Department for Business, Innovation & Skills

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: Vic McGeer
Organisation (if applicable):
Address: - -

Please return ~~completed forms~~ to: Rt Hon Sec. of State Dr Vince Cable M.P. * as of 28.12.2012

~~Name:~~ NOT Rachel Onikosi, Policy Manager

Postal address: Department of Business, Innovation and Skills

Consumer and Competition Policy Directorate,
1 Victoria Street, London,

SW1H OET

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.

☐	Business representative organisation/trade body
☐	Central government

* please see over and on reverse comments specific for your attention the Rt Hon Dr Vince Cable M.P. Secretary of State, BIS, HMG, → Addendum

28 · 12 · 2012

☑	Charity or social enterprise
☑	Individual
☐	Large business (over 250 staff)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local Government
☐	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
☐	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
☐	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
☐	Trade union or staff association
☑	Other (please describe) Redler and subject of HMQ Elizabeth II

Addendum (from page 1 = to Rt Hon Dr Vince Cable M.P.)

Vince, from your september 2012 address to conference:

(1) "We are bringing lost supply chain back to Britain"

= No! You are doing away with a statutory provision for entrepreneurs – replacing it with a series of repressive regulations. Where else is the retail sector so hampered by regulation? Where else is the service sector not provided by self-regulating authorisation?

(2) "This is no time for the state to be stepping back the abuse of monopoly power"

= No! This is what the state is doing AS A MONOPOLY POWER, and allowing a free market to become dominated by monopoly control

(3) "We must work within a market based, private enterprise system"

= No! Yes! but the "free market based, private enterprise system" is dominated by international corporations beyond effective regulation by single governance. UKCB2 "street" activity will become dominated by these operators

(4) "We are scrapping unnecessary red tape" = No! c.f. → 2

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.** *

* this is not possible using your form of reply c.f. below

Yes I have 28.12.2012

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 28. 12. 2012

Comments:

→ I will make a full response by my own words possibly before Feb 15th 2013 but as explained to Sec. of State 28.12.2012 and as to be joined with the response made by <pedlars.info>

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:

MOh 28.12.2012

This document is vile in construction comprehension and use of english MOh

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

Impact (use of english)

See further my objection to your definition of "genuine" MOh

Comments

immeasurable as my professional status (as recognised by EU Law) can be only as a POTENTIAL VICTIM by the change from CIVIL LAW to CRIMINAL LAW MOh

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.

Conditional on what? MOh

as above MOh

Comments

as above IMMEASURABLE
I have no capacity to measure impact on any one else apart from myself
This question does not set out the basis for its inquiry.

(As an overall criticism of this document's methodology: it has not set out its statistical basis. The effect of A REPEAL in LAW is upon the whole eligible population of UK & EUROPE + with the S.D. on of its population. Your own Impact Assessment is not well defined nor conclusive) MOh

MGH 28.12.2012

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 MGH 28.12.2012

Please fully explain your reasons ~~for agreeing~~ or disagreeing with any element of the proposed definition. ← what you have as "definition" is not definition but

Comments: proposed "allowed" (licensed?)

DESCRIPTION of an activity of a person (in a series of movements without end or defined purpose)

whilst proposing "de-regulation" you are setting forth Regulation that is unable to be enforced. You act against the principle of both the Pedlars Act & the Services Directive.

MGH 28.12.2012

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:

As I am not a local authority officer further comment is redundant* (as set out by your own URN 11/542 in that choice of word*)
I therefore refer all subsequent of my comments to that in joint response with

 < pedlars-info > MGH 28.12.2012

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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 ☒ YES 28.12.2012

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

4 Cont. from page 1

You are entering "unnecessary red-tape" into an area of law which at present has very slight necessity for registration.
Registration as a requirement for most service provision is ubiquitous throughout Europe including your department and this consultation.

5 "Liberal and social democratic principles"
– No! You are avoiding the PRINCIPLES of the Pedlars Act and of the European Convention itself.
You are being compliant to a mentality of codified behaviour that is anti-ethical to the British way of life, has attempted to be resolved by the European convention and was last worst used by the third Reich in post Weimar Germany – whereby a series of measurements can determine a person's identity.

28.12.2012.

© 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