SCC response to NR note on S22

- The status of S22 has not been material to SCC's case. The CC ~~believes~~ knows the crossing to be very well used, highly valued by all the community, young & old, ~~able~~ mobile & less mobile, and should be treated the same as any other public crossing in the order.

- NR have maintained the crossing as if it were public for many years, and not to our knowledge, ever erected signs to ~~the contrary~~ clarify its status.

- NR chose to include S22 in the order, when on their evidence they could have closed it w/o notice, thus ~~further reinforcing~~ to the public's & LA's belief NR was treating it as public.

- SCC believes NR should go the extra step and treat S22 the same as other crossings in the order, applying S 5(6) in the normal way, & to conclusion.

- SCC ~~opposes~~ ~~strongly~~ The Inspector recommend the withdrawal of S22 and the ~~Inspector recommend~~ NR determine the diversion is not S&C.

- SCC strongly opposes any option or ~~proposal/allowing~~ which might allow NR to close the crossing without a full investigation of its status having been undertaken first.

- To conclude, SCC believes above anything else ~~it should~~ that the greatest regard should be given to the local community's needs, use and enjoyment of the crossing as a means of accessing local services.

AW/SCC
14/3/18