

13 Kemplay Road
London, NW3 1TA

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12336-35
Revision: D1

April 2016

Campbell Reith Hill LLP
Friars Bridge Court
41-45 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 8NZ

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700
F: +44 (0)20 7340 1777
E: london@campbellreith.com
W: www.campbellreith.com

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	April 2016	Comment	FDjap-12336-01042016-13 Kemplay Road-D1.doc	F Drammeh	S Knight	E Brown

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Campbell Reith Hill LLP's (CampbellReith) appointment with its client and is subject to the terms of the appointment. It is addressed to and for the sole use and reliance of CampbellReith's client. CampbellReith accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes, stated in the document, for which it was prepared and provided. No person other than the client may copy (in whole or in part) use or rely on the contents of this document, without the prior written permission of Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole. The contents of this document are not to be construed as providing legal, business or tax advice or opinion.

© Campbell Reith Hill LLP 2015

Document Details

Last saved	12/04/2016 17:27
Path	FDjap-12336-01042016-13 Kemplay Road-D1.doc
Author	F Drammeh, MEng
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12336-35
Project Name	13 Kemplay Road
Planning Reference	2015/4373/P

Contents

1.0 Non-technical summary 1

2.0 Introduction 3

3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List 5

4.0 Discussion 9

5.0 Conclusions 12

Appendix

- Appendix 1: Residents’ Consultation Comments
- Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker
- Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden, (LBC) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 13 Kemplay Road, NW3 1TA (Camden Planning reference 2015/4373/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category B as defined by the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2. The Audit reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LBC's policies and technical procedures.
- 1.3. CampbellReith was able to access LBC's Planning Portal and gain access to the latest revision of submitted documentation and reviewed it against an agreed audit check list.
- 1.4. The BIA was prepared by Fairhurst Consulting Engineers, a well-known firm, using individuals who possess suitable qualifications.
- 1.5. The BIA has confirmed that the proposed basement will be founded within the Claygate Member and it is likely that the groundwater table will be encountered during basement foundation excavation.
- 1.6. The BIA recommends further trial pitting and groundwater monitoring to investigate the potential for inflows and the equilibrium water level. Although sump pumping is proposed to deal with potential inflows during construction, there is no indication of waterproofing proposals for the permanent case.
- 1.7. The BIA has shown that although there is a slight slope along Kemplay Road, there are no slope stability concerns.
- 1.8. The screening exercise has not identified that the site is in an area at risk of internal and external sewer flooding and the BIA should be updated to consider this potential impact.
- 1.9. The number of trees to be removed should be confirmed together with an assessment of impact on any nearby shallow foundations.
- 1.10. No method statement or details of the proposed underpinning is presented. This is requested with sufficient detail together with an indicative structural design, temporary works proposal and plans to indicate the construction and underpinning bay sequence to demonstrate the stability of the neighbouring property and infrastructure will be maintained.
- 1.11. The depth and nature of the neighbouring property foundations have been not been determined and the ground movement assessment assumes they are likely to be similar to the

foundations to No 13. Unless further information is forthcoming, or an investigation undertaken to determine these, the maximum differential depth should be assumed.

- 1.12. The anticipated damage category given in Section 5.4 of the Fairhurst BIA (negligible) contradicts the one given in Section 5.6 for No 15 Kemplay Road (slight or less). Supporting analyses considering vertical and horizontal movements from the underpinning and heave from the excavation together with resulting estimated movements for No 15 are requested.
- 1.13. An outline monitoring proposal has not been provided and this is requested. Details and trigger levels may be agreed as part of the Party Wall awards.
- 1.14. A works programme has not been provided and this is requested.
- 1.15. Queries and requests for further information are discussed in Section 4 and summarised in Appendix 2.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 13 Kemplay Road, NW3 1TA (Camden Planning reference 2015/4373/P).
- 2.2. The Audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC. It reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development.
- 2.3. A BIA is required for all planning applications with basements in Camden in general accordance with policies and technical procedures contained within
- Guidance for Subterranean Development (GSD). Issue 01. November 2010. Ove Arup & Partners.
 - Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 4: Basements and Lightwells.
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 27: Basements and Lightwells.
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 23: Water.
- 2.4. The BIA should demonstrate that schemes:
- a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;
 - b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run off or causing other damage to the water environment; and,
 - c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area
- and evaluate the impacts of the proposed basement considering the issues of hydrology, hydrogeology and land stability via the process described by the GSD and to make recommendations for the detailed design.
- 2.5. LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as *"Erection of a 2 storey plus basement dwelling following demolition of existing house"*.
- 2.6. The Audit Instruction also confirmed 13 Kemplay Road is not listed, nor is it a neighbour to listed buildings.
- 2.7. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 31 March 2016 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment (BIA): Fairhurst Consulting Engineers, November 2015 ,which includes as part of its appendices a screening and scoping report by Site Analytical Services (SAS) dated August 2015, which the BIA references and a factual Ground Investigation report by LMB Geosolutions Ltd, dated November 2015.
- Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment: SAS, August 2015
- Design and Access Statement: Archer Architects and Randall Architects, undated
- Tree Survey Report: Greenlink Ecology Limited, March 2016
- Planning Application Drawings consisting of
 - Location Plan
 - Existing Plans
 - Proposed Plans
 - Existing elevations
 - Proposed elevations

2.8. A number of consultation comments were sent by the Planning Officer on 8 April 2016 and out these, eight are pertinent to the BIA. These are addressed in Appendix 1.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Qualifications of all individuals concerned meet requirements of CPG4.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Proposal not sufficiently detailed (see Audit paragraph 4.11) and works programme not included.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	Description not sufficiently detailed (see Audit paragraph 4.11).
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	Included but inadequate. Scheme drawings not sufficiently detailed as required by Cl. 233 of the Arup GSD. Plans for each stage of the basement excavation and construction are not included (see Audit paragraph 4.11).
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	No	See Audit paragraph 4.11.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 2.5, although contradictory information is given on the number of trees to be removed.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 2.5.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	A 'No' response is given to Q6 which relates to flood risk, however, the site is an area at risk from sewer flooding (see Audit paragraph 4.5).
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 4 and Site Analytical Services (SAS) Ground Investigation Report (GIR).
Land Stability Scoping Provided?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 3, however, one issue which relates to

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?		proximity to pedestrian right of way should be assessed further (see Audit paragraph 4.13).
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 3.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	BIA Section 3, however, one issue which relates to flood risk should be carried forward from the screening.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	BIA Appendix A - LMB Geosolutions factual Ground Investigation Report (GIR).
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	BIA Section 4.3
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Assumed to be informed by SAS Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	SAS Phase 1 report Section 3.3 and Fairhurst BIA Section 1.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	Research from the LBC planning portal presented in the Fairhurst BIA Section 2.4 but states it is not known if the proposed basements in the neighbouring properties have been constructed (see Audit paragraph 4.6).
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	No	Not presented
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	Interpretation not presented.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	Greenlink Ecology Limited Tree Survey report.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	Although this is considered incomplete (see Audit paragraphs 4.6 to 4.9).

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	Considered but not confirmed.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Section 5, however, it is not accepted as stated that the impact on the roadway is sufficiently addressed without further justification (see Audit paragraph 4.14)
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	See Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	No	Not accepted as stated in the Fairhurst BIA that the impact on the roadway is sufficiently addressed without further justification (see Audit paragraph 4.15) and potential flooding issue not considered.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Some mitigation provided, however, as all the potential impacts of the proposed basement have not been identified, this is considered inadequate (see Audit paragraph 4.4, 4.5 and 4.11 to 4.15).
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	Recommended in Fairhurst Section 5.5 but outline proposal not presented (see Audit paragraph 4.16).
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	Not possible to determine if these are needed as all the potential impacts have not been considered.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	See Audit paragraphs 4.12 to 4.15.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	See Audit paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 2?	Yes	Although contradictory damage categories given in Fairhurst BIA Section 5.4 and 5.6.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	Fairhurst BIA Sections 2.6, 3.1, 4.6 and 5.6.

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Fairhurst Consulting Engineers and the qualifications of the individuals concerned are in accordance with the requirements of CPG4.
- 4.2. It is stated in Section 1.0 of the Fairhurst BIA that a BIA was previously undertaken by Site Analytical Services Ltd (SAS), however, this only comprised screening and scoping and Fairhurst have indicated that this previous BIA was reviewed and incorporated into the current BIA.
- 4.3. The ground investigation revealed Made Ground up to 1.30m below ground level (bgl) over the Claygate Member which was recorded to a maximum depth of 6m bgl over the London Clay. Groundwater was recorded to within c.1.85m bgl and this is indicated to be reflective of high winter groundwater levels.
- 4.4. The basement is to be founded within the Claygate Member and the BIA recommends trial pitting to the proposed basement depth is undertaken to further investigate the potential for groundwater inflows and that it would be prudent to continue to monitor groundwater levels. It further states that the contractor should have contingency measures such as sump pumping to deal with perched inflows. There is no indication however of basement waterproofing for the permanent condition.
- 4.5. A 'No' response is given to Q6 which relates to flood risk, however, reference to Camden's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that the property lies in an area with a risk of internal and external sewer flooding. Section 2.4.3.2 of the SAS BIA which is referenced and included as an appendix to the Fairhurst BIA states that *'The London Regional Flood Risk Appraisal (2009) advises that foul sewer flooding is most likely to occur where properties are connected to the sewer system at a level below the hydraulic level of the sewage flow, which in general are often basement flats or premises in low lying areas. There is no record of sewer flooding having occurred at 13 Kemplay Road and therefore the risk of sewer flooding is considered low'*. This statement is not accepted since a number of properties in the area have previously been affected by internal and external sewer flooding and given that a basement is proposed, this increases the risk. This issue should be carried forward to scoping/assessment and mitigation measures proposed if necessary.
- 4.6. Proposed basement developments from planning application searches for a number of properties in the vicinity of the site are included in Section 2.4 of the BIA, however, it is stated that it is unknown if these basements have been constructed.
- 4.7. Section 4.4 of the Fairhurst BIA and the investigation strategy in the LMB Geosolutions Ltd factual Ground Investigation Report (GIR) state that two trial pits (TP1 and TP2) were

undertaken adjacent to the walls of No 13 which revealed outstepped concrete foundations on the Claygate Member at depths of between 1.35 and 1.45m bgl.

- 4.8. It is stated on Section 5.3 that information on the configuration of the existing foundations is indicated on the Archers Stevenage drawings, however, none of the drawings referenced indicates the foundations.
- 4.9. It would appear that the foundations to No 15, the immediate neighbouring property have not been investigated as it is stated on Section 5.3 that *'information on the configuration of the existing foundations of the adjoining properties has not been provided and it is considered that they are likely to be placed at a similar depth based on the similar construction type of the building'*.
- 4.10. A tree survey report by Greenlink Ecology Limited states a tree which is indicated to have *'significant basal decay'* is to be removed to enable the proposed development and a replacement tree will be planted as part of the landscape scheme. The Fairhurst BIA states that two trees are to be removed due to disease and although the impact assessment states that the proposed basement will extend to well below the potential root action in accordance with guidance from Chapter 4.2 of the NHBC Standards. Consideration of the impact on nearby shallow foundations is required.
- 4.11. It is proposed to demolish the existing two storey building and construct a detached two storey building with a basement approximately 3m deep extending laterally by 3.80m from the front of the property. There is very limited information on how the proposed basement is to be constructed with only a brief reference to underpinning in Section 5.4 of the Fairhurst BIA. There is no indication of underpinning depth, width, bay sequence or type (mass or reinforced concrete). An indicative structural design and temporary works proposal have not been provided and this is requested together with a detailed description of the proposed underpinning and plans to indicate the construction and underpinning bay sequence.
- 4.12. Section 5.4 discusses the effects of ground movements and predicted damage category. Estimated vertical and horizontal movements as a result of the underpinning and heave movements are not indicated. Category 0 (negligible) damage is predicted for No 15 Kemplay Gardens, the immediate neighbouring property and this appears to be based on bearing capacity calculations which are referenced but not presented. Movements from the construction of the underpinning do not appear to be considered in the damage assessment. It is noted that a Damage Category 2 (slight) or less is predicted for No 15 in Section 5.6 of the Fairhurst BIA and clarification is requested as this is contradictory to Section 5.4.
- 4.13. Movement resulting from underpinning is almost entirely due to workmanship and whilst it may be possible to limit damage to Category 1 provided the works are properly controlled and the

affected structures are in sound condition, stability of the neighbouring properties and infrastructure still needs to be demonstrated by indicating anticipated movements and damage category.

- 4.14. As stated above, it appears the depth and nature of the neighbouring properties have been not been determined and the GMA assumes they are likely to be similar to the foundations to No 13. Unless further information is forthcoming or an investigation undertaken to determine these, the maximum differential depth should be assumed.
- 4.15. It is indicated that the site is within 5m of a pedestrian right of way and it is stated in the impact assessment that '*there is nothing unusual in the proposed development that will give rise to any concerns with regard to the stability of public highways*'. This is accepted.
- 4.16. Section 5.5 of the Fairhurst BIA recommends movement monitoring and states that this will be incorporated into the final construction scheme. No outline proposal is presented.
- 4.17. It is noted that a works programme has not been submitted as required by Cl.233 of the GSD.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Fairhurst Consulting Engineers and the individuals concerned in its production have suitable qualifications.
- 5.2. The basement is to be founded within the Claygate Member beneath the monitored water levels and the BIA recommends further trial pitting and groundwater monitoring to investigate the potential for inflows and the equilibrium water level. Although sump pumping is proposed to deal with potential inflows during construction, there is no indication of waterproofing proposals for the permanent case and this is requested.
- 5.3. The BIA has shown that although there is a slight slope along Kemplay Road, there are no slope stability concerns.
- 5.4. The screening exercise has not identified that the site is in an area at risk of internal and external sewer flooding and the BIA should be updated to consider this potential impact.
- 5.5. The number of trees to be removed should be confirmed together with an assessment of impact on any nearby shallow foundations.
- 5.6. No method statement or details of the proposed underpinning is presented. This is requested with sufficient detail together with an indicative structural design and temporary works proposal and plans to indicate the construction and underpinning bay sequence to demonstrate that the stability of the neighbouring property will be maintained.
- 5.7. The depth and nature of the neighbouring property (No 15) foundations have been not been determined and the GMA assumes they are likely to be similar to the foundations to No 13. Unless further information is forthcoming or an investigation undertaken to determine these, the maximum differential depth should be assumed.
- 5.8. The anticipated damage category given in Section 5.4 of the Fairhurst BIA (negligible) contradicts the one given in Section 5.6 for No 15 Kemplay Road (slight or less). Supporting analyses considering vertical and horizontal movements from the underpinning and heave from the excavation together with resulting estimated movements for No 15 are requested.
- 5.9. An outline monitoring proposal has not been provided and this is requested. Details and trigger levels may be agreed as part of the Party Wall awards.
- 5.10. A works programme has not been provided and this is requested.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Hollins (on behalf of the residents of Kemplay Road)	Hollins Planning The Boathouse 27 Ferry Road Teddington, Middlesex TW11 9NN	30/09/15	Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) inadequate – no consideration of the impact to adjoining properties Trees – absence of assessment from qualified arboriculturist	Fairhurst BIA Section 5.4 and see Audit paragraph 4.12 See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report
Sochor	33 Briardale Gardens London, NW3 7PN	27/10/15	Inadequate BIA - BIA does not mention numerous underground streams in the area, lack of consideration of potential impact to No 15 and lack of ground investigation. No tree survey and failure to respond to Q6 of the slope stability screening	BIA screening states nearest surface water course is greater than 450m away and no lost rivers within 100m and appended Arup GSD figures confirms this. New BIA undertaken by Fairhurst includes ground movement assessment (see Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13) and ground investigation undertaken. See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report. Response to Q6 in Fairhurst BIA (see Audit paragraph 4.10)
18 Kemplay Road Management	Not given	Undated	Major concerns about shifting water levels, cracks, movement and subsidence with the presence of underground wells, lakes and streams Independent geotechnical report with	New BIA undertaken by Fairhurst states nearest surface water course is greater than 450m away and no lost rivers within 100m and appended Arup GSD figures confirms this. Section 5.0 of the Fairhurst BIA addresses groundwater, subsidence and ground

			calculations requested.	movements (see Audit paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 with regards to ground movement)
Hollins (on behalf of the Heath and Hampstead Society)	Hollins Planning The Boathouse 27 Ferry Road Teddington, Middlesex TW11 9NN	9/9/15	No damage assessment or reference to potential damage of adjoining properties especially No 15	New BIA undertaken by Fairhurst includes ground movement assessment (see Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13)
Lynne	Kemplay Road	26/10/15	Queries 'No' responses to screening questions relating to the presence of watercourses within 100m and refers to historic maps of 1658 and 1866 which indicate a canal to the east of the site. Pumps in the area. Potential impact on trees	Historic map (1879) map from the Envirocheck report included as part of the BIA appendices indicates a canal c.30m to the east, however, this is not shown on the 1896 map which possibly indicates it was infilled/diverted/culverted. No surface water features indicated on recent OS maps. See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report
Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane	14/10/15	Impact on trees BIA not compliant with Camden guidance No ground investigation History of subsidence in the area and references to 11 Pilgrim's Lane	See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report New BIA by Fairhurst submitted Ground investigation undertaken by LMB Geosolutions Ltd Fairhurst BIA Section 5 addresses this issue following ground investigation
Hall	18A Kemplay Road London NW3 1SY	14/10/15	Impact on trees Impact on neighbouring properties	See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report See Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13

Daniels	4c Kemplay Road Hampstead London NW3 1SY	14/10/15	Damage to neighbouring property foundations Impact of tree removal	See Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13 See Green Link Limited Tree Survey report
---------	---	----------	--	---

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA format	Works programme not included	Open – to be provided	
2	Hydrogeology	Measures to deal with potential groundwater ingress in the long term	Open – to be provided	
3	Surface flow	Site potentially at risk of sewer flooding (screening Q6)	Open – to be taken forward to scoping and assessed/mitigated as necessary	
4	Stability	Neighbouring property foundations not determined	Open – to be investigated or maximum differential depth assumed	
5	Stability	Identification of the presence of any basements in the immediate vicinity	Open – to be provided	
6	Stability	No details on proposed construction method, no temporary works proposal or construction and underpinning bay sequence	Open – to be provided together with plans and/or sections with sufficient detail	
7	Stability	Contradictory damage category for neighbouring property, no supporting analysis and some construction activities, such as tree removal, not considered	Open – ground movement assessment to be revised as described on Audit paragraph 5.8	
8	Stability	Movement monitoring proposal not provided	Open – Outline proposal to be provided. Details and trigger levels to be agreed as part of Party Wall awards	N/A

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

None

London

Friars Bridge Court
41- 45 Blackfriars Road
London, SE1 8NZ

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700
E: london@campbellreith.com

Birmingham

Chantry House
High Street, Coleshill
Birmingham B46 3BP

T: +44 (0)1675 467 484
E: birmingham@campbellreith.com

Surrey

Raven House
29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill
Surrey RH1 1SS

T: +44 (0)1737 784 500
E: surrey@campbellreith.com

Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street
Manchester
M2 1HW

T: +44 (0)161 819 3060
E: manchester@campbellreith.com

Bristol

Wessex House
Pixash Lane, Keynsham
Bristol BS31 1TP

T: +44 (0)117 916 1066
E: bristol@campbellreith.com

UAE

Office 705, Warsan Building
Hessa Street (East)
PO Box 28064, Dubai, UAE

T: +971 4 453 4735
E: uae@campbellreith.com

Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Registered in England & Wales. Limited Liability Partnership No OC300082
A list of Members is available at our Registered Office at: Friars Bridge Court, 41- 45 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NZ
VAT No 974 8892 43