

**Summary Proof of Evidence on Need
Produced by John Dodsworth on behalf of
Mid-Sussex District Council**

April 2021

Appellant: Hartmires Investment Ltd

**Appeal Site: Land north of Turners Hill
Road, Turners Hill LPA**

Reference: DM20/2877 and AP/21/0009

PINS Reference: APP/D3830/W/21/326656

CD8.2a

1. My evidence relates to the need element of the proposal to build a crematorium at the consented natural burial ground off Turners Hill Road in Turners Hill, Mid Sussex.
2. In section 1, I give my credentials and experience of geographic and demographic analysis for over twenty five years.
3. Section 2 sets the context for the following analysis and the resources I have drawn on.
4. In section 3 I set out what criteria would affect the need element.
 - a. I outline the data, both demographic and geographic, and their sources, that are used in the analysis.
 - b. I also state the Appellant's case as I understand it. That is, that a need arises from how far many people in the area have to drive to a crematorium, that neighbouring crematoria are operating beyond their capacity, and that the provision of crematorium services will become worse as population and deaths increase.
5. In Section 4 I set out the methodologies for modelling drive time catchment areas and draw comparisons between the Appellant's analysis and my own.
 - a. The use of 30 minute cortege drive times
 - b. The use of different sized geographical units (Lower Super Output Areas and Output Areas)
 - c. How populations are allocated to drive time catchments
 - d. Why road speeds used for modelling corteges are important to derive the most accurate catchment areas
 - e. A comparison of 30 minutes drive time catchments and populations using maps and tables for the current scenario and one where Turners Hill crematorium is operating.
 - f. Comparison of Peter Mitchell's results and mine of the benefits of a new crematorium.
 - g. Detail of the incremental drive time benefit achieved.
 - h. I conclude that the effect on the Surrey and Sussex crematorium warrants more detailed analysis and compare that effect using the Appellant's analysis and my analysis.

- i. I conclude in 4.49 that the Appellant uses a drive time methodology insufficiently transparent or detailed, and that the benefit is smaller than claimed by the Appellant.
6. In section 5 the different methods of calculating capacity are presented: 'technical', 'core' and 'peak'.
 - a. The volatility of peak measurements is explained and a suggestion offered for better considering how the peak demand affects capacity measurement.
 - b. The unclear relationship between capacity and funeral delays is discussed.
 - c. In 5.14 and 5.15 I show the difference in capacity of Surrey and Sussex crematorium when different core slots and different capacity thresholds are applied.
 - d. I conclude in 5.16 that Surrey and Sussex crematorium is not currently over-trading.
7. In section 6 I examine when future capacity will likely become constrained, by two different measures, based on projected deaths. I conclude that the time will be between 2027 and 2034 assuming little change to external factors.
8. Section 7 analyses an alternative (theoretical) location by way of comparison with the Turners Hill analysis. I conclude that it is possible that substantially greater benefits can be achieved in terms of drive time and capacity while retaining viability.
9. Section 8 summarises and draws conclusions.
 - a. I conclude that the Appellant's methodology is not sufficiently accurate or transparent to support the drive-time analysis.
 - b. I also conclude that the benefits demonstrated by my analysis are only incremental, largely because of the proximity to an existing crematorium.
 - c. There is insufficient evidence that neighbouring crematoria have been operating over capacity in the last few years.
10. I conclude that there is no clear need for this development.