

Statement of Evidence

Reference: Kangaroo Bay Hotel - Major Project

Author: Rebekah Ramm

Field of expertise: Traffic Engineering

Filed on behalf of: Chambroad Australia

Date: 3 August 2026

**Pitt & Sherry
(Operations) Pty Ltd**
ABN 67 140 184 309

Phone 1300 748 874
info@pittsh.com.au
pittsh.com.au

Located nationally —
Melbourne
Sydney
Brisbane
Hobart
Launceston
Newcastle
Devonport



Memo

Date 3 August 2026

RE **Kangaroo Bay Hotel – Additional Information Regarding Traffic and Transport Engineering Matters**

1. Introduction

This document provides responses to items raised in the Statement of Evidence prepared by Mark Petrusma dated 28 July 2026 in relation to Transport Engineering matters for the Kangaroo Bay Hotel.

This is not a standalone document with its purpose to guide discussion in the hearing. This document relies upon information and assessment made in the following documents:

- Kangaroo Bay Hotel Development Traffic Impact Assessment – dated 17 February 2026
- Kangaroo Bay Hotel Development Transport and Movement Study – dated 17 February 2026
- Kangaroo Bay Hotel Major Project Response to Representations – dated 27 July 2026.

2. Car Park and Access Layout

2.1 Car Parking Facility Classification

This section provides a response to paragraphs 71-74 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

The users of the car park would generally be visitors to the restaurants in the hotel. As such, a Class 2 classification is still considered appropriate. Short-term, high turnover car parking is not expected.

It is recognised that spaces of 2.6m in width do provide more space for door opening and manoeuvring. If during design development there is opportunity to supply 2.6m wide spaces for the publicly accessible car parking, this could be considered.

2.2 Car parking Length

This section provides a response to paragraphs 75-85 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

Car parking spaces are required to be 5.4m long or 4.8m long to a kerb. The car parking spaces are designed to 4.8m with a kerb. Where certain plant species for the raingarden are higher than a kerb height they can be moved to locations where vehicles are not required to overhang.

Removing the raingarden from DDA spaces can be explored.

2.3 Parallel Car Parking Bays

This section provides a response to paragraphs 86-90 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

A turn around bay can be included in the parking aisle, at a loss of one car parking space, so that vehicles will not need to access the adjacent car park for turning.

Whilst the Right of Access is a publicly accessible route, it will appear like a car park where people expect vehicles turning and emerging from car parking spaces, volumes would be limited to vehicles accessing the car park, hotel and Bellerive Yacht Club and vehicles would be travelling at low speed.

2.4 Loading

This section provides a response to paragraphs 91-98 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

Loading vehicles will be equipped with warning signals (beeping) to alert pedestrians and nearby road users that truck reversing is taking place.

It is expected that the hotel provider would attempt to limit deliveries to outside the busiest times to minimise safety risk and allow convenient access to users at peak periods.

2.5 Right of Carriageway and Right of Access

This section provides a response to paragraphs 99-111 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

The encouraged users of the Right of Access have been considered. A width of 6.5m has been provided for two-way movement of vehicles.

The use of the Right of Access by pedestrians and cyclists was considered during preparation of the development plans and Traffic Impact Assessment.

Pedestrians and cyclists are encouraged to use the Foreshore shared use path. The need for two parallel shared use paths is not considered necessary as the foreshore shared use path also runs adjacent to the Bellerive Yacht Club and has the best connectivity to the existing foreshore path.

It was determined that use of the Right of Access by pedestrians and cyclists, whilst facilitated, is not preferred due to the amount of vehicle manoeuvring in the location and minimising pedestrians and cyclists travelling through car parks. To discourage high use of the path but still provide access, a 2.0m wide footpath has been provided. This width was determined to provide a fair balance between maximising parking supply, pedestrian and cycling access and user safety. The intention is that this footpath is used by people accessing the car parking.

2.6 Summary of Car Parking Issues

It is recommended that the conditions include a requirement for submission of detailed car parking design plans that address the above matters.

3. Parking Demand

This section holistically provides response to paragraphs 124-182 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

3.1 Fundamental Position when Considering Provision for Car Parking

There are two approaches that can be taken for this type of development:

- 13. Mode shift:** by supplying parking at a lesser rate, visitors to the precinct are given greater motivation to mode shift or car share instead of driving and parking.
- 14. Status-quo/ Planning Scheme compliance:** parking continues as per existing patterns and is provided at the Planning Scheme rate currently demanded.

3.2 Mode Shift

The Traffic Impact Assessment has taken on the mode shift approach to assessing the need for parking. When considering whether a location is suitable for mode shift, consideration can be given to:

- Densification of developments
- Access to other transport modes, particularly public transport and safe active travel paths.

3.2.1 Densification

The current expectation in Bellerive is that a person can travel by car and park their car in Bellerive all day, within a short walking distance of their destination.

There appears to be demand for the densification of Bellerive, with apartments already located in Bellerive Village, and a 13 apartment development proposed. This indicates that Bellerive is moving from a suburban centre to a large urban precinct. As urban centres densify, providing car parking at traditional rates becomes increasingly difficult. When it is provided at traditional rates, there is a risk of these centres becoming overrun with parking, therefore space is being provided for cars instead of people.

3.2.2 Access to transport modes

Bellerive is in the unique position of having a ferry terminal. Whilst the ferry is currently a limited service between Bellerive and the Hobart CBD, there are 3 more terminals proposed at Glenorchy (Wilkinson's Point), Lindisfarne and Sandy Bay with the intention that the network can continue to grow. Glenorchy and Lindisfarne currently have a timeline of 2027 delivery and Sandy Bay in 2028.

There is access to several bus routes at this location and there is the established foreshore shared use path.

For these travel modes to have higher frequency and better services, they require an increase in patronage. If parking is provided as per the status-quo, there is little motivation for people to mode shift.

If there is a place to encourage mode shift outside the Hobart CBD, Bellerive Village and Kangaroo Bay provide all the components for the success of this.

The Kangaroo Bay site currently has plans for a single level car park, if there can be success in mode shift, then this single level car park is considered a good balance between providing parking and encouraging mode shift.

3.3 Status Quo/ Planning Scheme Compliance

As an alternative to the mode shift scenario, the amount of parking that would be required to satisfy the Planning Scheme Parking and Sustainable Transport Code rate has also been calculated.

It is worth noting that the visitor accommodation Planning Scheme rate has been reduced since writing the Traffic Impact Assessment for several reasons:

- The Visitor Accommodation land use is very broad, it covers motels, large accommodation units with multiple rooms, camping grounds and caravan parks. It does not mention hotels but does mention parking at a rate of 1 parking space per 4 beds
- Hotels of this level tend to have 1 bed per room and 2 beds in some rooms
- The most recent available Australian parking rate is 1 space per 4 rooms as provided in the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments.

It is further noted that Mark Petrisma agrees in his Statement of Evidence (paragraph 127) that 1 parking space per 4 rooms is suitable in this context.

Table 1: Planning Scheme Parking Rate

Use	Capacity	Land Use	Car Parking Rate	Car Parking Requirement
Hotel	155 rooms	Visitor Accommodation	1 space per self-contained accommodation unit, allocated tent or caravan space, or 1 space per 4 beds, whichever is the greater. <i>Adopted rate:</i> 1 space per 4 hotel rooms	39 spaces
Wellness Centre (ancillary use)	145m ²	Sports and recreation	Parking not required as ancillary use	0 spaces
Café/ restaurant – Tenancies 1, 3 and 4	299m ²	Food Services	<i>Planning Scheme rate:</i> 1 space per 15m ² of floor area	20 spaces
Bar – Tenancy 2	143m ²	Hotel Industry	<i>Planning Scheme rate:</i> 1 space per 20m ² of floor area	7 spaces
Food and beverage (ground floor)	300m ²	Food services - restaurant	<i>Planning Scheme rate:</i> 1 space per 15m ² of floor area	20 spaces
Restaurant (in upper level of hotel)	208m ²			14 spaces
Function Area	703m ²	Community meeting and entertainment	1 space per 15m ²	47 spaces
Total				147 spaces

It is noted that the above calculation does not consider the following:

- If the ground floor restaurant and restaurant in the upper level of the hotel are directly associated with the visitor accommodation use, then the requirement for additional parking for these uses is removed
- The parking calculation does not consider a reduction in parking demand for hotel users visiting the restaurants and bar.

4. Foreshore Trail

This section provides a response to paragraphs 193-216 in Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence.

The reasoning for a 4.0m shared path is understood, though it is also noted that increasing the width of a path does not necessarily make it a safer or better option.

The Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A recommend a recreational path width of between 3.0 and 4.0m.

Crucial to the design of the shared use path are the following elements:

- The width of the foreshore path in each direction approaching the site should be considered and there is merit to maintaining a consistent width
- The shared use path should be designed for bike riders to travel at slow speeds due to additional activity in this section of the path
- The shared use path should be a sufficient width to minimise conflict but not so wide that cyclists are encouraged to travel at high speed which could increase the severity of conflict

I make particular note of paragraph 209 of Mark Petrusma's Statement of Evidence, where it is suggested that the bend is widened as the current bend only accommodates speeds of up to 20km/h. In this environment I would highly discourage bicycles travelling at speeds of over 20km/h and cyclists should not be leaning into a curve in this location.

The proposed shared path is considered suitable overall. The edge treatment on the development side could be considered to allow for people to access the shared path and allow for it to be a shared use path that people can access or exit as they please with good visibility, instead of a defined path that could encourage high speed travel.

Yours sincerely



Rebekah Ramm
Associate Roads and Traffic Engineer