Restoration of old <u>building</u> in main cities involves enormous government expenditure. It would be more beneficial to spend this money to build new houses and roads. To what extent do you agree or disagree? Give reasons for your answer and include examples from your own experience?

The issue of constructing a new building or refurbishing the old <u>one</u> has sparked a heated debate among researchers some of whom assume that we had better allocate certain <u>amount</u> of budget to building a new home and road rather than repairing the old <u>one</u>. From my point of view, if we reformed our existing constructions, it would be of great benefit, and I wholeheartedly agree with the group claiming that restoration is significantly more beneficial.

First and foremost, building a new home <u>is consist</u> of extortionate costs, for the builder <u>need</u> to spend huge sums of money on purchasing <u>resources</u> such as stone, brick and metals. By contrast, in refurbishing an old one the doer can save old instruments and they just need to be fixed. In other words, by restoring an old building we in fact transform otherwise useless items to last longer and effective tools, <u>thereby</u> the government enjoys saving more money and even grows capable of developing or building roads too.

On the other hand, some others assert that design of newly built homes is predicated on cost-efficient ways of constructing, hence their wasting less energy. In this way, the owner should consume less energy to make their accommodation cool or <u>heat</u> which is much more environmentally friendly and energy-efficient. Last but not least, these places are more adaptable to new generations' ideas and their life styles. For instance, in the past most families <u>consist</u> of three or more children as opposed to now when they mostly prefer to have merely one charge.

On the whole, I once again reaffirm my position regarding the opinion that reforming an old building is better <u>that</u> constructing a new one.