'cul-de-sac networks' (trees). Street patterns, then, can be seen significantly as products of their constituent elements – streets.

However, there are still some major issues of structure to resolve. It has been argued earlier that streets, as such, do not necessarily comfortably fit within hierarchies – at least, within conventional road hierarchies. To complete the investigation of the 'nature of structure', it will be necessary to establish more clearly how different kinds of streets might fit within different kinds of hierarchies. To do this involves a closer look at the issue of hierarchy, and how hierarchical structure relates to different kinds of street and different kinds of pattern. This synthesis is the subject of the next chapter.

NOTES

1   Tunnard (1970: 65).
2   Exceptions are the Hilberseimer and Reykjavik Tributary networks which, despite being tree-like – and hence appearing low in Figure 6.1(b) – have higher values of relative connectivity, due to their high proportion of four-way junctions (cf. X-tree, Chapter 4). X-tree layouts are uncommon in UK practice, in which context this subtle distinction is effectively immaterial.
3   The relative connectivity of Poundbury is 0.37, just less than its relative depth of 0.38. The corresponding values for Dorchester Central are 0.45 and 0.31 respectively.
4   Gordon (1984); McKean (1996); Walker (1996: 63).
5   This is being explored by Marshall (*Cities Design and Evolution*).