

**139 Cranley Gardens,
London, N10 3AG**

Basic Impact Assessment Audit

For
London Borough of Haringey

Project No.
13979-03

Date
March 2024

Campbell Reith Hill LLP
15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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
P1	22/11/2023	Preliminary	13979-03-CRH-XX-XX-GE-R- 139 Cranley Gardens	NS	EMB	EMB
P2	06/03/2024	Final	13979-03-CRH-XX-XX-GE-R-0001-139 Cranley Gardens_P2	NS	EMB	EMB

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 2023

Document Details

Last Saved	06/03/2024 17:17
Author	N Simonini, BSc MSc FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13979-03
Project Name	139 Cranley Gardens, London, N10 3AG
Revision	P2
File Ref	13979-03-CRH-XX-XX-GE-R-0001-139 Cranley Gardens_P2

CONTENTS

1.0	NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	4
2.0	INTRODUCTION.....	6
3.0	BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST	8
4.0	DISCUSSION	12
5.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	17

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Residents' Consultation Comment
- Appendix 2 Audit Query Tracker
- Appendix 3 Supplementary Supporting Documents

1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Haringey, (LBH) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 139 Cranley Gardens, London N10 3AG (planning reference HGY/2023/0850).
- 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 LBH's policies and technical procedures.
- 1.3 CampbellReith was able to access LBH'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 proposal includes the construction of a basement to a depth of c. 6.90m below ground level below part of the footprint of the house and the rear garden.
- 1.5 Screening and scoping assessments are presented, supported by desk study information.
- 1.6 The qualifications of the individuals involved in the production of the Basement Impact Assessment are in accordance with LBH guidance. Non-technical summaries are presented in the BIA.
- 1.7 Further site investigation information and additional evidence is provided to confirm the negligible impact to/from a culverted brook and the local and wider hydrogeological environment.
- 1.8 Clarification on the hydrology assessment is presented regarding proposed surface water discharge rates, provision of permeable areas above the basement and decrease in surface water flooding. The BIA concludes there are no adverse impacts to surface water and flood risk
- 1.9 Clarification on the proposed geotechnical parameters for detailed design of the basement is provided. The BIA confirms that the construction sequence is feasible in the identified ground conditions. Matters in relation to health and safety will need to be considered as part of the detailed design.
- 1.10 The Ground Movement Assessment provides further information to confirm that damage to neighbouring structures may be limited to Burland Category 1. The BIA recommends that trial pits are excavated prior to construction to confirm whether soft spots are present. Mitigation measures to deal with such risk are presented.
- 1.11 The proposed monitoring strategy appears reasonable although it is subject to agreement with party wall surveyors.
- 1.12 Any impact on this and any other underground assets that may be present within the zone of influence of the basement is subject to separate approvals and outside the scope of this report.

- 1.13 The BIA confirms that liaison with the owners of a combined sewer that crosses the site is ongoing. The impact on underground assets within the zone of influence of the basement is subject to separate approvals and outside the scope of this report.
- 1.14 Queries and requests for information are summarised in Appendix 2. Considering the additional information presented, the BIA meets the requirements of LBH guidance on basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Haringey (LBH) on 2nd of November 2023 to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 139 Cranley Gardens, London N10 3AG, planning reference HGY/2023/0850.

2.2 The audit reviewed the BIA for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development. An audit of land quality/contamination issues has not been undertaken and is outside the scope of this report.

2.3 A BIA is required for all planning applications with basements in Haringey in general accordance with policies and technical procedures contained within:

- Development Management DPD. July 2017.
- Draft Basement Development Guidance Note. June 2012.
- Haringey Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

2.4 The BIA should demonstrate that the scheme:

- a) maintains the structural stability of neighbouring properties;
- b) does not adversely affect drainage and run-off or cause other damage to the water environment;
- c) does not have a cumulative impact 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 and to make recommendations for the detailed design.

2.5 Although the site lies within the London Borough of Haringey, it was agreed that the audit of the screening, scoping and impact assessment would follow the procedure presented in the London Borough of Camden (LBC) Planning Guidance: Basements as it is widely known and is considered to provide a robust approach to the issues of concern.

2.6 The site is within the Highgate Neighbourhood Area.

2.7 LBH's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as "Basement Extension to existing semi-detached property, to implement a new gym, swimming pool, sauna room, plant room and bathroom".

2.8 CampbellReith accessed LBH's Planning Portal on 7th November 2023 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment Report by Symmetrys Ltd, ref.: 21066-SYM-XX-XX-RP-S-0001-Rev E, dated August 2023. Including structural drawings in Appendix A.
- Geotechnical Ground Investigation Report by SAS Ltd, ref.: SAS 21/33613 Rev 0, dated May 2021.

- Ground Movement Assessment by GEA Ltd, ref.: J23175 Rev 1, dated August 2023.
- Flood Risk Assessment & SuDS Report by Symmetrys Ltd, ref.: 21066-SYM-XX-XX-RP-C-0001-Rev A, dated May 2023.
- Existing and Proposed Architectural Drawings by Crawford Partnership, dated 24th March 2023:
 - Site and Location Plan
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - Proposed Mezzanine and Basement Plan
 - Proposed Sections
- Consultation responses. Of note, Independent Review of Basement Impact Assessment by LBHGEO – ref.: LBH4692, ver. 2.2, dated September 2023; Objection Letter from SM Planning, dated May 2023 and Objection Letter from Jason Small, Principal Engineer – Flood & Water Management.

2.9 CampbellReith raised a number of queries as part of the D1 revision of this audit issued in November 2023. The following additional information was submitted by the applicant to address those queries.

- Basement Impact Assessment Report by Symmetrys Ltd, ref.: 21066-SYM-XX-XX-RP-S-0001-Rev F, dated February 2024. Including structural drawings in Appendix A.
- Addendum to the Basement Impact Assessment by Symmetrys Ltd, ref.: 21066-SYM-XX-XX-RP-S-0002-Rev B, dated February 2024.
- Ground Movement Assessment by GEA Ltd, ref.: J23175 Rev 2, dated October 2023.
- Flood Risk Assessment & SuDS Report by Symmetrys Ltd, ref.: 21066-SYM-XX-XX-RP-C-0001-Rev B, dated February 2024.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	The BIA has been reviewed by individuals holding the relevant qualifications as per Haringey Draft Basement Development Note.
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	Clarification is provided on the construction sequence and on the potential impact of the culverted stream on the proposed development.
Are suitable plans/maps included?	Yes	All maps to support screening are included in the BIA.
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	Section 4.2 of the BIA.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Section 4.1 of the BIA.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Section 4.3 of the BIA.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Section 4 of the Ground Investigation Report.
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Section 5 of the BIA.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Section 5 of the BIA.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Section 5 of the BIA.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	See Ground Investigation Report.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	Monitoring has been carried out on a single occasion to date.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Section 3 of the BIA.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	However, the BIA assumes the absence of any neighbouring basements.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Section 7 of the Ground Investigation Report. However clarification on the bearing capacity is required.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Section 7 of the Ground Investigation Report.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	NA	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	
Do the baseline conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	The BIA assumes the absence of any neighbouring basements.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Section 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the BIA.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	See GEA GMA.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	Yes	
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	Further mitigation measures and/or revision of the presented mitigation measures is presented.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	Section 11 of the BIA.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	Impact assessment has been revised. BIA considers residual impacts are negligible.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	Yes	GMA presented; clarifications presented.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	Clarification on the FRA presented.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	Yes	As above.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	
Are non-technical summaries provided	Yes	

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1 The BIA has been carried out by Symmetrys supported by GEA. The hydrogeology assessment has been reviewed by individuals holding the qualifications required by LBH policy. A non-technical summary is now presented in the BIA which confirms a site walkover was undertaken.
- 4.2 The site is a residential property consisting of a 3-storey semi-detached house with a driveway at the front and a rear garden, which includes a paved patio, a single storey outbuilding, a garden and an astro-turf pitch. The main house does not have any basement or partial basement at present, however it is understood the outbuilding has a single storey basement. The property is attached to No. 137 Cranley Gardens to the west, while No. 141 Cranley Gardens is present to the east. It is unknown whether neighbouring properties have basements, however the BIA assumes no neighbouring basements are present. This is considered conservative in relation to the land stability assessment and, considering the anticipated groundwater flow and location of the proposed basement, neutral in relation to the hydrogeology assessment.
- 4.3 The proposals include the construction of a double storey basement to host a new swimming pool and including a mezzanine level where a gym is proposed. The basement will extend to a maximum depth of c. 6.90m bgl. The basement will be located underneath a small portion of the southern end of the existing building and mainly underneath the rear garden and outbuilding. The basement is to be constructed following a 'hit and miss' sequence of retaining wall construction and multistage underpinning. It is understood the existing outbuilding will be demolished except for the boundary wall which is going to be underpinned.
- 4.4 Screening and scoping assessments are presented and informed by desk study information. Most relevant figures/maps and other guidance documents are referenced within the BIA to support responses to screening questions. The assessment has been reviewed by qualified professionals as per LBH guidance.
- 4.5 A site-specific ground investigation was undertaken in April 2021. The exploratory hole location plan presented in the ground investigation report shows a cable percussive borehole and 4 trial pits. However, it is understood the trial pits were not undertaken due to site constraints.
- 4.6 The borehole encountered a limited thickness of Made Ground (to 0.60m bgl) over the London Clay Formation (to 12.00m bgl). Groundwater was not encountered during drilling. Although not shown on the borehole log, it is understood a standpipe was installed to a depth of 5.00m bgl and groundwater was monitored at 0.85m bgl during a visit in May 2021 and at a depth of 0.73m bgl during a second visit in January 2024. The BIA considers this to be shallow perched water. Recommendations are provided for dewatering in case perched water is encountered during excavation.
- 4.7 The BIA acknowledges the presence of a culverted brook (Moselle Brook) in the vicinity of the site and considers the direction of groundwater flow and the impact of the proposed basement.

- 4.8 The BIA concludes there will not be any adverse impacts on the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 4.9 The BIA states that the site is at medium risk from surface water flooding and within a critical drainage area. An FRA and SuDS Report has been prepared and indicates that impermeable areas are not going to increase. Clarification has been provided with respect to the provision of permeable areas over the basement and the proposal is in line with council guidance. An outline drainage strategy is presented which indicates the adoption of rainwater attenuation below ground and a reduction in proposed run off to decrease the surface water flood risk.
- 4.10 As indicated within the objection letter from Jason Small, there was a discrepancy between proposed discharge rates presented in Figure 33 and paragraph 10.81 which has now been corrected. In addition, a preliminary enquiry has been submitted to Thames Water and liaison with the public sewer owner is ongoing. It is noted final drainage design and strategy will require approval from the lead local flood authority.
- 4.11 Structural drawings for the proposed basement are presented with construction sequences for the underpinning and the construction of tension piles. These indicate transitional underpinning from ground level to proposed mezzanine level will be undertaken below the party wall to No. 137 to avoid an abrupt change in foundation depth. The sequence presented in the BIA indicates underpinning will be undertaken in two lifts. Structural drawings indicate that the proposed retaining walls will not be cantilevered at any time due to the inclusion of multi-level temporary props, shuttering and vertical struts. The structural engineering proposal advise that a detailed temporary works design will be agreed with the appointed contractor at a later stage.
- 4.12 Structural engineering calculations for the substructure are presented. Different sections of the proposed retaining walls are analysed with retained heights varying from 4.20 to 5.90m, reflecting the structural proposal. It is noted this is a preliminary design sufficient only to allow impact assessment. The structural information concludes that underpinning is a suitable retaining option for the proposed development in the identified ground conditions (London Clay). The BIA states that the residual risk of encountering soft spots during the excavation would be dealt with by excavating and replacing soft spots with suitably compacted engineered fill. The BIA recommends trial pits to be undertaken prior to any construction works to confirm ground conditions and potential presence of soft spots.
- 4.13 The geotechnical parameters used for the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) and the retaining wall calculations are presented in the GMA and the site investigation report. The site investigation report recommends a friction angle of 23° for the retained soil and an allowable bearing pressure of 250kPa at basement formation level. Although this is not considered a conservative estimate of the bearing capacity, the calculated bearing pressure is typically below that value and will provide a satisfactory factor of safety.

- 4.14 A GMA has been presented to demonstrate damage to neighbouring buildings will be limited to Category 1 of the Burland Scale. The sensitive structures and infrastructure relevant to this assessment are Nos. 137 and 141 Cranley Gardens and the footpath and carriageway of Cranley Gardens. As indicated in the CCTV survey presented in the FRA and as raised in LBHGeo's report, a combined drain is present at the proposed development location which affects the feasibility of the proposals. Any impact on this and any other underground assets that may be present within the zone of influence of the basement is subject to separate approvals and outside the scope of this report.
- 4.15 Commercial software XDisp was used and ground displacement curves presented in CIRIA C760 associated with construction and excavation were adopted in the analysis. Whilst the CIRIA approach is intended for embedded retaining walls, it is accepted that in certain situations the predicted ground movements can be within the range typically anticipated for underpinning techniques carried out with good control of workmanship. Clarification of different aspects of the GMA was required in the previous revision of this audit and further information was presented as detailed below.
- The GMA construction sequence has been updated to reflect the structural proposal of a 'bottom-up' construction.
 - The GMA states that anticipated ground movements include settlement due to the new structural loads, excavation and installation of the underpins (including those beneath the existing outbuilding) and that ground movements reflect the variation in excavation depth across the basement footprint. Considering the setting of the proposed basement in relation to neighbouring properties, it is accepted that the estimated ground movements are within the range expected for similar projects.
 - The structural proposal has confirmed the structural feasibility of a double lift of underpinning to a maximum depth of c. 7.00m bgl. Matters in relation to the health and safety associated with the basement excavation and construction must be clearly addressed as part of the detailed design.
 - The GMA states that the transitional underpinning proposed below the party wall to No. 137 Cranley Gardens is considered as a mitigation measure to limit any differential movement caused by the basement excavation.
 - The results of the GMA indicate damage to neighbouring structures will not exceed Burland Category 1 (Very Slight). It is accepted Cranley Gardens is outside the zone of influence of the basement.

4.16 The BIA indicates that a monitoring strategy will be developed at a later stage and will be subject to discussions and agreements with the owners of the adjacent properties and structures as part of the Party Wall Agreement. Suggested trigger levels are presented in the outline strategy.

4.17 Technical reports submitted as part of the public consultation raised matters that are relevant to the BIA as discussed below:

LBHGeo

- Trial pits from the site investigation or any additional site investigation have not been presented - see audit para 4.5;
- Clarification on the baseline of groundwater conditions required - see audit para 4.6.;
- SAS report does not provide any basement impact assessment or basement construction advice, geotechnical parameters and structural design - the impact assessment has been undertaken by Symmetrys with contribution from GEA on land stability, however clarification on the qualifications of the BIA in relation to the hydrogeology assessment is required, see audit para 4.1;
- The structural information presented at this stage has been evaluated to be suitable for the planning requirements although queries on geotechnical parameters have been raised - see audit para 4.12.
- Additional groundwater monitoring is recommended in the SAS report but not considered in the BIA - see audit para 4.6.
- Discrepancy in suggested sequence of works – the discrepancy relevant to this audit is that described in audit para 4.14 and clarification on this is required. Additional queries on the GMA have been raised, see audit para 4.14.
- The development is contributing to increased run-off and hardstanding areas are increasing – clarification on the provision of permeable areas over the basement and on proposed run-off rates is required, see audit paras 4.8. and 4.9.
- A shared public combined drain is present at the location of the proposed development – clarification on whether consultation with the asset owner is ongoing is required, see audit para 4.13.

SM Planning objection letter

- The BIA refers to the basement as single storey – it is agreed that 'single storey' may be misleading, however the BIA has correctly taken into consideration the proposed basement depth.

Jason Small objection letter

- Clarification on the discrepancy between proposed discharge rates in the FRA is required. In addition, clarification whether consultation with the statutory sewer system owner has been undertaken is required.

- 4.18 As discussed above, the matters/comments raised in the technical reports are considered to have been addressed in the updated BIA.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The proposal includes the construction of a basement to a maximum depth of c. 6.90m bgl below part of the footprint of the house and the rear garden.
- 5.2 Screening and scoping assessments are presented in the BIA, supported by desk study information. The qualifications of the individuals involved in the production of the BIA are in accordance with LBH guidance. Non-technical summaries are included.
- 5.3 It has been confirmed that all the available site investigation information has been presented, although an extra round of groundwater monitoring was carried out in January 2024 to inform the hydrogeological assessment. The BIA notes no adverse impacts to the local or wider hydrogeology.
- 5.4 The BIA presents mitigation measures to deal with perched water and the potential presence of localised soft spots at basement formation level and recommends that trial pits are excavated in advance of construction to confirm ground conditions.
- 5.5 Clarification is provided on the provision of permeable areas over the basement, and the proposed discharge rates. The BIA confirms there will not be adverse impacts to surface water or flooding risks. Evidence has been presented to confirm that liaison with the public sewer owner is ongoing.
- 5.6 Structural calculations and drawings are presented to demonstrate the feasibility of the scheme.
- 5.7 The Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) provides further information as described in Section 4. The GMA confirms damage occurring to neighbouring properties can be limited to be within Category 1 of the Burland Scale. It is accepted Cranley Gardens is outside the zone of influence of the basement.
- 5.8 Queries and requests for information are summarised in Appendix 2. Considering the additional information presented, the BIA meets the requirements of Haringey Council Planning Guidance.



CampbellReith
consulting engineers

Appendix 1

Residents' Consultation Comments

Residents Consultation Comments

Surname	Company/Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Susan Secher	-	07/06/23	Structural stability	See 4.13 to 4.15.
Janie	-		Flooding	See 4.8.
CREOS	-	06/06/23		
Yorke-Starkey	-	05/06/23		
Law	-	02/06/23		
La Vespa	-	01/06/23		
Van Basteen and Puzey	-	01/06/23		
Connor	-	31/05/23		
Barter	-	30/05/23		
Brock	-	30/05/23		
Evans	-	27/05/23		
Davies	-	22/05/23		
Rendle	-	22/05/23		
Rodger	-	22/05/23		



CampbellReith
consulting engineers

Appendix 2

Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA format	The hydrogeology impact assessment should be prepared and/or reviewed by qualified professionals as per LBH guidance.	Closed – See 4.1.	February 2024
2	BIA format	Non-technical summary to be included in the BIA.	Closed – See 4.1.	
3	BIA format	Clarification on whether a site walkover was undertaken is required.	Closed – See 4.1	
4	BIA format	Trial pit records to be submitted. Alternatively additional justification will be required to confirm the presence/absence of any soft and water bearing deposits associated with a culverted brook.	Closed – See 4.6.	
5	Hydrogeology	Baseline for groundwater regime not established. Additional evidence required.	Closed – See 4.6.	
6	Hydrogeology	Impact assessment on the wider hydrogeological environment to be reviewed following confirmation of absence of soft/water bearing deposits associated with culverted brook.	Closed – See 4.7.	
7	Hydrology	Clarification is required with respect to the provision of permeable areas over the basement and on the proposed decrease in the surface water flooding risk.	Closed – See 4.8.	
8	Hydrology	Clarification on proposed discharge rates and on whether liaison with the public sewer owner is ongoing is required.	Closed – See 4.9.	
9	Land Stability	Clarification regarding the allowable bearing capacity value used in the retaining walls calculation is required.	Closed – See 4.11.	
10	Land Stability	The Ground Movement Assessment is to be reviewed and, where necessary, updated following the comments provided in Section 4.	Closed – See 4.13.	
11	Land Stability	Trigger levels presented in the outline monitoring strategy may require amendments following GMA revision.	Closed – See 4.15.	
12	Third Party Consultation	Impact on any underground asset running across or nearby the proposed basement is outside the scope of this report. Early liaison with the assets owners is encouraged to agree methods of assessment.	Note Only – See 4.12.	NA
13	Hydrology	Final drainage design and strategy will require approval by the lead local flood authority.	Note only – See 4.9.	



CampbellReith
consulting engineers

Appendix 3

Supplementary Supporting Documents

None

London

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

Bristol

Unit 5.03,
HERE,
470 Bath Road,
Bristol BS4 3AP

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

Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street
Manchester
M2 1HW

T: +44 (0)161 819 3060
E: manchester@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: 15 Bermondsey Square, London, SE1 3UN
VAT No 974 8892 43