
To: Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force

From: Gord Tycho, Senior Regional Planner, Regional Planning
Parks, Planning & Environment Department

Date: September 6, 2018 Meeting Date: September 26, 2018

Subject: **Defining Industrial for the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy**

RECOMMENDATION

That the MVRD Board endorse the working definition of Industrial for the purpose of developing the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy as laid out in the report dated September 6, 2018, titled, “Defining Industrial for the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy”.

PURPOSE

To provide the Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force (Task Force) and MVRD Board with a recommendation for defining ‘Industrial’ for the purposes of the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy.

BACKGROUND

There is not a singular definition for what constitutes industrial use in the region. Stakeholders often enter discussions about industrial land supply and demand needs with their particular filter at the forefront. The wide range of permitted uses on industrially designated and zoned lands in the region, and the changing nature of industry also affect the ability to achieve a consistent definition.

Given the importance of the definition of industrial in framing the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy, staff provided a report to the Task Force on June 21, 2018, describing the complexity of defining what constitutes an industrial activity. Discussion ensued, and the Task Force requested staff undertake additional exploration of the issue and report back with a proposed definition of industrial for the purposes of the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy.

EXPLORING WHAT CONSTITUTES AN ‘INDUSTRIAL’ USE

As part of the report provided at the June 21, 2018 meeting, the Task Force received a draft Spectrum of Industrial Uses to help guide the discussion. The report categorized uses occurring on lands either designated or zoned ‘Industrial’ into three conceptual categories, Traditional, Non-Traditional and Non-Industrial. Discussion focused primarily on the Non-Traditional uses, providing feedback on how to address retail, wholesale, high tech, media production and studios, and other similar uses in terms of the Strategy.

Subsequent to the June 21 Industrial Land Strategy Task Force meeting, staff convened a workshop on July 13, 2018 with the Advisory Group providing analysis and technical support to the development of the Strategy to further explore the definition of ‘industrial’ (Attachment). The Advisory Group comprises the members and associate members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee

(RPAC), as well as representatives from other agencies and organizations that are represented on the Task Force. Attendees participated in small group conversations to: consider how their community/agency defines industrial, develop criteria to help define industrial uses, and then categorize the same uses considered by the Task Force into ‘Industrial’ lands, ‘Employment’ lands, or ‘Other’ lands. Participants applied the criteria they had identified when categorizing uses.

Defining ‘Industrial’

In general, participants defined ‘industrial’ as consistent with the *allowable uses* for industrial lands within their respective policy or regulatory framework (e.g. OCP designation, zoning bylaw, or Land Use Plan). And, there was recognition that some bylaws sought to limit permitted uses to more traditional activities, while others provided substantially more flexibility to accommodate other uses, such as commercial. Many participants expressed that there should be clearer and more consistent definitions for appropriate uses in industrial versus employment areas. Some participants recommended guidelines that are sufficiently narrow to protect the needs of region-serving and trade-enabling activities, yet sufficiently flexible to accommodate the changing nature of industry and the industrial-office hybrid spaces associated with the needs of the innovation economy.

Criteria to Assist in Defining Industrial

At the June 21, 2018 Task Force meeting, members identified some possible criteria for assisting in categorizing more Non-Traditional Industrial Uses as either Industrial or Other. In particular, members discussed retail uses and whether they were intended to serve other industrial businesses in the area or whether they were a draw for the public, as well as access and space requirements. Staff leveraged this initial discussion in designing the Advisory Group workshop and asked participants to identify criteria to assist in confirming the Traditional and Non-Industrial Uses as well as helping to better categorize the Non-Traditional Industrial Uses. There was substantial consistency on the criteria identified. Table 1 provides a summary of the criteria identified and definitions.

Table 1. Criteria to Assist in Defining Industrial

Compatibility with adjacent uses	Whether the business is an emitter of noise, vibration, odour, or visual nuisances that make occupying areas proximate to other land uses (e.g. residential, commercial, or institutional) challenging
Access (to site and goods movement network)	Whether the business requires access to particular infrastructure or modes of transportation such as water, rail, airport, and highway
Space requirements and scale of business	Whether the business requires large / unique site or building characteristics
Product Produced	Whether the business manufactures, distributes or repairs a physical product
Trip Generation	Whether the business generates or handles relatively large amounts of truck or client traffic
Client Type	Whether the business is geared toward other businesses or the public
Ancillary / Hybrid Use	percentage of the business that is office if a hybrid use (e.g. bio-tech)

Applying Criteria and Categorizing Uses

Workshop participants then applied the criteria they identified to the Spectrum of Industrial Uses considered by the Task Force at its June 21, 2018 meeting. They were asked to categorize the full list of uses as Industrial, Employment or Other.

Traditional Industrial Uses are commonly understood to include the general categories of production, distribution and repair, including uses that serve the region and activities that serve the trade-enabling function of the region. The following uses were confirmed as traditional industrial activities appropriate on lands designated or zoned as **Industrial**:

- light and heavy industrial production (e.g. cement manufacturing, food and beverage manufacturing, furniture manufacturing, metalwork and fabrication, sawmills);
- distribution (e.g. warehousing, industrial storage, and freight trucking, intermodal couriers);
- repair (e.g. autobody shops, truck and trailer repair, consumer goods repair)
- construction materials and equipment (e.g. building supplies and specialty trade contractors, heavy equipment rental and leasing);
- infrastructure (e.g. public utilities such as wastewater treatment facilities and pumping stations, works yards, rail / port terminals);
- storage activities (e.g. outdoor and container storage); and
- wholesale (e.g. merchant and logistic wholesalers).

The following uses were confirmed as **Non-Industrial uses**, that should not be permitted on lands zoned as Industrial:

- residential and supportive housing;
- artist studios and live/work space;
- agriculture (soil based growing);
- places of congregation; and
- institutional uses (e.g. schools, day cares, hospitals).

The following uses were identified as uses more appropriate on **Employment** lands rather than Industrial lands, but are currently permitted in several Industrial zones in the region:

- storage activities (such as self-storage);
- stand-alone office (such as law, financial);
- stand-alone recreation (e.g. karate studios, theatres, crossfit and climbing gyms, badminton/tennis facilities);
- retail / wholesale – big box;
- retail /wholesale – car dealership;
- retail / wholesale – furniture;
- retail / wholesale – automotive parts;
- high tech - software development; and
- consulting services (e.g. engineering, architecture, environment).

Finally, participants noted a number of uses that are more **context specific**, and that could be appropriate on either Industrial or Employment lands depending on the applicability of the criteria noted above. For example, micro-breweries were seen as context specific – a good fit on industrial land if most of the space is dedicated to production, but more appropriate on employment lands if the tasting room / retail element is the main space component. In addition, if a small micro-brewery grows its manufacturing component, the scale of production, space requirements, client type, and access needs would be different enough to warrant utilization of industrial space. Other such uses include:

- restaurants (e.g. serving adjacent industrial uses versus being a draw for the public)
- retail – microbreweries;
- services (e.g. commercial laundry, bakery, catering);
- research and development (high tech, Bio-tech);
- high tech distribution centres; and
- media production studios (such as movies, recording, television, and radio).

Although workshop participant responses varied, there was a general sense that activities that are a less obvious fit for one category should be considered in light of the criteria listed in Table 1.

The June 21, 2018 staff report to the Task Force highlighted the growing interest and use of more flexible ‘mixed employment’ zones that permit a wide range of industrial and commercial uses and how these zones may displace more traditional industrial uses necessary for the functioning of the region. A theme that emerged from the workshop is that there should be some further exploration of the potential of a larger format commercial designation / zone to better capture and direct the activities identified as appropriate for Employment rather than Industrial lands.

A WORKING DEFINITION FOR INDUSTRIAL

The Task Force’s input as well as the feedback received by workshop participants has been helpful in gleaning a clearer understanding of the uses occurring on land either designated or zoned Industrial as well as in helping to shape a working definition for the purposes of the Strategy. The upcoming evaluation of the economic contribution of industry in the region will be influenced by the categorization of activities in this report, as will other Strategy consultant studies undertaken. In addition, this categorization will be feedstock for possible recommendations that emerge as the Strategy is developed.

In terms of a working definition, and in service of the vision to ensure sufficient industrial land to meet the needs of a growing and changing regional economy to 2050, Industrial, for the purposes of the Strategy, will be defined as businesses and infrastructure services that meet one or more of the following:

1. are generally not compatible with residential or commercial uses, due to generating heavy vehicle traffic, odour or noise;
2. have unique location, site or space needs that are generally not well served by commercial areas, such as access to the goods movement network or requiring large-area buildings; or
3. are typically serving other businesses, not the general public.

These criteria would typically be met by businesses that produce, repair or distribute goods. In addition, some existing and new (or emerging) uses are context specific, but will be included in the definition of Industrial for the purposes of the Strategy.

Businesses that are part of the Non-industrial or Employment categories above are considered outside the scope of the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy and as such would not be targeted for outreach efforts or policy recommendations. These other business types could be considered through other initiatives such as the *Metro 2040* Industrial and Mixed Employment Policy Review.

The proposed definition is a 'working' definition as work completed over Fall 2018 may result in minor adjustments. Staff will report back in early 2019 if any changes are proposed.

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the MVRD Board endorse the working definition of Industrial for the purpose of developing the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy as laid out in the report dated September 6, 2018, titled, "Defining Industrial for the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy".
2. That the MVRD Board receive for information the report titled, "Defining Industrial for the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy", dated September 6, 2018 and provide alternative direction to staff.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications resulting from this report.

SUMMARY / CONCLUSION

Staff provided information to the Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force on June 21, 2018 regarding the definition of 'industrial', and the range of uses and activities that are occurring on the region's industrial lands, for the purposes of developing the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy. In response to direction received at the same meeting from the Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force to further explore the issue, a dedicated Advisory Group session was held on July 13, 2018.

This report provides both a summary of results from the Advisory Group session and a recommendation for a working definition for Industrial to guide work on the Regional Industrial Lands Strategy over Fall 2018.

Attachment: Attendees at the July 2018 Regional Industrial Lands Strategy Working Session

ATTACHMENT

ATTENDEES AT THE JULY 13, 2018 REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL LANDS STRATEGY ADVISORY GROUP WORKING SESSION

Caitlin Dorward, Land Use Planner, Agricultural Land Commission
Lee-Ann Garnet, Assistant Director-Long Range Planning, City of Burnaby
Andrew Merrill, Manager, Community Planning, City of Coquitlam
Marcy Sangret, Director of Community Planning and Development, City of Delta
Christine Carter, Director of Planning, City of Maple Ridge
Lisa Grant, Manager of Community Development, City of Pitt Meadows
Andre Boel, General Manager, Planning and Development, City of Port Moody
Tina Atva, Senior Planning Coordinator, City of Richmond
Katie Ferland, Business Development Liaison, City of Richmond
Markus Kischnick, Community Planner, City of Surrey
Preet Heer, Manager Community Planning, City of Surrey
Ingrid Hwang, Planner, City of Vancouver
Angele Clark, Community Planner I, District of North Vancouver
Johannes Bendle, Planner I, Fraser Valley Regional District
Barclay Pitkethly, Director of Regional Programs, Fraser Valley Regional District
Bob Denboer, Senior Analyst, Metro Vancouver (observer)
Eric Nicholls, Manager, Planning and Land Use, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Joanna Brownell, Manager, Partner Planning, TransLink
Greg Kolesniak, TransLink
Peta Wolmarans, Manager, Engineering Planning, Vancouver Airport Authority
Randy Ash, Vancouver Coastal Health
Marc Ballard, Manager, Real Estate, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority
Theresa Rawle, Manager, Development, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority