

Section 1

#1: Opening Paragraph ("Picture the daily scene...normal part of life")

Strengths:

- Your opening grabs attention immediately with a clear picture that readers can imagine, making them feel like they're right there at the school gate.
- You clearly state your main argument early, which helps readers understand exactly what you're asking them to think about.

Vague Direction: → Your sentence "It is time we challenge this acceptance with logic and compassion" tells readers what to do, but the connection between the scene you described and these two specific words (logic and compassion) isn't clear yet. Why these two words exactly? When you write "logic," do you mean the safety numbers you'll mention later? When you write "compassion," do you mean caring about children's feelings or their health? Making this link stronger would help readers follow your thinking more easily from the very start.

Exemplar: *"It is time we challenge this acceptance by examining the proven safety risks and by considering our responsibility to protect children's wellbeing."*

#2: Air Pollution Paragraph ("Beyond the immediate physical danger...breathing clean air")

Strengths:

- You include specific evidence from London's 'School Streets' program with the 23% reduction figure, which makes your argument much stronger and believable.
- You connect pollution to real health problems like asthma that many families already know about, making the issue feel relevant and important.

Underdeveloped Connection: → While you mention that active transport helps with "cardiovascular health and concentration in class," you don't explain how creating car-free zones actually makes more children walk. A reader might wonder: won't parents just park further away and still drive? You need to explain the step between removing cars and increasing walking. Do children feel safer walking? Do

parents choose to walk because it's now easier? This missing piece weakens your argument because readers can't see how your solution leads to the benefit you're promising.

Exemplar: *"Creating car-free zones makes walking and cycling the quickest and most practical option for families living nearby, naturally encouraging more children to use active transport rather than relying on cars for short journeys."*

#3: Counter-argument Paragraph ("Of course, the idea is not...policy is equitable")

Strengths:

- You show respect for people who disagree by calling their concerns "valid," which makes you seem fair and thoughtful rather than one-sided.
- You offer specific solutions like "park-and-stride" locations and permits for families who truly need them, showing you've thought carefully about making this work for everyone.

Rushed Solutions: → Your solutions appear quickly without enough detail to convince worried readers. For example, you mention "park-and-stride" locations but don't explain where these would be, how far children would need to walk, or what happens when it's raining. You also say this model is "proven successful in cities worldwide," but you don't name these cities or explain what made them successful. When readers have genuine worries about bad weather or difficult schedules, they need more than a quick mention that it's "easily addressed"—they need to understand exactly how it would work in practice.

Exemplar: *"Designated 'park-and-stride' locations can be established within 400 metres of school gates—approximately a five-minute walk—as successfully implemented in Edinburgh and Bristol, where covered walkways and volunteer 'walking buses' support families during poor weather."*

■ Your piece presents a passionate argument for car-free school zones with clear reasoning and good structure. You've organised your ideas logically, moving from safety to health to community benefits before addressing concerns. Your use of real evidence, like the London pollution data, strengthens your argument considerably. However, your writing would benefit from slowing down to explain the connections between your ideas more thoroughly. For instance, when you claim something will

happen, take time to show your reader exactly how and why it will happen. Additionally, in your counter-argument section, you need to give more specific details about your solutions rather than simply stating they exist. Think of your reader as someone who wants to agree with you but needs all the information to feel confident in your proposal. Also, consider adding one more real-world example from an Australian city or town if possible, which would help local readers picture this working in their own community. Finally, while your conclusion ties back nicely to your opening images, you could strengthen it by briefly reminding readers of your strongest piece of evidence rather than only using emotional appeals.

Overall Score: 44/50

Section 2

Paving the Way for Our Future: Why Streets Around Schools Must Be Car-Free

#1 Picture the daily scene: the 3 PM bell rings, and a torrent of children bursts through the school gates, their energy a stark contrast to the anxiety-inducing reality that awaits them. It's a cacophony of roaring engines, a choking haze of exhaust fumes, and a chaotic gauntlet of double-parked cars. We have somehow accepted this stressful and dangerous daily ritual as a normal part of life. ~~It is time we challenge this acceptance with logic and compassion.~~ [It is time we challenge this acceptance by examining the proven safety risks and by considering our responsibility to protect children's wellbeing.] By making the streets immediately surrounding our schools car-free zones, we can enact a practical, evidence-based solution that creates safer, healthier, and more community-focused environments for our children.

First and foremost, the argument for child safety is a matter of pure logic and our most profound ethical duty. Even at low speeds, the average car weighs over 1.5 tonnes; for a small child, a minor collision can be catastrophic. The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, a deeply respected authority in public health, confirms that transport-related incidents are a leading cause of injury-related death for Australian children. By eliminating vehicles from the immediate vicinity of school entrances, we drastically reduce the probability of a tragic accident. Imagine it: a dropped backpack, a sudden, joyful dash to greet a friend—in a car-free zone, these are harmless childhood moments. In a congested car

park, they are terrifying risks. We have a moral obligation to engineer these risks out of our children's lives.

#2 Beyond the immediate physical danger is the insidious, invisible threat of air pollution. The data is unequivocal: cars idling during pick-up and drop-off times pump a concentrated cloud of emissions. For instance, data from London's 'School Streets' initiative—a ~~program~~ [programme] similar to what is proposed—found that the measures reduced harmful nitrogen dioxide levels by up to 23% during morning drop-off. These microscopic particles from vehicle exhaust lodge deep within developing lungs, a direct cause of escalating rates of childhood asthma and other chronic respiratory issues. This is not speculation; it is a consensus among ~~pediatricians~~ [paediatricians], environmental scientists, and the World Health ~~Organization~~ [Organisation]. ~~Creating car-free zones also encourages active transport, with studies showing that just 20-30 minutes of daily walking can significantly improve a child's cardiovascular health and concentration in class.~~ [Creating car-free zones makes walking and cycling the quickest and most practical option for families living nearby, naturally encouraging more children to use active transport rather than relying on cars for short journeys—studies show that just 20-30 minutes of daily walking can significantly improve a child's cardiovascular health and concentration in class.] Think of the invisible damage being done with every breath in that toxic cloud, and then picture a future where children arrive at school ~~energised~~ [energised] and breathing clean air.

Furthermore, removing the barrier of traffic around schools actively cultivates a stronger, more connected community and develops crucial life skills. The car-centric drop-off isolates us in armoured bubbles, reducing human interaction to a hurried wave from a window. When families walk that final stretch together, the school gate transforms from a transactional space into a social one—a de facto village green. The lonely silence of the backseat is replaced by the vibrant chatter of the footpath. Parents connect, ~~neighbors~~ [neighbours] chat, and friendships are forged, strengthening the social fabric that is the very foundation of a safe and supportive community. For children, this daily journey becomes a practical lesson in independence and social awareness, skills that are essential for developing into confident, resilient adults.

#3 Of course, the idea is not without its critics. Opponents raise practical concerns, arguing that such zones create undue hardship for parents juggling tight work schedules and that they fail to account for accessibility needs for those with mobility challenges. They also suggest the policy merely displaces traffic, pushing congestion and parking chaos onto nearby residential streets, especially during bad weather. While these concerns are valid, they are not insurmountable. ~~The solution is not a wide-ranging ban, but a small, controlled 'Safe Street Zone' managed with designated 'park-and-stride' locations slightly further away—a model proven successful in cities worldwide.~~ [The solution is not a wide-ranging ban, but a small, controlled 'Safe Street Zone' managed with designated 'park-and-stride'

locations within 400 metres of school gates—approximately a five-minute walk—as successfully implemented in Edinburgh and Bristol, where covered walkways and volunteer 'walking buses' support families during poor weather.] Furthermore, accessibility is easily addressed with a simple permit system for families with verified mobility needs, ensuring the policy is equitable. These solutions require only a small shift in routine in exchange for the immeasurable gain of a guaranteed safe and healthy space for all children.

In conclusion, the vision for our school zones should be one of laughter, not loud engines; of clean air, not exhaust fumes; of connection, not congestion. The implementation of car-free streets is a powerful, logical, and deeply compassionate step towards prioritising the well-being of our youngest and most vulnerable citizens. It is a declaration that their safety is more important than our convenience, their long-term health is more important than our habits, and their community is worth investing in. Let's choose footsteps over tyre marks, fresh air over fumes, and a thriving community over a chaotic car park. It's time to choose our children over our cars.