*Argument 2*

*The following appeared in a letter sent by a committee of homeowners from the Deerhaven*

*Acres to all homeowners in Deerhaven Acres.*

*"Seven years ago, homeowners in nearby Brookville community adopted a set of restrictions*

*on how the community's yards should be landscaped and what colors the exteriors of homes*

*should be painted. Since then, average property values have tripled in Brookville. In order to*

*raise property values in Deerhaven Acres, we should adopt our own set of restrictions on*

*landscaping and housepainting."*

In this letter a committee of Deerhaven Acres homeowners recommends that in order to

enhance Deerhaven property values homeowners should follow certain restrictions conceming

their homes' exterior appearance. To support this recommendation the committee points out

that in the seven years since Brookwille adopted similar restrictions property values there have

risen. This argument rests on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions, and is therefore

unpersuasive as it stands.

A threshold assumption upon which the recommendation relies is that BrookviUe home

owners implemented Brookville's restrictions in the first place. The letter fails to substantiate

this crucial assumption. If these restrictions were not implemented, then any change in

Brookville's property values cannot be attributed to them. Accordingly, the committee cannot

draw any firm conclusion about what effect similar restrictions would have on Deerhaven

property values.

Even assuming that BrookviUe homeowners implemented these restrictions, the committee

relies on the additional assumption that this course of action was responsible for the increase

in BrookwiUe property values. However, it is entirely possible that one or more other factors

were instead responsible for the increase, especially since a considerable period of time has

passed since Brookville adopted its restrictions. Property values are a function of supply and

demand. Perhaps the demand for housing in the area has increased due to an influx of major

employers. Or, perhaps the supply of housing has decreased. Either scenario would provide

an alternative explanation for the increase in property values.

Even assuming that BrookviUe's rising property values are attributable to the

implementation of these restrictions, the committee fails to consider possible differences

between BrookviUe and Deerhaven that might help to bring about a different result for Deer

haven. For instance, potential Deerhaven home-buyers might be less interested in a home's

exterior appearance than BrookviUe home-bwers. For that matter, perhaps Deerhaven

home-buyers would find consistent exterior appearance a distasteful feature in which case

adopting these restrictions might actually tend to decrease Deer-haven property values.

Without accounting for these and other possible dissimilarities, the committee cannot assume

that what resulted in rising property values in Brookville would bring about the same result in

Deerhaven.

In conclusion, to persuade me that Deerhaven should adopt the proposed restrictions the

committee must supply clear evidence that the implementation of Brookville's restrictions, and

not some other factor, was responsible for the rise in Brookville's property values. The

committee must also provide evidence that other factors affecting home prices in the two areas

are otherwise essentially the same.