Many countries are experiencing population growth and need more homes. Should these new homes be constructed in existing cities or should new towns be built in the countryside?

Nowadays, population growth in many countries is basic <u>problem</u> for the governments. More people need more place to live, more home, more facilities and more infrastructures. Hence the governments must create new living <u>zone</u> in big cities to cover these demands.

In my opinion, we cannot develop existing cities while we do not think about their urban infrastructures. These substructures have high priority for constructing new homes for new people, if we <u>have</u> not cover those, people will have difficulties more and more. In these cases, there <u>are not</u> the differences between <u>develop</u> the existing cities or <u>built</u> new <u>town</u>. The governments must <u>have</u> pay attention to <u>create best</u> situation in both cases for their peoples.

For example, <u>on</u> Iran, the governments makes <u>decision</u> for <u>create</u> new living <u>zone</u> in all crowded cities of <u>the</u> country to cover the growth of population that <u>called</u> "Maskan Mehr". In most <u>of</u> cities, <u>responsible</u> of these <u>idea</u>, never forecast infrastructures and just try to build more homes for peoples without <u>think</u> about their <u>comforts</u>. For example, in all of them there is lack of schools, medical center, social services and shopping center. Most of them have a long distance <u>with</u> city center. Because of these restrictions, most of <u>the residences residents</u> are dissatisfied.

Anyway, I think we could develop cities just when we produce <u>an</u>urban master plan. We must think for the future generation<u>s</u>, we should not see today. Looking to the future, <u>we must</u> create new zone<u>s</u> with <u>a</u> master plan <u>which</u> can guarantee future life, future development and future construction. Without them we can bring the cities to ruin<u>s</u>.