

**IN THE MATTER OF the *Architects Act*, R.S.O.
1990, C. A.26 (the "Act")**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF Regulation 27,
R.R.O. 1990, under the Act (the "Regulation")**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF the *Statutory
Powers Procedure Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.22**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF a proceeding before
the Discipline Committee of the Ontario
Association of Architects pursuant to sections
34 and 35 of the Act to hear and determine
allegations of professional misconduct against
Ovidio Sbrissa, Architect, and **Ovidio Sbrissa
& The Architect's Workshop Inc.**, Holder**

J. William Birdsell, Member (Tribunal Chair)

Adam James Thom, Member

Michelle Longlade, Lieutenant Governor
Appointee

)

)

)

)

FRIDAY, THE 7th DAY OF

NOVEMBER, 2025

Grant Worden, Counsel to the Committee

Paul J. Davis, Counsel to the Association

REASONS FOR THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

1. The Discipline Committee of the Ontario Association of Architects (the “**Association**”) met on November 7, 2025, to hear and determine allegations of professional misconduct against Ovidio Sbrissa, an architect formerly licensed by the Association (the “**Architect**”), and Ovidio Sbrissa & The Architect’s, Workshop Inc. a former holder of a Certificate of Practice (the “**Holder**”). The Architect and Holder are collectively referred to as the “**Respondent.**”

BACKGROUND

2. In the Notice of Hearing dated April 24, 2025,¹ it was alleged that the Respondent committed the following acts of professional misconduct:
 - a. He engaged in an act or acts of professional misconduct as defined in s. 42(54) of the Regulation made under the Act, in that he engaged in conduct or an act relevant to the practice of architecture that, having regard to all of the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members of the Association as disgraceful, dishonourable, and/or unprofessional by failing to comply with the directions in the Decision and Reasons of the Complaints Committee of the Association dated June 8, 2023 (the “**Complaint Committee Allegation**”);
 - b. He engaged in an act or acts of professional misconduct as defined in ss. 42(9) and 47(2) of the Regulation in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession by failing to maintain chronological books, records, accounts, and files for each of their three most recent architectural projects (the “**Review and Audit Allegation**”); and
 - c. He engaged in an act or acts of professional misconduct as defined in ss. 42(1), 54(4), and 54(5) of the Regulation in that he contravened a provision of the Regulation by failing to complete and report continuing education hours as required by the Registrar for the 2022-2024 cycle (the “**Continuing Education Hours Allegation**”).

¹ Hearing exhibit 2.

3. For the reasons set out herein, we find the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct as alleged.

The Complaints Committee Decision and Written Caution

4. Part of the background leading to the issuance of the Notice of Hearing is the Reasons for Decision and Order of the Complaints Committee dated June 8, 2023, attached to these Reasons as **Appendix "A"**. The Complaints Committee also issued a Written Caution to the Respondent dated June 7, 2023, which is attached to these Reasons as **Appendix "B"**.
5. Briefly, in the matter before the Complaints Committee, the Committee appointed two investigators. The first was appointed to ascertain whether the Respondent was incompetent and/or had engaged in professional misconduct by:
 - a. affixing his seal or permitting his seal to be affixed to a design that he did not prepare in its entirety, and/or
 - b. otherwise using his seal improperly or aiding and abetting in the improper use of his seal, and/or
 - c. aiding and abetting an unlicensed person to hold out as engaging in the practice of architecture.
6. The second was appointed to ascertain whether the Respondent was incompetent and/or had engaged in professional misconduct by engaging in conduct or an act relevant to the practice of architecture that, having regard to all of the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members of the Association as disgraceful, dishonorable or unprofessional, most particularly using profane, sexual and/or offensive images, words, or gestures relevant to the practice of architecture between approximately March 2005 and May 2021.
7. The Complaints Committee concluded there was sufficient evidence to prove the allegations of incompetence and unprofessional conduct against the Respondent. However, rather than referring the matter to the Discipline Committee, the Complaints Committee directed the Respondent to:

- a. Attend no less than 10 hours of communication training or coaching with a consultant, at the Respondent's expense, within six months of the date of the decision (i.e., by December 8, 2023); and
- b. Cooperate with a review and audit of the Respondent's practice within 12 months of the date of the decision (i.e., by June 8, 2024).

Notification re Incomplete Continuing Education Hours

8. Separately, on July 12, 2024, the Association notified the Respondent that he had failed to complete the required continuing education hours for the 2022-2024 continuing education reporting cycle.
9. As described more fully below, the Respondent failed to comply with the Complaints Committee's direction and failed to complete the required continuing education hours. This non-compliance led the Registrar to issue the Notice of Hearing dated April 24, 2025.
10. Before addressing the evidence and submissions, it is necessary for the Committee to briefly discuss the notice provided to the Respondent in regard to the hearing, as well as his non-attendance and the consequences thereof.

NOTICE OF HEARING AND THE RESPONDENT'S NON-ATTENDANCE

11. On April 28, 2025, counsel for the Association, Paul Davis, sent a copy of the Notice of Hearing to the Respondent via email to the email address on record with the Association. At that time, the Notice provided that the hearing would occur on a date to be fixed by the Discipline Committee. On May 3, 2025, the Respondent replied to Mr. Davis by email, confirming receipt of the Notice of Hearing and providing what he described as "disclosure".² In his email, the Respondent stated the following:

I acknowledge having been served upon me the Notice of Hearing, containing the "arguable" allegations of "professional" misconduct that have been referred to the Discipline Committee even though a hearing date has not yet been fixed.

Unfortunately, I'm not in a financial state wherein I can retain legal counsel to assist me with this matter.

² Affidavit of Marian Pollux affirmed October 31, 2025 ("Pollux Affidavit"), hearing Exhibit 1, at paras. 19-20 and Exhibits K and L.

However, in preparation for that hearing I am attaching one of my recent theoretical writings which delves into the present state of the architectural condition and takes some heavy swipes at the Registrar. Consider it as: Disclosure: Doc. #1 2025-05-02.

12. Mr. Davis then contacted the Respondent four times by various means to deliver the Association's disclosure and to set a date for the hearing. Specifically:

- a. On May 9, 2025, Mr. Davis sent the Respondent the Association's disclosure by email to the email address on record with the Association and suggested that the parties discuss a hearing date once the Respondent had reviewed the disclosure.³
- b. On September 10, 2025, having received no response from the Respondent, Mr. Davis sent an email to the Respondent at the email address on record with the Association to address scheduling the Discipline Committee hearing. The Respondent did not respond.⁴
- c. On October 1, 2025, Mr. Davis sent a letter to the Respondent by email to the email address on file with the Association, and by courier⁵ to the address on file with the Association. The letter advised the Respondent that if he did not contact Mr. Davis by October 10, 2025, the Association would unilaterally select a hearing date for the Discipline Committee proceeding.⁶

13. On October 24, 2025, Mr. Davis sent a letter to the Respondent by email to the email address on file with the Association, and by regular mail and courier to the physical address on file with the Association. The letter advised that the Discipline Committee hearing had been scheduled for November 7, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. by videoconference, and that Mr. Davis would send the videoconference coordinates to the Respondent once they were available.⁷ The

³ Pollux Affidavit, para. 21 and Exhibit M.

⁴ Pollux Affidavit, para. 22 and Exhibit N.

⁵ Ms. Pollux explained that the letter was sent by courier rather than regular mail because of a postal strike.

⁶ Pollux Affidavit, para. 23 and Exhibit O.

⁷ The Discipline Committee notes that on October 28, 2025, and again on November 6, 2025, the virtual hearing facilitator, Arbitration Place, sent emails to the parties and to the Discipline Committee providing a Zoom link for the virtual hearing, and confirming the hearing date and start time. The Committee observes that both emails were both sent to the Respondent at the email address on record with the Association.

letter further advised that the Association would ask that the matter proceed in the Respondent's absence if he did not appear.⁸

14. As of the date of the hearing, the Respondent had not communicated with the Association or with legal counsel since May 6, 2025. However, Ms. Pollux noted that the Respondent continues to have an active website.⁹
15. The first order of business was for the Committee to determine whether the hearing should proceed in the absence of the Respondent. Counsel to the Association made submissions that the hearing should proceed, on the grounds that the Respondent had been duly notified of the hearing, he had corresponded with counsel to the Association in relation to the hearing, he had been apprised of the consequence of non-attendance, and he had not offered any notice of or rationale for his non-attendance. Counsel for the Association also provided several precedent decisions of the Discipline Committee where the Committee had proceeded in the absence of a respondent in similar circumstances.¹⁰
16. The Discipline Committee decided to proceed with the hearing, substantially for the reasons expressed by Counsel for the Association summarized in paragraph 15 above.

EVIDENCE AND SUBMISSIONS

17. Counsel for the Association submitted two affidavits: (1) the Affidavit of Sarah Marceau affirmed October 31, 2025 ("**Marceau Affidavit**");¹¹ and (2) the Pollux Affidavit.
18. Ms. Marceau is an independent professional frequently retained by professional regulators in respect of investigations and proceedings involving their members. In August 2024, she was appointed by the Registrar of the Association in relation to the Complaint Committee Allegation and the Review and Audit Allegation.¹² In her affidavit, Ms. Marceau describes the decision of the Complaints Committee dated June 8, 2023, and the requirements the decision

⁸ Pollux Affidavit, para. 24 and Exhibit P.

⁹ Pollux Affidavit, para. 25.

¹⁰ *In the matter of a proceeding before the Discipline Committee of the Ontario Association of Architects pursuant to Sections 34 and 35 of The Architects Act to hear and determine allegations of professional misconduct against Craig D. Jones*, dated August 21, 2000; *In the matter of a proceeding before the Discipline Committee of the Ontario Association of Architects pursuant to Sections 34 and 35 of the Architects Act, to hear and determine allegations of professional misconduct against Gary R. Stunden, Architect, and Gary R. Stunden Architect & Associates Incorporated.*, dated February 4, 2005.

¹¹ Hearing exhibit 3.

¹² Marceau Affidavit, paras. 1 and 18.

imposed on the Respondent. The Marceau Affidavit also describes the Association's various attempts to have the Respondent comply with those requirements, and his continued non-compliance.

19. Ms. Pollux is a Regulatory Clerk at the Association. In October 2024, she was appointed by the Registrar as an investigator in relation to the Continuing Education Hours Allegation.¹³ In her affidavit, Ms. Pollux explains the Respondent's failure to complete the requirements for the 2022-2024 continuing education reporting cycle, and the Association's various attempts to have the Respondent comply with those requirements and his continued non-compliance. The Pollux Affidavit also describes the numerous ways in which Association provided the Respondent with notice of the Discipline Committee hearing.
20. Despite having received notice of the hearing, as described above, the Respondent did not attend the hearing and provided no evidence beyond the "disclosure" he sent to the Association in advance of the hearing which was included in the Pollux Affidavit.

The Complaint Committee and Review and Audit Allegations

21. On June 8, 2023, the Complaint Committee Decision and Reasons and Written Caution were sent to the Respondent by email. On June 9, 2023, the Respondent responded to say that "*...I cannot accept 'the Caution' with its concomitant Undertakings.*"¹⁴
22. The Respondent did not complete communication training or coaching by December 8, 2023, as required by the Complaints Committee's Decision and Reasons. On January 9, 2024, the Association sent the Respondent a letter requesting that he provide records for the review and audit of his practice by January 29, 2024, and requesting that he outline the steps he had taken to complete the communication training or coaching directed by the Complaints Committee. After several unsuccessful attempts, Association staff finally spoke with the Respondent by telephone on January 31, 2024. He advised them he would respond to the Deputy Registrar's January 9th letter by February 7, 2024. When Association staff and the Respondent spoke again by telephone on February 13, 2024, the Respondent provided a

¹³ Pollux Affidavit, paras. 1 and 11.

¹⁴ Marceau Affidavit, paras. 5-6 and Exhibit D.

lengthy oral response to the January 9th letter, which Association staff requested that he put in writing. He failed to do so.¹⁵

23. On April 2, 2024, the Association sent the Respondent a letter from the Registrar which reviewed the requirements of the Complaints Committee Decision and the Respondent's failure to comply. The Registrar advised the Respondent she would appoint an investigator if the Respondent failed to advise by April 9, 2024, what steps he had taken to comply with the Complaints Committee Decision. On April 4, 2024, the Respondent replied to the Association. With respect to the requirement that he provide records relating to his three most recent architectural projects, the Respondent advised that "*none are to be had.*" With respect to the communications training or coach he advised as follows:

I cannot afford either the time nor the expense for such coaching...however, being that I have had an extraordinarily wonderful life which allowed me to befriend some of the most beautiful and talented women in this world, work along side of them in architecture and interior décor, alongside, in my studios; teaching and working and writing together; or in collaboration throughout the world on things that matter to poetry, rhetoric, higher education, the human understanding of ways of African, Asiatic, Eastern/Oriental, nuances ... my ultimate reaching-out must be: that with my two sisters, brother, and the incredible influence of my wife's personality.¹⁶

24. The Association appointed Ms. Marceau to act as an investigator under section 38(1) of the Act and asked the Respondent to provide any further submissions in respect of the investigation by September 10, 2024, but none were received. The investigator delivered her report on September 12, 2024, by which date the Respondent had not obtained communications training or coaching or submitted records for the practice review and audit directed by the Complaints Committee. This remained the case as of October 30, 2025, when the Marceau Affidavit was affirmed.¹⁷

¹⁵ Marceau Affidavit, paras. 8-12 and Exhibits F and H.

¹⁶ Marceau Affidavit, paras. 13-14 and Exhibits J and L.

¹⁷ Marceau Affidavit, paras. 18-21 and Exhibits M and N.

The Continuing Education Hours Allegation

25. On July 2, 2024, the Association send a notice to the Respondent advising that he failed to complete the continuing education hours requirement for 2022-2024 and that a \$750 late fee had been assessed. The Association then followed up by email on July 4, August 1, and 14, September 18 and October 1, 2024. In the August 14 email the Association advised the Respondent that his licence and/or certificate of practice would be cancelled unless he paid the outstanding late fee by October 14, 2024.¹⁸
26. Between October 1 and 4, 2024 the Respondent sent multiple emails and voicemail messages to Ms. Pollux. When they finally connected by telephone, the Respondent explained to Ms. Pollux in detail his views of the practice of architecture and why he did not need to complete continuing education hours. While the Respondent ultimately paid the outstanding fee, he did not report having completed structured education hours as required under the Regulation.¹⁹
27. The Association appointed Ms. Pollux to act as an investigator under section 38(1) of the *Act*. Ms. Pollux delivered her report on November 6, 2024, and as of that date, the Respondent had not reported structured continuing education hours required for the 2022-2024 cycle. This remained the case as of October 30, 2025, when Ms. Pollux affirmed her affidavit.²⁰

The Respondent's Licence and Certificate of Practice are Cancelled

28. In July 2025, Pro-Demnity, the professional liability insurer for members of the Association, advised the Association that the Respondent's insurance policy had expired on July 7, 2025, and had not been renewed. On July 18, 2025, the Registrar sent the Respondent a notice of default and intention to cancel the Respondent's licence and certificate of practice for failing to maintain professional liability insurance as required by section 28 of the *Act*. The Registrar cancelled the Respondent's licence and certificate of practice in August 2025, and as of October 30, 2025, the Respondent had not taken steps to have them reinstated.²¹

¹⁸ Pollux Affidavit, paras. 4-7, and Exhibits A to D.

¹⁹ Pollux Affidavit, paras. 8-10 and Exhibits F and G.

²⁰ Pollux Affidavit, paras. 11-13 and Exhibits H and I.

²¹ Pollux Affidavit, paras. 14-17.

Submissions

29. As regards the Complaint Committee Allegation and Review and Audit Allegation, Counsel to the Association submitted that the Respondent had committed acts of professional misconduct by failing to comply with the directions set out in the Complaint Committee Decision and Reasons. Among other things, Counsel to the Association noted that the Respondent's statement in response to the direction to produce records in relation to his three most recent projects that "*no such records exist*" is simply not credible. The suggestion that he has never performed architectural services is belied by the Complaints Committee hearing which specifically addressed services he had performed as well as his years of experience as a licensed architect.
30. As regards the Continuing Education Hours Allegation, Counsel to the Association submitted that the Respondent had committed acts of professional misconduct by failing to complete and report continuing education hours as required by the Registrar for the 2022-2024 cycle.

FINDINGS

31. The Committee finds that all three charges of professional conduct have been amply made out.
32. Specifically, the Committee finds that by failing to comply with the Decision and Order of the Complaints Committee, the Respondent engaged in an act or acts of professional misconduct:
- a. as defined in s. 42(54) of the Regulation by engaging in conduct or an act relevant to the practice of architecture that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members of the Association as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional; and
 - b. as defined in ss. 42(9) and 47(2) of the Regulation in that they failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession by failing to maintain chronological books, records, accounts, and files for each of their three most recent architectural projects.
33. The Committee also finds that by failing to complete and report continuing education hours as required by the Registrar for the 2022-2024 cycle, the Respondent engaged in an act or acts of professional misconduct as defined in ss. 42(1), 54(4), and 54(5) of the Regulation.

34. The Committee also finds that the various emails and letters sent by the Association to the Respondent to the email address and physical address on file with the Association as described in these Reasons constitute valid service pursuant to section 49(1)(b) and (d) of the *Act*.
35. The Committee is very troubled by the Respondent's blatant disregard of the *Act* and *Regulation* which govern the licensure and practice of architecture in Ontario, as well as the Complaints Committee and Association staff whose order and correspondence he repeatedly ignored. It is simply unacceptable for a licensed architect and holder of a certificate of practice to refuse to comply with a direction of the Complaints Committee and with continuing legal education requirements based on his mistaken belief that rules do not apply to him.

PENALTY

36. Counsel for the Association recommended that the Discipline Committee issue an order:
- a. Revoking the Respondent's licence and certificate of practice;
 - b. Requiring the Order and Reasons for Order to be published in the public register of the Association and an official publication of the Association, and on the website of the Association, *with* the name of the Respondent; and
 - c. Requiring the Respondent to pay the Association its costs of the November 7, 2025, hearing.
37. Counsel for the Association acknowledged that the Respondent's licence and certificate of practice have already been cancelled by the Registrar as a result of the Respondent failing to maintain professional indemnity insurance. However, Counsel for the Association submitted that a separate order of the Discipline Committee revoking the Respondent's licence and certificate of practice was necessary to ensure that any future application for reinstatement would be reviewed by the Discipline Committee. Otherwise, the Respondent could apply for administrative reinstatement by demonstrating to the Registrar that he had obtained professional liability insurance as required by the *Act*. Such a result would be insufficiently protective of the public, and insufficiently deterrent to the profession at large.

38. Counsel for the Association also submitted that an order of revocation was clearly appropriate. By refusing to comply with an order of the Complaints Committee, the Respondent threatened the integrity of the Committee which has no direct enforcement mechanism and proved himself to be ungovernable. Counsel for the Association cited a decision of the Discipline Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (“PEO”) which engaged similar considerations in support of this submission.²² At page 14 of its decision, the PEO Discipline Committee explained the rationale for granting an order of revocation in circumstances where a former member’s licence had already been surrendered through resignation:

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel is of the view that an outcome short of revocation would undermine public confidence in the regulation of the profession and fail to adequately provide for protection of the public and general deterrence to the profession at large. The Panel acknowledges that revocation is the most severe penalty the Panel may impose upon a member of the profession; however, it is of the view that it is entirely justified in light of the magnitude of the misconduct at issue in this case.

The Panel recognizes that the Member has already resigned from the profession and is not engaged in the practice of the profession; however, the Panel agrees with the submissions of the Association that revocation appropriately protects the public by ensuring that should the Member ever seek to return to practice, his licence application would have to be considered by the Discipline Committee in accordance with section 37(3) of the Act. This would enable the Discipline Committee to consider the full set of circumstances and appropriately weigh whether the Member poses an ongoing risk to the public. Under section 22(2) of the Act, such an application for reinstatement cannot be made until two years have passed after revocation of a licence.

39. Counsel for the Association noted that identical provisions exist under sections 42(1) and (3) of the Act.

²² Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (PEO) v Cugliari et al, 2020 ONAPE 15

40. With respect to the recommendation to publish the Order and Reasons for Order, Counsel for the Association noted that if the Respondent's licence is ordered revoked, section 34(5) of the *Act* requires publication of the order of revocation along with the member's name. Counsel for the Association also submitted that publication in the manner proposed would promote both general deterrence by sending a clear message that failing to comply with an order of the Complaints Committee carries consequences.
41. Finally, Counsel for the Association submitted that an award of costs was appropriate as the Discipline Committee hearing would not have been required had the Respondent complied with the order of the Complaints Committee. Counsel for the Association provided a Bill of Costs²³ showing that the Association's actual fees for the Discipline Committee hearing – not the Complaints Committee process – were \$9,799.10, and that a partial indemnity award of 60% of the actual fees would be \$5,948.07. Both amounts included fees, disbursements, and taxes (HST).
42. The Committee agrees with the submissions of Counsel for the Association that the Respondent's failure to comply with an order of the Complaints Committee, and his refusal to comply with the statutory requirement to complete continuing education hours annually are both very serious matters worthy of sanction. Through his conduct the Respondent has demonstrated that he cannot be trusted to practice in a manner sufficiently protective of the public or consistent with the standards of the Association.
43. Upon hearing the evidence submissions of the Association, the respondent having been duly served with the Notice of Hearing:
- a. THIS COMMITTEE FINDS the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct as defined in:
 - i. s. 42(54) of the Regulation;
 - ii. ss. 42(9) and 47(2) of the Regulation; and
 - iii. s. 42(1), 54(4), and 54(5) of the Regulation;

²³ Hearing Exhibit 4.

- b. THIS COMMITTEE ORDERS that the Architect's licence and the Holder's certificate of practice are hereby revoked as of the date of this order;
- c. THIS COMMITTEE ORDERS that this Decision and Order and the Reasons for Decision and Order shall be reflected in the public register of the Association and an official publication of the Association, and on the website of the Association, with the name of the Respondent; and
- d. THIS COMMITTEE ORDERS the Respondent to pay to the Association its costs of the hearing of November 7, 2025, assessed on a full indemnity scale in the amount of \$9,799.10 within 30 days of the date of this Order.

DATED AT TORONTO THIS 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER 2025.



J. William Birdsell, Member (Chair)



Adam James Thom, Member



Michelle Longlade, Lieutenant Governor
Appointee