APEAS

THE ARCHITECTS' PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION AUTHORITY IN SCOTLAND Ltd.

2026/27 PRACTICE PAPER

Day 2: Wednesday, 18 November 2026

Questions 5 to 8

(Questions are numbered 1 to 8 across both parts of the Practice Paper.)

All 4 questions must be attempted

Answers must be submitted by 7.30 pm on Wednesday, 18 November 2026 as per separately issued instructions.

All characters, locations and incidents contained in this Practice Paper are fictitious.

© This paper is the copyright of APEAS (the Architects' Professional Examination Authority in Scotland Ltd.) and the contents may not be reproduced in any form without written approval.

Question 5

Email to Candidate from Rhea (GFY Partner)

Wednesday 18th November 2026 09.32am

Dear Candidate,

Please see the email below from the client at Cairn Academy which we need to deal with as a matter of urgency.

Can you please prepare the following for discussion when I return this afternoon:

1. Draft emails to the key parties, outlining the necessary next steps (both immediate and longer-term).
2. Prepare an assessment of the roles, responsibilities and liabilities of all parties involved (This should include GFY, Client, Contractor & Sedum Roof Maintenance Company).
3. Prepare an internal briefing note on the professional risks/liabilities to GFY that we need to consider and what might happen next.
4. Prepare an internal briefing note which will allow us to reflect on this issue as part of our quality assurance procedures going forward.

I was on-site the day the Contractor carried out the testing last year (prior to practical completion), so I know for sure it did happen and the system passed. I trusted that the information in the H&S file and the O&M was accurate and present at handover, however we were so busy, I did not have time to check that our recently departed Part 2 had pulled it altogether correctly.

This is the first time we have taken on the role of Principal Designer, and I had hoped it would offer another revenue stream for the practice. This is not a great start!

I am out at a site meeting but will be back in the office later this afternoon to discuss it further.

Best

Rhea

Email to GFY from Client

Wednesday 18th November 2026 08.35am.

Dear Rhea,

I just want to make you aware of a serious accident that occurred yesterday afternoon at the school. I know we are due to meet next week to discuss the impending conclusion of the rectification period and you issuing the Final Certificate – but this can't wait!

The sedum roof maintenance company (Grass is Greener Ltd) were attending the property yesterday for their first visit to carry out the required annual maintenance/inspection of the sedum roof. Their operative was clipped on using the man-safe fall restraint system to access the upper roof and during the inspection, they fell (some 3m) to the lower garden roof area

below. Two of the roof bolts have come loose, resulting in significant slack on the cable, which allowed the fall over the edge. Having viewed the bolts from a distance, they appear to be corroded.

The operative sustained a broken leg, which required surgery but is in a stable condition in hospital. By the grace of God, they should make a full recovery, however they are looking at a lengthy period off work to recover. Unfortunately, we have been made aware that the operative intends to pursue us for loss of earnings and compensation.

Grass is Greener Ltd have been in touch to say that the man-safe is not fit for purpose and is unsafe to use. They advised that they have contacted both the HSE and the police to report the accident. They are adamant that the fault lies with us as their operative is fully trained, competent and is an experienced member of their team.

Prior to their visit, I did pass on both the H&S File /O&M manuals that you provided at handover, but they are now stating that neither included the necessary testing certificates for the system. I am sure I recall this being carried out but practical completion was a bit of a blur to be honest.

I don’t need to remind you that we were not keen on using a man-safe system in the first place, as we have no experience of using or maintaining such systems. However, upon your advice that this was the best solution to deal with the Planning height issue, we agreed (against our better judgement). We now have a sedum roof that requires maintenance, which we can’t access safely and a potential compensation claim in the pipeline.

I would be grateful if you could please deal with this immediately.

Kindest regards,

Atholl

(on behalf of Cairn Academy)

Question 6

Extract from GFY's Appointment

Architectural & CA Services & Overall Budget

The proposed fee for this project is based on a new layout and glazed roof feature to the café area, internal alterations to gallery spaces, new entrance, refurbished toilet facilities and fabric improvements for the new energy strategy.

For this project, we are pleased to confirm that our fee proposal for providing Architectural and CA services for the works, of 4.8% & 1.1% respectively of the construction cost, currently estimated at £1.5million, inclusive of expenses and exclusive of VAT. The fee will cover our services from Stages 0 to 6 inclusive as outlined in our appointment document and provide services according to the project scope and other services that may reasonably be required. Our fee has been broken down into clearly defined payment stages relating to the project as follows:

Stage 0-1 Brief 5%

Stage 2 Scheme Design 10%

Stage 3 Developed Design 20%

Stage 4 Technical Design 23%

Stage 5 Construction 40%

Stage 6 Handover *2%*

It is understood that the services of a QS, energy consultant and Structural Engineer will be appointed separately and the services of a Clerk of Works during construction are also recommended.

Dear Candidate,

The Lighthouse Development Manager (DM) is delighted that the Tenders have mostly come in under budget: (1) £1,385,000 (2) £1,440,000 (3) £1,295,000 & (4) £1,525,000. He says that during Tender, they had to accept that the original construction programme was unrealistic and extended it from 5 to 7 months.

Despite the figures, Derek, the DM, wants to make some changes, including instructing a reduction to the project brief by omitting the gallery spaces and says they've changed their mind about the design of the glazed roof feature and would like to take this out of our scope and give it to the Contractor's glazing specialist for a less 'bespoke solution!' We've already designed it using off-the-shelf system components assembled in an interesting way…I don't think we've been paid our full fee for this. Derek also seems keen on a lean Design Team during the works and says we have all we really need from Green & Green. I understand that Lighthouse has also been promised a digital model by one of the contractors, which Derek thinks will also reduce our workload as a more cost-effective approach.

Derek has asked for a revised fee from GFY, so can you help me with how we do this based on your understanding of:

1. What the Tender figures mean in relation to the budget and our fee?
2. Considerations of our bespoke appointment in terms of our fee and services?
3. Can you help me with a plan on how we tackle these variations with Lighthouse and discuss what our options are?
4. Obtaining planning permission took far longer than anticipated and the delay cost us money and you know that our staff had to be re-assigned to other things. Times have been hard and we had included this project's full fee in our budget forecast. In hindsight, would a lump sum or time charge have been better for us?

Regards,
Peter

Question 7

Dear Candidate,

I'm just back in the office from attending the Site Progress Meeting for the Smith's new build holiday house and there's an issue I need you to look at this afternoon.

As you know I didn't attend the site team meeting or have my usual walk-round for the last fortnight as I was on holiday. However, it seems the Smiths and ABC have taken the opportunity in my absence to go rogue, and I don't even know where to start…..

Firstly, if you remember the last Architect's Instruction we drafted together was for the inclusion of a separate spa style plunge pool next to the main swimming pool being installed by Splash. The Smiths told ABC that they didn't want the spa style plunge pool and they actually wanted some whirlpool bath instead. ABC has already told Splash to remove the plunge pool from the build and ordered the whirlpool that the Smiths picked from Splash's catalogue. It's a completely different size, has a completely different electrical and plumbing set up to what we've already designed, and from Green and Green's reaction on site they didn't know about this either.

Secondly, the Smiths have now moved equipment into the partially completed gym and are now actively using this as a gym in amongst the construction works.

Thirdly, it turns out that the Smiths weren't happy with the stained-glass window designs we had mocked up for them with Glass Ideal and despite us working up the detailed design with Glass Ideal, the Smiths have spoken to their own stained-glass designer who arrived on site whilst I was there today to fit the stained glass in the dining room. I have no idea what we do about the work we've done with Glass Ideal and ABC were completely thrown as the size of the stained glass doesn't match the size of what we'd factored into the design for the dining room with both ABC and Glass Ideal.

Fourthly, the Smiths have taken it upon themselves to reconfigure the walk-in wardrobe room with ABC who have removed the completed installation and fitted a new layout to match what the Smiths wanted. ABC now want paid for this extra work and they want us to advise on the finishing for the revised layouts. Meanwhile, speaking to the Smiths, they told ABC to remove and replace the wardrobes as they weren't to a good standard of workmanship. And I don't know who to believe, given that we agreed the standard of workmanship elsewhere with ABC, so I find it hard to believe that they've dropped the ball on this one and installed the wardrobes to a poor standard……

Fifthly, the Smiths said they paid £50,000.00 direct to ABC last week for the marble worktop to the kitchen. I have no idea why and this was already factored into the tender we had from Kitchens Direct, but they said ABC said the worktop hadn't been included within their tender and if the Smiths wanted that specific worktop they needed to pay for it now!

Lastly, ABC also reminded me when I was leaving that their next payment is due at the end of the month and given the above, they will be including all of this in their application.

Please could you prepare the following for me:

1. Short internal note on how we deal with the above issues, please refer to anything relevant in the Building Contract and also suggest how we manage both the Smiths and ABC and this situation going forwards.
2. Draft a letter to the Smiths setting out what issues they have caused above and how they should be conducting themselves on this project.
3. Draft a letter to ABC setting out what issues they have caused above and how they should be conducting themselves on this project.

Thanks,

John

Question 8

Memo

18th November 2026

Dear Candidate,

Santiago House

The attached correspondence arrived from the Client on Monday. I've had an e-mail exchange with Mannars Surveyors as well which is also included.

I know you are doing the contract administration on this project, but you were busy with your Part 3 exam on Monday, and I had a fantastic brunch and 18 holes at the Merchants of Cityburgh yesterday. Please can you undertake the following task

1. Draft a letter of response to the client.
2. Could you provide the appropriate contractual response.
3. Please also explain to me what our responsibilities in relation to issuing payment certificates, this situation seems a little unusual.
4. Why would the contractor act in this way?
5. Could we improve our procedures going forward?

Regards, John

From: Ben@Mannars.co.uk

Sent: 16 November 2026 16:58

To: John@GFY.com

Subject: Santiago House

Hi John,

Yes, I received the same certificate from the contractor. I've been out on site today so was going to write to you about this anyway. They have submitted this notice ahead of the contractual due date, which was the 12th November but it is far in excess of the valued works, they are at it frankly. I am too late to issue a valuation certificate.

I recommend that you issue an interim certificate in accordance with the contract confirming payment in the normal way for a gross payment amount of £2.4million which will authorise gross payment of around £50,000, retention is 3%. Time is of the essence!

Best,

Ben

From: John@GFY.com

Sent: 16 November 2026 10:36

To: Ben@Mannars.co.uk

Subject: Santiago House

Dear Ben,

I received the attached letter and Payment Notice from the client this morning. A bit concerning. What do you think we should do?

Regards,

John

Mr. + Mrs. J Santiago
10 Fleabridge Farm
Cityburgh
CT34 7XY

13th November 2026

GFY Architects

10 Apple Close

Cityburgh

C2 4ZZ

Dear Sirs,

Santiago House, Cityburgh Payment No 15

We received the attached notice from Doolittle Contractors which is very unusual before I have received your interim certificate.

It is for an outrageous amount and money we simply do not have the cash to cover, we are nearly finished and I was not expecting anything like this amount.

Based on the cashflow document provided by the contractor at the start the payment with a couple of months to go should be less than £100,000. This certificate takes us way over budget.

There have been no design changes, so I do not understand where all this additional cost has come from. If it turns out that I have to find funds to pay for this, I will be seeking recompense from GFY as I can only conclude that the contract has not been administered properly.

You also persuaded me not to apply liquidated damages to avoid demotivating the contractor. Well as they have been so late and now apparently so over budget, I'm motivated to change my mind about that as well. Please put this in place for me.

I expect to hear from you urgently.

Yours Sincerely,

J Santiago Enc.

Doolittle Payment Notice

SBC/Q/Scot 16

Issued by: Doolittle Builders Ltd
address: Seven Dials, Cityburgh C2 7OT

Quantity Surveyor : Mannars Surveyors
address: 12 Quantity Crescent, Cityburgh, C1 2XY

Job reference: 26000

Contract Administrator : GFY Architects
address: 10 Apple Close, Cityburgh

Certificate number: 26000-15

Payment Notice Date: 10/11/2026

Works: The Construction and Developmentof a New Build House
situated at: The Santiago Farm, Cityburgh

Due date: 12/11/2026

Final date for payment: 26/11/2024

This Interim Certificate is issued under the terms of the SBC/Q/ Scot 2016

Building Contract dated 06/03/2024

Gross Valuation		£ 2,850,000.00
Less Retention		£ 85,500.00
	Sub-total	£ 2,764,500.00
~~*Less* reimbursement of advance payment (statement attached)~~		£
	Sub-total	£ 2,764,500.00
Less total amount previously certified		£ 2,279,500.00
	Sub-total	£ 485,000.00
Less payments in respect of any Payment Notices		£ 0.00
Net amount for payment		**£** 485,000.00

All amounts are exclusive of VAT. The Employer shall in addition pay the amount of VAT properly chargeable.

I/We hereby certify the sum of (in words)

FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND POUNDS – 00p

To be signed and dated by or on behalf of the Issuer named above

Signed William Doolittle Dated 10/11/2026

This is not a tax invoice

END OF DAY 2 PAPER