



**PROPOSED  
BYLAW**

# Restricting Fertilizers Near Waterbodies

# Help us protect Parkland County waterbodies!

The County is considering a bylaw that will restrict the use of any fertilizers near Parkland County waterbodies. You are receiving this postcard as you are in a subdivision that will be impacted.



WHAT?	WHY?	HOW?
The bylaw will restrict the use of fertilizers (defined as any chemical used as plant nutrients or to aid in plant growth) for those living near waterbodies.	To protect the health of waterbodies. Increased nutrient levels from fertilizer cause faster growth of aquatic plants and vegetation, which depletes water of oxygen and results in algae blooms, dead zones and fish kills.	The bylaw would restrict the use of fertilizers in any subdivision adjacent to a Parkland County waterbody.

For more information on the proposed bylaw and to share your comments, please visit the website below or register to speak at the public hearing on September 24, 2024 at 9:30 a.m. You can register by calling 780-968-8888 ext. 8471 or by emailing [governanceagendas@parklandcounty.com](mailto:governanceagendas@parklandcounty.com)



[www.yourparkland.ca/Fertilizer](http://www.yourparkland.ca/Fertilizer)



ParklandCountyAB

Sep 13 at 01:00 pm



A public hearing will be held during a Council Meeting on September 24 at 9:00 a.m. for the purpose of reviewing the Fertilizer Bylaw which proposes restricted use of fertilizers in any subdivision adjacent to a Parkland County waterbody.

You can find the agenda at <https://events.parklandcounty.com/meetings>







Like



Comment



Share

 **ParklandC...** @Parkland Co... Sep 13    

A public hearing will be held during a Council Meeting on September 24 at 9:00 a.m. for the purpose of reviewing the Fertilizer Bylaw which proposes restricted use of fertilizers near a Parkland County waterbody.

You can find the agenda at [events.parklandcounty.com/m...](https://events.parklandcounty.com/m...)





## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance with the requirements of Section 606 of the Municipal Government Act, as amended, the Council of Parkland County has scheduled a Public Hearing regarding the proposed adoption of the following Bylaw:

Bylaw: 2024-16	Date: September 24, 2024	Time: 9:30 am	Location: Parkland County Council Chambers 53109A Hwy 779, Parkland County, Alberta
----------------	--------------------------	---------------	--

### Proposed Bylaw 2024-16: Restricted Use of Fertilizers by Waterbodies (Second Reading)

Administration is proposing a bylaw which will restrict the use of fertilizers in any subdivision adjacent to a Parkland County waterbody. The objective of this amendment is to address and protect the health of our waterbodies by reducing the use of chemicals around waterbodies. Please refer to [yourparkland.ca/fertilizer](http://yourparkland.ca/fertilizer) for the complete list of subdivisions and municipal addresses affected by the proposed bylaw.

### Hearing Procedure

This is a formal Public Hearing and Council is prepared to hear and receive formal submissions and presentations (verbal or written) from those who wish to speak to the proposed Bylaw. Written submissions or presentations may either be submitted in advance to Legislative Services by **12:00 p.m. on September 18, 2024**, or submitted at the commencement of the **Public Hearing on September 24, 2024**.

Anyone wishing to make a verbal presentation to Council must notify Legislative Services in advance of the Public Hearing by **12:00 p.m., on September 18, 2024**. Verbal presentations at the Public Hearing will be limited to a maximum of 10 minutes. Anyone wishing to make a verbal presentation who has not made prior arrangements may be allocated a time at the commencement of the Public Hearing. Council advises that this is your last opportunity to comment on the proposed Bylaw as Council is unable to receive further submissions after the Public Hearing is closed.

### Copies of the proposed Restricted Use of Fertilizers by Waterbodies Bylaw

Copies of the proposed Restricted Use of Fertilizer Bylaw 2024-16 are available free of charge on our website ([yourparkland.ca/fertilizer](http://yourparkland.ca/fertilizer)), by email or by visiting Parkland County Centre during regular business hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday to Friday). If you have any questions related to this Bylaw, please contact Dave Cross at [David.Cross@parklandcounty.com](mailto:David.Cross@parklandcounty.com)

The personal information you provide will be used for the purpose of the items described above and is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act. If you have any questions about the collection, use, and disclosure of this information, please contact the FOIP Coordinator at Parkland County, 53109A HWY 779, Parkland County, Alberta T7Z 1R1 (780-968-3229) or email [foip@parklandcounty.com](mailto:foip@parklandcounty.com)



- Home
- Current Projects
- County Website

- Sign in
- Register



Home / Bylaw Restricting the use of Fertilizers

# Bylaw Restricting the use of Fertilizers



## Bylaw Restricting Use of Fertilizers by Waterbodies in Parkland County

Parkland County is considering a Bylaw which will restrict the use of fertilizers in any subdivision adjacent to a Parkland County waterbody.

### What exactly are we proposing to do?

The Bylaw will restrict the use of fertilizers, which are defined as any substances that contain nitrogen, potassium, or any other chemicals that are used as plant nutrients or to aid in plant growth.

### Who will this impact?

This will directly impact any resident living in a subdivision or hamlet adjacent to a waterbody in Parkland County. "Waterbody" refers to any location where standing or flowing surface water is present, permanent, and naturally occurring; including, but not limited to: lakes, wetlands, streams, and rivers. Please refer to the **Appendix A** attachment for a complete listing of subdivisions and municipal addresses affected by the proposed bylaw.

Note that exceptions are proposed for agriculture producers and commercial operations.

### Why are we doing this?

The reason for doing this is to protect the health of our lakes by reducing the use of chemicals around waterbodies. Fertilizers increase the level of nutrients in the water which results in increased growth of aquatic plants and vegetation at faster rates, therefore depleting the lake of oxygen. Further effects on waterbodies include dead zones, fish dying, and algae blooming.

**How are we proposing to do this?**

Parkland County is proposing to put a Bylaw in place which will restrict the use of fertilizers in any subdivision adjacent to a Parkland County waterbody.

**Where are we at in the process?**

All Bylaws require three readings by Council. For a Bylaw to be put into effect, it requires an initial First Reading. This proposed Bylaw received First Reading June 11, 2024. Feedback is encouraged from residents which will be reviewed at or during a Public Hearing which is taking place on Tuesday, September 24 at 9:30 a.m.

Changes can be made by Council after each reading up to the third and final Reading. The third and final reading is scheduled for October 22, 2024. As part of this process, Council can implement changes to the Bylaw through the Reading processes.

**What can I do if I wish to provide feedback or comment?**

There are a few options for you, including:

- Submit comments directly through this section of the website.
  - Information will be compiled and shared anonymously with Council as part of the Second Reading presentation.
- Formal feedback can be provided by taking part in the Public Hearing on September 24<sup>th</sup>.
  - Comments can be made either in formal writing, or by attending the Public Hearing in person and speaking directly to Council.
  - To participate, in writing or in person at the Public Hearing, please contact the County at 780-968-8471 or email [governanceagendas@parklandcounty.com](mailto:governanceagendas@parklandcounty.com)


Comments

**Leave feedback regarding this proposed bylaw**

COMMENTS




*Page last updated: 27 Aug 2024, 01:53 PM*


 **Bylaw Proposed at Council meeting**  
**11 June 2024**

 **Public Hearing**  
**24 September 2024**

 **Final Reading**  
**22 October 2024**

## Proposed Bylaw

 **Proposed Fertilizer Bylaw (1.91 MB) (pdf)**

 **Appendix A.pdf (122 KB) (pdf)**

## Who's Listening

**David Cross**

General Manager, Agriculture, Community, &  
Protective Services



Contributor Details	Comments received from MyParkland portal, email, and phone calls as of Sept 16, 2024
Online	<p>Why are golf courses &amp; other commercial properties exempt from this bylaw, but residential properties have to comply with it? Shouldn't it be ALL or NONE if you really want to protect waterbodies fully. There are numerous golf courses that surround bodies of water in County of Parkland. Fertilizer goes directly into the ground where it is applied. It does not reach the water bodies as the distance is far.</p> <p>Show us the studies that proves your "why" section of this proposed bylaw.</p>
Online	<p>I think this bill is intended to curb excessive use of fertilizers to protect our wetlands. As an acreage homeowner in one of the targeted subdivisions I applaud the sentiment if not the actual bill. Conscientiously applied, fertilizer can be beneficial rather than harmful. "Less is more" as the saying goes. I don't see how a small amount of an appropriate fertilizer applied at the base of my fruit trees is a problem. I wouldn't know where to begin to define parameters for a bylaw but threatening the neighbours with a \$10k fine or 6 months in jail for fertilizing their tomatoes is excessive. Go ahead and pass another draconian bylaw to stop the worst offenders. The neighbours and I will continue to mind our own business as long as common sense prevails in our subdivision.</p>
Online	<p>I love the lakes and waterways in Parkland County and want to see them protected. However, I don't believe this bylaw will achieve that. I think it will only serve to encourage neighbors to tattle on each other and will ultimately be impossible to enforce. Education for landowners in the identified subdivisions is a much better approach.</p>
Online	<p>The term "adjacent" must be defined in this bylaw. In other jurisdictions within Alberta, a distance of 30m or 100m from the waterbody is defined as being "adjacent". In those jurisdictions, properties outside of this defined distance are allowed to apply fertilizers.</p> <p>Supporting information for the defined distance should be provided to residents to provide evidence that the distance is causal to the problems identified.</p>
Online	<p>I'm in favor of this bylaw should've been in place years ago. More environmental controls need to be in place. Bylaws are good but then there has to be enforcement! Returning to a balanced and healthy system is more challenging than prevention to the system. I'd like to see restrictions on pumping lake water also for the use of lakeshore residents watering their lawns.</p>

Online	<p>We do not support this initiative. It is far too sweeping and fails to integrate common sense practices into determining the likeliness of impact from fertilizer activity from residential applications which have very low volumes. Simply banning fertilizer applications based on land use boundaries as opposed to considering proximity from a flowing watercourse is not appropriate. For example, restricting a fertilizer on an entire subdivision when only one small component is near a water feature is overzealous. Perhaps considering limiting the total volume by area of fertilizer that can be applied in a single growing season to limit over fertilizing. Either way will be difficult to enforce. We request this initiative be terminated so that I'm not required to apply fertilizer on my lawn under the cover of darkness (I prefer even applications that are best achieved during daylight).</p>
Online	<p>My feedback is: you have all these bylaws that are not enforced either passively or actively. Bylaw officers that say, "I can decide whether or not in enforce this." Why bother having bylaws?!?!</p>
Online	<p>Good morning. We are fully in agreement with this bylaw as we have a summer home on Lake Wabamun. What about informal boat launches and boat inspections?</p>
Online	<p>Finally! This is a good step to protect our water bodies, but I hope this is also going to include the use of pesticides. All of these companies that spray fertilizers also spray many bug repellent chemicals that are also getting into our waterways. Mosquito sprays, ant sprays, wasp sprays are all affecting our environment and our wildlife. I hope this topic will enter the discussion.</p>
Online	<p>I am not opposed to this fertilizer bylaw but have some questions surrounding it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why are only subdivision lot owners being affected?</li> <li>2. Will farmers have the same restrictions? Please advise.</li> <li>3. The herbicide, Glyphosate (aka Roundup) causes significantly more environmental damage than any fertilizer. Please advise why products with glyphosate are not being looked at.</li> </ol> <p><a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6918143/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6918143/</a></p> <p>I feel this bylaw will not bring forth a significant environmental impact when banning the least impactful users.</p>
Online	<p>Does this include Parkland Village</p>

Online	<p>Long overdue. I would suggest that golf courses NOT be exempt. They should be subject to the same restrictions. Courses have the potential to use huge amounts of fertilizer which mitigates the impact of restrictions on individual lots. At the end of the day the health of our bodies of water is at stake.</p>
Online	<p>Would like to see more done to restrict the phosphates coming into the lakes from vast agricultural fertilizer use in the watersheds and waste coming from the ranching. This is the real problem, not a few lakefront homes.</p>
Online	<p>We've had a cottage at Jackfish Lake for about 65 years. Our mother used to wash vegetables in the lake, and we waded about and swam in the clear water. Now, even in the spring, the water is discoloured by weeds and algae. We think that the large number of houses/cabins/estates with their pristine lawns, which have been treated with fertilizer and weed killer are a significant reason for the degradation of the lake. There are also a large number of places with inappropriate clearing of the beach area. We support the ban on fertilizers and would encourage a ban on weed killers as well.</p>
Online	<p>I feel my property value will decrease as my lawn and plants will not be able to be kept up as well.</p> <p>Additionally, may we suggest doing a rotational fertilizing to “limit” rather than eliminate fertilizing, so we all have the opportunity to keep Up our properties?</p> <p>Are there certain effective product lists that can still be used, and can we have those recommendations?</p> <p>What is the true data on runoff risk for our lakes? If we do not have lake front, then it would be hard to think our fertilizer would be affecting these bodies of water?</p> <p>With my questions you can see I am not for this bylaw. I take great pride of ownership in my property and don't want to have this freedom taken away.</p> <p>I would like to see rather things being done to the lakes and bodies of water that could discourage algae blooms instead and I know there is chemical out there or potentially more natural things that could be done so our water bodies are protected.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my concerns</p>
Online	<p>Many property owners have invested thousands of dollars developing and maintaining residential property specifically related to landscaping, including significant areas of lawn grass, trees, shrubs, and flowers to accentuate their property and value. This results in significant benefits to the County i.e.: overall community appeal and environment, increased value and demonstrated pride of ownership.</p> <p>While the majority of residents would likely support and understand the negative impact of fertilizer run-off into our natural water bodies and streams it will be more acceptable to residents if this initiative is supplemented with a positive action plan that addresses alternative actions to develop and maintain beautiful landscapes within the County. Examples are: alternatives</p>

	<p>to current fertilizer's known in the common marketplace, alternative grass, trees, shrub and flower species that are less needy of fertilizer, and so on.</p> <p>Objections of commercial operators and manufactures: There are many small business's such as: mobile lawn, tree, shrub and flower fertilizer operators, Major local manufactures of fertilizers,</p> <p>Objection in Principle of the average acreage homeowner: Why focus on the minimal fertilizer users i.e. Acreage subdivisions such as Lakeshore Estates. Less than one acre/0.405 hectare residential developments vs. Golf Courses, Agriculture, Greenhouses and market gardens etc.</p>
Online	<p>The purpose of the bylaw is understood as are the impacts of fertilizer. As this will impact lawns in country residential subdivisions, what provisions for the homeowners are being considered? For example, a healthy lawn restricts weed growth. If lawns cannot be nourished and weeds become unmanageable unless herbicides are applied, will the County then police and issue fines for weeds? Second, if lawns decline, so does curb appeal and property value. Will the County compensate affected landowners with lower tax assessments? Third, will grants be made available to help landowners convert lawns to low maintenance landscaping given the lawns exist due to restrictive covenants that were put in place by the Developer and likely the County when the subdivision was developed?</p>
Online	<p>What about azomite? Its listed by the supplier as micronized trace minerals which are oxides with no chemicals added and are not bound to carbon. Azomite is mined, crushed and 100% natural.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
Online	<p>Can you provide the public the evidence that the owners of land around the lake are the cause of the problem you are trying to solve?</p>
Online	<p>I live on a land locked lot in Marrakesh  I grow grass and flowers for my pleasure  As understand this by law  I would no longer be able to fertilize my grass  I would no longer be able to fertilize my flower pots  This seems like a bit of overkill</p>
Online	<p>The proposed bylaw as presented appears primarily as virtue signaling without any substantiating data. What should be presented is the % of total fertilizer in the county that is applied in subdivisions vs the amount total in the county. It is expected that the amount applied in subdivisions is a non-consequential rounding error in the amount applied agriculturally over the same regions. This bylaw will negatively impact tax payers, however it will not remotely materially impact the amount hitting waterways as a result of agriculture. The notice of plan should have included clear statistical justification on application rates. The fact it doesn't either means homework</p>



	is not being done prior and the decision is uninformed, or the results do not back the action taken.
Online	Strongly support this initiative. Fertilizers not only pose potential harm to our waterbodies but can also eventually seep into the aquifer that we draw our water from. Thanks for taking the initiative to plan for our collective future health.
Online	We are in favor of a bylaw that restricts fertilizer use around Wabamun Lake. However some consideration should be given to assist landowners in the control of weeds on their property. How would this bylaw be enforced and what would be the penalties. We are also concerned about fertilizers affecting well water. thanks
Online	This by-law to restrict fertilizer is needed desperately. We have had a property at South Seba beach for the past 11 years and enjoy Wabamun. The quality of the water is deteriorating making it near impossible to safely enjoy the water near shore (people and pets). This was not the case 10 years ago and has been escalating for the past 5 years. Three of the neighbors directly next to our place fertilize heavily. I have discussed this with them and education is needed. None of them believe that when they fertilize it makes it into the lake. Two of them are "back lots" and they say there is "no way it makes it into the ground and across the street to the lake." They believe the quality of the lake issues is due to global warming. Enforcement will also be critical to the success of the program. The offending individuals need to know that the community is in strong support and firmly support the county enforcing the bi-law so that we can all continue to protect and enjoy the lake.
Online	<p>Do you have any information or studies that show how much of an impact residential use of fertilizers actually have had on these bodies of water. It would seem to me that commercial operations would contribute 90% or more of any negative impact, and that is allowed to continue. But a study would confirm if this bylaw will have any likelihood of lessening contributions that negatively impact any body of water.</p> <p>Why is it necessary to ban any and all use of fertilizers for your lawn and trees. Why can't you simply limit the amount used per area, the frequency of application, and other options for reducing the amount applied.</p> <p>Also this does not seem to cover the use of fertilizers in self contained raised gardens (e.g. old water troughs) or in pots. Will these also be restricted.</p>
Online	Does this mean that we could no longer fertilizer our gardens and flowers?

<p>Online</p>	<p>Parkland County has waited way too long to act. Wabamun lake and Alberta Beach are the worst it has ever been. The county needs to go further with this bylaw. It needs to include fertilizer, outhouses, and septic fields (no grandfathering). The amount of nutrients going into the lakes is way too high. Enforcement needs to be stringent. Pets are getting sick, and people going in to the lake are getting rashes and pimples (not swimmers itch). Ontario when they protected their lakes gave people notice and then when they checked back, if not in compliance they were evicted until remediated. Neighbours all around us are using fertilizer extensively only care about how green their lawn is. the lake is in trouble and needs government intervention ASAP. Please put this bylaw into effect immediately (like a fire ban). This does not need more consultation and public hearing. What possibly is the alternative?</p>
<p>Online</p>	<p>Our property backs onto a County park reserve that is unkept and unattended. The wildfire risk grows by the year as the fuel accumulates on the ground. Thistles grow in large blocks in an old road allowance. The lawn on our property provides a fire break from this hazard and some defense from the thistle seeds that enter the neighborhood. A lawn that is less robust will compound both of these issues. To save the waterbodies, the county would need to expend more effort in the park reserves to reduce the fire hazard and control the weeds that are left unchecked.</p>
<p>Online</p>	<p>Thank you for taking initiative to put this bylaw in place, our water bodies need this protection. It's unfortunate that a bylaw has to be in place and that those living close by can't make better decisions. How will the bylaw be enforced? I would also like to see something put in place to address the number of septic fields that still exist around the water bodies. Hopefully, this can be addressed soon. It doesn't feel like the health of our water bodies is getting any better and more needs to be done.</p>
<p>Online</p>	<p>I strongly support this bylaw, recognizing that restricting the use of fertilizers is critical to support the health of waterbodies in Parkland County. This bylaw will help to make all residents aware of the importance of preventing nutrient loading in our lakes. Instating and enforcing this bylaw will help us work together to keep our recreation areas usable and the ecosystem healthy.</p>
<p>Online</p>	<p>I am a resident of Parkland County in one of the impacted subdivisions. I disagree with this statement: "Note that exceptions are proposed for agriculture producers and commercial operations." I believe, if passed, the bylaw should include, without exception, Agricultural Producers and Commercial Operations as they absolutely contribute to nutrient runoff impacting our waterbodies and perhaps to a greater degree than the average homeowner. If Parkland County truly wants to show environmental responsibility, then these rules should apply to everyone in the County.</p> <p>A more pragmatic first approach may be to educate the public and allow us to adjust our behaviors over time as a result (similar to recycling).</p> <p>I'm not necessarily opposed to the Bylaw, but I don't agree it should only apply to Residential folks.</p>

Online	<p>First thank you for allowing feedback: With agricultural and commercial operations EXEMPT I believe this bylaw will have limited impact if any. Across from me is the Devon Golf course that uses an inordinate amount of fertilizer (not in your jurisdiction!) as well as a Grain grower (beside West 35 Estates) using heavy fertilizer as well as herbicides (round-up or glyphosate). I am certainly a proponent of EVIDENCE based abuse or use going into the river so please provide the factual data that supports this; we should really consider the motorized boats that pollute our drinking water and all the golf courses that line the North Sask. River in Edmonton. If you can address the real culprits then we are helping the environment. Please clarify 'restrict'....is that a BAN meaning no use??Thanks.</p>
Online	<p>Can you please give a definition of "near"?</p>
Online	<p>I am in total agreement with restricting the use of fertilizers for lake front properties - the health of the lake is of primary importance! However, every time it rains, I watch the water pour into the lake from the creek near us, after having passed through various farmers fields. I wonder why that isn't also a huge source of fertilizer coming into the lake?</p>
Online	<p>To be more specific...  What is your definition of "near".  We're near to Jasper. We're near to Dog Rump Creek in Stony, as is your office. We're near to Jackfish Lake. How far away from a waterbody are you no longer near?</p>
Online	<p>I live with a creek running through my property and do not fertilize except around roots of freshly planted trees. I understand the problem with fertilizer in the water system but the fertilizer in the water system is coming from large commercial farming operations to the south of me. Alberta environment is periodically testing the water and told me the herbicides and fertilizer in the water is coming from operations south of hwy 16 and 16a which are draining into my water system. Stopping acreage owners from using fertilizer is not going to cure anything if you don't ban fertilizer on the large farming operations that are draining into provincial water systems. I believe the water systems are under provincial jurisdiction and not the county. I am totally against the county accepting this bylaw in anyway</p>
Online	<p>The problem with the residue in the water sources is caused by agricultural and commercial operations filtering into all the surrounding water bodies including those going those adjacent to acreages.</p>

Online	We object to this bylaw because it penalizes acreage owners and does not affect the source of the problem which is large agricultural, golf courses and commercial enterprises.
Online	<p>I am for the proposed bylaw to restrict Fertilizers in the Parkland County area. My family and I have had a cabin here for over 40 years and we have never seen the Algae and the Blue Green Algae so bad. Even the smell can be choking at times affecting the air quality.</p> <p>My question, What can I do if I suspect a neighbor using fertilizer?</p>
Online	<p>I'm opposed to the proposed fertilizer bylaw. Just because you can doesn't mean you should. The MGA is pretty simple, a council shall provide Good Governance to its residents, e.g. low taxes, good roads etc. It doesn't reference saving the planet. You are proposing something that is out of scope of good governance. This reminds me of Calgary's Climate Emergency where the only thing achieved was to harass the public by eliminating straws /bags / napkins. Stay in your lane. No need to be Woke in municipal government. Let move to the enforcement aspect. The bylaw officer can issue a ticket where in his opinion I have used fertilizer. We all know that there needs to be proof of an infraction. So how would the County establish that proof of an infraction. Get a warrant to search my property for Fert bags? Take soil samples of my lawn? Please explain that to me. You are proposing an unenforceable bylaw. So, what is the use? Bully and harass the residents? Is that good governance as per the MGA? I suspect that there is already a whole bunch of unenforceable bylaws in the books. Why add to the list? The amount of Fert in acreages is negligible compared with agriculture that surround these same water bodies. What might be next? A bylaw preventing farming use of Fert? Please advise on that subject. If that is proposed, let's talk about larger issues such as food security and a farmers ability to make a living.</p>
Emailed Comments	<p>I respect the initiative to attempt protection of lakes from further degradation due to leaching of chemicals associated with fertilizer, but don't agree that the proposed approach specific to residential fertilizing is an appropriate solution to address the concern and a more reasonable approach could be applied with similar effectiveness. My house backs onto a wetland that has no inflow or outflow of water. The closest lawn that would be subject to fertilizing is more than 50m from the wetland edge with other sections of lawn being greater than 200m from the wetland. Suggesting that fertilizer leaching will have any significant impact on the watercourse at this distance is highly unlikely, and applying the restriction to neighbours who are even further from the wetland is even more egregious. Standard industry practice is to apply a 30m buffer to watercourses (subject to additional mitigation measures if activities must occur within the 30m buffer) which would be sufficient to add additional protection for interception of potential surface runoff of fertilizer especially considering the low volumes used in residential applications.</p> <p>Please consider altering the bylaw to only restrict fertilizer applications within</p>



	<p>30m of a wetland, watercourse, or lake. The restriction should not be based on an entire parcel of land simply because it is arbitrarily adjacent to a water feature; proximity needs to be the basis of determining when a restriction should apply. Any restrictive distance greater than 30m is overzealous and not based on any science especially in consideration of the small volumes of fertilizer used for residential applications.</p> <p>2. You indicated that enforcement of the bylaw is not intended to occur unless complaints are received. By having a bylaw with enforcement provisions, you are giving inspectors authority to exercise powers regardless of your political or altruistic intent. If council is truly not intending to be heavy-handed, then a bylaw is not the right approach and would be very difficult to enforce. Alternative to a bylaw, consider creating a guideline or best practices document to provide to country residential landowners. This document can include guidelines/best practices on proximity to watercourses where fertilizer should not be applied, recommended maximum volumes, and frequency of fertilizer applications. A bylaw provides unintended enforcement powers that could be inappropriately applied. If you believe that a bylaw is necessary, then please have the bylaw state the requirements are to apply the fertilizer guidelines, as appropriate. This at least provides opportunity to address where deviations are appropriate, but gross negligence regarding application of the guidelines would be reasonably subject to enforcement mechanisms.</p> <p>---In response to this feedback, Dave Cross has thanked resident for suggestions and will be taken into consideration for hearing 2</p>
Emailed Comments	<p>I do not support this bylaw for numerous reasons. Firstly, if we want to maintain our property value within parkland county we need to have yards that fit the bill for the value of our properties. Yards that are filled with weeds are not going to maintain the appropriate property value. We will no doubt see a dramatic increase in weeds should we not be allowed to use fertilizer. This brings my second point, Parkland already has a hard enough time limiting the amount of noxious weeds in the county. If we are not able to use fertilizer, these noxious weeds are going to spread to our properties eventually.</p> <p>I understand the concerns of the bodies of water nearby, however, unless there is going to be a ban on fertilizer for the farms and golf courses (which I also would not support) we will have little effect.</p> <p>--- In response to this comment, Dave Cross has noted resident's concern regarding property values, noxious weeds, and impacts of not including farms and golf courses. Concerns will be shared and taken for consideration in second reading of bylaw hearing.</p>

Resident Caller #1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Commercial needs to be included as they impact more than residential</li><li>- Will there be enforcement</li><li>- Will taxes be reduced for those of us not able to use fertilizer</li></ul>
Resident Caller #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Area being restricted is excessive should be reduced</li><li>- Concerns about pollinators and those folks that grow their own food, allowances should be made for these activities</li><li>- Some Organic fertilizers should be considered and allowed</li><li>- Questions on ability to enforce and what that approach would be, has concerns about it</li></ul>