

*CHAPTER 8*  
***POTENTIAL MASTER  
 PLAN GOALS***

The survey asked respondents to rate the importance of potential goals for the master plan process. The following table shows the results of this series of questions ranking elements in descending order by the percentage who found each “very important.”

Potential Goal	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
Protecting the environment	80.3%	17.1%	2.6%	0.0%
Developing neighborhood quality of life	80.2%	15.0%	3.3%	1.6%
Improving pedestrian access and safety	78.0%	16.9%	4.8%	0.3%
Encouraging downtown revitalization	76.7%	16.5%	4.5%	2.4%
Promoting economic growth	69.9%	24.2%	3.9%	2.0%
Expanding cultural and entertainment opportunities	63.8%	30.6%	3.6%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings and places	51.7%	39.6%	6.9%	1.8%
Providing more park and recreation facilities	50.3%	38.3%	9.9%	1.5%
Improving access to public transportation	47.8%	35.1%	15.6%	1.5%
Expanding housing opportunities	39.1%	36.9%	19.1%	4.8%

These results are very interesting because respondents were not asked to rank the various goals in relation to each other but have essentially done this. Their responses are consistent with their views of the community indicated by the answers to other questions. For example, the categories with the least support are those which Silver Spring already does well: provision of parks and recreation facilities, public transportation, and affordable housing. (Although “expanding housing opportunities” could mean adding more expensive housing as well as affordable housing, most people appear to interpret it as referring to affordable housing, which is currently widely available in the area.) Revitalization and economic growth are goals that are particularly relevant to Silver Spring and might be much less popular in other areas of the County.

The four master plan areas each had slightly different results. The top two “very important” goal areas are listed below for each master plan area.

North Silver Spring: “Encouraging downtown revitalization,” 86.6%  
“Improving pedestrian access and safety,” 83.1%

CBD: “Encouraging downtown revitalization,” 83.9%  
“Developing neighborhood quality of life,” 80.6%

East Silver Spring and Takoma Park: “Protecting the environment,” 82.7%  
“Developing neighborhood quality of life,” 80.0%

West Silver Spring: “Encouraging downtown revitalization,” 83.3%  
“Developing neighborhood quality of life,” 81.6%

**Table 8-1 Rate potential goals for master plan - expanding housing opportunities**

Question 8.7	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	425	24.7%	1128	44.5%	4520	44.3%	491	21.3%	6565	39.1%
Somewhat important	629	36.6%	980	38.7%	3511	34.4%	1069	46.3%	6189	36.9%
Not at all important	552	32.1%	427	16.8%	1619	15.8%	613	26.6%	3211	19.1%
Don't know	111	6.5%			563	5.5%	135	5.8%	810	4.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1716</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2536</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10214</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2308</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16775</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-2 Rate potential goals for master plan - protecting the environment**

Question 8.71	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	1390	81.7%	1791	70.5%	7786	82.7%	1679	80.0%	12645	80.3%
Somewhat important	250	14.7%	652	25.6%	1413	15.0%	381	18.1%	2696	17.1%
Not at all important	54	3.2%	99	3.9%	214	2.3%	40	1.9%	407	2.6%
Don't know	8	.5%							8	.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1702</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2541</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9413</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2099</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15755</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-3 Rate potential goals for master plan - promoting economic growth**

Question 8.72	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	1245	71.2%	2103	74.9%	6391	68.2%	1458	69.9%	11197	69.9%
Somewhat important	410	23.4%	542	19.3%	2437	26.0%	488	23.4%	3877	24.2%
Not at all important	76	4.3%	33	1.2%	428	4.6%	84	4.0%	621	3.9%
Don't know	18	1.0%	131	4.7%	109	1.2%	57	2.7%	316	2.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1749</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2810</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9365</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2087</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16010</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Greater Washington Consumer Research, "Survey of Silver Spring/Takoma Park Residents" (1/98); Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Department of Park & Planning.

**Table 8-4 Rate potential goals for master plan - providing more park and recreation facilities**

Question 8.73	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	603	34.3%	1074	40.9%	5430	56.3%	1054	47.8%	8162	50.3%
Somewhat important	887	50.4%	1090	41.5%	3225	33.4%	1021	46.3%	6223	38.3%
Not at all important	245	13.9%	362	13.8%	884	9.2%	118	5.4%	1609	9.9%
Don't know	24	1.3%	99	3.8%	109	1.1%	11	.5%	243	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1759</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2624</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2205</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16237</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-5 Rate potential goals for master plan - expanding cultural and entertainment opportunities**

Question 8.75	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		Eas SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	963	60.6%	1545	63.7%	6359	66.0%	1186	56.1%	10053	63.8%
Somewhat important	582	36.6%	750	30.9%	2683	27.9%	808	38.2%	4823	30.6%
Not at all important	24	1.5%	131	5.4%	321	3.3%	88	4.2%	564	3.6%
Don't know	21	1.3%			266	2.8%	32	1.5%	320	2.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1590</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2426</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9628</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2115</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15760</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-6 Rate potential goals for master plan - developing neighborhood quality of life**

Question 8.76	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	1408	79.5%	2043	80.6%	7756	80.0%	1740	81.6%	12947	80.2%
Somewhat important	251	14.2%	329	13.0%	1569	16.2%	265	12.4%	2414	15.0%
Not at all important	38	2.1%	66	2.6%	321	3.3%	101	4.7%	525	3.3%
Don't know	74	4.2%	99	3.9%	55	.6%	26	1.2%	253	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1771</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2536</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9700</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2131</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16138</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Greater Washington Consumer Research, "Survey of Silver Spring/Takoma Park Residents" (1/98); Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Department of Park & Planning.

**Table 8-7 Rate potential goals for master plan - improving pedestrian access and safety**

Question 8.77	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	1511	83.1%	1802	79.1%	8116	76.5%	1859	80.1%	13288	78.0%
Somewhat important	275	15.1%	362	15.9%	1903	17.9%	337	14.5%	2876	16.9%
Not at all important	24	1.3%	99	4.3%	592	5.6%	101	4.3%	815	4.8%
Don't know	8	.4%	16	.7%			23	1.0%	47	.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1818</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2319</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17026</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-8 Rate potential goals for master plan - improving access to public transportation**

Question 8.78	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	672	39.7%	1347	52.3%	5086	48.0%	992	47.5%	8097	47.8%
Somewhat important	574	33.9%	734	28.5%	3816	36.0%	820	39.3%	5945	35.1%
Not at all important	392	23.2%	460	17.9%	1531	14.4%	264	12.6%	2647	15.6%
Don't know	54	3.2%	33	1.3%	162	1.5%	11	.5%	260	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2574</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10595</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2087</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16949</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8-9 Rate potential goals for master plan - encouraging downtown revitalization**

Question 8.79	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Very important	1573	86.6%	1879	83.9%	7844	72.2%	1831	83.3%	13126	76.7%
Somewhat important	204	11.2%	329	14.7%	2000	18.4%	296	13.5%	2828	16.5%
Not at all important	24	1.3%			703	6.5%	37	1.7%	764	4.5%
Don't know	16	.9%	33	1.5%	321	3.0%	34	1.6%	404	2.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1816</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2240</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10868</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2198</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17122</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Greater Washington Consumer Research, "Survey of Silver Spring/Takoma Park Residents" (1/98); Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Department of Park & Planning.

**Table 8-10 Rate potential goals for master plan - preserving historic buildings and places.**

Question 8.8	Assigned Master Plan Area								Total	
	North Silver Sp		SS CBD		East SS & TP		West Silver Sp		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Very important	810	45.5%	1457	55.0%	5045	52.3%	1243	49.9%	8555	51.7%
Somewhat important	771	43.3%	937	35.3%	3926	40.7%	930	37.3%	6564	39.6%
Not at all important	182	10.3%	159	6.0%	508	5.3%	295	11.8%	1145	6.9%
Don't know	16	.9%	99	3.7%	162	1.7%	23	.9%	299	1.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1779</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2651</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9641</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2491</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Greater Washington Consumer Research, "Survey of Silver Spring/Takoma Park Residents" (1/98); Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Department of Park & Planning.