

From: [Mack](#)
To: [Toronto East York Community Council](#); [Mayor Chow](#); [Councillor Saxe](#); [Andrew Greene](#); jbelle-gp@ndp.on.ca
Subject: [External Sender] Concerns Regarding Application 20 190121 STE 11 OZ - 419-431 College St
Date: May 26, 2026 12:36:47 PM

Toronto and East York Community Council Members, Councillor Saxe and Team, MPP Bell and Team, Mayor Chow and Team, and Whom Else It May Concern;

I have already applied to speak at the meeting this coming Thursday May 28 with regards to Application 20 190121 STE 11 OZ, regarding the Development Proposal concerning 419-431 College Street. However, as each speaker only receives 5 minutes, I have had to cut my speech significantly for time.

I have, however, numerous concerns with the newly submitted proposal that I believe cannot be overlooked by the Council, along with data to back up my concerns; and I implore you to please consider this information when you consider the Applicant's Proposal. The following will refer to documents linked to the original proposal in 2020, which Council no doubt already possesses, and can be accessed by the public here: www.toronto.ca/419CollegeSt.

Item 1: Concern Regarding Timeline of Resubmission

1) "Linked Document" 2026-05-07, 0.12MB - Notice of Administrative File Closure - OPA / Rezoning Application No. 20 190121 STE 11 OZ.

This Document, dated April 15, 2026, notes that the Application was placed under "administrative file closure." It states: "As there has been no activity by the applicant to advance this application in over one calendar year, staff consider the application inactive and will be taking no further steps to process it."

2) "Resubmission Form", 2026-03-25, 0.36MB - Development Application Resubmission

"Linked Document", 2020-12-02, 0.34MB - City Planning Comments

The Development Application Resubmission and Cover Letter that would be sent by the Applicant to restart this proposal are both dated March 25, 2026.

3) "Linked Document" 2026-05-14, 0.1MB - 419-431 College Street Working Group Meeting 2: Retail and Music Venue

The last activity regarding this original 2020 Application is detailed by the Working Group Meeting 2 document, which took place on May 4, 2021, 6-8 PM.

Thus - the Applicant remained dormant on the Application for the period of 4 years,

10 months, and 21 days before resubmitting this proposal. **I Assert** that the Applicant only resubmitted to avoid “Administrative File Closure” and the potential “Resubmission Fee”.

Item 2: Concern Regarding Incomplete Nature of Resubmission

1) “Cover Letter”, 2026-03-25, 0.14MB - Cover Letter

This Document states that the original application was for a 13-storey mixed use building. “Since the initial application was filed, a number of circumstances have factored in, motivating a change for this site.” The change contains “Revised Architectural Plan are now being submitted contemplating a 15-storey mixed use building, containing 203 dwelling units”.

2) “Linked Document”, 2020-12-02, 0.34MB - City Planning Comments

This Document provides comments based on a number of items not addressed by the Proposal, including suggestions and recommendations, requests for revisions and updates, and requests for clarifications, information, and details regarding the application.

3) “Resubmission Form”, 2026-03-25, 0.36MB - Development Application Resubmission

This Document states that the “resubmission package includes revisions to address the City’s comments from Community Planning Comments, 2020.”

Replying to the comments from the City;

3a) Where the city states “The site is in Character Area B of SASP 533, which directs that new development shall have a maximum height of 30 metres, not including the mechanical penthouse.” - the applicant states “Information”.

3a-i) Where the city states that the “proposed building is too tall and is not compatible with the existing street proportion or planned context” - the Applicant states “The proposed building height is 48.15m and 15-storeys”.

3b) Where the city states “The HIA includes an assessment of the cultural heritage value of all properties on the site and concludes the property at 431 College Street contains historical or associative value related to a number of former uses since 1905 and as a formative space for local talent and visiting acts as the nightclub, Sneaky Dee's.” - the Applicant states “Acknowledged”.

3c) Where the city states "Please internalize the required loading space into the proposed building and provide screening to reduce its noise, odour and visual impact from the laneway and the existing Neighbourhoods designated areas to the south." - the Applicant states "Under Further Study".

3d) Where the city requests "mitigation measures" and further information regarding the Wind Study- the Applicant states "Will need a revised wind study. To be addressed at further submission."

3e) Where the city states "Please provide information about the expected wind speeds and conditions at the existing bus stop on Bathurst Street adjacent to the subject site" - the Applicant states "To be addressed at further submission" [misspelling quoted from original document].

3f) Where the city addresses the College Street Study and Official Plan Amendment 375 (SASP 533) with regards to Views from the Public Realm, and requests clarity and an update in the proposed development - the Applicant states "To be addressed at further submission" [typo quoted from original document].

3f) Where the city addresses the College Street Study and Official Plan Amendment 375 (SASP 533) with regards to Views from the Public Realm, and requests clarity and an update in the proposed development - the Applicant states "To be addressed at further submission" [typo quoted from original document].

3g) Where the city requests Landscape Details regarding pedestrian amenities, overhead wires, the location of the bus stop, sightlines requirements of the TTC, and requests inclusion of streetscape treatments of the sites adjacent to the subject site - the Applicant states "To be addressed at further submission" [typo quoted from original document].

3h) Where the city states that, with regard to Affordable Housing, "there is public interest for including affordable housing units within the proposed new development", and further details "incentives for the creation of affordable housing beyond those required by the Official Plan" - the Applicant states "Acknowledged" [typo quoted from original document].

3i) Where the city states "The proposed development is required to meet the TGS Tier 1; however, meeting a higher standard is strongly encouraged. A TGS Checklist and Statistics template is required, however, the statistics template provided is incomplete. It does not provide the total soil volume for the site." - the Applicant states "Acknowledged" [typo quoted from original document].

3j) Where the city states "The planning rationale has confirmed the existence of at

least two residential units, but a Rental Housing Declaration of Use and Screening Form not been provided” and “The applicant must provide a Rental Housing Declaration of Use and Screening Form and additional information confirming that an acceptable tenant assistance plan would be secured should the development application be approved” - the Applicant states “To be addressed at further submission” [typo quoted from original document].

3k) Where the city states “In the case of Sneaky Dee's, we understand that the applicant and the venue owner have begun discussing the possibility of the venue returning to the new building once it is completed. While the Music Office strongly supports this intention, we also recommend certain steps be taken to make such an arrangement feasible. Most notable would be an agreement by the applicant to cap future commercial rent for Sneaky Dee's so that this location remains affordable for the venue owner. A further agreement to subsidize Sneaky Dee's expenses between when construction on the site begins and ends would assist in keeping the business financially solvent during a multi-year period without revenue.” - the Applicant states “Acknowlegded” [typo quoted from original document].

Thus:

1), 3a) 3a-i) - The Applicant ignores the city’s request to adjust the building’s height from their original 13 storey building and instead proposes a taller structure. **I Assert** that the Applicant has no intention to adjust their Proposal to the city’s requirements as outlined by the College Street Study and Official Plan Amendment 375 (SASP 533).

3b), 3k) - The Applicant provides no future promises or plans to adequately ensure Sneaky Dee’s specifically is allowed to return to the new building once completed. The Applicant provides no agreements to cap future commercial rent for Sneaky Dee’s. The Applicant provides no agreement to subsidize Sneaky Dee’s expenses between when construction begins and ends. **I Assert** that The Applicant does not intend to honour city recommendations or previous communications with Sneaky Dee’s.

3c), 3d), 3e), 3f), 3g), 3h), 3i), 3j) - The Applicant has not provided any of the requested or suggested information, clarity, updates, or missing information from the original proposal within its Resubmission Form. **I Assert** again that the Applicant only resubmitted to avoid “Administrative File Closure” and the potential “Resubmission Fee”.

Item 3: Concern Regarding Disrespect for Music Venue Sneaky Dee’s

1) Heritage Impact Statement, 2020-09-04, 38.84MB - HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This Document discusses the total Historical relevance of the Proposed Development Area. Specifically related to Sneaky Dee's, this document states:

1a) "While numerous alterations have occurred to the current two-storey building, there are notable cultural associations with the site, dating from its occupation by Sneaky Dees from 1990 onward."

1b) "After moving to the location at 431 College Street in 1990, it became affiliated with the Kensington Market punk scene for much of the 1990s. From this period onward it has been regarded as a notable venue in Toronto music history, featuring a 200+ capacity concert venue on the second floor. Along with other venues along Spadina Avenue that include the Horseshoe Tavern, Grossman's Tavern, and the El Mocambo, it is representative of the Toronto music scene and has generated and showcased acts that have gone on to receive considerable recognition."

1c) "While it has origins in the punk music scene, Sneaky Dee's became a space for local talent while also providing a stage for larger visiting acts." "Local acts like Broken Social Scene, Owen Pallett, Feist, Ohbijou, and The Dirty Projectors have performed here."

1d) "Since the late 2000's the venue hosted the Wavelength series, and a mixture of community social and dance events. Sneaky Dee's was also featured in the graphic novels Scott Pilgrim Gets It Together, and Scott Pilgrim Vs The Universe, by Bryan Lee O'Malley (which would later be turned into a feature film)."

1e) "The importance of the Sneaky Dees lies in the community it helped to fuse together with the legacy of support for both well-established and emerging artists alike."

1f) "The property has Historical or Associative Value because it, i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community. Yes"

1g) "The property has Historical or Associative Value because it, ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. Yes"

1h) "The development site does not contain any properties on the City's Heritage Register. The proposed development will acknowledge the property's cultural heritage value and attributes will be retained, through appropriate commemoration."

1i) “In order to acknowledge the past use of 431 College Street (Sneaky Dee’s), by erecting a commemorative plaque and/or locating a potential music venue within the new development.”

Thus:

1h) and 1i) **directly contradict** 1a), 1b), 1c), 1d), 1e), and especially 1f) and 1g), where despite the stated Historical or Associative Value present within Sneaky Dee’s, the Applicant intends to “acknowledge the property’s cultural heritage value” “through appropriate commemoration”, “by erecting a commemorative plaque”. **I Assert** that despite the intentions to locate a new music venue within the city, the Applicant displays a flagrant lack of care for the community, culture, and historic value of the building as it currently stands and operates. **I Assert** further that the city require a further Heritage Impact Assessment that includes all current community involvement and use at the building, especially from the date of the initial Assessment (2020-09-04) inclusive to today (2026-05-26) as over 5 years has passed from the date of this Assessment.

Item 4: Concern for Lack of Affordable Housing

I will be referring to outside sources in Item 4 to provide data.

1) Muscovitch, A. (2025, May 17). *Chart Storm: Five graphs on Toronto’s historic condo market collapse*. The Hub. <https://thehub.ca/2025/05/17/chart-storm-five-graphs-on-torontos-historic-condo-market-collapse/>

1a) “Unsold NEW Condo Units in Toronto in Q3 of 2024 were at 23,918 units.”

1b) “The unsold condo inventory includes 10,934 units in pre-construction phases, 11,073 units currently being built, and 1,911 unsold completed units.”

1c) “Developers are cancelling condo projects.”

2) Stober, E. (2026, March 20). *A new \$1.3-billion fund will convert unwanted Ontario condos into rentals*. Toronto Life.

<https://torontolife.com/real-estate/ontario-high-art-capital-billion-building-fund-condos-rentals/>

2a) “Queen’s Park has launched a \$1.3-billion fund to buy unsold GTA condo inventory and convert it into affordable rental units.”

2b) “that the deal will create 2,200 rentals in the near term, with about 550 of them designated as affordable, which means they’ll go for 25 per cent below local market rent or 30 per cent of the gross median household income in the GTA.”

2c) “The move comes as Toronto’s condo market undergoes a historic glut of inventory and low sales, causing few new starts.”

3) Deeded. (2026, January). *What's happening with Toronto's condo market? January 2026 update*. <https://www.deeded.ca/blog/blog-toronto-condo-market-january-2026-update>

3a) “Active listings across the GTA stood at 17,975 in January 2026, up 4.8% year-over-year, even as new listings entering the MLS system actually declined 13.3% compared to last January. That tells you something: properties are sitting on the market longer, accumulating into a growing pool of unsold inventory.”

4) The City of Toronto. (2026). *Housing data*. <https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/data-research-maps/toronto-housing-data-hub/housing-data/>

4a) “The City of Toronto is tracking progress toward the provincial target of 285,000 new homes by 2031. Residential units that began construction on or after January 1, 2022 are counted toward the Housing Target, as pledged by City Council in 2023.”

4b) “Provincial Housing 10-year Target

88,345 / 285,000

New homes created (cumulative)

Jan 1, 2022 - Mar 31, 2026”

4c) “Rent-Controlled Homes Approved Under HousingTO

2,246 New homes created

Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2026”

5) Mirdamadi, M., & Gordon, J. (2026, May 6). *Millennials in the Canadian housing market: An intergenerational comparison*. Government of Canada.

<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/46-28-0001/2026001/article/00001-eng.htm>

5a) “In 2021, the share of millennials aged 25 to 39 living in a census family with parents (16.3%) was around twice the share of baby boomers of the same age in 1991 (8.2%). This trend has occurred gradually over time and is common to the large cities studied.”

5b) “After accounting for those living with their parents, millennials had the lowest rate of homeownership (49.9%), compared with Gen-Xers (56.2%) and baby boomers (55.9%) when they were aged 25 to 39 years.”

6) Statistics Canada. (2026, May 6). *Study: Millennials in the housing market*.

Government of Canada.

<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/260506/dq260506b-eng.htm>

6a) “Housing affordability is a concern for many younger Canadians. Homeownership rates have been declining since 2011, while rental markets have posed financial

challenges for young renters in recent years.”

7) McCormack, C., & Sheridan, T. (2025, March 26). *Familial support in entering the Canadian housing market*. Government of Canada.

<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/36-28-0001/2025003/article/00001-eng.htm>

7a) “In 2023, renters made up over one-third (35%) of Canadian families and over half (56%) of those under 35 years old.”

7b) “While choosing to rent can be a personal preference for many Canadians, rental rates vary across provinces and urban and rural areas. This is particularly evident in downtown cores, where the rental rate (69.5%) is more than double that outside of downtown (31.6%)”

7c) “Renters were more than twice as likely as homeowners to experience unaffordable housing conditions (Statistics Canada, 2023).”

7d) “In 2023, the median renting family aged under 35 held \$12,000 in liquid assets. Note By contrast, the median homeowner aged under 35 reported a principal residence with a median market value of \$460,000, in addition to \$37,000 in liquid assets.”

7e) “Even in a theoretical scenario where a young renting family liquidated all its available financial assets to purchase a home, it would still fall short of the 20% downpayment threshold by a median value of \$80,000. The median inheritance for young homeowners was nearly \$45,000 more than for renters of the same cohort, providing a generous advantage to their purchasing power.”

7f) “Similarly, renting families in the 35-to-44 age group faced a median shortfall of \$97,000 below the 20% downpayment threshold. These differences highlight the substantial barriers many renting families face when attempting to enter the housing market without familial support.”

Thus:

1), 2) and 3) detail large numbers of unsold new condo units in Toronto, that developers are cancelling projects, and that there is a historic glut of inventory and low sales. **I Assert** that this Development Project does nothing to ease these concerns, and only seeks to take advantage of the value of the land for gain I cannot surmise. **I Assert** further that this Development Project will remain at least partially empty upon completion in the state that the Application is in now.

4) Briefly discusses the City’s own Tracking of Provincial Targets. Summarizing these items we can see that the City is 50% of the way to its 2030 Targets, a 4% increase from the prior year. **I Assert** that the city must apply pressure on new developers to mandate inclusion of Affordable Housing within all new builds to meet its 2030 goals.

5), 6) and 7) detail that renters make up over one third of Canadian Families. That renters are more than twice as likely as homeowners to experience unaffordable housing conditions, that housing affordability is a concern for younger Canadians, that homeownership rates have been declining since 2011, and that the rental market has posed financial challenges for young renters in recent years. **I Assert** again that this Development shows no care for the very potential occupants it hopes to attract, with no plans on file to include Affordable Housing or Rental options.

To Summarize My Above Concerns:

1) The Applicant remained dormant on the Application for the period of 4 years, 10 months, and 21 days before resubmitting this proposal. The Applicant has not provided any of the requested or suggested information, clarity, updates, or missing information from the original proposal within its Resubmission Form. I Assert that the Applicant only resubmitted to avoid “Administrative File Closure” and the potential “Resubmission Fee”.

2) The Applicant ignores the city’s request to adjust the building’s height from their original 13 storey building and instead proposes a taller structure. I Assert that the Applicant has no intention to adjust their Proposal to the city’s requirements as outlined by the College Street Study and Official Plan Amendment 375 (SASP 533).

3) The Applicant provides no future promises or plans to adequately ensure Sneaky Dee’s specifically is allowed to return to the new building once completed. The Applicant provides no agreements to cap future commercial rent for Sneaky Dee’s. The Applicant provides no agreement to subsidize Sneaky Dee’s expenses between when construction begins and ends. I Assert that The Applicant does not intend to honour city recommendations or previous communications with Sneaky Dee’s.

4) The Applicant directly contradicts themselves, where despite the stated Historical or Associative Value present within Sneaky Dee’s, the Applicant intends to “acknowledge the property’s cultural heritage value” “through appropriate commemoration”, “by erecting a commemorative plaque”. I Assert that despite the intentions to locate a new music venue within the city, the Applicant displays a flagrant lack of care for the community, culture, and historic value of the building as it currently stands and operates. I Assert further that the city require a further Heritage Impact Assessment that includes all current community involvement and use at the building, especially from the date of the initial Assessment (2020-09-04) inclusive to today (2026-05-26) as over 5 years has passed from the date of this Assessment.

5) The Applicant does not include any plans for Affordable Housing within the Proposed Development despite city recommendations. I Assert that this Development

Project seeks to take advantage of the value of the land for gain I cannot surmise. I Assert further that this Development Project will remain at least partially empty upon completion in the state that the Application is in now.

6) The City is not, despite its own reporting, currently on track to meet its 2030 Affordable Housing Goals due to cancellations of Developments, slowed or delayed starts, and a glut of empty Condo properties. I Assert that the city must apply pressure on new developers to mandate inclusion of Affordable Housing within all new builds to meet its 2030 goals.

I implore you to seriously consider these concerns in addition to the emails you have received from community members, and the statements made at the Committee Meeting on Thursday, before Approving any further action with this Development Proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter;

Mackenzie Kundakcioglu

