

**TOWN OF ONONDAGA
Planning Board**

TOWN HALL
5020 Ball Road • Syracuse, NY 13215

Marc A. Malfitano, Chairman
Alfred Fuller David Hillery
James Hagan Otey Marshall

**Meeting Conducted at 7:00 p.m.
July 13, 2026**

Present:
Marc Malfitano, Chairman
Alfred Fuller
David Hillery
James Hagan
Otey Marshall
Nadine Bell, Attorney
Bill Perrine, Engineer

Chairman Malfitano called the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m.

Limestone-Norton Subdivision

Having received proof of publication dated July 9, 2026, of the notice of Public Hearing in the matter of the Limestone-Norton Subdivision, Chairman Malfitano opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Jay Holbrook appeared before the Planning Board and presented a plan for Limestone-Norton Subdivision located on the corner of Abbey Road and Norton Road and which consists of 8 lots. Six of the proposed lots will be future building lots, one lot will be adjoined with the lot owned by Benjamin Storie and one lot has an existing house. The property consists of approximately 26.5 acres total.

Chairman Malfitano noted that we received a letter from the Onondaga County DOT in May of 2025, providing approval of the driveway site distance. He also noted that this matter will need to be referred to the County Planning Board for review.

There were no further questions or comments; however, Chairman Malfitano declared that the Public Hearing will remain open until the response from the County is received.

Paladin Park Subdivision

Having received proof of publication dated July 9, 2026, of the notice of Public Hearing in the matter of Paladin Park Subdivision, Chairman Malfitano opened the Public Hearing. Mr. Hagan recused himself from this discussion due to a personal interest in this matter.

Mr. Robert DeForest of Cordelle Development Corporation presented plans for Paladin Park Subdivision which is a 4 lot subdivision. He stated that the property is zoned Neighborhood

Shopping in the front and PCO in the back. Changes were made to the plan as recommended by the Planning Board during a prior appearance.

Chairman Malfitano explained that this subdivision was applied for previously and approved for the two lots in the front, but it was never filed because the intention of the applicant changed. It was noted that an application has been filed and the application is waiting for an updated response from WEPP because the prior capacity letter expired in March.

Chairman Malfitano explained that this was previously referred to the County Planning Board as part of the prior application but it will have to be referred to them again for the new application. There were no further questions or comments; however, Chairman Malfitano declared that the Public Hearing will remain open until the response from the County is received.

Chairman Malfitano advised that we have a comment letter from the Town Engineer dated July 1, 2026, with a few minor comments for notations on the plan which are being addressed.

Woodridge Heights- Section 2

Mr. Tim Coyer of Ianuzi and Romans Land Surveying appeared before the Planning Board seeking approval of the preliminary plan for Woodridge Heights Section 2. Chairman Malfitano explained that the construction drawings were approved previously in the absence of an updated preliminary plan which was in response to the Town Engineers comments. Mr. Perrine wanted to emphasize the importance of certain lots which need minimum elevations as stated in the minutes of the June 22, 2026, Planning Board meeting. He also noted a correction as follows: Lots 21A and 21B, 22A and 22B, 23A and 23B, 26A and 26B and 27A and 27B at 768 feet of elevation, rather than 765 as stated in the draft minutes. The finalized minutes of June 22, 2026, will be corrected as such.

Chairman Malfitano made a motion to supplement the resolution made June 22, 2026, approving the construction drawings and incorporating the SWPPP, and add the approval of the final plan for Woodridge Heights Section 2, last revised April 22, 2026, and modify and confirm the minimum garage floor elevations recommended by the Town Engineer for Lots 21A and 21B, 22A and 22B, 23A and 23B, 26A and 26B and 27A and 27B at a minimum elevation 768 feet. Based upon this approval, the applicant can proceed to the Town Board to firm up using the alternate method for securities for construction. Mr. Hagan seconded the motion which passed with all in favor.

Oak Ridge Farms Re-Subdivision

The applicant, Ms. Susan DeRienzo, provided updated plans for the Oak Ridge Farms Re-Subdivision located at 3430 Case Road. She indicated that the dark lines show the new proposed 2 lot subdivision. Chairman Malfitano explained that the property on Case Road has 949 feet of frontage and this subdivision will carve out the one existing residence keeping the minimum road frontage. The flag entrance to the back portion of the parcel will be incorporated creating a road frontage of 341.80 feet for the proposed lot. The balance of the property will still have sufficient road frontage. Ms. DeRienzo noted that the light dotted lines represent her original property.

Chairman Malfitano noted that an application has been submitted and fees have been paid. A

Public Hearing for this matter will be scheduled for July 27, 2026.

Mr. Perrine will review the plan and provide a comment letter to the applicant and Mr. Olszewski, Land Surveyor. Ms. Bell requires a legal metes and bounds description of the entire parcel for the Notice of Public Hearing.

Woodland Hills Subdivision

Mr. Tim Coyer of Ianuzi and Romans Land Surveying appeared before the Planning Board and provided a plan by Ianuzi and Romans dated June 20, 2026, for the Woodland Hills Subdivision. Mr. Coyer explained that they are proposing a 3 lot subdivision.

Mr. Coyer stated that a variance was granted in March for the flag lot portion coming down on Cleveland Road. This leaves 2 large lots, Lot 100 and Lot 101. He stated that Lot 101 consists of approximately 16 or 17 acres, Lot 100 is almost 11 acres, and Lot 102 is almost 5 acres. Lots 100 and 101 are served by public sewer access and they will have individual water laterals off Cleveland Road. There will be an access easement for the combined driveways coming off Cleveland Road off the south side and Lot 102 will have its own individual driveway.

Chairman Malfitano asked why Lot 102 shows a septic field. Mr. Coyer noted that Lot 102 does not have access to the public sewer. Chairman Malfitano noted that it is in the county sewer district so it is mandated that they have to tie in. Chairman Malfitano stated that will be researched.

Chairman Malfitano stated that this matter will be taken under advisement. There was a question as to the scheduling of a public hearing. Chairman Malfitano noted that the Planning Board has not yet seen the variance approval and the minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals meetings are not in the ordinary course published. Ms. Bell made available a copy of the variance which will be provided to the members of the Planning Board.

Fineview Re-subdivision- Lots 46-49

Mr. Jay Holbrook, Land Surveyor, and Mr. Eric Gantley, property owner, appeared to discuss 4 lots located on Leonard Avenue in Nedrow. A copy of the tax map was provided along with the original survey. Mr. Holbrook explained that Lots 46 through 49 were combined and there is currently a house on Lot 46 and a shed on Lot 47. The other lots are vacant. They are seeking to divide the property between Lots 47 and 48, combining lots 46 and 47 and also lots 48 and 49 resulting in 2 lots.

It was noted that there is one tax map parcel but it is unknown if the lots were combined by deed. Mr. Holbrook will obtain a copy of the deed so it can be determined if the lots are legally combined. If the deed conveyed to the grantor 4 individually listed lots they may not have ever been combined and therefore a subdivision would not be necessary but rather recombining the lots by deed. Mr. Holbrook will provide a copy of the deed to Ms. Bell for review.

Onondaga Hill Fire Department

Chairman Malfitano received an email from the Town Clerk referring a sign replacement review to the Planning Board for the Onondaga Hill Fire Department. He explained that they are seeking to install an electronic sign in the exact location as the existing sign. Mr. Keegan Taylor

appeared representing the Onondaga Hill Fire Department. He explained that they are seeking to have a static image with public service announcements, upcoming events or initiatives rotating or changing regularly.

Chairman Malfitano noted that this matter went before the Town Board for site plan approval and it does not appear from reviewing the property survey that the current sign is in compliance with the setback requirement. Mr. Hillery shared that there was approval given way back because the sign is the exact same size so it was replacement in-kind and it was approved. Chairman Malfitano noted that the requirement according to the Zoning Code is for the sign to be setback a minimum of 15 feet from the front property line and a minimum of 25 feet from any other property line. The right of way shifted when the road shifted so it may have been compliant at the time.

Chairman Malfitano noted that the second issue is that the image on the sign will be changing. Enforcement of the Zoning Code is inconsistent as the Code states that the image cannot shift more frequently than every 12 hours. Several other fire departments have similar signs as well as Onondaga Road School and OCC. They all shift and flash. This raises the question as to if the Town Board needs to take a position as to enforcing the existing Code requirement or waive it for everyone by changing the Code.

Chairman Malfitano dictated a response letter to the Town Board. A motion was made by Mr. Hillery and seconded by Mr. Hagan approving the letter in the form as dictated. The motion passed unanimously. A copy of the letter is attached hereto.

Seneca Ridge PRC

Mr. John O'Brien representing Hueber-Breuer appeared to follow up on open items from the June 22, 2026, Planning Board meeting. He explained that the site plan was revised in terms of distribution of smaller and larger lots. The DOT has issued a formal letter approving the supplemental traffic report dated July 9, 2026. He provided a plan showing the layout of the multi-family properties including materials and colors of the exterior finishes. He noted there is a combination of lap siding, board and batten, and shakes. He explained that utility availability letters from WEPP and OCWA were previously submitted. He referenced an HOA template document that was submitted previously for review and he noted that Mr. Bouchard submitted a cover letter noting some of the aspects to be included in the HOA for this property including fencing, limitation of the location of pools, and prohibiting opaque fences. There was an issue with the timing and the survivorship of the HOA document. The applicant had proposed 10 years during a meeting in June but it was now extended to 30 years as the initial term and automatically extended for 10 year periods. A provision will be added requiring one tree per lot be planted on each of the residential lots.

Chairman Malfitano asked if the overview provided is outlined in a list. Mr. O'Brien noted it is contained in the CHA letter dated July 1, 2026. Chairman Malfitano reviewed the letter and stated that it was his understanding that fences can only be installed on the 60 and 80 foot wide lots in conjunction with an in-ground pool. Mr. O'Brien thought the restriction was for the 60 foot wide lots. Mr. Hillery confirmed that his noted indicated that it pertained to the 60 and 80 foot wide lots which Chairman Malfitano also confirmed. Chairman Malfitano explained that 60 and 80 foot lots are not typically permitted in R-3 Zoning but because this is a planned development and because of the difficulty in layout and enforcement, we wanted certain provisions in covenants that could not change. Flexibility has been given to the plan for sheds/accessory

structures attached to the primary structure and not freestanding and also fencing for homes with a pool, although the fences cannot go beyond the limits of the house.

Mr. James Trasher of CHA spoke regarding Timber Banks and the HOA there which does not have the fencing restrictions that are being proposed for Seneca Ridge. He stated it was his understanding that the fence restriction was just for the 60 foot wide lots. Chairman Malfitano clarified that the restriction was openly discussed for the 60 foot and 80 foot wide lots we would prefer no fences be permitted unless there is an in-ground pool. Above ground pools will not be permitted. Additionally, the fences will only be permitted no closer to the side lot line than the main building width.

Mr. Trasher asked if there could be a provision for the two cul-de-sacs only that the 80 and 100 foot wide lots could have fences regardless if there is a pool. There was discussion as to the rationale and clarifying the request. Chairman Malfitano explained that we are trying to have something simple and uniform and the applicant was asking for a planned unit development designation. The Planning Board thought that because of that, instead of the standard zoning, there were a couple areas in the interest of the quality of the project that we would restrict it. Chairman Malfitano stated that the idea was to establish the covenants and take it out of the realm of the Code Enforcement Officer. There was further discussion regarding covenants and HOA offering plans. Chairman Malfitano stated that the offering plan would include an attachment that would require approval by the Secretary of State that will contain the HOA form of agreement and the provisions would be attached and recorded in the County Clerk's office and they become the standard. Ms. Bell explained that if the applicant is seeking to not have the HOA be the enforcement, it will not work here because our Codes Officer will enforce the rules specific to Seneca Ridge. Mr. Trasher further explained his experience in other communities pertaining to covenants and deed restrictions and the challenges. Chairman Malfitano clarified that for Seneca Ridge these will be covenants that run with the land. Mr. Trasher described how in future years when the HOA members change and they want to seek changes they can bring the proposal to the population to vote on and an amendment is made to the offering plan.

Chairman Malfitano indicated that he wants to take all of the information and submissions and draft our comments and recommendation which will be reviewed by the members of the Planning Board for agreement. He would like the recommendation to include a requirement that no permit will be issued for the apartment unless and until there are at least 24 single family lots constructed.

Mr. Trasher reiterated that they thought the fence restriction was only for the 60 foot wide lots. He asked for clarification of the location of the lot width measurement. Chairman Malfitano stated that we measure lot width at the building setback line. He also noted that he would like to create a list of lots that the restrictions will apply to which will avoid question and the potential for disagreement.

Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Trasher indicated that they are seeking to be on the Town Board agenda and they were hoping for some type of approval or referral from the Planning Board so they could proceed. Mr. Hagan explained that Chairman Malfitano wants to put the letter together and summarize all of the information and issues that have been discussed so there is no misunderstanding. Mr. Marshall expressed that he will have to recuse himself from any vote pertaining to Seneca Ridge, however, if the only confusion is pertaining to fencing he would

recommend rather than speaking in terms of dimensions, we should speak in terms of lots that would allow fences and lots that would not.

Chairman Malfitano asked for further comments from the Planning Board. Mr. Fuller made a motion to refer the Seneca Ridge proposal to the Town Board based on the information that we have received with fencing restrictions on lots of 60 or 80 foot width on straight line roadways and the lots on the two cul-de-sacs do not have those restrictions. Chairman Malfitano agreed that four lots on the cul-de-sac would not have those restrictions and he asked for clarification as to what lots would have restrictions. There was discussion as to what lots are designated in the cul-de-sacs and the measurements at the building set back lines. Mr. Hillery expressed his opinion that the 60 and 80 foot lots should not have fences unless there is a pool regardless of whether or not they are in the cul-de-sac. Ms. Bell suggested that the motion should reference the plans in the packet of materials that are being discussed. Additionally she believes she is hearing that Mr. Fuller wants to make a recommendation that the Town Board approve the amendment. She suggested that the building elevations would also need to be referenced. Chairman Malfitano noted that we do not have the building elevations for all of the 80 foot and 100 foot wide lots.

Mr. Trasher indicated that they can come back to the next meeting after a letter has been drafted and they can provide finalized updated plans with all the information required and referenced. Ms. Bell noted that when this type of matter is handled in that way and they receive a letter from the Planning Board, it will all typically go into a resolution and they accept the recommendation of the Board. Having it laid out in that way would ensure that what the Planning Board has been hoping to achieve is realized. Mr. Fuller withdrew his motion.

Mr. Trasher asked if the Planning Board need anything additional or if the packages that we have are sufficient with dates updated. Chairman Malfitano will use what has been submitted and combine everything for the recommendation letter. Additionally, he noted that the Planning Board wanted this approved as a PR not a PRC from the standpoint that there is no commercial component to this plan.

Ms. Bell noted that the documents for Peregrine Way are forthcoming and the road dedication is anticipated to be addressed at next Town Board meeting.

Planning Board Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Fuller, seconded by Mr. Hillery, that after minor changes, the Board approve and accept the meeting minutes of the June 22, 2025, meeting. The motion passed with Mr. Hagan abstaining.

A motion was made by Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Fuller, that there being no further business to come before the Board the meeting be adjourned. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melinda L. Mayer
Secretary

**TOWN OF ONONDAGA
Planning Board**

TOWN HALL
5020 Ball Road · Syracuse, NY 13215

Marc A. Malfitano, Chairman
Alfred Fuller David Hillery
James Hagan Otey Marshall

July 14, 2026

Town of Onondaga, Town Board
5020 Ball Road
Syracuse, NY 13215

Re: Application of Onondaga Hill Fire Department

Dear Supervisor Mahar and Members of the Town Board:

We reviewed the referral of a sign application by Onondaga Hill Fire Department in accordance with the West Seneca Turnpike Overlay District requirements. Also present was Keegan Taylor representing the Onondaga Hill Fire Department.

We have two comments. First, we have the benefit of the updated survey for the Fire Department property prepared by CT Male Associates and last revised June 1, 2016. The existing sign location is shown. We recognize that the proposal is to replace the existing sign with a new sing in the same location. We simply note that based on the survey it does not appear that the existing setback would comply. We simply suggest that the Town Board determine whether the sign location was ever given the proper approvals for that location.

Second, we made known to the Fire Department representative that the Zoning Code applicable to this sign, Section 285-34, contains prohibitions against signs that flash and also signs which contain electronic messages that change, flash or revolve more than once in a 12 hour period.

We note that there are existing signs in place at the South Onondaga, Howlett Hill, and Navarino Fire Departments that also contain electronic messages and recent observation shows that they change "frequently". We also are aware of the flashing signs at Onondaga Road Middle School and OCC.

It is our suggestion that the Town should, and we think that the timing of this application is appropriate, that the Town Board articulate a position regarding electronic signs and determine if the Town is going to enforce the existing code requirement or not.

If it decides that it does not intend to enforce that requirement, it should be made known not only to the current application, but we suggest that the Zoning Code then be amended to make the appropriate changes to the descriptions. It was pointed out during our discussion that the Overlay District requirements at Section 285-32D(3)(b) provide that free standing signs shall not be internally illuminated. We provide that as additional Information.

Very truly yours,

Town of Onondaga Planning Board

Marc A. Malfitano
Chairman