



August 19, 2025

Damian Newell
Senior Planner | Village of Wellington
12300 Forest Hill Boulevard
Wellington, FL 33414
561.753.2577 | dnewell@wellingtonfl.gov

RE: Islepointe at Orange Point PUD

Mr. Newell,

The purpose of this letter is to provide a status update on the Islepointe at Orange Point PUD application. Following the April 22, 2025, Village Council Meeting, the Applicant and development team have been working on issues raised at that meeting. The second reading of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA-2023-0002) and hearing of the Master Plan Amendment (MPA-2023-0001) is scheduled for the September 3, 2025, Village Council Meeting.

The Isles at Wellington – Community Outreach

Following the April 22, 2025, Village Council Meeting, the Applicant team has continued to meet and correspond with the Isles at Wellington Community Association to find ways to resolve their concerns. We have worked on proposed conditions of approval that we have proposed to the Village and a private agreement with The Isles at Wellington Community Association, Inc. The private agreement, which will provide for an easement and maintenance agreement relative to increased landscaping between the two developments, is being finalized for execution in advance of the September 3, 2025, Village Council Meeting.

The proposed conditions of approval include reduction of proposed unit count to 25 single-family homes, relocation of the project entrance to the west- further from the adjacent Isles at Wellington community- protection for the Isles at Wellington community from potential street lighting impacts, and compliance with standard construction requirements.

As we went through the discussions, the Isles at Wellington Community Association has confirmed that they are no longer requesting single-story homes adjacent to their community and are in support of the new school bus stop for students, without a proposed multi-use path for pedestrian access along 120th Ave S.

Pathway Discussion

Following the April 22, 2025, Village Council Meeting, at which time the Applicant expressed to the Village Council that construction of a boardwalk over the drainage canal along 120th Ave S. would have negative impacts to the adjacent community and pose maintenance and safety concerns, the Applicant explored options for pathway access. The Applicant presented the Isles at Wellington Community Association with two options for a pathway through the Association's common areas to connect to their sidewalk network, giving their residents access to the new school bus stop at 50th St and 120th Ave and providing Islepointe

residents with a pedestrian connection through the Isles at Wellington. Ultimately, the Isles at Wellington Community Association declined the proposal due to privacy and security concerns.

As stated at the April 22, 2025, Village Council meeting, the issue of the pathway is not just one of whether it can physically be built, but the impacts of that construction, including impacts on the Isles at Wellington perimeter wall and homes adjacent to the canal, and the concerns for its safe use. As requested by the Village, please see additional feedback on the referenced Florida Statutes and Comprehensive Plan Mobility Elements below.

Section 1006.23(a)(1), Florida Statutes

This provision of the statute at issue specifically includes the following language:

“It shall be considered a hazardous walking condition with respect to any road along which students must walk in order to walk to and from school if there is not an area at least 4 feet wide adjacent to the road, *not including drainage ditches, sluiceways, swales, or channels....*” (emphasis added)

Put simply, the hazardous walking condition includes the circumstance of a drainage ditch, sluiceway, swale, or channel. The point of the language relates to making sure that there is an area of true safe passage. Being adjacent to (or worse within) a drainage ditch, etc. therefore is itself a hazardous condition; it is not a safe passage. This is consistent with the addition of the language to the statute in 2015.

The relevant language was added to Section 1006.23 in 2015 as part of “Gabby’s Law for Student Safety.” The title of the statute alone indicates the purpose – adjacency to ditches, etc. is unsafe and student safety is paramount. This is why the School District has agreed to provide bus service.

Comprehensive Plan Elements

The first three policies are subsets of Goal MB 1 and Objective MB 1.1. Goal MB 1 is to “[p]rovide a safe and effective mobility system that is accessible to all users and meets the needs of Wellington residents *while preserving neighborhoods, protecting natural resources,* and promoting economic development.” (emphasis added). Objective MB 1.1. is to “[m]aintain a safe, convenient, and effective *motorized and non-motorized transportation system consisting of arterial, collector and local streets and roads; sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and multiple-purpose pathways; and equestrian trails.*” (emphasis added)

Each of the policies must be read in light of the Goal and Objective it is implementing. It is about providing multiple forms of transportation, which includes the roadways in addition to other options, where that can be done without adverse impacts to neighborhoods and natural resources. As such, where a path could have adverse consequences, it would not make sense to provide it.

Policy MB 1.1.3: This Policy provides that the Village “[m]aintain safe, accessible pedestrian walkways along Wellington’s major roads, with a priority for the most heavily traveled roadways.” Although “major roads” is not defined, it seems unlikely that either 120th Ave S or 50th St South constitute “major roads,”

and certainly not “the most heavily traveled roadways” within the Village. More, to require a path over a drainage canal is not the typically contemplated pathway that would provide a “safe, accessible pedestrian walkway.”

Policy MB 1.1.4: This Policy provides that the Village “[c]ontinue to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to neighborhoods, schools, parks, community centers, along with transit stops, in a safe and convenient manner.” In the present case, a multi-mile pathway from a 25 unit subdivision is not the kind of pathway connecting neighborhoods, schools, etc. Further, this policy also allows for transit stops. The fact that the School District is providing bus service due to a finding that walking along 120th Ave. S would be an unsafe condition, furthers this policy. That that is the appropriate measure to provide a “safe and convenient” connection to the school.

Policy MB 1.1.6: This Policy requires the Village to “[p]rioritize pedestrian facilities or improvements within walking distances of neighborhoods to schools, parks, and transit stops.” This is similar to the language in Policy 1.1.4. In addition, while the Village may prioritize pedestrian facilities or improvements (even without a question of what constitutes “within walking distances”), that does not mean they are always required. There are multiple reasons (including safety and impact to the neighbors and environment) that indicate that this priority does not apply here, particularly when read in light of the Goal, Objective, and Policies as a whole.

Policy MB 2.1.4: This Policy provides that the Village “[e]nsure that new development provides access and circulation for non-automobile transportation including sidewalks, and multi-purpose pathways that serve pedestrians, bicyclist, golf carts, and other modes of personal transportation, which are amenities to the community.” Appropriate access and circulation for non-automobile transportation is being provided where possible – along 50th St. South. A pathway as proposed is not one that would serve as an amenity to the community. Typically, when considering amenities to a community, they are internal to that community, not public matters (which are public amenities). These options are provided. Further, there are no nearby public amenities to which any such paths would connect.

None of the policies referenced require a path be constructed within/over the existing canal. More, even if there was an implication of such a requirement, in the present circumstance there is (at least) no proportionality between the request and the impacts. The proposed project results in a reduction in people/trips/walkers/bikers, etc. from the current condition as allowed. To require a path to accommodate users that would already have been accommodated for, regardless of language in the comprehensive plan, would violate the proportionality requirement. Despite this, the Applicant did seek to find some alternative, some way to try to make the path work. But, it is simply infeasible given safety concerns, cost, number of potential users, impacts to the canal bed, and impacts to the neighboring homeowners.

Thank you for your ongoing coordination for this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at Jerrod.Purser@wginc.com or 561-537-4533.

WGI, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jerrod Purser", is positioned above the printed name.

Jerrod Purser, PLA
Senior Project Manager