

The Dufresnes contend, and the circuit court held, that the Planning Board “committed error” when it considered the recommendations of the AROS Master Plan as binding authority. But, even if we were to assume, *arguendo*, that the AROS Master Plan is inapplicable — and that is not our conclusion — the Dufresnes have not argued that Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance § 59-C.9.23, is also inapplicable. That ordinance, like the AROS Master Plan, places emphasis on the preservation of agricultural land. Indeed, the express terms of § 59-C.9.23 state that the “child lot option” is intended “to facilitate the continuation of the family farming unit or to otherwise meet the purposes of the RDT zone.” Section 59-C.9.23 further states that the intent of the RDT zone is to “promote agriculture as the primary land use in sections of the County designated for agricultural preservation in,” among other plans, the AROS Master Plan. *See also* Montgomery County Code § 50-35A(d) (stating that “[a]ny lot created through the minor subdivision process [which, pursuant to § 50-35A(8), includes child lots] . . . must satisfy all applicable zoning requirements in Chapter 59”). We conclude that § 59-C.9.23, by itself, provided the Planning Board with the legal authority to consider the impact of the Dufresnes’ proposed configuration of the three child lots on the preservation of agricultural land in the RDT zone.

Further, we also agree with the Planning Board’s contention that the terms of the AROS Master Plan are also binding on the Dufresnes’ pre-preliminary plan application. In *Mayor & Council of Rockville v. Rylyns Enterprises*, 372 Md. 514, 529 (2002), the Court