

35 Templewood Avenue
London, NW3 7UY

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For

London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12985-12
Revision: D2

November 2018

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

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

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	October 2018	Comment	CBemb12985-12-181018-35 Templewood Avenue-D1.doc	C Botsialas /F Drammeh	F Drammeh	E Brown
D2	November 2018	Comment	CBemb-jap12985-12-291118-35 Templewood Avenue-D2.doc	C Botsialas	E Brown	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	29/11/2018 12:48
Path	CBemb-jap12985-12-291118-35 Templewood Avenue-D2.doc
Author	C Botsialas, CEng MIMMM CGeol FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12985-12
Project Name	35 Templewood Avenue
Planning Reference	2018/1295/P

Contents

1.0	Non-technical summary	1
2.0	Introduction	3
3.0	Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List	6
4.0	Discussion	10
5.0	Conclusions	13

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 35 Templewood Avenue, London, NW3 7UY (planning reference 2018/1295/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category C as defined by the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2. The Audit reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) 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 checklist.
- 1.1. The site contains a four-storey building which includes a lower ground floor level. An atrium style Grade II listed building housing a swimming pool is also present.
- 1.4. The proposed development involves demolition and relocation of the Grade II listed swimming pool to the north west of the garden and construction of a new basement structure under the existing footprint that will be extended at the front garage entrance and at the rear section into the area where the swimming pool is currently located. The anticipated formation levels will involve excavations approximately 4.70m deep. A piled retaining wall is proposed to the south east at the location of a proposed car lift.
- 1.5. The Basement Impact Assessment was undertaken by individuals that possess suitable qualifications according to Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Basements (2018) requirements.
- 1.6. A ground investigation was carried out but the exploratory holes were terminated short of the proposed basement level and the base of the proposed swimming pool. Additional deeper intrusive investigation and groundwater monitoring is required to inform the impact assessment with respect to subterranean flows and stability and, subsequently, the design of the proposed structures including the pile retaining wall.
- 1.7. It is accepted that the proposed development is not anticipated to have any impact on the hydrology of the area.
- 1.8. The proposed construction sequence was included in the revised Structural Methodology Statement (SMS) report.
- 1.9. The presence or absence of basements beneath the neighbouring properties and the depth to their foundations should be confirmed and taken into account in the BIA.

- 1.10. The ground movement analysis (GMA) concluded 'Negligible' to 'Very Slight' damage for the neighbouring buildings at 33 Templewood Avenue and Schreiber House. The anticipated risk of damage to nearby highways was concluded to be low. However, the GMA should be informed by deeper investigation data and should include the potential impact on the boundary walls including the wall towards Schreiber House.
- 1.11. Consultation with the asset owner is recommended for the potential impact presented in the GMA on Thames Water sewer under Templewood Avenue.
- 1.12. An indicative monitoring strategy and a works programme was included in the revised SMS report.
- 1.13. A 'non-technical summary' should be provided.
- 1.14. Based on the above comments, a number of queries has been raised as summarised in Appendix 2. It cannot currently be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 21 September 2018 to carry out a Category C Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 35 Templewood Avenue, London, NW3 7UY (Camden planning reference 2018/1295/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: Basements (March 2018);
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 27: Basements and Lightwells;
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 23: Water;
 - Local Plan Policy A5: Basements.
- 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;
 - 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 detailed design.
- 2.5. LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as "*Demolition and relocation of Grade II listed swimming pool to the north west of the garden, associated excavation of the garden level and ground floor/basement infill extension to the house*".

- 2.6. The Audit Instruction confirmed that the swimming pool is a Grade II listed building. From existing information, it is understood that the site is neighbour to Schreiber House towards the west of the site, which is also a Grade II listed building.
- 2.7. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 27 September 2018 and 9 October 2018 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:
- "Planning Statement, 35 Templewood Avenue, NW3 7UY, Hampstead", undated document, unknown author.
 - "Desk study, ground investigation & basement impact assessment report for 35 Templewood Avenue, London, NW3 7UY" (BIA), dated 1 August 2018, job ref.no. P1019J1129, version final v1.2, issued by Jomas Associates Ltd;
 - "Ground Movement Assessment" (GMA), dated 15 August 2018, job ref.no. P1019J1129/ps/rs/v4, issued by Jomas Associates Ltd;
 - "Structural Methodology Statement for Basement Development" (SMS), dated 27/07/2018, issue P3, document no. 16.848-RP-02, issued by Barrett Mahony Consulting Engineers;
 - Planning application drawings dated February 2018 consisting of:
 - "Existing site plan", drawing no. EX01;
 - "Existing ground floor plan", drawing no. EX02;
 - "Existing first floor plan", drawing no. EX03;
 - "Existing section A-A' ", drawing no. EX07;
 - "Existing section B-B' ", drawing no. EX08;
 - "Existing section C-C' ", drawing no. EX09;
 - "Existing section D-D' ", drawing no. EX10;
 - "Existing north elevation", drawing no. EX11;
 - "Existing west elevation", drawing no. EX12;
 - "Existing south elevation", drawing no. EX13;
 - "Existing east elevation", drawing no. EX14;
 - "Existing Templewood Av. elevation", drawing no. EX15;
 - "Existing Heath Rd. elevation", drawing no. EX16;

- “Proposed site plan”, drawing no. P01;
 - “Proposed basement floor plan”, drawing no. P02;
 - “Proposed ground floor plan”, drawing no. P03;
 - “Proposed first floor plan”, drawing no. P04;
 - “Proposed section A-A”, drawing no. P08;
 - “Proposed west elevation”, drawing no. P09;
 - “Proposed north elevation”, drawing no. P10;
 - “Proposed east elevation”, drawing no. P11;
 - “Proposed Heath Rd elevation”, drawing no. P12;
 - “Proposed Templewood Av. elevation”, drawing no. P13;
- “Site location plan”, dated July 2017, drawing no. L01.
- 2.8. CampbellReith issued on 18 October 2018 the initial audit report (ref.no. CBemb12985-12-181018-35 Templewood Avenue-D1, rev.D1) with comments on the above BIA documents.
- 2.9. In response to the initial audit report CampbellReith received on 13 November 2018 from LBC senior planning officer Laura Hazelton, the following revised documents:
- “Desk study, ground investigation, basement impact assessment & ground movement assessment report for 35 Templewood Avenue, London, NW3 7UY” (BIA), dated 8 November 2018, job ref.no. P1019J1129, version final v2, issued by Jomas Associates Ltd;
 - “Structural Methodology Statement for Basement Development” (SMS), dated 09/11/2018, issue P4, document no. 16.848-RP-02, issued by Barrett Mahony Consulting Engineers;
- 2.10. Further, CampbellReith received on 19 November 2018 from LBC’s senior planning officer, comments from a neighbour of the subject site, which included comments on geotechnical and structural issues. As requested, those comments have been considered in this audit.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Refer to comment in audit paragraph 4.1.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Reference to this audit should be made with regard to additional information required for the assessment of potential impact.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	Reference to this audit should be made with regard to additional information required for the assessment of potential impact.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	Suitable plans and maps were included in the revised Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and the SMS.
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes	Refer to the revised BIA and SMS.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Refer to comment in audit paragraph 4.8.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	The revised BIA report included a ground model, however, this ground model should be further informed by additional investigation information. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.7.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	However additional investigation is required as discussed in audit paragraph 4.7.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	However, the information provided does not cover the depth required for the impact assessment as discussed in audit paragraph 4.7.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	However, additional deeper investigation information is required as discussed in audit paragraph 4.7.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Refer to the revised BIA report.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	The outcome of the site walkover is discussed in Section 2.2 of the revised BIA.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	The absence of nearby basements has been assumed as shown on the plans attached to the revised SMS. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.12.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Refer to revised BIA. However, additional deeper investigation information is required as discussed in audit paragraph 4.7.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	No geotechnical parameters for retaining wall design are included in the BIA. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.7.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping	Yes	A revised SMS report is presented.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
presented?		
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	Thames Water utilities information was included in the revised BIA. However, additional ground conditions and nearby basements information is required as discussed in audit paragraphs 4.7 and 4.12.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	The absence of nearby basements has been assumed in the revised BIA and SMS. Additional search is recommended as discussed in audit paragraph 4.12.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Refer to the revised BIA report. The impact assessment assumptions need to be confirmed by additional investigation.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	Refer to the revised BIA report. Estimates of ground movement and the structural impact is assessed for neighbouring buildings, highways, footways and underground services. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.14. for additional impact analysis required for boundary walls.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	Yes	However, not all potential impacts were assessed. The BIA requires revision in accordance with the comments in Section 4 of this audit.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	The BIA needs to be updated as discussed in audit Section 4.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	Refer to Section 3 and Appendix II of the SMS report.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	None identified.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Additional geotechnical information is required along with revision of the BIA and GMA reports as discussed in Section 4.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	Refer to Section 15.4 of the BIA report.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	Additional geotechnical information is required along with revision of the BIA and GMA reports as discussed in Section 4.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	However, additional assessment is required for boundary walls. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.14.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	Not provided. Refer also to audit paragraph 4.19.

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) report was carried out by engineering consultants Jomas Associates Ltd. A separate Structural Method Statement (SMS) report was prepared by Barrett Mahony Consulting Engineers. The individuals concerned in the production of those reports have suitable qualifications, which are in accordance with Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Basements (2018) requirements.
- 4.2. The site contains a four-storey building which includes a lower ground floor level. An atrium style Grade II listed building housing a swimming pool is also present.
- 4.3. The proposed development involves demolition and relocation of the Grade II listed swimming pool to the north west of the garden and construction of a new basement structure under the existing footprint that will be extended at the front garage entrance and at the rear section into the area where the swimming pool is currently located. The anticipated formation levels for the swimming pool and the new basement will be at about +107.50m AOD, which will involve excavations of approximately 4.70m depth. A piled retaining wall is proposed to the south east at the location of a proposed car lift.
- 4.4. A ground investigation was undertaken and included two window sample holes to 4.95m and 5.45m below ground level, which encountered the Bagshot Formation comprising interbedded sand and clay. A foundation inspection pit was also carried out. Groundwater was encountered neither during the fieldwork nor during post-drilling monitoring.
- 4.5. The window sample boreholes were terminated at about +107.80m AOD and +108.50m AOD. The base of the proposed basement and swimming pool excavations will be at approximately +107.50m AOD, that is at a lower level than the termination depth of the boreholes. Hence, the depth of the investigation undertaken to-date does not cover the foundation conditions of the proposed basement and swimming pool and does not allow for a full impact assessment.
- 4.6. Also, the site is underlain by an aquifer and the exploratory holes were terminated above the proposed basement level. A full assessment of the impact on the hydrogeology of the area cannot therefore be completed.
- 4.7. The undertaken investigation should be supplemented by additional deep borehole investigation data to confirm the conceptual ground model considered in the revised BIA report and provide ground parameters for retaining wall design in the area of the proposed car lift. Hence, the additional investigation recommendation presented in Section 15.3.3. of the revised BIA report should be adopted in order to further inform the conceptual ground model. Likewise, it is recommended that an additional deep borehole is undertaken in the area of the proposed swimming pool to confirm the assumed ground conditions. The additional investigation should

include groundwater monitoring to assess the potential for groundwater presence within or below the proposed excavations and the associated potential hazards, such as the “boiling” sands hazard discussed in paragraph 14.10.5 of the revised BIA report.

- 4.8. Reference to Arup’s GSD data was made in Section 7 of the revised BIA report for the screening stage. However, a ‘No’ response was given to Question 1 of the surface flow screening which relates to whether or not the site is within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath. According to Figure 14 of Arup GSD, the site is within the “Golders Hill Chain Catchment”. Hence, the answer to this screening question should be revised to “yes” and the issue should be carried forward to scoping and further discussed.
- 4.9. It is accepted that the proposed development is not anticipated to have any impact on the hydrology of the area, as discussed in Section 15.4 of the revised BIA.
- 4.10. The revised SMS report (p.4, Section 1.3) refers to CPG4 (2015) and NHBC Standards 2016, which have been superseded by CPG and NHBC Standards 2018, respectively. Amendments are required accordingly, however, those amendments do not affect the validity or the conclusions of the revised SMS report and, as such, they are not considered any further in this audit.
- 4.11. The proposed construction sequence is included in the revised SMS report. This is illustrated by sketches that indicate temporary propping be utilised for the proposed underpinning. The piled retaining wall for the proposed car lift is discussed in the revised BIA and the SMS reports. Indicative underpinning and retaining wall calculations are included in the revised SMS.
- 4.12. The presence or absence of basements beneath the neighbouring properties and the depths of the foundations was not confirmed. According to plans attached to the SMS, the proposed basement foundation appears to increase the differential depths relative to neighbouring structures. We recommend that, as a minimum, this is further confirmed (or otherwise) with a search of Council’s archive/planning applications database with regards to any existing foundation information for the neighbouring buildings, given that one of them (Schreiber House) is a Grade II listed building. This is in-line with the recommendation discussed in Section 7.2.9 of the revised BIA report.
- 4.13. The ground movement assessment (GMA) presented in the revised BIA report included the neighbouring structures and infrastructure. The GMA concluded ‘Negligible’ (Category 0) to ‘Very Slight’ (Category 1) damage for the neighbouring properties, 33 Templewood Avenue and Schreiber House, which is in accordance with CPG requirements. Further, according to GMA, the anticipated risk of damage as a result of the proposed works at both West Heath Road and Templewood Avenue is considered to be low. It also suggested allowance by the Contractor for minor ‘making good’ of pavement surfacing near the proposed car lift area.

- 4.14. Consultation responses have identified the presence of a boundary wall that divides Schreiber House from the subject site. As such, analysis and assessment of the potential impact should be included in the GMA for all boundary walls including the one towards Schreiber House.
- 4.15. For the Thames Water sewer under Templewood Avenue, the GMA concluded 'negligible' impact despite indicated high values of strain, and this was attributed to the simplistic modelling approach adopted. It is possible that a more rigorous or alternative analysis may be required to confirm the GMA outcome is correct although this is subject to a separate approval process. The asset owner (Thames Water) should be consulted to confirm that all assumptions made in the GMA about utilities details are correct.
- 4.16. The GMA should be informed by deeper investigation data as discussed in the previous paragraphs.
- 4.17. An indicative monitoring strategy (Section 3) and a monitoring location plan (drawing No.T-4000, issue P4) are included in the revised SMS report, along with indicative trigger levels of ground movement informed by the GMA.
- 4.18. An indicative works programme, as required by cl. 233 of Arup's GSD, is included in Section 2.8 of the revised SMS report.
- 4.19. A 'non-technical summary' satisfying the requirements of paragraph 4.6 of CPG should be submitted.
- 4.20. Based on the above comments, a number of queries has been raised as summarised in Appendix 2. It cannot currently be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG Basements.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment was undertaken by individuals that possess suitable qualifications according to Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Basements (2018) requirements.
- 5.2. Additional deeper intrusive investigation and groundwater monitoring is required to inform the impact assessment with respect to subterranean flows and stability and, subsequently, the design of the proposed structures including the retaining pile wall.
- 5.3. Reference to Arup's GSD data should be made for answering Question 1 of the surface flow screening and the issue be carried forward to scoping as required.
- 5.4. It is accepted that the proposed development is not anticipated to have any impact on the hydrology of the area.
- 5.5. The proposed construction sequence was included in the revised SMS report.
- 5.6. The foundations of surrounding properties including the presence or absence of basements should be further considered and searched.
- 5.7. The GMA concluded 'Negligible' (Category 0) to 'Very Slight' (Category 1) damage for the neighbouring buildings at 33 Templewood Avenue and Schreiber House. The anticipated risk of damage to nearby highways was concluded to be low. However, the GMA should be informed by deeper investigation data and should include the potential impact to all boundary walls including the boundary wall towards Schreiber House.
- 5.8. A more rigorous or alternative analysis may be required to confirm the GMA outcome for the Thames Water sewer under Templewood Avenue although this is subject to a separate approval process. Consultation with the asset owner (Thames Water) is recommended.
- 5.9. An indicative monitoring strategy and a works programme was included in the revised SMS report.
- 5.10. A 'non-technical summary' should be submitted.
- 5.11. Based on the above comments, a number of queries has been raised as summarised in Appendix 2. It cannot currently be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Kirsch	Unknown	18-11-2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk due to increase in impermeable areas • Potential disruption or diversion to underground water flow. • Schreiber House does not have a basement. • Necessity of the proposed swimming pool excavation near the listed boundary wall between Schreiber House and the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flood risk from surface flows is not anticipated to make any impact to the hydrology of the area, as discussed in Section 15.4 of the revised BIA. • A request has been made for additional deeper investigation required with groundwater monitoring to inform the ground model and assess the potential impact to groundwater. • A request has been made for the presence or absence of nearby basements to be confirmed. • A request has been made for assessing the potential impact on the boundary walls, including the wall towards Schreiber house.

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA	Author qualifications.	Closed	13-11-2018
2	BIA	Superseded references in BIA and supporting documents.	Closed	13-11-2018
3	BIA	Incorrect/insufficient responses to screening questions - answer to question no. 1 of surface flow is pending only.	Open	
4	BIA	Paragraph 15.5.3 of the BIA report should be revised to be in line with the construction solution discussed in the SMS.	Closed	13-11-2018
5	BIA/stability	Depth of the ground investigation not sufficient to inform construction methodology and design. Deeper investigation is required with groundwater monitoring.	Open	
6	Hydrogeology	The answer to groundwater screening question No.3 should be revised to "yes" and the issue forwarded to scoping.	Closed	13-11-2018
7	Hydrogeology	Extent of existing ground investigation does not allow impact of basement proposals on groundwater flow to be assessed.	Open	
8	Stability	The answer to land stability screening question Nos.2, 7, 11 and 13 should be reviewed and revised.	Closed	13-11-2018

9	Stability	The GMA report should be informed by deeper investigation data and should include the existing and proposed swimming pool as well as the adjacent footways and any utilities in the vicinity.	Open	
10	Stability	The monitoring regime should consider the impacts of the proposed swimming pool.	Closed	13-11-2018
11	Hydrology	The comments provided to questions No.2 and No.3 of the surface flow screening are contradictory and should be revised.	Closed	13-11-2018
12	Hydrology	Templewood Avenue 2002 flooding event and changes to impermeable areas should be included in the BIA.	Closed	13-11-2018
13	BIA	The presence or absence of nearby basements needs to be confirmed and be included in the BIA and SMS report.	Open	
14	BIA	Potential damage to Thames Water utilities should be further investigated.	Closed – Subject to separate approval process.	N/A
15	BIA	Potential impact to boundary walls should be assessed.	Open	
16	BIA	A non-technical summary is required.	Open	

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