

SETTLEMENTS AND SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT
**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012 (AS AMENDED) NOTICE OF ADOPTION**

JUNE 2026

In accordance with Regulations 11 and 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), notice is given that Dartford Borough Council adopted its Settlements and Sustainable Locations (SSL) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 25 June 2026.

The SPD provides guidance on towns and villages identified in the Borough, and how sustainable transport for locations is considered in Dartford's Local Plan. Minor modifications to the SPD were made in response to representations received during public consultation. These are summarised in the table below.

The SPD, Adoption Statement and Consultation Statement can be viewed:

- [Online – view the documents online.](#)

- In hard copy at Dartford Borough Council Civic Centre, Dartford Central Library and Longfield Library.

The SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of a future planning applications in the borough. Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the above SPD may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of the decision. Any such application must be made promptly and not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted (25 September 2026).

Please contact the Planning Policy team at planning.policy@dartford.gov.uk for further information.

Table 1: Council response to consultation

Respondent ID	Respondent	Rep. No.	Comment	Response
1	Natural England		No substantive comment on content of SPD policies.	N/A
2	Historic England		Recommend adding reference to Policies D1-D7 of the Dartford Plan into Section 2 of the SPD, or signposting to them as a consideration for future development particularly in Dartford Town Centre.	Comments taken on board
3	KCC Highways		<p>Supports the principle of the SPD and raises the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned the SPD is more focused on larger development sites. Requests clarification to ensure all development, including smaller developments, is located in areas that provide reasonable access to services and sustainable transport. • Suggests provision of an indicative list of services and facilities that contribute to a site being considered “sustainable”, such as schools, GP surgeries, supermarkets, employment areas, leisure facilities, and public open spaces. • Requests reference to “wheeling” to ensure inclusivity for wheelchair users, those with mobility aids and pushchairs. • Strengthen policies by replacing “can” with “should” or “must” where appropriate. • Clearly define “easy walking distance” or cross-reference to the defined thresholds in Section 3. • Recommends modifying wording to SSL1 and Paragraphs 3.8, 3.12, 3.14, 5.12, 5.28 – see full response for details. 	Comments largely accepted and amendments made

4	Environment Agency	Respondent requests acknowledgement that other factors such as flood risk also need to be taken into account when considering the sustainability of a location for development.	Comments taken on board
5	National Highways	Supports the content of SPD policies and no modifications requested.	N/A
6	National Grid Electricity Transmissions	No substantive comment on content of SPD policies.	N/A
7	Graham Simpkin Planning	<p>Respondent raises several comments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of term “non-urban” is inconsistent with paragraph 110 of the NPPF. • Concerned about the SPD’s dismissal of the national Connectivity Tool. • Agrees with the principle of village designations via the SPD but objects to limiting village development to non-Green Belt land. Suggest that settlement boundaries have not been designated with consideration of accessibility, but rather whether the settlements are not in the Green Belt. • Concerned the SPD does not address different scales of development. Disagrees with proposed universal approach to all housing and trip-generating developments; specifically objects to merging requirements for small and medium windfall sites. • Respondent suggests windfall development on “grey belt” land in circumstances such as a lack of five-year housing land supply. • In regard to existing lawful developments, the respondent suggests that if there is an existing trip-generating development in place, the trips associated with that lawful use must be taken into account in 	<p>Some objections are outside the scope of the SPD, or are not consistent with the Dartford Plan, or are inappropriate for an SPD, or not otherwise possible under the time restrictions.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to address appropriate feedback suggestions.</p>

		<p>judging the accessibility of the new development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respondent notes difficulty locating the original LCWIP isochrones and questions their accuracy for several locations across the Borough. 	
8	DPV Consult Ltd (on behalf of PMG Regeneration Ltd)	<p>Supports the principle of the SPD, but raises the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defer adoption of the SPD until revised NPPF is published or make explicit that the SPD will be reviewed post-NPPF publication to avoid policy misalignment. Concerned the draft SPD dismisses the national Connectivity Tool. Suggests amending SPD wording to confirm the national tool should be used as part of a wider assessment alongside local, regional and national evidence, while retaining the SPD's Dartford-specific critique. Recommends adding an explicit statement to confirm the SPD's accessibility benchmarks are guidance to support judgement (not a policy "pass or fail" test), and are to be applied flexibly and proportionately to site-specific context. Benchmarks should be used to inform development proposals and should not go beyond existing requirements of the Local Plan and national policy. Suggests encouraging Travel Plans to include "fallback options" and that transport assessments should address reasonable future scenarios. Also recommends promoting the need for a brief "scheme parameters and assumptions" statement (or single reference table) to ensure alignment across disciplines, particularly 	<p>Some objections are outside the scope of the SPD, or are not consistent with the Dartford Plan, or are inappropriate for an SPD, or not otherwise possible under the time restrictions.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to address appropriate feedback suggestions.</p>

where accessibility benchmarks are applied.

9	Resident	<p>Support for Dartford being identified as a town within the urban area and Policies SSL1 and SSL2.</p> <p>However SPD should make clearer that not every location within the Dartford settlement is equally sustainable and applicants should demonstrate actual site-specific accessibility, and applications should be assessed against the quality and safety of real walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>The SPD should make clear that further development in Dartford should contribute to improving sustainable transport and local infrastructure.</p>	Addressed in the Dartford Local Plan.
---	----------	---	---------------------------------------