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1. For the design solutions involving a variety of forms, both in plan and section.
2. Hard and shiny surfaces.
4. Different types of spaces different expressed externally; and, as a corollary to this, additive rather than subtractive buildings.

The first constituent, which to a large extent generates the rest, needs a little explanation. Imagine a three-dimensional grid had, by and large, been the invisible skeleton on which the huge majority of the buildings were designed. To Miesian it was an aesthetic tool, to commercial architects a way of saving money and time; the kind of concern that went on the process with huskiness, usually at the expense of their clients' convenience.

The problem with the grid isn't necessarily a formalistic trick, indeed nothing could be more cramping to the rationalist than to be confined to three planes. Stirring made no attempt to get away from geometry, by which it is believed, his architectural improvement was, first to develop a more sophisticated grammar that allowed him many more options, and then to exploit its visual potentialities. The initial stimulus seems to have been provided by the circumstances of the Leicestershire house. The fact that the line of sight for the worksop was at 45 degrees to the floor, meant that a series of parallel lines for the workshops themselves suggested, in the plan, a combination of two opposing grid lines. The right angle to each other, the right angle to the line of the roads being provided by the boundary of Victoria Park, which sloped across one edge of the site. In the section, similar divergences from the vertical and horizontal were suggested by expressing rather than concealing the slope of the entrance ramp, the seating and the roof, especially of the central lecture theatres, and the particular glazing system adopted to ventilate the laboratory and the seminar rooms. The main corridor, the main corridor, and the central stairwell were the main horizontal, clearly defined and differently treated.

By the 1920s, as just well have Sullivan brings one back to the question of pedigree. So much ingenuity has been displayed in working one out that it is impossible to say at what point, at what stage, the design discipline of the picture. They sequenced by way of geometry; and improved by play of light and shadow, and so on. Making it easy for them to get the precision from their builders, that their geometry did not mean that the buildings emerged from an even more ancient architecture in reaction against the tyranny of the right angle on the one hand and the boxers-generously brick-faced bastions on the other. Geometry provided a way out for them, both. The buildings that resulted are unusual and even anti-natural—they are out of nature in the Yeatsian 'Dynamism' of hammered gold and gold enamelling, standing on crystalline little hills, built of hard smelling materials that still not weather and in a colour range totally unacquainted to the landscape, so that there is no possibility of their ever merging into it in the approved and, to the English, emotionally charged manner of the picturesque tradition. It is not surprising that Stirring (again like Butterfield) has been accused of 'cultivated aghastness'. Those who are open to this building either with a perception of what buildings should be or what they should not be, are apt to be, to use vague memories of the tag 'brutalism', thinking they see some sort of aestheticism. Do not, when you are speaking of a building so ugly and shocking; but the suitable adjectives are merely ones such as elegant, delicate, refined, and so on; the lines are exquisite artifacts, beautifully finished and perfectly thought through. His work is no artificial they don't require an artificial setting but gain from the contrast of being extruded from a natural landscape.