



Center for Local Planning
INSTITUTE *for* PUBLIC SERVICE

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Public Chapter 1044

New Mandatory Deadlines for Development Application Review,
Site Inspections & Surety Releases

*What local governments need to know before January 1, 2027 —
from deadlines to deficiency notices to automatic approvals*

AUGUST 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Overview & Key Deadlines**
- 2 Applicability — Who & What Is Covered**
- 3 The 30-Business-Day Review Clock**
- 4 The 60-Business-Day Approval / Agenda Deadline**
- 5 Deficiency Notices & the Two-Notice Cap**
- 6 Automatic Approval — Deemed Approved**
- 7 Surety Release Provisions**
- 8 Interaction with Existing Subdivision Plat Law**
- 9 Third-Party Reviews & Traffic Studies**
- 10 Transitional Rules — Applications Before Jan. 1, 2027**
- 11 Applicant Delays & Deferrals**
- 12 BZA Actions & PC 1044**
- 13 What Local Governments Should Do Now**
- 14 Additional Webinar Questions & Responses**

SECTION 1 | OVERVIEW & KEY DEADLINES

Q1 What is Public Chapter 1044?

Public Chapter 1044 establishes the first statewide mandatory deadlines for local government review of development applications in Tennessee. Signed into law in 2026, it takes effect January 1, 2027, and applies to all Tennessee cities, counties, and planning commissions. The law is designed to streamline the development review process, ensure timely government action, and provide certainty for applicants while raising the stakes significantly for local governments that miss deadlines.

Q2 When does PC 1044 take effect?

PC 1044 takes effect January 1, 2027. Section 4 of the Act states that the law "must not be construed to repeal, modify, or apply to any contract existing on December 31, 2026." Plans submitted on or after January 1, 2027, are subject to the new requirements.

Q3 What are the key deadlines under PC 1044?

PC 1044 establishes four critical deadlines (see table below):

Deadline	Requirement	Consequence if Missed
30 Business Days	Staff must give written comments on a development application from the date of submission.	Application is deemed automatically approved as submitted.
60 Business Days	Staff must approve the application OR place it on the next available planning commission/governing body agenda.	Application is deemed automatically approved as submitted.
2 Deficiency Notices	Maximum number of written deficiencies notices a local government may issue per application.	After 2nd notice: must deny (refund 50% of fees), conditionally approve, or forward to commission/governing body.
120 Business Days	Timeline for surety release after an independent state-registered engineer certifies contracted work is complete.	Local government must release surety or place matter before planning commission/governing body; must respond in writing within 20 business days.

⚠ AUTOMATIC APPROVAL: If a local building commissioner, other administrative official, or board fails to approve, deny, or extend (with applicant consent) the application within the required time period, the application is deemed approved as submitted — regardless of whether it meets local standards.

SECTION 2 | APPLICABILITY — WHO & WHAT IS COVERED

Q4 Who does PC 1044 apply to?

The law applies to:

- ▶ All Tennessee cities and counties
- ▶ Local planners, building departments, and codes officials
- ▶ Road superintendents, utility agencies, and engineering staff
- ▶ Any local staff involved in reviewing development applications (e.g., site plans, subdivision plats, etc)

Q5 Who does PC 1044 NOT apply to?

The law does NOT apply to:

- ▶ Building, fire, mechanical, plumbing, or electrical permits (covered under separate statutes)
- ▶ State agencies
- ▶ Local government-funded projects such as public roadways and parks
- ▶ Decisions of the Planning Commission or Governing Body; PC 1044 is intended to ensure applications are processed in a timely manner. It does not impact the ability of a planning commission to approve or deny an application.

Q6 What types of development applications are covered?

Covered applications include:

- ▶ Preliminary Subdivision plats
- ▶ Site plans and development plans
- ▶ Other development applications subject to local planning commission or staff review

SECTION 3 | THE 30-BUSINESS-DAY REVIEW CLOCK

Q7 When does the 30-business-day clock start — at plan submittal or acceptance?

At plan submittal. The statute is clear that the clocks run from "the submission" (see §7-51-2204(b)(1)). If the plans are determined to be an incomplete submittal, then the local government must notify the developer of such incompleteness in writing within thirty (30) business days of receipt of the submission under subsection (e). This rejection effectively stops the review process; the clocks would only restart upon a new, complete submittal.

CLP recommends that completeness review occurs immediately upon submittal, ideally before formal acceptance and collection of application fees, so that the 30- and 60-business-day windows are preserved for substantive review of complete applications.

Q8 Do the 30 business days to determine "completeness" count as part of the same 30 business days to get comments out for deficiencies?

Yes. Both the completeness of determination under subsection (e) and the written report of deficiencies or request additional information under subsection (b)(1)(B)–(C) share the same 30-business-day clock, which begins running at the time of submission. Once a plan is submitted, the city/county coordinator or designated local representative has thirty (30) business days to either:

- ▶ Reject the submittal as incomplete under subsection (e), which does not count as a written report of deficiency; or
- ▶ If the submittal is determined to be complete, provide a written report of deficiencies or request additional information under subsection (b)(1)(B)–(C).

CLP strongly recommends that the completeness of review occurs as quickly as possible, ideally at or immediately after the time of submittal, to maximize the remaining time available for substantive plan review.

Q9 If additional information is required after submittal, does the 30-business-day clock reset? What if the information is never received?

The statute distinguishes between different scenarios:

- ▶ Under subsection (b)(1)(C), the local government may request additional information within 30 business days of the initial submission. This request would effectively constitute one of the two permitted written reports of deficiencies (or be combined with one).
- ▶ Under subsection (c), once the local government has issued a written report of deficiencies and subsequently receives documentation that each deficiency has been satisfactorily resolved, a new 30-business-day clock begins. Within that window, the local government must either approve the application or place it on the next available planning commission or governing body agenda.

If the information is never received, the statute does not explicitly address this scenario. As a best practice, CLP recommends the local government staff email the development team contacts at defined intervals, and if revised plans are not submitted within a reasonable timeframe, deny the application at the staff level (with the required 50% fee refund) or place it on the next available agenda. All decisions should be documented in writing.

SECTION 4 | THE 60-BUSINESS-DAY APPROVAL / AGENDA DEADLINE

Q10 What must happen within 60 business days of submittal?

Within sixty (60) business days of submission, the local government must "either approve the development application, development plan, or site inspection, or add the submission to the next available agenda of either the planning commission or the governing body" (§7-51-2204(b)(1)(A)). If neither action is taken within 60 business days, the application is deemed automatically approved as submitted.

Q11 Does the 60-business-day window mean the meeting must be held within 60 days, or just that the item must be added to the agenda?

CLP's understanding is that the item must be placed on the next available agenda within the 60-business-day window. If the next available meeting falls slightly outside that window due to the community's regular meeting schedule, the key is that staff have taken the affirmative step of adding the item to that next agenda before the 60-day deadline expires. The statute's language focuses on the act of adding to the agenda, not on the date the meeting is actually held.

Communities should structure their meeting schedules and submittal calendars to minimize this risk. Posting meeting calendars and submittal deadlines publicly will help ensure that applications are received with enough lead time to meet both the 30- and 60-business-day requirements.

SECTION 5 | DEFICIENCY NOTICES & THE TWO-NOTICE CAP

Q12 How many deficiency notices can a local government issue per application?

PC 1044 caps local governments at two (2) written notices of deficiency per application. Once the second notice has been issued, the local government must take one of three actions:

- Deny the application and refund 50% of fees paid to the applicant.
- Conditionally approve the application with conditions addressing the remaining deficiencies.
- Forward the application to the planning commission or governing body for a final decision.

Q13 Does the 50% fee refund apply when the Planning Commission denies an application?

The 50% fee refund requirement under subsection (d)(1) applies when professional staff denies the application after two written reports of deficiencies have been issued and deficiencies remain unresolved. CLP's reading is that Planning Commission denials of applications placed on the agenda under subsection (d)(2) would not trigger the 50% refund requirement, since the statute ties the refund specifically to the staff-level denial pathway.

Q14 Should denied applications be treated as new upon resubmittal?

Yes. CLP recommends that denied plans require a new submittal, particularly given that PC 1044 requires a refund of 50% of the fees paid by the developer when professional staff denies an application after two rounds of deficiency review (see §7-51-2204(d)(1)). A new submittal will reset the process — new application, new fees, and new review timelines.

SECTION 6 | AUTOMATIC APPROVAL — DEEMED APPROVED

Q15 What does "deemed approved" mean under PC 1044?

If a local building commissioner, other administrative official, or board fails to approve, deny, add the item to the upcoming agenda, the application within the required time period, the application is deemed approved as submitted, regardless of whether it meets local standards. This is the most significant consequence in the statute and applies to both the 30-business-day and 60-business-day deadlines.

Q16 Can the applicant consent to extend the review timeline to avoid automatic approval?

The statute is silent on this point. We would recommend that you consult with your legal counsel on this topic.

SECTION 7 | SURETY RELEASE PROVISIONS

Q17 What are the surety release rules under PC 1044?

When a developer has a formal contract with a local government:

- ▶ An independent, state-registered engineer may be hired by the developer to certify that work required by the contract is complete.
- ▶ Once certified, the local government has 120 business days to release the surety.
- ▶ If the government intends to withhold release, it must respond in writing within 20 business days.

SECTION 8 | INTERACTION WITH EXISTING SUBDIVISION PLAT LAW

Q18 Once a plat/plan is added to an agenda, do the existing statutory requirements of

T.C.A. §§ 13-3-304/ 13-4-404 still apply?

Yes. PC 1044 does not appear to alter the maximum time limits for final subdivision plat review and approval under T.C.A. §§ 13-3-404 and 13-4-304, which are in some ways more stringent than PC 1044. The existing subdivision process, including the automatic approval mechanism if the Planning Commission takes no action within 60 days of initial review, remains intact.

In practical terms, cities and counties will still need to get the subdivision plat on the next available Planning Commission agenda (typically within the 30-business-day staff review window) rather than hold it for the full 60 days. PC 1044's overarching 60-business-day requirement to either approve administratively or place on an agenda reinforces the existing expectation of timely action.

The interplay of these timelines means that diligent scheduling and clear submittal calendars are essential to ensure compliance with both the new and existing statutory frameworks.

SECTION 9 | THIRD-PARTY REVIEWS & TRAFFIC STUDIES

Q19 If a traffic impact study is required prior to a plat/plan submittal, is this subject to the review clocks?

If a traffic impact study or similar third-party review is completed and reviewed prior to any formal plan submittal, then it would not be subject to PC 1044's review timelines, because no development application has been submitted to trigger the statutory clocks. Review of a traffic study prior to submittal of a development application would be most unusual however, and not recommended.

CLP recommends that traffic studies and drainage calculations be treated as required components of a complete plan submittal and be part of the initial completeness determination under subsection (e) if they are required for that application type by local regulations. If these supporting materials are not included, the submittal can be rejected as incomplete, without that rejection counting toward the two (2) written notice of deficiency limit.

Traffic studies associated with a preliminary master plan or rezoning request would not fall under PC 1044's requirements, since the rezoning process is a legislative action and PC 1044 applies only to administrative processes. Communities should also review existing contracts with third-party plan reviewers to ensure those contracts' turnaround timelines comply with PC 1044's requirements.

SECTION 10 | TRANSITIONAL RULES — APPLICATIONS BEFORE JAN. 1, 2027

Q20 What happens with plats/plans already in the review process prior to January 1, 2027?

PC 1044 takes effect January 1, 2027, and Section 4 states that the act "must not be construed to repeal, modify, or apply to any contract existing on December 31, 2026." Plans submitted on or after January 1, 2027, would be subject to the new requirements.

For plans submitted prior to that date, those applications should generally continue to be processed under the procedures in effect at the time of their submittal. A city or county could choose to voluntarily apply the same expedited timelines to pre-existing applications.

CLP recommends continuing to process pre-existing applications under the rules in place at the time of their submission, unless the development team would benefit from a quicker response under the new framework and the local government has the capacity to deliver on that timeline.

SECTION 11 | APPLICANT DELAYS & DEFERRALS

Q21 How do we handle a situation where staff has sent out comments, but the applicant's engineer/surveyor hasn't resubmitted in a timely manner?

This is an important practical concern. PC 1044's timelines are primarily designed to hold local governments accountable for timely review, but the statute does not explicitly address delays caused by the applicant's team. CLP recommends:

1. The city/county staff coordinator should email the development team contacts (including the owner/developer) if revised plans have not been resubmitted within a reasonable timeframe, notifying them that the application will be denied at the staff level unless revised plans are submitted or a written deferment is requested.
2. If no response is received, staff may proceed with a staff-level denial with written justification. The 50% fee refund under subsection (d)(1) would apply. Alternatively, the unresponsive application could be placed on the Planning Commission agenda with a negative staff recommendation.
3. All communications and decisions should be documented in writing and provided to the full development team, including the owner/developer — not just the design engineer or surveyor.

The key principle is that inaction by the applicant should not leave the local government in an indefinite holding pattern that could create compliance issues under PC 1044.

Q22 What if an applicant asks to defer their application? Can they sign a form waiving automatic approval?

PC 1044 does not address applicant-initiated deferrals. However, since the automatic approval provisions exist to protect developers from government delay, it is reasonable to allow a developer to voluntarily request a deferral through a written request. CLP recommends:

1. Any deferral should only be made pursuant to a written request from the development team (owner/developer), and not just the design professional.
2. If the item is already on an advertised Planning Commission agenda, staff should include in the staff report that the request was deferred at the applicant's request.
3. Any deferral agreement should define a revised timeline for plan resubmittal and placement on the next available agenda.
4. The written deferral request should clearly acknowledge that the applicant is voluntarily pausing the review timeline and is not seeking automatic approval during the deferral period. Having the applicant sign a form to this effect is a prudent approach.
5. The owner/developer always retains the option to withdraw the deferral request and resubmit revised plans, which would restart the process under a new submittal.

As with all decisions under PC 1044, thorough written documentation is essential to protect both the local government and the development team. CLP recommends that communities work closely with their legal counsel on this topic in order to create a standardized approach, as it is likely to come up.

SECTION 12 | BZA ACTIONS & PC 1044

Q23 Do BZA actions qualify as "legislative" or "administrative" actions under PC 1044?

BZA actions are quasi-judicial in nature, but for purposes of understanding PC 1044, they fall on the administrative side of the legislative/administrative distinction. The BZA may not act in a legislative capacity. That said, BZA actions are governed by their own separate and recently revised statutory frameworks and particularly Public Chapter No. 465 (2025), which established specific requirements for administrative review of special exceptions and other BZA processes.

Notably, PC 1044 does not reference or call out the BZA at any point; its focus is on the administrative development plan review process involving professional staff, the planning commission, and the governing body. Communities should consult with legal counsel regarding whether any BZA-administered process could be interpreted as falling within the scope of PC 1044's requirements.

SECTION 13 | WHAT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SHOULD DO NOW

Q24 What steps should local governments take to prepare before January 1, 2027?

CLP recommends the following seven steps to prepare:

- 1. Designate a Development Administrator** — Assign a single point of contact with cross-departmental authority to coordinate all review timelines.
- 2. Require Pre-Submittal Meetings** — Ensure applicants receive guidance before formal filing to reduce deficiency cycles.
- 3. Document the Administrative Review Process** — Create a clear, written workflow with assigned responsibilities and internal deadline tracking.
- 4. Coordinate Review Teams** — Planners, road superintendents, utility agencies, building departments, engineers, and stormwater administrators must work closely to meet the 30-day comment window.
- 5. Train Staff on New Requirements** — Ensure all reviewers understand the 30/60/120-day deadlines, the 2-notice cap, and automatic approval consequences.
- 6. Update Subdivision Regulations** — Review and amend local regulations to align with PC 1044's procedures and timelines.
- 7. Establish Surety Tracking Systems** — Implement tracking for bond/surety release timelines, engineer certifications, and 20-day written response requirements.

SECTION 14 | ADDITIONAL WEBINAR QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

Q25 We often rezone with a master plan. Does the law apply if rezoning WITH a Preliminary Master Development Plan?

The law does not consider legislative actions such as rezonings as there can be no automatic approval of a legislative act.

Q26 If a comment is not made on a fire plan review in 30 business days, is it auto approved?

Any plans and materials that are considered as part of the development application must have some form of comment within 30 days, or it will be automatically approved. Fire review has separate timeframes and doesn't fall under this rule unless you are making comments that deal with the development application for review.

Q27 Does this include Building Construction Drawings/Plans - or is this only for site plan issues

Only Site Plans and other Development Plans. Plans connected to building permits are governed under different state law. Those reviews are held to a 10-day review standard per the International Code Council.

Q28 Does this apply to construction permits that do not involve a Board?

Yes.

Q29 Can the potential for a 50% fee refund be considered justification for additional application fees? For municipalities that utilize third party consultants, that 60-day denial after noted deficiencies does not negate the cost incurred by the municipality.

No. The 50% refund requirement does not constitute grounds to increase fees. Our recommendation would be to send the application to the PC instead of denying at the administrative level.

Q30 Since the term "complete application" is potentially subjective, does this need to be defined within a regulatory ordinance or resolution?

Yes TCA code includes a provision under the Vested Rights Act giving cities and counties the ability to define what is included as substantially complete or compliant submittal.

Q31 Can someone define development (development review, development plan, or similar) as it pertains to this statute? Would it mean all things required to go before a planning commission or admin review? Or is there a criterion it must reach?

"Development" for the purposes of the statute would be any land development plan or permit application submitted pursuant to the adopted zoning code, subdivision regulations or any other adopted local government standard. It would include all site plans, preliminary plats, construction plans, zoning compliance applications, land disturbance permits, and all site inspections conducted pursuant to those plans.

Q32 How would you charge for the time spent reviewing plans or plats to ensure the applicant is meeting requirements? If we do not charge up front, then our time spent on that review for compliance is paid for by taxpayers. Our Council and Mayor are determined to ensure developers are paying their share of the cost of our time for development.

Public Chapter 140, which was adopted by the General Assembly in 2025 and became effective in July 2026, requires that local governments document and provide justification for all development fees they charge. The act also requires that local governments document the cost basis for those fees. In setting your fees, you should conduct an analysis of the time that goes into different application types. The Center for Local Planning can provide template spreadsheets that show examples of how these cost bases can be calculated.

Q33 Is there a statutory timeframe if an item is Conditionally Approved by Planning Commission in which the developer must have final revised documents submitted for issuance of a final approval by the City?

No, there is no such requirement in state law. We would recommend that your local regulations provide a reasonable timeframe for submittal of revised plans. 60 or 90 days is a reasonable amount of time.

Q34 Who pays for the independent engineer?

They are paid for by the developer/property owner

Q 35 We require a one-year warranty for all public improvements in the City. We do not have a development project contract; the amount is noted on the plat. Will this prevent us from having a one-year warranty if a third-party engineer deems the work complete?

CLP's interpretation is that maintenance bonds defined by city/county regulations are still authorized since maintenance bonds are different from performance type bonds. Confirm with your legal representative.

Q36 So improvements already being constructed and awaiting inspections, does this not apply? It's only for improvements approved for installation AFTER January 1?

Our interpretation is that since the PC 1044 effective date is 1-1-2027, then projects ongoing prior to that date would be under existing defined regulations with plan approval and permit process.

Q37 Can the "independent engineer" be the design engineer, or does the government need to retain a 3rd party engineer?

The independent engineer is one that is hired by the owner/developer. The local government is not authorized by the statute to hire the indicated "independent engineer."

Q38 Often we'll have developers submit development plans with all documents filled out in accordance with the requirements but with significant holes in the plans to include permitted or inadequate design information for review verification. We'll receive these plans but won't uncover the shortcomings until days later. Are those types of submissions still permissible to be deemed incomplete?

If you have a checklist and are very clear as to what is missing, then yes, you can deny the submittal as incomplete. That said, we would not recommend rejecting applications based on routine issues or errors made by the surveyor or engineer. Take note that if the local government has accepted the application as complete then they have to meet the deadlines established by PC 1044.

Q39 So our city requires bonds for various things (stormwater, sidewalk, paving) - I didn't understand fully about the independent engineer. Can our consulting engineer certify the things are done or would it be on the developer's dime to get his own?

This is only required if you have a development contract for bonds and surety. But the owner/developer would hire and submit the report in that instance. PC 1044 gives the developer the option to hire a 3rd party engineer to certify that work is complete.

Q40 How do variance requests work with this process (for example buffer variance or floodplain variance)? Since these are required to be handled usually with a board that may not meet frequently, would the recommendation this be a condition of approval?

If the variance affects the community's ability to approve the plans and meet the deadlines, then they must have prior approval from the applicable review body (such as BZA, Stormwater Appeals Board, etc). We do not recommend Planning Commission approval of an application contingent upon obtaining a variance from some other review body.

Q41 Should we start charging for each inspection we do so we can just deny it and return 50% of the fee? Our inspections fees are typically charged prior to the preconstruction meeting so there has not historically been a charge for something like a failed proof roll - we have several that have close to 10 failed proof rolls because they just aren't ready

No, we would not recommend that approach.

Q42 So the Planning Commission will have to rule on whether or not a road is constructed correctly, for example?

CLP's opinion is that this could be the case for site inspection requests if the inspection is not approved or denied by city/county staff and the item is placed on the Planning Commission's agenda as per the statute.

Q43 So if the developer doesn't complete issues identified by our engineer, and we start the 60-day clock, this issue goes back before the PC. What does the PC do? Or is the point returning to the PC simply to allow this information to be captured in meeting minutes?

The PC can deny the project, or they can approve with conditions to be met by engineer. Following the revision of the plans to meet all imposed conditions, staff may issue permits.

Q44 Does 1044 apply to our stormwater permit reviews as part of our MS4 through TDEC?

Our opinion is that yes, storm water designs are included under PC 1044.

Q45 Should the jurisdiction create a new board to review plan review and inspection decisions?

No, the statute stipulates that these reviews must go to the Planning Commission or governing body.

Q46 Will the independent engineer have to be vetted by the jurisdictional staff?

PC 1044 only requires that the "independent engineer" be a state licensed professional engineer. The local government may not impose additional qualifications or requirements.

Q47 Can you provide Public Chapter # reference for 10-day approval for Building and other related trade permits? Also, is it recommended to process review fee payment before or after the review is complete?

Yes, pursuant to TCA 68-120-101. It would be recommended that fees be accepted after a sufficiency review has been conducted and the application has been determined to substantially comply with local requirements.

Q48 Shouldn't Independent Professional Architects confirm building construction, and Independent Landscape Architects confirm Landscape Construction / Landscape Plant Installation?

CLP's recommendation is that this would be a local administration decision regarding the final inspection process. PC 1044 only requires that an independent professional engineer may certify that a particular project has been completed in accordance with an approved contract between the developer and the local government.

Q49 If a plan is "auto approved" due to time, does the city still need to affix their approval stamp on the plans? If yes, I'm assuming we would be adding some sort of "hold harmless" type clause.

CLP recommends for recording keeping purposes to include a notation on plans that have been automatically approved in accordance with PC 1044 to indicate that they may not meet all local requirements. Consult with your attorney, as this is new territory.

Q50 How do factors in state and/or federal review, as their timeline may not align with this proposed timeline?

Plans can be approved contingent upon obtaining state and federal approvals. Or alternatively, the local government could require these approvals to be in hand prior to plan acceptance.

Q51 Despite diligent reviews, there's always issues that we end up catching during the construction phase of the project. Is there anything with this law that prohibits us from enforcing corrections in line with our regulations and ordinances even after plans have been approved?

PC 1044 is silent on this point, and you may wish to consult with your attorney on this topic, as requiring the developer to deviate from approved plans could result in legal questions.

Q52 Do you need to include resolved staff comments/deficiencies in the staff report to the Planning Commission?

CLP's recommends as a best practice to include these items in the staff report.

Q53 Will a city be able to charge the current adopted application fee for the review board or does this law require us to wave that fee in these instances?

The fee would be for the application type (preliminary plat, site plan, etc.). We would not recommend charging an additional fee if the item later needs to go to the planning commission or governing body.

Q54 Will this engineer be on site during all construction activities? How will they certify compaction/sub-base, utilities after the roads are constructed and the pipes covered?

CLP recommends the site inspection process expectations be discussed in detail during the project pre-construction meeting. PC 1044 does not indicate that the independent third-party engineer needs to be present at any time during construction in order to certify that the project has been completed in accordance with the contract between the developer and the local government.

Q55 In a previous webinar it was stated that construction plans, construction permits, trade permits must be justified per PC 140. Today it was stated that those are not intended for PC 1044. Do they have to be justified?

All development related permit fees, including building permits and construction plans, must be justified, and their cost basis provided per Public Chapter 140. Building and trade inspections are not covered by PC 1044 as there is a separate portion of state law that governs the timelines for those.

Q56 Can these actions go to an AHO (administrative hearing officer)

The statute requires that the items it addresses must either go to the planning commission or governing body.

Q57 Are planned unit developments (PUDs) considered legislative and exempt from this?

Yes, they likely would be, since there is no automatic approval of a legislative act, such as one requiring an amendment to the zoning map or ordinance. That said, a site plan or preliminary plat related to a PUD would be subject to PC 1044.

Q58 Does PC 1044 apply to a Concept Plan for a proposed subdivision?

Yes, if your Subdivision regulations require a Conceptual Plan approval, PC 1044 would apply.

Q59 Does PC1 1044 apply to a Concept Plan required for a Rezoning Request?

No, rezoning requests are legislative acts that cannot be automatically approved. Take note that requiring a concept plan for a "straight rezone" request (not part of a PUD) would not be recommended at all as it may appear to be a form of "contract zoning." The local community cannot hold an applicant to the Concept Plan as part of the "straight rezoning" application. The landowner may change and plans may change.

KEY STATUTORY REFERENCES

Public Chapter 1044 (2026)	New mandatory development review deadlines; effective January 1, 2027.
T.C.A. § 7-51-2204	Development application review timelines and procedures (new).
T.C.A. § 13-3-401 / § 13-4-301	Planning enabling legislation (Regional/County and Municipal).
T.C.A. § 13-3-404 / § 13-4-304	Procedure upon submission of plats; 60-day approval/disapproval requirement.
Public Chapter 465 (2025)	BZA administrative review of special exceptions framework.

Need Assistance?

The Center for Local Planning stands ready to provide advice to local governments as they work to comply with these statutory requirements by improving meeting practices, updating Rules of Procedure (Bylaws), and creating updated internal processes.

planning@tennessee.edu | clp.ips.tennessee.edu

UT Center for Local Planning | Institute for Public Service

Josh Suddath, AICP, CFM | Executive Director

Addam McCormick, AICP | Senior Division Planner, Middle Tennessee

Ambre M. Torbett, AICP | Senior Division Planner, East Tennessee

Jordan McKenzie, AICP | Senior Division Planner, West Tennessee

Shelia Huffmire | MTAS Public Works Consultant, Middle Tennessee