

Thames Valley Police response to Street Trading and Pedlary Laws
Consultation

C.Insp. Jim Weems

Insp. Keith Stacey (Reading)

Inso. Lis Knight (Oxford City)

1. Yes – the proposals will streamline procedures and remove local variations on how street trading is interpreted. The legislation should be applied equitably across the country. (1.1.1) Negligible – applications are made at police stations or in writing to LPAs; PNC checks conducted locally by intelligence teams; presumption on authorisations if no criminal record; certificate signed and issued by local police leaders. Not aware of any central register. By way of example, Oxford City issue less than 50 Pedlar certificates annually. (1.1.2) Depends on who the authorising authority is and who enforces breaches. If it is the local authority, then we will save a small amount administration time. (1.2) N/A. (1.3). If enforced, may have an impact on town centre businesses.
2. In the main, the proposed definition is similar to current one. However, size of trolley seems too large, especially as these will be taken through streets in Town Centres. This would encourage pedlars to adopt larger display cabinets. The other proposals are good, especially the 10 minutes time scale and 50m stipulation.
3. N/A
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes (7.1) Yes (7.2) If the product being sold is unsuitable for the environment or location (i.e. adult products being sold outside a school). (7.3) Yes

8. No. (8.1) Go with the proposed approach (8.2) N/A (8.3) No.

9. Not for the police. (9.1) No view

10. No (10.1) N/A (10.2) N/A

11. (11.1), (11.2), (11.3) Yes, but more relevant to local authority.

12. (i) No (ii) Yes.

13. Mainly a question for Local Authority. However, this may allow / encourage the number of structures (vehicles etc.) scattered about the town centres; causing obstructions, access problems, parking etc.

14. No, we don't see any problems.

15. N/A

16. N/A

17. N/A