B.

Shirley Dufresne also contends that, because her 1990 child lot application was approved by the Planning Board, the Board should be estopped from denying the 2007 pre-preliminary plan. Nevertheless, the 1990 child lot application expired, and the 2007 pre-preliminary plan differed in configuration and planning. The 1990 pre-preliminary plan divided the farm into eight lots; the 2007 pre-preliminary plan proposed three lots in different locations. After the passage of seventeen years, it was appropriate for the Planning Board to reevaluate a proposed pre-preliminary plan.

In addition, "zoning estoppel" is inapplicable here because Dufresne has not demonstrated any action taken in reliance on the Board's previous approval, which she herself allowed to lapse. *See Sycamore Realty Co. v. People's Counsel*, 344 Md. 57, 64 (1996).[3]

II. Forest Conservation Plan

As part of the subdivision approval process, the Planning Board also reviews whether a subdivision complies with Montgomery County Code's objectives regarding "conservation

---

[3]"The traditional, 'black-letter' definition of zoning estoppel is:

'A local government exercising its zoning powers will be estopped when a property owner,

(1) relying in good faith,

(2) upon some act or omission of the government,

(3) has made such a substantial change in position or incurred such extensive obligations and expenses that it would be highly inequitable and unjust to destroy the rights which he ostensibly had acquired.'"

Sycamore Realty Co. v. People's Counsel, 344 Md. 57, 64 (1996)(citations omitted).