Response for shape grammar

If we are able define a shape grammar to all of the design in a style, we could make predictions by generating new instances of the style. However, when we talk about style, most of time we are talking merely about the appearance. Building a parametric shape grammar for Frank Lloyd Wright’s prairies-style houses, could people have the same feeling inside the grammar-built house as in a real Wright’s design?

In my opinion, shape grammar has its value. When we are short of ideas, we always look up some magazines and books. Therefore, when we are short of forms, we could leverage from the powerful computation. We could refer to the shape generated by shape grammars. However, shape grammar should not be the center of a design. It is more like a tool. Also, shape grammar is useful for learning analyzing building in the graphic level. But to start designing a children school on a hill with shape grammars makes no sense in the real world.

The name of the shape grammar implies a constraint for itself. It is about shape. When we want to generate computer graphic, shape grammars are great. When we need ice-ray lattice designs, shape grammars are powerful. However, when we ask for a real building, we are limited by shape grammar. Even you could embed spatial qualities into shape, but what we are asking is users’ experience. It is about the space, but it is also about the presence, feeling, and interaction.

We could extend shape grammars to include more architecture attributes, but we will not able to call it shape grammar. It became a rule-based system. With delicate initialization, a rule-based system is probably a better representation for a real building.