

From: [David Cutaia](#)
To: [David Cutaia](#)
Subject: RE: Goleta City Council to Consider Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 9:00:12 AM

From: Nicolas Scozzaro <nscozzaro@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 6:09:23 PM
To: Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Fwd: Goleta City Council to Consider Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mrs. Wells,

I'm a Goleta property owner working to add housing the city actually needs. I previously reached out to you for help reforming attached-ADU permitting rules — a path that would produce real new housing units, and which under current rules cannot be used as STVRs. That request did not advance.

Separately, I recently obtained an STVR license for an existing unit on my property (Unit C) that I own as an LLC and have committed approximately \$1M in improvements based specifically on the current Chapter 5.08 framework.

The amendments before Council on May 5 would pull the rug and retroactively undermine that investment — and the data the City itself commissioned does not support the policy. I respectfully urge a **no vote**.

The May 20, 2025 BAE study concluded:

- Active STVRs in Goleta: 51 permits — 0.4% of 12,584 total housing units. ~69 active listings citywide versus ~2,400 in Santa Barbara County.
- Consultant finding (verbatim): STVRs are "not currently a significant driver of the observed shortage of available long-term housing."
- Local jobs: ~77 supported (1.5 per STVR × 51 active permits), plus ongoing TOT revenue.
- 44% of STVR listings are 1-bedroom units — not the family-sized housing the Housing Element targets.
- Hotel ADRs locally exceed \$300/night; STVRs keep middle-income visitors,

researchers, and contractors spending in Goleta rather than in Santa Barbara or Ventura.

The proposed LLC prohibition, night caps, waiting periods, and three-strike suspension would shrink supply and TOT revenue while addressing a problem the City's own consultant says STVRs aren't causing. They also signal to anyone considering long-term investment in Goleta that ordinance terms can be rewritten after capital is committed.

If the Council's underlying concern is housing supply, the highest-leverage action is on the production side — ADU rule reform, attached-ADU pathways, and similar measures that actually add units. Restricting 51 existing STVRs that the City's own analysis identifies as a non-driver does not produce housing, it keeps hotel prices high, reduces jobs, and TOT revenue for the city.

The consultant's own recommendation was continued monitoring. That is the measured, evidence-based path. I'd ask the Council to take it: preserve the current ordinance, monitor annually, and protect property owners investing in good faith.

Thank you for your service to the City.

Respectfully,
Nic Scozzaro
459 Linfield Place, Goleta
(805) 698-0457