Both define different ways of creating, connecting, and defining shapes in architecture. Shape Grammar is a way to build lines off of each other by following defined rules in order to create shapes. I think this could be an appropriate tool for design in some ways, and a limitation for design in others. In the schematic stages of design, shape grammar could help the design get started, to come up with a diagrammatic or massing form in order to develop a main idea for the design. It relies on the premises of rules, defined by the designer, which directs lines in different ways to create shapes. The problem with this approach to design is that it forms shapes instead of spaces. The rules that are set may be appropriate in the beginning stages of design, but as the programming of spaces continues, they may change, and the shapes created may not work for the design like they did before. There seems to be little intention of design characteristics involved in shape grammar, in that it is based on an algorithmic process of definition rather than intuition. The shapes created by shape grammar may be used in different ways, such as in plan, section, elevation, etc. This process fails to approach the 3D spatial qualities of the shapes. Transforming these shapes to work with the programmatic and spatial qualities of a design is possible, but may pose the problem of designing with intention from the beginning and carrying a design theory or main idea through the entire design process.

Another process for coming up with spaces in design is to use connections to different areas of a building site or to use connections of spaces within the building program to create other spaces in a way that falls and works good. This has been a more definitive and helpful process in my design work.