

Wednesday, June 25, 2008

# Deal could make Great Park 100 acres larger

Discussions between Irvine, developer center on financing and construction of public and private projects.

By SEAN EMERY  
STAFF WRITER

IRVINE – City and Heritage Fields officials are working to update financing and construction requirements for the Great Park and surrounding developments, including a more than 100-acre expansion of the planned 1,347-acre Great Park.

City staff has presented the council with the proposed development updates. Most critical to the Great Park's future are discussions centering on the creation of a community facilities district, staff said, which is expected to serve as a key funding source for infrastructure projects.

City and Heritage Fields officials are working to update the list of joint backbone infrastructure projects financed by the community facilities district, although they have yet to release a list of exactly which projects could be added. City officials are also hoping to shift responsibility for covering any cost overruns in setting up the community facilities district from the city to Heritage Fields, a subsidiary of Lennar Corp.

Several proposed changes could impact the physical layout of the park, including the transfer of 131 acres from the private Lifelong Learning District to the Great Park, reducing the size of a promised golf course from 45 to 18 holes and deciding exactly where a proposed police complex will be built.

Both the city and Heritage Fields are looking to clarify how and when runway demolition will take place on the former El Toro base. The developer is also looking to update agreements with the city regarding the phasing of park construction, which is currently expected to begin in the western portion of the Great Park with a sports park, entry gate, bosque and cultural terrace.

City staff emphasized that the changes would not add any density or housing units to the planned developments, but are needed to address the impacts of the housing crisis and the changing economic realities.

Councilwoman Christina Shea worried that the plan presented to the council was too ambiguous, with the exact details of proposed changes not yet included. A more detailed report is expected to come before the Planning Commission next week, and return to the council on July 27, staff said.

Contact the writer: 949-553-2911 or [semery@ocregister.com](mailto:semery@ocregister.com)