**Appendix C**

**The Statistics** –

**GYPSY & TRAVELLER PITCHES AND TRAVELLING SHOWPERSONS PLOTS IN THE CDC DISTRICT PER PARISH/WARD (the table) Statement of fact and commentary**

**GYPSY & TRAVELLER PITCHES AND TRAVELLING SHOWPERSONS PLOTS IN THE CDC DISTRICT PER PARISH/WARD***All CDC District Town Total Gypsy & Total travelling Total transit Total pitches /plots % of pitches/plots   
& Parish Councils traveller pitches showpersons plots site pitches with permission accommodated   
 with permission with permission*TOWN & PARISH COUNCILS ACCOMMODATING GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES:

Westbourne PC 36 1 0 37 22.02%

Funtington PC 19 2 3 24 14.29%

Southbourne PC 9 14 0 23 13.69%

Tangmere PC 23 0 0 23 13.69%

Sidlesham PC 12 3 0 15 8.93%

E Wittering PC 8 2 0 10 5.95%

Chid/Hambrook PC 9 0 0 9 5.36%

Westhampnett PC 0 0 9 9 5.36%

Oving PC 8 0 0 8 4.76%

Hunston PC 3 0 0 3 1.79%

Chichester DC 0 2 0 2 1.19%

Kirdford PC 2 0 0 2 1.19%

Birdham PC 1 0 0 1 0.60%

North Mundham PC 1 0 0 1 0.60%

Wisborough Grn PC 0 1 0 1 0.60%

TOWN & PARISH COUNCILS WITH NO GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES:

Bepton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Bignor PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Bosham PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Boxgrove PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Bury PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Cocking PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Compton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Donnington PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Duncton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Earnley PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Easebourne PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

East Dean PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

East Lavington PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Ebernoe PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Elsted & Treyford PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Fernhurst PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Fishbourne PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Fittleworth PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Graffham PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Harting PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Heyshott PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Lavant PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Lodsworth PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Loxwood PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Lurgashall PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Linchmere PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Midhurst Tn Council 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Milland PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Northchapel PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Petworth Tn Council 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Plaistow & Ifold PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Rogate PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Selsey Town Council 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Singleton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Stedham & Iping PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Stoughton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Sutton PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Tillington PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Trotto/Chithurst PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

West Dean PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

West Itchenor PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

West Lavington PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

West Wittering PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Woolbeding PC 0 0 0 0 0.00%

Totals 130 25 12 168 100.00%

**GYPSY & TRAVELLER PITCHES AND TRAVELLING SHOWPERSONS PLOTS PERMISSIONS GRANTED 2012 TO 2016**GYPSY & TRAVELLER PITCHES AND TRAVELLING SHOWPERSONS PLOTS PERMISSIONS GRANTED 2012 TO 2016

*Parish 2012 2016 2012 to 2016 2012 to 2016*

*Total pitches/plots Total pitches/plots Increase in pitches/plots % extra pitches/plots*

*with permission with permission with permission accommodated*

INCREASES 2012 TO 2016:

Westbourne 18 37 19 25.68%

Southbourne 9 23 14 18.92%

Funtington 4 24 10 13.51%

Westhampnett 0 9 9 12.16%

Chidham/Hambrook 1 9 8 10.81%

Sidlesham 7 15 8 10.81%

Hunston 0 3 3 4.05%

E Wittering 8 10 2 2.70%

Birdham 0 1 1 1.35%

NO INCREASE 2012 TO 2016:

Chichester 2 2 0 0.00%

Kirdford 2 2 0 0.00%

North Mundham 1 1 0 0.00%

Oving 8 8 0 0.00%

Tangmere 23 23 0 0.00%

Wisborough Green 1 1 0 0.00%

**Totals** 94 168 74

**NOTES ON THE FIGURES ABOVE:**• With the granting of this latest permission Westbourne houses a total of 41 pitches/plots. The percentage housed in Westbourne Parish stands at over 25% of all the pitches/plots in the entire CDC district.• CDC has a total of 60 Parish and Town Councils within its District which are covered by the CLPKP 2014-2029. Of the 60 only 15 Councils accommodate Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Show persons’ plots.   
• Between 2012 to 2016 Westbourne has seen by far the biggest increase in extra pitches/plots than any other Council/ward in the CDC whole district. In that period the amount of permissions has more than doubled.  
• Between 2012 to 2016 only 9 parishes have had to accommodate additional pitches/plots. Westbourne has had to accept 19, or 25%, of those new pitches/plots. To now recommend to permit an additional 4 plots is unsound, unsustainable and at odds with the rate paying residents of Westbourne who wish to retain a balanced community.   
• This intensification and unbalanced approach to planning policy fails to offer the sensible planning practice that is expected of the CDC planning department’s leadership. Whilst the Gypsy and Traveller subject is sensitive CDC must, on behalf of entire community, draft and implement a coherent, fair and balanced long term policy; a policy that is currently sadly lacking.