

regular categories. Therefore, so far, the consideration of pattern has not distinguished the kind of connectivity and complexity that are hallmarks of street patterns in general, and neo-traditional patterns in particular.

In the last chapter, we have seen how the structure of a network reflects the kinds of routes that make up that network. Chapter 5 showed that it is possible to recognise different kinds of route – such as the ‘connector’ – according to route structural properties. This chapter now looks at whole networks, and seeks ways of using route structural properties to characterise network structure in a way that can help identify and distinguish ‘preferred’ and ‘discouraged’ patterns. In this chapter, then, the ‘design debate’ will be informed not so much by scrutiny of the debate (as in Chapter 2), but by a detailed investigation of the ‘nature of structure’ itself.

EXAMPLE NETWORKS

This chapter focuses on the study of 60 example networks, which are analysed in terms of their route structure. The example networks include not only a range of actual street patterns, but some prototype and demonstrative patterns. These serve the various purposes of calibration and explanation as well as empirical comparison. The three categories of network analysed are shown in Table 6.1.

The distinctions between the actual and more theoretical structures are not incidental. Part of the exploration will be to find out how the properties of actual street networks may differ from those that were never built, or from those structures which are not otherwise seen as street network structures.

Actual street patterns

The ‘actual’ street patterns are drawn from 21 cities and towns in the UK and 15 elsewhere. The selection is eclectic – even somewhat idiosyncratic – but this is for a reason: the aim here is not to compile a representative sample of urban patterns, but to demonstrate that any diverse kind of pattern should be capable of analysis and interpretation in route-structural terms.

Some of these examples have been selected from different parts of the same city (distinguishing traditional inner areas versus modern suburban areas). Some networks are more ‘planned’ than others. Apart from these distinctions, the detailed contextual circumstances of particular examples are not of primary concern here. The aim here is not so much to study or explain the nature of particular sites from their structural properties, but

Table 6.1 Categories of example networks analysed

Network category	Description of category	Figure ref.	Number
Actual	As-built networks, including historic as well as contemporary examples	6.1	36
Prototype	Settlement prototypes, or plans for parts of settlements	6.2	4
Demonstrative	Networks used to demonstrate representative types, or individual structural characteristics	6.3	20
Total			60