

BOISE, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2025, AT 11:10 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

GEORGE CROOKHAM, an individual;)
CROOKHAM COMPANY, an Idaho)
corporation; JOHN HOADLEY, an)
individual; and RON AMAREL, an)
individual,)

Petitioners-Appellants,)

v.)

COUNTY OF CANYON and CANYON)
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,)
a political subdivision of the State of Idaho,)

Respondents.)

Docket No. 52514

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District of the State of Idaho,
Canyon County. Brent L. Whiting, District Judge.

Sawtooth Law Offices, PLLC, Boise, for Appellants.

Chris Boyd, Canyon County Prosecuting Attorney, Caldwell, for Respondents.

Petitioners-Appellants are engaged in various agribusinesses in Canyon County and appeal a district court decision denying their petition for judicial review of a zoning decision by the Canyon County Board of County Commissioners. Plaintiffs challenge the Board's approval of a conditional rezoning application submitted by the Judith A. Gross Trust and Douglas Gross involving approximately 145 acres of real property in Canyon County. The Gross applicants sought to rezone the property from agricultural to light industrial but did not provide the Board with specific details regarding the property's intended future use.

Petitioners-Appellants assert that rezoning the Gross property will directly harm their businesses by reducing the amount of agricultural land in Canyon County and, in turn, reducing demand for the goods and services they provide to local agricultural producers. At least one Petitioner-Appellant has previously conducted business on the Gross property. Petitioners-Appellants further contend that industrial development of the property will negatively affect local conditions necessary to support farming operations, thereby indirectly reducing demand for their products and services.

The district court concluded that Petitioners-Appellants lack standing to challenge the Board's approval of the rezoning application. The court found that none of the Petitioners-Appellants demonstrated a concrete injury resulting from the approval and that the alleged harms

were neither redressable nor particularized. On appeal, Petitioners-Appellants argue that the district court failed to adequately consider their evidence of injury to establish standing as “affected persons” under the Local Land Use Planning Act. Petitioners-Appellants further maintain that any lack of specificity in their alleged injuries stems from the Gross applicants’ failure to specify how the property will be used once rezoned to light industrial—and that, regardless of the precise use, they have shown sufficient injury to establish standing.