

# Writing Feedback

TERM 1 2025 | DAY 2 WRITING | 15th April

---

## Section 1:

**#1 (Opening paragraph) Strengths:** Your passionate tone immediately establishes urgency and emotional appeal. Your metaphor of "economic dumpster" effectively conveys your disdain for the proposed development.

**Weakness:** Emotional overreliance → Your opening relies heavily on emotional language ("destroy," "obliterate," "meaningless, soulless") without establishing a balanced foundation for your argument. The repetition of accusatory "you are" statements may alienate council members rather than persuade them. The paragraph lacks a clear thesis statement that would frame your subsequent arguments.

**Exemplar:** *"Dear Council Members, I write with grave concern regarding the proposed demolition of our historic library to make way for a commercial development. This decision threatens to remove a vital educational resource that has served as the backbone of our community for generations, providing irreplaceable services to students, families, and vulnerable populations who depend on its resources."*

**#2 (Environmental impact paragraph) Strengths:** You connect the library issue to broader environmental concerns, which widens the scope of your argument. The rhetorical question effectively challenges readers to consider consequences.

**Weakness:** Lack of specificity → While you mention environmental concerns, you don't provide concrete evidence about the environmental impact of demolition or new construction. The paragraph makes sweeping generalizations ("Nobody wants a community with bustling townspeople...") without supporting data. The environmental claims would be stronger with specific figures about emissions, green space reduction, or comparable development impacts.

**Exemplar:** *"The proposed demolition and construction would generate approximately 350 tonnes of carbon emissions according to similar projects assessed by the Environmental Building Council, while eliminating 0.8 hectares of green space currently surrounding the library. Research from Oxford University indicates that urban developments replacing public buildings typically increase local carbon footprints by 27% in the first five years."*

**#3 (Counterargument paragraph)Strengths:** You acknowledge an opposing viewpoint about economic benefits, which demonstrates fairness. The long-term versus short-term framing creates a compelling perspective.

**Weakness:** Underdeveloped refutation → While you acknowledge the economic argument, your refutation lacks specific economic data that would strengthen your case. The paragraph contains unsupported generalizations about billionaires and CEOs without naming specific examples or studies. The connection between libraries and economic benefits needs clearer articulation with evidence.

**Exemplar:** *"While the proposed commercial centre would indeed create an estimated 75 local jobs and generate £2.3 million in annual revenue as outlined in the Council's proposal, research from the British Library Association demonstrates that public libraries yield a £5 return on every £1 invested through improved literacy rates, employability, and reduced social service needs—creating sustainable economic growth rather than temporary gains."*

■ Your piece demonstrates commendable passion and raises important concerns about community values and priorities. To strengthen your argument, focus on balancing emotional appeals with concrete evidence. Your second paragraph about equity effectively highlights the library's importance to underprivileged communities, but would benefit from specific local demographics or usage statistics. Also, try organizing your arguments in a more strategic sequence—perhaps beginning with the historical/cultural significance before addressing economic and environmental impacts. While your conclusion effectively returns to the personal impact, consider ending with a constructive alternative proposal rather than just opposition. Additionally, vary your sentence structure to avoid the repeated accusatory format that might alienate council members. Your rhetorical questions are powerful but would be more effective if spaced throughout the piece rather than clustered together.

---

**Overall Score: 42/50**

---

## Section 2:

Dear Council Members,

This is not acceptable. You are choosing to destroy and obliterate~~,~~ our dear library to construct what? Another meaningless, soulless, economic dumpster for shops to generate INCOME. By choosing to demolish our historic library, you are erasing a lifeline for students, families, and countless others who depend on it. You are choosing to erase a space that has enriched minds, powered students and built our ~~striving~~ [thriving] community.

When the dust settles and the shopping complex stands in its place, it will not be the developers or the corporations who bear the blame—it will be you. You will be remembered as the council that turned its back on education, culture, and the very people you were elected to serve. The loss of this library will be your legacy, and the community will not forget who made this choice. You are the ones ~~that~~ [who] widened the gap between the poor and the rich. You are the ones ~~that adds~~ [who add] to the environmental pollution. You are the ones ~~that~~ [who] burn down our community's history and culture. Is this truly the legacy you wish to leave behind?

Many students, especially those who come from ~~underprovided~~ [underprivileged] backgrounds are at risk. By destroying the library, you are not only ~~boycotting~~ [denying access to] the library from the rich and wealthy but from the poor too! You are only widening the gap and ~~abuse~~ [disadvantaging] the poor and needy. How would you feel, if your only refuge was a library that housed your sanctuary, only for it now to be destroyed in the makings of a new shopping complex that you do not have the money for? Well, you don't need to. ~~They\*\* will\*\* go~~ [They **will** go] through such trauma. Such individuals already had such problems without you adding more! Is this really the outcome the 'council' wants?

#2 Tearing down the library to build a commercial complex would contribute to pollution, carbon ~~gas~~ [emissions], loss of green parks and spaces and would only increase the greenhouse effect even further. Nobody wants a community with bustling townspeople, cars dotting the streets and skyscrapers to the sky. Nobody wants a colourless city. Is this still what the 'council' wants?

The library is not just a building; it holds historical significance and serves as a cultural hub of the community. Its demolition would erase a space that has fostered generations of learners, readers, and thinkers, diminishing the town's identity and heritage. Without the

protection and knowledge of our library, how will our community thrive? The Winston Library in Winston reported that 95% of students studying at their library ~~gets~~ [get] 25% higher grades than students that don't. Is this perceived destruction really still what our 'council' wants?

#3 If you think that demolishing the library will ~~peak~~ [boost] economic growth and more jobs, ~~your~~ [you're] correct. But, while economic development seems like the goal, a commercial shopping centre is a band-aid approach for short-term gains. This sale fails to ~~prioritize~~ [prioritise] what will be beneficial in education, literacy, and quality-of-life enhancement over many years. Storefronts are easier to come by than educated people—an educated citizenry benefits a stable economy far more than tangible storefronts. The library is an investment in the next step of knowledge, new projects down the line, career growth, and citizenship involvement. Even billionaires ~~realize~~ [realise] at some point that their success has come from public libraries when they were young, and some Nobel Peace Prize winners and Fortune 500 CEOs don't forget their roots.

#1 The decision to demolish our beloved library is not just a loss of a building—it is a loss of opportunity, equity, and community spirit. It is a sanctuary for learning, a bridge for the underprivileged, and a cornerstone of our shared history. By choosing to replace it with a commercial complex, you risk alienating the very people you were elected to 'serve'. Now, finally do you see the problem in our eyes? Or do you still think that this is what our community needs?