

2026 Zoning Code Amendments Questionnaire Feedback Summary

Below is a concise summary of the feedback captured from Let's Connect from November 10, 2025 – January 10, 2026

Q1 — Active-use retail amendments

- **Provide parking and access to support new/expanded retail.** Several comments urge pairing any retail activation with adequate parking, access routes, and supporting infrastructure—especially where tourism or use of public spaces/rights-of-way is expected.
- **Process/usability issue:** One respondent notes that links to the amendment materials were broken.

Q2 — “Businesses Open” pedestrian routing signage requirements - No substantive, question-specific feedback was recorded in the dataset beyond general process/usability concerns (broken links).

Q3 — Amendments to business-oriented definitions - No direct feedback specific to business-oriented definitions was captured.

Q4 — Simplifications for Food Truck & Pop-Up Retail Courts and Publicly Accessible Enhanced Amenities Spaces

- **Pair activation with infrastructure:** One commenter asks that any simplifications still ensure adequate **parking access and supporting infrastructure** when activating food trucks/pop-ups and enhanced amenity spaces, particularly where tourism is anticipated.

Q5 — Fence & retaining wall regulations

- **Clarify technical standards:** Requests to ensure the code clearly addresses **setbacks, property lines, rights-of-way, materials, height, and construction requirements**, with attention to adjoining properties.
- **Noise-adjacent context:** A commenter asks for **exceptions for taller fences** along major roads (e.g., 140th Ave NE) to help mitigate traffic noise impacts on residential lots.

Q6 — Energy code & conversions (HB 1757)

- **Allow plug-in micro-PV:** One comment requests permitting **up to ~2,000 W plug-in solar panel systems** (micro-inverter “plug-in” kits) that connect via a wall outlet—citing other jurisdictions that allow similar setups.

Q7 — Lot splitting (HB 1096)

- **Define the “Administrative” pathway:** A request to **explain the rationale and differences** between the proposed **“Administrative” lot split**, subdivisions, and short subdivisions.

Q8 — Miscellaneous amendments to Redmond Zoning Code, Article 1 - No question-specific feedback was identified in the file for Article 1 beyond general comments elsewhere.

Q9 — Miscellaneous amendments to Redmond Zoning Code, Article 2 - No question-specific feedback was identified in the file for Article 2.

Q10 — Parking regulations (SB 5184 & HB 1183)

- **Parking supply & access:** Calls to ensure parking regulations **support added retail and tourism/public-space use**, with appropriate **access and infrastructure**.
- **Visibility & landscaping safety:** Feedback that **parking-lot landscaping** (e.g., tall shrubs) can **obstruct driver sightlines**; suggestions to **limit shrub heights** to ~1–2 ft and remove vegetation that blocks views near **crosswalks** (e.g., Downtown Park/Cleveland St).

Q11 — Zoning for child care centers (SB 5509) - No feedback specific to child-care center zoning was captured.

Q12 — Subdivision regulations (SB 5559) - No feedback specific to subdivision regulations was captured.

Q13 — Permitting timelines (SB 5611) - No feedback specific to permitting timelines was captured.

Q14 — Affordability streamlining - No feedback specific to affordability streamlining was captured.

Q15 — Co-living residential suites- No feedback specific to co-living suites was captured.