

Dear Urang,

Formal objection to Section 20 Notice of Intention dated 20 April 2026

I write to formally object to the Section 20 Notice of Intention dated 20 April 2026 relating to proposed lift repair, replacement and modernisation works across Chelsea Bridge Wharf.

Having reviewed both the Notice and subsequent correspondence from Urang, I do not consider the consultation to be valid or procedurally fair in its current form, and I believe the approach being taken is unreasonable for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the Notice attempts to bundle together an extremely broad and undefined programme of works covering lifts across multiple blocks and external estate lifts, without specifying which lifts actually require replacement or modernisation within any defined timeframe. The Notice explicitly states that works may be carried out in varying order depending on future assessments, contractor availability and funding, and that the scope may later be “refined” following tendering and technical review. This effectively seeks approval in principle for large-scale expenditure without leaseholders knowing precisely which works will occur, when they will occur, or at what final cost.

In effect, leaseholders are being asked to approve a rolling estate-wide programme rather than identifiable qualifying works. In my view, this is contrary to both the spirit and purpose of the Section 20 consultation process.

The estimated costs subsequently disclosed by Urang suggest expenditure of approximately £90,000–£100,000 per lift. **Across the estate this potentially represents expenditure running into millions of pounds over an undefined period.** Yet leaseholders were not initially provided with cost estimates, timescales, condition surveys or supporting expert evidence alongside the Notice of Intention. That information only emerged after repeated requests from leaseholders and is still extremely vague.

I also object to the fact that the independent KSK Consultants report, which Urang now relies upon heavily to justify the programme, was not circulated with the original Notice and has still not been circulated to leaseholders even though the period for objection to the notice of intent closes in a few days. If the report forms part of the evidential basis for the works, it should have been disclosed from the outset to allow leaseholders to make properly informed observations during the consultation period. **Withholding the report seems like an attempt to manipulate the section 20 process by claiming there is independent evidence to support the proposed works but not allowing leaseholders to inspect it or ask questions about it. It is very convenient that this report (which we cannot see) apparently supports (as you claim) a course of action which you had already decided to take in December 2025.**

Furthermore, the Notice appears deliberately drafted to create what amounts to a “blank cheque” mechanism whereby Urang and the RTM company seek flexibility to undertake substantial works at a future date of their choosing without returning to leaseholders for fresh consultation. You have stated, after my initial objections to the notice of intent, that if any of the proposed works

were not carried out within 12 months then a new section 20 process would be started but there is no guarantee that you would keep your word on that and leaseholders would have no way to legally enforce that.

Given that Urang tried to push through a Section 20 Notice of Intent just before Christmas 2025, and then later had to withdraw it after you were unable to answer leaseholders' questions about costs and timescales, you will appreciate that most leaseholders have little trust in your handling of Section 20 processes

. The Notice itself confirms that lifts may be prioritised and addressed over time according to future condition assessments and operational considerations.

This is problematic for several reasons:

1. There is no certainty regarding the actual scope of works to be undertaken within the life of the consultation.
2. Costs may materially increase over time due to inflation, revised specifications or changes in market conditions.
3. Leaseholders are unable to properly scrutinise whether replacement is genuinely necessary in each case, as opposed to repair or more limited refurbishment.
4. The approach risks circumventing the requirement for proper consultation on specific qualifying works affecting specific leaseholders.

While I acknowledge that lift reliability and maintenance are important issues, I remain unconvinced that the scale of replacement proposed has been adequately justified. Much of the language used by Urang refers to "modernisation", "strategy", and "long-term reliability improvements", which raises legitimate concern that this programme may partly represent an upgrades agenda rather than strictly necessary major works.

I also note that Urang previously suggested estate-wide carpet replacement works as an "urgent priority", yet these now appear to have been paused without explanation while contractors continue measuring blocks for quotations. This inconsistency further undermines confidence in the decision-making and prioritisation process being adopted.

Accordingly, I formally object to the proposed Section 20 consultation process and reserve all rights to challenge the reasonableness, necessity and recoverability of any associated costs, including before the First-tier Tribunal if necessary.

I request that:

- The current consultation be withdrawn and reissued on a more limited and properly defined basis;
- Any future Section 20 notices regarding lifts relate only to specific lifts where works are genuinely anticipated within a defined 6–12 month period;

- The full KSK Consultants report and any associated surveys, breakdown data and cost-benefit analyses be disclosed to all leaseholders immediately;
- Detailed cost estimates and lifecycle justifications be provided for each individual lift proposed for replacement;
- Leaseholders be provided with a clear explanation of why repair or partial refurbishment is not considered viable in each case.

Furthermore,

Leaseholders should be consulted on what THEY consider to be priorities

- Leaseholders should be able to see results of the resident survey and staff satisfaction survey which you carried out in November 2025 but have refused until now to share with residents.
- Leaseholders should be able to see the contract which was signed between Urang and the Chelsea Bridge Wharf RTM company in January without any consultation with leaseholders (and indeed not even informing them afterwards that this had happened).

Please treat this email as a formal written observation under Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

Yours sincerely,

Mike O'Driscoll
Leaseholder
Chelsea Bridge Wharf