

From: 'Gordon, Warren' via Tenant Connectivity Consultation

<tenantconnectivity@culture.gov.uk>

Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2018 at 15:27

Subject: CMS's response to DCMS consultation on ensuring tenants' access to gigabit-capable connections

To: tenantconnectivity@culture.gov.uk <tenantconnectivity@culture.gov.uk>

Cc: Hill, Rosalind <[REDACTED]> Garner, Martin <[REDACTED]> ,

Wood, Robert <[REDACTED]> , Drummond-Brassington, Danielle <

[REDACTED]> , Moore, Sarah <[REDACTED]>

Please see below the response of CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport's Consultation on Ensuring Tenants' Access to gigabit-capable connections. Please acknowledge receipt of this response.

1. Would the placing of an obligation on landlords in the manner proposed encourage more landlords to respond to requests sent by operators?

It is not so much the obligation to facilitate an operator's access that will encourage landlords to respond to the operator's requests. Landlords are more likely to respond because of concerns about the consequences of a failure to comply with the obligation and the possibility of an operator obtaining a warrant of entry from the magistrates' court.

It should be said that the majority of our property owner clients already seek to be responsive to operators' requests, because they want to ensure that their tenants' needs are met in relation to the business critical matter of having suitable connectivity. Property owners will often proactively interact with operators to ensure that their properties have state of the art communications infrastructure to make the properties more attractive to potential tenants.

There may be legitimate reasons why it may be difficult for a landlord to respond promptly to an operator's request. The operator may be unable to contact the landlord. Their contact details may have changed, or the landlord may be based overseas and the operator does not know who acts for the landlord in relation to the property. So the landlord will be unable to respond to the request, because they will be unaware of it. The operator's request must be clear and complete to enable the landlord to respond.

The obligation of itself will not necessarily encourage a landlord's response to an operator's request. It is more likely to be the concern about the consequences of a failure to comply.

2. To what extent would placing an obligation on landlords complement or undermine the facilitation within the Electronic Communications Code of negotiated agreements between landlords and operators?

Generally speaking, landlords (certainly our clients) seek to work with operators to install digital infrastructure in their properties, whether for an entire building or to serve particular tenants. The consensual approach involving the landlord and operator negotiating an agreement is the one invariably used, especially in relation to the installation of fixed line infrastructure in properties. It is worth bearing in mind that the Electronic Communications Code (Code) does not even come into play if there is no written agreement between the occupier (property owner) and operator. While operators could use the Code to apply to a court or tribunal to impose a Code agreement on an occupier, this is rarely done in the case of fixed line infrastructure. So in the context of fixed line installations, it is debateable whether the Code facilitates negotiated agreements between landlords and operators. It is more likely that there will be a commercial motivation for both the occupier and operator to sign up to an agreement. Efforts have been made in the industry to streamline the

negotiation process through the production of industry standard wayleaves, which are broadly acceptable to property owners and operators and, therefore, require little negotiation.

The obligation to respond to an operator's request may complement a negotiated agreement if the owner, without the obligation, desires to enter into such an agreement. However, the owner may be irritated by being compelled to facilitate the deployment of digital infrastructure in its property. A compulsion to respond may actually dissuade an owner from dealing with a particular operator.

So for our clients the wayleaves are usually agreed because there is a commercial motivation to do so. Obliging landlords to do so is unlikely to promote harmonious relationships between the parties, because the sense of compulsion undermines the concept that an agreement is negotiated.

3. Do you consider that the use of the courts for the purpose of granting entry to operators where they have been unable to contact a landlord is reasonable? If not, why not?

We agree that it is important for properties to benefit from state of the art infrastructure such as full fibre, gigabit-capable connections and many landlords will want to ensure high quality apparatus is installed to make their properties attractive to prospective tenants. However, we are concerned about the means by which the equipment would be installed. We consider that obtaining entry to a landlord's property via a warrant of entry is an interference with the landlord's property rights. The magistrates' court (or the Sheriff Court in Scotland) would decide the application for the warrant based on the operator's evidence alone and the landlord may have no opportunity to present evidence as to why it would be inappropriate for a warrant to be granted.

We have highlighted earlier that there may be legitimate reasons why a landlord is either not contactable at all or within the 2 months envisaged by the Consultation. To be able to force entry onto the landlord's property via a warrant can be seen as an interference with the rights of a landlord who has no opportunity to object. No account is taken of for example insurers of the property who may invalidate cover for the property if entry is obtained using the warrant. No account is taken of other tenants or occupiers at the property who may be disrupted by the operator's entry to install. And yet as stated no opportunity is provided for the landlord to object, who may be unaware of the request.

The legislation must provide greater safeguards for the landlord before such a warrant can be granted by the court. They are dealt with in the following questions but in addition the operator should be responsible for any damage and disruption caused by its entry. The operator should also ensure that they maintain security at the property at all times.

It may also be the case that a landlord may not want to deal with a particular operator and, therefore, refuses to respond to that operator. Why should a landlord be compelled to accept the equipment of a particular operator with whom it does not want to deal but where it would be quite happy to deal with another operator? Of course if a Code agreement is in place, there are statutory rights to share the apparatus.

Linked to that is if there is ongoing discussion with an operator over a proposed agreement, or if a landlord cannot come to an agreement with an operator during the course of negotiations, or if a landlord has sent a holding response because the details of the operator's request are being considered, then landlords may well consider that a magistrates' court warrant should not be available. Operators can utilise Part 4 of the Code.

4. Do you agree that two months is an appropriate amount of time to pass before a landlord is considered absent and an operator can seek entry via the courts? If not, what how much time would be appropriate?

While we have stressed our concerns about the grant of access to the property to carry out works without the landlord's consent, the time period of two months does not seem unreasonable in which to seek to establish contact with the landlord.

5. What evidence should an operator be reasonably expected to provide to the courts of their need to enter a property and their inability to contact a landlord?

There should be stringent and precise requirements as to what evidence needs to be provided by the operator in view of the interference with the landlord's property rights. Evidence needs to be provided of the number and modes of attempts to contact the landlord. Did the operator seek to liaise with the tenant making the request as to the contact details that the tenant has for the landlord? Evidence needs to be provided of why the request for entry is so urgent that a magistrates' court warrant is required. If there is existing contact with the landlord but agreement cannot be reached (for example, because of dispute over the terms of the agreement, or because the landlord does not want to allow the particular operator into its property), then the court should not grant a warrant in those circumstances. In the warrant, the court should be able to set down the basis for the access arrangements. Perhaps reference could be made to the standard OFCOM access arrangements. See the references to access arrangements in OFCOM's Electronic Communications Code's Code of Practice (for example, in paragraphs 1.33-1.41 and Schedules A and B) https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0025/108790/ECC-Code-of-Practice.pdf

6. Is there a need to define what constitutes a request by a tenant for a communications service?

This needs to be carefully prescribed to avoid any misunderstandings. First, to whom is the request made? To the operator? Or the landlord? There should be a requirement for the request to be in writing and receipt acknowledged by the recipient. Should the request be limited to an installation or other works involving a full fibre gigabit-capable connection, since this is the reason behind the Consultation?

7. Do you agree the temporary access granted by the court should be valid until such a time as a negotiated agreement, underpinned by the Code, is signed between an operator and landlord?

The Consultation provides that the warrant of entry is not intended to be an alternative to a formal access agreement and efforts should continue to engage with landlords to achieve a formal agreement. The Consultation's view is that the Code's underpinning of the formal agreement should provide an incentive for landlords to engage. However, negotiations over such an agreement are likely to be impacted by the fact that the apparatus is already in situ. It is not a level playing field for a negotiation because the operator has already got what it wants.

It is not entirely clear whether the installation of infrastructure or upgrading pursuant to the warrant attracts the protection of the Code. It appears that it does not. Therefore, what ability does the landlord have to remove the apparatus (assuming the Code does not apply) if the formal agreement is not completed within a prescribed period such as a year? We consider that the warrant should be time limited to incentivise both parties to try and seek agreement on a more long-term solution.

Also if the operator obtains a warrant permitting access and that temporary arrangement remains in place until a formal arrangement is negotiated, there appears to be no ability for the landlord to oppose the equipment being placed (for example as it is proposing to redevelop) – perhaps the temporary arrangement should be akin to an interim right under paragraph 26 of the Code.

8. Would temporary access granted by the court provide an incentive for landlords to re-engage?

See our answer to question 7. It is worth noting that while the Code grants rights to the landlord, it does not grant automatic rights to remove, just to request removal and then the relevant parts of the Code play out. Entering into a Code agreement in fact could prove quite burdensome on the landlord with for example the lengthy and restrictive termination process.


9. Do you foresee any issues with operator/landlord negotiations which take place after the installation has taken place?

See our answer to question 7. The Consultation states that negotiations which take place following the re-engagement of the landlord will be conducted in the context of provisions within the Code, including the ability to seek resolution via the Tribunal. If the Code does not apply to the warrant and no Code agreement has been entered into, how can the Code have an influence on the negotiations unless Part 4 is applied?

We assume that the warrant does not have Code protection, but the legislation should make this clear.

Warren Gordon
Senior Professional Support Lawyer

T
F
E



CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP | Cannon Place, 78 Cannon Street | London EC4N 6AF | United Kingdom

cms.law
cms-lawnow.com

CMS has 73 offices around the world, located in Aberdeen, Algiers, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Barcelona, Beijing, Belgrade, Berlin, Bogota, Bratislava, Bristol, Brussels, Bucharest, Budapest, Casablanca, Cologne, Dubai, Dusseldorf, Edinburgh, Frankfurt, Funchal, Geneva, Glasgow, Hamburg, Hong Kong, Istanbul, Kyiv, Leipzig, Lima, Lisbon, Ljubljana, London, Luanda, Luxembourg, Lyon, Madrid, Manchester, Mexico City, Milan, Monaco, Moscow, Munich, Muscat, Paris, Podgorica, Poznan, Prague, Reading, Rio de Janeiro, Riyadh, Rome, Santiago de Chile, Sarajevo, Seville, Shanghai, Sheffield, Singapore, Skopje, Sofia, Strasbourg, Stuttgart, Tirana, Utrecht, Vienna, Warsaw, Zagreb and Zurich.

CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP is a member of CMS Legal Services EEIG (CMS EEIG), a European Economic Interest Grouping that coordinates an organisation of independent law firms. CMS EEIG provides no client services. Such services are solely provided by CMS EEIG's member firms in their respective jurisdictions. CMS EEIG and each of its member firms are separate and legally distinct entities, and no such entity has any authority to bind any other. CMS EEIG and each member firm are liable only for their own acts or omissions and not those of each other. The brand name "CMS" and the term "firm"

are used to refer to some or all of the member firms or their offices. Further information can be found at cms.law

CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registration number OC310335. It is a body corporate which uses the word "partner" to refer to a member, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of England and Wales with SRA number 423370 and by the Law Society of Scotland with registered number 47313. A list of members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, Cannon Place, 78 Cannon Street, London EC4N 6AF. Members are either solicitors or registered foreign lawyers. VAT registration number: 974 899 925. Further information about the firm can be found at cms.law

The contents of this e-mail (including any attachments) are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of its contents is strictly prohibited, and you should please notify the sender immediately and then delete it (including any attachments) from your system. Notice: the firm does not accept service by e-mail of court proceedings, other processes or formal notices of any kind without specific prior written agreement.

Information on how we use personal data and about how data subject rights can be exercised is available on our website [here](#). As a controller of personal data, we take great care over how we collect, use and protect that information. If you have any queries in relation to our processing of personal data you can contact us at privacy@cms-cmno.com.