



6.6 • Full netgram demonstration showing full set of real, prototype and demonstrative networks. Most cases fall within the central 'diamond'. Two notable outliers are Hilberseimer and *Ciudad Lineal* – significantly, these are prototypes rather than actual street patterns.

From Figure 6.6, we can discern a differentiation of recognisable 'network types'. Generally speaking, the modern suburban layouts are towards the top and left (indicating relative depth and lack of connectivity), while the traditional layouts are towards the bottom and right (indicating relative connectivity and lack of depth). There is some variation in continuity, although this is narrower than the variation in the other two parameters. In practice, it will often be possible to base distinction only on the comparison of relative connectivity and relative depth, giving a spectrum from (high relative connectivity, low relative depth) to (low relative connectivity, high relative depth). In fact, it will often be convenient to simply rank networks by relative connectivity alone (as in Table 6.2).

We could graduate this spectrum into four convenient divisions (from top left to bottom right), for example:

- *tributary* – implies deep branching, with systematic use of culs-de-sac and/or layered loop roads. These have been commonly used in the UK since the 1960s, for example in new towns and outer suburbs, and are typical of 'hierarchical' road systems;
- *semi-tributary* – refers to the kind of pattern typically found in older suburban neighbourhoods, with some degree of layering and some use of culs-de-sac, but with less hierarchical distinction (allowing more direct connections between minor access roads and major roads). In the example networks here, these are typically mainly configured with T-junctions;