

TENANT NEWS

SEPTEMBER 15, 2026

1522 HI POINT STREET 90035

THE RSO RENT DEDUCTION

Did you receive a notice of rent increase between July 2025 and June 2026? The owner may overcharging you. Check Your Rent Notice: How to Force Your Los Angeles Landlord to Remove Invalid Utility Surcharges

The article discusses the Los Angeles Housing Department's handling of a 2% utility allowance reduction affecting rent-controlled units. A tenant filed a complaint regarding an illegal rent increase, citing an ordinance that prevents landlords from charging for utilities. The case remained unresolved despite evidence supporting the tenant's claims, resulting in potential monetary losses.

<https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/check-your-rent-notice-how-to-force-your-los-angeles-landlord-to-remove-invalid-utility-surcharges/>

CITY CODE ENFORCEMENT UNDER SCRUTINY

Tenant Challenges Los Angeles Over Years of Alleged Accessibility and Code-Enforcement Failures

Redacted July 27 complaint asks City to explain whether later renovations, intercom replacement and parking-lot work triggered accessibility requirements

LOS ANGELES — A long-running dispute between a Los Angeles apartment tenant and City officials has intensified following a July 27, 2026 code-violation filing questioning whether the City properly investigated accessibility and building-code issues at an 18-unit Hi Point Street apartment building.

Tenant **Geary J. Johnson** alleges that complaints dating back to 2014 have been ignored or inadequately addressed and that his efforts to obtain accessibility-related services have been met with discrimination and retaliation.

The allegations are those of the tenant and have not been adjudicated.

THE CENTRAL ISSUE

Did later work at the property trigger accessibility requirements that the City failed to investigate?

Johnson's filing focuses on four separate periods of activity:

2014 renovations — Did alterations to the building trigger current accessibility requirements?

2023 intercom replacement — Did replacing the original wired intercom with a modern Akuvox system create new accessibility obligations?

2026 parking work — Did repaving and restriping the parking lot require an accessible parking space?

Recent apartment renovation — Was work in Unit 8 properly permitted, inspected and reviewed for accessibility?

The complaint asks the City to provide specific code sections and factual findings supporting any conclusion that the property is exempt from current accessibility requirements.

ACCESSIBILITY COMPLAINTS REMAIN UNRESOLVED

The filing identifies several conditions Johnson says remain unresolved, including the absence of a wheelchair-height accessible door viewer, an accessible parking stall and an accessible indoor intercom/door-entry interface in his apartment.

Other repair issues identified in the complaint include a bedroom closet track, bedroom drapery hardware, the apartment door viewer and the unit's intercom door-entry interface.

Johnson says his original complaints regarding the intercom and parking date back to **2014**. Beginning approximately in 2023, he says those complaints increasingly became requests for reasonable housing accommodations.

A QUESTION OF TIMING

The tenant's filing challenges the idea that the building's original construction date necessarily resolves the accessibility issue.

Instead, it asks whether subsequent alterations and replacements changed the legal analysis.

“Did the City review the 2014 and 2023 and 2026 building permits to determine whether accessibility upgrades were triggered?”

The filing specifically asks the City to determine whether the 2014 work was classified as an alteration, repair or reconstruction and whether accessibility provisions were triggered.

THE INTERCOM DISPUTE

A major part of the dispute concerns the building's intercom.

According to the complaint, the property originally had a wired intercom system and later received a modern **Akuvox** system.

Johnson argues that when an owner voluntarily replaces an existing building communication system, the question arises whether the replacement must comply with accessibility requirements applicable to the project and whether reasonable accommodations remain required for disabled tenants.

The complaint therefore asks the City to determine whether the 2023 replacement constituted an alteration subject to current accessibility requirements.

PARKING-LOT WORK UNDER THE MICROSCOPE

The complaint also raises questions about recent work to the property's parking area.

Johnson asks whether the City's review considered the **recent parking-lot repaving and restriping** and whether that work required an accessible parking space under the California Building Code.

The filing asks the City directly:

Did the City evaluate whether the recent parking-lot work required an accessible parking space?

The complaint states that the property does not have a marked accessible parking stall.

WHAT HAPPENED IN UNIT 8?

The filing also asks City officials to investigate renovation work performed in **Unit 8**, which Johnson identifies as an apartment other than his own.

The complaint asks:

- Was a building permit issued?
- Was the work reviewed by the Building Department?
- Was an accessibility review performed?
- Was the work classified as an alteration, repair or reconstruction?
- Were accessibility requirements triggered?

The tenant is asking the City to determine whether permits were issued, inspections performed and accessibility requirements considered.

(Google) lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission denied apartment services hi point1522 lawsuit explains why

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE RAISES ANOTHER QUESTION

Johnson's filing also asks whether the property's receipt of government financial assistance creates additional obligations under federal disability laws.

The complaint asks whether the tenant's requests qualify as reasonable accommodations under applicable disability-housing laws and whether the requested modifications are required under federal or state law.

“SHOW ME THE CODE”

Perhaps the most direct demand in the filing is for the City to identify the actual legal authority supporting its position.

The tenant asks:

What specific code or regulation establishes that this property has “non-conforming rights” exempting it from current accessibility requirements?

He further requests the specific code sections and factual findings supporting the City's conclusion.

The complaint asks the City to explain whether it considered the 2014 renovations, 2023 intercom replacement, 2026 parking work and recent apartment renovation when making its determination.

CLAIMS OF DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION

Johnson alleges that his complaints are being ignored because of racism and retaliation by City employees acting in concert with the property owner.

He characterizes the City's handling of the matter as involving alleged abuse of process, abuse of authority and abuse of discretion.

Those allegations remain disputed and are presented in the filing as the tenant's claims.

The complaint states that the issues have been brought to the attention of the Mayor, City Council, code-enforcement personnel and building-code inspectors through emails, postal correspondence, court documents and City Council agenda filings.

SEPARATE VEHICLE-DAMAGE ALLEGATION

The filing also describes a separate dispute involving Johnson's automobile.

He alleges that adhesive material placed on the vehicle damaged the driver's-side window and asserts that the incident may have been motivated by racial hostility and retaliation. Johnson states that the Police Department was notified.

A BROADER PUBLIC QUESTION

The July 27 filing ultimately raises a question extending beyond one tenant or one apartment building:

When an older building undergoes later renovations, system replacements or reconstruction, does the City have a duty to determine whether those later projects trigger accessibility requirements?

Johnson is asking the City to answer that question with **specific code provisions, permit records, inspection records and factual findings** rather than simply relying on the property's age.

THE TENANT'S REQUEST

The filing asks the City to explain:

- Whether the 2014 renovations triggered accessibility requirements.
- Whether the 2023 intercom replacement triggered accessibility obligations.
- Whether the 2026 parking-lot repaving and restriping required accessible parking.
- Whether the recent Unit 8 renovation was properly permitted and inspected.
- Whether accessibility reviews were performed.

- Whether reasonable-accommodation requirements apply.
- Whether government financial assistance creates additional obligations.
- What specific laws or regulations support any claimed exemption from current accessibility requirements.

The City government Los Angeles refuses to respond in writing. A city discrimination complaint was also filed against the owner, but the City refuses to release to the Public what was the answer of the owner. The owner also communicated to city employee Steven Harrison and the City refuses to release to the Public what Harrison told the owner.

What is the City trying to hide from tenants?

8/1/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2023/23-0386_PC_PM_08-01-2026.pdf

PUBLIC SAFETY and PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES' REPORT relative to establishing a program to authorize the Fire Department to proactively demolish abandoned structures that pose a significant fire risk. THIS MATTER IS OPPOSED. A History of Los Angeles government housing racism and retaliation.

HI POINT 1522 LLC
11900 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD
SUITE 810
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064

Reference LA Tenants Union. P.O. Box 27354, Los Angeles, CA 90027. info@latenantsunion.org . 213-986-8266