

Compassion not an option in trailer park dispute: IRAC

Last Updated: Friday, March 6, 2009 | 8:01 AM AT [Comments28Recommend6](#)
[CBC News](#)

Residents of a Charlottetown mobile home park lost their appeal Thursday to prevent rezoning that would clear the way for condominiums, and now must move.

The proposal was originally turned down by city council but approved on appeal by the Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission. The appeal to IRAC to change that ruling ended in failure Thursday.

'There should have been strong consideration and sensitivity and compassion.'

— Coun. Mitchell Tweel

Residents have been told they will be given at least a year to move.

The IRAC ruling said it "sympathizes" with the residents, but compassion cannot play a role in IRAC's decision-making process.

"The idea that IRAC has said they don't have the capacity to look at mitigating circumstances, I don't think they contemplated that the mitigating circumstances would be as extensive as they are in these particular circumstances," said Coun. David MacDonald.

The residents complained to IRAC that rezoning would mean uprooting an entire community. There are 19 trailers in the park, though some are empty.

No errors or new information

In its 12-page decision, IRAC said the only way the commissioners can change an original decision is if errors were made, or new information was provided, and that didn't happen.

Coun. Mitchell Tweel has been lobbying for the trailer park residents.

"The concerns of the residents fell on deaf ears," said Tweel.

"I think there should have been strong consideration and sensitivity and compassion. There was absolutely no compassion whatsoever."

MacDonald said it's too soon to say if the city will appeal to the courts.

The developers have to give residents at least six months notice to pack up their trailers and move them off the land.

- [Post a comment](#)
28Comments have been posted
- [Recommend this story](#)
6People have recommended this story

Story comments (28)

Sort: [Most recent](#) | [First to last](#) | [Agreed](#)

[countryboy08](#) wrote: Posted 2009/03/09

at 7:47 AM ET Compassion is never a consideration with the IRAC gang. Otherwise they might take a different tact with the oil companies every time they cry hard times and demand a price increase.

After all it is just business. Never mind that someone has to be uprooted from their family home and move to God knows where. It isn't them so it doesn't matter.

Same mentality at work when they increase fuel prices when the crude price is at a five year low. Never mind the couple struggling to make ends meet on minimum wage. Stick it to them.

They (IRAC) can afford the increase on their huge salaries.

Maybe it's time to fire the whole IRAC gang. It's has nothing to do with compassion, just getting rid of high paid civil servants who don't serve the needs of the public.

- [3](#)
- [1](#)

[3](#)Agree [1](#)DisagreePolicy Report abuse

[Markphd](#) wrote: Posted 2009/03/08

at 8:32 PM ET It is unfortunate that people have their lives disrupted, but they do not own the land. And that's really the bottom line. A lot of people are asking for compassion. Perhaps these people could demonstrate their own compassion by allowing one or two of the displaced trailers on their land. Or is compassion only expected on the part of other landowners and not on their own part?

- [3](#)
- [0](#)

[3](#)Agree [0](#)DisagreePolicy Report abuse

[Omeneves](#) wrote: Posted 2009/03/07

at 10:04 PM ET This article is quoted as follows : The IRAC ruling said it "sympathizes" with the residents, but compassion cannot play a role in IRAC's decision-making process.

Regretably the words ; "compassion" and "business", cannot be used in the same sentence.

Business is just that - absent of emotion.

- [4](#)
- [2](#)

[4](#)Agree [2](#)DisagreePolicy Report abuse

[RedSpud00](#) wrote: Posted 2009/03/07

at 6:56 PM ET I am a resident in this trailer park and want to clarify a point in this piece. We have not yet been given notice of eviction by the land owner, but the land owner has acknowledged that he is open to given more notice than the required 6 months notice.

- [5](#)
- [1](#)

[5](#)Agree [1](#)DisagreePolicy Report abuse

[lyndatwo](#) wrote: Posted 2009/03/07

at 12:43 PM ET If I had lots of money to invest in property a condo would be the very last thing i would think of. However, this is PEI. And by that, I mean when someone with loads more money than you says jump, you usually have to wind up jumping. I'm afraid that, when I look ahead, we are going to have more than one empty condo. We have some rich people but most of them prefer to own their own private homes. They may attract some young professionals with great jobs. Hope for that.

- [1](#)
- [1](#)

[1](#)Agree [1](#)DisagreePolicy Report abuse

- Previous
- [1](#)

- [2](#)
- [3](#)
- [4](#)
- [5](#)
- [6](#)
- [Next](#)

Post your comment

Note: The CBC does not necessarily endorse any of the views posted. By submitting your comments, you acknowledge that CBC has the right to reproduce, broadcast and publicize those comments or any part thereof in any manner whatsoever. Please note that comments are pre-moderated/reviewed and published according to our [submission guidelines](#).

You must be logged in to leave a comment. [Log in](#) | [Sign up](#)

Comment:

Post [Submission policy](#)