



Consultation Response form for England and Wales ONLY

Consultation on Street Trading and Pedlary Laws – Compliance with the requirements of the European Services Directive

The Department may, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, make available, on public request, individual responses.

The closing date for this consultation is **15 February 2013**.

Name: **Laura Driscoll**

Organisation (if applicable): **Bracknell Forest Council**

Address: **Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD**

Please return completed forms to:

Name: Rachel Onikosi, Policy Manager

Postal address: Department of Business, Innovation and Skills
Consumer and Competition Policy Directorate,
1 Victoria Street, London,
SW1H 0ET

Tel: 020 7 215 5898

Email: stcompliance@bis.gsi.gov.uk

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents by selecting the appropriate interest group from the list below.



Local Government

Repeal of the Pedlars Acts:

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed repeal of the Pedlars Acts 1871 and 1881 UK-wide?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

There are currently many persons who abuse the system of pedlary and most of those persons operating within this area under a pedlar certificate are to all intents and purposes street traders who wish to avoid making an application for a street trading consent.

Question 1.1 If you are a police force:

(i) what is the approximate annual cost of administering the pedlar certification scheme?

(ii) what impacts would repeal of the Acts have in terms of cost, time and/ or other factors?

Comments:

N/A

Question 1.2: If you are a pedlar: what do you consider are the impacts of repeal, both in terms of costs, time and/ or other factors?

Comments

N/A

Question 1.3: Do you consider that repeal would have an impact on any other organisation, individual or group? If so, please provide details of that organisation etc and what you consider the impacts on them would be.

Comments

Not known.

Question 2: Do you agree with our proposed new definition of a pedlar for the purposes of the pedlar exemption from the “national” street trading regime in England and Wales?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please fully explain your reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with any element of the proposed definition.

Comments:

In particular, the requirement for a pedlar to keep on the move is key. The proposed size of the receptacle to carry goods seems rather large and we would not want these dimensions to increase. However, due to the difficulties we foresee in enforcing this, our preferred option would be for pedlary to be included within Sch 4 to the LG(MP)A to ensure the Council is able to effectively manage activities in the town centre and protect residents from nuisance and counterfeit goods.

Amendments to Schedule 4 to the LG(MP)A

Question 3: If you are a local authority, do you envisage that there might be circumstances in which you would be able to designate a street as a licence/ consent street in relation to established traders but not in relation to temporary traders?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 4: Do you agree that only one photo needs to be submitted with street trading applications which are made electronically?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

Photographs should be of passport quality to enable full identification of the individual.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposal to replace the mandatory refusal ground? If not, please explain why you do not think that the 1933 Act provides adequate protection and why the minimum age requirement of 17 needs to be retained. (see paragraph 1.32).

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

None

Question 5.1: If you are a local authority, can you indicate the approximate number of applications you would expect to be made from those under 17 years of age?

Comments:

None

Question 6: Would it be helpful for BIS to issue guidance on the circumstances in which the discretionary grounds in 3(6) (a), (d), (e) and (f) can be used? (see paragraphs 1.33 and 1.34 above).

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

None

Question 7: Do you think there are any circumstances in which the existing paragraph 3(6)(b) ground could be used compatibly with the Directive and, if so, please give reasons. (see paragraphs 1.36 - 1.37).

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 7.1: Do you consider that it is necessary to insert a new replacement “suitability” refusal ground into paragraph 3(6)? (see paragraph 1.38)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

There may be occasions on which a street may be deemed as unsuitable for traders due to, for example, ongoing street works, or a special or temporary event in the area.

Question 7.2: In relation to this new ground, can you tell us:

(i) In what circumstances you would use this ground and how often?

(ii) Whether this ground would produce costs on you as a local authority, or on you as a business and what these costs are likely to be?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

There may be occasions on which a street may be deemed as unsuitable for traders due to, for example, ongoing street works. It is not known how often this may occur. We are not aware of costs this would produce.

Question 7.3: Would it be helpful for BIS to issue guidance on the circumstances in which this replacement ground could be used?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

None

Question 8: Do you think there are any circumstances in which either of these grounds could be used compatibly with the Directive in relation to temporary traders? (see paragraphs 1.39 -1.42)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 8.1: Do you think it would be preferable to pursue our proposed approach of expressly preventing the grounds from being used in relation to temporary traders or to repeal the grounds completely?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

Proposed approach is preferable.

Question 8.2: Will local authorities continue to use these grounds in relation to established traders?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

This approach could be justified if there are other persons wishing to trade in the same areas on a greater number of days each week than the number for which the applicant wishes to trade.

Question 8.3: Do you foresee any difficulties with our proposals to limit the circumstances in which these grounds could be used in relation to established traders?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 9: Do you foresee any problem resulting from the proposed repeal of paragraph 3(8) of Schedule 4 to the LG(MP)A? (see paragraph 1.43)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 9.1: Do you agree with our assumption that those who may benefit from this provision are more likely to be UK nationals than nationals of other Member States?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

None

Question 10: Do you foresee any problems with our proposal to give local authorities flexibility to grant licences for longer than 12 months or indefinitely? (see paragraphs 1.44 – 1.47)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

If you are a local authority can you further tell us

Question 10.1: Whether lengthening the duration of licences would have a positive, negative or neutral impact on the ability of new street traders to obtain licences to trade in your licence streets?

Comments:

Neutral impact provided we retain a level of control in respect of authorisations to trade in the street.

Question 10.2:

(i) Whether you are likely to issue licences for more than a 12 month period of indefinitely?

(ii) If you are likely to issue licences for a defined period which is longer than 12 months, what period you are likely to choose?

Comments:

It is not known whether there will be demand for this, but this can be considered by the Council in due course

Question 11: Would it be helpful for BIS to issue guidance as to how the PSR may affect a local authority's ability to use some or all of the revocation grounds contained in paragraphs 5(1)(a) to (c) in relation to established traders/temporary traders? (see paragraphs 1.48 – 1.50)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

None

Question 11.1: Do you think there are circumstances in which the paragraph 5(1)(d) ground could be used compatibly with the Directive in relation to temporary traders?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 11.2:

(i) Do you think it would be preferable to pursue our proposed approach of expressly preventing that ground from being used in relation to temporary traders or to repeal the ground completely?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(ii) Will local authorities continue to use that ground in relation to established traders?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

This approach could be justified if there are other persons wishing to trade in the same areas on a greater number of days each week than the number for which the applicant wishes to trade.

Question 11.3: Do you foresee any difficulties with our proposals to limit the circumstances in which that ground can be used in relation to established traders?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 12: Do you foresee any problems with our proposals - To disapply regulation 19(5) of the PSR where a mandatory ground for refusal of the application exists; or

☐ Yes

☒ No

To leave it to local authorities to decide whether to put arrangements in place to disapply the regulation in other circumstances, or to specify what conditions will automatically attach to a licence which is deemed to have been granted under regulation 19(5)? Please give reasons for your views (see paragraphs 1.51 – 1.53)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

It is a matter for local authorities to determine whether there is an overriding reason in the public interest as to why an application may not be determined within a set period of time. Bracknell Forest Council do not deem it appropriate for tacit consent to apply in respect of street trading applications.

Question 13: Do you foresee any problems with our proposals to allow local authorities to relax the prohibition in paragraph 7(7) in its entirety where appropriate? (see paragraphs 1.54 -1.57)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 14: Do you foresee any problems with our proposals to amend paragraph 10(1)(d)? (See paragraph 1.59)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

None

Question 15: Please can local authorities tell us about any other local Acts regulating street trading which are not listed at Annex B of this document (or any Acts listed in Annex B which have in fact been repealed).

Comments:

Not applicable

Question 15.1: Please can local authorities tell us-

(i) whether having screened your local street trading Acts for compliance with the Directive, amendments /repeals need to be made to that legislation;

(ii) if such amendments/ repeals are needed whether you wish us to include them in our regulations.

Comments:

Not applicable

Question 16: Please can local authorities tell us-

(i) what consequential amendments are needed to the provisions listed in Annex C as a result of the repeal of the Pedlars Acts (and provide appropriately drafted provisions);

(ii) whether any consequential amendments are needed to other provisions of local Acts as a result of the repeal of the Pedlars Acts (and, if so, provide appropriately drafted provisions);

(iii) if any of the provisions listed in Annex C are no longer in force.

Comments:

Not applicable

Question 17: Can local authorities tell us-

(i) what consequential amendments are required to the provisions of local Acts listed above at paragraph 1.73 as a result of our proposed amendments to Schedule 4 to the LG(MP)A, and provide appropriately drafted provisions?

(ii) whether (and, if so, what) consequential amendments are required to any other provisions of local Acts as a result of our proposed amendments to Schedule 4 to the LG(MP)A (and again provide appropriately drafted provisions)?

Comments:

Not applicable

Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole? Please use this space for any general comments that you may have, comments on the layout of this consultation would also be welcomed.

Comments:

None

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply ☐

At BIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

☒ Yes

☐ No

