

---


---

## MEMORANDUM

---

---

**TO:** Mayor Natasha Moore  
Vice Mayor David Stern  
Members of the Town Commission

**FROM:** Leonard G. Rubin, Town Attorney 

**RE:** Amendments to the Town's Sign Regulations (SB 180)

**DATE:** November 12, 2025

**CC:** Marshall Labadie, Town Manager  
Lanelda Gaskins, Town Clerk

---

At its November 4, 2025 meeting, representatives of the Villa Magna Condominium presented proposed modifications to its existing signs to the Town Commission. As discussed at the meeting, the proposed signs are larger than what is currently permitted by Section 23-5 of the Town Code of Ordinances, which allows a permanent single-faced or double-faced identification sign not to exceed ten (10) square feet and entrance (ingress) and exit (egress) signs not to exceed three (3) square feet. Consequently, the proposed signs would require an amendment to the Town Code.

Any amendment to the Town's sign regulations would need to comply with Senate Bill 180 (Chapter 2025-190, Laws of Florida), which prohibits the Town from proposing or adopting "*more restrictive or burdensome amendments*" to its land development regulations until October 1, 2027. Because the statutory definition of the term land development regulations includes sign regulations, I previously advised the Commission that the Town could *not* move forward with a *reduction* to the allowable size of temporary signs because such an amendment would be more restrictive or burdensome. The Town Commission then requested clarification as to whether SB 180 restricted the Town's ability to *increase* the allowable sign area for permanent residential signs.

As previously discussed with the Commission, SB 180 contains no definition for the term "more restrictive or burdensome." When analyzing a statutory provision, the two basic rules of statutory interpretation are as follows: (1) the language should be interpreted in a manner that effectuates the legislature's intent; and (2) in the absence of a definition, words used in a statute should be given their plain and ordinary meaning. SB 180 was intended to address emergencies, and the quoted language was an (albeit overly broad and arguably unconstitutional) attempt to ensure that local governments do not adversely impact a property owner's ability to reconstruct damaged structures after a major storm event. Additionally, having reviewed various definitions of the terms "restrictive" and "burdensome," it is my opinion that SB 180 would only prohibit amendments to the Town's

sign regulations that are more limiting or oppressive than the current regulations and would *not* prohibit an amendment that would increase the allowable sign area.

In summary, SB 180 would not prohibit the Commission from amending the Town's sign regulations to increase the allowable sign area if the Commission determines that larger signs serve a legitimate public purpose and are rationally related to the public welfare. When determining whether such an amendment serves a legitimate public purpose, the Commission may consider visual/aesthetic impacts throughout the Town.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.