

Minutes of Mole Valley Cycling Forum Meeting, Thursday March 26th 2026 Held at MVDC Offices, Pippbrook, Dorking

Present: Lisa Scott (LS) [Chair; Hookwood/Charlwood], John Arnold (JA) [Treasurer; Dorking], Ian Houghton (IH) [Bookham], Roger Troughton (RT) [Secretary; Dorking], Julia Dickinson (JD) [Bookham] Cllr Bradley Nelson (BN) [Holmwoods], Robert Whitcombe (RW) [Fetcham Residents Association (FRA)],

Apologies:

Eric Palmer [Leatherhead], Peter Mayor [Leatherhead], Penny Tyson-Davies (PT-D) [Newdigate]

1. Previous Minutes

Accepted.

2. Matters Arising and Outstanding Actions from previous meetings not covered elsewhere

Nothing to report.

3. Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

BN had received the following Officer report that there were sessions with Council Members in November 2025 on:

- Cycle Corridor 1a Leatherhead to Great Bookham / Effingham
- Cycle Corridor 5 Leatherhead to Epsom (north corridor) and
- Core Walking Zone 2 Leatherhead.
- Core Walking Zone 23 Leatherhead North.

More recently in March 2026 the equivalent stage Member sessions were held on:

- Dorking Core Walking Zone
- Bookham Core Walking Zone

No further workshop sessions are scheduled, and it is understood is that SCC's intention is to conclude the feasibility in the summer and then undertake the public consultation.

It is worth noting that the Core Walking Zones also include elements of cycling!

Omitted from the above Officer report is that an online review session was organised by the LCWIP team on 16 March to update the FRA (Fetcham Residents Association) and other interested parties on Cycle Corridor 1: Leatherhead to Great Bookham and Core Walking Zone 2: Leatherhead. Further details on this session can be found in the Appendix to these notes.

JD reported that the Howard of Effingham school will not now be rebuilt by Berkeley Homes as part of their proposed new homes development. *Post meeting note:* details can be found here -

<https://www.effinghamparishcouncil.gov.uk/effingham-planning/>

There was a wide-ranging discussion on the current LCWIP proposals, with RW arguing that pragmatic solutions would be needed to achieve the necessary backing when they go out to consultation. RW also noted that ATE (Active Travel England) accept that parts of routes may not always be able to fully meet standards and this applied to Cycle Corridors and CWZs under consideration in Mole Valley. FRA strongly recommended a workshop session for Bookham residents, prior to Public Consultation on Cycle Corridor 1a, as BRA has indicated they will oppose the current proposals for Bookham in the absence of such a session. RW believes this will have a negative impact on public support for the overall route and funding decisions on the Fetcham sections – which have the support of FRA. *Post meeting note:* RW has since (7th April) spoken to Tim Hall as County Councillor for Fetcham and Leatherhead and he has said he will speak to senior personnel in SCC Highways to press for a BRA session.

There was a general consensus that the LCWIP process was dragging on and that the stakeholder involvement lacking. LS proposed that the Forum write to The LCWIP team and Neil McClure expressing these concerns.

Action: LS/RT.

LS reported that approval had been given to build around 446 houses plus a further 148 in the Hookwood area and that this scheme, having been previously removed from the LCWIP, needs to be added back in as a scheme for the team to consider. Of particular note is that in the vicinity there is 2/3mile of road without any footway which is the route to school and Gatwick train station.

4. BMX Track

LS has completed reviewing the contract and returned the proposed revised document to MVDC, and was awaiting a response. In February the Friends of Deepdene assisted with another clearance session. There are possible plans to organise an event to promote the track ahead of the summer holidays.

5. Route & Infrastructure Updates (where there is anything to report)

Bookham/Effingham area:

The consultation on the proposals to reduce sections of Lower Road to 20mph as part of wider traffic calming schemes focusing on Church Road, High Street, and surrounding roads in the vicinity of the "squareabout" has closed.

Leatherhead/Fetcham area:

- Givons Grove to Dorking eastern side – there was a suspicion as to whether this been resurfaced. *Post meeting note:* RT has since ridden along the cycle path between Mickleham and the Burford Bridge roundabout. Whilst it might appear to have been resurfaced, it has not, although any encroaching vegetation has been cleared.

Dorking Area:

- A25 Safety Improvements - see <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/a25-dorking-to-reigate-road-safety-improvements-scheme>.

Nothing to report as no progress is expected until after after the local government elections in May.

Westcott-Dorking Shared Route (NCN 22)

BN reported that the funding for bid to resurface the cycle route has been approved and that work is expected to commence around August time. Meanwhile BN is looking to approach SES Water with a view to connecting the route through to Curtis Road to avoid the narrow section in the Vincent Lane – West St – Station Road area. RW may be able to assist with details of the land management personnel at the Pennon Group.

Trig St

RT received the following update by email from PT-D:

“With regard to Trig Street, there is a possibility that, due to the dreadful state of the present surface of the footpath which renders the path unusable for pedestrians, it could go ahead with a much lesser width than the original specification of three meters. In fact, I believe this would be a much better option as it would allow for horses to go on the grassy verges when dry enough. Also, it would be less interference with the flora in the area. I have asked for this as a solution as surely this would be so much safer for everyone than the option of doing nothing at all.”

6. Gatwick DCO

Nothing to report on the DCO (Development Consent Order). Meanwhile the cycle lockers adjacent at South Terminal have been replaced with Sheffield stands, not all are covered. There are 6 Sheffield stands at North Terminal for public use, with staff cycle parking elsewhere.

Discussion within Gatcom regarding the number of representatives it will comprise will be resumed post the unitary elections.

7. Cycling Issues and Events: Road Racing/Sportives/Off-Road

No further reports had been received regarding issues with off-road cycling in the Leith Hill area.

8. Local Government Reorganisation and MVCF

The proposal to establish a Dorking and the villages Neighbourhood Area Committee has been given the go-ahead. RW has suggested that this Local Government Reorganisation Initiative <https://www.surrey.ac.uk/news/coalface-engagement-and-centre-britain-and-europe-launch-local-government-reorganisation-initiative> might be able to advise on getting better Stakeholder Engagement for RAs, Cycle Forum etc.

9. Dates and Venues for Future Meetings

The next formal meeting of the Forum will be in the **MVDC Offices**, Pippbrook, Dorking in Committee Room 1, at **7.00pm on Thurs 28th May (TBC)**. It was suggested that we hold an interim meeting on **Thurs 23rd April in The Stepping Stones, Westhumble**, from 7pm.

10. AOB

Launch of Our Future Surrey Pledge Campaign: LS reported that this includes a focus on Active Travel and Public Transport improvements.

MVCF Funding – JA to write to Cty Cllr Stephen Cooksey with regard to bidding for some funds.

RT had been notified that GBUG are organising the next Kiddical Mass ride on Sunday 17th May - more details on our (MVCF) website.

As reported last time, JA had written to Chris Coghlan MP, requesting that he ask Local Transport Minister Lilian Greenwood to make sure there is a stronger public awareness campaign to promote the new Highway Code rules as part of the new Road Safety Strategy. RT also sent in a similar request and subsequently received the response that such a question would be raised – details of which together with the response received can be viewed here: <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2026-02-09/111967/>

Shortly before the meeting was due to start, EP emailed a list of points he felt worthy of consideration. Some of them have been covered by these meeting notes, others we will endeavour to address offline.

Appendix: Fetcham Residents Association (FRA) Comments on the LCWIP Proposals

(photos have been omitted for conciseness, the original content is available upon request)

During the presentation on 16th March and the subsequent Q&A, the FRA in particular had the opportunity to provide feedback on the latest proposals. Set out in writing here are general and detailed comments which they have asked to be taken into account during the preparation of the “Feasibility Designs” for Public Consultation.

BRA Consultation

First, with reference to the exchanges with Simon Edge of Bookham Residents Association (BRA), FRA understand the BRA request for a further session to focus on the western (Bookhams) end of the “Lower Road spine” and FRA does support this. Participants at the June 2025 and March 2026 sessions, did allow FRA representatives (as prime initiators of the workshops) to focus on the Eastern (Leatherhead / Fetcham) end of the route. The discussion on some sections of the Lower Road through Bookham were either limited or almost non-existent, through no fault of BRA.

FRA believe it is really important that the LCWIP team does work with Bookham representatives to explore further some of the issues and pros and cons of different solutions. Then what goes forward to Public Consultation should have the broad support of key stakeholders as “reasonable”, even though there will not be consensus between all users of this transport corridor. Therefore, FRA strongly encourage you to arrange a Bookham session; a few hours of preparation and engagement in the short term may avoid negative reactions at Public Consultation and angst and extra work later.

FRA General Comments

- Overall FRA is happy to see the efforts made to incorporate suggestions made previously and the improvements to walking and cycling scores across the entire route (Slide 27)
- FRA sees the creation of the LCWIP Section 3 backbone, across Leatherhead and through Fetcham and Bookham, as being a strategic and important highways improvement to balance the needs of different users and reduce motor vehicle dominance
- FRA accepts the 20 mph limit benefits across much of the route, noting that the B2122 / A245 (Hawks Hill / Guildford Rd) route will provide the main through traffic option for motor vehicles to the south-west of the River Mole
- Keep design proposals simple and cost-effective where possible
- FRA urges that the LCWIP team expedites completion of the current Feasibility stages of the study, so that Public Consultation can take place before mid-July (and the start of the summer holidays) and funding opportunities can be pursued
- FRA requests that the LCWIP team arranges a combined briefing session on the “Feasibility Design” proposals (as updated in the light of the 16th March Session and Comments) for both Members and Representatives of Key Stakeholders, as a “sense check” before Public Consultation. Then all parties can have some confidence that the Feasibility Design has addressed issues raised by Stakeholders as far as reasonably practical and can encourage constructive feedback from residents.

FRA recognises that the Lower Rd section from Keswick Rd to Eastwick Park Avenue does not have simple / cost effective solutions (that meet with ATE standards) and therefore some kind of compromise / “double” solution is required here. Implement the 20 mph limit and traffic calming along Lower Rd for much of the route to make it safer for competent cyclists, but accepting that the high (peak) traffic flows mean it is still dangerous, especially for less-competent cyclists. Therefore, the Keswick Rd route should also be improved (address the bumps for cyclists at least) as a **Quietway** and take the route through East Street as the least-worse option.

Whilst there may be pressure to use the Lower Road as the most direct route, some roads around the Oakfield, Eastwick and Great Bookham School are suitable for cycling [i.e. back routes]. FRA understand that these are used by Bikeability Instructors in their Risk Assessments. Cyclists would use well signposted routes as alternatives to Lower Road if well-defined and they feel SAFE. Additional infrastructure should not be needed and existing roads can be used that are “good” for cycling.

In essence, best is the enemy of good. They won’t please everyone and comply with all standards, but let’s try to move forward in a collaborative way with some workable proposals and a view to delivery sooner, not later. Achieving benefits to the residents of the north of Mole Valley, in terms of accessibility and health, should nor be forgotten!

FRA Specific Comments (ref slide numbers of presentation circulated in advance)

SLIDE	COMMENTS - Cycle Corridor 1A Leatherhead to Great Bookham via Lower Road
13, 14, 15	Two-way cycle track on Leret Way. Not recognised as a priority cycle route by FRA. Would contribute to traffic delays and add to costs. FRA suggest this could be dropped.
16, 17	Leatherhead Town Centre - Bridge Street and Town Bridge. Generally supportive of phased traffic and lights. Option 1 preferred with ITS and footway on both sides of bridge (maximising socio-economic benefit of river views to pedestrians).
18, 19	Guildford Road / Waterway Road / Bridge Street, Mill Lane junction (by Pumping Station). Roundabout treatment at the Pumping Station/Mill Lane Jct preferred. It was mentioned during

	<p>the presentation that a simpler / lower cost solution at this junction was being investigated (perhaps with a Controlled Crossing at Mill Lane and a Zebra Crossing across Bridge Street?). Such an investigation, to reach a simple / pragmatic solution, is fully supported and FRA will be interested in the outcome.</p>
20, 21	<p>Fetcham Springs path. FRA request that the 'spur' route follows a straight line across the field to a junction with FP60 to the north of the bench by the Mill Pond (near one of the lamp posts) – see images below. The proposed alignment on slide 21 bends in a southerly direction; instead, the desire line should be followed.</p> <p><i>Archaeology.</i> As part of SCC's Communities at the River (CAR) Project, SES Water has, in February, cleared the vegetation from the FRA preferred alignment so that Geophysical and Metal Detecting Surveys can be carried out on behalf of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit (SCAU) along the route. This will help to inform the need for any further archaeological investigation prior to (or in association with) the construction of the shared use path.</p> <p><i>Ecology.</i> Any difference in impact on ecology would be negligible (the FRA preferred alignment here cuts mostly through brambles which have been cleared – see photos). The slightly greater difference in elevation at this location (between field and FP60) can be dealt with at the design stage. The FRA preferred shared use path alignment has been cleared to facilitate archaeological survey</p>
20, 21	<p>Fetcham Springs access to Cobham Rd and Roundabout at Lower Rd. We suggest these proposals are re-visited.</p> <p>Approaching Cobham Rd from Lower Rd, there is an acute corner to the west (direction of Fetcham Village) with poor sight lines to the proposed Toucan Crossing which is set some distance from the junction (partly because of a large Plane Tree). Fast moving traffic from Lower Rd has a late view of the crossing and little time to react. We had anticipated that the cycleway from Fetcham Springs would follow a less divergent alignment coming straight to a crossing on the western edge of the roundabout, which would have much better visibility - especially if the roundabout is moved eastwards for which there is space. Such a lay-out, with the shared-use path on the north side of Lower Rd, could still be explored and presented as an option</p> <p>However, FRA now suggests that a simpler solution for this junction could be based on the Lower Rd shared-use path being on the South Side, with the cycleway from Fetcham Springs being segregated (from the FP60 shared-use path) for just c.25m at the approach to a Controlled (Toucan?) Crossing on Cobham Rd – where there would be “light segregation” of cyclists and pedestrians. A shared use path from this crossing would then run along the south side of Lower Rd.</p> <p>This option would avoid the need for a Toucan crossing on Cobham Rd to the west of the roundabout. Also, the proposed Toucan Crossing on Lower Rd could be simplified to a Zebra Crossing or Pedestrian Refuge and should be moved further south-west away from the roundabout (one crossing should be sufficient at the location near The Drive on the north side).</p> <p>On the Fetcham Springs side, this would avoid “sterilising” a large triangle of land created by the additional path on SES Water land. Much less land take would be required to allow for a short stretch of segregated cycle route, and loss of a very short section of hedge to allow for wider access to Lower Rd, where sight lines are currently very poor.</p> <p>The southern side of Lower Rd is constrained by an earth embankment for the first c. 100m to 150m from the roundabout and there may be some local resistance to a new shared use path encroaching onto this. Nevertheless, on balance, FRA considers this may be a better option, especially since the verge on the south side is generally wider than that on the north and it also lines-up with the shared-use path continuing west from the Ridgeway Roundabout to Keswick Rd.</p>
27	<p>ATE Check Tool. Despite the remaining “Critical Issues” the proposed layout demonstrates significant improvement in safety, accessibility etc. and highlights the benefits of the scheme.</p>
28	<p>Key Challenges. Fetcham Springs paths. The studies conducted, along with proposed mitigation measures, mean that the challenges can and are being addressed – no show-stoppers.</p>
22, 23	<p>Section 3: Lower Road a. Cobham Road to Keswick Road and Ridgeway Roundabout</p> <p>See previous comments for suggested treatment of Cobham Rd to the Ridgeway Roundabout. Also, with the shared use path on the south side of Lower Rd a parallel crossing should not be needed next to Badingham Drive, just a simple pedestrian-only Zebra crossing to The Old Street.</p> <p>With the shared-use path on the south side of Lower Rd to the east and west of the Ridgeway roundabout, we suggest the crossing arrangements can be simplified. A shared use or parallel crossing is required across the Ridgeway, and another for pedestrians and cyclists on the west side to connect Lower Road and the Ridgeway to Bell Lane. Do these need to be signal controlled (higher cost)? No significant north-south crossings should be needed east of the roundabout – pedestrian refuges sufficient.</p>
24	<p>Section 3: Lower Road b. Keswick Road to Great Bookham High Street</p> <p>FRA recognises that, due to the narrow width of the carriageway / footpaths along much of Lower Rd between Keswick Rd and Eastwick Rd, that it is not practical to upgrade this route to meet ATE standards. Therefore, we support traffic 'calming' measures and a 20 mph speed limit to improve safety for proficient cyclists that choose to use this route.</p> <p>We also support Option B for the use of cyclists being diverted via Keswick Road, Footpath 61 and East Street as a more practical and safer “Quietway” for cyclists who may be less confident and prefer a quieter route between Fetcham and Bookham, even if slightly longer. We recognise that it is 'off route' for some Bookham schools (Eastwick) and that there is not a perfect solution for children wishing to access</p>

	<p>this school from South of Lower Rd by bike. Should it be accepted that Lower Rd and this diversion can be regarded primarily as a “spine” for longer journeys between Leatherhead and Effingham? For pupils living to the north of Lower Rd we understand that there are “back routes” to Eastwick school. The carriageway of Keswick Rd needs attention to make it suitable for cyclists, but the whole road needs resurfacing and a wholistic intervention for all users should be regarded as beneficial to Bookham. Though the location of Eastwick Road is suitable, as a connection to Lower Rd and the Eastwick Park Medical Practice and School area, there are no pavements and the presence of Finch’s Transport make Eastwick Road a dangerous bottle neck for pedestrians and cyclists. Therefore, the East Street connection to Lower Rd is preferred as the “least-worse” option. The connection is shorter than Eastwick Rd and there is a footpath on its east side. Cyclists would need to be protected by signs / road markings and the existing 20mph limit.</p> <p>We understand that the design of a suitable crossing to the shared use path on the north side of Lower Rd, for cyclists wishing to travel east (right), back to the Medical Practice etc, may not be simple – though an uncontrolled Zebra or Parallel Crossing may be adequate? For cyclists turning left (west towards the centre of Bookham) they should be accommodated on the south side of the road up to the Squareabout and beyond.</p> <p>The need for and locations / designs of pedestrian crossings between Keswick Rd and the Squareabout is primarily an issue for Bookham residents, but FRA would advocate simple, low-cost solutions tied in with traffic calming measures.</p>
25	<p>Great Bookham High Street to Howard of Effingham School. FRA defer to Bookham Stakeholders on the preferred solutions for this section. FRA recognises that the spring-line seasonal flooding after Little Bookham Street is an issue, but understands that the drainage solutions will be part of detailed design and construction and should not affect the LCWIP route selection.</p>
SLIDE	COMMENTS - Core Walking Zone 2 Leatherhead
34	<p>Waterway Rd. Point 2. FRA understands that cutting the highway into the verge on the east side buys 0.5m that could be added to the west and that this allows just enough space for a 2.5m wide shared use path for most of the length of Waterway Rd. It is acknowledged that minimum widths that are compliant with design standards cannot be achieved for the full length of this section. Nevertheless, supports the implementation of even sub-standard solutions as a matter of urgency, given the current situation where children and other cyclists ride (illegally) on the pavement; the narrow road is dangerous, especially when there are peak traffic flows.</p> <p>The absence of a footway on the east side of Waterway Rd is not regarded as a critical issue; a shared use facility on the west side just needs to be optimised, ideally with some safety features? However, consideration could be given to a road crossing (Zebra) just north of the bridge over the river, to footpath that runs along the river.</p> <p>Given the problems with improving Waterway Rd, mention should still be made in the Feasibility Study of the long term possibility of shared use bridge across the River Mole to the west of Waterway Rd and into the Business Park – noting that studies have previously been undertaken by SCC of bridge crossings near Town Bridge and a cycle route through the Business Park as an alternative to a route along Station Approach (as per details shared previously with the LCWIP team).</p>
34	<p>Point 4. Extend shared use facility to Station Road to link to the business park. FRA supports this proposal, but please note the recommendation under Point 5, that will require measures to be taken to protect cyclists crossing the road entering the Business Park, so that they can ride onwards (from the shared use facility under the Railway Bridge) to Station Approach. Perhaps some form of ITS so that cyclists can follow this route prior to vehicles proceeding from the signalised junction at the end of Waterway Rd?</p> <p>Point 5. Localised footway widening on Station Approach. First it should be noted that provision has already been made for cyclists to enter the access road to Leatherhead Station at the traffic lights at the northern end of Station Approach. This is helpful and supports the approach suggested below. We strongly recommend that a Shared Use or Cycle-only Facility (route) is investigated along Station Approach. We suggest it is not helpful to have cyclists travelling to the station via the Bull Hill development and then out again; users of this route include many school children who pass the station when going to/from Therfield School. i.e. a shared use path through “Bull Hill” is just a through route for cyclists that is both disruptive for cyclists and traffic around the gyratory. We suggest that this route through Bull Hill could be simplified and developed for pedestrians only, while the route along Station Approach could be for cyclists only in a segregated, two-way cycle lane. Station Approach is not a pleasant route for pedestrians from the Business Park to get to the Station; they can instead exit the Business Park at Randalls Road and access the Station that way. Those pedestrians going from the Business Park to the Town Centre can use the footways proposed along Station Road i.e. a footway along Station Approach is not required. This allows more space for a segregated cycleway along Station Approach.</p> <p>N.B. There is a short length of abutment protruding into Station Approach that may need to be “engineered out” (a small stretch of sheet piling?), but if there is no requirement for a footway this may not be necessary?</p>