

Building a long lasting house or providing a temporary accommodation, which one is in priority? What the answer would be, definitely, deals with the needs and the uses, in other words, the purpose why the house is built comes into consideration. Generally speaking, it would be more convincing to build houses which are guaranteed to be used a long time, on the contrary, there might be a sort of conditions that ~~a~~ cheaper and less time consuming buildings ~~is~~ are desired.

Most people, including me, prefer the best ~~instruction-construction referring with regard~~ to its planning and implementing such as the design of the house and the qualified material used. While ~~in construction of applying~~ such houses a large amount of money and time need to be spent, the result would be both convenient and precious due to its strength upon any upcoming natural disasters such as floodss or earthquakess.

Although the quality of housing has received great credit amongst individuals, when a disaster such as an earthquake occurs and leaves great numbers of people homeless what exactly is urgent could be the people to be settled. In such situations, the length of time on hand is so pressed that the only thing is providing a shelter. No longer is the design and long-lasting criterion considered and the only significant aim would ~~be getting it~~ wrapped up by using ~~prefabricated/restructured~~ materials to provide a comfortable accommodation for homeless families in a shorter time and at a cheaper price.

All in all, based on my point of view, it is relatively true to say that the purpose of housing has widely influenced ~~on~~ the way an ~~instruction-structure~~ is built. Only by the time there is some force to build the house temporarily, should the people choose the fast building matter otherwise, the more qualified the houses are, the more assured the people would be.