CIAT-Accredited Conservationist Register **Candidate Application Form**

**Before completing this form, please ensure that you have read the CIAT-Accredited Conservationist Candidate Guidance Notes.**Please ensure you complete the entire form and submit the required additional documents and appropriate payment. Failure to do so will result in a delay in processing your application.

All applicants must be a Chartered Architectural Technologist.

See eligibility criteria on page three of the **CIAT-Accredited Conservationist Candidate Guidance Notes.**

**Part 1 – Confirmation of application requirements checklist** *(Please write yes or no in column on right)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Are all the basic requirements for a successful application met?* |  |
| * Fully completed application form | **Yes** |
| * Application fee paid with proof of payment | **Yes** |
| * Relevant academic and professional qualifications attached | **Yes** |
| * An up-to-date CV attached | **Yes** |
| * Summary of Experience completed | **Yes** |
| * Maximum five case studies of up to five projects in the last five years | **Yes** |
| * Competence Mapping List | **Yes** |
| * Evidence appendices | **Yes** |
| Have you submitted and described up to five case studies (in 100-150 words initially) to demonstrate  how you meet all sections of the five units (e.g., unit 1.1)? | **Yes** |
| Have you submitted a clearly referenced, organised and indexed portfolio of evidence in support of each case study? | **Yes** |
| Do the evidence appendices meet a minimum of five pieces or maximum of 12 pieces per case study? | **Yes** |
| Have you submitted clear Evidence Appendix lists and collated all your evidence appropriately? | **Yes** |
| Do the written sections (Summary of Experience and case studies) meet a minimum of 500 words and a maximum of 750 words? | **Yes** |
| Has each of the written sections been spell-checked/proofread? | **Yes** |
| Is it easy to see where a unit section has been referenced in the written sections (and which one it is)? As well as where ICOMOS E&T Guideline has been referenced in the text (and which one it is)? | **Yes** |
| Have you clearly indicated that you have met the requirements of unit section within this application and provided a Competence Mapping List to identify them? | **Yes** |

**Part 2 – I wish to apply for the following grade of conservationist** *(Please tick appropriate box)*

**CIAT-Accredited Conservationist CIAT-Recognised Conservationist (non-practising)**

sxxx

**Part 3 – Contact details** *(All applicants)*

Title: Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other *(please specify)*

Surname:

Forename(s):

Home address:

Postcode:

Telephone:

Mobile:

Email address:

Membership number:

Practice reference number *(if applicable):*

**Work Details**

Employer:

Address:

Postcode:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email address:

Website:

Previous relevant conservation employment history:

**Part 4 – Summary of experience and case study descriptions**

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Experience** |
| Word count (500-750 words):750 |
| Briefly describe your professional experience and how this relates to the scheme requirements. |
| **Background.**  I joined XXXX in 2006 as a senior technician and started to work within the conservation team in 2008. Under the leadership of XXXX (RIBA AABC Architect), I have been able to develop my knowledge and skills on a broad range of building conservation projects spanning the last 16 years which has allowed me to become more proficient and lead on projects, including grant aided projects.  XXXX has an excellent reputation for their work in building conservation and this was a major factor in my decision to join the practice. The work is often challenging but is very involved and rewarding. Every project is unique and provides you with the opportunity to learn new skills and practices. In particular I enjoy developing solutions to all aspects of the existing fabric where failure has occurred over time and look to provide solutions that are both sympathetic and suitable for modern day climate and use.  As part of my application to become a Chartered Architectural Technologist with CIAT in 2013, I included a number of building conservation projects, showcasing both repair and new build schemes. Through my continued work within the conservation team at XXXX, I have been promoted to Associate, Associate Director and am now a Director with the practice. My aim is to continue the practice’s excellence in all aspects of architectural design but especially in the conservation field.    **Experience.**  I have been very fortunate to be able to work on a broad range of projects during the last 16 years which have included major repair schemes for Grade 1 listed premises, reordering & extension schemes through to Quinquennial Inspections for various churches and grant applications for heritage high street schemes.  Although competent at building specification and detailing, I had very little experience within building conservation initially (I had a background of commercial, leisure and residential work prior to 2008). Therefore, the work that I undertook on projects was under supervision by the accredited Architects at XXXX. However, I was required to develop schemes of repair along with drawings and specifications and expected to liaise with heritage consultants and stakeholders in order to obtain relevant consents.  St Helen’s House in Derby (Grade I listed) is a project I have worked on several times over years. It has been a great learning experience for me personally. It was the first project that I was involved with in the conservation team and still remains a project that I work on now, albeit with a more senior managerial role. Designed by Jospeh Pickford, it is the finest surviving Georgian town house in Derby and also appears on the statutory list of buildings with special historic or architectural interest. The building was in an extremely poor state of repair and phased works were carried out on the roof and facades in order to make the building weathertight and structurally stable prior to undertaking a scheme of repair internally. This was (and remains) such a fantastic project, and one which I feel very fortunate to have worked on during all phases of work. It is certainly a project that gave me the desire to specialise in building conservation and it enabled me to significantly develop my knowledge base.  During the last 16 years I have been able to sufficiently develop my knowledge, skills and experience through project-based building conservation & CPD which has enabled me to lead on various conservation projects. In recent years I have led successful projects of varying size and complexity, from small repair projects (minor stone repairs, roof repairs) to phased repairs and conversion works on highly significant sites of historic importance (the Trentham Estate, Dunham Massey, Highclere Castle).  I have developed good working relationships with various Local Authorities and worked with them on Townscape Heritage schemes (Dudley MBC & Wolverhampton City Council). These have been largely funded by grants provided by Historic England. My work with Stoke-on-Trent City Council has seen me lead on major repair and restoration projects for multi million pound schemes, during which I carried out condition surveys, provided analysis and developed cost plans for repair needs on a number of historic buildings.  Each project is bespoke and requires thorough analysis and attention to detail which is something I have really enjoyed about my work within building conservation. To be able to assess the historic value and to be a positive influence on a site’s evolution is really exciting and continues to provide challenges that help me to further develop and learn new skills. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study 1: description** |
| Please state word count (100-150 words): 119 Words |
| In the box below, briefly describe the project that you will be using to draw your examples from  for the following sections, and your role in it:   * Project title * Location * Nature of the project * Listing status * Relevant dates and budget * Your official role/title |
| **Repair & Refurbishment of Tunstall Town Hall.**  Location: High Street, Tunstall, Stoke-on-Trent  Project: Work carried out in two phases. Phase 1 – repairs to the fabric and structural works to stabilise the existing structure, repairs to windows and roof along with significant treatment of internal elements to combat dry rot. Phase 2 – internal repairs and refurbishment of internal spaces to bring the spaces back into use and to enable the Town Hall to be used by the Local Authority inclusive of M&E installations.  Listing: Grade II (1290967)  Relevant Dates: Design Work Aug 2017 to Feb 2020. Site Work April 2020 to October 2022. Project Costs were £3.2 million Phase 1 and £2.5 million Phase 2.  Role: Lead/project Technologist, Client liaison. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study 2: description** |
| Please state word count (100-150 words): 125 words |
| In the box below, briefly describe the project that you will be using to draw your examples from  or the following sections, and your role in it:   * Project title * Location * Nature of the project * Listing status * Relevant dates and budget * Your official role/title |
| **St Helen’s House**  Location: Kings Street, Derby  Project: We have worked for a private client at St Helen’s House for 16 years carrying out repairs to the roof, façade, windows and conversion of the existing building into office accommodation. The current project relates to the associated Pearson Building and Headmasters House, both of which required significant repairs to maintain their integrity and to allow conversion works to be carried out In order to provide mixed use accommodation and secure the sites long-term future.  Listing: Grade 1 (1228285)  Relevant Dates: 2008-2012 Repairs and conversion of St Helen’s House. Jan 2020 Planning and listed building application(s) & Sept 2022. On site July 2019 to January 2023. Budget costs for recent projects was £1.5 million.  Role: Lead/project Technologist. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study 3: description** |
| Please state word count (100-150 words): 134 words |
| In the box below, briefly describe the project that you will be using to draw your examples from for the following sections, and your role in it:   * Project title * Location * Nature of the project * Listing status * Relevant dates and budget * Your official role/title |
| **The Royal Hotel**  Location: Station Road. Ashby-de-la-Zouch  Project: Repairs, extension and reordering of the existing Royal Hotel. Centrally located in Ashby, the hotel had fallen into a state of disrepair with significant works required to the roof and all facades. The works we undertook were part of a wider site development that also included the erection of a number of townhouses that would be an enabling development for the internal works of the hotel. Repair schemes were prepared for the roof (slate, tiled, lead and copper), external joinery (110 windows split over 3no floors) and external masonry (brick and stone).  Listing: Grade II\* (1073594)  Relevant Dates: September 2022 – submission for listed building consent. January 2023 – consent received. October 2024 – present developing technical details for all repairs.  Role: Lead/project Technologist for repair works, Client Liaison |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study 4: description** |
| Please state word count (100-150 words): 150 words |
| In the box below, briefly describe the project that you will be using to draw your examples from  for the following sections, and your role in it:   * Project title * Location * Nature of the project * Listing status * Relevant dates and budget * Your official role/title |
| **Trentham Estate**  Location: Trentham, Stoke-on-Trent  Project: A site that has significant importance nationally & locally. Whilst the main hall was sadly lost some years ago, the remaining Charles Barry designed Italianate structures are certainly worthy of retention & repair. I have been involved in carrying out a significant programme of condition surveys on a number of the heritage assets on the site. Assisted in preparing a programme of phased repairs to the former stable block and service quarters with some of the phases now complete and others due to commence.  Listing: Structures have separate listings:   * Remains of Trentham Hall: The Grand entrance & Conservatory – Grade II\* * Remains of Trentham Hall: Former Stable Block & Service Quarters – Grade II   Relevant Dates: Condition surveys carried out December 2019. Various repair projects undertaken since to the stable block (between March 2020 and August 2024).  Role: Lead Technologist, Client Liaison, Contract Administrator |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study 5: description** |
| Please state word count (100-150 words): 138 words |
| In the box below, briefly describe the project that you will be using to draw your examples from for the following sections, and your role in it:   * Project title * Location * Nature of the project * Listing status * Relevant dates and budget * Your official role/title |
| **Burslem School of Art**  Location: Queen Street, Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent  Project: Appointed by Stoke-on-Trent City Council to undertake a condition survey of the School of Art along with providing recommendations for repair works, their priority and also maintenance strategies moving forward. I carried out the survey on the exterior, interior and the site curtilage and produced the condition survey findings along with priority areas for repair. Since issuing my findings, I have carried out further survey work and produced schedules of work and specifications for the priority A and B repair works. Site works are due to commence in Spring 2025 where I will be contract administrator.  Listing: Grade II (1297941)  Relevant Dates: Survey & issue of condition report - July 2022; Priority A & B works schedules and issue for tender – September-November 2024  Role: Lead/Project Technologist, Client Liaison. |

**PART 5 – Scheme units**

Please write a statement which uses your case studies described above to meet the requirements of each unit.

Please state which case study you are referring to, and note the competences in brackets   
(e.g., case study 2, unit 1.2) directly after the sentence in which they are referenced.

|  |
| --- |
| **Unit 1: Conservation Knowledge** |
| **1.1**  Understand and interpret *heritage assets* (such as a monument, ensemble or site).  **1.2**  Understand the setting of a *heritage asset* (such as a monument, ensemble or site)  and its cultural, physical and intellectual context. |
| Please state word count (500-750 words): 703 |
| Knowledge of the site you are working on is critical to enable a designer to appropriately develop strategies and proposals against any brief. Understanding the historical context, a site’s development over time, it’s significance locally and/or nationally will often inform how a project progresses and develops.  The Pearson Building & Headmasters House (*Case Study 2*) are two structures that form part of the Grade 1 listed St Helens House site, Derby. Having worked on repair and restoration projects to St Helen’s House, I already had a broad knowledge of the site and its significance. St Helen’s House is one of the finest surviving townhouses in the country outside of London. Being Grade 1 listed It holds national significance and has links with the nearby Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site through its connection with William Strutt (Director of a cotton & silk spinning enterprise & owner of St Helen’s House from 1803), it has been recognised by Pevsner as an excellent stone faced Palladian house and is located within the Strutt’s Park Conservation Area (*ICOMOS - C & D*) (*Evidence 1-A*).  Both the Pearson Building and Headmaster’s House are later extensions, and both were built following the sale of the site to the Governors of Derby School 1863 – the Pearson Building being built in 1874 and the Headmaster’s House being bult between 1900 & 1914 (*Evidence 1-B*). Visually and in terms of architectural detail, they are a simpler design, scale and construction than St Helen’s House – the Pearson Building being largely Ashlar faced and the Headmaster’s House taking the form of a much smaller “dwelling” like structure (*Evidence 1-C*). Both are clearly subservient to St Helen’s House in the setting and both were clearly designed to complement the new use as a school, particularly in their plan form (*ICOMOS - B & D*) (*Evidence 1-D*). However, their contribution to the site is still of significant value & importance. They are physical forms of historical development that show how the site has changed from a cultural, social and physical perspective (*ICOMOS - A*).  The significance of a site, setting or building comes in many forms and is often bespoke to the site in question. Tunstall Town Hall (*Case Study 1*), whilst not as significant on a national basis in comparison to St Helen’s House, was locally significant to Tunstall and to the wider Potteries area. This is in terms of the townscape, it’s links with the six towns of Stoke-on-Trent, the Architect and also with regards to some of the external & internal features.  Absalom Reade Wood (A. R. Wood) was a locally significant Architect to Tunstall & to the wider Potteries area from 1874. He was Architect for many notable buildings including Tunstall Town Hall & the Burslem School of Art (*Case Study 5*). The current town hall was designed around 1883 and was a replacement town hall positioned in front of the existing market hall (*Evidence 1-E*).  The Town Hall is Neo-renaissance in style and is characterised by its three bays, the central bay being more prominent and grand, its design uses brick pilasters, large scale arched window openings, the decorative stone frieze (which is inscribed) along with a decorative stone cornice, weathering and pediments (*Evidence 1-F*). The classical symmetry across the elevation is striking, which is another characteristic of the Neo-renaissance style in the later 1800’s. A modern extension had been built to the South-West corner at ground floor level during the 20th century and some of the original detailing had sadly been lost – a poor design choice which was likely carried out to suit the changing landscape of the Town which makes the elevation feel more cluttered (*ICOMOS - A*) (*Evidence 1-G*).  Internally, the spaces were dilapidated and were suffering from neglect and a lack of maintenance. The ceiling to the first floor “Ballroom” was completely lost although the timber formwork still remained. The decorative plaster to the internal pilasters and columns was still evident and this mirrored the external façade. However, of more significance was the Minton tiled floor to the first-floor landing which was largely intact (*Evidence 1-H*) – Minton being a prominent pottery and ceramic design & production from 1793 in Stoke-on-Trent (*ICOMOS - A & B*). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Unit 2: Conservation Analysis** |
| **2.1**  Understand the setting of a *heritage asset* (such as a monument, ensemble or site), their contents  and surroundings, in relation to other buildings, gardens or landscapes.  **2.2**  Find and absorb all available sources of information relevant to the *heritage asset*  (such as a monument, ensemble or site) being studied. |
| Please state word count (500-750 words): 746 |
| The analysis of a heritage asset is critical in being able to develop clear conservation strategies for any given site. At the onset of every project I visit the site and also carry out research using various sources in order to develop my understanding of the asset and its contents, its surroundings and also it’s connection with the wider area, whether on a national or local basis.  My work on the Trentham Estate (*Case Study 4*) was in connection with the repair and preservation of the Stables & Service Quarters to the North-East corner of the site along with concept proposals for the redevelopment of the remains to the Porte Cochere. The stables themselves were designed by Sir Charles Barry around 1840 in Italianate style which is confirmed within the Historic England listing (*Evidence 2-A*) (*ICOMOS - B).* The Trentham Estate website ([www.trentham.co.uk](http://www.trentham.co.uk)) and text within the conservation strategy for the remodelling of the site in 2004 (*ICOMOS - D*) provided further details of historical site development and showed why the site was both locally and nationally significant (*Evidence 2-B*) – having started as a Priory site in the 12th century, the estate had been redeveloped with a Hall being built on the Priory ruins, this was later replaced with a new Elizabethan style mansion in 1633. In the 18th century, notable landscape Architect Capability Brown reshaped the gardens with some of his work still evident today (the gardens being listed in their own right – list entry 1001168 – *Evidence 2-C*). Barry’s involvement at Trentham began in 1833 and included remodelling the layout of the mansion on a palatial scale, designing the Stables & service quarters and also remodelling some of the gardens along with designing pavilions within the gardens of which only one remains and is separately listed (*ICOMOS - C*). Barry also had influence on some of the buildings on the adjacent Park Drive Estate which also adopted the Italianate style seen on the Stables, and this has been identified on the site plan I produced for more recent condition surveys (*Evidence 2-D*) (*ICOMOS – G*). The research undertaken in order to fully understand the site and its wider context and influence was extremely important and allowed me to develop considered repair strategies in the next phase(s) of the project.  St Helens House (*Case Study 2*) is nationally recognised as one of the finest surviving townhouses outside of London and as mentioned in Unit 1 is identified in the Pevsner guides as being an excellent stone-faced Palladian house (*Evidence 1-A*). The site is steeped in historical context and forms part of the Strutt’s Park Conservation Area (*Evidence 2-E*) – William Strutt being owner of the site between 1803-1831. This is also where the site began its connection with the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site with Strutt being a Director of a cotton & silk spinning mill. This was well documented in previous conservation plans developed for the site (*Evidence 2-F*) (*ICOMOS - B & C*).  The Pearson Building & Headmasters House were additions to the site that came much later on. The site was sold to the Governors of Derby School in 1863 – it is from this date that the site saw many alterations some of which can be seen on the ordinance survey map published in 1882 (*Evidence 2-G*). In 1875 a large annex was built to the side of St Helens House to provide additional accommodation for the school. Changes to the transport system in Derby also impacted the site setting - the introduction of a railway line led to demolition of the stables block, the extension of Arthur Street to the rear demolished part of the rear extension to St Helen’s House (built by Strutt) and the widening of King Street to the front destroyed most of the original forecourt. This was all documented in “An Architectural & Archaeological Analysis” by Richard Morris (*Evidence 2-H*) (*ICOMOS - C & D*). The Headmaster House was built 1900 and again was much less subservient and more domestic in appearance.  Through my research of the site, I was able to understand how the site had been developed over time. The setting of the site is still very prominent today and is the centre piece for the Strutt’s Park Conservation Area (*ICOMOS - C*). Both the Pearson Building and Headmasters House are an integral part of the sites history and show its development from Townhouse estate to educational setting – that is very evident in their designs & appearance |

|  |
| --- |
| **Unit 3: Conservation Techniques** |
| **3.1**  Understand and analyse the behaviour of *heritage assets* (such as monuments, ensembles and sites) as complex systems.  **3.2**  Diagnose intrinsic and extrinsic causes of decay as a basis for appropriate action. |
| Please state word count (500-750 words): 747 |
| The majority of my work within building conservation relates to repair & restoration projects and the ability to assess the condition, functionality and defects within a heritage asset along with forming reasoned and justified solutions for intervention. I have also carried out a number of condition surveys and Quinquennial Inspections, providing reports that identify the condition and potential defects within an asset along with providing priority work areas.  The Royal Hotel (*Case Study 3*) had been derelict for some time and had fallen into a very poor state of repair. Many of the issues related to extrinsic causes – lack of maintenance which had been exacerbated due to building obsolescence. Copper parapet gutters had become blocked and slipped / damaged tiles had allowed water to enter the building – this was saturating the roof timbers and was also the cause of partial collapse of some of the second-floor ceiling finishes (*Evidence 3-A*) (*ICOMOS – F*).  However, in addition to the issues above, a number of Intrinsic causes of decay were identified including erosion of the external stone and defects affecting the integrity of structural timbers due to water ingress to perimeter gutters. The central flat roof, hidden between the main pitched roofs, had narrow perimeter gutters with only 2no outlets. In addition to this, rooflights had been positioned which obstructed the gutters & efficient discharge from the roof, causing water to back up and breach the finishes (*ICOMOS – F*). To overcome this I prepared drawings and details that maintained the outlet positions but increased the width of the gutters and created better falls to the flat roof and gutters. The roof and gutter finish was also changed from modern felt to lead (*ICOMOS – I*). Details were submitted for Listed Building consent and further updated once work was on site and areas stripped back (*Evidence 3-B*).  At Tunstall Town Hall (*Case Study 1*), further investigation of the structure identified significant structural movement to the front façade. The upper sections of the external walls were pulling away and starting to lean over the pavement below – this was evident in cracking to the masonry at each end of the parapet wall (*Evidence 3-C*). This was being caused by a lack of maintenance to clear gutters (vegetation growth obstructing outlets – extrinsic cause) along with lead gutters and outlets that were no longer suitable (intrinsic cause) to accommodate the wetter climate and more intense rainfall events were contributing in allowing water into the building, saturating structural roof timbers and allowing dry rot to manifest and prosper (*Evidence 3-D*) (*ICOMOS – E & F*). Previous repairs had been carried out to the roof truss ends which hadn’t stopped the façade from moving. Therefore I assisted in developing schemes in conjunction with the Structural Engineer (*ICOMOS – J & M*) to provide a further method of restraint. In addition to this, I prepared schemes and proposals for the perimeter gutters which included widening the gutters and increasing the flood depth along with increasing the outlet sizes and methods of discharge to prevent further saturation of the stone and brickwork (*Evidence 3-E*) (*ICOMOS – I*).  Another issue we faced at Tunstall Town Hall was due to the amount of pigeons within the town. Pigeon netting had been provided but this had failed and pigeons had been allowed to nest on many of the buildings weathering’s, stone transoms and string courses. Whilst the pigeon guano was corroding the stone (extrinsic cause) due to the high levels of uric acid, the netting was also eroding the stone, and fixings had rusted & expanded which was contributing to fractures in the stone and in some cases stone becoming dislodged entirely (*Evidence 3-F*) (*ICOMOS – E& F*). A proposal put forward by specialists Rentokil included the use of dishes bonded to stone surfaces which contained am optical gel designed to deter the Pigeons. The Conservation officer shared my concerns that this proposal was inappropriate for the building (*ICOMOS – N*) due to the lack of information as to how the adhesive & gel would react with the stone surfaces. Additionally, regular maintenance would have been difficult to manage (*Evidence 3-G*). A more considered approach was developed – an Avishock system that would emit a small electric shock was provided across string courses and weathering’s. This was a system adopted on a number of historic buildings within Stoke-on-Trent. Additionally, areas of netting were provided to protect cornices, string courses, weathering’s and the pediments although the amount was much less than was originally provided across the building (*Evidence 3-H*). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Unit 4: Conservation Methods** |
| **4.1**  Inspect and make reports intelligible to non-specialist readers of *heritage assets* (such as monuments, ensembles or sites), illustrated by graphic means such as sketches and photographs.  **4.2**  Know, understand and apply UNESCO conventions and recommendations, and ICOMOS and other recognised Charters, regulations and guidelines.  **4.3**  Make balanced judgements based on shared ethical principles and accept responsibility for the long-term welfare of cultural heritage.  **4.4**  Recognise when advice must be sought and define the areas where different specialists are required, e.g., wall paintings, sculpture and objects of artistic and historical value, and/or studies of materials and systems. |
| Please state word count (500-750 words): 691 |
| Throughout this assessment I have made reference to the criteria stated within Section 5 of the ICOMOS “Guidelines for Education & Training in the Conservation of Monuments, Ensembles & Sites” (a-n) as evidence to prove my competence against that Charter. In addition to this, I also adopt the principles set within the “ICOMOS Charter – Principles for the Analysis, Conservation & Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage (2003)” on all projects undertaken as these help me develop clear conservation strategies for works through all stages.  At St Helen’s House (*Case Study 2*) a number of ICOMOS Principles were adopted (*Evidence 4-A*). In particular, criteria 1.7 (see Evidence 4-A for exact criteria) refers to ascertaining the achievable benefits & harm to the heritage asset. During the design phase, I developed Heritage Impact Assessments that identified areas of significance, intervention and change, and provided balanced judgments and reasoned arguments where required. As an example, an external fire escape stair extended from ground level up to the Second Floor. The section up to the First Floor was original, however, the section between the First & Second floor was modern and couldn’t be used under safety grounds. Additionally, the installation of this section had meant modern fire glazing had been installed to the first-floor windows as secondary glazing, and an existing window opening had been modified to form a door. My assessment sought improvement by the removal of this insignificant upper section of stair which would also allow the reinstatement of the original second-floor window opening and removal of the secondary glazing (*Evidence 4-B*) (*ICOMOS – B, G, H & I*).  I carried out an onsite inspection at the School of Art, Burslem (*Case Study 5*) inclusive of the exterior fabric and internal spaces in order to provide a condition report which identified the overall condition along with any defects using photographs and written text. The inspection did identify a number of issues that related to defects within the external fabric (lead gutters, parapets, vegetation growth) which were also now affecting the internal finishes. These were documented within my report along with photos to show the issues being reported (*ICOMOS – F, G & N*) (*Evidence 4-C*). I developed a priority works report that identified what repairs were necessary along with timescales (*Evidence 4-D*) – these sought to address the root cause and not just the symptom which is a requirement under 3.1 of the ICOMOS Charter (refer to Evidence 4-A for details). A more significant defect identified was potential movement between the main structure and a single storey extension to the West elevation. Due to the nature of this defect, I recommended to the client that further investigation would be required in conjunction with a suitably experienced Structural Engineer in order to develop a suitable strategy for it’s stabilisation and repair (*ICOMOS – E, F, G, H & J*) (*Evidence 4-E*).  Work on any heritage asset can require advice and specifications from various specialists. At Tunstall Town Hall (Case Study 1) early design team meetings identified the need for specialist reports and advice with regard to a number of items inclusive of movement to the front façade, timber rot survey, dry rot assessment (with recommendations) and the Minton tiled floor (*Evidence 4-F*) (*ICOMOS – J*). The verticality survey for the front façade identified that the façade was indeed moving which was largely due to a lack of support at roof level. This assessment was confirmed when the specialist report into the condition of the timber was received and identified a number of structural timber members that were rotten which was impacting on the stability of both the roof and the front façade (*Evidence 4-G*) (*ICOMOS – E, F & J*). Through use of the specialist reports, a more authoritative conservation strategy that included both repair and intervention proposals was developed. This allowed pre-application discussions with the Local Authority Conservation Officer and Historic England (*ICOMOS – N*). The strategy adopted was based around the criteria set within the ICOMOS Charter - Principles for the Analysis, Conservation & Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage (2003) which is evident in the minutes of a meeting with the Conservation Officer (*Evidence 4-H*) (*ICOMOS – H, I, M & N*). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Unit 5: Conservation Expertise** |
| **5.1**  Give expert advice on maintenance strategies, management policies and the policy  framework for environmental protection and preservation of heritage assets  (monuments and their contents, and sites).  **5.2**  Document works executed and make same accessible.  **5.3**  Work in multi-disciplinary groups using sound methods.  **5.4**  Be able to work with inhabitants, administrators and planners to resolve conflicts and to develop conservation strategies appropriate to local needs, abilities and resources. |
| Please state word count (500-750 words): 754 |
| My work at Tunstall Town Hall (*Case Study 1*) spanned from project inception in 2017 through to completion on site in 2022. A multi-disciplinary team was established from the onset inclusive of structural engineers & M&E consultants. The minutes taken from an early design team meeting in May 2018 (*Evidence 5-A*) show how repair strategies and design proposals would need to progress, including identification of specialist survey requirements (*ICOMOS – M & J).* Prior to this meeting we also held preliminary meetings with the Local Authority Conservation Officer & Historic England in order to agree on a conservation strategy prior to commencement of the design phase (*Evidence 5-B*) (*ICOMOS – N*).  Liaison with consultants, the conservation officer, the contractor and various specialist sub-contractors was critical during the design & construction phases of the project. In one instance we identified significant cracking to the corner of the parapet owing to movement in the façade which was linked to defects in the lead gutter and outlets. Following consultation with the Structural Engineer, I recommended the panel be taken down, rebuilt and consolidated whilst also improving the drainage outlets from the gutter. The engineer issued a drawing & specification for the consolidation works to which I provided comments back requesting bed joint reinforcement be considered owing to movement in the front façade and drawings were also produced to show the proposals around the outlet which was issued to the Conservation Officer for consent (*Evidence 5-C*) (*ICOMOS – E, F & M*).  The lack of maintenance at the Town Hall was a significant factor in the decay of the building. Whilst access was available to high level areas through the roof voids, it wasn’t safe. Working with the client, the engineer, project managers and the contractor we developed a safer route through the roof space to access the parapet gutters in order to allow them to be cleared (Evidence 5-D) and developed maintenance plans for inclusion within the O&M manuals that the client and users of the building could base maintenance policy around (*Evidence 5-E*) (*ICOMOS – K*). This included the issue of as-built drawings that documented the works undertaken and the specification(s) of materials used (*Evidence 5-F*) (*ICOMOS – L*).  The proposals at St Helen’s House (*Case Study 2*) included alterations to the Pearson Building & the Headmaster’s House. Liaison with the Local Authority Planners & Conservation Officer was critical in being able to obtain consents. There were a number of conflicts between our proposals and the support of the Conservation Officer. However, the best example of this relates to the removal of an external covered walkway between the Headmaster’s House & Pearson Building.  The covered walkway / canopy structure was a later addition to the site and was in an appalling state of repair, temporary props being used to prevent collapse. Proposals submitted included the removal of the walkway due to it’s poor condition and lack of historic significance (*Evidence 5-G*) (*ICOMOS – B, E, F & I*). During the consultation period, the Conservation Officer voiced concern over the removal of the walkway citing it as a key part of the historical development of the site. However, when the proposals were discussed at the Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC), they agreed that the removal of the walkway would better reveal the original historic form of the two buildings (*Evidence 5-H*).  Following receipt of these comments and further discussion with the Planner and the Conservation Officer I reaffirmed my belief that the removal of the walkway would be beneficial in defining the two assets in their historic setting (*ICOMOS – N*). An engineer was appointed following my recommendation to the client to provide a report into the condition of all elements of the walkway and this confirmed our initial assessment as being correct – the structure was beyond repair and would need to be rebuilt entirely in new timber if rebuilt (*Evidence 5-J*) (*ICOMOS – J & M*). However, given the significance of the walkway in providing historical evidence of site development across the site, I formed proposals within the landscaping scheme that would demarcate the footprint of where the walkway was should it’s removal be approved. This was also reflected in the amended justification document I submitted in support of the application (*Evidence 5-K*) (*ICOMOS – C, L & N*).  Conditional approval was duly granted for the scheme which included pre-commencement conditions for recording the existing structures along with recording works during construction and at completion. Liaison with the conservation officer has been critical throughout the project an is still ongoing as works progress on site. |

**Part 6 – Declaration**

I submit this form and additional documentation as an accurate record in support of my application as   
a CIAT-Accredited Conservationist/CIAT-Recognised Conservationist (non-practising) and am eligible  
to apply for assessment to be included within the CIAT-Accredited Conservationist Register.

I fully understand the requirements as set out in the Candidate Guidelines*.*

The portfolio submitted is my own work and where others’ work is included, or referred to, this is clearly marked. Where case studies have been used, the extent and limit of my active contribution is clearly marked.

I give my consent for the portfolio to be assessed by CIAT and its assessors.

I understand that evidence submitted with my portfolio will not be returned after assessment.

I am willing and able to attend a formal interview, to be arranged at a mutually convenient time and location, subject to successful completion of the Portfolio Assessment stage of my application.

I understand an annual fee must be paid to remain included on the CIAT-Accredited Conservationist, subject   
to retention of Chartered or Fellow Membership of CIAT. Failure to pay said fees will result in termination   
of my register entry.

Once entered onto the CIAT-Accredited Conservationist Register, I am happy for my details to be made available to the public, by CIAT and its services, with respect to conservation work. Should this change, I will contact the Institute. I will keep CIAT informed of any change in my circumstances in writing, which may affect my membership.

I declare that I will comply with the CPD requirements as laid down by CIAT and its *Code of Conduct.*

Signature of Applicant: Date:

**Part 6 – Declaration of Referee**

I am a current CIAT Chartered Conservationist, former employer, Chartered Architectural Technologist or Suitably qualified Build Environment Professional and am willing to act as referee in support of this applicant, as I consider them to be suitable for accreditation or to re-join the Chartered Conservationist Register.

The information on this form is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, correct. I am not related to the applicant

Signature of Applicant: Date:

Name of referee:

Job title of referee:

Professional qualification/s of referee:

Email of referee:

Address of referee:

**Disclosure**

All personal data will be held in keeping with General Data Protection Regulation principles. If you have any queries or requests, then contact [conservation@ciat.global](mailto:conservation@ciat.global) Our Privacy Policy can be viewed at [https://architecturaltechnology.com/privacy-policy.html](https://architecturaltechnology.com/privacy-policy.html%20) – N.B. You cannot elect to be excluded from CIAT related mailings (via mail or email).

|  |
| --- |
| **Checklist for applicants** |
| *I have completed the following:*   * All sections of the application form * Summary and report of relevant projects in portfolio * Written statement * Signed the declaration * Enclosed copies of my proof of qualifications * Enclosed one referee declaration * Made payment by card or bank transfer to:  Sort code: 30-93-68, account number:17672960, account name: CIAT Subscriptions with Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists. Please use your name as the reference. |

**For internal use only**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CIAT Representative** | **Decision** | **Date** | **Initials and signature** |
| Central Office | Checked, all documentation provided and approved |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Conservation Assessor** | **Decision** | **Date** | **Initials and signature** |
| Central Office | Checked, all documentation provided and approved |  |  |

**Please return this form to** [**conservation@ciat.global**](mailto:conservation@ciat.global)

**For any queries please contact:**T. +44 (0)20 7278 2206  
E. [conservation@ciat.global](mailto:conservation@ciat.global)  
architecturaltechnology.com