Delayed & Blocked Projects

Six development cases | Approval risk, scale and the route forward

The research view

The most recent cases turn on the approval process itself. Lordstown shows the importance of a complete application before rules change. Upper Merion shows a developer leaving the administrative process while litigation continues. Hood County shows that a settlement proposal can fail alongside the underlying permit appeal.

The commercial question is not simply whether a project was opposed. It is which decision stopped progress, how much of the development it affected, and what would allow it to move again.

Project	Latest selected action	Scale
Bristolville 25 / Lordstown	October 20, 2026 Court rejects mandamus	Four three-story buildings
MLP Ventures cluster	October 19, 2026 Applications withdrawn	Reported 4 million sq. ft.
Comanche Circle / Sailfish	October 13, 2026 Permit appeal denied	Multi-phase development
Project Tomahawk / White Rose	September 8, 2026 Application withdrawn	$580 million reported proposal
Highlander SM One	February 18, 2026 Planning request denied	380 MW proposed power
Pacifico / Fort Spunky	March 10, 2026 Concept plan revoked	100 MW requested grid power

Capacity assessment

The selected cases contain proposed power, a grid request, floor area and multi-phase infrastructure plans. The report retains those measures separately. Highlander is 380 MW of reported proposed power; Fort Spunky is a 100 MW grid request. A combined lost-capacity headline would obscure that difference.

Case histories

Recent decisions and development implications

Bristolville 25 / Lordstown | Lordstown, Ohio

October 20, 2026 / Court rejects mandamus / Four three-story buildings

The Ohio Supreme Court unanimously declined to compel Lordstown to process the developer's site plan under the earlier zoning rules. The applicant had begun preliminary review but had not completed the steps needed to apply for a zoning permit. The village moratorium extends through the remainder of 2026.

Land was acquired in February 2025. A draft plan arrived in October 2025, followed by a November ban. The village replaced the ban with a six-month moratorium in January 2026 and subsequently extended it.

RegLayer assessment. Filing early did not secure the entitlement route. The critical exposure is the gap between initial site-plan submission and a complete permit application. Next watchpoint: a change in the village restriction or a new legal route.

Evidence: October 20, 2026

MLP Ventures cluster | Upper Merion, Pennsylvania

October 19, 2026 / Applications withdrawn / Reported 4 million sq. ft.

MLP Ventures and Brian O'Neill withdrew applications for a large King of Prussia data center cluster after summer rejections. The October 21 zoning hearing was canceled. Patch reported that separate litigation against the township remained pending.

The proposal involved multiple properties around Renaissance Boulevard, Horizon Drive and Swedeland Road. The latest withdrawal follows the earlier rejection and appeal process, rather than an initial screening decision.

RegLayer assessment. The administrative applications have exited the hearing queue, but the legal dispute remains the next source of potential change. Treat the cluster as one development program for this comparison; a parcel-level dataset would retain each application separately.

Evidence: October 19, 2026

Case histories

Project-level evidence and follow-through

Comanche Circle / Sailfish | Hood County, Texas

October 13, 2026 / Permit appeal denied / Multi-phase development

County commissioners denied the permit appeal and rejected a proposed settlement by a 3-1 vote. The action preserves a local approval obstacle for the Comanche Circle development after sustained opposition.

The public record uses several large power figures across different phases and related infrastructure: an earlier 5 GW masterplan, a 600 MW supply figure and a 2 GW generation proposal. Those describe different assets and development scopes.

RegLayer assessment. This is a significant siting and approval dispute, not a clean 5 GW capacity loss. The useful next evidence is a revised permit route, a court order or a settlement that changes the county decision.

Evidence: October 13, 2026

Project Tomahawk / White Rose | Prosper, Texas

September 8, 2026 / Application withdrawn / $580 million reported proposal

White Rose Partners withdrew the rezoning and comprehensive-plan amendment for its proposed data center. The withdrawal followed a planning commission recommendation against the project and resident opposition, before a final council decision.

The reported proposal occupied about 37 acres. The planning commission opposed it unanimously on September 1; the application was withdrawn the following week.

RegLayer assessment. The withdrawn land-use requests are the actionable setback. Monitor a resubmission or an alternative site, rather than carrying the abandoned application forward as an active entitlement case.

Evidence: September 8, 2026

Case histories

Project-level evidence and follow-through

Highlander SM One | San Marcos, Texas

February 18, 2026 / Planning request denied / 380 MW proposed power

Council voted 5-2 against the preferred-scenario-map request. The approximately $1.5 billion proposal envisaged five data center buildings, reported at roughly 76 MW each, on a roughly 200-acre site.

The vote occurred amid heavy public participation. The requested planning change was a necessary part of the applicant's chosen development route; the adverse decision therefore matters before construction or occupancy could become the relevant milestone.

RegLayer assessment. This case supplies a documented scale figure for a policy-driven setback: 380 MW of proposed power. Follow any revised land-use application and the parcel's subsequent planning history before assigning a recovery date.

Evidence: February 18, 2026

Pacifico / Fort Spunky | Hood County, Texas

March 10, 2026 / Concept plan revoked / 100 MW requested grid power

The project's concept plan was revoked after denial of water service. The sequence shows how an infrastructure decision can undermine the land-use path even when the development has previously moved through a local planning step.

Reporting identifies a 100 MW grid-power request. Water access, county decision-making and opposition sit together in the history; the request is a useful scale indicator, while the delivery schedule depends on a viable service and approval route.

RegLayer assessment. A new water-service arrangement would be an important recovery signal, but it would still need to be paired with a renewed local approval path. This is a service-linked siting setback, distinct from a financing failure.

Evidence: March 10, 2026