

The Dufresnes also contend that the Planning Board acted *ultra vires* when it found that the proposed lots should be minimized in size, because only the Montgomery County District Council may make decisions regulating the size of lots. See Md. Code, Article 28 § 8-101(b)(1). But the Planning Board did not overstep its authority in making a decision with respect to the permissible size of the child lots. “There are three integral parts of adequate land planning[:] the master plan, zoning, and subdivision regulations.” *Board of County Cmm’rs of Cecil County v. Gaster*, 285 Md. 233, 246 (1979). Like planning, zoning involves land uses, but planning is “a broader term and indicates the development of a community” *Id.* (quoting 1 E. Yokley, *Zoning Law and Practice* § 1-2 (4th ed. 1978)). The Court of Appeals has stated: “We have approved delegation to the agency administering subdivision regulations of the authority to limit density of development, where the maximum density was first fixed by the legislative body.” *West Montgomery Citizens Ass’n, et. al. v. Maryland-Nat’l Capital Park & Planning Comm’n*, 309 Md. 183, 200 (1987).

The Dufresnes state that there is no *specific* maximum set by the legislature. Nevertheless, Section 50-35A(a)(8)(d) states that “[l]ots created in the RDT Zone through the minor subdivision procedure [the “child lot” process] must not exceed an average lot size of five (5) acres in size unless approved by the Planning Board in the review of a pre-preliminary plan of subdivision.”

Moreover, part of the goal of the Master Plan and the RDT subdivision regulation sections that the Planning Board applied was to preserve and maximize agricultural uses of