

Like many others, I am astonished by the allegation that some solar farm NSIP applicants have been flagrantly misleading the Planning Inspectorate. These applicants purport to be *bona fide* solar farm constructors, but it subsequently emerges that their intention was solely to obtain planning permission (DCO) for a quick sale.

PVDP appears straightforward (*All construction will be undertaken by the Applicant and its appointed contractors* in APP-019, for example), but I am becoming sceptical in light of some comments that have been made during this examination.

The dangers of misleading the Inspectorate should be obvious. If an applicant does not intend to take its project through to completion, it is most unlikely that it has gone to the effort of scoping the design adequately, and the performance claims will be wildly exaggerated in order to impress the examiners. The ultimate investors (pension funds, for example) take the Inspectorate's approval as endorsement of the proposal, with possibly catastrophic consequences for the investors, our environment and the electricity network.

This was never the government's intention for Net Zero NSIP procurement.

Mr Field (REP4-047) is not entirely correct when he says there is no regulatory protection. The legal teams of the applicants are subject to the Codes of Conduct of the Solicitors Regulation Authority. Code 1.4 requires:

*You do not mislead or attempt to mislead your clients, the court or others, either by your own acts or omissions or allowing or being complicit in the acts or omissions of others (including your client).*

If the Planning Inspectorate suspects that it may have been wilfully misled by some applicants, it should bring this to the attention of the SRA:

*We need others to alert us when things go wrong which may be the result of a breach of our rules by a solicitor or firm that we regulate. The public, clients and judiciary all play an important role and we provide resources to help them to make a report.*

Contact details are on the Solicitors Regulation Authority website. It is up to the SRA to make a determination as to whether there has been a breach that warrants further investigation.