

## TESTIMONY

### **ZONING COMMISSION CASE NO. 08-06-6** **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS – INDUSTRIAL**

Good Evening. I am Christopher Collins with the law firm of Holland & Knight, appearing on behalf of Stanley Martin Commercial (SMC) and its related entities, in qualified support of the Office of Planning's recommendations. SMC controls and manages approximately 1.85 million square feet of land that is zoned C-M-1 and M along V Street, N.E., between Bladensburg Road and South Dakota Avenue. I have submitted a letter for the record which provides more detail on the specifics of SMC's position.

The use of industrial land in the District, particularly for warehouse and related uses, has significantly changed over time. Woodward & Lothrop, Hecht's and Sears all had warehouses in the District of Columbia, but moved their operations out of the city, into larger facilities. Supermarkets and other food retailers and wholesalers also controlled much of the warehouse market in the past, but have also moved out of the city, to larger facilities in the suburbs. Storage of bank and other records has been digitized, doing away for the need for warehouse space. Distribution businesses generally locate in very large facilities, adjacent to interstate highways, on many, many acres of property. Currently, SMC's warehouse properties are generally occupied by a mix of uses, including storage facilities for the U.S. Government and the D.C. Government, with office facilities also included in those buildings. Other uses which occupy warehouse facilities include churches and charter schools.

Notwithstanding OP's position that industrial land in the District should be retained, there is much vacant warehouse space in the District, including space that leases at a lower rate than

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 08-04-6

EXHIBIT NO. 7

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 08-06-6  
EXHIBIT NO. 7

the surrounding suburban jurisdictions. As a result, SMC needs flexibility both now and in the future to respond to market demand by tenants, whether they are PDR, or non-PDR tenants.

Recommendation No. 4 in the OP report in this case, which proposes lower matter of right FAR limits for non-PDR uses than for PDR uses, also recognizes the need for special treatment for the industrially-zoned land along V Street, N.E. that is called for in the Comprehensive Plan. As reflected in Recommendation No. 4, OP has indicated to SMC that OP would support a map amendment to retain SMC's ability to redevelop its property for non-PDR uses at the same density as the current FAR limitation. On that basis, SMC supports the proposal.

Thank you. I would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

# 5823592\_v1