

Accessibility Analysis of Existing Disabled Users at Neha Hub, Cilandak Jakarta

Elsa Fasfahisofkha ^{a,1}, Sri Riswanti ^{a,2}, Rio Setia Monata ^{a,3}

^a Universitas Gunadarma, Jl. Taman Puspa Cimanggis, Depok, 16451, Indonesia

¹ elsafasfahisofkha96@gmail.com; ² sririswanti@staff.gunadarma.ac.id; ³ riosetiamonata20@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author



Received 25 December 2024; accepted 8 April 2025; published 13 Juni 2025

ABSTRACT

As a public space, Neha Hub is a mixed-use space that involves various facilities including educational art spaces, art gallery spaces, music studios, and is a means of various entertainment and cultural arts performances. Neha Hub also collaborates with Creativite Indonesia, a management engaged in the organization of creativity activities that collaborate in various arts and creativity activities, such as crafts, fashion, interiors, architecture, photography, and performing arts through educational activities. With various facilities available to realize the vision and mission of further developing the quality of performances by not distinguishing participants in terms of age, gender, interests and inclinations including people with disabilities to be able to participate in it. This will be the focus of the research compiled. The research aims to find out the barriers and find solutions to accessibility problems faced by people with disabilities when visiting Neha Hub. The research was conducted at the Neha Hub public space in Cilandak, South Jakarta. The author uses a combination of quantitative methods in data collection and ergonomic aspects and qualitative methods as a basis for analyzing the humanities of existing conditions. Referring to Ron Mace's universal design theory, (1980) which states that with the perception of projects and environments designed and occupied, considering the possibility of their use by different user profiles: from children to the elderly, including certain limitations. Based on the survey that has been conducted, it is known that accessibility in the Neha Hub public space is not friendly to people with disabilities. Therefore, Neha Hub as a public space must have facilities and infrastructure needed by all groups including people with disabilities.

KEYWORDS

Accessibility
People with
disabilities
Public space

This is an open-
access article under
the [CC-BY-SA](#)
license



1. Introduction

Universal design, as explained by Ron Mace in his work *Accessible, Adaptable, and Universal Design*, is an effort to create products and environments that can be used by everyone without requiring modification or special accommodation (Jonathan 2017). This principle aims to make products and environments accessible and usable by as many individuals as possible; toilets, for instance, are one small but telling aspect of this concept, where the underlying goal is simply that every user should be able to use them comfortably.

Accessibility for people with disabilities has been addressed across various levels of regulation in Indonesia—central government laws, government regulations, Ministry of Public Works regulations, and regional regulations. However, no regulation specifically governs accessibility guidelines for open public spaces: a 2006 Ministry of Public Works regulation provides technical guidelines for facilities and accessibility within buildings and their immediate environment, but stops short of addressing accessibility in open space specifically. This regulatory gap persists despite legislative efforts to strengthen disability rights more broadly. The shift from Law No. 4 of 1997 to Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities, grounded in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, reflects the government's growing attention to fulfilling disabled individuals' rights (Ramadhan, Solekhah, and Marinda 2021)—yet, in practice, access to movement for people with disabilities remains difficult, and public facilities nominally designed with their needs in mind frequently still fall short, including open and green public spaces.

This gap in protection extends to legal frameworks beyond physical infrastructure: Article 5 of Law No. 31/2014, amending Law No. 13/2006 on Witness and Victim Protection, has not provided adequate protection of personal safety, freedom from threats, temporary living assistance, and proper mental and physical support for victims with disabilities.

This gap between regulatory intent and lived accessibility is reflected in how disability itself is defined and discussed. *Difable*—short for "differently abled"—has emerged as an alternative to "disabled," reflecting a view of individuals with special needs that remains, in practice, frequently underestimated by the rigid systems they must navigate, from slow task division to interactions that fail to meet their actual needs (Purwanto 2020). Law No. 8/2016 formalizes this understanding, defining persons with disabilities as individuals experiencing physical, intellectual, mental, and/or sensory limitations over a long period, facing obstacles that limit their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others. This framing is consistent with the broader shift toward the term "different ability," favored for being more humanist and less discriminatory while still protecting disabled individuals' human rights (Firdaus and Iswahyudi 2010; Tarsidi 2017). Read together, these definitions position people with disabilities as individuals whose abilities differ as a result of specific conditions, and who require deliberate ease of access to participate as full members of society.

This requirement for accessible participation is precisely what public space is meant to provide. Public space has been defined as the place where collective life occurs (Carr 1992, 78), as the area between buildings in urban settings—or "urban space," in Rob Krier's preferred term (Krier 1979, 78, as cited in Putra 2020)—and, more functionally, as space formed in direct response to the need for people to meet and communicate (Hakim, as cited in Hantono 2013, 78). Across all three framings, public space plays an important role in building community across social strata: it is where people learn to navigate difference, where diverse political and social aspirations find room to coexist, and where democracy and equality find the conditions to grow—conditions essential to both individual and collective wellbeing (Hantono 2020). Realizing this role requires more than comfort and aesthetics alone; it requires spatial patterns and structures that genuinely support how people interact, share, and participate, whether individually or in groups, across both closed and open forms of public space (Mulyandari 2011).

Set against this definition, the gap becomes clear: genuinely disability-friendly public space remains difficult to find. Even non-disabled visitors are sometimes inadequately served by existing facilities and comfort standards—a baseline shortfall that only compounds the barriers faced by people with disabilities specifically, and the starting point for the research presented in this study.

2. Methods

This research uses a qualitative descriptive method, aimed at describing the study's findings as they are rather than extending them into broader generalizations. The study was conducted at Neha Hub, a public space in Cilandak, South Jakarta, and data was collected through three complementary techniques.

First, direct field observation and measurement were carried out across each of Neha Hub's functional areas—entry access, parking, outdoor paths, tenant areas, the gallery, the amphitheater, and the toilet and musalla facilities—recording existing dimensions such as road width, parking clearance, and room size. Second, these measured dimensions were systematically compared against established ergonomic and universal design standards for accessibility—covering parking clearance for wheelchair users, ramp gradients, tactile paving, stair and handrail dimensions, and toilet accessibility requirements—allowing each area's existing condition to be assessed against a concrete accessibility benchmark rather than general impression alone. Third, an interview was conducted directly with Neha Hub's owner, guided by a set of outline questions prepared in advance, to capture management's own perspective on the site's facilities and their accessibility considerations, providing context alongside the physical measurements and standards comparison.

Together, these three techniques allow each functional area of Neha Hub to be assessed consistently: existing conditions are measured, measured against accessibility standards, and read alongside the owner's own account of the space, forming the basis for the area-by-area analysis presented in the following section.

3. Results and Discussion

Following Ron Mace's universal design theory (1980)—that a project situated within the general public will be used by a wide range of user profiles, from children to the elderly, including individuals with specific limitations—this section assesses Neha Hub's existing accessibility condition against established ergonomic and accessibility standards. Vehicle access and parking show a consistent pattern of undersized infrastructure (Figure 1). The entry road measures only 2.00 m against a 5.00 m standard, constraining it to one car, two motorbikes, or three pedestrians at a time. Motorcycle parking fares similarly, at 1.00 m of access width against a roughly 2.00 m standard needed for two-directional entry and exit. Car parking, by contrast, has an allocation rather than a space problem: its overall footprint is large enough to accommodate a dedicated accessible space, but currently provides neither dedicated clearance for wheelchair users—standard practice calls for 1,500 mm between a parked car and an adjacent accessible space—nor any corresponding signage.



Fig. 1. Vehicle access and parking: (a) entry area, (b) car parking, (c) motorcycle parking.

This same undersizing recurs across Neha Hub's outdoor circulation. The outdoor area, tenant area, and Kingdat area are addressed together here because they share the same two problems: paths narrow enough to accommodate only one pedestrian at a time, and loose gravel surfacing that is uncomfortable to walk on and effectively unusable for a wheelchair, whose standard width of 900 mm leaves no margin on paths already this constrained. None of the three areas provide tactile paving, ramps, or supporting facilities such as bench seating—gaps that standard accessibility specifications address directly and could be retrofitted onto existing paths without major structural change.



Fig. 2. Outdoor circulation areas: (a) outdoor area, (b) tenant area, (c) Kingdat area.

Neha Hub's indoor and semi-outdoor program spaces each present a distinct barrier. The Educational Creative area is difficult to reach at all, combining a narrow access road with the absence of ramps, tactile paving, and handrails. The Arts Creative area, at 6.35 m × 3.30 m, is cramped even before accounting for exhibition items of varying sizes that further narrow usable floor area, compounded by an absence of wayfinding and descriptive signage and by sightlines that, based on direct observation, fall short of standard visibility requirements for exhibition viewing. The Amphitheater area is the most hazardous of the three: an elevation change across its floor surface, combined with a narrow path and the total absence of tactile paving, handrails, and ramps—including a stair section with no railing to grip—makes this area genuinely unsafe rather than merely inconvenient for visitors with limited mobility.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 3. Program spaces: (a) Educational Creative area, (b) Amphitheater area, (c) Arts Creative area.

Neha Hub's supporting facilities show the clearest gaps of any area assessed. The musalla, at 3.50 m × 2.85 m, is sized for a single person to bow in prayer, leaving no real margin for a visitor with limited mobility, and its signage is both uninformative and poorly positioned. The toilet facilities present the single most direct accessibility failure in the entire site: only standard public toilets are available, with no accessible toilet—meeting specifications such as a 1,500 mm × 1,500 mm wheelchair turning space and appropriately positioned grab rails—provided for people with disabilities at all.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 4. Supporting facilities: (a) musalla, (b) toilet area.

Read together, these findings describe a systemic rather than isolated problem. Every functional area assessed—vehicle access, outdoor circulation, program spaces, and supporting facilities alike—falls short of established accessibility standards in some form, indicating that Neha Hub's accessibility gap is a matter of site-wide planning rather than a handful of fixable details.

4. Conclusion

Based on the observations and standard comparisons carried out in this study, Neha Hub's public space is not yet friendly to people with disabilities, and this shortfall is systemic rather than confined to one or two overlooked spots. Across vehicle access and parking, circulation paths consistently fall short of the width needed for comfortable, accessible movement—the entry road, motorcycle parking, and

several outdoor paths all measure well below their respective ergonomic standards—while the car parking area, despite having sufficient overall space, provides neither a dedicated accessible bay nor the signage to indicate one. Outdoor circulation compounds this problem with loose gravel surfacing that is uncomfortable for any pedestrian and effectively unusable for a wheelchair, combined with a consistent absence of tactile paving, ramps, and supporting facilities such as bench seating across the outdoor, tenant, and Kingdat areas alike.

These gaps extend into Neha Hub's core program spaces. The Educational Creative area remains difficult to reach at all due to its narrow access road and lack of ramps and handrails; the Arts Creative area is constrained both physically, by its limited floor area and varying exhibition item sizes, and functionally, by the absence of wayfinding signage and sightlines that do not meet standard visibility requirements; and the Amphitheater area presents the most pressing safety concern, where an unramped elevation change paired with the total absence of handrails and tactile paving makes the space genuinely hazardous rather than merely inconvenient for visitors with limited mobility. Supporting facilities show the clearest and most direct gaps of all: the musalla's dimensions leave no real margin for a visitor with limited mobility to maneuver, and most critically, Neha Hub currently provides no accessible toilet whatsoever—only standard public facilities—despite this being one of the most basic accessibility provisions expected of any public space.

Taken together, these findings show that Neha Hub's accessibility gap cannot be addressed through isolated fixes to individual areas; it requires a coordinated, site-wide approach to redesign. Concretely, this means widening and resurfacing circulation paths with wheelchair-appropriate materials in place of loose gravel; installing tactile paving, ramps, and handrails at every elevation change and area transition identified in this study, particularly the Amphitheater; adding clear, well-positioned wayfinding and descriptive signage throughout the Arts Creative area and beyond; designating and signing an accessible parking space within the car park's existing footprint; and, as the most urgent single intervention, providing at least one fully accessible toilet meeting standard wheelchair clearance and grab rail specifications. Addressing these gaps would not only bring Neha Hub into closer alignment with established accessibility standards, but would also support its own stated mission as a mixed-use cultural and creative space—one that, by its own description, aims to welcome participants without distinction of age, gender, interest, or ability. Realizing that mission in practice will depend on treating accessibility as a foundational design requirement for Neha Hub going forward, not an optional addition to be considered after the fact.

References

- Adi Putrag, G. and Triwahyono, D. (2020). Ruang Temporer Sosial Sebagai Salah Satu Bentuk Ruang Sosial Dan Aspirasi Masyarakat Dalam Pemenuhan Kebutuhan Ruang Publik Kota. *Pawon: Jurnal Arsitektur*, 4(01), pp.77–88. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36040/pawon.v4i01.2348>.
- Hantono, D. and Ariantantrie, N. (2018). Kajian Ruang Publik Dan Isu Yang Berkembang Di Dalamnya. *Vitruvian*, 8(1), p.43. doi:<https://doi.org/10.22441/vitruvian.2018.v8i1.005>.
- Hantono, D., Sidabutar, Y.F.D. and Hanafiah, U.I.M. (2018). Kajian Ruang Publik Kota Antara Aktivitas Dan Keterbatasan. *Langkau Betang: Jurnal Arsitektur*, 5(2), p.80. doi:<https://doi.org/10.26418/lantang.v5i2.29387>.
- Harahap, R., Gambiro, H. and Sanjaya, R. (2019). Studi Penerapan Desain Universal Pada Mesjid Manarul Amal Kampus Meruya Di Universitas Mercu Buana Jakarta Barat. *Studi Penerapan Desain Universal Pada Mesjid Manarul Amal Kampus Meruya Di Universitas Mercu Buana Jakarta Barat*, 7(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.30998/jurnaladesain.v7i1.4188>.
- Priscyllia, F. (2016). Kajian Hukum Terhadap Fasilitas Pelayanan Publik Bagi Penyandang Disabilitas. *Lex Crimen*, 5(3), p.3442.
- Ramadhan, D.A., Solekhah, A.S. and Marinda, F. (2021). Revisi Undang-Undang Perlindungan Disabilitas: Aksesibilitas Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Kekerasan Seksual. *Ikatan Penulis Mahasiswa Hukum Indonesia Law Journal*, 1(2), pp.206–224. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15294/ipmhi.v1i2.53331>.