

The city council's decision to raze four massive residential city blocks in our city center and replace them with new affordable housing is both shortsighted and too costly in both human and economic terms. A more logical and cost-effective solution to the problem of abandoned and ramshackle buildings—and an entire neighborhood in crisis—is to turn the abandoned lots on those blocks into community gardens or urban farms. Once this is accomplished, falling construction, garbage dumps, and sites for nefarious activities will be transformed into beckoning open space. Such a change will help regenerate the entire area by bringing life and beauty to a devastated urban core and by eventually sparking urban pioneering and renewal.

Write a response that discusses the questions that would have to be answered in order to further determine the reasonableness of the recommendation and the argument on which it is based. Be sure to explain how the answers to the questions would help to determine whether the argument and recommendation are reasonable.

The author of this memo claims that city council's decision is **unsubstantiated**/not **substantial**. He asserts that removing four massive residential **block** would not help to bring up the soul of city. To support this assertion he pointed out some solutions which, **on-in** his opinion, will help residents to be more active in such areas. On the basis of this evidence the author **infers** that having open space is more logical and economical. However, this argument rests on **a series** of unsubstantial assumptions, and is therefore unpersuasive as it stands.

To begin with, the memo contains no statistics and numbers to support this assumption. The author did not cite any reliable survey which can support his solutions. He did not ask any well-known residents in the area to find out the needs of individuals there. Lacking **in** such information, it is entirely possible that the abandoned accommodation has other reasons in their background. Perhaps the drug dealers fill the entire block and people have decided to move out. In that matter, wiping them out will bring safety back to area and the houses will be ready to live **in** sooner.

On the other hand, the author fails to consider possible differences between a beautiful city and livable one, **that-which** might help bring about some different **alternatives** for this situation. Gardens and urban farms are long term projects, they cannot be achieved in short time. Considering that shows his offer is limited and lends little credible support to his claim.

In short, without ruling out other possible reasons for unfinished constructions or new places for putting garbage, or new **restricted-restrictive** laws to confine the unlawful activities, **the plan** cannot convince me on the basis of open space **it** can lead to a beautiful and safe place to raise a child. Since the memo fails to account for this alternative explanation, the article's author cannot make any sound recommendations about the solutions of abandoned residential areas.

In sum, the argument is logically flawed and therefore unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen it the author must provide clear evidence that the new gardens and public places can bring life to city. To persuade me, I would like to know more statistical factors and charts to compare both proposals. It would also be **needed-necessary** to **regardconcern** the duration of either scenario of changing the places. It helps **s** better to make a sound decision. **Sound mind in a sound body**