

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Anon 1	Unknown		Unightly and spoil local environment	Same as last section	Spoil quality of the environment in the area	
Anon 2	Unknown		It is a touristic area, so any effort to keep it tidy and presentable always welcome	It is the only way to sort the situation out. It has lasted a long time and it doesn't mean anything any more!	One's freedom finishes where others start! People have right to enjoy surroundings without noise!	
AN Other	Unknown		It is not acceptable for any minority or protesting group to practise antisocial behaviour at expense of taxpaying law abiding members of public	The communes are unsightly, unhealthy and tend to attract drug users	Absolutely, excess noise is inconsiderate and antisocial. It can be responsible for accidents and injuries	
Auld	Whitehall Court	Comprehensive	Prevents protesters exceeding bounds of what I regard as legitimate protest.	Byelaws need to have teeth	Byelaws need to have teeth	
Bentley	Whitehall Court	Seems reassuringly comprehensive	Areas not designed/laid out with these activities in mind. Hampering legitimate public access/movement. Litter, public hygiene issues	To be expected if non-compliance with lawful requirement arises.	Causing public nuisance	

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Brownlie	Whitehall Court	Should be extended to include Whitehall near Downing St and Horseguards Parade - a very obvious target for a prolonged sit-in	Secures the right balance between recognising the legitimate right to protest and maintaining rights of passage	See earlier answer. The descriptions of obstructive structures inadequately defined. Section 4(a). What about caravans?	See earlier answer	
Catling	Marsham Street	Worried that it will force protesters to go elsewhere. We need comprehensive legislation against anti-social behaviour	Current situation in Parliament Sq is a national disgrace. It serves as a sign of social disintegration. Many are simply anarchists or bent on overthrowing democratic system	Necessary to enforce the restriction. Will also help prevent people moving to next location.	A public nuisance that creates an atmosphere of tension and unease among law-abiding public	
Chapman	Whitehall Court	Agree it. Malfeasants may move to new areas but you can't predict that today.	Unless police give direct, people will not realise they are breaking the law	Unless police have this power, it will not be a practically enforceable rule	Immediate seizure stops the argument and the noise. Will be a deterrent	
Crockett	Whitehall Court		Such tents and sleeping equipment deface the areas. They represent a security risk and are manifestation of anarchy, relative or otherwise. Not	If tents and sleeping equipment are prohibited, it follows that if those responsible do not remove them, relevant authority must	Such use of equipment is designed to be provocative and cause disturbance. Interferes with any citizens right to peaceful existence	

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
			compatible with orderly society.	do so		
Davidson	Monck St	Agree with the extent	Use of tents and sleeping equipment in these areas is not compatible with general public's right to free access and use. Public's rights at very least equal to any rights to erect tents and sleeping equipment	Would be a suitable deterrent	People making noise nuisance should have less right to than law abiding people have to reasonable quiet	
Downey	Whitehall Court		This will provide fair warning to offenders that non-compliance will result in further action by seizure and forfeiture. Right to protest should not be abused at expense of safety and amenity enjoyed by others	This could be used to prevent offenders decamping from one place to another	Use of such equipment often a gross intrusion on right of majority to enjoy amenities of London. Without the powers offenders will be able to set up nuisance elsewhere	
Fretwell	Marsham St					

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Green	Whitehall Court	As a resident of Whitehall Court, submits that Embankment Gardens in front of Whitehall Court should be included as have MoD gardens	Considers proposed new byelaws to be necessary to terminate present and prohibit future use of tents etc which pollute and disfigure in unhealthy, unsanitary and intimidatory manner	In order to provide adequately for enforcement of the proposed byelaws	In order to provide adequately for enforcement of the proposed byelaws	
Home Office						<p>Concerned about encampments on the Department’s land or pavements surrounding headquarters. Home Office may be a particular target because it brought forward the Parliament Square legislation, ministers have made clear their view that they do not consider the right to protest extends to the right to set up encampments and there are areas at and near the building which might attract those wishing to set up encampments.</p> <p>Public walkways have been incorporated through the site and it is important they be kept open and available for public use, which would be much more difficult in the event of threats to the building’s security</p> <p>Essential that there is continuity of uninterrupted use of the HQ without threats arising to safety, access or use of the building. It is in the essential national interest that business continuity is maintained which could be put at serious risk if an encampment or similar intrusion were to appear close to the building.</p> <p>There is no wish in any way to prevent legitimate demonstrations or protests which have taken place outside the building</p>

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Kirkham	Marsham St	The byelaws should apply to all public and private spaces in London	Public places should not be cluttered. They are for the public. Protesters abusing rest of us.	If equipment is not seized and destroyed, selfish protesters will just set up again somewhere else	Agree with right to orderly protest but do not believe that protesters should be allowed to cause noise pollution or obstruct highway/occupy public places other than briefly . Public places must be kept [tidy?].	
Luke	SW1P					As a resident of Westminster, relieved that at last there is a sense of proportion being shown. I am a big believer in maintaining rights achieved for the public over the last 800 years. However rights necessarily involve corresponding obligations. Nobody has the right to pitch their tents in public places. Suggest an area in Hyde Park near Speakers Corner be made available for those who feel it vital to stay overnight to protest but under no circumstances should Parliament Square and surroundings be offered. This includes pavements as well as green areas.

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Oppler	Whitehall Court		Encourage genuine protest not protest as way of life. A genuine protester is prepared to go home at night and come back the next day. If not, he abuses right of protest	A tent is a temporary structure, not a home. Therefore not only can but should be moved. The tents should be returned to their owners (made available for collection) if that is practicable. Without seizure, no viable enforcement		
Payne	Monck St		No indication that tents are actually occupied overnight and are subsequently unlit and cause obstruction to public.	Only those unoccupied overnight that are causing an obstruction to public		
Reeve	Marsham St	Agree	Necessary to avoid a repeat of the encampment at St Paul's. The council must safeguard the interest of the general public using the highway without upheaval or unsightly encampments in the areas as	If an offence is committed and an officer or constable seizes the equipment to be used in that offence, you have outlined perfectly fair proposals on how to deal with	If an offence is caused by noise equipment, the authorising officer or constable should seize the offending equipment and your proposals outline a fair procedure to	

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
			marked on the map as “controlled areas” and ensure proper protection, safety and security of our beautiful historic and listed buildings.	the equipment.	return the equipment, or not, as the case may be.	
Royal Horseguards Hotel	Whitehall Place	Extent of designated area is fine	By preventing this it will help to stop any potential problems before they begin	Prevent any potential issues arising	Prevention of any potential issues before they arise.	
Sudding	Monck St		They are obstructive, untidy, insanitary, and add nothing to the defence of our democratic rights	To simply move on those camping illegally just moves the problem from one area to another	Acts as deterrent to their use	
Temple	Monck St	I agree with them as outlined	I agree with the right to protest but this can be done in normal hours on foot and not over a prolonged period. So tents etc. are an unnecessary disruption, obstruction etc.	Clear that protesters who use tents will not leave voluntarily or even keep them in an orderly way, there comes a point where reason must be replaced by action.	In line with previous comment. Amplified noise is a public nuisance and there must be some sanction on this.	

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Westminster Abbey						Co-operated over the proposed byelaws and approve and agree them

Annex B: Summary of Responses of those who generally agree with the proposals

Surname or organisation	Address	Comment on designated area	Comment on tents provisions	Comment on tents seizure provisions	Comment on noise seizure provisions	Comment (general)
Westminster School	Little Dean's Yard	Content with the area. The main part of the school including the boarding areas are contained within the boundary which allows for the protection from noise and hindrance for young children and older pupils	Pupils walk through area on daily basis. The prohibition in the designated area will ensure that pupils do not suffer hindrance as they travel to/from school or to playing fields on Vincent Square	Apart from unsightly result of encampments in a world heritage site such places will become a focus for unacceptable kinds of protest and noise. Pupils should not have to negotiate such encampments on daily commute	Area should be a place of calm to the extent possible. Allowing for normal democratic protest which is notified and approved, other noise such as street music and loud hailing adjacent to the Abbey where pupils worship and Abingdon St Gardens which is near to boarding houses needs to be curtailed	

