Section 1:

#1 Strengths: You've created a strong opening paragraph that clearly states your position against converting roads into car-free zones. Your use of rhetorical questions effectively engages the reader.

Underdeveloped reasoning \rightarrow Your reasoning follows a simplistic cause-and-effect pattern without exploring the complexity of urban planning. You write "If we closed off roads, there would be traffic jams on another road" without acknowledging potential traffic redistribution or public transport alternatives. This presents a limited view that assumes traffic simply moves elsewhere rather than considering how people might change their travel habits.

Exemplar: Converting some roads to car-free zones can actually reduce overall traffic when paired with improved public transport options, as seen in cities like Melbourne where pedestrian zones have encouraged more people to use trams and buses instead of driving.

#2 Strengths: Your second paragraph about traffic jams uses vivid imagery that helps readers visualise the frustration of being stuck in traffic. The paragraph has a clear focus on a single disadvantage.

Logical leaps \rightarrow You make several unsupported jumps in your reasoning chain. For instance, you write "More traffic means more going crazy. Going crazy means losing your sanity. Losing your sanity means throwing a tantrum." These connections aren't logically substantiated and rely on emotional appeals rather than evidence. This weakens your argument as readers may question these assumed connections.

Exemplar: Studies show that traffic congestion increases stress levels and journey times, affecting both mental wellbeing and productivity. When properly planned, car-free zones can actually help distribute traffic more evenly across the transport network.

#3 Strengths: Your paragraph about delivery people identifies a practical concern that many readers might not have considered. You demonstrate awareness of how policy changes affect different stakeholders.

One-sided perspective \rightarrow In your discussion about delivery people, you present only extreme negative outcomes: "you go supersonic speed and get there on time while creating a million accidents." This fails to consider adaptations like designated delivery times, special access permits, or the use of cargo bikes in pedestrian zones that many cities successfully implement. Your argument would be stronger if it acknowledged and then countered these alternatives.

Exemplar: While delivery timing is important, many car-free zones successfully accommodate deliveries through morning access hours or special permits, allowing businesses to receive goods without disrupting the pedestrian experience during peak hours.

• Your piece shows passion for your position, which is engaging, but would benefit from more balanced reasoning. The current arguments rely heavily on emotional appeals and worst-case scenarios rather than examining the nuanced reality of urban planning. You could strengthen your writing by acknowledging some potential benefits of pedestrian zones before explaining why you believe the disadvantages outweigh them. Also, consider researching real examples of cities that have tried car-free zones with both positive and negative outcomes to support your points. Your traffic jam paragraph could be more compelling if you included specific examples or statistics about congestion increases in areas where roads have been closed. Additionally, your business impact paragraph would be more convincing if you explored different types of businesses—some might actually benefit from increased foot traffic in pedestrian zones while others might struggle.

Score: 41/50

Section 2:

Urban areas shouldn't convert more roads into car-free zones, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. Why? Haven't you considered the cons if we did? Think about it. #1 If we closed off roads, there would be traffic jams on another road. If we closed off roads it would also affect businesses. If we close off roads it will make delivery people's lives worse. You may not be convinced but do you really want to make life harder than it is now?

#2 First, traffic jams. Imagine being stuck in the same place on a road and just waiting till [until] the traffic starts to move. Waiting for an eternity until the cars in front finally move a singular centimetre. I think we can all agree that traffic jams are annoying. They are brain numbing and they destroy your sanity. Closing off roads for pedestrians and cyclists will only change one fact. Even more traffic. No one wants more traffic. More traffic means more going crazy. Going crazy means losing your sanity. Losing your sanity means throwing a tantrum. No one wants to be stuck in a car with a screaming driver so do not close the roads.

Second, affecting businesses. Imagine having an amazing business on a busy road. Perfect for making money until some people come and close the road. Your money making days are now gone. You are drowning in debt. Just because some people came and fenced off the road. One second ago you were flooding your house with money and now you are flooding your house with unpaid debt. [Yesterday you were financially secure, and today you're overwhelmed with unpaid debt.] Everyone hates debt so why make other people have debt?

#3 Last, delivery people. Delivery people need to get to the place on time to deliver something. If you close roads, they have to take another route that would most likely be longer and the thought of being on time is your top priority so you go supersonic speed and get there on time while creating a million

accidents on the way. That is not worth it. In addition, not fencing off roads in urban areas will make these hard working people's lives easier and less stressful.

In conclusion, urban areas shouldn't convert more roads into car-free zones, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. If you really want to make people's lives happier and easier than ever before, do not convert roads into pedestrian and cyclist zones. Remember never ever to convert roads into no cars zones.