

SUMMARY STATEMENT
Crookham v. Canyon County
Docket No. 52514

Petitioners 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. They challenge the Board's approval of a conditional rezoning application submitted by the Judith A. Gross Trust and Douglas Gross for 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 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 has previously conducted business on the Gross property. Petitioners 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 ruled that the Petitioners lack standing to challenge the Board's approval of the rezoning application. Applying the Idaho Supreme Court's traditional three-part standing inquiry, the district court found that none of the Petitioners demonstrated a concrete injury resulting from the rezoning and that the alleged harms were neither redressable nor particularized to the individual Petitioners.

On appeal, Petitioners argue that allegations of injury need not articulate the precise impact of an anticipated injury, and that their allegations of injury are sufficiently plead to establish standing, contrary to the district court's ruling. Petitioners further argue that the district court erred in declining to consider their allegations of injury under the Local Land Use Planning Act's ("LLUPA") "affected person" standard instead of the traditional standing inquiry.

The Idaho Supreme Court reversed the district court and remanded for it to determine whether Petitioners have standing to challenge the Gross rezoning under LLUPA's 'affected person' standard. The Court held that, by enacting LLUPA, the Idaho Legislature exercised its power to define the appellate jurisdiction of Idaho's district courts, and that LLUPA's affected person standard therefore displaces the Court's traditional standing doctrine, which is merely a self-imposed constraint.

******This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court, but has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.******