

Communication from Public

Name: Geary Juan Johnson
Date Submitted: 04/28/2026 12:31 AM
Council File No: 26-0512

Comments for Public Posting: 26-0512 HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS COMMITTEE REPORT relative to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and the City Administrative Officer (CAO), with the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) and HR&A Advisors, to report on the progress of transitioning households in the Time Limited Subsidy program with expiring funding into permanent housing, and related matters. This matter is OPPOSED because White tenants at this address —says the City Civil Rights Department —do not have unit intercom audio or video connections, as mandated by the city building code. The Mayor does not believe whites are entitled to an accessible intercom in their unit. Is Mayor Karen Bass racist? President EUNISSES HERNANDEZ, First District. President MARQUEECE HARRIS-DAWSON, Eighth District . ADRIN NAZARIAN, Second District. NITHYA RAMAN, Fourth District. President Pro Tempore BOB BLUMENFIELD, Third District KATY YAROSLAVSKY, Fifth District. IMELDA PADILLA, Sixth District. MONICA RODRIGUEZ, Seventh District. Assistant President Pro Tempore JOHN S. LEE, Twelfth District . CURREN D. PRICE, JR., Ninth District. HEATHER HUTT, Tenth District. TRACI PARK, Eleventh District. HUGO SOTO-MARTÍNEZ, Thirteenth District. YSABEL JURADO, Fourteenth District. TIM MCOSKER, Fifteenth District. Hate Crimes at 1522 Hi Point Street 90035. How Hi Point 1522 LLC, Power Property Management Inc and Mayor Karen Bass Try to Kill Black Tenants Who Complain.
<https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/how-hi-point-1522-llc-power-property-management-inc-and-mayor-karen-bass-try-to-kill-black-tenants-who-complain/>.
Why you should not seek medical care at Kaiser Permanente <https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/why-you-should-not-seek-medical-care-at-kaiser-permanente/>

April 15, 2026. Housing services and requested reasonable accommodations still not supplied

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: alan.christensen@lacity.org; vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; bob.blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; lahd.rso.central@lacity.org; lahd.reap@lacity.org; controller.mejia@lacity.org; dod.contact@lacity.org; aoa.crsa@aoausa.com; aram.avedisian@lacity.org; eric.bane@lacity.org; doran.bobadilla@lacity.org; laura.zimmerman@lacity.org; grant.woods@lacity.org; sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org; jason.wilson@lacity.org; kelly.warner@lacity.org; mark.wang@lacity.org; gavin@gavinnewsom.com; fabian.gonzalez@lacity.org; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; rene.flores@lacity.org; 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Bcc:

Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 at 08:01 PM PDT

Who is Responsible for the Cost? Generally, in affordable housing financed or assisted by a program administered by the City or CRA/LA, including bond-financing, the housing provider is responsible for the costs associated with a reasonable accommodation or modification. Source: Los Angeles City Clerk

<https://housing.lacity.gov/housing/reasonable-accommodations-and-modifications>

<https://share.google/DNYpwwMdlTgUeFJ5s>

Summary

1. This complaint concerns a request to property owner for reasonable accommodation handicap parking stall, pending since around December 2025.
2. This complaint concerns a request to the property owner for reasonable accommodation, wheelchair accessible unit peephole along with peephole that can see to both ends of the hallway, pending since around December 2025. Tenants in about 15 other units were given peep hole in 2014 that can see both ends of the hallway. I did not receive the same such peephole in 2014.
3. This complaint concerns request to the property owner, reasonable accommodation interface or indoor monitor to be installed in the unit. This has been pending since 2014 and 2023 when the owner installed the latest Wi-Fi based Intercom system but admits there is no accompanying interface or video or audio capability in the unit. Tenants in fifteen other units around 2014-2018 were given indoor connections to the intercom system, and denied to me as city code enforcement complaints show.
4. I reference city building code section 11A-708 and any other codes applicable at the the time the building was built, and at the time the parking gate was installed and the 2023 door entry system was installed.
5. A picture is attached showing vacant stalls tandem numbered 13, 14, 15.
6. Reference code violation complaint 983423.
7. The city code enforcement employees have the authority to verify the parking assignments at this property.

ADA applies to the parking lot

The ADA applies when some of the parking on site are for the public or for guests. A previous resident manager indicated in writing that there are parking stalls for guests on this site. In addition since there are 18 units and parking for a 27 cars, then the conduct of the owners that some of these stalls are to be used for guests. The ADA applies and there must be a handicap parking stall designated. In addition, some tenants who do not have a car or under the belief that their parking stall can be used for their guests. If that is the case, then the ADA applies. Since the property owner frequently lies, refuses to reassign me to one of these three vacant tandem stalls, then this indicates that those stalls are to be for purposes of guests.

City Inspector Alan Christensen,

(alan.christensen@lacity.org). Date: March 17, 2026. (Via email to council members also).

Thank you for inspecting on March 16, 2026 at about 10:00 am for the property 1522 Hi Point Street.

I memorialize the visit. This recount is meant to be indicative but not all inclusive. I showed you the nonfunctional intercom in my unit Artolier, I showed you that there is no connection or interface in my unit for the outside accessible required feature Akuvox system (since 2023), I showed you the unused mailbox slot in the unit door, I mentioned that I do not have a key to the building front door lock as the owner changed the lock, I showed you the need for a wheelchair accessible peephole (my wheelchair was in sight) in my unit door, I asked that the owner be ordered to supply a peephole that I can see both ends of the hallway (due to disability and vision disability), I showed you trash that is on the property but is not in the dumpster, I showed you the parking security gate in a non-operating position, I mentioned my need for a tandem or accessible parking stall, on the grounds my doctors have certified my disability and requested such parking stall or accommodation.

Further, I am following up to request written confirmation of your findings and next steps: you witnessed the building's Akuvox exterior entry panel has no indoor interface/monitor provided to tenants, we tested the system together and found there is no intercom functionality for many units and especially mine, there is no accessible peephole/alternative to identify visitors at my unit door, and the property owner (parking 27 stalls: single stalls 1A,1B,2-12; tandem 13-19; vacant/unused 1A,4,6,10,13-15; stalls 17-18 each have one car) has not assigned me an accessible parking stall near the rear accessible entry; the building received major renovations and new parking security gate in 2014-2017 and a new Akuvox door entry system in 2023 and the owner receives Section 8 assistance.

In response, the investigator Alan did take pictures and notes. He indicated that it was his personal opinion that I could use my personal property cell phone to access the Akuvox intercom function; I indicated that the building code does not authorize me to use my personal property for any reason, and that applicable building codes specifically require the Wifi type Akuvox have in each apartment unit an interface or indoor monitor capable of displaying voice and video. My cell phone is not for such use, is not an interface or indoor monitor owned by the property owner or owned by the city government. There is no mention in the applicable building codes that a tenant cell phone can satisfy the building code requirements.

It is a violation of my personal property to attempt to illegally steal my phone for purpose of the property owner and for purposes of violation of the city building code.

I also believe from the city website the city code enforcement inspectors have authority to investigate certain ADA violations at the property.

I believe it is an abuse of authority and abuse of discretion and abuse of federal tax dollars if ADA violations are not investigated by City code enforcement inspectors in a timely manner. Please advise in writing whether the Housing Department will (a) open a code compliance investigation regarding the lack of an indoor monitor and accessibility issues, (b) issue correction notices to the owner, or (c) refer this matter to another city office (Housing, ADA coordinator, or other).

If enforcement is limited, please provide the appropriate contact or case number so I can follow up. I appreciate a written response.

Thank you,
Geary J. Johnson
1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Angeles. CA. 90035

(Tenant since 2010)
Alan Christensen worked as a Housing Inspector for the city of Los Angeles, California and in 2020 had a reported pay of \$96,507.36-\$107,573.76 according to public records. (Source: Google AI).

Note: Brian Vasquez is the resident manager at this location.

The email above appears on Citywatch and also Facebook.



2026-4-3 Parking Lot Tandem Stalls.jpg.pdf
2.4 MB

Editor: Blank spaces are redactions.

To Kaiser Doctors, West Los Angeles, Via Portal
Particularly Dr Jeffrey Siegal, Dr. Apurba Pathak, Dr. Boris Kazimiroff, Dr.
Thippavong
MRN [REDACTED]
From Geary J. Johnson

April 24, 2026

Board of Directors. Key Board Members and Officers (as of March 2025):

- Gregory A. Adams: Chairman of the Board, CEO, and President.
- Ramón F. Baez: Director.
- David J. Barger: Director.
- Regina M. Benjamin, MD: Director.
- Jeff Epstein: Director.
- Leslie S. Heisz: Director.
- David F. Hoffmeister: Director.
- Judith A. Johansen, JD: Director.
- Jonathan S. Lewin, MD: Director.
- Jenny J. Ming: Director.
- Matthew T. Ryan: Director.
- Richard P. Shannon, MD: Director.
- Vivek Sharma: Director.
- Cynthia A. Telles, PhD: Director (effective 3/1/25).
- A. Eugene Washington, MD: Director.

Cc: Civil Rights Case [REDACTED]

Address: May Lee State Office Complex, 651 Bannon St #200,
Sacramento, CA 95811

This shall be a response to the April 13, 2026 letter from Adriana Duarte, RN, Kaiser Permanente and her response to my April 7 letter to the Portal.

I do note in the portal Kaiser Past Visit Summary documents from March 30, 2026, April 6, 2026, April 8, 2026, and April 14, 2026. I will be reviewing those shortly. I also note a letter from the Physical

Who are the Medical Professionals Who Can Write a Reasonable Housing

Accommodation Letter? (Taken from Google AI.) Under U.S. Fair Housing laws, a letter verifying the need for a reasonable accommodation can be written by a licensed health care or related professional who is familiar with the patient's condition and its impact on their housing needs. This can include:

◦

Physicians (including specialists such as psychiatrists)

◦

Psychologists

◦

Nurse practitioners or registered nurses

◦

Licensed clinical social workers (LCSWs)

◦

Occupational therapists

◦

Physical therapists

◦

Speech-language pathologists

◦

Vocational rehabilitation specialists

◦

Licensed mental health counselors or therapists

The key requirement is that the professional must be qualified to diagnose or confirm the disability and explain how the requested accommodation is necessary for the patient to fully use and enjoy their housing.

Apparently there is no employee qualified at Kaiser Permanente West Los Angeles to diagnose or confirm my disability for purposes of a letter requesting a reasonable housing accommodation.

I question has Adriana Duarte or any other employee in her department been trained so she can converse on what a request for

reasonable housing accommodation is, and has Duarte been trained on what are the types of housing accommodations.

Sincerely,

Geary J. Johnson
Via Kaiser Portal

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Assessor Parcel Number: 5058018035
Total Units (legal unit count may vary): 18
Rent Registration Number: 0270090
*Census Tract: 215700
*Council District: 10
Official Address: 1522 S HI POINT ST, Los Angeles, CA 90035
Total Exemption Units: 0
Rent Office ID: Wilshire
Code Regional Area: West Regional Office
Year Built: 1972
*Bureau of Engineering Data

987103

PROPERTY VIOLATION REPORTED

Thank You, we have received your request for inspection:

Your Case number is **987103**

Thank you for your interest. Your Property Violation Report has been received by our office. You will be contacted by phone to schedule a site visit so we can verify the conditions you reported and take any necessary action to address any violations.

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Assessor Parcel Number: 5058018035
Total Units (legal unit count may vary): 18
Rent Registration Number: 0270090
*Census Tract: 216700
*Council District: 10
Official Address: 1522 S HI POINT ST, Los Angeles, CA 90035
Total Exemption Units: 0
Rent Office ID: *Wishire*
Code Regional Area: West Regional Office
Year Built: 1972
*Bureau of Engineering Data

COMPLAINT DETAILS

All fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

First Name: *

Geary

Last Name: *

Johnson

Address:

1522 Hi Point St 9

Unit #:

9

City:

Los Angeles

Zip:

90035

Phone (H): *

3238073099

Phone (C):

Email Address:

Violation Location:

(Example: Kitchen, Bathroom, Outdoor)

Violation Category: *

Violation Type: *

Selected Violation Types: *

(Note: Select a Violation type you wish to remove from the selected list before you click the button)

Additional Comments:

Manager Name:

Manager Phone(H):

Manager Phone (W):

Owner Name:

Owner Phone(H):

Owner Phone (W):

Owner Address:

Owner City:

Recall Code enforcement Inspection- attach to code violation complaint.
3279 words

9:35 am.
Monday, April 27, 2026

Debris behind dumpster glass door.
Debris plastic tarp in stall #12

No posted in common area "right to counsel."

I told city employee Alfredo that previous city employee Christenson had taken pictures of the peephole in my door, mailbox slot which could be easily with little cost changed to accessible level peephole.

Inspector Alfredo came into unit and saw nonworking Artolier intercom and also saw my wheelchair near the unit door.

I told Alfredo that the previous owner had replaced the Artolier system in 2014 but did not replace mine. There was a new box on the outside of the building and interface wired connections to each of the 15 other units. I told Alfredo that in 2023 the new owner installed the AKUVOX on the outside of the building but no connection was made by interface or otherwise to the inside of each unit. I also showed Alfredo the outside box for a AKUVOX door entry intercom and showed him some of the functions that do not work and showed him that it does appear to be a camera, but I said I've been told by the city discrimination department that there is no audio and no cameras connecting the outside units to each apartment. I quoted building code section at 11 B – 708 accessibility requirements.

The Akuvox system installed is "R29
World's First Facial Recognition Android Doorphone
Akuvox R29 is a SIP video doorphone with a 7" touch screen, which performs AI-powered offline facial recognition for door access. It is typically used in apartment buildings, high-rise office buildings and building complexes." According to the manufacturer, the device contains two cameras, and "Yes, the Akuvox R29 is a high-end SIP-based smart IP video intercom that features advanced two-way audio and video communication,

facial recognition, and mobile app integration. It allows residents to see and speak with visitors, as well as remotely unlock doors via smartphone, indoor monitors, or IP phones.” (Ad). So so says the manufacturer, this is an intercom two way communication device. The ad does not say the intercom/camera function can be turned off.

I indicated that the accessible peep hole, accessible parking stall, and accessible two-way communication Intercom system are requirements of the city building code. Alfredo said that he was not sure, but he would have to check on all of those areas and get back to me.

This indicated to me that there has been numerous code enforcement complaints filed with the portal as well as copies sent to specific and individual code enforcement employees as well as City Counsel employees and that Alfredo appeared to have no awareness of those complaints nor had he read those complaints. I feel this is abuse of federal tax dollars being that the employee should be aware of the complaint or complaints before they come out to the property although he did say he was doing a follow up.

I showed Alfredo the debris glass door behind the garbage can, and I also showed him what looked like some plastic sheets rolled behind parking stall number 16. Alfredo said he was more concerned if there's a large communication or accumulation of debris rather than one or two items.

I indicated to Alfredo that I have requested a dedicated handicap parking install that would be near the back door. Currently, I am assigned to a shared parking store number eight.

Alfredo said he believed that the ADA is subject to grandfather clause. My response that there is no grandfather clause look back on the ADA requirements. I have previously said to the city code enforcement, inspectors that there is guest stalls on this parking lot, proven by a written statement from the previous resident Manager. I believe that guest stalls are under the jurisdiction of the ADA and that therefore the parking stalls are under the jurisdiction of the city code enforcement..

I also indicated to Alfredo that besides being local accessibility building code requirements, the repair items that I am speaking of are repair maintenance

items and maintenance that is covered under the Health & Safety Code and the jurisdiction of the code enforcement inspectors. There is striping of a parking stall to make it into a handicap. Parking stall is under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department; the replacement of the unit door people with an accessible wheelchair height peephole is a maintenance issue under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department; the maintenance of the Intercom system in order to make it contain a camera and audio is a maintenance issue under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department. Since these are all maintenance issues, then they are covered by the rental agreement and rent paid, then the owner cannot charge a fee to provide these housing services or accommodations. There is no posting on the property that there is a fee to provide a parking single or tandem. There is no fee posted to the property or there is no sign posted to the property that there is a fee to install an accessible door peephole and in fact in December, the owner installed another peephole in my door and there was no charge. I think the code enforcement does have jurisdiction over the fact that if the owner tries to charge us a fee for a reasonable accommodation, housing service, then that would be the jurisdiction of the housing department as an illegal rent increase.

I mentioned the safety factor of having an abandoned water heater on the property. He examined it and it is clearly not connected but is strapped to the wall. Alfredo said as long as it is not hurting anyone, even though it is trash, the city would not require the owner to move it. It seems like a potential for harm since it is not operated and children may be in that area since it is the laundry room. It is the type of debris that could cause harm. Alfredo said he did not consider the debris I pointed out as "excessive." I disagreed.

I told him that I believe code enforcement does enforce the ADA regulations. I mentioned that the building is not wheelchair accessible that I cannot come up the front steps with the wheelchair. I said I would use the wheelchair at the back door since it is more accessible (only one step to navigate) but that I need a handicapped assessable parking stall, not the shared one a I currently occupy stall #8.

Alfredo said code enforcement goes by the year of the building and that the ADA does not allow them to go back retroactive; I told him I do not think the ADA has a retroactive prohibition.

As I have stated to city employees, the ADA has authority over parking if there are guest parking stalls. Since there have been guest stalls since 1972, the ADA would apply.

I did explain to Alfredo that the property was modified in year 2014 with the addition of an electronic parking gate, thus the gate and modification of parking lot is under the jurisdiction of the ADA.

I also believe that parking stall 1A is numbered as such to indicate "guest" stall which puts the property under ADA requirements.

The numbers on the parking stalls are faded, as faded paint is an accessibility violation. Faded paint is an architectural barrier that the code enforcement has jurisdiction over.

NO RIGHT TO counsel notice in common area, as told to Alfredo.

ADA units vs ADA building says Alfredo.

- **Existing Buildings (Readily Achievable):** For older, existing buildings, removing barriers (such as replacing an inaccessible intercom) is required if it is "readily achievable"—meaning it can be done without much difficulty or expense.

RESEARCH (mostly AI from Google)

In the City of Los Angeles, the primary agency enforcing reasonable housing accommodations for people with disabilities in city-mandated housing is the **Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD)** through its Accessible Housing Program (AcHP). LAHD handles reasonable accommodation and modification requests, ensuring fair access to housing.

Key agencies involved include:

- **LAHD (Los Angeles Housing Department):** Enforces, reviews, and processes reasonable accommodation requests.
- **HACLA (Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles):** Manages reasonable accommodations for public housing and Section 8 voucher holders.
- **California Civil Rights Department (CRD):** Enforces state fair housing laws regarding accommodations.

For violations, residents can file complaints with LAHD or the Fair Housing Rights Center. (Source AI).

Key Guest Parking Regulations in Los Angeles

- **Multifamily Requirements:** For developments with 11 or more units, the city generally requires a minimum of 1 guest parking space for every 10 dwelling units.
- **Signage:** Guest parking spaces must be clearly posted with signs at building entrances, indicating the location and number of reserved spaces.
- **Security Gates:** If guest parking is located behind a security gate, the code requires an electronic intercommunication system to be accessible for visitors to call individual units.
- **Location:** Guest spaces should be distributed throughout the development.
- **Dimensions:** Standard parking stalls in LA City are typically 8.5'x18' for standard, 7.5'x15' for compact, while accessible spaces must be 108 inches (9 ft) wide with a 5 ft access aisle, or 144 inches (12 ft) for vans.

Key details regarding ADA guest parking requirements include:

- **1-25 total spaces:** 1 must be accessible.
- **26-50 total spaces:** 2 must be accessible.

- **51-75 total spaces:** 3 must be accessible.
- **Van Accessibility:** At least 1 of every 6 accessible spaces must be van-accessible.
- **Location:** Accessible spaces must be on the shortest accessible route to the accessible entrance.
- **Residential Parking:** For residential, parking must be accessible if it is for first occupancy on or after **March 13, 1991**.

Does the ADA apply retroactively to older buildings? The building was built in 1973 but the owner modified the property in 2014 with security parking gate. The 2010 ADA parking requirements would apply.

Yes, the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design apply to parking lot modifications (such as restriping or resurfacing) performed in 2014. Because the work occurred after March 15, 2012, the altered areas must comply with the 2010 regulations, specifically regarding the number, size, and location of accessible spaces.


Key ADA Compliance Rules for 2014 Modifications:

- **Trigger for Compliance:** Any alterations—including restriping, resealing, or resurfacing—made after March 15, 2012, trigger the requirement to comply with the 2010 Standards.
- **Safe Harbor Clause:** If the parking lot complied with the 1991 ADA Standards and was not altered between 1992 and March 15, 2012, it was "grandfathered." However, making modifications in 2014 voids this safe harbor for the altered elements, requiring them to meet the 2010 standards.
- **Extent of Compliance:** If only specific spots are restriped, only those spots need to comply. If the entire lot is modified, the entire lot must comply to the maximum extent feasible.

- **Requirements:** Accessible parking must be on the shortest accessible route to the entrance, with appropriate signage and van-accessible spaces

Yes, the installation of an electric parking gate is generally considered an **alteration to the property**. It is frequently classified as a structural modification, improvement, or addition rather than normal maintenance, because it involves permanent changes to the property's infrastructure, such as adding new structures, electrical systems, and changing the site's layout. Here is a breakdown of why it is classified as an alteration:

Why It's Considered an Alteration

- **Structural Change:** Installing a gate—especially one with a concrete foundation for a sliding track or a concrete pad for a swing motor—alters the existing landscape and pavement.
- **Electrical System Modification:** Installing an electric gate requires running new electrical lines from the building's power supply to the gate, which is considered a significant alteration.
- **Safety & Access Regulations:** An electric gate must comply with local, state, and national safety codes (e.g., [ICC standards](#) ) , ensuring that the new, automated structure does not create entrapment risks.
- **Impact on Usability:** An automatic gate changes how people enter, exit, or use the parking area.

If the property has not been altered since 1972, the primary federal requirement is compliance with the FHA for common areas (common area parking, leasing offices), rather than the full ADA parking technical standards. [[1](#), [2](#)] Source: AI. The property was altered in 2014 (full electrical, plumbing, intercom , and parking gate installed) and 2023, so the ADA does apply.

233.3.1.2 Residential Dwelling Units with Communication Features

In facilities with residential dwelling units, at least 2 percent, but no fewer than one unit, of the total number of residential dwelling units shall provide communication features complying with 809.5.

Certificate of Occupancy for this property was issued 4/17/1973.

MODIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY IN 2014 INCLUDING PARKING GATE, INTERCOM SYSTEM, AND DOOR PEEPHOLES. AT THE TIME, THERE WAS NO ADDITIONAL SEPARATE FEE OR CHARGE TO TENANTS.

New door peepholes were installed at this address in 2014 for all units except units 8,9,5. Those peepholes allowed tenants to see both ends of the hallway. This was a modification of the property,

Yes, changing a door peephole is generally considered a **modification or alteration** in a rental or condominium setting. While it is often classified as a minor alteration, it involves a physical change to the structure of the door, which is property owned by the landlord or the association. [1, 2, 3] **No-Drill Products:** Use wireless peephole cameras that mount over the existing, original peephole using adhesives.

Building accessibility triggers are events, such as renovations, alterations, or changes in use, that mandate compliance with standards like the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Alterations to a "primary function area"—such as renovating a lobby, office, or dining area—trigger the requirement to provide an accessible path of travel. This path, including restrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains, must be upgraded if the cost is not "disproportionate" (typically up to 20% of the overall project cost).

Key triggers and requirements include:

- **Alterations to Primary Function Areas:** Any remodeling that affects the usability of a major functional space triggers path-of-travel accessibility requirements.
- **Path of Travel Cost Constraint:** If the alterations trigger is met, 20% of the construction cost must be spent on barrier removal on the path of travel (e.g., parking, walkways, restrooms).

- **Renovation Scale:** In some cases, if the cost of a renovation exceeds a certain percentage (often 30%) of the total property value, full building compliance may be triggered.
- **New Construction/Additions:** Newly constructed facilities or additions to existing buildings must meet full accessibility standards.
- **Barrier Removal:** Under ADA Titles II and III, entities must remove architectural barriers in existing buildings, even without renovations, if it is "readily achievable".

Examples of Triggers and Improvements:

- **Trigger:** Renovating a restroom \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Installing grab bars and widening doors.
- **Trigger:** Repaving a parking lot \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Creating accessible parking spaces.
- **Trigger:** Upgrading lighting \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Installing flashing fire alarm lights.
- **Trigger:** Rearranging retail layout \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Creating wider aisles.

Yes, the lack of a unit peephole (or equivalent door viewer) is often considered a violation of building codes or safety standards in many jurisdictions, particularly for multi-family dwellings.

Here is a breakdown of the requirements:

- **Legal Requirements:** In many cities, including New York City, it is mandatory to provide and maintain a peephole in the entrance door of each dwelling unit.
- **Building Codes:** Many jurisdictions follow codes requiring a means of identifying visitors without opening the door, often interpreted as a peephole with a 180-degree view.
- **Accessibility Standards:** ADA guidelines often require peepholes to be installed at specific, accessible heights (e.g., 43 to 60 inches) to accommodate all residents.

- **Exceptions:** These rules often apply to multi-family, R-2, or apartment-style buildings. In some cases, a vision panel or sidelight next to the door can satisfy the requirement.
- **Repercussions:** If a door lacks a required viewer, it is usually considered a maintenance issue that the landlord must fix.

Yes, a lack of accessible parking stalls is considered an architectural barrier under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other accessibility standards. Physical features, including parking, that limit or prevent people with disabilities from accessing goods or services constitute a barrier that often requires removal.

Key aspects regarding parking as an architectural barrier include:

- **Essential Components:** Lack of required designated spaces, absence of van-accessible spaces, or failure to provide a proper, stable, and level access aisle.
- **Location Constraints:** Accessible spaces must be on the shortest, most level, and safe accessible route to the entrance.
- **Maintenance:** Faded paint, missing signage, or deterioration that renders a space unusable is also considered a barrier violation.
- **Legal Obligation:** Businesses are required to remove such barriers if it is "readily achievable" (easily accomplishable without much difficulty or expense). [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]

The City of Los Angeles has the duty to assure that in this city funding assisted building, that the owner must remove all architectural barriers to providing me reasonable accommodations as requested.

Yes, the lack of an accessible, two-way tenant communication system (intercom) is considered an **architectural barrier** under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Fair Housing Act (FHA) if it prevents people

with disabilities from accessing the building or using common areas. [1, 2, 3]

If a building is required to be accessible (due to new construction, renovation, or being a public accommodation), the intercom system must allow for independent use by individuals with hearing, speech, or mobility impairments. [1, 2]

Key Accessibility Requirements for Intercoms

To avoid being classified as an architectural barrier, intercom systems must meet the following standards:

- **Mounting Height (Mobility Access):** Intercoms must be mounted at a reachable height for wheelchair users, generally with the highest operable part no more than **48 inches** above the floor.
- **Two-Way Communication (Hearing/Speech Access):** The system must offer more than just audio. It should include **visual signals** (e.g., LED lights indicating the door is unlocked) to ensure communication for the deaf or hard of hearing.
- **Operational Ease:** Controls should not require tight grasping or twisting to operate.
- **Clear Floor Space:** There must be a clear floor space of at least $\backslash(30 \backslash \times 48 \backslash)$ inches in front of the intercom to allow for a wheelchair approach. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

When is it a Legal Violation?

- **New Construction & Major Alterations:** Under the ADA and FHA, new multifamily housing (built after March 13, 1991, with 4+ units) must have accessible, operable, and usable communication features.
- **Existing Buildings (Readily Achievable):** For older, existing buildings, removing barriers (such as replacing an inaccessible intercom) is required if it is "readily achievable"—meaning it can be done without much difficulty or expense.
- **Public Housing:** Public housing providers receiving federal funding (HUD/Section 504) must provide accessible, effective communication,

including flashing lights or visual notification systems for residents who are deaf. [1, 2, 3, 4]

What Constitutes an Inaccessible System?

An intercom system is likely an architectural barrier if it:

- Is mounted too high to be reached from a wheelchair.
- Requires a handset that cannot be used by someone with a hearing impairment (lacks a TTY or text-based option).
- Uses only voice to signal that help is on the way during an emergency.

If you are a tenant facing this issue, you may have the right to request a "reasonable accommodation" or "reasonable modification" to the building's intercom system.

Older buildings (pre-1990) are not exempt from the ADA and must remove barriers if it is "readily achievable" (easily accomplishable without much difficulty or expense). While full retrofitting isn't always required, owners must ensure accessible parking, entrance, and paths of travel if possible. If the building is altered, those areas must comply with current ADA standards.

Geary J. Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 90035

April 27, 2026. Word count 3279.

