

Mike O'Driscoll  
Warwick Building  
Chelsea Bridge Wharf  
London SW11

9th November 2025

Dear Urang,

**Formal complaint regarding the election for RTM directors, lack of service charge accounts, and various related matters on which you have refused to give satisfactory explanations or replies.**

**My reference: URANGCOMPLAINT 091125**

Having tried over a period of two months to obtain answers on the following points, I now, with regret, turn to a formal complaint in the hope of receiving some meaningful responses — not just for myself, but for leaseholders generally at Chelsea Bridge Wharf. These questions cover

- The misconduct of the **election for directors of the RTM company**
- The **unexplained delay in presenting the service charge accounts** for Warwick Building
- **Urang's refusal to be transparent** about the **management contract** with the Chelsea Bridge Wharf RTM company
- The findings from the poorly designed and managed **"survey of residents"**

These are important issues and are addressed to Urang and the body which contracts them – the Chelsea Bridge Wharf Right to Manage Company, [whose unelected directors have an atrocious track record in relation to the governance of this development](#). These issues do not relate to the concierge and cleaning staff who continue to do a great job, which is much appreciated,

#### 1. **Elections for Directors of the Chelsea Bridge Wharf Right to Manage (RTM) Company**

**The fact that there are any elections at all result from a long campaign [and a petition by myself](#) and others. Just over a year ago, Louis Kendall state there would be no elections for directors of the RTM company.** In May, it was announced that there would be elections, but no date or process was given. [At the first leaseholder meeting with Urang in July this year](#), Tony Hymers of Urang promised elections on 14th September, [but these were postponed without any valid reason, only a few weeks before the planned date](#). At the meeting with leaseholders on 15th September, various dates were mentioned — October, November, and "the end of the year." We were then finally given a date of 26th November for the first AGM and the finalisation of the election process. **It would be hard to imagine a more confused and delayed process and it is very clear to all that neither Urang nor the existing directors want to have these elections and have been dragged to them kicking and screaming.**

These elections are, in theory, **run by Urang**, and the **voting platform is provided by LUMI** but have little doubt that the people who actually designed and are making the decisions regarding the election process are the **unelected directors whose primary concern is to preserve their own positions.**

- **Can you please explain why was there no meeting of candidates** wishing to become directors, no discussion, and no promotion of the election process? How is it possible for leaseholders to make meaningful decisions about which candidates they support or do not support in the absence of an opportunity to meet them and ask them questions?
- **Why was the "abstain" option omitted** from the voting papers? (This is referenced in the chart but does not state who made the decision.)? Please explain **who made this decision and why**. LUMI has refused to confirm whether it was **their decision** or whether they were **instructed to do so** by Urang or the RTM company. [Handing the chair a large number of votes to use at their discretion, and not reporting the number of discretionary votes has made a mockery of a fair election process](#) and Urang is accountable for that.

**No ‘Abstain’ option is offered on the motions for each candidate on the LUMI platform.** So, if RTM members do not wish to vote for a candidate, and do not wish to appoint a proxy, they have to give their vote to the *Chair*. **However, we did not know who the Chair was until a few days ago and the Chair is not named on the LUMI platform, nor is it made clear that the Chair(Louis Kendall) is in fact one of candidates in the election .** Therefore, it is clear that the voting process has been set up in a way which means the Chair has control of a significant pile of ‘discretionary’ votes which they can use to support their preferred candidates (including themselves) and to vote against those they are desperate to keep out (i.e. those who support greater leaseholder consultation and transparency and a ballot on whether Urang’s contract should be renewed). **LUMI are unable to explain why they did not offer an ‘ABSTAIN’ option and whether this was their decision or an instruction from the unelected CBW RTM directors.** They also state they will not report how many ‘discretionary’ votes were used by the Chair for or against each candidate. Regardless of who made this decision it is has clearly undermined the fairness so the election and means that whoever is elected will have no legitimacy.

- Why is the voting window an extraordinary four weeks long?**

It is quite obvious that the first two weeks of the election period could have been used for meetings with candidates and campaigning, but you have sought to block that by having an unnecessarily long voting period. LUMI, the online voting platform provider, has confirmed that this was **not on their advice**, but a **requirement of Urang/the RTM company**. Can you please explain why you did this?
- In your **email to leaseholders of 7th November 2025**, you admit there is **difficulty reaching a quorum** in the vote (i.e. obtaining enough votes to make the process valid), but you do not state what the quorum actually is. It is unsurprising that this is the case, given the absence of any forum for leaseholders to discuss candidates, policies, ideas, or reasons for support. What is the **required number of votes** you are referring to?
- Can you confirm **where in the CBW RTM Articles of Association** there is any provision to hold a **month-long online ballot** for the election of directors ahead of an AGM? It seems very clear that this election process is **not compliant** with the Articles of Association.
- What is the process for notifying leaseholders that they have been allocated proxy votes? I have been told by leaseholders that they have assigned their votes me by proxy on the LUMI platform yet I have received no notification of this from LUMI or Urang.
- Leaseholders who have posted on the CBW app expressing concerns about the election process have had their posts removed without explanation or any proper process**, even though there is a moderation procedure in place (which I created) designed to prevent arbitrary removal of posts. This constitutes online censorship and bullying. Can you please clarify who made this decision , who carried it out and why the appropriate process was not followed (i.e. The person whose post was removed **was never informed of the reason for its removal and was not given any opportunity to respond or appeal**. This behaviour constitutes a **clear and deliberate act of censorship and online bullying**, which has been occurring for at least **four years**. [It includes the previous closure of my CBW app account](#) after I pointed out that the then Residents’ Association (CBWRA) was **misinforming leaseholders** by claiming that **Right to Manage was not possible**. The **same individuals** who were involved in that incident — **Stephen Thompson, Louis Sebastian Kendall, and Toby Spoerer** — are now **among the current unelected directors of the Right to Manage company**.
- The notice of the AGM which you sent to RTM members carefully avoids any mention of members wishing to submit motions.** The clear impression is that no such motions will be accepted. Can you please explain why you did not inform members that they could submit a motion if they wished, and how that process works?
- Why have you decided to hold the AGM (scheduled for 16th November) online only?** It seems the real reason is to give control to Urang/the RTM directors and thereby silence people who ask

awkward questions. This follows the meeting with leaseholders on 15th September, where Urang and the RTM directors were publicly criticised for delays in the election process and lack of consultation with leaseholders — clearly you wish to avoid being challenged by leaseholders.

- **The notes of that meeting on 15th September were issued only a few hours after it ended and appear to have been produced using AI. The notes are not an accurate reflection of the meeting** and omit nearly all comments made by myself and other leaseholders, particularly those critical of the current (unelected) RTM directors and of Urang.
- **Although you recorded the meeting with leaseholders on 15th September, you have refused to share the recording or transcript with leaseholders** and have provided no valid reason. You invited me to a meeting where I could hear “extracts,” but when I asked which extracts you were prepared to share, you went silent and have not replied further. Can you explain why you have not shared the transcript? This was a public meeting, and everyone present was aware that it was being recorded. **I also note that you claim to have lost the recording from the previous meeting with leaseholders in July.**
- **I have asked you repeatedly how many members of the RTM company there currently are,** and to be allowed to inspect the register of members. This has simply been ignored.
- **Can you confirm** that at least one of the **candidates for election as a director is not a leaseholder** at Chelsea Bridge Wharf and has **not been one for some time**? It may be permitted within the **Articles of Association** for non-leaseholders to be **appointed by existing directors**, but I am not sure it is allowed for such individuals to **stand for election**. In addition, it appears that the **candidate concerned has not been transparent** about the fact that they are not a leaseholder, and I believe they have they not been transparent about their relationship to one of the current directors.
- **What is the total cost of running this farcical excuse for an election?** How much has been spent on the LUMI platform? It is clear that legal advice has been obtained, although it is not clear on what. How much has been spent on legal fees?

## 2. Service Charge Accounts for Warwick Building

- **The service charge accounts for the year ending 31 March 2025 are now more than two months overdue.** Myself and other leaseholders have repeatedly asked you to explain this and have received no reply — not even an acknowledgment. **Please confirm why the accounts are delayed, and when they will be presented to leaseholders.**
- **Are you withholding the accounts until after the election results are known because they are likely to include demands for additional service charges or balancing payments,** which could place the current RTM directors in a bad light?

## 3. Urang’s refusal to be transparent about the management contract with the Chelsea Bridge Wharf RTM company

- **Urang were ‘selected’ to be the new agent at Chelsea Bridge Wharf by a secret ballot amongst an unelected committee who were not allowed to see the contract – leaseholders have still not seen it.** **It is vital** that leaseholders can see the terms and conditions on which Urang are employed, what fees are paid and what the notice period is. **Leaseholders must decide whether Urang’s contract is renewed or not. Please can you give leaseholders access to the contract or explain why this is not possible.**

## 4. Why are leaseholders paying for Urang PR staff?

- It seems that leaseholders are paying all or part of a Urang ‘customer relationship manager’ (Bella Metcalfe). I am not at all clear what this person does apart from Urang “spin” i.e. telling leaseholders that everything is great and giving evasive answers or no answers at all to queries from

residents. **Can you please clarify exactly what this role entails and how much of the salary for this role is being paid for by leaseholders at Chelsea Bridge Wharf and what the actual cost to leaseholders is annually.**

## 5. Surveys of residents

- **Following the meeting with leaseholders on 15th September**, at which Urang and the RTM directors were severely criticised for not consulting leaseholders (but instead consulting Garton Jones) on estate priorities, **two surveys were hurriedly rushed out.**
- The first of these was a **staff satisfaction survey**. When will the **results of this survey** be shared with leaseholders?
- The second was a **very poorly designed 40+ question ‘resident survey’**, supposedly intended to gather residents’ views. In reality, it was written in a **highly biased way** and seems primarily intended to produce **positive PR for Urang**. I can say that with some confidence as a researcher with **over 30 years’ experience**. The questionnaire is a **disgrace** — given its excessive length, unclear design, lack of reminders, and the fact that it closely followed the staff satisfaction survey, it is likely that the **response rate will be very low**. It seems that is the outcome you wish for so that you can then say how uninterested residents are in being consulted.
- I also offered you my help in drafting this questionnaire, and you could have used a **professionally designed survey** which I prepared and delivered at CBW in 2021. But of course, that would have produced **accurate data** rather than **PR material** for Urang.
- When will the **results of this so called residents’ survey** be shared with leaseholders?

More generally, the way in which you are **conducting yourself at Chelsea Bridge Wharf is disgraceful**. You make repeated statements about a new era of **transparency** and your wish to be a “*model*” RTM, but in reality, you are showing exactly **how not to manage** a large and complex development. You appear to be in a **mutually supportive arrangement** with the current **unelected directors**, and your overriding priority seems to be **to remain in power**.

**That is why, If elected as a director, despite the grotesquely biased election process, the key policies I will pursue are:**

- i) Leaseholders will be able to see the contract with Urang (currently kept secret).
- ii) There will be annual elections for directors of the RTM company.
- iii) There will be quarterly (hybrid) meetings between Urang, leaseholders, & the RTM company (Urang currently only offer two).
- iv) Leaseholders will be able to see a monthly account of the weekly meetings between RTM directors and Urang.
- v) Performance information will be published quarterly.
- vi) A serious and objective consultation on the future of the pond and fountains.
- vii) Urang will have a target to reduce the service charge by 10% (whilst recognising that this cannot be guaranteed).

It has **taken many requests over a long period of time to obtain the Urang complaints policy** from you.

Given the **repeated failure to address the questions in this letter** over a long period of time, as well as the fact that the **election is currently live** and some of the issues are **urgent**, I expect a **full reply within seven working days (i.e. the 19<sup>th</sup> November)**. Failing that, I will with regret have to **escalate this complaint to the Ombudsman**.

Yours sincerely,  
*Mike O’Driscoll, Warwick Leaseholder*