



Michelle Walsh-Doucette  
Commission Clerk  
Email: [mwalshdoucette@irac.pe.ca](mailto:mwalshdoucette@irac.pe.ca)

March 31, 2026

**VIA EMAIL**

Charlie Hicken  
[charlieh748352@gmail.com](mailto:charlieh748352@gmail.com)  
1763 Rte 17  
Albion, PE C0A 1R0  
Appellant

Lee Kenebel  
[lkenebel@threeriverspei.com](mailto:lkenebel@threeriverspei.com)  
Planning & Development Officer  
Town of Three Rivers  
172 Fraser St, Montague C0A 1R0  
Respondent

[Tse-han.wang@outlook.com](mailto:Tse-han.wang@outlook.com)  
Great Enlightenment Buddhist Institute  
c/o Tse Han Wang  
2661 Heatherdale Road  
Montague, PE  
C1A 1R0  
Developer

**RE: Appeal #LA26004 – Charlie Hicken v. Town of Three Rivers**

The Prince Edward Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission has received a Notice of Appeal from Charlie Hicken against the March 11, 2026, decision of the Town of Three Rivers to approve a development at 2661 Heatherdale Rd, pertaining to PIDs 483404, 253666, 759001 and 729939 located in Montague, PE (the “Subject Property”). A copy of the Notice of Appeal is attached. All parties involved will receive copies of submissions made by another party.

The Appellant’s Notice of Appeal lists his mailing address as being several kilometers away from the Subject Property. This raises a preliminary question for the Commission as to whether the Appellant, Charlie Hicken, qualifies as an “aggrieved person”, as defined at section 27.1 of the *Planning Act* and whether this appeal can be brought before the Commission pursuant to subsection 28(1.1) of the *Planning Act*.

The Notice of Appeal includes the following submission at paragraph 9:

I feel I am an affected person.

If this permit is allowed to stand there are three houses across the road from my home and there will be nothing to stop each one from putting a doghouse in the front yard, then adding an accessory building. Once built they only need to add a bed to it & we will have two homes on each lot. The property values, lifestyle & neighbourhood atmosphere will be forever changed.

The burden of proof is on an appellant to show that they are an aggrieved person. That means the Appellant must prove that he is an aggrieved person in order for his appeal to continue. The burden must be shown on a balance of probabilities.

The Appellant is invited to make further written submissions with respect to his standing as an “aggrieved person” before the Commission determines whether this appeal can proceed to a hearing on its merits.

- The Appellant may provide further submissions in response to the question of how he meets the standard of an “aggrieved person” as defined at section 27.1 of the *Planning Act* by **April 8, 2026**, at 4:00 p.m.
- The Respondent and Developer may provide submissions in response by **April 15, 2026**, at 4:00 p.m.
- The Appellant may provide reply submissions by **April 17, 2026**, at 4:00 p.m.

Rule 41 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure provides that the Commission may determine, at its discretion, that a public hearing on this jurisdictional issue will not be held and the Commission will issue a decision in writing. Please keep this in mind when preparing your submissions.

If upon receipt and review of the parties’ submissions the Commission determines that a public hearing is required, you will be advised accordingly.

If you have any questions, please be in touch.

Yours truly,



Michelle Walsh-Doucette  
Commission Clerk