

Within Circulation Area

Received May 29, 2026

From: Kimberley Lambert
Sent: May 28, 2026 6:19 PM
To: Town of Ladysmith <info@ladysmith.ca>; Rahul Parameswaran <rparameswaran@ladysmith.ca>; Mark Carson
Subject: OBJECTION- DVP 26-03, 420 Cook Street, Units 7-9

Good Evening ,

Subject: Written Submission re: DVP 26-03, 420 Cook Street, Units 7-9

Date: May 28, 2026

File: DVP [3090-26-03](#)

PID: 026-445-778

To the Director of Development Services,

1. Acknowledgement

I am writing as an directly affected property owner regarding the Notice of Development Variance Permit

for 420 Cook Street, Units 7, 8, 9, Strata Plan EPS2747.

I understand the application requests a variance to increase the maximum permitted building height

from 10.0 metres to 10.7 metres under Zoning Bylaw 2014, No.1860 for Building 4, Phase 4 of this development.

2. Concerns

My property directly abuts the proposed Building 4. Based on the site plan and the current construction

visible from my yard, I have the following concerns about the additional 0.7m in height:

• **Privacy/Overlook:** The upper-storey windows and roofline of Building 4 are in close proximity to my rear yard and fence line. The added height increases the potential for direct overlook into private outdoor living space, including my deck and garden area.

• **Shadowing/Sunlight:** The increased roof peak may reduce afternoon sun exposure to my yard and garden. Given the lot grades shown on the site plan, even a 0.7m increase could have a noticeable impact.

• **Neighborhood Character:** The variance sets a precedent for additional height in this triplex zone. I ask that impacts to adjacent homes be carefully weighed.

3. Request

I am not opposed to development generally, but I request that the Town consider the following before approving the DVP as submitted:

1. **Confirmation of impacts:** Please confirm whether a shadow study or privacy impact review was completed for adjacent properties.

2. **Mitigation conditions:** If the variance is granted, I ask that conditions be added to reduce overlook, such as:

- Frosted or obscure glazing on any upper-storey windows facing my property
- Enhanced landscaping AND fencing with topper along the shared property line to provide screening at the cost of the builder .

3. **Clarification:** Please advise why the building was constructed to 10.7m instead of the permitted 10.0m. Was this due to grade, roof design, or a construction change?

I would appreciate the opportunity to review elevation drawings showing window placement relative to my property before a decision is made.

Thank you for considering this submission. I can be reached at _____ or _____

Kimberley Lambert and Mark Carson

108 Burns Place , Ladysmith V9G 1P8

Sincerely ,



Within Circulation Area

Received May 29, 2026

From: Mark Carson
Sent: May 28, 2026 5:27 PM
To: Town of Ladysmith <info@ladysmith.ca>
Subject: Notice if development variance permit DVP 26-03

Regarding units 7,8,9 - Cook street Ladysmith:

We have received a notice that the massive building that has been constructed behind our home at 108 Burns place has requested a variance to Town of Ladysmith Zoning Bylaw 2014, No. 1860 to allow for over height build from 10.0 metres to 10.7 metres.

We bought our home, a new constructed home when the foundation only was in place at 420 cook st units 7,8,9

We expected a building to be constructed, however the final massive size and height has been very stressful for us as all the privacy has been taken away.

Now hearing that the Bylaw has been broken and the developer wants permission to keep the extended height has infuriated us as home owners already dealing with the shock of this development being so high and towering over our once private sanctuary.

We are adamantly opposed to allowing the extended height to be allowed and a Bylaw to be changed to allow this extra height as there is no way we can create any form of privacy at this point. Had we known the final height of this building we would not have purchased here.

What are our rights and what is our recourse in this situation? (Legal action against the builder or city or?)

Please advise.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

