



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:

Organisation (if applicable):

Address:

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Business representative organisation/trade body
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central government

<input type="checkbox"/>	Charity or social enterprise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large business (over 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal representative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade union or staff association
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe)

Below we set out a variety of questions in relation to our draft set of regulations attached at Annex A of the consultation document

We would like all consultees to fully consider our proposals and **explain the reasons for your answers as fully as possible.**

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:

It is agreed that the authorisation scheme provided by the 1871 & 1881 Acts is inconsistent with the Requirements of the Services Directive, for the reasons stated.

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:

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

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

The extent and scope of any impact caused by repeal would largely be dependent upon the detail of any successor regime put in it's place. One potential impact if an effective replacement regime is implemented is that it could lead to better and more effective enforcement against some of those individuals who use the inherent weaknesses in the existing controls to flout the spirit of the laws on pedlary. An improvement of this sort could bring benefits to groups such as the existing street traders who have licensed pitches. It could also be of benefit to the hosts of the large sporting and leisure venues within the borough that attract pedlars and are often frustrated at the weaknesses within existing controls.

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:

There are positive and negative aspects to the proposed definition. The definition as in 1.15 through to 1.21 is supported. However the proposals in 1.22 & 1.23 are a real negative and will largely undermine potential improvements in this area. The “clarification” as regards a pedlar being able to conclude business when approached by customers as he is making the required move away from an area introduces a big loophole. Transposing these proposals to the situation we most encounter at a busy football stadium or concert venue it would be very difficult to enforce as the trader would constantly be able to claim this exemption. This element of the proposal does not meet the real world test and needs to be reconsidered.

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:

Question 4:

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

This is a common sense proposal and the receiving authority can easily reproduce the image as required.

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:

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:

It is our view that there is unlikely to be any significant number of applications forthcoming from those under 17 years of age

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:

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:

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:

We can envisage scenarios where such a suitability requirement would be useful in the general public interest, rather than to protect applicants competitors. As an example an application could be made for a “Head Shop” type stall selling legal highs or legally-sold drugs paraphernalia in close proximity to a school.

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:

A Local Authority using this ground could face legal costs defending a legal challenge to a decision to refuse.

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:

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:

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:

Preferable to repeal completely. Most LA's would not want to be in a position where they have denied established traders a chance to trade only for temporary traders to be able to trade legally.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

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:

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:

There is potential for established traders to feel aggrieved by and challenge these proposals as they may feel an entitlement to continue as they did before

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:

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:

No, providing that this is available as an option should it suit the local authority and the trader rather than an expectation or a requirement to move to extending licence duration periods.

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?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Comments:

It may have a negative impact on those traders with fledgling businesses who are not yet established enough to commit financially to a longer duration. It could have a positive impact on those well established traders who have the finance available to expand their existing operation to secure longer tenures on new stalls. The well established traders often own multiple pitches within families.

Question 10.2:

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

(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:

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:

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:

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:

11.2 (i) Get the questions framed so that they make sense.

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:

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 would be better on balance to invest local authorities with the flexibility to make local arrangements which are suited to local conditions. The overarching requirements to have to be able to justify these measures would ensure a level of consistency with the principles whilst retaining local flexibility.

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:

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments:

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 aware of any

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:

It is understood that a response addressing these issues in respect of the Greater Manchester Act has been submitted by the Association of Greater Manchester Licensing Managers Group.

--

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:

(See answer to Q 15)

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:

N/A

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:

No.

The response document suffers in places when presenting respondents with a yes/no tick box response yet lays out the question in an either/or format e.g. Q 11.2

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

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is also available on our website at www.bis.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
Tel: 020 7215 5000

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk, or call 020 7215 5000.

URN 12/605RF