

# Bond Case Briefs

*Municipal Finance Law Since 1971*

---

## **ZONING & PLANNING - IDAHO**

### **City of Ririe v. Gilgen**

**Supreme Court of Idaho, Boise, February 2022 Term - August 9, 2022 - P.3d - 2022 WL 3206113**

City petitioned for judicial review of decision of county board of commissioners to grant applicant a conditional use permit that allowed her to place mobile home on her property located in city's area of impact and sought declaratory relief.

After county filed notice of non-objection, the Seventh Judicial District Court granted petition, remanded the matter, and denied applicant's motions for reconsideration. Applicant appealed, and city cross-appealed.

The Supreme Court held that:

- City was required to file separate declaratory judgment action in order to obtain declaratory relief;
- City was not "affected person" allowed to seek judicial review under Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) of board's decision;
- Appropriate remedy for city to enforce county's compliance with area of impact agreement adopted pursuant to LLUPA was to file original civil action; and
- City acted without reasonable basis in fact or law, such that applicant, as prevailing party on appeal, would be awarded appellate attorney fees.

In order to obtain declaratory relief, city was required to file separate declaratory judgment action, instead of attempting to request such declaratory relief in its petition for judicial review of decision of county board of commissioners to grant applicant a conditional use permit that allowed her to place mobile home on her property located in city's area of impact; civil actions and administrative appeals were processed differently by the courts and governed by different standards.

Counties and city governments are considered "local governing bodies" rather than "agencies" for purposes of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which is intended to govern judicial review of decisions made by agencies, not local governing bodies.

City was not "affected person" allowed to seek judicial review under Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) of decision of county board of commissioners to grant applicant a conditional use permit that allowed her to place mobile home on her property located within city's area of impact; city did not have bona fide interest in real property outside city limits as it had no jurisdiction over such property.

Appropriate remedy for city to enforce county's compliance with area of impact agreement adopted pursuant to Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) was to file original civil action, not to file petition for judicial review of decision of county board of commissioners to grant applicant a conditional use permit that allowed her to place mobile home on her property located within city's area of impact; LLUPA did not allow city to petition for judicial review as city did not have bona fide interest in real property outside city limits, but LLUPA allowed governing board, defined as city council or board of

county commissioners, to institute civil action to enforce compliance with any ordinance enacted pursuant to LLUPA.

City acted without reasonable basis in fact or law in petitioning for judicial review of decision of county board of commissioners to grant applicant a conditional use permit that allowed her to place mobile home on her property located in city's area of impact and in requesting declaratory relief in same petition, such that applicant, as prevailing party on appeal, would be awarded appellate attorney fees, although city defended position that was accepted by district court judge; Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) did not authorize city to bring action as "affected person" for judicial review, and it was settled law that action for declaratory relief could not be combined with action for judicial review.