Block 1, Oakwood Court, Abbotsbury Road, Holland Park, London W14 8JY.**
- (b) No terms are imposed on the grant of dispensation.**
- (c) The applicant shall send a copy of this decision to each of the respondents, either by email, hand delivery or first-class post and shall send an email to the Tribunal by 22 October 2021, confirming the date(s) when this was done.**

The application

1. The applicant seeks dispensation from the consultation requirements imposed by section 20 of the 1985 Act.
2. The application was submitted to the Tribunal on 19 July 2021. Directions were issued on 11 August 2021. Revised directions were issued on 01 September 2021. These provided that the case be allocated to the paper track, to be determined upon the basis of written representations. None of the parties has objected to this allocation or requested an oral hearing. The paper determination took place on 12 October 2021.
3. The relevant legal provisions are set out in the appendix to this decision.

The background

4. Oakwood Court comprises two substantial 8-storey buildings on both sides of Abbotsbury Road. There are six blocks in each building and a total of 226 flats. Blocks 1-5 and 7-11 each have one passenger lift. Blocks 6 and 12 each have two lifts.
5. The applicant seeks dispensation from the statutory consultation requirements for the modernisation of the lift in Block 1, which contains 15 flats. The lift has been condemned and is no longer in service. The microprocessor in the main control panel has completely failed. The panel is now obsolete and cannot be repaired. The lift will remain out of action until modernisation takes place.
6. The managing agents have obtained a quotation from Murray Lift Maintenance Limited ('MLML') dated 06 July 2021 for £59,720 plus VAT. The proposed work will involve the supply and installation of:

- Lester Almega II control system
 - Cedex Shaft encoder
 - Schmersal electro mechanical limit switches
 - Montinari – A3 bi directional over speed governor and safety gear
 - Car door operator – Wittur – RCF1
 - Car station with indicator – Brushed Stainless Steel with Lester Controls TFT 7.0 and Anti-Bacterial buttons from Lester Controls or Dewhurst
 - Landing Indicators – Lester Controls TFT. 4.3” on all landings with Brushed Stainless Steel surface mounted stations
 - Landing Push Stations – Brushed Stainless Steel surface mounted stations with Anti-Bacterial buttons from Lester Controls or Dewhurst
7. The only issue for the Tribunal is whether it is reasonable to dispense with the statutory consultation requirements. **This application does not concern the issue of whether any service charge costs will be reasonable or payable.**

The grounds of the application

8. The grounds are contained in the application form and a witness statement from the block manager for Oakwood Court, Ms Annabelle Louvros, dated 06 October 2021. These are summarised below:
- (a) The modernisation works are urgent, as the lift will remain out of action until these take place.
 - (b) There is only one lift in Block 1. There are elderly and disabled residents and people with young children, all of whom require access to a lift.
 - (c) Block 1 is eight storeys high. Modernisation is required so all residents can access their flats.
 - (d) At the time of the application, the intention was to start the works within six weeks, being the lead time for the contractors. There is insufficient time to undertake a section 20 consultation during this period.

9. Paragraph 2 of the directions gave the respondents an opportunity to object to the dispensation application by completing and returning reply forms and serving statements, setting out their grounds of opposition. No objections have been received by the Tribunal

The Tribunal's decision

10. The Tribunal grants dispensation for the lift modernisation in Block 1, as detailed in MLML's quotation dated 06 July 2021. No terms are imposed on the grant of dispensation.

Reasons for the tribunal's decision

11. The Tribunal accepts that the lift modernisation is urgent, given the lift is out of action, the height of Block 1 and the substantial inconvenience to residents. A full section 20 consultation would take three months or more and the works cannot wait this long.
12. None of the respondents has contested the application or identified any prejudice that might arise from the grant of dispensation or proposed any terms as a condition of granting dispensation.
13. Having regard to the particular facts of this case and the guidance in *Daejan Investments Limited v Benson [2013] UKSC 14*, it is reasonable to dispense with the strict consultation requirements.
14. This decision does not address the cost of the lift modernisation, or whether the respondents are liable to contribute to the cost via their service charges. Nothing in this decision prevents the respondents from seeking a determination of 'payability', pursuant to section 27A of the 1985 Act.

Name: Tribunal Judge Donegan **Date:** 13 October 2021

Rights of appeal

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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 the appropriate tribunal for a determination to dispense with all of 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, and
“qualifying long term agreement” means (subject to subsection (3)) an agreement entered into, by or on behalf of the landlord or a superior landlord, for a term of more than twelve months.

Section 27A

- (1) An application may be made to the appropriate tribunal for a determination whether a service charge is payable and, if it is, as to –
 - (a) the person by whom it is payable,
 - (b) the person to whom it is payable,
 - (c) the amount which is payable,
 - (d) the date at or by which it is payable, and
 - (e) the manner in which it is payable.
- (2) Subsection (1) applies whether or not any payment has been made.
- (3) An application may also be made to the appropriate tribunal for a determination whether, if costs were incurred for services, repairs, maintenance, improvements, insurance or management of any specified description, a service charge would be payable for the costs and, if it would, as to –
 - (a) the person by whom it would be payable,
 - (b) the person to whom it would be payable,
 - (c) the amount which would be payable,
 - (d) the date at or by which it would be payable, and
 - (e) the manner in which it would be payable.
- (4) No application under subsection (1) or (3) may be made in respect of a matter which –
 - (a) has been agreed or admitted by the tenant,
 - (b) has been, or is to be, referred to arbitration pursuant to a post-dispute arbitration agreement to which the tenant is a party,
 - (c) has been the subject of determination by a court, or

- (d) has been the subject of determination by an arbitral tribunal pursuant to a post-dispute arbitration agreement.
- (5) But the tenant is not to be taken to have agreed or admitted any matter by reason only of having made any payment.