

Studio House,
1 Hampstead Hill Gardens,
NW3 2PH

Basement Impact Assessment

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12727-43
Revision: F1

February 2019

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	February 2018	Comment	AGrm-12727-43-130318-1 Hampstead Hill Gardens-D1.doc	A Gleeson	R Morley	R Morley
D2	July 2018	Comment	AGrm-12727-43-030818-1 Hampstead Hill Gardens-D2.doc	A Gleeson	G Kite	G Kite
F1	February 2019	Planning	CBcb-12727-43-150218-1 Hampstead Hill Gardens-F1.doc	C Botsialas	E M Brown	E M 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	15/02/2019 10:30
Path	CBcb-12727-43-150218-1 Hampstead Hill Gardens-F1.doc
Author	Christos Botsialas, BSc MSc MBA CEng MIMMM CGeol FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12727-43
Project Name	Studio House, 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens, NW3 2PH
Planning Reference	2017/6381/P and 2017/6951/L

Structural ♦ Civil ♦ Environmental ♦ Geotechnical ♦ Transportation

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 Studio House, 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens, NW3 2PH (planning reference 2017/6381/P and 2017/6951/L). 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 qualifications of the authors of the BIA and the associated reports have been demonstrated in accordance with LBC guidance.
- 1.5. The building is located in the Hampstead Conservation Area and is Grade II listed. There are other Grade II listed buildings neighbouring the site.
- 1.6. It is proposed to construct a single storey basement by forming reinforced concrete underpins in a 'hit and miss' sequence beneath the existing property. The foundations will bear on to the London Clay.
- 1.7. According to the site investigation findings, the ground conditions are indicated to be 0.4m of Made Ground overlying the London Clay, the latter designated unproductive strata. Groundwater was not encountered during the ground investigation. One round of subsequent monitoring recorded groundwater at 1.97m below ground level reflecting perched water. It is accepted that there will be no impact to the wider hydrogeological environment from the proposed development. The BIA recommends that the contractor should make an allowance for temporary dewatering of any perched water encountered.
- 1.8. Factual and interpretative geotechnical information is provided in the revised BIA and the GMA reports. Retaining wall preliminary calculations are provided.
- 1.9. The BIA notes that heave protection measures should be provided beneath the basement slab to mitigate the risk of residual heave following construction. Indicative temporary propping proposals and details of the basement construction sequence are provided.

- 1.10. A Ground Movement Assessment report has been undertaken. The predicted impact of category 1 ('very slight') damage has been demonstrated for the neighbouring buildings situated at No. 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens and No. 14 Rosslyn Hill, in accordance with CPG Basements.
- 1.11. It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with the respective nearby asset owners including a nearby gas pipe to ensure that the anticipated ground movements are within their acceptable limits/criteria.
- 1.12. An outline monitoring plan is presented. The monitoring strategy should be finalised prior to construction and include the existing listed building on-site, the adjacent neighbouring properties and, potentially, the infrastructure in the proximity.
- 1.13. The 'Tree Constraints Plan' shows the proposed basement overlapping with a root protection area. It is accepted this this will have limited impact on the basement proposal but is noted for consideration by the LBC's Tree Protection Officer.
- 1.14. A Construction Management Plan and programme of works has been provided.
- 1.15. It is accepted that there will be no increase in the hardstanding area and that there will be no impact to the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 1.16. It is accepted that the risk of flooding of the proposed development is low and that there are no slope stability concerns regarding the proposed development.
- 1.17. It is confirmed that the revised BIA documents meet the requirements of CPG Basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 16 January 2018 to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for Studio House, 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens, NW3 2PH, reference: 2017/6381/P and 2017/6951/L.

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): Basements;
- Camden Development Policy (DP) 27: Basements and Lightwells;
- Camden Development Policy (DP) 23: Water;
- Local Plan 2017, 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 the detailed design.

2.5. LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as *"Excavation of basement level extension and formation of lightwell. Erection of replacement conservatory to side elevation."*

The Audit Instruction also confirmed 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens involved, or was a neighbour to, listed buildings.

- 2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 15 January 2018 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:
- Basement Impact Assessment Report (BIA) by RPS, December 2017;
 - Planning Statement by RPS, November 2017;
 - Schedule of Works by RPS, November 2017;
 - Tree Survey Data by Indigo Surveys, October 2017;
 - Construction Management Plan, November 2017;
 - Architect's Proposals including:
 - Design and Access Statement (DAS) by Nick Leith-Smith, November 2017;
 - Existing Elevations and Sections;
 - Existing Site/Location Plan;
 - Proposed Elevations;
 - Proposed Plans;
 - Site Photographs.
 - Relevant consultation comments.
- 2.7. CampbellReith issued an initial BIA audit report (rev. D1) on 13 March 2018 raising a number of queries on the above documents.
- 2.8. The following additional information were provided between April and June 2018, in response to the queries raised in the initial BIA audit report (rev. D1):
- Revised Basement Impact Assessment Report (BIA) by RPS;
 - Basement Construction Method Statement by BCS Consulting, 29 September 2017;
 - Suggested Structural Monitoring Plan by BCS Consulting, 14 May 2018;
 - Foundation Underpinning Design by BCS Consulting, undated;
 - Ground Movement Assessment by RPS, June 2018.
- 2.9. CampbellReith issued a second BIA audit report (rev. D2) on 3 August 2018 raising a number of queries on the above additional information.
- 2.10. The following documents have been provided between September 2018 and February 2019 in response to the queries raised in the second BIA audit report (rev. D2):

- Revised Ground Movement Assessment report (GMA) by RPS, rev.01 (September 2018) to rev.05 (February 2019). The latest revision (rev.05) of the GMA report, is considered in the present audit.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	Yes	
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes	
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	In Section 3 of the revised Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) report.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	As above.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	As above.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	In the Ground Movement Assessment report (GMA).
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	In Section 4 of the revised Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) report.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	As above.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	As above.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	In the revised BIA report.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	One round in dry summer months.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	The absence of nearby basements was conservatively assumed in the GMA report, suggesting that the neighbouring structures are founded at ground level. Also, due to the small thickness of Made Ground (0.4m) underlain by the unproductive London Clay, no impact on groundwater conditions is anticipated from the proposed development, regardless of the presence of any basements in the proximity.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	In Section 4.2 of the GMA report.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Also, the proposed walls will be propped both in the short (construction) and in the long term.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are the base line conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	No	Refer to comment above about the absence of nearby basements.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	Yes	
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	An outline monitoring plan is presented. This should be finalised at the detailed design stage to include the adjacent neighbouring properties and infrastructure and the existing listed building on-site.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	As above.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	Heave protection measures, such as clay board, is proposed by the BIA to be provided beneath the basement slab to mitigate the risk of residual heave following construction.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	Yes	In the GMA report.
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?	Yes	Refer to the revised BIA and the GMA reports.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	In Section 4.3 of the GMA.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	In the front sections of the revised BIA and the GMA reports.

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by RPS engineering consultants. The qualifications of the authors of the BIA and the associated reports are in accordance with the requirements set out in CPG Basements.
- 4.2. The BIA includes screening, scoping, site investigation and impact assessment stages as defined and required in LBC Planning Guidance document CPG Basements.
- 4.3. 'Studio House', 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens is part of a masonry building, previously converted to six apartments and houses, which varies in height from two to four storeys. The proposed development is about the two-storey house to the northern side of the building, referred to as the 'Studio House'. The building is located in the Hampstead Conservation Area and is Grade II listed. The property shares a party wall with the southern part of the building, which is also part of 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens.
- 4.4. The Planning Statement identified a number of listed properties in close proximity to the development which are all Grade II listed.
- 4.5. The proposed works include the excavation of a new single storey basement beneath the footprint of the existing building, extending into the garden of the property to form a new light well to the front. The depth of the proposed basement is approximately 4m below the existing ground floor level. It is proposed to construct the new basement by forming reinforced concrete underpins in a 'hit and miss' sequence beneath the existing property. The BIA confirmed that the existing foundations are stepped shallow strip footings bearing on the London Clay. A new retaining wall is proposed to be constructed to form the new light well structure. The basement slab is to be ground bearing.
- 4.6. Site investigation has been undertaken, consisting of one foundation inspection pit and one deep borehole. The ground conditions are indicated to be 0.40m of Made Ground overlying the London Clay, the latter designated unproductive strata. Groundwater was not encountered during the ground investigation. One round of subsequent monitoring recorded groundwater at 1.97m bgl. It is accepted that there will be no impacts to the wider hydrogeological environment. The revised BIA recommends that the contractor make an allowance for temporary dewatering of any perched groundwater encountered.
- 4.7. Factual and interpretative geotechnical information is provided in the revised BIA and the GMA reports. Retaining wall preliminary calculations have been provided.

- 4.8. Indicative temporary propping proposals and details of the basement construction sequence have been provided. It is confirmed that the proposed basement wall is to be propped during both the short and the long term.
- 4.9. The BIA notes that heave protection measures, such as clay board, should be provided beneath the basement slab to mitigate the risk of residual heave following construction.
- 4.10. A revised (v.05) Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) report has been provided. The GMA has assessed anticipated vertical and horizontal ground movements from basement excavation, and ground movements due to basement wall installation. A detailed utilities report has been included in Appendix B of the GMA report. A damage assessment has been undertaken for the two nearest buildings, the Northern Line London Underground rail tunnel and the overground rail line, as well as the existing utility services. The damage assessment is based on Burland classification, as described in CIRIA C760 report.
- 4.11. The GMA calculations indicate that the ground movements can be limited to within damage category 1 ('very slight') for the adjacent properties of No. 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens and No. 14 Rosslyn Hill. The GMA report, assumes that a good standard of workmanship will be in place during construction and that a robust temporary propping strategy will be implemented to control lateral underpin deflection. Consequently, the predicted impact of category 1 ('very slight') damage, in accordance with the Burland Scale, has been demonstrated for the neighbouring buildings, in accordance with CPG Basements.
- 4.12. According to the GMA report, the anticipated ground movements of the nearby Northern Line influence zone, overground rail line and existing utilities will be less than 5mm. It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with the respective nearby asset owners including the gas pipe owner for the gas pipeline being present along the pedestrian pathway towards Hampstead Hill Gardens, to ensure that the anticipated ground movements will be within their acceptable limits/criteria.
- 4.13. An outline monitoring plan is presented. The monitoring strategy should be finalised prior to construction. It should include the existing listed building on-site and the adjacent neighbouring properties and be designed to limit damage to no greater than Burland Category 1. Monitoring of the infrastructure in the proximity may also be required after consultation with the respective asset owners as noted above.
- 4.14. It is noted that the 'Tree Constraints Plan' shows the proposed basement overlapping with the Root Protection Area of the tree reference 'T2:C3'. While any nearby trees is not expected to impact on the proposed basement formation or design, further consideration should be given to the impact on trees by the proposal by the LBC's Tree Protection Officer.

- 4.15. A Construction Management Plan and programme of works have been provided.
- 4.16. The new light well is proposed to be constructed within an existing paved area, therefore there will be no increase of the hardstanding area and it is accepted that there will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment.
- 4.17. It is accepted that the risk of flooding of the proposed development is low.
- 4.18. It is accepted that there are no slope stability concerns regarding the proposed development.
- 4.19. In this context, all our previous queries have been closed out and the revised BIA documents meet the requirements of CPG Basements.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The qualifications of the authors of the BIA and the associated reports are in accordance with LBC guidance.
- 5.2. It is proposed to construct the single storey basement by forming reinforced concrete underpins beneath the existing property. The foundations will bear on to the London Clay.
- 5.3. The ground conditions are Made Ground overlying the London Clay with the latter designated unproductive stratum. It is accepted that there will be no impact to the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 5.4. Indicative temporary propping proposals and details of the basement construction sequence have been provided.
- 5.5. A Ground Movement Assessment report has been undertaken. The predicted impact of category 1 ('very slight') damage has been demonstrated for the neighbouring buildings of No. 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens and No. 14 Rosslyn Hill, in accordance with CPG Basements.
- 5.6. According to the GMA report, the anticipated ground movements of the nearby Northern Line influence zone, overground rail line and existing utilities will be less than 5mm. It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with the respective nearby asset owners including a nearby gas pipe to ensure that the anticipated ground movements will be within their acceptable limits/criteria.
- 5.7. An outline monitoring plan is presented. The monitoring strategy should be finalised prior to construction and include the existing listed building on-site, the adjacent neighbouring properties and, potentially, the infrastructure in the proximity.
- 5.8. The 'Tree Constraints Plan' shows the proposed basement overlapping with a root protection area. It is accepted this will have limited impact on the basement proposal but is noted for consideration by the LBC's Tree Protection Officer.
- 5.9. A Construction Management Plan and programme of works have been provided.
- 5.10. It is accepted that the risk of flooding is low and that there are no slope stability concerns regarding the proposed development.
- 5.11. The revised BIA documents meet the requirements of CPG Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Lewis	Flat 2, 4 Hampstead Hill Gardens	01.01.18	Subsidence	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment and predicted damage categories.
Wick	The Coach House, 2 and a half Hampstead Hill Gardens	03.01.18	Flooding	It is accepted that the proposed development will not increase the risk of flooding in the locality.
Berman	3 Hampstead Hill Gardens	01.01.18	Groundwater Flow/ Increase flood risk Heave/Subsidence	London Clay is an unproductive stratum, and only perched water was identified during the ground investigation. It is accepted that the proposed development will not impact groundwater flow or increase the risk of flooding. Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement and heave.
Seelig	The Conservatory, Hampstead Hill Gardens	05.01.18	Water run off Subsidence	It is accepted that the proposed development will not increase the hardstanding area, therefore it is accepted the water run off will not increase. Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement.
Spearman	22 Rosslyn Hill	02.01.18	Stability/Ground Movement Groundwater Flow	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage categories and ground water flows.
Giranzani	1C Hampstead Hill Gardens	09.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment and predicted damage categories.
Williams	Bowderbeck	09.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage

	4a Hampstead Hill Gardens		Groundwater Flow	categories and ground water flows.
Vallaey's	15 Hampstead Hill Gardens	10.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage Groundwater Flow Flooding	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage categories and ground water flows. It is accepted that the proposed development will not increase the risk of flooding in the locality.
Suddaby	6 Hampstead Hill Gardens	09.01.18	Ground movement and potential damage	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment and predicted damage categories.
Mbe	24 Rosslyn Hill	16.01.18	Groundwater flow/Flooding	London Clay is an unproductive stratum, and only perched water was identified during the ground investigations. It is accepted that the proposed development will not impact groundwater flow or increase the risk of flooding.
Li	1E Hampstead Hill Gardens	07.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage Groundwater Flow	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage categories and ground water flows.
Theoharis	Flat 5 12 Rosslyn Hill	24.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage Groundwater Flow	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage categories and ground water flows.
Roberts	Flat 4, 12 Rosslyn Hill	23.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment and predicted damage categories.
Walton	Flat B, 15 Hampstead Hill Gardens	25.01.18	Ground movement/Potential damage Groundwater Flow	Refer to Section 4.0 of the audit for comments on ground movement assessment, predicted damage categories and ground water flows.

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA	Qualification of authors to be confirmed in accordance with CPG Basements.	Closed	May 2018
2	BIA	Answers to be provided for all screening questions set out in CPG Basements, and scoping revised accordingly.	Closed	May 2018
3	Stability	Retaining wall design parameters to be included.	Closed	February 2019
4	Stability	GMA to be provided noting impacts to and protection of all neighbouring properties and infrastructure. Mitigation measures to be addressed to limit Damage Category 1 on the Burland Scale. Impact and protection of infrastructure assets should be agreed with the asset owners.	Closed	February 2019
5	Stability	Once the geotechnical and structural design elements have been confirmed and the GMA updated, the monitoring strategy should be considered further. An outline monitoring plan should be provided to demonstrate that works will be controlled to protect surrounding structures / assets, as well as 1 Hampstead Hill Gardens itself due to its listed status.	Closed – The monitoring strategy should be finalised prior to construction.	February 2019
6	Impact Assessment	A conceptual model should be presented indicating the proposed changes to the site in the context of the ground and groundwater conditions and the adjacent structures / infrastructure, noting potential risks and impacts and proposed mitigation.	Closed	May 2018
7	Stability	Further details of lightwell construction to be provided. Further detail to be provided for temporary propping proposals and construction methodology/sequencing.	Closed	May 2018
8	BIA Format	Non-technical summaries should be included in any updated BIA submissions.	Closed	May 2018

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