

From: [Grant Johnson via Smartsheet](#)
To: [Council Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Heruy Damer
Date: Monday, August 3, 2026 11:02:57 AM



Public Comment: Heruy Damer

Date: 08/03/26, 11:00 AM

2026-00809

I am writing to share feedback and express my strong concerns regarding the proposed amendment to Minneapolis Code of Ordinances Section 389.100(b) (4) concerning motion-sensor audio devices.

My intent in submitting this comment is not to advocate for unchecked neighborhood surveillance or constant recording, but rather to urge the City to adopt practical, evidence-based standards that do not penalize everyday residential safety equipment.

1. A Request for Data: Is This a City-Wide Issue or a Reactive Measure?

Consumer motion-sensor cameras and doorbell audio devices have operated in Minneapolis homes for well over a decade. Before voting on a city-wide code change, I ask the Committee to examine the historical complaint data: How many official complaints regarding motion-sensor camera audio has the City received across Minneapolis over the past 10+ years?

This question is critical because this amendment appears to be a purely reactive response to my specific situation rather than a broad municipal need:

- A neighbor submitted a complaint regarding my Ring camera audio.
- A city inspector initially cited me under three separate existing noise and nuisance ordinances.
- After I challenged these citations and the Director of the (Healthy Homes and Environment Division) reviewed the case, the Department confirmed that those initial citations were inapplicable and that current city code explicitly permits

standard motion-sensor audio.

- Roughly a month after concluding I was not in violation of any existing law, city staff emailed me to announce they were submitting an ordinance amendment to City Council—specifically drafting new language so my property would be in violation.

Rewriting city-wide legislation simply to create an enforcement hook where none previously existed sets a concerning precedent for municipal governance. Code should reflect broad public necessity, not post-hoc adjustments to resolve isolated disputes.

2. Unworkable Standards in High-Density Neighborhoods

The proposed amendment prohibits motion-sensor audio if it can be heard from an adjacent property line. In many Minneapolis neighborhoods—including the Jordan neighborhood in North Minneapolis where I have lived for over five years—homes sit only 5 to 10 feet apart. My front door is less than 10 feet from my neighbor's door.

In a high-density environment, an absolute "zero audibility at the property boundary" standard is practically impossible to achieve. Normal human interactions on a front porch—such as a casual conversation or a sneeze—carry across property lines that close. Requiring low-volume motion-activated chimes to remain completely silent at the boundary line functionally operates as a total ban on standard safety features for high-density residents.

3. Request for Balanced, Objective Guidelines

Rather than overhauling city code in response to a single case, I urge the Committee to reject this amendment and rely on existing decibel-based noise standards or private dispute resolution. If specific motion-sensor regulations are deemed necessary, they should rely on objective decibel thresholds rather than an absolute audibility ban across close property lines.

Thank you for your time and for examining the background and data behind this proposed change.

Ward: Ward 5

Public Health, Safety & Equity (PHSE)