



Town of _____

Micanopy
Florida

Citizen Appeal Application Form

Town of Micanopy – Application for Town Commission Review of a Planning & Historic Preservation Board Decision

(Section 10.13, Land Development Code)

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name: Michael D. Roberts
Mailing Address: 551 Seminary Ave.
City/State/ZIP: Micanopy, FL 32667
Email: yucon@bellsouth.net
Phone: 352 234 0066

STATUS AS AN “AGGRIEVED PERSON”

(Required under LDC §10.13.02)

Please check **one** that applies:

- I am the applicant** for the project that was decided by the Planning & Historic Preservation Board.
- I reside within 400 feet** of the subject property **and**
- I submitted written comments at the PHPB hearing, **or**
 - I provided oral comments at the PHPB hearing.
- I am a Town Commissioner.**

706 NE Cholokka Blvd.
PO Box 137, Micanopy, FL 32667-0137
(352) 466-3121 Town Hall (352) 466-4912 Fax
townhall@micanopytown.com

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: MACS School Expansion
Project Location / Parcel ID: 16808-002-000&16520-067-000
Type of Approval Appealed (check one):
 Preliminary Site Plan
 Final Site Plan
 Special Use Permit
 Variance
 Lot Split
 Other (describe): _____

Date of PHPB Decision: _____

STATEMENT OF APPEAL

(Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Please describe specifically **what aspect of the PHPB decision you are appealing** and the basis for your appeal:

See attached

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Your submission **must include:**

- 1. This completed appeal application.
- 2. Any supporting documents you wish the Town Commission to consider.
- 3. A copy of any written comments you submitted to the PHPB (if applicable).

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the information provided is true and correct, and that I am filing this appeal **within 20 calendar days** of the final PHPB hearing as required by LDC §10.13.03(B).

Signature: _____
Date: _____

706 NE Chokolka Blvd.
PO Box 137, Micanopy, FL 32667-0137
(352) 466-3121 Town Hall (352) 466-4912 Fax
townhall@micanopytown.com

Mike Roberts Appeal of Site Plan Approval for MACS
December 16, 2025

The approved site plan for the MACS does not comply with the Micanopy Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code because the site design is too crowded and the school facility is oversized for the site. The site plan does not comply with the applicable school safety standards and requirements necessary to protect the safety and welfare of the students, staff and citizens of the Town of Micanopy. The school site is inadequate for the size of the facility and approved number of students for the school. The size and capacity of the approved school use is disproportionate to the needs, legal jurisdiction, and population of the Town of Micanopy. The intensity of development on this site unreasonably burdens the citizens of Micanopy with excessive traffic and safety impacts, and unreasonably diminishes the quality of life for the residents of Micanopy. The site plan does not adequately protect the adjacent residential uses from the noise, traffic, and light impacts of the school use. See attached documents in support of this appeal.

Questions

1) The MACS R-2 lot is half of the original platted lot 67 in Smith's subdivision which had already been split prior to 2023. Why was the MACS R-2 lot allowed to be split again in 2023 into even smaller lots without a replat and without meeting the minimum lot size requirements for an R-2 Zoning District.

2) How can you approve a Special Use for the R-2 lot when it fails to meet the required standards for special Use approval, specifically the R-2 lot does not meet the minimum lot size and was split in violation of the lot split code requirements and the R-2 minimum lot size requirements?

3) How can you allow a commercial waste water utility and commercial driveway on an R-2 lot when neither are allowed as of right principal uses, accessory uses, or special uses permitted in an R-2 Zoning District?

4) If the septic drainfield system is not an accessory use as per the Town Attorney's opinion letter, then isn't it a prohibited use?

5) How can MACS increase the size of the building by 249 square feet after the preliminary site plan approval with a smaller building. This was not an approved condition in the preliminary site plan hearing. The smaller building was approved "as presented" with no further changes allowed.

6) Why doesn't the new site plan show the setbacks for the R-2 lot as required by the Code's requirements for a complete site plan application?

NEXT PAGE

7) How can you approve a special use for an off site gravel parking lot drive not permitted in an R-2 Zoning District through when the Code requires a hardened surface for parking facilities?

8) How can you approve a site plan with a septic system designed for 100 students when the previous site plans were designed and previously approved for only 57 students?

9) Why can't you protect the abutting residential uses from traffic disruption, and light and noise pollution by requiring larger buffers and tall solid fencing???

10) Why can't you protect the mounded drainfield from parking and vehicle traffic by requiring a solid barrier separating the drainfield from the gravel drive turnaround?