Clear typology

This suggests, simply, the existence of clearly recognisable types. (This accords with the first structural condition of the tree analogy.) Such types would be particularly apparent where these were expressly designed as particular types in the first place – which would be typical for 'planned' layouts – as in the case of Poundbury (Figure 2.9).

Clear hierarchy

This suggests any case in which recognisable route types are both clearly ordered and connect to each other in consistent ways. Hence, any constitution with both a clear typology *and* clear explicit rules for arteriality or access constraint could be equated with a 'clear hierarchy'. Such constitutions have a clear rank order related to spatial layout.

'Less rigid' hierarchy

This might be a hierarchy which relaxes either the access constraint or the arteriality condition: in short, anything other than a dendritic constitution.

'Good' hierarchy

The type of hierarchy often deemed desirable by urban planners and designers seems to allow explicit differentiation of route type, but not necessarily arteriality or access constraint. This encompasses a range that includes both the Poundbury case (mosaic constitution) and also the Craig Plan (dendritic constitution). To cover all these kinds of cases, we could interpret an urban designer's 'good hierarchy' as one in which streets play a satisfactory structural role in route hierarchy (where streets are functional as streets, not just 'access roads').

Inter-connected networks

The conjoint constitution could be seen as the structure most predisposed to offer inter-connectivity, since it assures a certain connectivity through arteriality, while not constraining connections through access constraint. Conversely, the serial constitution is the least inter-connected, since it constrains access without assuring arteriality.

The foregoing suggested associations – conclusions from the nature of structure for the design debate – are summarised in Table 7.5.