

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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 3		It is to draconian	Everyone in a free society has the right to protest short or long term	I disagree because this looks like a law to stop long term protest, which is our right.	As long as they are used during the day, I don't see a problem	
Anon 4		See right hand column	See right hand column	I disagree with the byelaw which outlaws the use of tents as a form of protest in designated areas.	Citizens have a basic right to protest, and there may be occasions when this necessitates the use of amplified equipment to give speeches OR inform protesters of event proceedings for their own health and safety. Equipment should not be seized for these reasons.	<p>Designated area: I strongly disagree with this proposed byelaw. It is an infringement on our basic democratic right to protest and take our protest to the places in which our leaders reside.</p> <p>Tents: Using tents to form longer protests is a valid democratic expression and right. To remove this right to protest is draconian and oppressive and has no part in a so called free and democratic state. Any government which suppresses protest is less a democracy and more an oppressive regime, as it denying its citizen the right to criticize it and seeks to quash any criticism of its policies.</p>
Anon 5			See right hand column	The argument given in favour of passing this proposal (cf. obstruction of highways) is has a legal precedent of being overruled by the right to protest, as mentioned in the Consultation Appendix (p. 2). In addition, and following the precedent set by DPP v Jones, the right of trespassory assembly has been established (http://tyneside.metapath.org/legalsupport/caselaw96.html) and	I find this a deeply disturbing proposal, concealing a grave threat to our political freedom and democracy. The proposal involves using the EPA 1990 act (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/section/80A , section 1(b)) to ban/seize loudspeakers, megaphones or loudhailers employed in static demonstrations, such as the one currently taking place at St Paul's. Although it is stated in	<p>The right to protest is derived directly from the EU and international laws protecting the freedom of speech, peaceful assembly and association (article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, articles 9-11 of the European convention of Human Rights, articles 18-22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights). Separately, the right to static demonstrations and assemblies, is recognised and protected by UK law (http://www.yourrights.org.uk/yourrights/the-right-of-peaceful-protest/static-demonstrations-and-assemblies.html).</p> <p>Under none of these laws are static demonstrations like St Paul's subject to the imposition of conditions by police. For example, according to the ICCPR (http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm), the only restrictions for such an intervention are:</p> <p>"national, racial or religious hatred" and "in the interests of</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
				<p>obstruction of the highway must be shown to be unreasonable for it to be illegal. In other words, only an unreasonable obstruction is currently unlawful. A legitimate protest is neither unlawful nor unreasonable, therefore the right of trespassory assembly can be applied to static protests like St Paul's.</p>	<p>the Consultation Appendix that "this particular provision does not apply to noise made by a political demonstration or a demonstration supporting or opposing a campaign or cause", no attempt is made to explain how legitimate demonstrations would be distinguished from non-legitimate ones. As outlined previously, St Paul's camp is a legitimate, static demonstration calling for social, political and economic change, a therefore a protest to which all the above-mentioned national, European and international laws apply. Making static demonstrations illegal would set a dangerous precedent for eroding our civil liberties and rights.</p> <p>Additionally, and of as much concern, since the nature (e.g. transient versus static) of the</p>	<p>national security or public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others." None of these restrictions apply to protests such as the one at St Paul's.</p> <p>Additionally, tents, sleeping equipment etc. constitute an integral part of the wave of static protests (Occupy movement) that in the UK has gained national and international recognition or endorsement from individuals and bodies as diverse as Edinburgh City council (http://local.stv.tv/edinburgh/news/28067-occupy-edinburgh-gains-backing-from-edinburgh-council/), Sheffield City Council (https://occupysheffield.org/2011/12/08/statement-8-dec/), the Quakers (http://www.quaker.org.uk/news/news-release-quakers-express-support-occupy-london), the Archbishop of Wales (http://www.bc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-politics-15778206), Jewish (http://www.jewdas.org/2011/10/a-statement-of-support-for-occupy) and Islamic (http://irna.ir/ENNewsShow.aspx?NID=30616968) groups, UK-Uncut (http://ukuncut.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=occupyworld&action=display&thread=1403), world-renowned artists (http://www.uncut.co.uk/radiohead/radioheads-thom-yorke-and-massive-attack-play-occupy-london-movement-gig-news), civil rights leaders (http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/video/2011/dec/16/jesse-jackson-occupy-london-video) and so on.</p> <p>Such recognition came only after Occupy camps had spread across the UK. It could not have arisen from a one-off, time-limited demonstration and underlines the effectiveness of long-term, static protests in catalysing awareness and promoting social, political and economic change.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
					<p>demonstrations in which noise/loudspeakers etc. is not specified in this proposal or otherwise referred to, directly or indirectly, passing this proposal into law would pave the way towards extending this ban to any and all types of protest, essentially muting dissent, an action that would quite simply signal the death of our democracy.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that more wisdom and mature thought is put into rethinking all aspects of this proposal.</p>	<p>The above serves to underline the legitimacy of protests such as St Paul's. The Consultation Appendix (p. 3) clearly states that: "The Council does not wish to prevent legitimate protest."</p>
Anon 6			I think citizens should have the right to camp on Parliament Square to show their disapproval of Government policies	I think citizens should have the right to camp on Parliament Square to show their disapproval of Government policies	Citizens should be allowed to use noise instruments to protest	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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 7		The state should not limit the time citizens may protest about the way the state is run.	To not allow use of tents and sleeping equipment is to put a one day limit on the amount of time a British citizens may protest.	This policy has resulted in the destruction and/or loss of citizens' private property in Occupy Wall Street and Occupy Boston.	This is a thinly veiled attempt to silence the voice of protesters	
Anon 8		Yes, it is too big.	If a person wishes to pitch a tent they should be able to. This is an attempt to stifle protest, as it is an effective form of protest. People are not penalised for pitching tents in order to wait in line for a cinema showing or sale and so on, so it should be allowed as a form of protest.	These items are people's personal property and unless they are directly violating health and safety or similar issues they should not be confiscated for any reason.	These items are people's personal items, and so unless they directly violate existing byelaws concerning noise they should not be confiscated for any reason. Any reason for confiscation should first be attempted to be settled in a different manner so as not to antagonise the situation.	
Anon 9		See right hand column	It is our right and duty as human beings to identify and challenge corrupt regimes in a peaceful manner, publicly.	You have no right to touch other peoples property without their consent.	You have no right touching other people's property without their consent.	OCCUPY EVERYTHING!!!! Only a matter of time.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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 10	Westminster		See right hand column	As right hand column	I think that this is justified, however I do think that a warning or something similar should be given before the seizure is made, as it is someone's personal belongings and they should have a fair chance to prevent the seizure.	People have a right to free speech and to voice their opinions. The encampment at St Pauls is both justified and gives a view of today's crises without being judgmental, demanding or ridiculous. The government needs to remember that everyone has an equal right to be in a public place, and that just because their opinion differs to that of the protesters at St Pauls and similar parties. The government also needs to remember that the protests at Occupy LSX are peaceful and do not harm anybody or anything.
Anon 11	Unknown	See right hand column	See right hand column	People should have their private property respected at all times, especially when they are being used in the service of the greater good.	PA systems are a necessary form of communication with press, police and the public at large.	<p>Designated area: I believe that there should be no designated area because protest is a necessary part of democratic society and to stop is a disgrace to every democratic process.</p> <p>Tents: The right to protest peacefully is one which is enshrined in the Human Rights Act and should be protected. The Occupy movement, despite its shortcomings has created a lot of debate and discussion in British society of many much needed topics and to ban it would be a travesty to this movement to protect the rights we are fighting for,</p>
Hoyle	Unknown					Another member of the British public, very much against the proposed amendments.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Aird	Camberwell	The area designated appears to encompass both thoroughfares and areas normally considered free for public access, enjoyment and peaceful assembly.	See right hand column	It is entirely unnecessary and draconian for the police to confiscate the property of protesters and seems to be a way of authorising forced eviction of camping protests.	See right hand column	<p>Tents: Legitimate protest cannot be limited to a certain allotted time period or easily managed form. All night vigils, sit ins, occupations and other protests carried out over long periods all require the presence of equipment allowing sleep and shelter. All are valid, peaceful and necessary ways demonstrating. Your own consultation letter notes that sufficient provision already exists to address the problem of obstructed highways, and that previous demonstrations in the area have not been deemed a problem in this respect. The concern that encampments may interfere with visual enjoyment of the area misses the point that any protest must by definition be highly visible and is not concerned with being aesthetically pleasing. It is also far too trivial a reason to deny a fundamental right recognised in both national and international law.</p> <p>Noise: The exemption for the use of amplification during demonstrations in the Environmental Protection Act is there for a clear reason, which is to ensure the act is not misused as a way of curbing protest. This amendment/addition to the Byelaws appears precisely to be an attempt to misuse legislation in order to prevent the public from exercising their right to protest. The idea that the use of megaphones during protests could be a threat to health in one of the busiest, most traffic-heavy, non-residential areas in London, is clearly inadmissible. It is also unlikely to cause any serious nuisance, but where it is, it must be conceded that occasional nuisance is an inevitable feature of even the most moderate form of protest.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Bailey	Kings Langley	See right hand column	I believe the powers are too extensive and the the proposals open to interpretation	The term 'sleeping equipment' is open to interpretation. Power of seizure should stay ONLY with the police, the use of 'authorised agents' is quite wrong.	Power of seizure should remain only with the police. Parliament should learn to live within a lively democracy; politics is not a contemplative profession – if they can work with the police sirens in that area then they should learn to work to the accompaniment of democratic noise	<p>Designated area: I believe the proposed designated area is far too wide, that the powers are too far reaching already within PRASRAC</p> <p>I feel there are many flaws within the PRASRA restrictions in Parliament Sq, that these are in any case untested and that to roll them out to a wider area is wrong, anti democratic and a legal quagmire.</p>
Bamford	NW5	There should be no area where tents, sleeping equipment and similar structures are prohibited (see below for my reasons).	See right hand column	As right hand column	I have not had time to look at information relating to this proposal so cannot offer detailed comments. However in principle I believe that 'making noise' is a legitimate form of protest and we should not be introducing additional legislation to discourage it.	<p>The ability to carry out long-term protests (over 24 hours) is an important element of our right to protest in general, and in practical terms tents and sleeping equipment are necessary for this form of protest. It is clear that a ban on tents etc would in practice constitute a heavy crackdown on long-term protests per se, given that it would be inhumane to expect someone to carry out such a protest without any form of shelter.</p> <p>The consultation letter does not give any explanation of what is deemed to be harmful about long-term protests. Given that such a serious restriction on the right to protest is being proposed, it would seem necessary for Westminster City Council to give a full and detailed account of why it feels that such measures are necessary. In the absence of any such information the consultation begins to look like part of a trend of general prejudice against long-term protests such as the Occupy camps. The claims of public disorder and obstruction of the highway made against these camps have been highly exaggerated: the protesters at the camp near St Paul's, for example, have consistently worked with the police and the local</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>authorities to keep the camp within an area that does not impede the movement of members of the public. Protesters have also been proactive in dealing with and if necessary expelling those disruptive individuals who have entered the camps. You will surely agree that such individuals are sadly to be found engaging in public disorder in streets across London, and the blame for this cannot be laid at the door of those organising static, non-violent protests.</p> <p>Even if it were true that tents ought to be banned in the proposed areas, the wording of the proposed byelaws is vague and could be used to attack a wide range of activities. Section 3.2.a.ii proscribes 'any structure that is designed, or adapted... for the purpose of... staying in a place for any period'. This is extremely vague and could be used to refer to almost anything, for example a camping chair which an old or infirm protester has set up for five minutes in order to briefly rest. To remove such objects would be unreasonable and aggressive towards peaceful protest. Laws worded in this way are not acceptable.</p> <p>In summary, none of the proposed new byelaws relating to tents and similar structures should be enacted. If Westminster City Council wishes to consult on such laws then it must produce and make readily accessible a detailed and convincing body of evidence demonstrating that the nature of long-term static protests is sufficiently dangerous to warrant an extreme restriction on our right to practice them non-violently. As a free and democratic society we must be at pains to avoid such restrictions, and my own experience and knowledge indicates nothing to necessitate them. In the absence of the necessary evidence the present consultation cannot be used as the basis for enacting new byelaws.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Barker	Oxfordshire		See right hand column	This is just legitimised theft.		<p>If someone feels strongly enough to commit to such a long term protest then,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. they should be encouraged as it obviously shows a dedication to the democratic process, 2. they should be allowed some protection from the elements and basic overnight accommodation at the site of vigil. <p>Whilst it is understood that such encampments may look untidy, a greater principle is at stake which is the right of the people of this country to temporarily occupy a public (i.e. their own) space and allow protest against the privileged few who set out to dictate the use such spaces and how UK people must live their lives.</p>
Beech	Liz	See right hand column	See right hand column	See right hand column		<p>I am particularly concerned about this bye-law with regard to Parliament Square but also concerned in a more general sense.</p> <p>I am on the electoral register and have exercised my voting rights throughout my adult life. I am now an OAP. It has been my experience that my 'elected' representatives do not represent my point of view, or the point of view of a large number of my friends and acquaintances.</p> <p>Of course, being polite, middle class people we have adopted all the usual methods of 'protest' – letters to our respective M.P.'s, local councillors, signing petitions, 'marching' etc. All to no avail.</p> <p>The decade long encampment on Parliament Square has been a comfort and inspiration to our aspirations for a democratic society. Without the ongoing nature of this visible encampment the topic being highlighted could be swept under the carpet.</p> <p>It is noticeable that our politicians laud people in other countries, notably of late the Middle East, when they take to the streets and challenge their leaders, but have no similar respect for us –not people who want to live on a</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						pavement in London, but people prepared to do so because they ,I, believe that what is at stake IS democracy itself and this is the way it can be discussed non-violently
Blue		As I am against the Byelaws in principle, I have no comment on the size of designated area other than it is unnecessary and therefore effectively too large.	See right hand column	Same as right hand column	As well as for all the reasons given before, I would add that loud-hailers and other amplifying equipment are absolutely essential tools to rally, organise and address political demonstrations. This, as you have acknowledged in your notes, is why demonstrations are specifically exempted from the 1990 Environmental Protection Act. To try to outlaw, criminalise, and allow seizure and forfeiture of such items, and to still maintain the falsehood that you are not attempting to stifle protest is frankly an insult, and anyone voting for this measure is participating in this manifest lie.	<p>“The council does not wish to prevent legitimate protest” is, in the context of these proposals, a magnificent Orwellianism.</p> <p>For ten years, the authorities waged a failed war on Brian Haw, but these Byelaws, had they been available earlier, would have swept him away in an instant. His iconic decade-long peaceful protest is known and admired throughout the world, and yet, shamefully, with these proposed powers Westminster would have been able to erase Brian’s historic achievement.</p> <p>Westminster claims it is concerned at the “new threat” of urban camping, and “see no place for tents in a legitimate protest”. Have they not heard of Greenham Common; do they not know of equivalent permanent protests carried on, and tolerated, outside government buildings for many years in other Western democracies including Australia and the USA?</p> <p>For a committed full-time campaigner, willing to put their normal life on hold as a sacrifice to the greater good, a tent is essential for survival.</p> <p>We are living in extraordinary times - an ‘end of Empire’ orgy of lawlessness, when comparatively small numbers of the richest and the most greedy on this planet, lead us into illegal wars and plunder our pockets. The rule of law, and the illusion of democracy, are being shattered, as we enter wars on the flimsiest of evidence and excuses, with no democratic mandate. Meanwhile, our tax inspectors, taken out for cosy champagne lunches, allow major corporations to avoid billions of pounds of tax at a stroke, as our so-</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>called 'deficit' (of those missing billions of pounds) is addressed through vicious ideological attacks on social services, education, health and welfare, youth services, old age provision, and public enterprise.</p> <p>In response to all the above injustice, small numbers of dedicated, peaceful, committed, and well-meaning citizens are meeting together in camps to discuss solutions, make proposals, form a visible presence to others (including the media), and to protest against the undemocratic, un-mandated, and destructive actions of a few. This 'occupy' movement began with the Arab Spring, which has been cheered on by Western powers. Were these laws enacted in these Arab countries, our media would be condemning their governments for sweeping away peaceful protest by force, seizure and forfeiture, and yet Westminster wants to introduce them here.</p> <p>For these amazing, visionary protestors, tents are simply tools of their campaigning trade. Without the tents, the whole nature of their protest would be undermined, and the very power of their activism would be purposefully destroyed. For Westminster to claim that this Byelaw is not an attack on protest is either a carefully constructed lie, or is an ill-thought out and easily-corrected misunderstanding.</p> <p>The recent protest camps have not been without problems, mostly due to the unfortunate fact that even in our rich Western democracy, our society still has issues of homelessness, destitution, drug dependence and alcoholism. The camps have on occasion attracted people suffering these problems, partly through providing an apparently safe haven and a rare space characterised by respect and understanding. But despite such issues, the recent encampments are notable for their absolutely</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>sincere attempts to minimise disruption, to co-operate with and negotiate with land-owners, and to adapt to the needs of genuine public concern. If it were otherwise, then perhaps Westminster might have an excuse to legislate, but only if and when other legitimate laws failed to deal with truly anti-social or destructive intent.</p> <p>This legislation can be seen as part of an on-going ideological battle between the interests and requirements of the rich and powerful against the real needs of the majority of people in society, and against true democracy and justice.</p> <p>If Westminster go ahead with these proposals, do they really think that they will be able to legislate protest from our streets? Instead, they will be criminalising decent people. With their powers of seizure and the use of force, they will be condoning shameful repressive violence to clear away civilised and peaceful protest. They will in effect be issuing a declaration of war on ordinary people, and they will be coming down on the side of injustice.</p> <p>As cuts hit deeper into public provision, it may be that some of you deciding on these proposals will find an urgent need to protest when your own livelihoods and pensions are stolen. If you side with repression now, perhaps you will regret it when you find your own voices diminished and silenced later.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Brackley	Unknown					<p>I would like to voice my horror at this proposal. Successive British govts have been 'banging on' about democracy for years; they keep trying to tell us that democracy is their motive for going into other countries and killing multitudes of people! It is our democratic right to peacefully protest, and Parliament Square is an obvious logical place to do it, being opposite Parliament !</p> <p>Please register my opposition to this most silly proposal</p>
Bredel	NW2		See right hand column	This again is criminalisation of peaceful protest. Tents and sleeping equipment cannot be treated as if they were weapons.	The same like above, as long as they do not cause disturbance in residential areas during the night.	<p>The use of tents and sleeping equipment per se does not pose any risk to the public, as long as they do not obstruct fire brigade access.</p> <p>Apart from that criminalising camping protesters put an unreasonable stretch on the justice system, taking up police or court time and resources they could use for prosecuting actual criminals.</p> <p>If everyone having taken part in peaceful protest would in future be given a criminal conviction this fact would lead to even more unemployment, as these people would be kept out of jobs.</p> <p>Eventually, protesting is part of a healthy democracy and I find it very concerning that the right to do so would be compromised by this proposal.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Britten	Farnham	See right hand column		You may not seize the property of people who will have committed no crime. The passing of a byelaw does not legitimise an action that, by any standard, is theft.	You may not seize the property of people who will have committed no crime. The passing of a byelaw does not legitimise an action that, by any standard, is theft.	<p>My contribution to the debate on this issue is to warn you that any attempt by Westminster council, or indeed any other, to suppress the right of the Occupy movement to protest in the fashion that it has found to be most effective will have serious consequences. There is a groundswell of discontent throughout Britain regarding the way our country is run, apparently for the benefit of the ruling elite and their wealthy friends in the City.</p> <p>Do not be so foolish as to declare war on the people of Britain. You will lose.</p>
Bustin	Not London					<p>The proposed byelaws for Parliament Square and surrounding areas have been brought to my attention. Whilst I am not a London resident I feel strongly that laws impacting on conduct in my capital city and, consequently how it is portrayed in the wider world, are of my concern.</p> <p>The geographical area proposed is of less importance than the principle behind the proposals. It is of vital importance that the freedom for which our nation is cherished is not destroyed. The freedom to peaceful protest is vital for a living democracy and yet these proposals would seem to limit the extent to which such peaceful protest can be conducted to such a degree as to leave our 'democracy' open to ridicule. Freedom to peaceful protest should not be limited to a couple of hours on a Sunday afternoon - when nobody is looking! which is where I can see this leading to if it is implemented.</p> <p>The world IS changing. The old values are being questioned. This is healthy and right. If the old values are still applicable, they will win out - but people have a right to question them and to show others the arguments behind their questions.</p> <p>Please do not introduce bye-laws that remove the means</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						for people to undertake meaningful protest. Seizure of equipment that might make it feasible to conduct an extended protest is, in a very underhand and dishonest way, removing the right to any meaningful peaceful protest. These are not the standards that the world expects from Great Britain.
Causevic	Unkown					Civilised governments don't ban protests and are not afraid of hearing oppinions of their critics. Supressing discent does not make any government look good.
Christopher-Bowes	Abingdon	See right hand column	I do not agree that tents should be removed people and protectors are not just sleeping on the streets for the sake of it. We have a right to protect and this should not be taken away form use as people.	We need to stop trying to shut people up over concerns which affects our lives, pensions, housing, the banks and the environment. It is wrong to just sit back and relax and not say any thing. I fully support the occupy group and especially St Pauls .		that a tent or similar structure is an important and necessary tool of trade for a full-time campaigner, and outlawing their use WILL impact on legitimate peaceful protest. people don't take up a full-time protest lightly. the whole point of an 'occupy'-style protest, or a long-term vigil, is that it is a CONSTANT presence. such protesting is NOT the "turn up, march a bit, and go home" pageantry that our rulers would like to convince us is legitimate protest and a sign of a healthy democracy. no. a real democracy will allow ANY legitimate protest, and a 24-hour protest or a peace vigil IS legitimate and should be encouraged, not legislated against.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Clarke	SW10	See right hand column	<p>Because people have a right to protest. Our freedoms are slowly being eroded. You may mean well with your laws but you should remember who might come after you. These proposals are shameful.</p> <p>First they came for the Jews...</p>	I absolutely DO NOT agree with the proposal to seize tents and sleeping equipment. I am utterly appalled at the idea. Freedom is so important and you are treating our heritage with asinine contempt. These are peaceful protesters and you simply cannot whitewash our society in this manner.	If existing law protects citizens from noise then why make another? Will you seize my neighbour's TV in the same manner when he has it so loud it constitutes a breach of the peace? No, I don't think it is quite that simple.	Designated area: I think it is quite wrong to attempt to erode democracy. You may not like them, not appreciate them but it is important, even in Westminster, for people to be able to protest. It is a cornerstone of our society.
Coatman	Unknown					I am strongly against the proposals as I feel they are an attack on civil liberties and the right to protest. I can't see any reason behind these byelaws that could warrant restricting the freedom to protest. A long term protest such as an occupation or vigil is entirely legitimate.
Coville	Reading		See right hand column	If tents and sleeping equipment are seized or forfeited, then they cannot be used. Please refer to my comments above.	I do have some sympathy for this proposal, especially where local residents are affected. However I think a blanket measure might be open to abuse. Isn't noise nuisance covered by other laws?	Tents: The right to free speech and thus to protest is not time-limited in the UK, as far as I know. This means that there is a right to permanent protest. If there is a right to permanent protest then there must be a right to sleep during protest. Sleeping safely in the UK without a tent or sleeping bag is not conceivable. Therefore prohibiting the right to use tents and sleeping bags would be tantamount to an infringement of the right to protest. As a matter of fact, permanent protests have made a valuable contribution to the atmosphere of free speech and open debate in the UK (think of the Greenham Common women). They may be inconvenient, but isn't this principle more valuable? If this right is eroded here, it will set a precedent for eroding it in other locations.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Covington	SE15		Any ruling of this kind is a direct restriction of potential protests as well as homeless or vulnerable people in need of shelter. The passing of the bylaw would set the precedent for future similar laws to be passed in other areas of London and the rest of the country. This fundamentally restricts the UK democracy and peoples right to peaceful protest	Seizure without consent is stealing a persons property and potentially livelihood. This will only enhance the power of the police, allowing greater prejudice, fear and frustration that already exists.	Seizure without consent is stealing a persons property and potentially livelihood. This will only enhance the power of the police, allowing greater prejudice, fear and frustration that already exists. Amplified noise equipment within reason causes no threat to public and can be turned off or down if requested without the need to be seized	<p>I feel that a law of this kind fundamentally damages peoples right to peacefully protest by the best means they see fit (given that the aim of protest is to express objection by a variety of means and to potentially disrupt - for a limited period of time- the normal course public life to draw attention to the cause). It will also cause a threat to homeless or vulnerable people in need of shelter.</p> <p>I appreciate the desire to 'protect' certain buildings, but this also reduces the potential to hear strong objection and for people to partake in freedom of speech and objection. An amendment would be to reduce the areas to just outside the buildings themselves, not including the connecting streets.</p> <p>I seriously urge you to reconsider this proposal, as if it goes through it will set the precedent for further similar laws that considerably harm and restrict freedom of speech, right to peacefully protest (by whatever means are thought as best) and democratic life.</p>
Crisis	London					See attached response
Deacon	Folkestone	See right hand column	Why would you want to stamp out calm, peaceful, rightful occupation as a form of protest? As the job being done by the government becomes less outrageous so the levels of protest will naturally decline. The last I heard, we were a free country	It is highly unethical + potentially illegal [until you've rewritten your own laws]. I'm not legally trained or well versed so may be in the wrong here on the legal aspect, but assuming there is no physical danger or perceived psychological threat of danger, where is the issue? It's called Protest for a reason, if people	ONLY at night-time where people have a human right to sleep, during the day between designated hours they should be allowed to continue unabated. It's free speech, only louder. The usual rules of Public Disorder, Disturbing the Peace etc still apply.	<p>Designated area: Risk assess it. By this I do not refer to the assessment of risk to business profitability or government reputation, but purely physical not ideological Health+ Safety.</p> <p>The government cannot justify the seizure of any property or any removal of people unless it IS PURELY ON THE BASIS OF IMMEDIATE HEALTH+ SAFETY, eg- a tent in a road, too close to a road</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
			<p>with free speech+ the freedom to go wherever we wanted (assuming that this is not private property +that the occupation is not violent or threatening) without the risk of excessive state intervention.</p> <p>This is an example of so-called “top-down State intervention”. You don’t like it? Don’t do it.</p>	<p>feel strongly enough to dedicate time, effort + emotional energy. DO NOT steal from them</p>		
Deller	Sutton	See right hand column	<p>Restricts activities of legitimate protest in a democracy, the people should be allowed to occupy areas long term to make their points. A one off march is not the only form of protest, the people should be allowed to stay long term until politicians meet their demands, that is</p>	<p>Restricts activities of legitimate protest in a democracy, the people should be allowed to occupy areas long term to make their points. A one off march is not the only form of protest, the people should be allowed to stay long term until politicians meet their demands, that is the nature of democracy.</p> <p>Puts homeless people</p>	<p>The existing law is already fairly extensive, the council needs no further powers in this matter, Environmental health can already confiscate the equipment of people who are making excessive noise to the detriment of residents. Seems to me to be another attempt to repress legitimate peaceful protest.</p>	<p>Designated area: These proposed byelaws seem solely designed to prevent legitimate peaceful protest rather than arising from any particular problem. If this country professes itself to be a democracy then it should accept democracy is messy and that people have a right to go and protest at the seat of power in this country and any petty byelaws restricting people from doing that in and around the area of the houses of parliament should be scrapped, there should be no restrictions on the use of tents and sleeping equipment at all anywhere in Westminster, on another note is it your intention to persecute the homeless and if they have a sleeping bag confiscate it? What kind of inhuman monsters are you that you would put an already vulnerable person at risk of hypothermia.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
			<p>the nature of democracy</p> <p>Risks persecution of homeless people.</p>	<p>at risk of hypothermia and death in cold winters if byelaw allows officers to confiscate their sleeping equipment.</p>		
Elliott	Colchester	I disagree with the designation of ANY area for this purpose.	See right hand column			<p>Tents: These items are used by groups and individuals dedicated to peaceful, non-violent protest, addressing humanitarian, environmental and social justice issues of relevance and concern to us all. Therefore they are acting in the service of the people of this country, sacrificing their time and comfort in doing so. Often this takes place as an act of solidarity with those who are most vulnerable in society, those who have no-one else to make their voice heard. Maintaining a presence for a period of time is fundamental to this. To legislate against the use of these items is to legislate against such peaceful protest and is NOT acceptable in a democracy.</p> <p>Tents seizure: These items are used by groups and individuals dedicated to peaceful, non-violent protest, addressing humanitarian, environmental and social justice issues of relevance and concern to us all. Therefore they are acting in the service of the people of this country, sacrificing their time and comfort in doing so. Often this takes place as an act of solidarity with those who are most vulnerable in society, those who have no-one else to make their voice heard. Maintaining a presence for a period of time is fundamental to this effort. To legislate against the use of these items is to legislate against such peaceful protest and is NOT acceptable in a democracy. The act of seizing such items is that of criminalising some of the most altruistic and free-thinking members of society- we NEED these people and should not be using legislation to suppress them.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>Noise: To legislate against the use of these items is to legislate against such peaceful protest and is NOT acceptable in a democracy. The act of seizing such items is that of criminalising some of the most altruistic and free-thinking members of society- we NEED these people and should not be using legislation to suppress them. Amplification is needed to address an assembly, of protesters and interested public alike, and to disseminate the message behind the protest. Protesters engaged in overnight vigils are considerate of neighbours are already fully aware that misuse of such equipment, eg excessive noise late at night, will provide grounds for its confiscation under existing byelaws.</p> <p>There is already ample legislation to stop 'raves' and so on- peaceful protest has nothing in common which such activity.</p>
Enayat	N19		I disagree because I think it is an attempt to stop legitimate protest.	This equipment is essential to 24 hr protests which are legitimate as long as they are carried out peacefully and with proper consideration of the public interest in terms of access, hygiene etc ...	If the protests get too loud they can become too much of a nuisance and overstep the mark of legitimate 24 hour protest.	
Fordham	Unknown					I would like to register my strong objection to this proposal on the basis that it is a step towards preventing the most effective form of protest available and will hamper the activities of movements for change such as Occupy. These protests/movements have opened up and are keeping in public/political/media awareness some of the most important debates of our times. There is a pressing social need for this kind of movement. Enacting byelaws to repress tented protests is, in my opinion, against the public good which these byelaws should be protecting.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Gallastegui	Parliament Square Protester	See right hand column	<p>No person takes to living in a tent in a city setting lightly. Quite often it is cold and uncomfortable, with no facilities. You are vulnerable, and it can be quite dangerous, as the tent can be collapsed by hostile opponents while you are sleeping.</p> <p>Again, the phenomena of 'tents' in protest is very powerful, and that is the very reason that the authorities want to clamp down on them.</p> <p>If you have a cause, and the problem is not dealt with, then sometimes people are driven to what would normally be classed as extreme measures.</p> <p>Protest that goes on for a period of time usually reflects</p>	I disagree to seize peoples property. If they are doing something wrong, then it should be properly defined in law. This bye law is too arbitrary, THE HARM HAS NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED.	<p>In certain circumstances, an amplifier will always have to be used, to organise and inform protesters of what is going on. For health and safety reasons an amplifier or megaphone is essential.</p> <p>Like everything, it should be used in a responsible manner.</p>	<p>Designated area: The area has been drawn up specifically outside, or in the near vicinity of Government buildings and places of symbolic significance within Westminster.</p> <p>The government and the establishment do not want to deal with social or political problems on their doorstep.</p> <p>This is understandable during normal times. However these are not normal times, we are a country at war. The people of this country are now suffering deep financial cuts. We have financed a war we do not believe in, and now we are severely affected by harsh austerity measures.</p> <p>Pretending problems don't exist by legislation is folly. The problem only manifests in other ways.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
			great concern. Point is, why do the government not want to take on board such concerns?			
Global Women's Strike	London	See right hand column	See right hand column	For the same reasons as above. In addition the tents and sleeping equipment cause no harm or obstruction to anyone.	<p>Proposal to seize amplified noise equipment from Parliament Square and the surrounding areas in Westminster must be rejected. Amplified noise equipment is essential for protesters to make their legitimate voices heard to legislators and the general public.</p> <p>A blanket ban on people's right to use amplified sound would amount to censorship and stifle dissent and protest. There is no justification for it. When the Global Women's Strike "Anti-war Community Picket and Open Mic" protested every Wednesday evening from March 2003 until September 2005, we were able to work with the police to reduce the level of noise when</p>	<p>Designated area: Byelaws relating to tents, sleeping equipment, sound systems . . . (and their seizure) should not apply to any area of London at all as they discriminate against people's right to protest, and against homeless people who can die if forced to sleep unprotected in the open air, especially in winter.</p> <p>Tents: For over two hundred years, people have exercised their right to speak out in Parliament Square as part of their actions for social change: Chartists, Suffragettes, trade unionists, and more recently Mr Brian Haw's 24/7 10-year protest against war in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Peace Strike, the Global Women's Strike "Anti-war Community Picket and Open Mic", the Tamils' protest against genocide, and others.</p> <p>These are amongst internationally renowned protests in Parliament Square that continue a great tradition of non-violent dissent. They represent millions of people nationally and internationally, and must have the right to be there and maintain themselves including by using tents and sleeping equipment.</p> <p>Parliament Sq belongs to the 99%. At a time when the government is dismantling fundamental human rights and about to destroy the welfare state and plunge large numbers of people poverty, homelessness and destitution, it is crucial that we defend our right to be seen and heard on Parliament Square and Whitehall where the decisions that affect the 99% are being made.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
					needed. Since more draconian restrictions have been introduced the police have been more heavy handed and provoked confrontations that could have been avoided.	
Gould	Dumfries					<p>I am deeply concerned by the change in proposed Bylaws by Westminster City Council that would outlaw the use of temporary sleeping equipment to be used in the vicinity of the Parliament. As I understand it a democracy should encourage the involvement of the people in the act of governing. Where the people see their elected representatives falling into error they should be encouraged to point this fact out. The continuing 'War in Afghanistan' and the past 'War in Iraq' were both pursued in extremely questionable fashion by both the present government and the past administration. Quite rightly a protest was mounted to draw attention to this matter in particular by Mr Brian Haw till his untimely death last year.</p> <p>By amending the law in this way we are in danger of 'outlawing' protest itself in the vicinity of Parliament and later by rolling out these measures, in our capital city itself. If we are banned from protest we move from a democracy to a tyranny and are no different from the regimes cast down in the so called Arab Spring of last year.</p> <p>I do hope you can represent the greater majority of people who feel that should have the right of peaceful protest at measures they feel are in error as only this keeps the checks and balances on a healthy democracy.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Griffin	Unknown					<p>I am very concerned that the proposed byelaws will make it more difficult for people to protest. Peaceful protest is legitimate and Westminster Council should be supporting the public right to protest, not making it more difficult. My concern is that if peaceful protesters are "moved on", arrested and bullied out of Westminster, things will get a lot less peaceful than if they are tolerated and allowed to make their point.</p> <p>The "turn up and march" model of protest is fine but so are 24-hour vigils and other overnight protests. These should be supported as part of a healthy democracy.</p>
Hadcocks	Oxfordshire	<p>I do not think there should be such an area, therefore the extent is irrelevant. It is precisely in public places and near parliament and other politically and socially significant sites that peaceful protest should be allowed,</p>	<p>Prolonged peaceful protest is a legitimate form of protest. A constant, considered presence is reasonable and should be permissible. Tents and sleeping equipment are a necessary item in ensuring the health and safety of those exercising their democratic right. To refuse their use poses a risk and appears to be designed to infringe on that right.</p>	<p>Prolonged peaceful protest is a legitimate form of protest. A constant, considered presence is reasonable and should be permissible. Tents and sleeping equipment are a necessary item in ensuring the health and safety of those exercising their democratic right. To remove them poses a risk and appears to be designed to infringe on that right. Further, the right to indiscriminately seize items used in what is not and should not be considered a criminal act is highly suspect.</p>	<p>It is my understanding that except in extreme situations, under normal circumstances where there is a genuine noise nuisance, such items can only be actually seized after repeated, proven infringements of a bye law and when there has been full investigation and a court order has been put in place demanding the seizure. Any forfeiture without this process being properly and fairly implemented appears highly suspect. It implies that the seizure would be intended not to protect those who may suffer as a result of a noise</p>	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
		and in fact welcomed.			nuisance, who in this instance would be relatively few if anyone, but rather to silence the voice of legitimate, peaceful protesters. This is disturbing to say the least, in an area which should surely welcome and encourage open, democratic debate.	
Haire	Not Westminster					<p>While I am not a resident of Westminster, I am fully aware of the importance of such central spaces as Westminster Square as places of public protest, I am angered by the erosion of civil liberty which the council wishes to further by limiting protest within the centre of London.</p> <p>Protests such as those at Parliament Square and the more recent one in Finsbury Square and St Paul's Churchyard show that Britain is a country tolerant of protest, where thoughtful and conscientious opponents to government and city decisions may make their views peacefully known. They hold a mirror up to the conscience of the lawmakers and the 1%, showing that some sections of the population are not willing to acquiesce silently to decisions taken far above their heads.</p> <p>I would be concerned and uncomfortable to live in a country where the right to such peaceful protest were not supported. In view of the British government's recent vocal opposition to regime's which actively oppose protest, and our supposed commitment to a healthy political debate, I respectfully ask that you, the council, do not continue with these measures to control and diminish this vital element of our public life,</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Hambleton	Unknown					<p>Parliament square and the surrounding areas are significant to the people of England because this is close to where government sits. In a democratic society it is vital that people can take their peaceful concerns and protests, in whatever, form they take, to the government and to the streets, without being tied to an administrative system in which the need to follow rigid and complex procedures impedes free social expression.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about sections 142-149 of the above act and more concerned that Westminster council appear to intend to bring in bye-laws that could be used to disrupt peaceful protestors when Part 3 of PRSRA 2011 has not yet been tested. It appears to be a hasty move to silence peaceful protest. This is the deeply saddening action of bureaucrats in a country that promotes itself to be a model of democracy. It is important to understand that people don't take up a full-time protest lightly. The whole point of an 'occupy'-style protest, or a long-term vigil, is that it is a constant presence. True real democracy will allow all voices in debating the actions we take as a country no matter the length of time it takes. Long-term vigils are legitimate and should be encouraged, not legislated against or attempts made to forcibly silence them.</p> <p>My hope is that you will reconsider the proposed bye-laws and take a fresh look at the significance of what is occurring here - on all sides. I look forward to hearing the result of the consultation and also hope for clear and transparent communication regarding this and all matters concerning a citizen's right to freedom of speech and peaceful protest.</p>
Hamel	New Malden					<p>I am not opposed in principle to the maintenance of law and order.</p> <p>Westminster is at the centre of government activity which is sometimes controversial and many feel our election</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>system is inadequate to reflect their views and interests. Justifiably, in my view, politicians are not held in high esteem and certain actions and decisions they have been responsible for are widely seen as partisan and undemocratic. In the circumstances some visible demonstration of disagreement and dissent is a natural and healthy response. To adopt excessively restrictive measures to inhibit reasonable protest can not in the long run be healthy and it might have a consequence opposite to that intended, particularly if resentment is engendered.</p> <p>There are already existing laws and byelaws that enable appropriate action to be taken against disorder and harm and one can only wonder that Westminster Council should now decide that the existing powers are insufficient. Is the Council opposed to demonstration? Does the Council envisage being able to stifle public opposition to the current government particularly? Are there factions in our society which the Council supports and wishes to defend from legitimate public opposition?</p> <p>In reaching decisions about policing measures designed to curtail popular protest it is always important to consider how and when the additional measures might be applied, how and by whom, and what the likely outcome might be and the cost in £s and manpower. The Blair government took a number of decisions that were of doubtful wisdom and which were widely opposed. In order to curtail the inevitable demonstrations of public disquiet the Serious Organised Crime Act was hurried through with the aim of disuading demonstrations of public opposition. The public demonstrated its opposition despite Tony Blair. I suggest further legal measures to disuade public protest will not persuade the public they are wrong but may persuade the public that Westminster Council and the government are.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Harris	E9	See right hand column	See right hand column	The proposal aims to use the seizure of private property to curtail political expression by attacking the ability to establish peaceful extended vigils to voice political opinion. For the reasons given above I consider this a miss use of authority and state/police power and breaching the intent of seizure rules.	The proposal aims to use the seizure of private property to curtail political expression by attacking the ability to establish peaceful extended vigils to voice political opinion. For the reasons given above I consider this a miss use of authority and state/police power and breaching the intent of seizure rules.	<p>Designated area: This area seems to focus specifically on the political institutions which really ought to be the focal point of any political expression. The ability to express political opinions, dissent or support for issues being raised in the national political forums, is vital to a vibrant, representational and democratic political process within a representational democracy.</p> <p>Tents: Establishing sustained political protests is vital to bringing issues to the forefront of the political agenda. Traditional forms of temporary political protests such as marches and sit-ins, existing within a predictable and agreed-upon spatial and temporal presence, form part of an established political theatre which has ceased to be effective in bringing issues onto the political agenda. Long-term vigils and constant sustained political expression offer the potential for expressing more complex political opinions, for being a focal point for engaging with the public in a participatory and meaningful way. Existing laws protect the public from obstruction of highways and other potential public risks. This proposal seems to be directly aimed at curtailing the peaceful and democratic expression of political opinion in the area around our national political institutions and thus would constitute an attack on the public's ability to engage with the political process.</p>
Hayton	Monck St		See right hand column	As detailed in previous answer	As detailed in previous answer	I believe that the byelaws would have the effect of appointing constables and authorised officers of the Council as judge, jury and executioner of existing Byelaws for Good Rule and Government, and thus allow the council to bypass due legal process that is put in place to protect the general public from persecution and tyranny from the ruling classes. I feel that this goes against the long established legal principle of Presumption of Innocence. I also fear that Members of Parliament are pre-emptively acting in an attempt to prevent popular protest such as the recent and famous "Occupy" movement at St. Paul's

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						Cathedral, and doing so in their own and parties' interests, not those of their constituents. Finally, as a local resident I have not been inconvenienced in the slightest by the protest movements so far and although I cannot commit to joining such protests, nor would I intend to break nor support breach of any laws or byelaws of the land, do support their political message and believe that if their concerns were better addressed by government, such harsh byelaws as those in force and proposed would not be necessary.
Hill	SE3	Am against this designated area	Loss of rights	Loss of rights	Loss of rights	
Hinson	Bristol	The byelaws should not apply anywhere.	See right hand column	For the reasons stated above. Tents and sleeping equipment are tools for protest. They do not cause real harm to anyone. While the council might claim that they are an unsightly imposition on the order of things, many people find them an aesthetically pleasing reminder of the fact that many citizens are conscious of the damage that is being done to the planet as part of the governing/economic systems that we live in, and hold out hope for a future where things are	The goal of much protest is to make heard what is normally lost amongst an inarticulate babble. There are already many pieces of legislation (Breach of Peace; Crime and Disorder Act etc) which exist to give police power to seize amplification equipment in a whole variety of circumstances, Doing more puts the council squarely in the position of legitimating the power to seize arbitrarily.	Tents: This is a fundamental issue. The right to protest should not be limited to certain forms that are not considered too inconvenient to the government of the day. Repressing the desire to hold vigil, making an extended presence calling into question the status quo, especially while there is no threat of violence against persons, holds back citizens creative potential. Making mechanisms for registering protest fit into certain forms of representation that have been so often ignored by our rulers in the past makes a mockery of liberal democracy's claims to unique legitimacy.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
				done differently.		
Houston	Chelmsford		Faced with a givernemnt that just will not listen even when they are in the wrong do you really expect people with a concience to just have one march and then pack up and go home. These by-laws are a slippery slope to a police state.	Such seizure would be theft pure and simple.	See answer above.	<p>Although I am not a Westminster resident I regularly work in London so am absolutely horrified by these attempts at Westminster council to give itself the sort of powers that would normally be associated with China or Iran.</p> <p>It is an affont to our human rights to protest for there to be a designated area for its suppression at all! People have been protesting for so long because our government is guilty of War Crimes.</p>
Jackson	W2 - Queens Gardens					These proposals would further curtail the democratic right to protest in an area which is at the very heart of our democratic system and has a long history of hosting long-lasting and legitimate protest. By introducing these laws the council would be damaging its democratic credentials at a time when they are already being questioned over changes to parking rules. They should be opposed.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Kaye	Unknown					<p>Very little time left for consultation so I will just say that the proposals are an assault on the right to protest and obviously designed to prevent the "Occupy London". type of protest.</p> <p>A sustained protst such as this needs the shelter of a tent and toilet facilities and by denying these our democratic right to peaceful protect is undermined.</p> <p>Please accept this as my contribution to the so-called public consultation.</p>
Lewis	Unknown	See right hand column	<p>The reasons are quite clear and set out above and below</p> <p>The proposed rulings are in direct opposition to fundamental points within the Human Rights Act Human Rights Act 1998</p>	<p>As stated before;</p> <p>The proposed rulings are in direct opposition to fundamental points within the Human Rights Act Human Rights Act 1998</p>	<p>The proposed rulings are in direct opposition to fundamental points within the Human Rights Act Human Rights Act 1998</p>	<p>It is the duty of government and councils to facilitate, where and whenever possible, all people's requirements and needs. The proposed rulings are in direct opposition to fundamental points within the Human Rights Act Human Rights Act 1998 and The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</p> <p>Namely the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •freedom from torture and degrading treatment. •the right to liberty •the right to respect for private and family life •freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and freedom to express your beliefs •freedom of expression •freedom of assembly and association •the right not to be discriminated against in respect of these rights and freedoms •the right to peaceful enjoyment of your property
Liberty						<p>Liberty's detailed comments are set out in their letter, which is attached separately.</p>
Littler	NW6	See right hand column	See right hand column	<p>Once again, the people in the tents are causing no disruption, they are protesting peacefully, and are not affecting the public or the</p>	<p>The land which Occupy LSX is on is very noisy anyway, there is more noise from traffic and the public than from them. They are not creating</p>	<p>I think that there should be no reason to seize the tents in the Occupy LSX areas across London. The tents are not obstructing the highway, and the people living in the tents are peaceful protesters and are not disturbing the public in any way whatsoever. The seizure of the Occupy LSX sites, tents, sound equipment etc is not fair or acceptable, they</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
				highway in any way.	noise for no reason, but are using it to educate and inform.	<p>mean no harm, and so not disturb anyone.</p> <p>Having passed through the site several times, and having spent evenings there, I can clearly see that the people living there do not mean any harm. They are peaceful protesters and stand for a cause. They do not cause any disruption, and saying they are blocking the highway is unjustified, as they clearly are not.</p>
Lorentz	Unknown					<p>The right to free, non violent protest is a right that we should not have to question. It is a breach on our civil liberties to take this powerful means of communication and discourse away from us. For many disabled individuals this will mean a particular blow, some of whome will find it difficult to make themselves heard already- removing our right to be heard does not remove the validity of what we have to say.</p> <p>For a number of years activists led a peaceful protest in Parliament Square against the war. This was done without violence and without an increase in crime in this area. It was also important, in that it kept a clear reminder that many of us did not agree with the war.</p> <p>Allowing this proposal to go through will only highlight further the oppressive tactics employed by the government to deal with those that do not agree with their policies.</p>
Lynch	SE1		See right hand column	This proposal is an assault on the right to protest and would give individual police constables the power to bully protestors by confiscating their personal property.	The use of amplified noise equipment, in a very literal sense, is a vital part of having your voice heard. On the busy streets of London they are no more of a nuisance than the noise of traffic.	<p>Tents Provisions: The proposals are an erosion of the legitimate right to protest. It is particularly important that this right should not be curtailed in the area containing the seat of power in this country. In a properly functioning democracy, it is vital that citizens can make known their concerns. The ability to protest 24 hours a day rather than just through a one-off march, say, is therefore an essential part of the democratic ideal of which we are so proud in this country. And far from being a nuisance, encampments are a tourist attraction that benefits Westminster, as they</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						are part of the centuries-old heritage of protest in this country! The main reason given for the proposals – that such encampments are becoming more prevalent – is therefore not compelling.
McDade-Byrne	EC1					<p>My reasons are as follows. In a democracy, it is the right of the citizens to hold peaceful protests. Although Westminster council claims that its aim is not to curb legitimate protest, I believe that this law has no other target. There are already sufficient laws in place which prevent unlawful actions during a protest (Breach of the Peace and Obstruction of the Highway in particular). Therefore the proposed new byelaw is designed to prevent people from protesting in ways that are peaceful and, at present, legal.</p> <p>The key issue is whether or not a protest is peaceful or not. These new byelaws place restrictions on the duration of protests. However, it is my view that in a democracy, people should be allowed to hold protests for as long as they wish. In fact, it is often only through a sustained protest that protests can have any success.</p> <p>I do not see any reason for the creation of these byelaws, and I wholeheartedly oppose them.</p>
McDonald	Southampton	The designated area should be the whole of Parliament Square Green. I.e the roundabout where the existing	Because the proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate in view of the need for protestors to have a safe place to stay.	Because the proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate in view of the need for protestors to have a safe place to stay. In addition, the seizing of people's personal possessions is illegal and much waste of money would be spent on retrieval of property	Because the proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate in view of the need for protestors to have a safe place to use amplified sound equipment occasionally in the course of their protest.	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
		Peace Camp is situated.		through the courts.		
Musty	Brighton	See right hand column	Because as I said above it is a violation of a human right to free expression and the right to stand up for what you believe in and a clear attempt to squash resistance to the current system.	Because, I repeat, it is a violation of a human right to free expression and the right to stand up for what you believe in and a clear attempt to squash resistance to the current system.	Because, I repeat again, it is a violation of a human right to free expression and the right to stand up for what you believe in and a clear attempt to squash resistance to the current system. Amplified noise equipment is a vital part of any protest	I believe that these byelaws present a violation of the right under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right of freedom of expression). I am therefore against them FULL STOP and therefore my only comment on the designated area is that it should not exist.
Naftalin	Edinburgh		See right hand column	If the law is wrong in the first place (see above) then this would be gratuitous punishment, having the effect of deterring reasonable political expression.	Same reason as given above in respect of seizure of tents and sleeping equipment.	Tents and sleeping equipment are a necessary part of any sustained protest. Sustained protest is a form of free speech and legitimate political activity which should be legal and legitimate in a democracy. This byelawa would be an illiberal repression of legitimate political expression.
Neeve	Alton		See right hand column	The tents and equipment are not being used to commit crime. They belong to people, they are the property of someone else and you should not equip yourself with the right to take or destroy someone else's property through a bye law. I would hate to see	The equipment is not being used to commit crime. They belong to someone else and you should not equip yourself with the right to take property via a mere bylaw. The council already have an existing byelaw to deal with instances of excessive noise, it is more	Tents: There is a long history of protest in this country and indeed it has brought about much in the way of positive social change. Using tents and camping as a form of protest has a long historical precedent throughout the world. I do not think it is appropriate that a byelaw should be introduced in order to try and stop legitimate peaceful protest. In a free and democratic country, known for tolerance, we should not suppress freedom of speech or the right to protest with tents petty bye laws. Tents are used to convey messages in much the same way as a banner and this is invaluable to protest movements. I do not want to live in an oppressive police state, where the

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
				the sort of scenes we have seen in America occurring in Great Britain. Whatever you think of the protests or the people involved in them, they still deserve to be treated with respect.	reasonable to use this bylaw in the same way as you would with other people. To attempt to create a new law just to penalise a certain group of people seems to me to be a rather prejudiced approach and makes me question if the City Council is acting in the interests of one sector of society at the expense of many others.	great British public are not allowed to express themselves. We have a wonderful tradition of freedom of speech, we have all kinds of festivals and traditions that have grown up out of historical events. Please don't try to stop protest, social change and history with this mean spirited bylaw.
Obedencio	St Paul's protester	See right hand column	See right hand column	I refer you to my previous two answers... In addition, any seizure and/or forfeiture of private property by the police or 'authorised' officers will amount to state sanctioned theft and will result in costly lawsuits being filed either in the UK or, if necessary, in the European Court of Human rights, against the police and relevant agencies.	I refer you to my previous two answers...	Designated area: Yes, I do. The 'designated area' appears to encircle a number of high profile government / establishment buildings, their associated public highways and nothing else, indicating that the purpose of these proposals is solely to safeguard likely sites of political demonstrations in the coming months and years. Clearly, these proposals are entirely politically motivated and have nothing to do with the common good or any public safety concerns. Indeed, they run contrary to the public interest, in the big scheme of things. Tents: The proposal to prohibit the use of tents in the designated areas is a clear attempt to criminalise legitimate protest, and silence dissent in the run up to this years London Olympics, and Jubilee celebrations following on from the rapid growth of the worldwide Occupy movement in 2011. This movement exists to fight needless inhumane cuts, described with the weasel word 'austerity' measures, which is the transfer of wealth from the people of this country, to the privileged corporatocracy, illegal wars and the corrupting influence on supposed 'democracies' of exorbitant corporate influence. The 99% are slowly waking

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						<p>up to the true Corporatist nature of the societies we live in. As such, they cannot, and will not, be silenced or brushed under the carpet. Any and all attempts to do so will surely only compound the problem further and make future protests and dissent ever bigger and louder. Therefore, on every conceivable level, these proposals are short-sighted, unjustifiable and counter-productive.</p> <p>General: In conclusion, an infinitely smarter, and wiser approach to the inevitable continuation of what is now an unstoppable democracy movement, would, in my view, be for the state to first acknowledge that its allegiance is meant to be to its people in a true democracy, as opposed to a corporatocracy, and then to take real steps to redress that situation by roundly rejecting the illegitimate proposals that these corporate lobbyists are seeking to make law.</p>
Olszowski	Truro	Inimical to justice and the exercise of, admittedly qualified, European Convention/HRA rights around the right to assembly. Would be bad enough in ANY local authority area – but in the locale of the seat	The right to protest is an important bulwark against unchecked executive power. Any suppression of this qualified right must be proportionate to the threat posed and time limited only for the duration of the threat. The protection of amenity and restricting noise levels, while undoubtedly	While tents and sleeping equipment may again be seen as disturbing the amenity of this area, this should not be used as a pretext for a pre-emptive crackdown on a legally protected right to assembly.	These powers are too broad and leave too much discretion in the hands of police and officials. The opportunities for mission creep are also very real here. This must be resisted.	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
		of parliament, this is a symbolic affront to democracy and further insulates elected officials from those who put them there.	important, does not justify a permanent suppression of the right to protest in this area.			
Pasteur	N1		See right hand column	As above	As above. This equipment is not used in an antisocial manner as part of protest, but to make a point to those who otherwise may not hear or listen. Again, I would suggest that this amendment to the byelaws is specifically designed to restrict the right to protest in the vicinity of Parliament.	Because this is specifically designed to restrict the right to protest in the vicinity of the Houses of Parliament and government departments. As we have seen in recent years from Parliament Square to Tahrir Square, the tent has become part of the protesters tools that goes beyond a petition, a one day march or a picket and can be used to demonstrate the strength of feeling towards particular issues. It is essential that citizens' right to protest is not gagged by unnecessary laws in our democracy. This is legitimate peaceful protest that is a crucial part of a healthy democracy.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Pearce	Oxfordshire					<p>I do not know what world you are living in but the drafted bylaws for Parliament Square that will remove the right for the erection of tents, other structures and not permit the use of sound equipment are clearly a direct attack on democratic movements such as Occupy and Union Strikes. I very much feel that such action is disproportionate, inappropriate and against the basic freedom of British citizens to protest peacefully in a manner that they see fit.</p> <p>Your time would be better spent listening to these people and working to broaden the freedoms of British citizens and towards building an environmentally sustainable future for our country, our children and the world rather than working to protect oil companies, banks, big business and a corrupt political system.</p> <p>The question I ask myself is who would I trust to represent me politically? Those currently in power with their large salaries, huge bank balances, untrustworthy theft of tax payers money and total lack of understanding for public opinion OR those who have really captured the national mood and are willing to camp in the cold, wet streets for free in the aim of making a fairer, greener future for all.</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Polden	Unknown					<p>1) In trying to introduce such powers are seeking to pervert the decisions of Parliament. The Government, in section 3 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 gave almost identical powers, expressed in identical words, to the police to deal with tents, other sleeping equipment and noise equipment to the proposed bye-law. However, Parliament decided, in its wisdom, to limit the application of the law to the area within Parliament Square. In the light of this, it ill behoves Westminster Council to subvert this clear decision by attempting to extend the reach of what are basically the provisions of part 3 to a much wider area in the form of bye-laws.</p> <p>2) The situation that arises would be confusing, particularly for those on the streets, but also to those charged with enforcing them. We would have two almost identically-worded laws, one applying only to the area in Parliament Square, enforced by the police and bearing a maximum penalty of £5000 and another applying to both Parliament Square and a jigsaw of surrounding streets, enforced by agents of Westminster Council (eg bailiffs, who may be no more than licensed thugs), and bearing a maximum penalty of £500.</p> <p>3) The notes to the proposal say that the bye-law is not meant to apply to “rough sleepers”, but it would clearly prevent them making themselves comfortable by erecting structures or even using equipment to help them sleep such as blankets, sleeping-bags, cardboard or even newspapers in the designated areas. (Section (3) (2) (c) & (d) of the proposed byelaw includes as “prohibited activities”, “(c) placing or keeping in place in any area to which Byelaws 3 to 8 apply any sleeping equipment with a view to its use (whether or not by the person placing it or keeping it in place) for the purpose of sleeping overnight in that area”; and “(d) using any sleeping equipment in any area to which Byelaws 3 to 8 apply for the purpose of sleeping overnight in that area.”</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Pollard	Milton Keynes	See right hand column	<p>Would the council be considering this action if it were not for the occupy movement camped outside St Pauls Cathedral? No they wouldn't.</p> <p>Does this action not show the council as weak and scared of any further action by the occupy movement? Yes it does.</p> <p>Is this whole process another waste of tax payers money? Yes it is.</p>	<p>British citizens have the right to protest peacefully, tents do not cause a problem and neither do sleeping people. The only reason for these new byelaws is to save face in the future and to prevent any embarrassment caused by any action by the occupy movement around the time of the Olympic games.</p>	<p>Britain prides itself on the rights of its citizens, one of which is the freedom of speech. As long as there is no offensive content then there should be no restrictions on this. Speaking out about the unfair policies of central government and large corporations is only offensive to central government and large corporations.</p> <p>Amplification equipment is used in the house of commons so why cant it be used in the open when there are large crowds of people who all want to hear what is being said.</p>	<p>Designated area: As the area is a public area and not private grounds, should there be any restrictions on its use at all?</p> <p>Would the council be considering this action if it were not for the occupy movement camped outside St Pauls Cathedral?</p> <p>Does this action not show the council as weak and scared of any further action by the occupy movement</p>
Pritchard	Kingston		It is of utmost importance that prohibition does not go ahead.	It is also of utmost importance.	As above.	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Rees	SE20	These proposals are repressive, draconian and anti-democratic; they should be scrapped at once. If there is to be a, "designated area", which, I repeat, there should not be, it should be shrunk to the smallest possible size, perhaps that of a postage stamp	Set out in right hand column	Set out in right hand column	You want to steal our music too do you? Never tire of playing the part of the pantomime villain? There are fairytales of old about evil or deranged kings who banned music throughout their realms. And these are the role models you seek to emulate? Seriously, you couldn't make this stuff up. Like I said, pathetic	<p>Tents provisions: We have a sham democracy in which the politicians serve their corporate masters & the public doesn't even bother voting because they know nothing changes. All life on the planet is threatened by climate change & there is no possibility of addressing this whilst corporate interests dictate public policy. The only way any of this will change is through popular uprising, and this is brewing. Time magazine, not usually noted for it's left wing perspective, has named the protester as person of the year for 2011, predicting that what has happened so far, in the occupations here & elsewhere, is merely the tip of the iceberg & that major change is coming. These proposals are any attempt to stifle the people in our righteous call for change to the existing corrupt & destructive regime. They will fail miserably but are nonetheless to be utterly despised for the cowardly strategy of bullies that they truly are. They will not alter the course of history, but will unnecessarily hurt individual people along the way, but then what else should we expect from ruthless profiteers, who make a ludicrously excessive living from the suffering of others & destruction of ecosystems on a daily basis?</p> <p>Tents Seizure: Please see above. Frankly, it is pathetic & contemptible, the super-rich & powerful elites, in their massive shiny towers & ostentatious palaces to unrestrained capital, getting all worked up over a few poor people in tents, sending out the storm troopers to seize their tents, taking what little they have from people who have next to nothing, to punish them for daring to speak up. Shame on the lot of you, I hope the foie gras & quails' eggs stick in your craw.</p>
RMT Finsbury Park (Mr Watson)	Finsbury Park					please do not pass this bill as this would kill ordinary people's right to tell parliament of their true feeling

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Routley	Bristol		This is obviously a measure designed to prohibit the occupy campaign which is a peaceful protest. Limiting the rights of the public to protest in order to keep them out of sight and the news will only undermine the confidence the public has in the government.	Physically removing occupy encampments is only going to give further bad press. Also those tents etc are the property of the individuals, if you want to evict them, give them a chance to pack up their things and leave with them.	There is no real difference between a megaphone and a tannoy in a shop. We accept that we are likely to hear broadcasted messages when we leave our houses, it is not an issue. As for the confiscation of this equipment, refer to my disagreement with the previous section.	
Rowley	Unknown					I strongly oppose the proposal to restrict democratic protest in Parliament Sq and its environs, or anywhere else. The right to peaceful protest is inalienable and should not be curtailed in any way. To do so moves us inexorably closer to being a police state.
St Bruno	E11	See right hand column	Existing laws and bylaws are perfectly sufficient. I cannot see any reason why an amendment to existing legislation is required. I consider this particular amendment to represent an unwanted infringement on civil liberties. A thinly veiled attempt by	I do not see any reason why current legislation is lacking. The proposed seizure and forfeiture of tents, etc and sleeping equipment in the designated areas seems to be an hysterical over reaction by authorities to a peaceful, non-violent expression of free speech. The seizure of property and threats of legal action to encampment	I firmly believe that the benefits of free speech outweigh the inconvenience posted by tents, public demonstrations and noise equipment.	Countless generations have helped to build, fund, maintain and cultivate a civic community in this proposed area. It has significance for every citizen. It is no surprise then that this area is sometimes used to focus community attention on issues that relate to the society of the day. The fact that changes to major issues are more often than not slow to arrive and in many cases hard won is not surprise either. Although there are numerous methods employed to lobby for a cause, it would seem reasonable to admit that there will always be a given section of activist that will highlight their concern by long term non-violent action or civil disobedience. To attempt to eradicate this practice is erroneous and undermines a good part of what democracy is all about.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
			authorities to limit the paradigm of public debate.	participants represent and unnecessary, unwarranted and unjustified hostility.		
Salter	Brighton		Protest is a legitimate means of expressing discontent, the alternative to which is violence	Why should people be at risk of losing their possessions simply for being in public space?	See previous comment. There is no legal precedent for the seizure of personal possessions when no crime has been committed.	
Sangster	London	There should be no designated area - this new byelaw is simply about creating an exclusion zone around parliament and government where protest is restricted	See right hand column	That Council officials will be able to seize possessions on the streets of London is a dangerous precedent to set. It will be unworkable in practice and lead the council into embarrassing court cases about the way it has dealt with people and their possessions.	The ability to convey the message of a protest audibly is fundamental to the raison d'être of holding any demonstration. This byelaw will rule out speeches – a traditional and vital part of demonstrations. It will effectively allow the council to silence people as they make their protest in the name of reducing noise in what must be one of the boroughs most blighted by traffic noise in the	<p>Tents: Westminster Council should not be clamping down on any form of protest particularly in areas adjacent to the Houses of Parliament or government buildings. The map reveals that this new byelaw is simply about creating an exclusion zone around parliament and government where protest is restricted and emasculated.</p> <p>The 'unsightly' situation that has arisen in Parliament Square could have been handled differently by the authorities, in order to deal with tents that are not authorised or not occupied, while leaving in place others legitimately protesting. The fence did not need to remain in place. It looks like the situation has been allowed to deteriorate in order to make the case for new legislation.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the Council feels it has to act out of 'fear' that a 'new encampment could appear in the precincts of Westminster Abbey.' New laws should not be</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
		and emasculated.			<p>country. Parliamentarians should be subject to seeing and hearing demonstrations otherwise the idea of our democratic right to protest becomes farcical.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important for the coordination of protests, for organisers to be able to address people attending a demonstration using amplification equipment. Without that ability, protests are more likely to become unmanageable.</p>	put in place because of the remote possibility that something may happen – this does not demonstrate a clear need. The Occupy camp at St Pauls has proved to be a well managed and responsible response to the most important political situation of the times and they have huge public support. The Council should be prioritising democratic freedoms over managing unwarranted fears.
Sears	E8		I think long term protests are justified, it is too easy for the authorities to ignore marches and demos	My family feel proud to live in a country (a) where there are people with enough dedication and conviction to stand up for what they believe in (not just for a few hours but for as long as it takes) and (b) where they are allowed to do so	Bearing silent witness is a powerful act, I don't think protesters should make others lives uncomfortable (apart from their consciences)	
Spoiala	Harrow		See right hand column	See right hand column	Noise equipment has always been used around London's streets and sometimes for ridiculous reason but they have not	Tents: I disagree with the proposal as I know it would not be right to have such an important part of protest taken away. When important points are being made and need to be heard people should be allowed to peacefully do so and if they are willing and truly dedicated to the cause they are

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
					<p>caused much concern to me and people I know. We should be allowed to hear other points of view or even things we already hold an interest in where ever we are and therefore sound equipment shouldn't be seized. While advertisements are now such a big part of our lives as we hear and see nearly everywhere we are, so should the voices and faces of protestors because they too are entitled to freedom of speech.</p>	<p>entitled to have their voices heard and given space to do so. The point about living in a democratic society with freedom of speech, I am sure has been raised again and again. This proposal relating to use of tents etc will not benefit people's opinions, especially young people, of what makes a just and fair government when freedom of protest, being allowed to fight for a cause in difficult times, is repressed. Protests where camping is involved and whether it is not, should be still taken as a protest and so not be legislated against.</p> <p>The people living in "protest" tents aren't doing this for fun but because they want to truly make a point. They do deserve to be respected for dedicating a part of their life to try change things that have been shown not to have benefited in some shape or form our country. If these people haven't been able to be listened to in the past or even now by the government and others, that does not mean they are not worthy of protesting in tents. It does not mean that they are there to cause a danger to public safety or health as it has been mentioned. Rather than neglecting them, more support for these people's tent accommodation might improve order and stigma around protestors being unhygienic.</p>
Stanley	Horsham	See right hand column	See right hand column	<p>Repeats previous answer and adds</p> <p>In addition, any seizure and/or forfeiture of private property by the state will amount to state authorised theft and will almost certainly result in costly lawsuits being filed either in the</p>	<p>Repeats previous 2 answers and adds</p> <p>In conclusion, an infinitely smarter and wiser approach to the inevitable continuation of what is now an unstoppable democracy movement, would be for the state to first</p>	<p>Designated area: Yes, I do. The 'designated area' merely encircles a number of high profile government / establishment buildings, their associated public highways and nothing else, indicating that the purpose of these proposals is solely to shut down likely sites of political demonstrations in the coming year/s. This clearly indicates that these proposals are entirely politically motivated and have nothing to do with the common good or any public safety concerns. Indeed, they are run contrary to the public interest.</p> <p>Tents: These proposals are a clear attempt to criminalise</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
				UK or, if necessary, in the European Court of Human rights, against the police and relevant agencies.	acknowledge that its allegiance is meant to be to the people in a true democracy, not big business, and then to take real steps to redress that situation by roundly rejecting the illegitimate proposals that these corporate lobbyists are seeking to make law.	legitimate protest and silence dissent in the run up to this years London Olympics and Jubilee celebrations following on from the rapid growth of the worldwide Occupy movement in 2011. This movement exists to fight needless inhumane 'austerity' measures, illegal wars and the corrupting influence on supposed 'democracies' of exorbitant corporate influence. The 99% are slowly waking up to the true Corporatist nature of the societies we live in. As such, they cannot, and will not, be silenced or brushed under the carpet. Any and all attempts to do so will surely only compound the problem further and make future protests and dissent ever bigger and louder. Therefore, on every conceivable level these proposals are shortsighted, unjustifiable and counter-productive.
Swindle	Unknown					I wish to inform you that the email address supplied for your public consultation of changes to bye laws in and around Parliament Square is an invalid address, leaving those without the means to post letters unable to support or object to the proposal. This error makes the public consultation invalid and I suggest you rectify your clerical error and add another 14 days to the public consultation end date to allow the public ample time to give their opinions.
Tajasque	SW19					I am writing to complain about the proposed bye-laws to remove tents and restrict the use of megaphones in Parliament Square, Whitehall and other areas of Westminster. Westminster is the heart of our democracy and people must be allowed to exercise their democratic right and human right to protest when they believe their government is acting undemocratically or illegally. This is especially important when it concerns an issue as serious as the launching of a war. I particularly object to the provision concerning the issue of whether a protest is slightly or not. Westminster should be the hub of our democracy, not a museum.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Tarbet	Penzance	I object to any and all of the proposed designated areas proposed for making peaceful protests an offence.	I believe that peaceful protest should be encouraged as it shows that we are tolerant and open society. These sorts of laws that are proposed are worthy of Franco who was, I believe, fascist.	While some may think these items may be ugly they are evidence of a healthy democracy. If they were to be seized it would shame Westminster City Council	As far as I can tell there has been no excessive noise. But then there has been no media coverage at all, perhaps because there has been no trouble at all?	
Tobin	Wallington	I fully disagree with the proposals. Turning London into a Police State is just unacceptable.	It is legitimate vehicle of protest	It is legitimate protest	Amplified public speaking should not be banned.	
Topiman	Fishguard	Seems to nicely outline where the rich people are. A cocoon for those in power to be yet further distanced from the people they're	All citizens have a democratic right to be heard and to protest, for as long or short a time as they feel they need to. This consultation is just a way to sweep away the visual representation of the shame the authorities feel for their actions.	Seizure of people's possessions for exercising their right to protest is undemocratic and unlawful.	As above. Does the consultation extend to the noisy money-making areas of Soho on a Saturday night? Of course not. This is blatant targetting of protesters.	

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
		<p>supposed to represent.</p> <p>I'm against the very concept of this consultation</p>	<p>Citizens must be allowed to voice their opinions, and if that takes time then they must also have the right to shelter etc for them to do so.</p>			
Townend	SE5		<p>I think this greatly endangers the public right to protest. There is no evidence from the recent protest camp at St Paul's that in my opinion endangers the public or is unsafe. Using this excuse to stop people protesting therefore is grossly unfair.</p>	<p>I do not see why protesters wishing to stay for long periods should be stopped from doing so.</p>	<p>I do not see evidence for why this would be necessary. Current legislation should cover this.</p>	
Tucker	Parliament Square Protester					<p>Set out at the end as they are too extensive to fit in the table</p>
Tutty	N22	<p>See right hand column</p>	<p>See right hand column</p>	<p>I disagree, because it isn't hurting anyone, and it isn't your property to steal.</p> <p>This view may seem quaint or naive to</p>	<p>Same as in "Tents" in right hand column</p>	<p>Designated area: Yes, if it is in a public place and the tents/equipment is private property, then this restricts the rights of any member of the public carrying or placing anything the Law doesn't approve of.</p> <p>In the case of dangerous goods or weapons this makes sense, but in this case we are talking about public areas, in</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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, but this is the line that the majority of citizens will take.		<p>which carrying or placing non-dangerous objects would seem reasonable.</p> <p>I do not believe even the existing bylaws are in the public interest. Espically not if they were brought into existence to protect property, rather than people.</p> <p>These laws are to keep public order, which doesn't appear to have suffered any great problems from the tents, unlike the riots in Tottenham which were effectively allowed to freely run their course before anything was done.</p> <p>Tents I disagree with these proposals, as the bylaws are not there to allow Westminster to control their citizens, but to restrict any use that stops their citizens from using it legitimately.</p> <p>The tents may be untidy to the eye, but they are genuine attempts to engage with Westminster authorities, in such a way that the authorities are made to come down from their ivory towers and engage on an equal basis with their citizens. Something they have previous not appeared to have done.</p> <p>If this proposal does anything other than reduce the current restrictions, it will invite condemnation of the Westminster authorities, as ruling their constituents rather than serving them. Unless there is a more vocal group than those occupying the area, these are the representatives of the majority of citizens.</p>
Van Looy	Unknown					I would implore you to think again regarding this radical reduction in the freedom to protest.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Webster-Brown	Alton	No area should be designated. This is a free country and its citizens should be at liberty to pitch tents and the like when it is part of a political protest.	This is purely to stop the Occupy movement and is undemocratic.	It is licensed theft.	Again, this is licensed theft. If people want to protest loudly why shouldn't they?	
Whittaker	Shepshed	See right hand column	To allow peaceful protest to carry on. Demonstrate we are a free country and not oppressive towards change and freedom of speech.	These are the tools of a new form of peaceful protest. The alternatives are violent uprisings as seen in other counties so surely this needs to be an acceptable form of protest.	For all the issues already discussed being free speech and peaceful demonstration.	Designated area: This is the heart of the seat of power of the UK and if we truly are a free country surely we should allow protest in any peaceful means. These tented protests are peaceful and should not be outlawed.
Williams	Parliament Square protester	See right hand column	As things stand, it is still legal for us to use tents and other personal effects to facilitate our protest; I see no reason why the authorities should be permitted to change the law in this respect.	Apart from this measure being intended to inconvenience campaigning, there is also the fact that it would effectively render permanent campaigners homeless.	I am for the limited use of amplified equipment in certain situations, but against it where use of such equipment is used to merely create a nuisance, with no definite objective from the user(s).	In a true democracy, the perceived need for an exclusion zone around Parliament would not exist. The proposed legislation gives the distinct impression that various authorities, whatever they might claim in public, do not support the right to protest; and, considering that the government of the UK continues to break international law on a daily basis, never more has it been necessary to speak out freely against their actions, committed in the name of this country.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
Wood	Fulham	See right hand column	See right hand column	Protest is a human right, these people should not be moved	Human rights, these people have the right to protest	<p>The tents and people should not be removed. Stop giving the police the powers to be thugs to anyone who disagrees with the government. It is a human right to be able to protest.</p> <p>Because we are a democratic country and people have the right to protest, Our wonderful country is being ruined by our government and their policing. People are getting fed up from all walks of life and backgrounds. The more you move the protesters on the more backlash you will receive from the general public. This is not a wise move.</p>
Young	W2					<p>A resident of Westminster, where our family have occupied the same house for 5 generations.</p> <p>We value London as our home, and as a magical city of freedom and creativity, where people are enabled to make a living, speak their minds, do what's right for them, take responsibility for themselves and stand up against injustice when they need to.</p> <p>I am concerned that these new proposals are explicitly intended to prevent</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. protest camps and 2. dancing in the street. <p>Considering the scale of the problems we face, in particular the scale of lawbreaking and insititutionalised theft still underway in the City of London and the hedge fund offices of Mayfair, it seems a little strange to see Westminster Council cracking down on those who take peaceful action to draw attention to the ongoing pillage, and to express themselves and their cultures through music and dance.</p> <p>After all, it will be up to the Council to deal with the homeless, the impoverished, the mentally ill etc who all the evidence shows are adversely affected by profound inequalities present in our society today.</p> <p>Please. We elect and pay the Council to keep good order in our city.</p> <p>There is a far, far greater risk to good order from an</p>

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree 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)
						unbalanced economy, official inaction against white collar crime and a creeping loss of civil liberties, than there is from a few tents and some dancing in the streets. Angry people need outlets for their feelings. If you prevent their expressing them peacefully... Looking forward to hearing a considered and intelligent response from our local Council
Young	E1	The map should not include the immediate area surrounding the House of Parliament and Parliament Square.	We should, as British citizens have the right to make our protest known and heard by the members of parliament.	Equipment should not be seized if it is part of a long-term protest. The need to protest is far more important than keeping any area pretty for tourist and removal of the equipment may impact on the protestors rights.	Whether we agree with the protest aims, protestors have the right to protest as long as the it does not breach equality laws.	

Babs Tucker

The comments of Babs Tucker, who is a protester in Parliament Square are as follows:

in essence my response was to file an application for judicial review on december 16th 2011 (co/12316/2011).

the state could only impose conditions under the public order act, on what has been a ten year 24/7 peaceful assembly called the parliament square peace campaign, if there were serious public disorder etc.

beyond that the state would be acting disproportionately.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree with the proposals

and it is well established in case law that you cannot punish someone for the actions of others.

on 17th january 2011, westminster city council used an undercover police operation called peace strike/democracy village to try to bring proceedings against our ten year 24/7 parliament square peace campaign, under the highways act, as you can see below, those proceedings, have not proceeded ..very far.

on 17th march 2011, in satellite proceedings in argument over the location of our campaign, involving the mayor and our campaign, in The Mayor of London (Greater London Authority) v Haw & Ors [2011] EWHC 585 (QB) (17 March 2011)
URL: <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/QB/2011/585.html>

(note i am the tucker)

our campaign, in it's entirety, and including tents, was ruled lawful (ie: proportionate), albeit the judge, who did not consider all the evidence decided that he would like the whole campaign to be on the pavement. and of course, he was under a duty not to place us through his ruling, in an unlawful position.

so, neither the tents or our position could be illegal.

and, here's where it gets really corrupt

so when i was illegally imprisoned in august & september 2011, (when the court illegally denied me access to a duty solicitor) to try and cover up much state corruption, including the fact that the government ordered the police to remove our campaign on 23rd may 2006 (during which i was unlawfully arrested):

westminster city still failed to get their high court injunction while i was in prison, because steve jago filed the necessary paperwork

so on 31st august 2011, when no crime was even alleged, the police stole the whole campaign lock, stock and barrel, while it was manned, (including all the legally privileged material also pertaining to the alleged wcc claim)

and at this point, let's remind ourselves, that we are what ? a..... longstanding...errr peaceful assembly.

but still, as we notified the police in writing, who did not dispute the fact, our ten year 24/7 peaceful assembly/campaign continued.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree with the proposals

and westminster city council have failed to explain how they are continuing with proceedings, making me, legally responsible for the high court ruling where a judge put us on the pavement !!!!

so then parliament passed some incomprehensible legislation that is completely arbitrary called the police reform and social responsibility act on september 15th 2011.

this was despite parliament knowing we already had the ruling that we were proportionate, incl. tents, so parliament and the public authorities could not - then - get a ruling that our tents were not proportionate.

and all the public authorities would know that they were acting illegally, using any law that is arbitrary, because it is well established that laws that are arbitrary are unlawful.

parliament illegally intended that any public authority could take property, without proceedings being brought, and the law being subject to challenge.

taking property with force without proceedings is called theft, so all the public authorities would know they were acting illegally.

and i am not handing over campaign property, so how could i be arrested for obstruct pc, when police are not bringingproceedings ?

so on 16th december 2011, following the secretary of state for the home department's confusing commencement order on 23rd november 2011, i filed an application for judicial review of the new law that includes the old law, including the involvement of the various public authorities.

this includes westminster city council's illegal consultation.

westminster council began an illegal consultation (which should be subject to being included in my application for judicial review)

the consultation is illegal because westminster city council have refused without reasonable excuse to:

a) provide upon request as they must, a legal opinion to show, how in the absence of serious public disorder, it is (a) proportionate (ie: a condition) that a subjective view of how our campaign looks, can be made into a criminal offence

b) provide the necessary legal basis as to how there could be both primary and secondary legislation over the same issue of tents, in the same area

and attached is the sign that the police have put in parliament square.

Annex C: Summary of Responses of those who generally disagree with the proposals

the police (like westminster city council) know that it would only be proportionate to ...remove... tents that are not manned by any campaign.

and i have always identified property that is not part of our campaign.
and no court could find it proportionate to do otherwise.

it was disrespectful for mr anghel to a) refuse to engage in meaningful communication that included providing me with the necessary legal opinions, while
b) demanding 158 pounds for his time....

all he has shown, is that wcc are not fit to in effect impose conditions.

the whole point of our being in parliament square is because people are dying in illegal wars, because the necessary conversations - about law - are not being had.