

July 8, 2021

Via email: [shahada.khan@mississauga.ca](mailto:shahada.khan@mississauga.ca)

City of Mississauga  
300 City Centre Drive  
Mississauga, Ontario L5B 3C1

**Att: Shahada Khan**  
**Manager, Development Financing & Reserve Management**

**Re: Mississauga Development Charges**

---

Shahada,

Thank you for taking the time to provide us with the Industrial FSW analysis and data. We have reviewed the data and have the following observations and comments.

- 31 new industrial buildings presented
- Total GFA approximately 5.6 M s.f.
- Approximately 4.6 M s.f. (82%) is generated from buildings greater than 100,000 s.f.
- Approximately 930,000 s.f. (18%) is generated from buildings less than 100,000 s.f.
- The average FSW for buildings greater than 100,000 s.f. equates to 2,721 s.f./employee
- The average FSW for buildings less than 100,000 s.f. equates to 1,300 s.f./employee
- The sum of 17 buildings GFA divided by employment for buildings greater than 100,000 s.f. is 1,429 s.f./employee
- The sum of 14 buildings GFA divided by employment for buildings less than 100,000 s.f. equates to 875 s.f./employee
- 3,274 employees (75%) are located in buildings larger than 100,000 s.f.
- 1,064 employees (25%) are located in buildings less than 100,000 s.f.
- Expansion data not dissimilar to new buildings

The presentation identified 58 new buildings, however only 31 new building data was provided and analyzed. What was the reason for that?

The data suggests that for the period of the study the majority of buildings (53%) were greater than 100,000 s.f., and such buildings accommodated the vast majority of employment (75%) and such buildings represented the vast majority of GFA constructed (82%).

We accept that this is historical data and we should be forward looking, however in previous background studies we encouraged a forward looking approach but the City's consultants insisted on using the data as presented.

We are prepared to accept the suggested 130 m<sup>2</sup> (1,346 s.f.) per worker as the FSW input into the background study.

We do not however accept that the FSW should be adjusted for NFPW (no fixed place of work). We continue to submit that the NFPW category is a separate employment category and should not be subsidized by the built form.

We look forward to continuing our dialogue on the background study in general and the non-residential inputs in particular.

Yours truly,

**ORLANDO CORPORATION**



Phil King, P.Eng.  
Vice Chairman

PK/lds