

that neither ‘traffic flow’ nor ‘vehicle type’ need be used directly in mode or street classification, but we can focus instead on certain key ‘active ingredients’ such as speed and transit orientation, that most directly relate to design problems of street type and urban structure. Focusing on modes as ‘modes of movement’ – rather than vehicle type *per se* – not only enables design for compatibility of a diversity of existing modes, but also allows the possibility of creating favourable niches for novel emerging modes without having to expressly rule them in (or inadvertently rule them out).

On this basis, it has been possible to generate an ‘articulated’ route hierarchy based on two independent dimensions: first, a stratification by speed band, and second, a ‘transit-oriented hierarchy’ organised according to strategic contiguity. The resulting hierarchy promotes an integrated public transport–pedestrian system. This route hierarchy is offered as an alternative to the ‘structure of car orientation’.

This chapter has also suggested an ‘urban streetspace classification’ which allows a rationale for the reconciliation between the role of a street as an arterial connection and its role as an urban place. As anticipated in Chapter 3, arteriability is not necessarily incompatible with urban place. Both may be considered on comparable terms – based on geographical scale of significance. Real streets treated in this system may still throw up conflicts, but these can be handled in a transparent way. The proposed system can ensure contiguity of the street system (positive urban place) and therefore provide an alternative to the ‘structure of disurban creation’.

Finally, a variety of street types incorporating spatial or built form properties is possible. As long as the coding for speed and transit-oriented arteriability are part of the designation, any proposed street type can be fitted structurally within the hierarchy. This addresses the challenge of Chapter 2, and could be considered beneficial in combining the need for an ordered, structured classification that addresses concerns for traffic compatibility and safety, with the desire for a flexible, diverse, street-oriented classification.

The diversity of street types is possible because the hierarchy is ‘articulated’ – the underlying dimensions of classification are independently

**8.20 •** A diverse street typology. Any number of street types may be classified according any kind of form, use, relation or designation. As long as each street type is integrally coded for speed and arteriability, it will automatically fit the ‘articulated’ route hierarchy. There are two rules: (1) Each route type must connect to another route of the same or higher transit orientation; (2) Routes are stratified by speed: there is no direct connection between S4 to S2 except via S3. For all streets (roads with a non-zero value of urban place) urban contiguity can also be assured. (a) Tram Mall, Amsterdam (A2). (b) Tram boulevard, Tashkent (A3). (c) Tram artery, Hong Kong (A3.5). (d) Classical square, Edinburgh (D3). (e) Central traffic street, Richmond (B3). (f) Suburban through road, Richmond (C4). (g) Gravel promenade, Richmond-upon-Thames (E1.5). (h) Mews, London (D2). (i) Residential street, Poundbury (D2). (j) Alley, Jaffa (F1). (k) Arcade, Leeds (F1). (l) Walkways, Leeds (F1).