

Y Tribiwnlys Eiddo Preswyl

Residential Property Tribunal Service (Wales)

Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (Wales)

**Welsh Tribunals Unit, Oak House, Cleppa Park, Celtic Springs, Newport,
NP108BD**

Telephone 0300 025 2777. Email: rpt@gov.wales

Ref: LVT/0025/11/25

**In the matter of an application under S20ZA of the Landlord and Tenant Act
1985**

Applicants: Caerphilly County Borough Council- Applicants

Respondents: Leaseholders of 3,5,7 and 11 Claude Road - Respondents

DECISION AND REASONS OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRIBUNAL

1. In this case the Applicant seeks dispensation from the consultation requirements provided for by section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. The Applicant is Caerphilly Borough Council ("The Applicant"). The necessary Respondents to the application are the leaseholders of the premises affected by the application which is 3,5,7 and 11 Claude Road, Caerphilly CF83 1GJ ("The premises").
2. The Applicant has applied for dispensation from the statutory consultation requirements in respect of major works which have already been carried out. In summary they recognise that their notice of intention may have been deficient in its description of works to be dealt with.
3. This is the second dispensation request made by the Applicant on virtually identical grounds. Suffice to say that we would not expect to see a third dispensation request. The Applicant clearly needs to improve its procedures so that basic errors are not made.
4. In the present case the Applicant accepts that its notice of intention was inadequate in describing the forthcoming major works. In any event the second stage notice included the tendered costs. When the works were actually carried out additional works were identified which had not previously been envisaged. These were clearly associated works and a further consultation would not be necessary. In reality, therefore the dispensation relates solely to the deficient notice of intention.

The law on dispensation

Landlord and Tenant Act 1985,s.20ZA

20ZA Consultation requirements: supplementary

(1) *Where an application is made to [the appropriate 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, 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.

(3) *The Secretary of State may by regulations provide that an agreement is not a qualifying long term agreement—*

(a) if it is an agreement of a description prescribed by the regulations, or

(b) in any circumstances so prescribed.

(4) *In [section 20](#) and [this](#) section “the consultation requirements” means requirements prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State.*

(5) *Regulations under subsection (4) may in particular include provision requiring the landlord—*

(a) to provide details of proposed works or agreements to tenants or the recognised tenants' association representing them,

(b) to obtain estimates for proposed works or agreements,

(c) to invite tenants or the recognised tenants' association to propose the names of persons from whom the landlord should try to obtain other estimates,

(d) to have regard to observations made by tenants or the recognised tenants' association in relation to proposed works or agreements and estimates, and

(e) to give reasons in prescribed circumstances for carrying out works or entering into agreements.

(6) *Regulations under [section 20](#) or this section—*

(a) may make provision generally or only in relation to specific cases, and

(b) may make different provision for different purposes.

(7) *Regulations under [section 20](#) or this section shall be made by statutory instrument which shall be subject to annulment in pursuance of a resolution of either House of Parliament.*

Daejan

5. In *Daejan Investments v Benson* [2013] UKSC 14, the landlord was the freehold owner of a building comprised of shops and seven flats, five of which were held by the tenants under long leases which provided for the payment of service charges. The landlord gave the tenants notice of its intention to carry out major works to the building. It obtained four priced tenders for the work, each in excess of £400,000, but then proceeded to award the work to one of the tenderers without having given tenants a summary of the observations it had received in relation to the proposed works or having made the estimates available for

inspection. The tenants applied to a leasehold valuation tribunal under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 , as inserted, for a determination as to the amount of service charge which was payable, contending inter alia that the failure of the landlord to provide a summary of the observations or to make the estimates available for inspection was in breach of the statutory consultation requirements in paragraph 4(5) of Schedule 4 to the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 so as to limit recovery from the tenants to £250 per tenant, as specified in section 20 of the 1985 Act and regulation 6 of the 2003 Regulations in cases where a landlord had neither met, nor been exempted from, the statutory consultation requirements. The landlord applied to the tribunal under section 20(1) of the Act for an order that the paragraph 4(5) consultation requirements be dispensed with, and proposed a deduction of £50,000 from the cost of the works as compensation for any prejudice suffered by the tenants, which offer they refused. The tribunal held that the breach of the consultation requirements had caused significant prejudice to the tenants, that the proposed deduction did not alter the existence of that prejudice, and that it was not reasonable within section 20ZA(1) of the Act, as inserted, to dispense with the consultation requirements. The Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) dismissed the landlord's appeal and the Court of Appeal upheld the Upper Tribunal's decision.

6. The Supreme Court , allowing the appeal (Lord Hope of Craighead DPSC and Lord Wilson JSC dissenting), held that the purpose of a landlord's obligation to consult tenants in advance of qualifying works, set out in the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended) and the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 , was to ensure that tenants were protected from paying for inappropriate works or from paying more than would be appropriate; that adherence to those requirements was not an end in itself, nor was the dispensing jurisdiction under section 20ZA(1) of the 1985 Act a punitive or exemplary exercise; that, therefore, on a landlord's application for dispensation under section 20ZA(1) the question for the leasehold valuation tribunal was the extent, if any, to which the tenants had been prejudiced in either of those respects by the landlord's failure to comply; that neither the gravity of the landlord's failure to comply nor the degree of its culpability nor its nature nor the financial consequences for the landlord of failure to obtain dispensation was a relevant consideration for the tribunal; that the tribunal could grant a dispensation on such terms as it thought fit, provided that they were appropriate in their nature and effect, including terms as to costs; that the factual burden lay on the tenants to identify any prejudice which they claimed they would not have suffered had the consultation requirements been fully complied with but would suffer if an unconditional dispensation were granted; that once a credible case for prejudice had been shown the tribunal would look to the landlord to rebut it, failing which it should, in the absence of good reason to the contrary, require the landlord to reduce the amount claimed as service charges to compensate the tenants fully for that prejudice; and that, accordingly, since the landlord's offer had exceeded any possible prejudice which, on such evidence as had been before the tribunal, the tenants would have suffered were an unqualified dispensation to have been granted, the tribunal should have granted a dispensation on terms that the cost of the works be reduced by the amount of the offer and that the landlord pay the tenants' reasonable costs, and dispensation would now be granted on such

terms. Per Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury PSC, Lord Clarke of Stone-cum-Ebony and Lord Sumption JJSC. (i) Where the extent, quality and cost of the works were unaffected by the landlord's failure to comply with the consultation requirements an unconditional dispensation should normally be granted (post, para 45). (ii) Any concern that a landlord could buy its way out of having failed to comply with the consultation requirements is answered by the significant disadvantages which it would face if it fails to comply with the requirements. The landlord would have to pay its own costs of an application to the leasehold valuation tribunal for a dispensation, to pay the tenants' reasonable costs in connection of investigating and challenging that application, and to accord the tenants a reduction to compensate fully for any relevant prejudice, knowing that the tribunal would adopt a sympathetic (albeit not unrealistically sympathetic) attitude to the tenants on that issue (post, para 73).

7. Lord Neuberger giving the leading judgment stated *inter alia* the following:

56. More detailed consideration of the circumstances in which the jurisdiction can be invoked confirms this conclusion. It is clear that a landlord may ask for a dispensation in advance. The most obvious cases would be where it was necessary to carry out some works very urgently, or where it only became apparent that it was necessary to carry out some works while contractors were already on site carrying out other work. In such cases, it would be odd if, for instance, the LVT could not dispense with the requirements on terms which required the landlord, for instance, (i) to convene a meeting of the tenants at short notice to explain and discuss the necessary works, or (ii) to comply with stage 1 and/or stage 3, but with (for example) five days instead of 30 days for the tenants to reply.

Determination

8. The leaseholders who took part in the consultation raised financial issues which can still be addressed by means of an application under s.27A Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. They suffered no financial prejudice as a result of the defective notice of intention and we accept that dispensation is required. The notice of intention was overly general and failed to properly particularise what major works were being carried out. In some respects, the Applicant made up for this in acting on comments made by the leaseholder in converting the specification in relation to the roof works. Yet this also raises questions about the adequacy of the original survey. This mirrors the previous application we dealt with.
9. Although the Tribunal remain concerned about the quality of the surveying by the Applicant we reluctantly conclude that the application has merit. It was clearly necessary to carry out the works outlined. There is no evidence of the type of prejudice identified in *Daejan*. Accordingly, we agree to give dispensation. This is subject to the condition that the Applicant will not seek to recover any costs of the dispensation from the leaseholders. **It is emphasized again that the dispensation does not affect the leaseholders' ability to challenge the service charges pursuant to s.27A Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.**

10. Our comments above are repeated. We do not expect to see any further dispensation applications made by this Applicant. Procedures need to be improved to ensure that they are not necessary.

Dated this 18th day of March 2026

Judge Shepherd