

Minutes of Mole Valley Cycling Forum Meeting, Thursday July 23rd 2026 Held at MVDC Offices, Pippbrook, Dorking

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

Apologies:

Cllr Bradley Nelson (BN) [MVDC, Holmwoods], Eric Palmer [Leatherhead], Peter Mayor [Leatherhead], PennyTyson-Davies (PT-D) [British Horse Society/Newdigate]

1. Previous Minutes

Accepted with the following notes: RW pointed out that during the LCWIP discussion, RT had quoted from Active Travel England's "A best practice guide to community consultation and engagement":

1. Introduction

If done well, community engagement and consultation can transform the introduction of changes to a road layout, town or city centre into a conversation of discovery and opportunity. It can enable people to have their say and make sure that the scheme delivers for local people and businesses – and it can be so much more than that.

3.2. Why engage and consult?

There are two core reasons for carrying out consultation and engagement. Firstly, it's a legal requirement to go through any statutory consultation process.

Secondly, involving people to help develop schemes, and decide on options, leads to not only better schemes but a greater likelihood that the local community will embrace the proposal and enjoy the changes when implemented.

RW requested that BN take steps to allow RA/MVCF reps to at least be "observers" to meetings when local members are re-engaged on the final feasibility designs and be given the opportunity to channel any written comments through members

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

JD had brought a copy of the Bookham flood risk study to pass to BN as she was concerned that the implications may not been considered in the LCWIP designs. JD to share with RW and interested parties when re-scanned.

3. Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

AM read out an update – rather than attempt to summarise, a verbatim copy from the SCIL report is appended.

There followed a wide-ranging discussion on the lack of progress.

RW suggested that the Forum sending a letter expressing our concerns to key people including Tim Oliver, Marissa Heath & Matt Furniss. ***RW offered to draft the wording and JA offered to assist.***

AM to ask to that key stakeholders be included at the meeting for Councillors etc due in October.

LS reported that Gatwick has received a grant to develop their own LCWIP and that they are engaging with her, with a meeting scheduled in early August.

4. BMX Track

LS had spoken with Pat Smith with a view to organising an event during Love Parks Week (at the end of July), however with the agreement with MVDC not yet formalised there is no suitable Public Liability insurance.

A member of the public had contacted the Forum with regard to assisting with maintenance and LS is passing their details on to the team.

5. Route & Infrastructure Updates

Bookham/Effingham area:

20mph signs have been installed on the roads around the "squareabout". IH had contacted Cllr Claire Curran regarding incomplete signage, who had responded that this was now on order and that a safety audit would then be carried out. ***IH to ask for a copy of this safety audit, with particular reference to cycling/cyclists.*** Whilst the scheme doesn't appear to be as extensive as originally proposed, it is surmised that it has not been fully implemented owing to (signage) costs. It is expected that consultation/scheme would be passed to the incoming Unitary Authority. JD reported that following on from the news that the Howard of Effingham school will not now be rebuilt, the builder has submitted changes to the planned housing. However, as this is all in the Guildford area, any S106 money will likely go in that direction. It was noted that as there are legal requirements for walking and cycling facilities, any new development will need to include these. It may be that Berkley Homes are relying upon connecting in to a cycle route through the proposed Preston Park development (currently held up by probate issues), which JD noted is a route liable to flood and which also relies upon access along a private road.

Leatherhead/Fetcham area:

A road table is to be installed on Kingston Road by Trinity School.

Bull Hill redevelopment (planning ref: MO/2025/02695) – a revised planning application is due later this year with a decision to be taken before MVDC hands this over to the UA. It was noted that if the off-road cycle route is removed from the revised plans there needs to be a suitable replacement. RW in comments on the Leatherhead LCWIP has recommended this be along Station Approach – cyclists traversing Bull Hill already have to go on and off the development site, which is a risk to themselves and an additional cause of delay to the gyratory traffic.

Dorking Area:

A25 Safety Improvements: RT had contacted SCC's Duncan Knox who had responded as follows: "We are in the process of refining the designs and hope to go live with public engagement in the Autumn. This is later than we would prefer, but we are working as fast as we can with the resources we have.... we will be sure to consult with Mole Valley Cycle Forum especially once we are ready."

Meadowbank: *RT to copy the Forum's original proposals for a cycle route around the football ground to BN and Cllr Wright. c/f.* NB. Elements of this had been taken up by the Dorking Masterplan, most of which has now gone quiet.

Westcott-Dorking Shared Route (NCN 22)

Mary-Ann Edwards (SCC Rights of Way) provided an update on the proposed improvements:

"There have been some unexpected delays due to the section that regularly floods where they are waiting on some support from highways designers, and the legal element of securing an upgrade of an extension of the route to bridleway status – which will connect the route through to Westcott St, thus bypassing Springfield Road."

Nevertheless, they are hopeful they can deliver this financial year.

See also paragraphs 2.6, 2.7 of the Active Travel report appended.

Hookwood/Charlwood

LS reported with regards to the proposed new housing development that the emergency access connects to Charlwood Road where the Parish Council would be pushing to upgrade the existing pavement to LTN1/20 standards to allow safe cycling into the village and to Povey Cross/Longbridge roundabout.

6. Gatwick DCO

Post meeting note: the legal challenge for the second runway at Gatwick Airport has been dismissed.

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

Nothing to report.

8. Local Government Reorganisation and MVCF

It is unknown as yet what the appetite for Active Travel will be in the new Unitary Authority.

AM explained that unless there is a compelling (eg. legal) reason, Surrey Highways services will be "disaggregated", with the provision of some services being initially kept as they are and provided by one authority to the other as a "Hosted Service" for up to 36 months (eg. street lighting).

The Fire Service will stay as it is and move in due course to the new Mayoral Authority along with the Strategic Transport function.

RT relayed the following item:

Transport Webinar for Community Groups this September

The Surrey Climate Commission and Healthy Travel Surrey are hosting a webinar on 10 September at 6.30-7.30pm, with Steve Howard, Surrey's Transport Strategy Lead, will be joining:

<https://www.tickettailor.com/events/surreyclimatecommission/2323517>

"With new unitary councils taking shape, this is a genuine window for community groups to help set the agenda. Tell us, and your councillors (many of whom will be present), what changes you want to see, whether that's safer routes to school, more reliable rural bus services, or better-maintained footways and cycleways.

The session will also help community groups build lasting dialogue with their new councillors, many of whom are keen to hear directly from residents about what matters on the ground. Join us and help shape the future of transport in your community."

9. Dates and Venues for Future Meetings

Owing to issues with booking a suitable room, the next formal meeting of the Forum is still to be confirmed (probably early October). Meanwhile it was suggested that we hold an interim informal meeting on **Thurs 27th August at The Stepping Stones, Westhumble**, from 7pm.

10. AOB

There was a brief discussion on the Brockham build-outs (raised by EP via email) – RT understood that there can be safety issues resulting from the provision of cycle bypasses (the retrofitting of which would be highly unlikely).

PT-D reported via email that the BHS are actively involved with impact of ATE - see:

<https://www.bhs.org.uk/media/0ctbwapd/202505-the-impact-of-active-travel-plans-and-ltn-120-on-equestrians-british-horse-society.pdf> as the needs of horse riders and carriage drivers need to be taken into account (more an issue for route designers).

Appendix – Active Travel Extract from the Transport section in the MVDC SCIL Report (14 July 2026)

2.1 A programme funding application requesting £1m for the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) programme (SCIL6 TAT) was submitted by Surrey County Council (SCC) for the December SCIL Working Group. The funding request was stated to be a 20% contribution to a £5m project, with 80% identified as coming from Active Travel England (ATE) funds, and a zero-capital commitment from SCC. SCC subsequently decided to wait for the feasibility process to be completed before submitting an application for programme funding. Officers advised SCC that it would be better to delay resubmission of the application until after a public consultation, so that the working group can take account of the public views on the proposals.

2.2 Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) has now paid its share (£129k) of the feasibility costs, as approved at the September 2023 Cabinet. The MVDC contribution was drawn from the Surrey Infrastructure Feasibility Fund allocation. The latest estimated timescales for the LCWIP work are as follows:

1. 2026/27: Q3 (October – December 2026) – Member Re-engagement on final feasibility scheme designs.
2. 2026/27: Q4 (January – March 2027) – Strategic CIL funding application. SCC states that with other districts and boroughs the timing of CIL funding application submission has been prior to public consultation.
3. 2027/28: Q1 (April – June 2027) – Public Consultation. This is subject to the timings of the other public consultation being progressed for other Surrey districts and boroughs. SCC notes that initial schemes for other areas are being programmed for Q3/Q4, with, as a consequence, Mole Valley scheduled later.

2.3 At the SCIL working group, on the issue of submission and review of the LCWIP funding application prior to going out to public consultation, Members suggested that they would not be inclined to see and hear the application prior to public consultation. However, such a situation would make it difficult to give a positive response.

2.4 The LCWIP projects had been budgeted on the basis of a 70% contribution from the Department for Transport (DfT), a 15% contribution from MVDC and a matching 15 % CAB21 contribution from SCC. Due to local government reorganisation, SCC is no longer making those capital commitments. Furthermore, the amount of funding that can be secured from the DfT is now significantly more modest than previously anticipated. A total of £16m for capital projects is available from ATE for the entire Surrey area over a four-year period (2026/27 to 2029/30).

2.5 The SCC Mole Valley LCWIP bid would be to obtain a £1m SCIL allocation as match funding to secure a further £4m (25%) of the Surrey ATE allocation, making a total of £5m to spend on Mole Valley LCWIP interventions. It is considered unlikely that the Mole Valley area, amongst all 11 areas within Surrey, would secure more than 25% of the ATE capital funding available during the four-year period. As a result, it is considered sensible that the indicative contribution from Strategic CIL to the LCWIP feasibility projects should be significantly scaled back. Given that only £1m in SCIL is likely to be sought over the next four years, for the period of the PSP it is proposed to reduce the total overall indicative SCIL contribution to the LCWIP schemes to £3.25m, with the £2.25m covering the subsequent nine years of the Plan period (2030/31 – 2038/39).

2.6 SCIL7 TAT the Westcott to Dorking Cycle Track scheme was awarded project delivery funding in March 2026. The Grant Funding Agreement (GFA) is being finalised. SCC was intending to undertake the works over the summer.

2.7 The original full PSP scheme included a potential link via the consented development off Milton Court Lane through the adjacent Sutton and East Surrey (SES) Water land into Beech Close and on to Curtis Road. However, SES Water has explained that it cannot assist due to risks associated with the potential contamination of its water sources and the insurance implications. Therefore, such a link will not be delivered in the foreseeable future.

Acronyms Used:

CIL – Community Infrastructure Levy. It is a local council charge on new building projects.

SCIL – Strategic CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is the major portion (typically 70% to 80%) of developer contributions collected by local authorities. It funds large-scale, borough-wide or district-wide infrastructure projects—such as major transport schemes.

ATE – Active Travel England

PSP – Priority Spending Programme