

In some cities people can build and design homes and office buildings however they like. This is preferable to having strict controls over the design and construction of housing and office buildings.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Whether people should build and design their own homes in their city or give it to the city's authorities by applying restrictions is a controversial issue. Actually, I advocate the idea of designing homes by their owners.

First ~~if-of~~ all, increasing the belonging sense to their homes, citizens are permitted to design their own buildings. Consequently, these people will maintain their houses in a better way than ones ~~that are endured~~ tough controls over build of their housing.

Another advantage is variety which can improve the appearance of the city. Although diversity in immense degree could have visual turbulence, it causes beauty and manifestation of the individual identity in the city in a balanced way. Moreover, this way leads to more creativity, so that the various styles of architecture, forms and materials have a chance to apply.

Besides, although imposing strict restrictions on the designing of the buildings leads to ~~a~~ harmony in the city, not only can it ~~may~~ give rise to a monotonous urban landscape, for instance, the same rhythm for all the facades, shapes and forms of the buildings, but also, it can ~~it~~ neglect the tastes of ~~the different strata stratum~~ of society.

To put it in ~~the-a~~ nutshell, I personally opine that if cities can experience unity and plurality simultaneously, they ~~would-will~~ change into ~~the-a~~ more responsive environment for living. It means, authorities can apply the overall regulations and codes which control constructions and methods of building for observing the standards, ~~in-at~~ the same time, citizens can build their homes ~~whatever-however~~ they want but in the defined framework.