Before the Panel Convener FTAA-2603-1186

Under the	Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA**)
In the matter	of the application by Ridgeburn Limited in relation to 122 Morven Ferry Road

---

MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONDING TO MINUTE 5 OF THE PANEL CONVENER

8 July 2026

SIMPSON GRIERSON

Sarah Scott
T: +64 3 968 4018
sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
shanae.richardson@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874 Christchurch

May it please the Convener:

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This memorandum is provided on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) in response to Minute 5 of the Panel Convener (**Minute**) regarding the Ridgeburn Limited application (**Application**).

1.2 The Convener has directed QLDC to confer with the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (**NZTA**) and file and send to the applicant a preferably agreed scope for an integrated transport assessment (**ITA**), by 8 July 2026.

1.3 This memorandum attaches as **Appendix A**, an ITA scope that QLDC has agreed with NZTA.

Date: 8 July 2026

_____

S J Scott

Counsel for Queenstown Lakes District Council

Appendix A: Integrated Transport Assessment Scope

Ridgeburn Fast-track Project

Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) Scope

**Prepared by QLDC in consultation with NZTA, for the purposes of Ridgeburn FTSA. This scope is agreed between NZTA and QLDC*

1. Basis for this Scope: Methodology

This scope has been informed by transport matters identified by Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC), NZTA Waka Kotahi, and transport specialists engaged by both QLDC and NZTA in relation to Ridgeburn proposal. Most importantly, the scope has been prepared with reference to the principles and requirements set out in:

- **NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi, NZTA Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines** (Research Report 422); and
- **Auckland Transport (AT) Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines (Version 2, 2025)**, which provide more recent guidance for the assessment of significant and complex development proposals, such as the Ridgeburn development.

QLDC and NZTA have had specific regard to **Table 6.3 of NZTA Research Report 422** (appended to this scope), which provides guidance on the appropriate content of simple, moderate, broad and extensive Integrated Transport Assessments. Having regard to the scale, strategic implications and infrastructure dependencies associated with the Ridgeburn proposal, QLDC and NZTA consider that the proposal falls within the category of development for which an **extensive ITA** is appropriate.

In addition, the scope has also been informed by more recent Auckland Transport ITA Guideline. Extensive ITAs for development proposals of this nature are recommended in the AT Guidance, particularly where they are *large-scale greenfield developments, occur outside planned growth areas, rely on infrastructure that is not yet programmed or funded, or depend on future public transport provision and travel behaviour change assumptions*.

It is important that the Panel recognises that the Ridgeburn proposal significantly elevates the assessment threshold. In particular, it is not appropriate to rely on optimistic assumptions regarding future public transport services, travel mode shift, or the delivery of third-party infrastructure unless these are supported by robust evidence and demonstrated implementation pathways.

In determining the appropriate scope, QLDC and NZTA have therefore had particular regard to the assessment approaches set out in both the NZTA and Auckland Transport guidelines. These approaches are commonly applied to proposals that exhibit one or more of the following characteristics, all of which are relevant to the Ridgeburn application.

Characteristics identified in NZTA and AT guidance for Extensive ITAs	**Ridgeburn**
Major greenfield developments	✓
Out-of-sequence development	✓
Development occurring outside planned growth areas	✓
Reliant on infrastructure that is not currently funded, programmed, or committed	✓
Dependent on future public transport services and mode shift assumptions	✓
Transport effects extending beyond the immediate site and affecting strategic transport corridors and regional movement patterns	✓

2. Purpose

This document has been prepared in response to the Panel Convenor's direction to file and send the applicant the scope and information requirements of the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) that QLDC and NZTA consider is necessary for the Ridgeburn development proposal.

Given the scale of the proposal, its location outside planned growth areas, its reliance on strategic transport corridors, and its potential to generate transport effects well beyond the immediate locality, the ITA should comprise a comprehensive assessment of transport effects across all modes and at local, district and regional scales.

The assessment should extend beyond a traditional site-access or traffic impact assessment and provide sufficient information for decision-makers to understand:

- The immediate and future transport effects of the proposal.
- The infrastructure and transport services required to support the development.
- Funding, delivery and ongoing operational responsibilities relating to proposed transport system upgrades.
- The feasibility and deliverability of public transport and active mode assumptions.
- Implications for the wider SH6 and SH6A corridor and regional transport network.

- Strategic consistency with regional growth and transport objectives.
- Infrastructure dependencies and delivery risks.
- The extent to which adverse transport effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- Any residual effects that would remain following mitigation.

The ITA should ultimately provide the Expert Panel with sufficient information to determine whether the proposal represents an efficient, safe, accessible, resilient and sustainable transport outcome for the wider Whakatipu Basin and regional transport network.

3. Extent of Assessment Required

Consistent with NZTA and Auckland Transport guidance, the proposal is assessed as a major out-of-sequence development, requiring an extensive ITA that considers the extent of assessment necessary to evaluate scenarios where anticipated transport interventions, public transport services, or mode-shift outcomes are delayed, modified, or not realised.

Therefore, the extent of assessment required is determined by the degree to which the proposal:

- Requires transport infrastructure that is not currently programmed or funded.
- Relies on public transport services that are not currently operating or funded.
- Relies on future mode-shift outcomes that have not yet been demonstrated.
- Accelerates the need for strategic transport investment.
- Creates dependencies on NZTA, QLDC, ORC, or other third parties.
- Generates transport effects extending well beyond the site and local road network.
- Creates risks associated with infrastructure delivery timing, funding and implementation.

4. Strategic and Policy Context

The ITA shall assess consistency with:

- Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.
- NZTA investment and corridor strategies.
- Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan.
- Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan.
- Transport Network Plan.
- Strategic Network Plan.
- Otago Regional Public Transport Plan.
- Relevant NZUP transport projects.

- Other adopted transport and growth strategies.

The assessment shall specifically identify where the proposal aligns with, or departs from, planned growth and transport investment strategies and the consequences arising from those departures.

5. Regional Policy and Strategic Outcomes Assessment

Given the scale of Ridgeburn and its potential effects on regional movement, the ITA shall include a strategic assessment of **whether the proposal contributes positively to regional transport outcomes.**

Economic Development and Network Efficiency

The ITA shall recognise that transport effects form part of the assessment of net regional benefit under the Fast-track Approvals Act. Where regional economic benefits are claimed, the assessment should also identify and quantify material transport dis-benefits arising from increased congestion, reduced travel reliability, diminished accessibility and increased infrastructure costs. Consistent with cost-benefit assessment principles, the same geographic area should be used when assessing both benefits and dis-benefits to ensure a balanced understanding of net regional outcomes.

The ITA shall assess:

- Effects on travel times and reliability including for public transport movements.
- Effects on freight movements.
- Effects on tourism movements.
- Congestion costs imposed on existing users.
- Vehicle kilometres travelled.
- Network efficiency impacts.
- Infrastructure costs generated by the proposal.

Particular consideration shall be given to strategic movements between:

- Queenstown and Cromwell.
- Cromwell and Gibbston.
- Queenstown and Arrowtown.
- Queenstown and Wanaka.
- Queenstown Airport and surrounding growth areas.

Particular consideration should also be given to the cumulative effects of (additional) development-generated traffic on the SH6 corridor between Lake Hayes, the Shotover Bridge, and Frankton. This assessment should take account of existing and anticipated developments that will rely on the same strategic transport infrastructure, including the recently approved Simplicity Living referral (approximately 1,100 residential units), the Homestead Bay development, which is reliant on the BP Intersection, and other listed projects under the Fast-Track Approvals Act, including the NZSki Doolans Basin expansion, the Gibbston development, and additional developments within the Gibbston area, such as the Waitiri Project (that is currently at the referral stage).

Collectively, these developments are likely to generate additional travel demand within a corridor already experiencing significant capacity constraints, with the potential for resulting congestion effects to extend beyond the immediate network and give rise to broader economic impacts.

Safety and Security

The ITA shall assess:

- Safe System outcomes.
- Vulnerable road user safety.
- Public transport safety.
- Construction traffic safety.
- Network resilience.
- Emergency access.
- Personal security associated with transport facilities.

Access and Mobility

The ITA shall evaluate accessibility to:

- Employment.
- Education.
- Healthcare.
- Retail and commercial services.
- Community facilities.
- Public transport services.

Accessibility outcomes shall be assessed for:

- Private vehicle travel.
- Public transport.
- Walking.
- Cycling and other users (such as, horse riders)

Sustainability

The ITA shall assess:

- Vehicle kilometres travelled.
- Transport emissions.
- Energy consumption.
- Public transport viability.
- Active mode opportunities.
- Efficient use of existing infrastructure.
- Long-term infrastructure servicing requirements.
- Consistency with sustainable growth objectives.

6. Study Area

The primary study area shall include:

- Morven Ferry Road.
- Arrow Junction Road.
- McDonnell Road.
- SH6 (particularly East of Shotover Bridge) and SH6A
- All side-road intersections connecting to SH6.

7. Existing Transport Environment

The ITA shall establish existing conditions relating to:

- Traffic volumes.
- Intersection performance.
- Travel times.
- Travel time reliability.
- Queue lengths.
- Freight movements.
- Public transport performance.
- Walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Parking demand.
- Network resilience.
- Safety performance and crash history.

8. Development Description

The ITA shall describe:

- Proposed land uses.
- Population and dwelling yields.

- Visitor accommodation.
- Education activities.
- Employment generation.
- Development staging.
- Internal street network.
- Active transport facilities.
- Parking provision.
- Public transport facilities.
- Construction programme.

9. Trip Generation and Travel Demand

The ITA shall provide robust justification for all trip-generation assumptions.

Sensitivity testing shall be undertaken for:

- Internal trip capture.
- Pass-by trips.
- Remote working.
- Carpooling.
- Reduced vehicle ownership.
- Public transport uptake.
- Walking and cycling mode share.
- Visitor travel demand.

10. Mode Shift Deliverability Assessment

The ITA shall explicitly test whether proposed behavioural assumptions are realistically achievable. The assessment shall include:

Assumption	Evidence Required
Public transport use	Comparable developments and ORC feedback
Walking mode share	Walking catchment analysis
Cycling mode share	Network quality assessment
Internal trip capture	Land-use interaction analysis
Reduced vehicle ownership	Demographic and market evidence
Carpooling uptake	Evidence from comparable locations

The assessment shall test:

- Optimistic scenario.
- Expected scenario.
- Conservative scenario.
- No mode shift scenario.
- No public transport scenario

11. Transport Model Requirements

A multi-modal transport model shall be developed that is capable of assessing strategic and cumulative transport effects across the SH6/SH6A Eastern Corridor and wider Whakatipu Basin transport network. The model shall be of sufficient scale and sophistication to assess district and regional transport impacts rather than solely local intersection effects.

Model Objectives

The model shall enable assessment of:

- Existing network performance.
- Future network performance with and without Ridgeburn.
- Corridor-wide congestion effects.
- Travel time reliability.
- Queue formation and propagation.
- Regional accessibility impacts.
- Public transport demand and performance.
- Active mode opportunities.
- Infrastructure staging requirements.

Geographic Coverage

The model shall include, at a minimum:

- SH6 from Cromwell through to Frankton.
- SH6A corridor.
- Kawarau Bridge.
- Crown Range Road intersection.
- Arrow Junction Road and Morven Ferry Road intersections.
- Ladies Mile corridor.
- Lake Hayes Road corridor.
- Howards Drive intersection.
- Lower Shotover Road intersection.
- Frankton Road corridor.

- Connections to Arrowtown, Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country and Gibbston Valley.

Forecast Scenarios

The model shall assess, at a minimum, the following scenarios:

Current Baseline

- Existing network conditions.
- Existing travel demand.
- Existing public transport operations.

Future Baseline (Without Ridgeburn)

A future network including:

- Committed developments.
- Approved developments.
- Anticipated growth within existing zoned areas.
- New Zealand Upgrade Programme (NZUP) Queenstown Package improvements.
- Planned transport investments.

Future With Ridgeburn

The future baseline scenario plus Ridgeburn traffic demand and associated mitigation measures.

Cumulative Growth Scenario

The future baseline plus:

- Ridgeburn.
- Ladies Mile growth.
- Gibbston Valley growth.
- Cromwell growth.
- Other relevant fast-track proposals and approved developments affecting the SH6/SH6A corridor.

Forecast Years

The model shall assess at a minimum:

Opening Year

The anticipated year in which the first stage of Ridgeburn becomes operational.

Intermediate Year (Indicatively 2035)

Representative of medium-term growth and infrastructure requirements.

Design Horizon Year (Indicatively 2045)

Representative of full build-out conditions and longer-term transport effects.

If staging extends beyond these horizons, additional forecast years may be required.

Sensitivity Testing

In recognition of the proposal's reliance on future transport interventions and behavioural assumptions, the model shall include sensitivity testing for:

Public Transport Sensitivity

- Forecast public transport uptake.
- Reduced public transport uptake.
- No public transport service.

Mode Shift Sensitivity

- Applicant assumptions.
- Conservative mode-share assumptions.
- No mode-shift scenario.

Infrastructure Delivery Sensitivity

- All mitigation delivered.
- Delayed delivery of mitigation.
- Non-delivery of key third-party infrastructure.

Growth Sensitivity

- Planned growth only.
- Planned growth plus Ridgeburn.
- Higher-than-forecast regional growth.

> The **most important scenarios are** *the "no public transport", "no mode shift", and "delayed infrastructure delivery" scenarios*. The current Ridgeburn assessment appears to be heavily dependent on assumptions about future behavioural change and future service provision. It is important that an ITA contributes to the better understanding of not only how the development performs if everything goes perfectly, but also how it performs if those assumptions are not realised.

12. Public Transport Feasibility Assessment

Because public transport forms a key component of the proposed transport strategy, the **ITA shall demonstrate that public transport services are realistic, deliverable, fundable and operationally viable.**

The assessment shall address:

Existing Context

- Current bus services.
- Service frequencies.
- Current patronage.
- Existing service capacity.
- Regional transport plans.

Service Feasibility

Assessment shall consider:

- Direct service options.
- Arrowtown connections.
- Ladies Mile connections.
- Park and Ride integration.
- Demand responsive transport.
- Shuttle services.

Operational Viability

Assessment shall include:

- Travel times.
- Reliability.
- Fleet requirements.
- Driver requirements.
- Turnaround facilities.
- Bus stop infrastructure.
- Road access requirements.

Financial Viability

The ITA shall identify:

- Patronage forecasts.
- Operating costs.
- Fare recovery.
- Subsidy requirements.
- Funding source.
- Responsible agency.

ORC Consultation

The ITA shall document engagement with ORC and identify:

- Whether the service is supported in principle.
- Whether it is included within future service plans.
- Whether funding is available.
- Delivery timeframes.
- Fleet and operational constraints.

Failure Scenarios

The ITA shall assess how the development performs under each scenario:

- No public transport available.
- Delayed implementation.
- Lower-than-forecast patronage.
- Withdrawal of subsidy support.

13. Park and Ride Assessment

The ITA shall assess:

- Proposed Park and Ride facilities.
- Alternative locations near SH6.
- Ladies Mile opportunities.
- Capacity requirements.
- Operational requirements.
- Funding arrangements.
- Long-term management responsibilities.

14. Active Modes Assessment

The ITA shall assess:

- Internal walking and cycling facilities.
- Trail network integration.
- Arrow Junction Road connections.
- Arrowtown Trail crossings.
- Safety and comfort.
- Accessibility to public transport.
- End-of-trip facilities.

15. Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction Road Assessment

A detailed assessment shall evaluate:

- Road geometry.
- Pavement condition.

- Capacity.
- Safety.
- Heavy vehicle suitability.
- Construction traffic effects.
- Maintenance implications.
- Walking and cycling provision.

16. Road Safety Assessment

A Safe System assessment shall be undertaken for the **Study Area described in Section 6** of this document.

17. Construction Traffic Assessment

The ITA shall assess:

- Construction vehicle volumes.
- Workforce travel.
- Construction routes.
- Temporary traffic management.
- Worker parking.
- Enabling works.
- Road upgrade requirements prior to construction.

18. Network Resilience and Emergency Access

The ITA shall assess:

- Incident management.
- Alternate routes.
- Road closures.
- Natural hazards.
- Emergency access.
- Evacuation capability.
- Dependence on SH6 and Morven Ferry Road.

19. Infrastructure Funding Responsibility Assessment

The ITA shall identify all infrastructure required to mitigate transport effects and clearly allocate responsibility for funding and delivery.

Infrastructure shall be categorised as:

Category A – Direct Development Mitigation

Infrastructure required solely due to Ridgeburn.

Category B – Shared Growth Infrastructure

Infrastructure supporting multiple growth areas.

Category C – Strategic Network Infrastructure

Infrastructure required for wider network operation and resilience.

For every mitigation measure the ITA shall provide:

- Infrastructure item.
- Estimated cost.
- Delivery agency.
- Funding agency.
- Trigger for delivery.
- Land requirements.
- Consents required.
- Funding risk.
- Consequences of non-delivery.

The ITA shall explicitly identify any infrastructure funding gap arising from the proposal and explain how that gap will be addressed.

20. Mitigation, Staging and Delivery Framework

The ITA shall identify:

- All mitigation measures.
- Concept designs.
- Delivery triggers.
- Development staging requirements.
- Responsible agencies.
- Funding sources.
- Land requirements.
- Consent requirements.

For each mitigation measure the ITA shall identify the consequences of delayed delivery or non-delivery.

21. Transport Risk Assessment

The ITA shall include a formal transport risk assessment that assesses the likelihood and consequences of transport-related risks.

Risk	Likelihood	Consequence
Public transport not delivered	High	Major
Public transport patronage below forecast	High	Major
Required SH6 upgrades unfunded	High	Major
Strategic corridor congestion worse than forecast	Medium	Major
Safety deterioration at key intersections	Medium	Major
Morven Ferry Road unable to accommodate forecast demand	Medium	Major
Walking and cycling uptake not achieved	High	Moderate
Third-party infrastructure delayed	High	Major
Land acquisition constraints	Medium	Major
Emergency access limitations	Medium	Major
Infrastructure funding shortfall	High	Major
Regional economic costs exceed forecast benefits	Medium	Major

For all High and Extreme risks, the ITA shall identify:

- Risk owner.
- Monitoring requirements.
- Trigger points.
- Contingency measures.
- Funding responsibility.
- Residual risk.

22. Residual Effects

The ITA shall clearly identify:

- Capacity effects and safety effects that remain after mitigation.
- Public transport and funding uncertainties.
- Infrastructure dependencies.
- Regional network effects.
- Effects that cannot reasonably be mitigated.

Attachment: Table 6.3 of NZTA Research Report 422

Table 6.3 The possible content for ITAs with different scopes

Matter for consideration	Scoping discussions?	ITA scope			
		Simple	Moderate	Broad	Extensive
1 Background					
Description of proposed activity	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Intended use for ITA	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Outline of discussions with RCAs and TAs*		Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
2 Existing land data					
Location plan	✓	Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Site plan	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Existing use	✓	Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Existing consents		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Adjacent land use	✓	Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Surrounding land use		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
3 Existing transport data					
Walking network		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Cycling network		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Public transport modes and accessibility		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Access arrangements	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Service accesses		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
On site car parking		Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Off site car parking		Suggested	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Cycle parking		Suggested	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Roading hierarchy	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Traffic flows	✓	Likely	Likely	Likely	Probable
Travel times		Unlikely	Unlikely	Suggested	Likely
Congestion		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Crash records	✓	Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
4 Committed environmental changes					
Walking network	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Cycling network	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Public transport modes and accessibility		Suggested	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Road network improvements	✓	Likely	Likely	Probable	Probable
Other local (partly or fully unimplemented) developments		Suggested	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Other major (partly or fully unimplemented) developments	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Uptake of vacant land		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable

Table 6.3 (cont.) The possible content for ITAs with different scopes

Matter for consideration	Scoping discussions?	ITA scope			
		Simple	Moderate	Broad	Extensive
5 Existing travel characteristics					
Person-trip generation		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Modal split		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Vehicle-trip generation		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip type proportions		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip distribution		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip assignment		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Special event trip generation		Suggested	Likely	Likely	Likely
6 Proposal details					
Site layout		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Schedule of land or activity uses	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Operational hours		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Special events		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
On site car parking		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
On site cycle parking		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Drop-off area		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Access		Likely	Likely	Probable	Probable
Service accesses		Likely	Likely	Probable	Probable
Internal vehicle circulation		Likely	Likely	Probable	Probable
Proposed implementation planning	✓	Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Construction management		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
7 Predicted travel data					
Adjustment of existing travel data to assessment year		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Person-trip generation	✓	Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Modal split		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Vehicle-trip generation	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip type proportions		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip distribution		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Trip assignment		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Special event trip generation	✓	Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
8 Appraisal of transportation effects					
Environmental	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Safety	✓	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Accessibility	✓	Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Integration		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Economic		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Sensitivity testing		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable

Table 6.3 (cont.) The possible content for ITAs with different scopes

Matter for consideration	Scoping discussions?	ITA scope			
		Simple	Moderate	Broad	Extensive
9 Avoiding or mitigating actions					
Physical on site mitigations		Likely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Physical off site mitigations		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Encouraging public transport, walking and cycling		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Travel plans		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Special event mitigation		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Revised environmental effects		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Revised safety effects		Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Revised accessibility effects		Unlikely	Probable	Probable	Probable
Revised integration effects		Suggested	Likely	Probable	Probable
Revised economic effects		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Sensitivity testing mitigations		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
10 Compliance with policy and other frameworks					
District plan rules	✓	Probable	Probable	Likely	Unlikely
District plan objectives and policies	✓	Unlikely	Likely	Probable	Suggested
Other relevant local strategies	✓	Unlikely	Likely	Probable	Probable
RLTS	✓	Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Probable
Other relevant regional strategies	✓	Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Probable
Other relevant national strategies		Unlikely	Unlikely	Suggested	Likely
11 Discussion and conclusions					
Assessment of effects		Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Conclusion of effects		Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
12 Recommendations					
Summary		Unlikely	Suggested	Likely	Probable
Proposed conditions (if any)		Suggested	Likely	Likely	Probable

* TA = territorial authority