

**Member:** Dr Aaran Marriner-Clark MCABE C.Build E

**Date of disciplinary hearing:**

05/12/2025

## Outcome

1. Mr. X got in touch with ("the Business") owned by Dr Marriner-Clark, via a third-party site, for the purposes of obtaining structural engineering calculations in connection with the proposed removal of a load-bearing wall at Mr X's kitchen.
2. Mr. X subsequently obtained a further engineers report from another professional.
3. Mr. X was dissatisfied with the report produced by the member after receiving feedback from multiple builders that the calculations within it were incorrect.
4. The Disciplinary Panel first convened on 17 July 2025 and upon consideration of the available evidence and information opted to adjourn the hearing, to provide both parties to provide the additional information the Panel believed it required.
5. The Panel noted that it had received two reports, one from Dr Marriner-Clark and one from Mr X, which were materially different. The Panel further noted that the reports carried different headings (Building Engineer's Report and Structural Engineer's Report respectively) and that only one report included terms and conditions.
6. The Panel found that it was unable to state with certainty that Dr Marriner-Clark's report was incorrect. However, the Panel concluded that Dr Marriner-Clark's report was limited in scope and contained minimal technical detail.
7. The Panel further noted that the walls referenced in Dr Marriner-Clark's report and the report prepared by the second engineer related to different walls within the kitchen.
8. The Panel concluded that, without further information, it was not possible to determine whether: (a) the beam dimensions recommended were incorrect; and (b) the recommendations, if implemented as set out by Dr Marriner-Clark, would have created a health and safety risk.
9. The Panel noted that the complaints handling procedure link provided by Dr Marriner-Clark was dated after the parties entered into the contract and referred to a company that was materially different to the one associated with this complaint.
10. The Panel concluded that it was unclear whether a complaints handling process was in place before, or during, the period in which the complaint arose.
11. The Panel concluded that Dr Marriner-Clark's communication to Mr X, in which he stated that he had put "his solicitor on notice" and would "counterclaim for wasted costs", was threatening and unprofessional. The Panel considered this to amount to bullying behaviour towards Mr X.
12. The Disciplinary Panel concluded that Dr Marriner-Clark was not in breach of Professional Standard 1 of the Code of Professional Conduct.
13. The Disciplinary Panel concluded that the Member was in breach of **Professional Standard 2** and **Professional Standard 3** of the **Code of Professional Conduct**.
14. Given the breaches identified, the Disciplinary Panel determined that it was appropriate and proportionate to direct the Subject to provide a written undertaking confirming that:
  - a. They will complete courses in professional client communication and report writing; and
  - b. They will not misrepresent themselves, nor represent that they possess competencies beyond those held, having regard to the Guide to Ethical Professionalism.
15. The Panel directs that Dr Marriner-Clark's **grade be reduced from Fellow (FCABE) to Member Chartered Building Engineer (MCABE C.Build E)** for a period of not less than **nine months**.