

PCC Chair Report to Board

for Open session

Subject:

Annual Report of the PCC Chair

Board meeting:

19 March 2026

Agenda item:

13

Action:

- For noting
- For discussion
- For decision

Purpose

To receive the annual report of the Chair of the Professional Conduct Committee, which covers the work of the committee in 2025.

Recommendations

That the Board notes the Professional Conduct Committee Annual Report.

Annexes

Annexe A: List of Professional Conduct Committee decisions 2025 (January to December)

Author/Key Contact

Martin Winter, Chair, Professional Conduct Committee.

Please send any queries to Matthew Harding, Hearings Manager, at matthewh@arb.org.uk

1. Open Session

- 1.1 This item will be taken under the open session.
-

2. Background and Key points

- 2.1. This is the fifteenth annual report of the Professional Conduct Committee (“PCC”). It is the first from me as Chair of the PCC. I took up the role in October 2025.
- 2.2. This report offers me the opportunity to highlight the main issues that the PCC has dealt with over the last 12 months and provides the Board an opportunity to ask me any questions about the work of the committee.
- 2.3. The PCC dealt with 25 cases in 2025, comprising of 16 hearings and nine matters concluded through consent order.
- 2.4. We welcomed three new Legally Qualified Chairs to the committee in 2025. Two of the new panel members have completed a thorough induction process, with one scheduled to complete their induction shortly.
- 2.5. Some members of the PCC left the Committee in 2025 due to other work commitments. I, together with the other PCC members, have truly appreciated the commitment of the previous PCC Chair, Margaret Obi, as well as the contributions of Jetinder Shergill (Legally Qualified Chair).

The Role of the PCC

- 2.6. The PCC is a committee constituted in its own right under Schedule 1, Part II of the Architects Act, to consider allegations of unacceptable professional conduct (UPC) and serious professional incompetence (SPI) against architects.
- 2.7. If the PCC makes a finding of UPC and/or SPI, it can impose one of a number of disciplinary sanctions under section 15 of the Architects Act 1997. The sanctions available are issuing a reprimand, imposing a penalty order, suspending an architect from the Register, or in the most serious cases – ordering that an architect be permanently erased from the Register.
- 2.8. The Committee is made up of 18 active members: five architects, five lay members and eight legally qualified Chairs. Each panel considering a case is made up

of one architect, one lay person, and one legally qualified Chair. The Panel is assisted by a member of staff from the ARB, usually the Hearings Officer, who assists in the smooth running of the hearing.

2.9. The PCC is governed by its own set of rules, and we consider a wide range of case law and judicial guidance in reaching our decisions. We are also guided by the PCC rules and always strive to ensure that our decisions are fair, transparent and supported by relevant case law.

2.10. Although the PCC is a standing committee of the Board, we place great importance in our operational independence from ARB's Board and Executive. Not only does that independence instil public confidence in the robustness of the disciplinary proceedings, but also mitigates the key risks associated with legal challenges that might arise from regulatory decisions. That independence is reflected in the appropriate number of factual particulars that are not found proved at PCC hearings. This is common across all regulators, with not every hearing resulting in an adverse finding.

Statistics for 2025

2.11. The PCC made 25 decisions in 2025 (listed in Annexe A to this report). This comprised of 16 hearings and nine cases concluded through consent orders between the ARB and the architect. Of the 25 decisions, two cases (8%) did not result in a finding of UPC or SPI; this rate remains as expected. We know cases can evolve considerably while being prepared for the PCC and during the course of a hearing, therefore not-guilty findings do not suggest in isolation that cases have been incorrectly brought.

Convictions

2.12. There were five conviction cases concluded during 2025. Three of these cases resulted in erasure, one case resulted in a four-month suspension, and the final a £2,500 penalty order. This indicates that early review of the cases by ARB to determine whether a conviction has the likelihood to impact on an architect's fitness to practice goes through a robust process.

2.13. With declaration of convictions now an embedded part of the annual retention fee process, more self-declared convictions are being reported to ARB. Decisions involving criminal convictions have more than doubled since the renewal process changed.

Trends in complaints

- 2.14. The most common standards engaged at the PCC during 2025 were standard 6 (carrying out work conscientiously and with due regard to relevant technical and professional standards) and standard 1 (honesty and integrity). This is the first time standard 4 (competent management of business) has not been a main area of complaint. Notwithstanding this, a failure to have adequate terms of engagement remained a common complaint during 2025.
- 2.15. Breaches of standard 1 are often the most serious cases brought before the PCC. Acting with honesty and integrity is a core tenet of the Code and so these cases often result in more severe sanctions. The increase in complaints relating to standard 1 is in part due to the increase in conviction cases, where the standard was most commonly breached. We also saw honesty and integrity complaints involving inadequate insurance arrangements, management of money and invoicing, and in misleading or dishonest interactions with ARB and membership organisations.
- 2.16. Standard 6 complaints covered a wide range of issues, the most common of which related to undue delays in work and failing to communicate adequately with clients and keep them updated. These have been common areas of complaint for several years and are often charged together as architects fail to keep clients informed of delays in work.
- 2.17. We have not yet begun considering complaints relating to conduct under the new Code and its supporting guidance. We will see in due course if that has any impact on the nature of the complaints being brought before us.

Hearing length and representation

- 2.18. My predecessor, in the 2025 report to the Board, mentioned that there has been a trend with regard to PCC hearings becoming increasingly longer. I am pleased to say that the average hearing length in 2025 appears to have stabilised at four and a half days. In 2024 the average hearing length was four and a half days and in 2023 the average hearing length was four days.
- 2.19. 56% of architects were in attendance and represented at their hearings in 2025. Represented architects can engage in hearings more effectively. It allows for every opportunity to provide a defence to all the points raised, and for a thorough and robust consideration of the evidence and issues.

Hearing adjournments

- 2.20. Adjournment of hearings impact on the ability of the PCC to dispose with the cases before it in a timely manner. In 2025 there were three adjournments, with two of these cases being adjourned for health reasons and one for the architect to seek additional legal representation. Most adjournments take place as result of events outside of ARB's control – for example health issues or witness unavailability. ARB continues to schedule hearings well in advance of hearing listed dates to mitigate the risks of avoidable delays.
- 2.21. In some cases, the PCC is unable to conclude hearings in the time set aside and they must resume at a later date. This impacts the timely conclusion of cases and can result in lengthy delays due to the process of securing availability for all of the parties. Hearings conclude part-heard for a variety of reasons, many of which cannot reasonably be foreseen. This year, four hearings concluded part-heard. Two of those have now concluded with two scheduled to be heard in Q2 of this year.

Inputs received during the PCC Annual Review Day

- 2.22. Each year, a PCC Annual Review Day takes place. The 2025 Review Day took place on 2 February 2026.

Expert evidence

- 2.23. A discussion took place regarding ARB's new process for securing expert evidence for hearings. This followed feedback from the PCC at the last Review Day and was outlined by the previous PCC Chair in the 2025 annual report to the Board.
- 2.24. As a result of that feedback ARB has now separated the roles of experts and inquirers, and I am pleased to hear that ARB has sought independent expert witnesses in cases, focusing on securing the right skills and experience in each case. The aim is to ensure the committee receives quality evidence from experienced experts; evidence which is objective, unbiased and within their respective areas of expertise. ARB told the PCC that steps have been taken to ensure experts understand their role is to assist the committee and not to advance the ARB's case.
- 2.25. Those experts are now beginning to appear before the PCC and ARB has encouraged the committee to provide feedback on their performance.

PCC development and performance management

- 2.26. The committee has received periodic training through ARB's Shine course portal and panel members have completed courses on Equality and Diversity, GDPR and Sexual Harassment Awareness Training.
- 2.27. As PCC Chair I have also provided a comprehensive update to panel members on the latest relevant case-law and regulatory developments.
- 2.28. The PCC also received a training session exploring neurodiversity and how to support neurodiverse respondents and witnesses at the PCC. The training was delivered by an experienced barrister working in this area. This topic was requested at the 2025 Review Day and was detailed in the PCC report to the Board last year. I am pleased to hear that the other PCC members found the presentation informative and that it generated significant discussion on personal style and considerations to be made before and during hearings.
- 2.29. Future training has been requested on approaching UPC in the context of freedom of expression and social media use. We are aware of the impact freedom of expression is having on society as a whole, and emerging case law and decisions at other regulators. I will discuss with ARB the best way to deliver appropriate training on this topic.
- 2.30. In terms of performance management, all PCC members are invited to provide peer feedback following each hearing and I encourage further reflection on an ongoing basis, in relation not only to the performance of the committee, but also of ARB staff, facilities, advocacy and the quality of the documentation provided.
- 2.31. The committee understands ARB is currently working towards a performance management framework that would apply to all associates and we as a PCC will be subject to this overall scheme. This was discussed at the meeting in 2025 but is not yet in place. In the interim, ARB has proposed a temporary arrangement to provide confidence and assurance to the Board that PCC members are competent to undertake their roles, and can recommend any reappointments, as necessary. I will discuss and agree an approach for this scheme with ARB, considering the suggestions put forward by the committee at its recent meeting.

Learning from consent orders

- 2.32. ARB and a fellow Legally Qualified Chair introduced a discussion on consent orders. There followed a detailed discussion about the types of evidence that should

be shared with Consent Order Panels, and the PCC's view of consent orders where there are particulars including dishonesty and/or lack of integrity. This followed two cases where a consent order had been proposed but rejected by the Panel.

- 2.33. There were healthy contributions of both ARB staff and PCC members in exploring ideas around this important topic. ARB plans to take this feedback away and review its consent order processes and considerations going forward.

3. Equality and Diversity implications

3.1. The training for PCC members on dealing with neurodiverse stakeholders will enable us to better manage neurodiversity issues which may arise during hearings.

3.2. In terms of statistics, 96% of concluded cases in 2025 related to PCC cases against male architects and 4% against female architects. In terms of age demographic, 16% of concluded cases in 2025 related to architects between the ages of 20-40, 68% between the ages of 40-60, 8% between the ages of 60-70, and a further 8% aged 70 plus.

Recommendations

That the Board notes the Professional Conduct Committee Annual Report.

Annexe A

List of PCC Decisions 2025 (January to December)

DATE	SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION BROUGHT BY ARB*	Outcome
21 January 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">Criminal Conviction:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person (RP) has been convicted of a criminal offence other than an offence which has no material relevance to his fitness to practise as an architect, in that he was convicted on 24 May 2024 of:</p> <p>(a) Between 22/04/2023 and 30/11/2023 at London supplied goods, namely and services, in contravention of a condition requiring you to give a security for the payment of any Value Added Tax which was or may have become due from you. Contrary to section 72 (11) of and paragraph 4 (2) of Schedule 11 of the Value Added Tax Act 1994</p>	£2,500 Penalty Order
27 January 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person did not produce tender and/or construction drawings and/or documents with due skill and care;</p> <p>(2) The Registered Person did not:</p> <p>(a) Adequately inspect the works from January 2023 onwards;</p> <p>(b) Produce adequate pricing and/or cost documents for the building contracts;</p> <p>(c) Adequately certify the works</p>	Not guilty
27 January - 5 February 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) In respect of Project A:</p> <p>(a) The RP did not provide adequate written terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architects Code;</p> <p>(b) The RP did not complete work without undue delay and/or keep the client updated on progress, contrary to Standard 6.2 and/or 6.3 of the Architects Code;</p> <p>(c) The RP did not act competently and/or with due skill and care in relation to the planning application and/or site drainage;</p> <p>(d) The RP did not safeguard and manage client money appropriately in that they:</p> <p>i. did not pay the planning application fee despite</p>	Erasure

*Not all factual charges were found in every case

	<p>receiving funds from the client to do so; ii. asked the client to deposit money and/or received money into a personal bank account and/or in cash; (e) The RP's actions at 1(d) above lacked integrity; (f) The RP did not notify his Professional Indemnity Insurers that he had received a claim.</p> <p>(2) In respect of Project B: (a) The RP did not provide adequate written terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architects Code; (b) The RP did not complete work without undue delay; (c) The RP did not safeguard and manage client money adequately in that he: i. asked the client to deposit money into a personal bank account and/or pay in cash; ii. did not refund the planning application fee; iii. did not keep planning application fee in a designated interest-bearing bank account called "client money" separate from any personal or business account</p>	
17 February 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) In respect of Project A: (a) The RRP failed to act without undue delay, contrary to Standard 6.2 of the Architects Code; (b) The RP failed to keep his client adequately informed of the progress of the project, contrary to Standard 6.3 of the Architects Code.</p> <p>(2) In respect of Project B: (a) The Registered Person failed to act competently and/or with skill and care in that he: i. did not maintain and/or apply adequate knowledge of local planning requirements; and/or ii. did not address the reasons for refusal of the original planning application in revised drawings. (b) The RP failed to act without undue delay, contrary to Standard 6.2 of the Architects Code; (c) The RP failed to keep his client adequately informed of the progress of the project, contrary to Standard 6.3 of the Architects Code; (d) The RP failed to provide adequate technical and administrative resources in relation to the work on the Referrer's project.</p>	£2,000 Penalty Order (Consent Order)
26 February 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP did not advise the client on statutory obligations under the Party Wall Act;</p>	£2,000 Penalty Order (Consent Order)

	<p>(2) The RP did not act with due skill and care in that he did not ensure that the prestart planning conditions were discharged prior to work commencing on site;</p> <p>(3) The RP did not adequately advise the client in relation to Building Regulations;</p> <p>(4) The RP did not adequately communicate with their client and/or the project manager appointed by the client after a site meeting on 13 April 2023;</p> <p>(5) The RP did not adequately and/or appropriately carry out his duties as contract administrator in that he:</p> <p>(i) Did not carry out adequate inspections;</p> <p>(ii) Did not appropriately certify the works</p>	
07 April 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person failed to carry out adequate inspections prior to the issuing of the Professional Consultants Certificate (“PCC”);</p> <p>(2) The Registered Person failed to provide the client with a copy of their written complaints procedure; and</p> <p>(3) The Registered Person failed to adequately communicate with the Referrer and or respond to a complaint, contrary to Standard 10.2 of the Architect’s Code (“the Code”).</p>	£1,000 Penalty Order (Consent Order)
10 April 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP did not adequately supervise non-registered/junior members of staff;</p> <p>(2) The RP did not provide a design in line with the client’s requirements and/or relevant technical standards.</p>	£1,000 Penalty Order (Consent Order)
11 April 2025	<p>Criminal Conviction:</p> <p>(1) At Dundee Sheriff Court on 30 April 2024, the Registered Person was convicted of two criminal offences, other than an offence which has no material relevance to his fitness to practice as an architect, being:</p> <p>(a) on 20 November 2022 at Dundee you did behave in a threatening or abusive manner which was likely to cause a reasonable person to suffer fear or alarm in that you did act in an aggressive mariner towards your then 14 year old son, [Child A], born [Redacted date] care of Police Service of Scotland, pursue him with a meat cleaver or similar implement, chase him up the stairs, repeatedly punch and kick on a door and shout and</p>	Erasure (Consent Order)

	<p>scream; CONTRARY to Section 38(1) of the Criminal Justice and Licensing (Scotland) Act 2010; and</p> <p>(b) on 20 November 2022 at Dundee you did assault [Person B], your wife, c/o the Police Service of Scotland, and did repeatedly push her on the body causing her to fall to the floor to her severe injury and it will be proved in terms of section 1 of the Abusive Behaviour and Sexual Harm (Scotland) Act 2016 that the aforesaid offence was aggravated by involving abuse of your partner or ex-partner</p>	
<p>24 - 28 March 2025 & 16 April 2025</p>	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) In respect of Project A, the RP failed to act without undue delay contrary to Standard 6.2 of the Architects Code in that he:</p> <p>(a) Failed to submit the planning application for Project A in a timely manner; and/or</p> <p>(b) Did not take adequate steps to ascertain the status and/or progress of the planning application for Project A; and/or</p> <p>(c) Did not keep Referrer 1 adequately informed about the status and/or progress of the planning application for Project A.</p> <p>(2) In respect of Project B, the RP:</p> <p>(a) Did not provide adequate terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architects Code;</p> <p>(b) Failed to act without undue delay contrary to Standard 6.2 of the Architects Code in that he:</p> <p>(i) Failed to submit the planning application for Project B in a timely manner; and/or</p> <p>(ii) Did not take adequate steps to ascertain the status and/or progress of the planning application for Project B; and/or</p> <p>(iii) Did not keep Referrer 2 adequately informed about the status and/or progress of the planning application for Project B.</p>	<p>£2,500 Penalty Order</p>
<p>23 - 25 April 2025</p>	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP did not maintain adequate and appropriate Professional Indemnity Insurance cover (PII), contrary to Standard 8.1 of the Architects Code;</p> <p>(2) The RP did not inform clients that he did not hold adequate and appropriate PII cover;</p> <p>(3) The Registered Person's actions at 1 and/or 2:</p> <p>(a) Lacked integrity; and/or</p> <p>(b) Were dishonest.</p>	<p>6 month Suspension</p>

02 May 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP did not maintain adequate and appropriate Professional Indemnity Insurance cover, contrary to Standard 8.1 of the Architects Code.</p>	£1,000 Penalty Order (Consent Order)
23 - 24 June 2025	<p>Conviction:</p> <p>(1) On 1 July 2024, the Registered Person was convicted, following a trial, at Chelmsford Magistrates Court of the following offence: On 2 May 2023 at Harlow in the County of Essex, assaulted [Person A], thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861</p>	Erasure
16 - 27 June 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP failed to run an adequate tender in that they failed to provide an adequate design at the tender stage. (2) The RP failed to adequately carry out their duties as contract administrator in that: (a) they did not conduct adequate inspections before certifying the works and/or over-certified the works; (b) they failed to issue or adequately record Architect's Instructions in accordance with the contract administrator's duties to reflect the works certified in interim payment certificates; (c) they failed to adequately notify that the Contractor was in culpable delay and/or failed to issue adequate notification of an extension of time.</p>	Reprimand
3 - 11 July 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP failed to adequately communicate with the client in relation to a planning application. (2) The RP failed to complete a service for which he had received upfront payment. (3) The RP did not act appropriately following the termination of his engagement by making demands for payment from the Referrer which were excessive. (4) The RP's actions at particulars 1 and/or 2: (a) were misleading; and/or (b) lacked integrity; and/or (c) were dishonest. (5) The RP's actions at particular 3:</p>	9 month Suspension

	(a) lacked integrity; and/or (b) were dishonest.	
12 – 19 May, 1 – 2 July, 15 July and 17 July 2025	UPC: (1) The RP did not provide adequate terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architect’s Code; (2) The RP: (a) Did not act without undue delay; and/or (b) Did not provide adequate advice regarding project timescales; (3) The RP did not adequately communicate with the client; (4) The RP did not act appropriately and/or impartially in respect of: (a) The appointment of a builder; and/or (b) The preparation of the building contract; and/or (c) The appointment of a Structural Engineer; (5) The RP: (a) Did not provide adequate tender documentation; and/or (b) Did not provide adequate advice in respect of tender documentation; (6) The Registered Person’s acts at particular 4 lacked integrity.	£2,000 Penalty Order
25 July 2025	UPC: (1) The RP did not provide any and/or adequate terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architects Code; (2) The RP did not maintain adequate and appropriate Professional Indemnity Insurance cover, contrary to Standard 8.1 of the Architects Code.	£1,500 Penalty Order (Consent Order)
21-25, 28 and 31 July 2025	UPC: (1) The RP did not keep his knowledge of local authority guidance and policy up to date; (2) The RP did not provide his client with adequate advice in relation to a planning application; (3) On 17 November 2023 the RP provided documentation to the Architects Registration Board	24 month Suspension

	<p>(ARB) in respect of a planning application made in around October 2021 and that documentation contained information that was not provided to the local authority at the time that the application was originally made in around October 2021;</p> <p>(4) On 17 November 2023 the RP provided documentation to the ARB in respect of a pre application made in around February 2022 and that documentation contained information that was not provided to the local authority at the time that the application was originally made in February 2022;</p> <p>(5) On or around 4 January 2024 the RP contacted EPC, a roofing company, and he suggested to them that he was working at the Referrer’s property when that was no longer the case;</p> <p>(6) The RP's actions at allegation 3 and/or 4 and 5: (a) were misleading and or; (b) lacked integrity and or; (c) were dishonest.</p>	
18 - 19 August 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">Conviction:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person has been convicted of a criminal offence other than an offence which has no material relevance to his fitness to practise as an architect, in that he was convicted on 20 November 2023 of the offences of:</p> <p>a. “On 5 November 2022 at Macclesfield without lawful excuse, destroyed a Toyota Prius to the value of £22,240 belonging to [person] intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged. Contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.”</p> <p>b. “On 5 November 2022 at Macclesfield without lawful excuse, damaged a fence to the value of £1,300 belonging to (person) intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged. Contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.”</p> <p>c. “On 5 November 2022 at Macclesfield with intent to cause [person] harassment, alarm or distress use threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour or disorderly behaviour thereby causing that or another person harassment, alarm or distress and the offence was racially aggravated within the terms of Section 28 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.</p>	Erasure

	d. "On 5 November 2022 at Macclesfield assaulted [person], and the offence was racially aggravated within the terms of section 28 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998."	
26 - 27 August 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">Conviction:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person has been convicted of criminal offences other than offences which have no material relevance to his fitness to practise as an architect, in that he was convicted on:</p> <p>(a) 27 March 2023 of the offence of: 'On 29/08/2022 at Daresbury drove a mechanically propelled vehicle, namely an Audi [Reg No.] on a public place, namely the car park of Creamfield music festival, without due care and attention'</p> <p>(b) 27 March 2023 of the offence of: 'On 29/08/2022 at Daresbury drove a motor vehicle, namely an Audi [Reg No.] on a public place, namely the car park of Creamfields music festival, when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely Benzoylcgonine, in your blood, namely greater than 200ug/L, exceeded the specified limit'</p> <p>(c) 27 March 2023 of the offence of: 'On 29/08/2022 at Daresbury drove a motor vehicle, namely an Audi [Reg No.] on a public place, namely the car park of Creamfields music festival, when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, in your blood, namely not less than 2.2ug/L, exceeded the specified limit'</p> <p>(d) 27 March 2023 of the offence of: 'On 29/08/2022 at Daresbury had in your possession a quantity of cocaine a controlled drug of Class A in contravention of Section 5 (1) of the Misuses of Drugs Act 1971'</p> <p>(e) 27 March 2023 of the offence of: 'On 29/08/2022 at Daresbury had in your possession a quantity of Ketamine, a controlled drug of class B in contravention of section 5 (1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971'</p> <p>(f) 25 February 2024 of the offence of: 'On 25/02/2024 at Tiptree in the County of Essex drove a motor vehicle namely Toyota (Japan) MR2 [Reg No.] on a road namely Chapel Road while disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence'</p>	4 month Suspension
8 - 12 September 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP acted as an Office Mentor and/or RIBA Examination Supervisor for Person A during her Part Three RIBA Course and in that role he:</p>	Erasure

	<p>(a) Did not appropriately manage a conflict of interest in that he continued to act in his role after he then began a romantic and/or personal relationship with Person A and/or did not inform RIBA of the relationship;</p> <p>(b) Drafted and/or amended Person A's Case Study prior to its submission to RIBA;</p> <p>(c) Opened the Part Three examination paper in advance of the examination taking place;</p> <p>(d) Provided Person A with the examination questions in advance of the examination;</p> <p>(e) Advised Person A to review the questions and study them in advance of the examination;</p> <p>(f) Provided Person A with model answers to the examination questions;</p> <p>(g) Signed a declaration confirming that the examination had been conducted in accordance with RIBA examination conditions and that there had been no collusion, when that was not the case</p> <p>(2) The Registered Person assisted Person A in obtaining the award of an uplift payment to be awarded to her on a project, which had not been disclosed and/or agreed with the client;</p> <p>(3) The Registered Person's actions at particulars 1a and/or 1b and/or 1c and/or 1d and/or 1e and/or 1f and/or 1g and/or 2</p> <p>(a) Lacked integrity; and/or</p> <p>(b) Were dishonest.</p>	
22 - 26 September 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP did not appropriately manage his own self-interest in that he made misrepresentations about matters relating to the works at his property and their impact on the neighbouring property;</p> <p>(2) The RP did not communicate in a professional manner;</p> <p>(3) The RP did not inform ARB of his Public Reprimand issued by the Royal Institute of British Architects on 12 September 2022 within 28 days of the finding;</p> <p>(4) The RP's acts at particulars 1 and 3 lacked integrity.</p>	Reprimand
17 & 21 October 2025	<p>UPC:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person did not provide adequate terms of engagement, contrary to Standard 4.4 of the Architects Code.</p>	Reprimand (Consent Order)

17 November 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person failed to maintain adequate and appropriate professional indemnity insurance cover, contrary to Standard 8.1 of the Architects Code;</p> <p>(2) The Registered Person's actions at 1 lacked integrity.</p>	6 month Suspension (Consent Order)
18 November 2025	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) The Registered Person failed to provide an appropriate response to the Referrer's complaint, contrary to standard 10.2 of the Architects Code.</p>	Reprimand
8 - 9 December	<p style="text-align: center;">UPC:</p> <p>(1) The RP failed to act competently and/or with due skill and care in that they did not observe the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 in their design.</p>	Not guilty