From: Sabrina Enyeart
To: City Clerk Group
Cc: Stuart Kasdin
Subject: First University Village Parking Situation
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 5:51:40 PM

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 Goleta City Council,

I understand the city council will be discussing the possibility of permanent parking permits for the First University Village Homeowners Association neighborhood at the February 17th meeting. We have lived on Pomona Court since March 1990. In these past 36 years, the volume of non-resident parking has increased tremendously. The number of cars lining both sides of every street limits visibility making it unsafe to drive or walk in our neighborhood when the local colleges, UCSB and SBCC, are in session. MarBorg Industries has trouble sweeping debris from our streets, as well as picking up our trash, recycle and green waste bins, due to the volume of cars everywhere. Our local delivery services, as well as maintenance service and emergency providers also have trouble getting through the maze of cars. The difference during the summer time and winter breaks is like night and day compared to the rest of the year.

In addition to the volume of cars parked, the students tend to drive at a higher speed than what is safe, especially in a neighborhood where children, pets and elderly folks are out and about. I have personally stopped two students in their cars to just talk to them about being courteous drivers, and that they need to drive more safely and be considerate of our neighborhood. However, it's impossible for me to personally mother all of the college students who park in our neighborhood, to teach them something they should have learned years ago, nor is it my responsibility.

Having worked at UCSB for 35 years, I personally know that parking on campus is difficult and very expensive. Also, UCSB maintains that first- and second-year students shouldn't bring their vehicles to campus, but they do, anyway. How else will they be able to get to their off-campus jobs and other places they need and want to go? Available public transportation doesn't meet the needs of varying schedules and destinations.

If the city doesn't support the idea of parking permits, would they consider painting the curbs red on the street corners, so at least our neighborhood intersections might be somewhat safer? When UCSB and SBCC are in session, there are so many cars parked on the curved corners near Pomona Court, Armstrong Road, and Mills Way, it makes it impossible to see whether it is safe to enter the cross street when driving or walking. I do not know if the students would disregard the red curbs like they ignore the California AB413 daylighting law, but it might help.

I do appreciate the additional Parking Services staff and the jobs that they do with Officer Crabtree.

Thank you for reading my email. I will try to attend the meeting, but am unsure if I will be able to do so.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Enyeart

(805) 453-4248

sabrina.ennyeart@gmail.com

430 Pomona Court, Goleta, California 93117-4012

From: brenda Kennedy
To: City Clerk Group
Subject: Parking First University Village
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 8:46:02 AM

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.

Parking is out of control. Not only do we not have parking for any guests, it's dangerous. Every corner is blind. We're required to pull out into intersections to see if it's safe to go. It's difficult to see pedestrians crossing the streets until they're out in the intersection. Cars parking into the corners is illegal, but they still do it.
Please issue overnight parking permits for residents only. I have lived on the corner of Armstrong and Pepperdine for 38 years. Parking only became a problem after the Sierra Madre housing was built.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Jacinta
To: City Clerk Group
Subject: Re: Item C.2 26-073 of Agenda
Date: Tuesday, February 17, 2026 3:59:32 PM

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.

I would also like to submit the attached photos which reflects how impacted our neighborhood is when UCSB is in session and students are parking in our neighborhood vs the photos from the summer when UCSB is not in session.

Thank you.

ARMSTRONG

STOP

STOP

> On Feb 16, 2026, at 12:28 PM, Jacinta Hoang <jacintahoang@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> I would like the opportunity to speak at the City Council meeting scheduled for 2/17/26 at 5:30pm.
>
> Regarding concerns about parking issues and congestion and safety in the First University Village neighborhood and to implement restrictive parking year round (not just during Deltopia and Halloween).
>
> Jacinta Hoang
> (805) 403-8670 call/text

Making the affordable housing requirements apply to all housing developments

Inclusionary housing, the policy to require that a fixed percent of the units in new housing developments must be affordable to those with lower income is only applied to new housing developments. This proposal aims to spread the burden of affordable housing more fairly. It would impose a parcel tax (or an in-lieu alternative of providing affordable housing) on developments which do not currently provide affordable housing, while exempting those housing developments that had inclusionary requirement previously applied to them.

Ensures that the affordable housing burden is applied fairly across city housing is by using a parcel tax on housing that has not contributed to affordable housing.[1] As an in lieu option, property managers could provide affordable housing, similar to how inclusionary housing works). The tax is a means to ensure that all residential multifamily developments contribute to the costs of providing affordable housing in the city, and provides that if the multifamily has already met that obligation by having provided units and/or some other form of prior contribution that they don't need to pay the tax. Accordingly, it is not preempted by Costa-Hawkins.

- The city would impose a parcel tax on rental units. A building or a development would be taxed based on the number of units. Could be only applied in sites that are zoned as for affordable housing (20 units/acre or above) and exclude housing with only a few units.

- Buildings or developments that have not provided inclusionary housing (or which had not paid an in-lieu fee) would be taxed based on the numbers of units short of the obligation faced by newer housing developments.

- A parcel tax is considered a qualified special tax in California and requires a two-thirds (66.67%) vote for approval. As a special tax, funds collected would only be applied to the provision of affordable housing.

---

[1] A direct inclusionary housing requirement or other affordability restriction could not be imposed on existing rental units. State and case law consider inclusionary housing requirements exclusively in the application to "new developments" with cities unable to treat inclusionary housing requirements as a requirement for property owners on already approved developments.

- It won't affect the new housing starts, since those units are covered by the existing inclusionary housing requirement and exempt from the tax. A tax (or the in lieu alternative) imposed on already constructed housing does not affect new housing.

- Inclusionary housing requirements imposed on new construction means that the existing properties that avoided inclusionary housing have government-created lower operating costs. This increases the profits to these property owners with rental unit built in prior years. It does not encourage more affordable housing.

	Rent Control/stabilization	**Parcel Tax/universal inclusionary**
Who does it apply to?	Applies to pre-1995 construction	Parcel tax applies to all rental housing that has not already provided inclusionary or an in lieu. More units covered by tax, but fewer units created as BMR deed restricted
Beneficiaries	Available to all regardless of income. Beneficiaries are those who don't move and break lease	Benefits targeted to those who meet income thresholds for the proceeds of the tax or the in lieu housing
Timing of benefits	Small impact in early years of renting; significant reduced rent only comes for residents who do not move. Difference from market rate increases over many years	Benefits to recipients are immediate – below market rate (BMR) housing for income-qualifying as goal.
Problems	Discourages investments in maintenance and improvements since these costs cannot invariably be recouped. Encourages landlord to convert units to condos to receive market value.	Adds an expense to those developments that do not offer inclusionary
HCD	Does not help with HCD	May help achieve HCD affordability goals for RHNA progress
Administrative costs	Requires a rent control board to monitor rent increases in units. A rent control board is generally highly labor-intensive.	Requires income verification for recipients of BMR housing. Relies on an existing mechanism used for inclusionary (Housing Authority?)