

**TOWN OF ONONDAGA**  
**5020 Ball Road - Syracuse, NY 13215**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

JOHN ELLEMAN, CHAIRMAN  
MITCHELL CARMODY  
BÉNÉDICTE DORAN  
RONALD RYAN  
CAROL SCHATTNER  
NADINE BELL, ATTORNEY  
STACY MARRIS, ATTORNEY  
VICTORIA ROGERS, SECRETARY

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – SPECIAL MEETING**

**Minutes of April 21<sup>st</sup> , 2026**

Present:

John Elleman

Mitch Carmody

Carol Schattner

Ronald Ryan

Stacy Marris, Town Attorney

Victoria Rogers, Secretary

Chairman John Elleman called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m.

**Volodymyr Kachurenko - 4734 Cedarvale Rd. (023.-01-53.4)      Area Variance**  
**Public Hearing:**

The Board considered the application of Volodymyr Kachurenko, as owner and applicant, for area variance relief from Section 285-4 of the Zoning Law of the Town of Onondaga to construct an accessory structure in excess of 50% of the size of the principal structure. The property is located at 4734 Cedar Valley Road, Tax Map No. 023.-01-53, in the R-1 One-Family Residential District.

The Board confirmed that the required public notice had been published in the *Post-Standard* on April 16, 2026, and that the record contained the applicable environmental assessment information. The Board noted that the application had previously been discussed at an earlier meeting and that additional information and a larger drawing had subsequently been submitted.

The Board reviewed the proposed location of the accessory structure and discussed its proximity to the neighboring property and the visibility of the structure from the neighboring residence. The applicant indicated that there is existing vegetation between the properties that would provide screening. The Board also discussed whether the neighboring property owner had provided written acknowledgment or consent regarding the proposed structure. It was indicated that the neighboring owner had signed a letter and that the document had been delivered to the Town, although the Board was unable to immediately locate the letter in the application file. The Board noted that the neighboring property owners had been identified in the application and had received the required notice of the public hearing.

The Board asked the applicant about the proposed use and construction of the accessory structure. The applicant confirmed that the building would not have water service and discussed the proposed electrical service. The Board also discussed the proposed wrap-around porch/overhang and whether it would consist of an open roof structure rather than enclosed space. The applicant explained that the feature was primarily intended for aesthetic purposes. The Board further discussed the proposed exterior appearance and siding, which was described as a gray color with black trim. The Board considered the size of the property and the relationship between the proposed accessory structure and the principal residence. Members noted that the property is substantially larger than a typical residential lot and that applying the 50% limitation strictly as a percentage could produce an unreasonable result when compared with the actual scale and character of the property. The Board also noted that the principal residence is located approximately 290 feet from the front property line and that the proposed accessory structure would be located behind the principal residence. The Board observed that the accessory structure would be oriented with its shorter side facing the road, which would reduce its visual impact and was considered aesthetically appropriate.

The Board discussed the surrounding neighborhood and determined that the proposed structure was consistent with the character of the area. Members noted that there are other similarly sized accessory structures in the surrounding rural residential area and that the proposed structure was not the largest structure in the vicinity. The Board also considered the substantial setback of the proposed structure from the road and the existing vegetation and screening between the property and neighboring residence.

There being no further questions or public comment, the public hearing was closed. The Board indicated that, based upon the information presented and its discussion during the hearing, there was general agreement that the requested variance was appropriate. A motion was made by Board member Mitch Carmody to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Board member Carol Schattner and approved unanimously.

The applicant was advised that the approval would be transmitted to the Code Enforcement Office and that the applicant must follow up with the Code Enforcement Office to obtain the necessary building permits before commencing construction. For purposes of the record, the Board noted the applicable SEQRA determination, including the determination that the action would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. The Board also noted that the approval would be subject to the Town's standard condition requiring the applicant to obtain any necessary permits or approvals from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), including any permits applicable to wetlands, to the extent required.

Following the Kachurenko matter, the Board reviewed several outstanding resolutions and prior meeting minutes, primarily relating to the National Grid

applications. The Board agreed to make several corrections to the previously prepared minutes.

For the National Grid minutes, the Board clarified that the proposed subdivision would result in the creation of a new lot that would subsequently be combined by deed with the existing National Grid parcel. The Board further clarified language concerning the interpretation of the nonconforming lot provisions, noting that a nonconforming lot could not be created unless there was first an area from which the parcel could legally be created through the granting of the necessary area variance.

The Board also directed that the language concerning the proposed setbacks be clarified to state that the setbacks are those depicted on the specific revised plan submitted with the application. The Board agreed that the applicable plan and revision date should be identified in the minutes and resolution so that the approved setbacks are clearly tied to the plan reviewed by the Board.

Additional corrections were discussed concerning the history of the National Grid application, including the applicant's communications with Town Supervisor John Mahar regarding the applicable highway setback requirements and the Town's determination concerning the required highway setback.

The Board agreed that the identified corrections could be incorporated into the minutes without requiring the revised minutes to be brought back for another formal reading, and the minutes were approved subject to those corrections.

Respectfully submitted,

*Victoria Rogers*

Zoning Board Secretary