



CIAT

Application form for Principal Designer Registration - HRB

The Principal Designer (PD) Register is open to Chartered Architectural Technologists practising in industry who undertake the role of PD under the Building Regulations etc. (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2023.

To apply please confirm your eligibility:

→ I am a Chartered Architectural Technologist

In doing so, I agree to fulfil the Institute's PD Competency Framework requirements for registration as selected above.

Application

Applicants are required to:

- Complete all sections of this form;
- Include a 2 page CV outlining their relevant experience working on Non HRBs and HRBs;
- Include relevant and focused information and supporting project based evidence demonstrating experience in line with the Institute's PD Competency Framework, and;
- Pay the £350 fee.

Assessment

A Panel will review and assess each application and has three options:

1. Pass: the candidate is accepted onto CIAT's PD Register/s and will be listed on a publicly available Register as being competent to work on Non HRBs and HRBs. All applications for HRB registration will require an assessment interview.
2. Defer: the application does not satisfy the criteria or provide sufficient information for the Panel to make an informed decision. Should the first submission be deferred, the candidate will have the opportunity to make two further submissions for the written/portfolio at no additional charge.
3. Refer: the application does not satisfy the criteria following three submissions or after Assessment Interview. Guidance on remedial actions and a timeframe outlining eligibility to re-apply will be provided. All subsequent submissions will require a new application and the appropriate fee.

The decision of the Panel will be communicated accordingly and is final with no right of appeal.

Section A: Personal details

Full name	
Membership number	
Email address	
Telephone number/s	

Section B: Supporting statement of 3000 words (+/- 10%) for Competencies A-D per application for registration.

The supporting statement must include:

- Context 1 and 2: Information about you and a brief overview of your experience working on Non HRB and HRB projects. *This section can include a maximum of 500 words in addition to the above word count.*
- Summary of how the applicant meets the performance criteria as outlined in PAS 8671 and The Building Regulations etc. (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2023 (or any subsequent amendments/updates). Evidence must be provided to support this summary and clearly labelled. *Please refer to the Institute PD Competency Framework and Candidate Guidance Notes for a full outline of the registration process and requirements.*

The application for the PD Register should be a concise, honest, and insightful written account of your current experience of working on Non HRBs and HRBs and how you satisfy the Institute's PD competency framework.

Acceptance onto the Register is based on the applicant successfully meeting the performance criteria as set out in PAS 8671 by providing suitable evidence of them meeting these through their own portfolio of similar project types (i.e. HRB buildings). The purpose of providing evidence is to add value to your statement. Therefore, supporting documentation is mandatory and should be carefully considered to ensure it is relevant to the application and type of PD competence you wish to be assessed against.

Where relevant, you can include links to websites or make reference to other documents within the written statement. All additional documentation, references or links must be relevant, focused, and succinct.

Context (500 words max)

1 – Project/s summary demonstrating experience.

I am a Principal Designer and Fire Safety Consultant at ABC Ltd, specialising in Building Regulations compliance and coordination of statutory design risk management. I am a Chartered Architectural Technologist and Technician Member of the IFE, with nearly 20 years' experience across healthcare, residential, education and refurbishment sectors.

My current role involves acting as Principal Designer under both the Building Regulations 2010 and CDM 2015 on HRB and non-HRB schemes. I support clients through Gateway processes, lead regulatory audits, prepare structured compliance evidence, and coordinate prescribed documents in line with the HRB Procedures Regulations. I also review value engineering changes, support change control assessments, and provide early-stage design risk advice.

On recent HRB schemes, I have led development of Building Regulations compliance trackers, advised on GW2 deliverables, reviewed dutyholder declarations, and supported coordination between design and construction teams. I've also contributed to the establishment of change control and mandatory occurrence reporting procedures in line with Part 3 of the HRB regulations.

In parallel, I continue to work on complex non-HRB schemes. I have experience of leading hospital projects, sensitive refurbishments, and listed buildings. I regularly assess compliance with Building Regulations, coordinate input from consultants, and support clients in understanding their legal responsibilities.

My approach is built on technical rigour, early engagement, and clear documentation. I author and maintain tools such as compliance trackers and briefing templates to support clients and design teams in meeting statutory obligations. Where necessary, I adapt these to reflect the competence of individual dutyholders and the needs of each project.

I remain active in supporting continuous improvement through CPD, mentoring, and technical writing. I contribute to ASFP and IFE networks and regularly publish internal notes and client-facing guidance on emerging compliance issues. I am committed to improving understanding and delivery of regulatory duties across the sector.

Competency A: Behavioural competence: Principal Designers must be able to demonstrate behaviour in accordance with legal duties and the “behavioural competencies” set out in BS 8670-1:2024, or any code of professional conduct aligned to BS 8670-1:2024.

A:1- Evaluate the limits of their own competence and, if relevant, their own organisational capability sufficient

i. not to take on a specific Principal Designer duty holder role when the needs of the project in question are beyond the Principal Designer’s competence and, if relevant, organisational capability; and

ii. ask for help from other appropriately competent persons when needs emerge during a project that can no longer be met by the Principal Designer’s competence or, if relevant organisational capability.

I am often required to assess both my competence and organisational capability before accepting appointments. For each project, we undertake a capability and resource check to determine suitability, particularly for HRBs or complex schemes. Where gaps are identified, I either advise the client that we are unsuited to the role or engage appropriately qualified specialists, such as structural fire engineers or other consultants. For example, on a recent fee proposal request we were asked whether we could undertake inspections as part of our façade consultancy but as this was outside of our expertise we deferred the appointment and suggested reaching out to others, ensuring that compliance risk was appropriately managed¹.

A:2- Demonstrate the integrity to refuse to accept design work for building work that cannot conform to relevant requirements and to report safety occurrences to relevant parties

I have challenged design proposals where key safety requirements appeared unachievable. On the ABC project, I raised repeated concerns about the viability of bed movement through a dual-aspect evacuation lift with split levels. After delays, the architect’s tracking drawings confirmed the route was unworkable. I formally recorded the issue and recommended a full-scale mock-up ². Consequently, this led to a redesign of the lift core whereby it was to be accessed and exited without any turns.

A:3- Evaluate how to cooperate with all duty holders in a way that achieves design work compliance

i. assisting clients to provide information to duty holders; and

ii. liaising with Principal Contractors to share relevant information and having regard for the Principal Contractor’s comments in relation to compliance.

ABC Project (HRB) - The client was unsure how to define each designer’s scope. I tailored our Building Regulations compliance tracker to align dutyholders with relevant design criteria and regulatory requirements. This clarified responsibilities across disciplines and helped designers understand what justification was needed to evidence compliance. I identified coordination gaps early and supported the client in briefing the team to ensure expectations were understood⁶.

ABC Project (HRB) - I liaised with the Principal Contractor, to review their readiness for GW2. Although they believed the design was sufficiently developed, I challenged this by identifying omissions, including structural justification, interface detailing, and vent reinstatement methodology¹⁴. My input enabled the contractor to reallocate resources, close compliance gaps, and align their submission with the HRBP Regulations.

<u>A:4-</u> Apply interpersonal communication skills <i>i. encourage designers to perform their own duties, including to cooperate with other duty holders;</i> <i>ii. challenge designers to rework designs if evidence of design work compliance is insufficient; and</i> <i>iii. challenge the Principal Contractor's comments if they compromise design work compliance.</i>
I use direct, well-reasoned communication to encourage cooperation and challenge poor practice. ABC Project (HRB) - I referenced Regulations 11J(4) and 11K(4) to prompt coordination between the fire engineer and architect, after the engineer declined to review related design work. This led to further input and shared understanding of dutyholder roles³. I challenged weak statements in the Compliance Tracker, prompting resubmissions with improved, cross-referenced evidence⁴. ABC Project (non-HRB) - I refused to sign the declaration until items under A1, B4, and K2 were addressed, reaffirming that compliance must be evidenced by relevant dutyholders⁵. These examples demonstrate my ability to reinforce roles, uphold statutory process, and promote collaborative compliance through clear, proportionate dialogue.
Competency B: Legislative and regulatory framework for compliance: Principal Designers must be able to apply the legislative and regulatory framework related to how designers and design work meet legal requirements.
<u>B:1-</u> apply understanding of the duties and behaviours required of Principal Designers
I understand the Principal Designer must coordinate design work to ensure compliance, support the client in fulfilling Regulation 11 duties, and ensure designers cooperate³. ABC Project (HRB) - I led preparation of GW2 evidence, managed the compliance tracker, and assessed VE changes to determine if they triggered Regulation 19 notifications⁷. ABC Project (HRB) - I tailored the tracker to allocate responsibilities and clarify expectations⁶. ABC Project (non-HRB) - I refused to sign the compliance declaration until outstanding risks under A1, B4 and K2 were resolved, reinforcing my role in maintaining compliance and traceability⁵. Across projects, I act in line with PAS 8671, demonstrating integrity, transparency, and accountability.
<u>B:2-</u> apply understanding of the purpose, structure, and scope of the legislative and regulatory framework to appraising and challenging evidence of design work compliance
I regularly interpret the framework of the Building Act 1984, the Building Regulations 2010, and associated guidance to appraise and challenge compliance evidence. ABC Project (non-HRB) - I assessed the application of Regulations 3, 5, and 6 in relation to a material change of use and advised that the façade must meet Requirement B4(1) as the building exceeds 11m in height. I explained that legal definitions in Regulation 2 take precedence over guidance-based interpretations⁸. I also reviewed proposals for retained combustible insulation and recommended a risk-based approach aligned with ADB 12.7 and industry best practice⁹. My structured responses clarified statutory duties, informed specification decisions, and avoided non-compliance through misinterpretation of scope.
<u>B:3-</u> understand how to find and apply information in the legislative and regulatory framework governing: <i>i. how design work, including HRB design work, if built, is expected to comply with relevant requirements; and</i> <i>ii. how Principal Designers and other duty holders are expected to perform their duties, follow prescribed</i>

procedures, and comply with legislation, including when working on HRB design work.

I reference BSR and CLC guidance, the Building Regulations, and HRBP Regulations to support teams in applying duties and following prescribed procedures.

ABC Project (HRB) - I challenged a Stage 4 fire strategy that cited recommendations rather than confirmed decisions, citing GW2 expectations and recent BSR updates. I advised revisions and coordinated supporting plans to align with Building Regulations¹⁰.

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I interpreted Regulations 2, 3, 5, and 6 to confirm that a material change of use triggered full façade compliance with B4(1), based on the building's height⁸.

ABC Project (HRB) - I reviewed VE changes and advised on change classification under Regulation 19⁷.

These examples demonstrate how I apply the regulatory framework to interrogate evidence, advise dutyholders, and guide compliance on HRB and non-HRB schemes.

B:4- analyse their understanding of the legislative and regulatory framework related to designing HRBs, including in relation to prescribed procedures and information

I have developed strong working knowledge of the regulatory framework governing HRBs, including the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the HRBP Regulations.

ABC Project (HRB) - I reviewed prescribed documents for GW2, including the Construction Control Plan, Change Control Plan, and Mandatory Occurrence Reporting Plan. I identified unsupported competence declarations in breach of Schedule 1 and a misinterpretation of the MOR threshold. I also advised that the Change Control Plan address risks arising from assumptions about existing wall construction and confirmed how Regulation 19 change classifications must be structured¹¹.

These reviews demonstrate my understanding of how prescribed procedures operate in practice and how to challenge and improve submissions to meet statutory obligations.

B:5- evaluate duties of other duty holders in the context of HRB projects for the ways they could affect the Principal Designer's duties and design work compliance

At the outset of HRB projects, I issue a client advisory letter outlining their duties under the Building Regulations, HRBP Regulations, CDM, the RR(FS)O, and Control of Asbestos Regulations. This is followed by a briefing meeting to confirm their understanding, including the obligation to appoint competent dutyholders under Part 2A¹².

This ensures clients understand how their procurement decisions and appointment timing affect design compliance and the effectiveness of the Principal Designer and others. It also allows me to plan coordination and reporting structures to address potential oversight gaps

Following appointment, I review the scope of services for all designers, including the DRM, to confirm responsibilities are clearly defined and coordinated. This helps mitigate risk of non-compliance arising from unclear or duplicated duties¹³.

Competency C: Management of design work Compliance: Principal Designers must be able to apply general principles of management to plan design work compliance, and to manage, monitor, and coordinate designers and design work in relation to compliance during the design phase.

C:1- demonstrate an understanding of how clients' project briefs, key performance indicators, programmes, designers' competence requirements, and, if relevant, their own organisational capability can affect design work compliance

ABC Project (HRB) - I identified that the appointed PC and PD (main contractor), lacked the organisational competence to discharge the PD role. I addressed this in my proposal by offering advisory support, including preparation of prescribed documents. I also challenged the assumption that design information was sufficiently developed for GW2, highlighting missing structural justification, interface detailing, and vent reinstatement methodology¹⁴. In a further client and PC briefing, I advised that the proposed 2-week window for preparation of GW2 information was inadequate, recommending extended time to produce robust, compliant information.

My input helped the contractor and the client manage risk and allocate appropriate resources to align with regulatory expectations.

C:2-demonstrate an understanding of how the scope of relevant insurances, the limitations of relevant warranties, the terms and conditions of appointments, and the allocation of risk in appointments and contracts can impact on design work compliance

At ABC, I regularly reviewed consultant appointments and raised concerns where clauses conflicted with PII. A recurring issue was the inclusion of fitness-for-purpose obligations, particularly on D&B schemes. I challenged these terms, as they extended liability beyond the insurable scope of the policy. I worked with legal advisers to redraft appointments so that duties under Part 2A remained achievable and insurable¹⁵.

ABC Project (HRB) - I distributed a tailored Building Regulations compliance tracker that mapped design responsibilities against the relevant requirements. This informed consultant scopes and ensured that design accountability was aligned with contractual competence and coverage, supporting coordinated and compliant delivery⁶.

C:3- create strategies for managing design work compliance

I've led the development of a new Practice PQP in response to the BSA, establishing a design compliance framework for all projects. This embedded regulatory prompts by RIBA stage, checklist reviews, and alignment with fire strategy outputs at each milestone¹⁶.

I've expanded this approach through a live Building Regulations Compliance Tracker. The tool acts as a compliance statement and information management system, supporting evidence collation for HRB applications and tracking design elements requiring specialist input. Mapped across disciplines, it provides transparency on where further input is needed and from whom, enabling coordination and accountability on compliance matters⁶.

C:4-apply understanding of how to manage the recording, maintenance and approval of evidence of design work compliance

I lead the development and maintenance of the Building Regulations Compliance Tracker, which maps how each relevant requirement is addressed across disciplines. The live tracker is shared with the project team, allowing dutyholders to input evidence aligned to their scope¹⁷. I coordinate inputs to ensure they are complete and adequate, version-controlled, and supported by specifications and test data. It forms a core part of the GW2 submission and aligns with Golden Thread principles by linking design intent to compliance evidence. Whilst the HRB schemes I've supported haven't yet reached GW2 approval, the tracker is structured for ongoing use to facilitate implementation of Part 3 of the HRBP Regulations.

C:5-understand the effect of designers' duties and, in the context of a specific project, their contracted responsibilities

ABC Project (HRB) - I identified reluctance from a designer to review coordinated design work by others. I referred them to their statutory duties under Regulations 11J(4) and 11K(4), which require cooperation and reasonable steps to ensure compliance where design is interdependent. I also flagged a possible misalignment between their duties and appointment and advised the PC that the designer's scope may need amending to enable discharge of duties³.

This intervention closed a compliance gap and reinforced that design coordination is a shared legal responsibility, not one held solely by the lead designer.

C:6-analyse ways to identify and manage gaps in designers' competencies, capabilities, or capacities sufficient to coordinate design work compliance

I developed a competency assessment toolkit aligned with CIAT/ARB frameworks to identify gaps across the team¹⁸.

Through regular drawing and specification reviews, I noted repeated issues with compartmentation and junction detailing, suggesting insufficient understanding of guidance. I responded by arranging targeted CPD with a passive fire protection manufacturer and adding benchmark details to our internal library^{19,20}. I reassigned safety-critical packages to more experienced staff and issued guidance notes to improve baseline competence^{21,22}. This improved output quality and enabled more effective coordination of design compliance across the practice.

C:7-analyse how to monitor identified risks to compliance and control changes affecting design work compliance

I manage and monitor compliance using the Building Regulations compliance tracker, progress reports, and direct engagement.

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I raised concerns over unresolved life safety issues, including inadequate emergency lighting and missing fire alarm coverage. When fire plans and MEP layouts still didn't align, I escalated the issue in a DTM, outlining discrepancies around damper arrangements and advising the team to coordinate and update the drawings²³. These risks were also logged in the tracker, which I maintain as a live tool to monitor status, control changes, and ensure resolution of compliance issues.

C:8-evaluate how to manage the process for achieving consensus from designers that coordinated design work is compliant

I manage consensus by establishing structured coordination reviews and holding designers accountable to their Part 2A duties. I issue a Building Regulations Compliance Tracker highlighting areas of overlapping responsibility, requiring consultants to confirm their designs are both compliant and coordinated.

ABC Project (HRB) - I identified discrepancies between architectural layouts and the fire strategy. I escalated the issue, referencing Regulations 11J(4) and 11K(4), which require mutual review and coordination^{3,4}.

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I flagged similar issues²³.

In both cases, my intervention prompted revised submissions from all parties, confirming that coordinated compliance had been achieved.

C:9- evaluate the system of regulated procedures and information related to working on HRBs and their implications for the performance of the Principal Designer's duties, including contributing to the golden thread of information, reporting safety occurrences to the Building Safety Regulator, and making competence and compliance declarations

I manage GW2 evidence in line with the HRBP Regulations, structuring deliverables around the Building Regulations Compliance Tracker with traceable records, version control, and change justification to support the golden thread. I retain coordination evidence to demonstrate compliance with Part 2A.

ABC Project (HRB) - I raised a potential safety occurrence involving lightweight blockwork below DPC level. I notified the architect, client, and Principal Contractor via marked-up drawings and recorded it in the compliance tracker²⁴. As work had not commenced, an MOR was not triggered.

Though I've not yet submitted a formal compliance declaration on an HRB, I understand the statutory process, its legal implications, and advise clients on timing and content. Robust tracking ensures declarations are evidence-based and auditable.

This process reinforces the Principal Designer's duty to coordinate statutory compliance, ensure readiness for submission, and maintain credible project-specific records across all regulated procedures.

C:10- evaluate ways to establish and maintain throughout the construction phase a system for inspecting HRB design work for safety occurrences and promptly reporting safety occurrences

I supported the practice template for the Construction Control Plan and MOR Plan, aligning it with the HRBP Regulations^{25,31}. The templates set out how inspection, escalation, and reporting are to be managed during construction, with protocols for identifying, recording, and addressing safety occurrences that could impact Building Regulations compliance.

I ensure responsibilities for inspection and reporting are agreed early with the PC to clarify how issues will be monitored and escalated.

Our MOR Plan also defines roles, reporting triggers, and communication pathways, and is designed to support the cultural shift toward proactive compliance and transparency expected by the Regulator.

C:11- create ways to instruct reporting persons about the system for mandatory safety occurrence reporting related to working on HRBs.

I supported the creation of the MOR template, which defines what constitutes a safety occurrence, includes reporting thresholds, and sets out a clear escalation pathway. A process flowchart reinforces clarity of roles and lines of communication²⁵. The plan is issued to BSR as part of the GW2 submission.

To ensure reporting persons understand the system, our pre-construction briefing will include a walkthrough of the MOR process. During the briefing, I intend to relate it to real-world examples and project-specific triggers to ensure dutyholders understand how to escalate occurrences and document them within the golden thread.

Competency D: Technical framework for compliance: Principal Designers must be able to understand general principles of building design, general principles of construction, and the "core criteria for building safety" set out in BS 8670-1:2024 sufficient to:

D:1- understand the purpose, structure and scope of technical guidance, and standards governing building design and construction compliance with all relevant requirements

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I advised the client that structural fire protection deficiencies could fall under Regulation 4(3), but only where new works did not worsen them. I highlighted the impact of increased structural and fire loading from the new use, demonstrating application of both statutory requirements and the intent of the Regulations²⁶.

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I advised how a material change of use triggered Regulation 6(2)(c), requiring façade upgrades to meet B4(1). I referenced Regulation 2 legal definitions and clarified the framework around material change of use⁸.

I also produced a technical note to address repeated misunderstandings around stair guarding heights across multiple projects²⁷.

These examples show how I apply the structure and scope of technical guidance to support compliance.

D:2-understand how to find and apply information in technical guidance, and standards sufficient to:

- i) appraise and challenge designers' evidence of design work compliance with all relevant requirements;*
- ii) manage design work compliance when different packages of design work are coordinated and when design work is coordinated with building work; and*
- iii) contribute to identifying risks to compliance.*

I utilise Approved Documents and relevant British standards to assess compliance.

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I identified excessive travel distances to manual call points (BS 5839-1), inadequate headroom at roof level (AD.K), and recessed external wall treatments requiring fire protection (AD.B)^{5,23}. I established and managed a shared compliance tracker, assigning package-specific responsibilities and reviewing inputs to ensure all elements aligned. I followed up with designers to resolve inconsistencies, supported coordination between conflicting layouts, and used the schedule to highlight compliance risks early.

D:3-evaluate the potential impact of identified risks on design work compliance with all relevant requirements

ABC Project (HRB) - I reviewed the architect's partition and fire strategy drawings and identified that cross-corridor doors were shown full-width without nibs. This caused two issues: first, the lack of a nib obscured the extent of fire-resisting walls on plan, creating a misleading impression that the wall only required the same fire rating as the door. Second, projecting ironmongery meant doors couldn't open beyond 90 degrees, as required under BS 9991, therefore compromising evacuation. I flagged this in the CDE and followed up with a meeting to explain the implications to the architect^{10,28}.

This led to revised drawings being issued ahead of GW2. The example demonstrates how I evaluate the impact of detailing risks on wider compliance and support their resolution through technical guidance and engagement.

D:4-understand general principles of construction sufficient to appraise Principal Contractors' comments about compliance with all relevant requirements

ABC Project (HRB) - the PC queried whether EPDM membranes proposed by the subcontractor around external openings would comply with Regulation 7. I reviewed the proposal, referencing Regulation 7, the material's reaction-to-fire classification, and CWCT guidance. I explained that while EPDM strips under 250mm may be classified as seals and exempt, wider applications would be considered membranes requiring Class B-s3,d0 or better, which EPDM typically does not achieve. I advised limiting width, encapsulation with non-combustible materials, and avoiding configurations that could exacerbate fire

spread²⁹. This helped the contractor align the installation method with regulatory expectations while maintaining buildability.

D:5- understand information management systems sufficient to arrange for the establishment and maintenance of ways to:

- i) record strategies for achieving design work compliance with all relevant requirements;*
- ii) manage the strategies; and*
- iii) control changes affecting design work compliance with all relevant requirements.*

ABC Project (HRB) - I supported the PC by reviewing their Change Control Plan ahead of GW2, confirming it aligned with Part 3 of the HRBP Regulations and captured categories of change and affected regulations in a traceable format. I also prepared the Building Regulations Compliance Tracker, which was updated following MDT comments. The tracker links relevant requirements to consultant evidence and supports version-controlled updates as design evolves³⁰.

ABC Project (HRB) - I assessed VE proposals to classify change classifications and identify affected regulations⁷.

These tasks demonstrate my understanding of structuring, managing, and maintaining live compliance strategies and change control systems as part of the golden thread.

D:6- evaluate building safety risks in connection with the regulated system of mandatory safety occurrence reporting sufficient to report events related to structural safety, fire safety and other prescribed matters in HRBs

ABC Project (HRB) - I supported development of the MOR Plan, aligning it with Regulation 20 of the HRBP Regulations. The plan defines thresholds for reporting structural and fire safety occurrences, supported by a flowchart outlining how events are identified, assessed, escalated, and recorded. It includes guidance on early investigation, lead responsibility, and managing unresolved risks²⁵.

On this project, I identified a specification error involving lightweight blockwork below DPC, which posed a structural risk. I escalated the issue with the PC and design team²⁴. Although resolved pre-construction, the process reinforced the need for structured reporting aligned with the MOR system.

D:7- evaluate the potential during inspections of design work throughout the construction stage for new building safety risks to emerge and for the assessed severity of potential impacts of all risks to change, including to become safety occurrences

ABC Project (non-HRB) - I identified emerging risks while reviewing design work during the construction phase. For example, emergency lighting coverage to protected routes was unintentionally omitted in later MEP revisions, posing a risk to occupants and firefighters. I also flagged a conflict between the mechanical layouts and fire strategy, where lack of damper positioning risked breaching compartmentation²³.

These issues weren't apparent at design stage but emerged as design development continued during construction. I issued formal observations and coordinated a resolution with the architect and MEP consultant²³.

I recorded the risks and corrective actions in the Building Regulations Compliance Tracker.

This demonstrated how construction-phase risks can evolve and the importance of reassessing their severity in real time to avoid escalation into safety occurrences.

D:8- evaluate design work compliance sufficient to follow prescribed procedures for declaring compliance

I maintain a Building Regulations Compliance Tracker for each project, aligning consultant responses to each regulation and tracking status to ensure compliance declarations are only made when supported by coordinated, appropriate information. I understand the legal implications of unsupported declarations and use the tracker to mitigate risk through traceable evidence. Where compliance was unclear, such as incomplete specifications or conflicting responses, I issued formal comments in the tracker and followed up by email and in meetings until resolved. An example of this would be on ABC Project (HRB), where the architect's fire door compliance statement conflicted with the fire engineer's. This was flagged and corrected⁴.

This process ensures that, as PD, I can declare compliance with confidence that the information provided is complete, coordinated, and compliant.

D:9A- contribute to the collation, accurate maintenance, and accessibility of digital records in the golden thread of information

ABC Project (HRB) - I've contributed to the structured collation of compliance evidence within a CDE, accessible to the full project team. I maintain a version-controlled Building Regulations Compliance Tracker to ensure consultant information is traceable and auditable³⁰. Other key documents, such as the Change Control Plan/Log, Construction Control Plan, and GW2 drawings, are also held within the CDE. The platform will remain live through the construction phase, capturing final drawings, updated specifications, construction-stage changes, commissioning data, and safety-critical inspections. My role as PD will include coordinating this data to support accurate 'as built' records for GW3, ensuring the golden thread remains current and accessible. The Compliance Tracker will continue to be updated and act as a checklist at GW3.

D:9B- arrange the establishment and maintenance of the mandatory occurrence reporting system.

I supported development of the template MOR Plan in line with Regulation 32 of the HRBP Regulations²⁵. On HRB projects such as ABC Project, I arranged for the MOR system to be issued alongside the Construction Control Plan, ensuring dutyholders understand reporting triggers, escalation routes, and statutory responsibilities. The plan includes a flowchart and worked examples to support comprehension and is uploaded to the CDE for accessibility and version control.

Although construction has not commenced, the system is prepared for live use and will be maintained through coordination meetings and briefings as part of the golden thread. It will be reviewed regularly during construction to monitor effectiveness, identify trends, improve practices, and help prevent recurrence. The final version will form part of the GW3 submission.

Number of words (n.b. references are not to be counted and should only further support your statement and experience): 3234

Section C: Declaration of applicant

I submit this form as an accurate record in support of my application for the specific purpose of assessing my eligibility to be on the publicly available PD Register of the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists. I am aware that falsifying information in this application may result in investigation under the [Code of Conduct](#) and possible referral to the Conduct Committee.

I agree to accept the decision of the Institute regarding my eligibility for the PD Register and I am aware that the application and assessment fees are non-refundable.

If successfully on the PD Register, I will continue to abide by the rules and regulations specified in the [Code of Conduct](#) and any other directive issued by CIAT.

I will keep CIAT informed of any change in my circumstances in writing which may affect my Registration.

Signature of applicant: _____ Date: _____

Disclosure - Data Protection Act 2018

All personal data will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. If you have any queries or requests, please contact pdregister@ciat.global or refer to the Institute's Privacy Statement at <https://architecturaltechnology.com/privacy-policy.html>

N.B. You cannot elect to be excluded from CIAT related mailings (via post or email).

The decision of the Panel will be confirmed in writing (via email) within 28 working days with a time and date for your Professional Review Interview (PRI). If successful at your PRI, once registered, you will be listed at <https://architecturaltechnology.com/resources/building-safety-hub/ciat-principal-designer-register.html> to confirm your competence as a PD for non-HRB and HRB projects. You will be able to use the descriptor and logo as a registered 'CIAT Principal Designer', which you should use in conjunction with the protected descriptor and logo as a 'Chartered Architectural Technologist'. You are encouraged to use these whenever possible and appropriate.

Checklist for applicants:

- ☐ All sections of the application form are complete.
- ☐ Include a 2 page CV outlining their relevant experience working on Non HRBs and HRBs.
- ☐ Application contains relevant supporting information/documentation to corroborate your suitability as detailed in Section B.
- ☐ £350 fee paid electronically through architecturaltechnology.com.