

**WALDWICK ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
FORMAL SESSION
March 25, 2026**

The Formal Session of the Waldwick Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Wednesday, March 25, 2026 at 8:00 p.m. and was called to order by Marty Nieman, Chairman, who made the announcement of adequate notice of all meetings.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Nieman	present	Mr. Cericola	present
Mr. Walsh	absent	Ms. Luppino	absent
Mr. Wekarski	present	Mr. Centineo	present
Mr. Sanzo	present	Mr. Hartmann	present
Mr. Myerjack	present		

Also Present:

Cliff Singer, Board Attorney
Joyce Sinclair, Board Secretary
Joe Mysliwicz, Zoning Officer
Jim McGinnis, Board Engineer
Liz Leheny, Board Planner

GREETINGS TO THE PUBLIC:

No one appeared.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Sanzo and seconded by Mr. Cericola for the approval of the Minutes of February 25, 2026. The Minutes were approved as submitted.

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBER:

Bert Hartmann was sworn in as Alternate #2 on the Zoning Board.

RESOLUTIONS:

RAHIMI 26-E	117 Lilyan Street Block 153.02, Lot 2 Convert Garage RESOLUTION
-----------------------	--

PEHUSH 26-A Ed Sherman, Architect	14 Longview Drive Block 163.05, Lot 7 Add-A-Level & New Covered Porch RESOLUTION
--	---

MILLAN 26-G Ed Sherman, Architect	52 Grand Avenue Block 6, Lot 7 Add-a-Level, Covered porch, Deck RESOLUTION
MARROQUIN 26-H Ed Sherman, Architect	75 Franklin Turnpike Block 76, Lot 9.01 2-story Addition, Driveway, Shed/walk RESOLUTION
DICHRISTINA 26-I Ed Sherman, Architect	12 Cathy Lane Block 162.07, Lot 5 Attached Garage, Add-a-level, Portico, Deck RESOLUTION

A motion was made for the approval of the above Resolutions by Mr. Sanzo and seconded by Mr. Cericola. A unanimous vote was taken. The Applications were approved.

WALLACE 26-F SM-1	41 White Pond Road Block 153.04, Lot 21 New Home Construction Variance Application & Soil Movement RESOLUTION
--------------------------------	---

This Resolution will be approved at the April 22nd meeting.

RAMOS 26-J John Hooper, Esq.	4 Frederick Street Block 107, Lot 17 Boutique, Tattoo Parlor Use Variance NEW APPLICATION
---	---

John Hooper, Esq. appeared before the Board. Mr. Hooper explained that the Applicant is before the Board for a Use Variance for a Tattoo Parlor and Artist boutique which will be called "Lucky Fridays." Currently at this location is a barber shop which has been there for 15 years. The Applicant is a resident of Waldwick. The use of the premises as a Tattoo Parlor is a prohibited use. The Barber Shop is a permitted use in a C-1 zone. The Barber Shop will be subdivided.

Adam Ramos, owner, appeared before the Board. He has been working as a cosmetologist for 20 years and is a 7 year Waldwick resident. Mr. Ramos explained that the 800 sq. ft. tattoo parlor would have two tattoo artists, and would be by appointment only, not walk in. A medical waste supplier would be contacted. Mr. Ramos would also like to create a space for local art within the community, which is a permitted use. He would like to contribute something meaningful to the town and add to the cultural fabric of Waldwick. Mr. Ramos is not a tattoo artist.

Mr. Ramos noted that tattoo parlors come with a different connotation than they used to. Their shop would be for people looking for higher quality tattoos. They would not do piercing at this location, The nearest tattoo parlor is in Ramsey.

The Board questioned how allowing a prohibited use within the community is a benefit to the community as a whole. Mr. Ramos feels his proposal is of benefit as it contributes to the local artists having exposure. The Board noted if it were just an art gallery a use variance would not be required.

Mr. Myerjack questioned parking and it was noted that there is no on-site parking. The Rite Aid parking lot space is often used. The average length of time for a tattoo is two hours.

The proposed hours for the art gallery would be Saturday evenings, 5:00 pm – 8:00 pm and Sunday 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm. The only changes needed are interior to reset into an art gallery. It would be a separate space from the barber shop in the area which is currently a waiting area.

Mr. Centineo questioned the difference between a high end and regular tattoo. Mr. Ramos noted it is the customer service and caliber of the artist. Mr. Centineo questioned whether a client would be turned away. Mr. Ramos said yes for various reasons, e.g., intoxicated or asking for something they cannot provide.

Mr. Cericola noted he is familiar with the current barber shop business and questioned if there would be a doorway closing off that area. It was indicated yes. Mr. Cericola expressed his confidence that Mr. Ramos would run a fine tattoo business as his current business is well run.

Mr. Wekarski questioned “high end” and Mr. Ramos noted it is how they handle their clientele. The tattoo artists would work on a commission basis. There will be a receptionist in the front of the building and a separate door for the barber shop.

There was no one in the audience to address this Application.

Michael Kauker, Planner, Wyckoff, appeared before the Board. He noted that he has reviewed the plans and the Master Plan of Waldwick. A D-1 use variance is proposed to convert the site to a hybrid tattoo parlor and art gallery. Exhibits marked as A-1 depicting photographs of the area, were passed out to the Board.

Mr. Kauker noted the aerial photograph taken by Mr. Kauker showing the building front and the two doors. There is a deli in the front corner and a collectible antique store adjacent to that. There have always been four tenants in this building and the barber shop owns one and would like it to be a second. There are residential units above. There is no on-site parking except for those reserved for residential tenants.

The barber shop is immaculate and Mr. Ramos would continue that in his Tatoo Parlor. The parking that is provided on the street can accommodate 12 - 15 vehicles. All of the tenants have to rely on parking on Frederick Street. As each tattoo takes approximately

two hours there would be low volume traffic. The barber shop would be higher volume. The proposed use is not a high intense use. The surrounding conditions are primarily commercial and borders the Rite Aid property. There is residential to the west. It is characterized as a commercial area.

Mr. Kauker noted that the Applicant is aware that it is a prohibited use and that they are required to show the negative and positive criteria for the Board to grant a D-1 use. Historically tattoo parlours were prohibited and associated with health and safety risks. This use and public perception of it have changed. They are sanitary and professional businesses and are licensed. The social and commercial perceptions evolved and are now widely accepted as artistic expression. The art gallery is a good extension of the tattoo parlor. This is an appointment only business and fits in to other personal type uses that are permitted.

Mr. Kauker believes the use reflects modern evolution of modern uses and is compatible with C-1 uses. The use is not referenced in the last Master Plan of 2018. Mr. Kauker feels the proposed use is appropriate for this location and in the C-1 district as a personal use service. Schools for art and dance are also permitted which carries through the artistic framework. He feels this site meets the purpose of the master plan and noted the surrounding mix of personal service uses. Only minor interior modifications are needed. It would further the purpose of the zoning and promote the public good by providing a legitimate service for a service which is in demand. It would be promoting the use of an already developed property without intensifying the use. There would be no detriment to the public good. The Applicant will maintain a respectful business, there would be no odor or traffic and the use would be contained in the building. Tattoos are recognized as mainstream and not incompatible with the zoning goals. It does not impair the Borough's Master Plan and the Board's objectives of that plan.

Tattoo parlors are highly regulated; when zoning was created they were not. The applicant meets the positive criteria and outweighs any negative.

Mr. Myerjack questioned how they are mainstream. Mr. Kauker noted they are in different communities and more widely accepted than they used to be and are significantly regulated. The health and safety concerns are not there as they used to be.

Mr. Myerjack questioned whether he had studied the business uses in that area, noting the high school students which frequent the deli on the corner. He also questioned whether he had factored into the development which is proposed to occur around the corner on Harrison Avenue. Mr. Kauker was not familiar with the proposed development of Harrison Avenue.

There are two tattoo artists proposed. It was noted that the parking is an existing condition. The signage will be on the awning.

Mr. Wekarski questioned the parking spaces by the building. Mr. Mysliwiec noted that those spaces belong to the residents upstairs. He does not have record if they are strictly stipulated, however, it is his understanding that the residents park there. Mr. Ramos currently rents two stores and now wants to expand his business.

Mr. Singer pointed out the major difference between a barber shop service and tattoo parlor noting if you don't like what was done to your hair you are not stuck with it – a tattoo, you are stuck with it. He feels there is a marked difference between something that is temporary and something that is permanent. None of the other personal uses perpetuate a permanent change.

The Board Planner's Report of March 16, 2026 was noted. The Board questioned how this is an inherently beneficial. Mr. Kauker noted that it is not, that is just one of the justifications, we do not have to show it is. Mr. Kauker noted that the use is particularly suited for the general welfare. Mr. Myerjack noted that it may not be a detriment to the public good but the code prohibits it. Mr. Kauker noted that the change in tattoo parlors and their evolution reconciles it. He noted that this type of use provides a personal service.

Mr. Hartmann questioned the increasing demand and whether he had anything to document that. Mr. Kauker noted no, just from his general observations and conversations with Mr. Ramos. Mr. Kauker added that people in general have more tattoos than previous, so there is more of a demand for it.

Mr. Myerjack questioned whether this is a prohibited use in neighboring towns. Mr. Kauker did not know but indicated many are outdated.

With regards to parking, Mr. Mysliwec noted that many of the businesses in the area rely on street parking. Rite Aid has been a great neighbor and this location is no different from the other businesses. Mr. Centineo questioned the number of hairdressers the barber shop has and where they parked. It was noted there are 4, with two there at any given time, and they park in Rite Aid or in the street. There are two proposed tattoo artists. The parking is an existing condition.

Mr. Wekarski questioned whether the parking spaces by the building are for the tenants. Mr. Mysliwec noted that although there is no record strictly stipulating that the on-site spaces belong to the residents upstairs, it is his understanding that the residents park there.

Mr. Singer questioned if there was anything that could be relied on to say tattoos are more mainstream. Mr. Kauker noted that it is just personal observation, he is not aware of planning studies. Mr. Ramos noted that it was more of his observation, not by data research.

There was no one in the audience to address this Application.

Shayla Nolan, proposed gallery operator, appeared before the Board. She noted her desire to contribute from a creative aspect. She is an artist and has exhibited her work throughout the US. She is also a public school teacher and is involved with One River Art Studio. Ms. Nolan noted that a tattoo is a personal expression and something you have control over and, yes, permanent. She further noted that there are not a lot of opportunities to display art in the area. usually just in the city.

Ms. Nolan feels having a space like this in the community is ground breaking and provides an opportunity for sales of a service in demand. They will have rotating artists on the wall. She views art and tattoo under the umbrella of fine art.

Mr. Hartmann questioned the synergy between tattoo and art gallery. Ms. Nolan feels it is finding a bridge between the two things. Mr. Hartmann questioned if the variance is denied, would the art gallery continue. Ms. Nolan noted they would take an objective look at it. Ms. Nolan noted that when the art gallery is operating the tattoo parlor is not. They would not operate at the same time.

Mr. McGinnis questioned if there would be events held. Ms. Nolan noted they will have openings and events 5:00 pm – 8:00 pm on Saturday and Sunday late afternoon 3:00 – 5:00 pm. Mr. McGinnis questioned parking for these events. Mr. Ramos noted that attendees would be encouraged to take NJ transit.

Mr. Centineo noted he was not happy with the parking and had issues with defining a high end tattoo. A motion for approval of the Application was made by Mr. Sanzo and seconded by Mr. Cericola. A vote was taken. Mr. Centineo and Mr. Myerjack voted no, all others voted yes. The Application was approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made for adjournment at 10:00 pm by Mr. Sanzo and seconded by Mr. Wekarski.

Joyce C. Sinclair
Secretary