

Geographical Characterisation of British Urban Form and Function using the Spatial Signatures Framework

Martin Fleischmann^{1,*} and Daniel Arribas-Bel¹

¹Geographic Data Science Lab, Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool, Roxby Building , 74 Bedford St S , Liverpool , L69 7ZT, United Kingdom

*corresponding author(s): Martin Fleischmann (m.fleischmann@liverpool.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT

The spatial arrangement of the building blocks that make up cities matters to understand the rules directing their dynamics. Our study outlines the development of the national open-source classification of space according to its form and function into a single typology. We create a bespoke granular spatial unit, the enclosed tessellation, and measure characters capturing its form and function within a relevant spatial context. Using K-Means clustering of individual enclosed tessellation cells, we generate a classification of space for the whole of Great Britain. Contiguous enclosed tessellation cells belonging to the same class are merged forming spatial signature geometries and their typology. We identify 16 distinct types of spatial signatures stretching from wild countryside, through various kinds of suburbia to types denoting urban centres according to their regional importance. The open data product presented here has the potential to serve as boundary delineation for other researchers interested in urban environments and policymakers looking for a unique perspective on cities and their structure.

Background & Summary

How the building blocks that make up cities are spatially arranged is worth quantifying and understanding. By "building blocks", we mean both the activities and agents that inhabit cities, as well as the (infra)structure that supports them. The former can be conceptualised as *urban function*, while the latter falls under the study of *urban form*. Understanding urban form and function is important for two main reasons. First, the combination of both *encodes* rich information about the history, character and evolution of cities. For example, the shape and properties of the street network encode the technology of the time (e.g., automobile); while the degree of mix in land uses can reflect cultural values. Second, the spatial pattern of urban form and function also acts as a frame that *influences* a variety of outcomes, from economic productivity to socio-economic cohesion to environmental sustainability.

In this paper, we use the Spatial Signatures framework^{1,2}, which develops a "characterisation of space based on form and function designed to understand urban environments"¹. Spatial signatures are theory-informed, data-driven computable classes that describe the form and function of a consistent patch of geography. Figure 1 presents an overview of the development of a spatial signature classification. We build a series of enclosures that we combine with building footprints to further subdivide geographical space into what we call enclosed tessellation cells (ETCs). We then attach form and function characters to each of these subdivisions, and use those to group them into consistent and differentiated classes we call signatures. Each phase is expanded in detail in the next section.

We introduce an open data product (ODP³) containing a classification of spatial signatures for Great Britain (illustrated in a figure 2). In doing so, we provide an analysis-ready layer that brings together urban form and function consistently, in detail, and at national scale. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first dataset capturing urban form and function published both with a degree of detail and scale as ours. Our results are based on the analysis of more than 14 million of ETCs, to each of which we attach more than 300 characters capturing a wide range of aspects relating to urban form and function. We provide access to both granular geographical boundaries of the delineated spatial signatures as well as measurements for each character at the signature level. The ODP also includes a web map that allows exploration without any technical requirement other than a web browser, and we have open sourced all the code, including details on the computational backend. The uniqueness of our ODP makes it challenging to set up a technical validation as a comparison with existing datasets. Nevertheless, we relate our signatures to a few well-established data products that capture each a subset of the form and function dimensions we consider. Our results are encouraging in that they show broad agreement in expected areas, but also highlight aspects that can only be discovered when considering form and function in tandem.

The approach and outputs presented bring several benefits to a range of stakeholders interested in cities. This spatial signatures ODP provides insight generated from detailed, comprehensive and computationally intensive data analysis and




Figure 1. Diagram illustrating the sequential steps leading to the delineation of spatial signatures. From a series of enclosing components, to enclosures, enclosed tessellation (ET), the addition of form and function characters to ET cells, and the development of spatial signatures.




Figure 2. Illustration of a classification of spatial signatures in Liverpool and Birkenhead area, in the north west of England.

39 presents it in a way that is easy to access, work with and integrate into larger projects. Together with the importance of form
 40 and function discussed above, we anticipate the output will be relevant to both academic researchers as well as policymakers
 41 and practitioners. As a framework, the spatial signatures provide a flexible yet generalisable way to understand, characterise
 42 and quantify urban form and function. One way to understand our results is as an application to Great Britain of a more general
 43 approach to quantitatively characterise the spatial dimension of cities. As such, our conceptual approach can be applied in many
 44 more local contexts and regions beyond Great Britain. It is true that Great Britain currently represents an unusual case in that it
 45 is specially “data dense”, with a large variety of open data that may not be readily available in other parts of the world. However,
 46 given form and function reinforce each other, spatial signatures are designed to be robust to variations in the specific data
 47 sources used, and two different classifications do not need to be based on exactly the same data to be useful. At the same time,
 48 we note that the combination of volunteered geographic information (e.g., OpenStreetMap) and technologies such as modern
 49 satellites and artificial intelligence are filling many of these gaps very rapidly, and we anticipate near-future developments that
 50 will make the implementation of classifications such as the one presented here possible in almost any (urban) area of the planet.
 51 In this sense, our ODP (data, code, and methodology) can be a useful illustration for researchers and practitioners who, even if
 52 not specifically interested in the British use case, would like to implement a similar approach on their own.

53 As illustration of potential applications, we provide two. The spatial signatures may be used to delineate types of (origin
 54 and destination) locations in mobility analysis, that could unveil patterns of commuting or migration in situations like the
 55 COVID-19 pandemic. A second application may focus directly on supporting policy on inequalities. For example the spatial
 56 signatures can underpin analysis on equality of access to services and amenities within the UKs Levelling Up agenda⁴, using
 57 them to target areas based on their signature type, since they will share key structural components. It is important to note we do
 58 not expect signatures to focus on a single aspect of urban environment as, for example, Local Climate Zones⁵ do with climate,
 59 but instead on a wider range of uses due to their inclusion of both form and function and a data driven nature reflecting the
 60 specific place rather than abstract conceptual classes. In this respect, we hope the present paper serves not only to document our
 61 own work but to inspire future efforts aimed at urban form and function.




Figure 3. Diagram illustrating the sequential steps leading to the delineation of enclosed tessellation. From a series of enclosing components, where blue are streets and yellow river banks (A), to enclosures (B), incorporation of buildings as anchors (C) to final tessellation cells (D).

62 Methods

63 The method of identification of spatial signatures consists of three top-level steps. First, we delineate a spatial unit of analysis
 64 that reflects the structure of urban phenomena on a very granular level. Then we characterise each of them according to form
 65 and function, capturing the nature of each unit and its spatial context. Finally, we use cluster analysis to derive a typology of
 66 our spatial units that, once combined into contiguous areas, forms a typology of spatial signatures.

67 Spatial unit

68 The first major methodological decision relates to the definition of the spatial unit. An ideal candidate needs to reflect space in
 69 a granular manner, and we argue it should fulfil three conditions. First, it should be *indivisible*, meaning that any subdivision
 70 would result in a unit that is incapable of capturing the nature of urban form and function. Second, it needs to be *internally*
 71 *consistent* - it should always reflect only a single signature type. Last, it should be geographically *exhaustive*, covering the
 72 entirety of the study area.

73 Spatial units used in literature can be split into three groups. One is using administrative boundaries like city regions⁶,
 74 wards or census output areas⁷, that are convenient to obtain and can be easily linked to auxiliary data. However, those rarely
 75 reflect the morphological composition of urban space and, in some cases, may even “obscure morphologic reality”⁸. At the
 76 same time, most of them are divisible, and larger units are not always internally consistent. Another group is based on arbitrary
 77 uniform grids linked either to spatial indexing methods like H3⁹ or Ordnance Survey National Grid, or to ancillary data of
 78 remote sensing or other origins like a WorldPop grid¹⁰. Grids however cannot be considered internally consistent as they do not
 79 consider the underlying structure of the landscape. Finally, urban morphology studies tend to use morphological elements as
 80 street segments¹¹, blocks¹², buildings¹³ or plots¹⁴ as units of analysis. Some of those could be seen as indivisible and internally
 81 consistent, but since they are largely based on built-up fabric, they are not exhaustive. For example, in areas without any
 82 building or street, there is no spatial unit to work with. Plots could be theoretically considered as exhaustive, consistent and
 83 indivisible, but there is no accepted conceptual definition and unified geometric representation¹⁵.

84 We are, therefore, proposing an application of an alternative spatial unit called *enclosed tessellation cell* (ETC), defined
 85 as "the portion of space that results from growing a morphological tessellation within an enclosure delineated by a series of
 86 natural or built barriers identified from the literature on urban form, function and perception"¹. ETCs follow the morphological
 87 tradition in that it is based on the physical elements of an environment but overcome the drawbacks of conventionally used
 88 units. Its geometry is generated in the three steps illustrated in Figure 3. First, a set of features representing physical barriers
 89 subdividing space, in our case composed of the street network, railways, rivers and a coastline, is combined, generating a layer
 90 of boundaries (3 A). These then partition space into smaller enclosed geometries called *enclosures* (3 B), which can be very
 91 granular or very coarse depending on the geographic context. In dense city centres where a single enclosure represents a single
 92 block is a high frequency of small enclosures. At the same time, in the countryside, this approach leads to very few large
 93 enclosures as their delimiters are far away from each other. Enclosures are then combined with building footprints (3 B), which
 94 act as anchors in space and potentially subdivide enclosures into enclosed tessellation cells using the morphological tessellation
 95 algorithm¹⁶ (3 D), a polygon-based adaptation of Voronoi tessellation. The resulting geometries are indivisible as they contain,
 96 at most, a single anchor building, internally consistent due to their granularity and link to morphological elements composing
 97 urban fabric, and geographically exhaustive as they cover an entire area limited by specified boundaries.

98 In our ODP for Great Britain, street networks are extracted from OS Open Roads datasets¹⁷ representing simplified road
 99 centrelines cleaned of underground road segments. Railways are retrieved from OS OpenMap - Local¹⁸ ("RailwayTrack"
 100 layer) which captures surface railway tracks. Rivers are extracted from OS OpenRivers¹⁹ representing river network of GB
 101 as centrelines, and a coastline is retrieved from OS Strategi®²⁰, capturing coastline as a continuous line geometry. Building

102 geometry is extracted, again, from OS OpenMap - Local ("Building" layer) and represents generalised building footprint
103 polygons.¹

104 **Characterisation of space**

105 Spatial signatures capture the character of the built and unbuilt environment based on two components - form and function.
106 Each of them is quantified at the level of individual ETCs using methods appropriate for each specific dataset. While form is
107 described using urban morphometrics (i.e. quantitative analysis of urban form)²¹, function is a composite of a variety of data
108 inputs. We outline each component with a bit more detail below.

109 **Form**

110 Morphometric characterisation of urban form is based on the numerical description of four elements capturing the built
111 environment - buildings, streets, ETCs, and enclosures - and reflects their patterns based on six categories of characters:
112 dimensions, shapes, spatial distribution, intensity, connectivity and diversity²². Each element is considered across different
113 scales, from the measurement of individual geometries, to relations of neighbouring geometries, to a graph-based analysis of
114 the street network. The combination of elements, categories and scales results in a set of 59 individual morphometric characters
115 listed in the table 1. The selection builds on the principles outlined by²¹ and later explored by²³, both following the rules
116 derived by²⁴. The gist is to include as many characters present in literature as is feasible, while minimising potential collinearity
117 and limiting redundancy of information.

Table 1. Morphometric characters used to describe the form component of spatial signatures. For details of the implementation, refer to the reproducible Jupyter notebooks available at urbangrammarai.xyz.

| character | category | reference |
|--|--------------|-----------|
| area of building | dimension | 25 |
| perimeter of building | dimension | 26 |
| courtyard area of building | dimension | 27 |
| circular compactness of building | shape | 21 |
| corners of building | shape | 28 |
| squareness of building | shape | 28 |
| equivalent rectangular index of building | shape | 29 |
| elongation of building | shape | 28 |
| centroid - corner distance deviation of building | shape | 23 |
| centroid - corner mean distance of building | dimension | 27 |
| orientation of building | distribution | 27 |
| street alignment of building | distribution | 27 |
| cell alignment of building | distribution | 23 |
| longest axis length of ETC | dimension | 23 |
| area of ETC | dimension | 13 |
| circular compactness of ETC | shape | 23 |
| equivalent rectangular index of ETC | shape | 23 |
| orientation of ETC | distribution | 23 |
| covered area ratio of ETC | intensity | 30 |
| length of street segment | dimension | 12 |
| width of street profile | dimension | 11 |
| openness of street profile | distribution | 11 |
| width deviation of street profile | diversity | 11 |
| linearity of street segment | shape | 11 |
| area covered by edge-attached ETCs | dimension | 23 |
| buildings per meter of street segment | intensity | 23 |
| area covered by node-attached ETCs | dimension | 23 |

Continued on next page

¹Note that the dataset does not distinguish between individual buildings when they are adjacent (e.g. perimeter block composed of multiple buildings is represented by a single polygon).

| character | category | reference |
|---|--------------|-----------|
| alignment of neighbouring buildings | distribution | 31 |
| mean distance between neighbouring buildings | distribution | 31 |
| perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC | distribution | 23 |
| area covered by neighbouring cells | dimension | 23 |
| reached ETCs by neighbouring segments | intensity | 23 |
| reached area by neighbouring segments | dimension | 23 |
| node degree of junction | distribution | 32 |
| mean distance to neighbouring nodes of street network | dimension | 23 |
| mean inter-building distance | distribution | 33 |
| weighted reached enclosures of ETC | intensity | 23 |
| reached ETCs by tessellation contiguity | intensity | 23 |
| reached area by tessellation contiguity | dimension | 23 |
| area of enclosure | dimension | 21 |
| perimeter of enclosure | dimension | 12 |
| circular compactness of enclosure | shape | 27 |
| equivalent rectangular index of enclosure | shape | 29 |
| compactness-weighted axis of enclosure | shape | 34 |
| orientation of enclosure | distribution | 12 |
| perimeter-weighted neighbours of enclosure | distribution | 23 |
| area-weighted ETCs of enclosure | intensity | 23 |
| local meshedness of street network | connectivity | 34 |
| mean segment length within 3 steps | dimension | 23 |
| local cul-de-sac length of street network | dimension | 23 |
| reached area by local street network | dimension | 23 |
| reached ETCs by local street network | intensity | 23 |
| local node density of street network | intensity | 23 |
| local proportion of cul-de-sacs of street network | connectivity | 35 |
| local proportion of 3-way intersections of street network | connectivity | 32 |
| local proportion of 4-way intersections of street network | connectivity | 32 |
| local degree weighted node density of street network | intensity | 21 |
| local closeness of street network | connectivity | 36 |
| square clustering of street network | connectivity | 23 |

118 However, measuring individual characters is not enough to understand the predominant spatial patterns. For some types
 119 of urban environment, high heterogeneity is not uncommon. This means that using, for example, areas of building footprints
 120 would, in most cases, result in largely discontinuous clusters that do not capture the pattern within an area. Therefore, we
 121 represent each of the morphometric characters using three summary variables reflecting statistical distributions of measured
 122 data within a spatial context of each ETC. Context is defined as tenth order of contiguity computed across the mesh composed
 123 of contiguous ETCs as illustrated in figure 4. Furthermore, each value is weighted by the inverse distance between so-called
 124 poles of inaccessibility (defined as a centre of a maximum inscribed circle) of each ETC. Three proxy variables then capture the
 125 first, the second and the third quartile of the resulting weighted distribution. Such a characterisation can capture the contextual
 126 tendency of each morphometric character and hence identify contiguous clusters in both homogenous and heterogeneous urban
 127 tissues. These contextual values are then used as an input for cluster analysis while the original non-contextualised versions are
 128 left out, making the final form component composed of 177 contextual characters.

129 **Function**

130 Characterisation of the function component uses a different approach. While data describing urban form are not generally
 131 available in a processed format, forcing us to employ morphometric approaches, different aspects of function are often available
 132 as open data products. We guide the compilation of functional characters following three main principles: first, we identify from
 133 the literature on urban function key areas to be represented; second, we translate those abstract areas into measurable features;
 134 and third, we select open data available in for Great Britain that allows for the redistribution of derivative products. With a
 135 list of function characters selected, the main goal of our characterisation of ETCs based on function is to develop appropriate
 136 transfer methods to link data published as grids or linked to administrative boundaries to ETCs.




Figure 4. Illustration of a definition of spatial context used to capture the distribution of values around each ET cell. For the yellow ET cell in the middle, we propose to define a neighbourhood of 10 topological steps on the tessellation and weight the importance of each cell within such an area by inverse distance between poles of inaccessibility of each cell.

In this work, we are using five different transfer methods: Areal interpolation, Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation³⁷ using building footprint area, Network-constrained accessibility, Euclidean accessibility, and Zonal statistics. Areal interpolation is used when the functional data covers the entirety of space in the form of polygon geometry and when there is no assumption that the phenomena it captures are linked directly to the human population, such as land cover data. When there is an assumption of relation to the population, building-based dasymetric areal interpolation is used instead. The main difference is that instead of ETC polygons, building footprint polygons linked to individual ETCs are used as a target of interpolation. That ensures that data like population estimates are linked to ETCs proportionally to their ability to house population rather than by their area. Network-constrained accessibility is used when the input data represents points of interest like locations of supermarkets. Points are then snapped to the nearest node on the street network and linked to the ETCs through the count of observations accessible from the cell within 15 minutes of walk (1200m on the street network) and a distance to the nearest point. In some cases, Euclidean (as-crow-flies) accessibility is measured instead to accommodate for phenomena that are often outside the reach of a drivable network like water bodies. Zonal statistics are used to transfer data originally stored in a raster format to ETCs as the mean value of raster pixels intersecting each polygon geometry. Finally, characters based on interpolation and zonal statistics are expressed using their contextual versions following the method used for form characters to, again, reflect the contextual pattern of measured values. As in the case of morphometric characters, only contextual versions are then used in the cluster analysis. The selection of datasets and the chosen transfer method are listed in the table 2.

Table 2. Functional characters used to describe the function component of spatial signatures. For details of the implementation, refer to the reproducible Jupyter notebooks available at urbangrammarai.xyz.

| character | data | source | input geometry | transfer method |
|---|----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| Population | Population estimates | ONS Census Output Area population estimates, Statistics.gov.scot | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Night lights | Night Lights | VIIRS DNB Nighttime Lights | Raster (500m) | Zonal statistics |
| Workplace population [Agriculture, energy and water] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Manufacturing] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Construction] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and restaurants] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Transport and communication] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Financial, real estate, professional and administrative activities] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census Workplace population | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |

Continued on next page

| character | data | source | input geometry | transfer method |
|---|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Workplace population [Public administration, education and health] | Workplace population | ONS Census Workplace population, Scotland's census | Vector (output area polygon) | Building-based dasymetric areal interpolation |
| Workplace population [Other] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Airports] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Non-irrigated arable land] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Industrial or commercial units] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Salt marshes] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Estuaries] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Sport and leisure facilities] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Green urban areas] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Discontinuous urban fabric] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Pastures] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Broad-leaved forest] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Mineral extraction sites] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Port areas] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Road and rail networks and associated land] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Water bodies] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Land principally occupied by agriculture, with significant areas of natural vegetation] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Mixed forest] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Peat bogs] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Natural grasslands] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Moors and heathland] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Transitional woodland-shrub] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Continuous urban fabric] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Intertidal flats] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |

Continued on next page

| character | data | source | input geometry | transfer method |
|--|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Land cover [Sea and ocean] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Coniferous forest] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Construction sites] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Sparsely vegetated areas] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Bare rocks] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Inland marshes] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Dump sites] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Fruit trees and berry plantations] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Complex cultivation patterns] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Beaches, dunes, sands] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Water courses] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Burnt areas] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Agro-forestry areas] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| Land cover [Coastal lagoons] | Corine land cover | Copernicus Land Monitoring Service | Vector (land cover zone polygon) | Areal interpolation |
| NDVI | NDVI | GHS-composite-S2 R2020A | Raster (10m) | Zonal statistics |
| Supermarkets [distance to nearest] | Retail POIs (supermarkets) | Geolytix | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| Supermarkets [counts within 1200m] | Retail POIs (supermarkets) | Geolytix | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| Listed buildings [distance to nearest] | Listed Buildings | Historic England, Historic Environment Scotland, Lle Geo-Portal for Wales | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| Listed buildings [counts within 1200m] | Listed Buildings | Historic England, Historic Environment Scotland, Lle Geo-Portal for Wales | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| FHRS points [distance to nearest] | Food Hygiene Rating Scheme Ratings | CDRC.ac.uk | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| FHRS points [counts within 1200m] | Food Hygiene Rating Scheme Ratings | CDRC.ac.uk | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |

Continued on next page

| character | data | source | input geometry | transfer method |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cultural venues [distance to nearest] | Culture (theatres, cinemas) | OpenStreetMap | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| Cultural venues [counts within 1200m] | Culture (theatres, cinemas) | OpenStreetMap | Vector (point) | Network-constrained accessibility |
| Water bodies [distance to nearest] | Water bodies | OS OpenMap Local | Vector (water body polygon) | Euclidean accessibility |
| Retail centres [distance to nearest] | Retail centres | CDRC.ac.uk | Vector (retail centre polygon) | Euclidean accessibility |

153 Cluster analysis

154 When combined, contextual summaries of form and function characters (or characters themselves when they are reflecting
 155 the context by definition) compose a dataset describing each ETC by 331 variables (177 contextual characters representing
 156 59 initial characters for form and 154 for function composed of 144 contextual characters representing 48 characters that do
 157 not capture context by design and 10 accessibility-based characters that do). Assigning equal weight to each variable, we
 158 standardize them applying Z-score normalization, and use them as input for K-Means cluster analysis. Although collinearity is
 159 likely to be present between several of them, we do not view this as a problem: we select each character not from a purely
 160 statistical point of view (i.e., which ones will be more effective at segmenting the dataset), but instead from a conceptual one.
 161 Each variable has been identified by the literature on urban form and function as a relevant aspect that contributes to collectively
 162 characterising these two more abstract concepts. We thus see this situation as a way of adding robustness to the measurement of
 163 more conceptual notions which are ultimately our aim. We opt for K-Means because we consider it strikes a compromise in the
 164 trade-off between performance and scalability. K-Means is widely used in the literature on unsupervised learning, and in much
 165 of that concerning the clustering of geographic entities³⁸. To select the algorithm, we experimented with a random subset of our
 166 dataset, comparing K-Means with alternatives such as Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM) or Self-Organising Maps (SOM).
 167 We found results from the latter two were not notably better in terms of cluster compactness and qualitative examination of
 168 the geographic clusters, but were significantly slower in computation runtime, posing serious challenges to be run at scale.
 169 Although K-Means does not consider space explicitly, our approach incorporates information about the geographic context of
 170 each observation through the operation described above and illustrated in Figure 4. We prefer this over a spatially-constrained
 171 algorithm (e.g., SKATER³⁹) that restricts the clustering only among spatially contiguous observations because we are not
 172 interested in areas that are spatially contiguous unless they are sufficiently similar to each other on the attribute space. Our
 173 contextual approach is more similar to spatially-encouraged algorithms such as the GeoSOM⁴⁰ or spatially-encouraged spectral
 174 clustering⁴¹ that incorporate geographic proximity when clustering but do not restrict. Our choice in this case was led by its
 175 scalability over other such algorithms. Nevertheless, we consider this a fruitful avenue for future research.

176 Due to the nature of the selected K-Means clustering, the step preceding the final analysis is the selection of an optimal
 177 number of clusters. We use the clustergram exploratory method⁴², reflecting the behaviour of different options, the relationship
 178 between clustering solutions regarding the allocation of individual observations to classes, and the separation between the
 179 clusters within each tested solution (figure 5). Clustergram is further accompanied by measures of internal validation measures
 180 - the Silhouette score diagram, Calinski-Harabasz index⁴³ and Davies-Bouldin index⁴⁴. The optimal number of classes is
 181 selected based on the interpretation of clustergram supported by additional measures aiming at a balance between cluster
 182 separation and an appropriate detail of resulting classification. We use mini batch K-Means with a batch size of 1,000,000 and
 183 100 initialisations to create the clustergram and test number of clusters between 2 and 25. The results indicate 10 clusters as an
 184 optimal solution. The final clustering solution is generated using mini batch K-Means with a batch size of 1,000,000 and 1,000
 185 initialisations to ensure the stability of the outcome.

186 The results of the clustering capture the first group of a national signature classification composed of ten clusters. However,
 187 since the classified ETCs cover the entirety of space, from vast natural open spaces to dense city centres, it may result in only a
 188 few classes representing urban areas. While that is caused by the variable heterogeneity of our dataset in combination with
 189 K-Means clustering, the measured characters have the ability to further distinguish classes of already identified clusters. As
 190 spatial signatures are focused on the urban environment, we further subdivide those clusters covering a substantial portion of
 191 urban areas using another iteration of K-Means clustering (one class into nine and another into three clusters). Both subdivisions
 192 were created using standard K-Means (single batch) using 1,000 initialisations. The resulting classification then provide
 193 classification capturing the typology of spatial signatures with a detailed focus on urban development.

194 Finally, individual spatial signature geometries are generated as a combination of adjacent ETCs belonging to the same




Figure 5. Clustergram and relevant metrics of a goodness of fit (Silhouette score, Calinski-Harabasz score, Davies-Bouldin score) for tested numbers of clusters. The clustergram suggest two potential solutions, the very conservative option of 4 clusters and 10 clusters selected as an optimal result (indicated by a vertical yellow line).

signature class. To describe each geometry and each signature type, we measure mean values of the original, non-contextualised characters, and release it as additional descriptive tables. The resulting numerical profile of each signature type is available as table 3. Table 4 contains pen portraits derived from these numerical profiles.

Table 3. Numerical portraits characterising each signature type. Each value is computed as a mean of values of all ETCs within the type.

| type | Accessible suburbia | Connected residential neighbourhoods | Countryside agriculture | Dense residential neighbourhoods | Dense urban neighbourhoods | Disconnected suburbia | Concentrated urbanity | Gridded residential quarters | Hyper concentrated urbanity | Local urbanity | Metropolitan urbanity | Open sprawl | Regional urbanity | Urban buffer | Warehouse / Park land | Wild countryside |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| area of building | 176.95 | 272.52 | 204.10 | 375.60 | 588.36 | 212.71 | 3713.38 | 283.89 | 3358.10 | 823.35 | 2413.94 | 226.72 | 1480.26 | 209.42 | 393.22 | 209.86 |
| perimeter of building | 53.90 | 69.12 | 56.05 | 80.56 | 107.36 | 61.63 | 376.30 | 69.67 | 330.82 | 135.54 | 283.94 | 59.64 | 195.98 | 55.94 | 75.68 | 57.12 |
| courtyard area of building | 0.48 | 1.07 | 0.51 | 2.13 | 5.03 | 0.52 | 159.09 | 0.75 | 90.82 | 12.67 | 118.95 | 0.90 | 43.19 | 0.74 | 3.26 | 0.22 |
| circular compactness of building | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.49 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 0.50 |
| corners of building | 4.25 | 4.45 | 4.37 | 4.69 | 5.21 | 4.35 | 12.48 | 4.51 | 9.27 | 6.01 | 9.72 | 4.37 | 7.78 | 4.34 | 4.56 | 4.38 |
| squareness of building | 0.78 | 1.47 | 0.81 | 1.86 | 3.28 | 1.02 | 18.59 | 1.66 | 22.51 | 5.07 | 12.41 | 0.99 | 8.84 | 0.86 | 1.35 | 0.71 |
| equivalent rectangular index of building | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.78 | 0.98 | 0.80 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| elongation of building | 0.64 | 0.56 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.52 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.51 | 0.63 | 0.54 | 0.59 |
| centroid - corner mean distance of building | 9.60 | 12.41 | 9.79 | 13.96 | 18.00 | 11.11 | 35.93 | 12.41 | 37.22 | 20.71 | 29.68 | 10.49 | 25.25 | 9.81 | 13.20 | 9.95 |
| centroid - corner distance deviation of building | 0.36 | 0.71 | 0.56 | 1.07 | 1.88 | 0.54 | 9.03 | 0.80 | 7.70 | 2.98 | 6.78 | 0.55 | 4.98 | 0.49 | 0.88 | 0.60 |
| orientation of building | 19.56 | 25.50 | 20.57 | 16.41 | 20.64 | 26.39 | 20.32 | 23.13 | 26.26 | 20.78 | 22.30 | 20.21 | 21.82 | 21.10 | 23.30 | 21.86 |
| longest axis length of ETC | 50.84 | 57.72 | 220.30 | 64.46 | 73.56 | 53.55 | 112.12 | 52.89 | 126.58 | 80.14 | 100.52 | 60.97 | 91.91 | 105.16 | 78.67 | 449.71 |
| area of ETC | 1147.25 | 1517.81 | 31193.48 | 1917.31 | 2410.32 | 1259.03 | 5708.23 | 1251.54 | 8654.32 | 2696.40 | 4442.21 | 2000.37 | 3535.28 | 8658.83 | 3520.84 | 155623.92 |
| circular compactness of ETC | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.38 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.46 | 0.42 | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.35 |
| equivalent rectangular index of ETC | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.91 |
| orientation of ETC | 20.40 | 24.94 | 21.92 | 17.77 | 21.07 | 25.28 | 20.37 | 23.06 | 25.96 | 21.22 | 22.38 | 21.07 | 21.88 | 21.86 | 23.27 | 22.51 |
| covered area ratio of ETC | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.07 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.22 | 0.91 | 0.23 | 0.61 | 0.60 | 4.85 | 0.18 | 1122.51 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.04 |
| cell alignment of building | 7.38 | 6.12 | 11.49 | 6.52 | 5.61 | 8.08 | 4.43 | 5.48 | 2.72 | 5.64 | 4.86 | 8.64 | 5.25 | 9.76 | 8.03 | 12.55 |
| alignment of neighbouring buildings | 5.31 | 5.36 | 8.45 | 5.39 | 5.17 | 5.67 | 5.95 | 4.93 | 6.55 | 5.67 | 6.37 | 6.48 | 6.27 | 7.06 | 6.06 | 10.05 |
| mean distance between neighbouring buildings | 17.82 | 19.17 | 111.38 | 20.84 | 21.13 | 18.63 | 18.96 | 16.48 | 22.95 | 20.62 | 22.33 | 22.13 | 20.94 | 45.37 | 28.71 | 238.45 |
| perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 7.46 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| area covered by neighbouring cells | 8620.11 | 11990.46 | 277883.95 | 15619.36 | 20375.37 | 9503.57 | 52023.10 | 9962.17 | 61122.40 | 22892.04 | 39665.51 | 16780.98 | 31594.99 | 76942.43 | 31956.96 | 1485709.28 |
| weighted reached enclosures of ETC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| mean inter-building distance | 21.97 | 24.07 | 167.60 | 26.48 | 27.37 | 22.03 | 22.73 | 21.34 | 23.74 | 26.28 | 26.99 | 28.94 | 26.32 | 67.27 | 40.97 | 367.72 |
| width of street profile | 28.38 | 26.84 | 32.84 | 26.29 | 24.84 | 27.65 | 19.47 | 24.27 | 17.47 | 24.56 | 22.61 | 28.59 | 23.44 | 31.00 | 30.85 | 34.31 |
| width deviation of street profile | 3.30 | 3.27 | 3.91 | 3.50 | 3.45 | 3.71 | 3.29 | 3.87 | 2.85 | 3.60 | 3.50 | 3.74 | 3.62 | 3.76 | 3.26 | 3.41 |
| openness of street profile | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.83 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.28 | 0.38 | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.62 | 0.53 | 0.92 |
| length of street segment | 187.61 | 162.45 | 574.25 | 153.66 | 151.58 | 150.53 | 108.90 | 126.02 | 93.90 | 143.14 | 123.30 | 183.43 | 132.18 | 333.77 | 220.94 | 842.79 |
| linearity of street segment | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| mean segment length within 3 steps | 2327.31 | 2374.39 | 5884.25 | 1992.44 | 2113.58 | 1707.52 | 1944.94 | 1950.07 | 2057.70 | 2011.42 | 2112.12 | 1862.02 | 2034.72 | 3170.78 | 2339.74 | 8062.03 |
| node degree of junction | 2.87 | 3.00 | 2.78 | 2.89 | 2.94 | 2.68 | 3.12 | 3.04 | 3.33 | 2.94 | 3.14 | 2.68 | 3.01 | 2.70 | 2.77 | 2.69 |
| local meshness of street network | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.05 |
| local proportion of 3-way intersections of street network | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.72 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.68 |
| local proportion of 4-way intersections of street network | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.23 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| local proportion of cul-de-sacs of street network | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.28 |
| local closeness of street network | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| local cul-de-sac length of street network | 228.58 | 163.78 | 636.07 | 196.63 | 170.89 | 275.96 | 84.41 | 133.13 | 75.11 | 167.72 | 79.56 | 288.26 | 128.76 | 408.67 | 253.49 | 1186.52 |
| square clustering of street network | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| mean distance to neighbouring nodes of street network | 132.49 | 118.06 | 373.74 | 112.48 | 111.55 | 111.69 | 86.38 | 92.19 | 81.24 | 106.90 | 93.66 | 129.03 | 99.79 | 212.34 | 150.43 | 601.60 |
| local node density of street network | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| local degree weighted node density of street network | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| street alignment of building | 8.73 | 7.53 | 11.81 | 8.25 | 7.57 | 9.98 | 7.84 | 6.95 | 6.23 | 8.05 | 8.32 | 10.97 | 8.06 | 11.33 | 10.02 | 12.77 |
| area covered by node-attached ETCs | 22426.36 | 14599.22 | 286081.33 | 14037.94 | 13513.86 | 15656.96 | 13069.71 | 9488.11 | 20051.57 | 11878.66 | 13201.87 | 25443.99 | 12080.93 | 100470.30 | 33097.00 | 1215083.95 |
| area covered by edge-attached ETCs | 36496.96 | 24423.69 | 502883.47 | 25413.44 | 26111.44 | 26810.65 | 33257.27 | 17094.77 | 38566.99 | 25905.75 | 31497.77 | 47178.87 | 29440.27 | 188719.66 | 66614.68 | 2174736.93 |
| buildings per meter of street segment | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| reached ETCs by neighbouring segments | 49.09 | 33.99 | 38.08 | 26.79 | 21.56 | 32.35 | 8.88 | 26.76 | 8.57 | 16.97 | 11.04 | 35.17 | 13.53 | 43.96 | 30.27 | 26.08 |
| reached area by neighbouring segments | 113290.06 | 88462.74 | 1591397.39 | 89313.79 | 97515.74 | 84060.33 | 145420.68 | 64059.40 | 151507.35 | 100616.06 | 132683.99 | 140813.94 | 119718.73 | 556190.10 | 211678.46 | 5556960.68 |
| reached ETCs by local street network | 166.98 | 126.07 | 110.89 | 90.93 | 74.36 | 102.39 | 28.79 | 99.87 | 27.00 | 56.17 | 36.29 | 103.45 | 43.97 | 123.39 | 93.33 | 71.94 |
| reached area by local street network | 451276.21 | 390719.33 | 5858316.88 | 369240.03 | 416784.68 | 316062.25 | 703631.50 | 296524.52 | 621126.10 | 439804.09 | 643746.00 | 506987.49 | 540975.07 | 1982158.35 | 794621.33 | 17403052.98 |

Continued on next page

| type | Accessible suburbia | Connected residential neighbourhoods | Countryside agriculture | Dense residential neighbourhoods | Dense urban neighbourhoods | Disconnected suburbia | Concentrated urbanity | Gridded residential quarters | Hyper concentrated urbanity | Local urbanity | Metropolitan urbanity | Open sprawl | Regional urbanity | Urban buffer | Warehouse / Park land | Wild country-side |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| reached ETCs by tessellation contiguity | 36.80 | 40.24 | 46.23 | 43.10 | 45.61 | 39.57 | 53.52 | 42.04 | 48.46 | 47.29 | 51.81 | 41.55 | 51.95 | 43.57 | 42.93 | 47.56 |
| reached area by tessellation contiguity | 60511.46 | 87537.63 | 2410926.40 | 115962.63 | 152810.21 | 63671.98 | 372984.21 | 73335.07 | 306427.88 | 173857.48 | 302746.84 | 136577.35 | 238390.55 | 692699.47 | 297667.66 | 14081627.81 |
| area of enclosure perimeter of enclosure | 242778.35 | 95677.02 | 3591565.15 | 133719.21 | 105561.74 | 282930.77 | 28859.85 | 110195.65 | 31788.41 | 83656.67 | 29460.25 | 640071.17 | 63476.79 | 1854684.23 | 430998.35 | 44036373.80 |
| circular compactness of enclosure | 2046.29 | 1360.81 | 7599.46 | 1693.62 | 1463.16 | 2380.50 | 683.27 | 1150.58 | 538.87 | 1299.32 | 671.29 | 3793.33 | 1009.07 | 5664.05 | 2992.30 | 21952.84 |
| equivalent rectangular index of enclosure | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.41 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| compactness-weighted axis of enclosure | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.79 |
| orientation of enclosure | 515.77 | 344.74 | 1777.66 | 441.16 | 397.37 | 567.78 | 144.75 | 289.81 | 120.13 | 345.64 | 153.64 | 986.37 | 249.05 | 1434.02 | 780.52 | 5069.06 |
| perimeter-weighted neighbours of enclosure | 19.24 | 25.62 | 21.39 | 16.18 | 20.88 | 27.07 | 20.23 | 23.04 | 24.93 | 21.09 | 21.77 | 20.39 | 22.00 | 21.52 | 24.08 | 22.66 |
| area-weighted ETCs of enclosure | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Population | 4.51 | 8.57 | 1.91 | 10.02 | 17.52 | 6.55 | 36.91 | 7.74 | 37.93 | 28.87 | 43.70 | 5.06 | 42.99 | 3.43 | 6.93 | 1.31 |
| Night lights | 11.02 | 19.99 | 1.39 | 22.63 | 34.74 | 12.35 | 115.70 | 15.17 | 183.23 | 51.19 | 87.38 | 10.96 | 67.53 | 5.08 | 18.29 | 0.48 |
| Workplace population [Agriculture, energy and water] | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 2.44 | 0.03 | 1.41 | 0.18 | 1.01 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.11 |
| Workplace population [Manufacturing] | 0.12 | 0.29 | 0.22 | 0.64 | 1.10 | 0.21 | 12.80 | 0.36 | 20.14 | 1.32 | 4.18 | 0.42 | 2.03 | 0.38 | 1.25 | 0.09 |
| Workplace population [Construction] | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 0.18 | 9.16 | 0.20 | 10.68 | 0.80 | 3.80 | 0.17 | 1.40 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.07 |
| Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and restaurants] | 0.21 | 0.61 | 0.19 | 1.17 | 2.30 | 0.38 | 54.16 | 0.73 | 152.31 | 4.16 | 22.76 | 0.45 | 11.90 | 0.32 | 1.00 | 0.12 |
| Workplace population [Transport and communication] | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.41 | 0.88 | 0.13 | 39.51 | 0.18 | 97.90 | 1.96 | 18.93 | 0.16 | 5.70 | 0.14 | 0.51 | 0.04 |
| Workplace population [Financial, real estate, professional and administrative activities] | 0.15 | 0.40 | 0.13 | 0.78 | 1.81 | 0.26 | 258.67 | 0.38 | 172.75 | 4.89 | 65.30 | 0.27 | 16.45 | 0.21 | 0.61 | 0.06 |
| Workplace population [Public administration, education and health] | 0.43 | 0.94 | 0.22 | 1.67 | 3.21 | 0.59 | 41.70 | 0.98 | 30.82 | 5.71 | 42.90 | 0.59 | 14.50 | 0.39 | 1.06 | 0.12 |
| Workplace population [Other] | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.56 | 0.10 | 23.06 | 0.17 | 38.16 | 1.14 | 8.74 | 0.09 | 3.40 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.03 |
| Land cover [Airports] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Non-irrigated arable land] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.15 |
| Land cover [Industrial or commercial units] | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Salt marshes] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Estuaries] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Sport and leisure facilities] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Land cover [Green urban areas] | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Discontinuous urban fabric] | 0.98 | 0.95 | 0.20 | 0.88 | 0.75 | 0.98 | 0.06 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.34 | 0.68 | 0.77 | 0.03 |
| Land cover [Pastures] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.59 |
| Land cover [Broad-leaved forest] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.03 |
| Land cover [Mineral extraction sites] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Port areas] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Road and rail networks and associated land] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Water bodies] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Land principally occupied by agriculture, with significant areas of natural vegetation] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Land cover [Mixed forest] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Land cover [Peat bogs] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Land cover [Natural grasslands] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Land cover [Moors and heathland] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Land cover [Transitional woodland-shrub] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Land cover [Continuous urban fabric] | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 0.07 | 0.97 | 0.25 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Intertidal flats] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Sea and ocean] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Construction sites] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Burnt areas] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Dump sites] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Complex cultivation patterns] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Inland marshes] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Water courses] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Coniferous forest] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Land cover [Bare rocks] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Coastal lagoons] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Continued on next page

| type | Accessible suburbia | Connected residential neighbourhoods | Countryside agriculture | Dense residential neighbourhoods | Dense urban neighbourhoods | Disconnected suburbia | Concentrated urbanity | Gridded residential quarters | Hyper concentrated urbanity | Local urbanity | Metropolitan urbanity | Open sprawl | Regional urbanity | Urban buffer | Warehouse / Park land | Wild countryside |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Land cover [Beaches, dunes, sands] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Agro-forestry areas] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Sparsely vegetated areas] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Land cover [Fruit trees and berry plantations] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| NDVI | 0.29 | 0.25 | 0.48 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.29 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.29 | 0.56 |
| Supermarkets [distance to nearest] | 828.82 | 679.96 | 4751.23 | 661.77 | 587.28 | 761.86 | 229.90 | 577.68 | 324.42 | 483.02 | 299.93 | 948.03 | 331.07 | 1752.87 | 1043.84 | 9854.12 |
| Supermarkets [counts within 1200m] | 1.89 | 2.86 | 0.09 | 3.13 | 4.44 | 2.07 | 22.51 | 3.41 | 18.79 | 6.85 | 17.27 | 1.47 | 12.53 | 0.65 | 1.43 | 0.03 |
| Listed buildings [distance to nearest] | 744.22 | 596.61 | 557.94 | 506.61 | 350.89 | 729.61 | 31.73 | 516.20 | 69.75 | 216.86 | 51.87 | 760.26 | 115.00 | 673.93 | 934.00 | 1324.03 |
| Listed buildings [counts within 1200m] | 11.27 | 24.28 | 11.22 | 37.47 | 62.78 | 24.18 | 685.16 | 31.77 | 1142.57 | 140.03 | 456.53 | 18.17 | 324.50 | 16.14 | 10.57 | 4.21 |
| FHRS points [distance to nearest] | 218.46 | 152.48 | 725.69 | 144.02 | 106.08 | 217.95 | 16.22 | 129.24 | 14.10 | 82.47 | 40.06 | 267.24 | 56.87 | 379.17 | 256.22 | 1699.17 |
| FHRS points [counts within 1200m] | 334.43 | 692.66 | 44.47 | 860.93 | 1568.44 | 342.08 | 6297.61 | 1081.38 | 9213.15 | 2167.91 | 4490.95 | 253.88 | 3163.83 | 132.66 | 271.09 | 33.07 |
| Cultural venues [distance to nearest] | 5384.64 | 3946.05 | 13156.20 | 3497.51 | 2287.43 | 5831.52 | 702.75 | 4094.92 | 351.33 | 1273.23 | 644.53 | 6309.75 | 850.25 | 8939.65 | 5121.47 | 20695.29 |
| Cultural venues [counts within 1200m] | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.08 | 10.39 | 0.24 | 34.20 | 1.13 | 4.45 | 0.06 | 2.23 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.00 |
| Water bodies [distance to nearest] | 542.61 | 555.96 | 304.49 | 483.12 | 528.85 | 523.05 | 565.25 | 522.09 | 759.60 | 507.71 | 467.71 | 378.36 | 461.42 | 345.79 | 417.43 | 236.73 |
| Retail centres [distance to nearest] | 849.45 | 536.47 | 4943.97 | 421.09 | 224.33 | 725.57 | 29.80 | 445.52 | 32.54 | 161.85 | 66.32 | 1002.66 | 90.87 | 2102.46 | 898.17 | 11041.32 |

Table 4. Interpretative pen portraits characterising each signature type based on its numerical profile.

| Signature type | Pen Portait |
|-------------------------|--|
| Wild countryside | In “Wild countryside”, human influence is the least intensive. This signature covers large open spaces in the countryside where no urbanisation happens apart from occasional roads, cottages, and pastures. You can find it across the Scottish Highlands, numerous national parks such as Lake District, or in the majority of Wales. |
| Countryside agriculture | “Countryside agriculture” features much of the English countryside and displays a high degree of agriculture including both fields and pastures. There are a few buildings scattered across the area but, for the most part, it is green space. |
| Urban buffer | “Urban buffer” can be characterised as a green belt around cities. This signature includes mostly agricultural land in the immediate adjacency of towns and cities, often including edge development. It still feels more like countryside than urban, but these signatures are much smaller compared to other countryside types. |
| Open sprawl | “Open sprawl” represents the transition between countryside and urbanised land. It is located in the outskirts of cities or around smaller towns and is typically made up of large open space areas intertwined with different kinds of human development, from highways to smaller neighbourhoods. |
| Disconnected suburbia | “Disconnected suburbia” includes residential developments in the outskirts of cities or even towns and villages with convoluted, disconnected street networks, low built-up and population densities, and lack of jobs and services. This signature type is entirely car-dependent. |
| Accessible suburbia | “Accessible suburbia” covers residential development on the urban periphery with a relatively legible and connected street network, albeit less so than other more urban signature types. Areas in this signature feature low density, both in terms of population and built-up area, lack of jobs and services. For these reasons, “accessible suburbia” largely acts as dormitories. |
| Warehouse/Park land | “Warehouse/Park land” covers predominantly industrial areas and other work-related developments made of box-like buildings with large footprints. It contains many jobs of manual nature such as manufacturing or construction, and very little population live here compared to the rest of urban areas. Occasionally this type also covers areas of parks with large scale green open areas. |

Continued on next page

| Signature type | Pen Portait |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Gridded residential quarters | “Gridded residential quarters” are areas with street networks forming a well-connected grid-like (high density of 4-way intersections) pattern, resulting in places with smaller blocks and higher granularity. This signature is mostly residential but includes some services and jobs, and it tends to be located away from city centres. |
| Connected residential neighbourhoods | “Connected residential neighbourhoods” are relatively dense urban areas, both in terms of population and built-up area, that tend to be formed around well-connected street networks. They have access to services and some jobs but may be further away from city centres leading to higher dependency on cars and public transport for their residents. |
| Dense residential neighbourhoods | A “dense residential neighbourhood” is an abundant signature often covering large parts of cities outside of their centres. It has primarily residential purpose and high population density, varied street network patterns, and some services and jobs but not in high intensity. |
| Dense urban neighbourhoods | “Dense urban neighbourhoods” are areas of inner-city with high population and built-up density of a predominantly residential nature but with direct access to jobs and services. This signature type tends to be relatively walkable and, in the case of some towns, may even form their centres. |
| Local urbanity | “Local urbanity” reflects town centres, outer parts of city centres or even district centres. In all cases, this signature is very much urban in essence, combining high population and built-up density, access to amenities and jobs. Yet, it is on the lower end of the hierarchy of signature types denoting urban centres with only a local significance. |
| Regional urbanity | “Regional urbanity” captures centres of mid-size cities with regional importance such as Liverpool, Plymouth or Newcastle upon Tyne. It is often encircled by “Local urbanity” signatures and can form outer rings of city centres in large cities. It features high population density, as well as a high number of jobs and amenities within walkable distance. |
| Metropolitan urbanity | Signature type “Metropolitan urbanity” captures the centre of the largest cities in Great Britain such as Glasgow, Birmingham or Manchester. It is characterised by a very high number of jobs in the area, high built-up density and often high population density. This type serves as the core centre of the entire metropolitan areas. |
| Concentrated urbanity | Concentrated urbanity” is a signature type found in the city centre of London and nowhere else in Great Britain. It reflects the uniqueness of London in the British context with an extremely high number of jobs and amenities located nearby, as well as high built-up and population densities. Buildings in this signature are large and tightly packed, forming complex shapes with courtyards and little green space. |
| Hyper concentrated urbanity | The epitome of urbanity in the British context. “Hyper concentrated urbanity” is a signature type present only in the centre of London, around the Soho district, and covering Oxford and Regent streets. This signature is the result of centuries of urban primacy, with a multitude of historical layers interwoven, very high built-up and population density, and extreme abundance of amenities, services and jobs. |

198 Data Records

199 The data product described in this article is available through the Consumer Data Research Centre Open Data repository available at <https://data.cdrc.ac.uk/dataset/spatial-signatures-great-britain> under the Open Government Licence v3.0
200 license and archived at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.16691575.v1>. The dataset stored in the repository contains
201 a GeoPackage with a signature geometry (OSGB36 / British National Grid (EPSG:27700) CRS) and related signature
202 type, plain-text pen portraits describing individual signature types, a series of CSV files describing individual signatures
203 and signature types, and a CSV files linking signature types to the Output Area and Lower Super Output Area geom-
204 etry. An online interactive map of spatial signatures for the whole of Great Britain is available on the project website
205 (<https://urbangrammarai.xyz/great-britain>). The underlying data used to create the ODP are available in a dedicated GitHub
206 repository available from (https://github.com/urbangrammarai/signatures_gb).

208 Composition and comparison

209 Character importance

210 The characters used in the cluster analysis have each different importance in distinguish between signature types. Those
 211 characters which spatial distribution most closely matches the distribution of signatures can be seen as more important than
 212 those that are seemingly random or mostly invariant (as some of the land cover classes are). Unpacking the importance of
 213 individual characters from K-Means clustering cannot be done directly, but a useful method is to train a supervised model, in
 214 our case Random Forest, designed to predict individual signature types from input data. Such a model then provides a feature
 215 importance - a relative measure of a strength of each character in distinguishing between the types. The results of this approach
 216 are shown in a table 5. As you can see, form-based characters dominate the top 10 characters but it is worth noting that these
 217 top 10 characters together bear only 0.196 of the overall importance.

Table 5. Relative importance of top 10 most important characters in predicting spatial signature types using the Random Forest model.

| | relative importance |
|--|---------------------|
| covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | 0.036944 |
| covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | 0.031717 |
| perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC (Q2) | 0.023476 |
| mean inter-building distance (Q2) | 0.016662 |
| area of ETC (Q3) | 0.016005 |
| area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q3) | 0.014813 |
| longest axis length of ETC (Q2) | 0.014501 |
| weighted reached enclosures of ETC (Q1) | 0.014115 |
| reached area by neighbouring segments (Q3) | 0.014000 |
| reached area by neighbouring segments (Q1) | 0.013904 |

218 A similar exercise can be done on a level of individual clusters, with a binary Random Forest model trained to distinguish
 219 that particular class from the other. Resulting relative importance of top 10 characters for each signature type is presented in a
 220 table 6. While it is clear that form-based characters still dominate the prediction, the more urban signature types are, the higher
 221 the importance of function seems to be. Complete tables with all characters are available as online tables 1 and 2.

Table 6. Relative importance of top 10 most important characters for each signature type in predicting using the Random Forest model.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Wild country-side | name | longest axis length of ETC (Q1) | covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | area of ETC (Q2) | area of ETC (Q2) | perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC (Q3) | reached area by neighbouring segments (Q1) | reached area by tessellation contiguity (Q1) | area of ETC (Q3) | mean distance between neighbouring buildings (Q2) |
| Countryside agriculture | importance name | 0.197 covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | 0.151 covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | 0.146 mean inter-building distance (Q2) | 0.096 area of ETC (Q2) | 0.075 area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q2) | 0.049 mean distance to neighbouring nodes of street ... | 0.018 reached area by neighbouring segments (Q1) | 0.016 Land cover [Discontinuous fabric] (Q2) | 0.015 perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC (Q2) | 0.011 longest axis length of ETC (Q2) |
| Gridded residential quarters | importance name | 0.154 local closeness of street network (Q3) | 0.144 local closeness of street network (Q2) | 0.079 perimeter of enclosure (Q1) | 0.073 area of enclosure (Q2) | 0.067 local closeness of street network (Q1) | 0.066 weighted reached enclosures of ETC (Q3) | 0.063 local proportion of 4-way intersections of str... | 0.055 area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q1) | 0.022 area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q2) | 0.021 weighted reached enclosures of ETC (Q2) |
| Accessible suburbia | importance name | 0.095 weighted reached enclosures of ETC (Q3) | 0.046 reached ETCS by tessellation contiguity (Q3) | 0.044 reached area by tessellation contiguity (Q2) | 0.037 area of ETC (Q2) | 0.037 reached ETCS by neighbouring segments (Q1) | 0.032 reached ETCS by neighbouring segments (Q2) | 0.021 reached ETCS by local street network (Q2) | 0.019 perimeter-weighted neighbours of ETC (Q1) | 0.018 reached area by tessellation contiguity (Q1) | 0.017 reached ETCS by local street network (Q1) |
| Connected residential neighbourhoods | importance name | 0.064 cell alignment of building (Q1) | 0.062 local proportion of 4-way intersections of str... | 0.048 cell alignment of building (Q2) | 0.045 area of enclosure (Q2) | 0.037 orientation of ETC (Q2) | 0.03 equivalent rectangular index of building (Q1) | 0.026 local proportion of 4-way intersections of str... | 0.024 perimeter of enclosure (Q1) | 0.023 local proportion of cul-de-sacs of street netw... | 0.02 orientation of enclosure (Q1) |
| Urban buffer | importance name | 0.028 area covered by neighbouring cells (Q2) | 0.023 covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | 0.017 mean distance to neighbouring nodes of street ... | 0.017 covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | 0.017 reached area by neighbouring segments (Q1) | 0.016 circular compactness of ETC (Q2) | 0.014 area covered by neighbouring cells (Q1) | 0.014 buildings per meter of street segment (Q2) | 0.014 reached area by tessellation contiguity (Q1) | 0.013 area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q3) |
| Open sprawl | importance name | 0.072 reached area by local street network (Q1) | 0.05 reached area by neighbouring segments (Q1) | 0.049 area covered by node-attached ETCs (Q2) | 0.046 covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | 0.038 local node density of street network (Q3) | 0.035 reached area by neighbouring segments (Q2) | 0.033 covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | 0.032 area of enclosure (Q2) | 0.03 compactness-weighted axis of enclosure (Q3) | 0.028 area of ETC (Q2) |
| | importance | 0.058 | 0.034 | 0.024 | 0.022 | 0.019 | 0.018 | 0.018 | 0.017 | 0.017 | 0.016 |

Continued on next page

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Warehouse/Park land | name | elongation of building (Q1) | centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q3) | elongation of building (Q2) | circular compactness of building (Q1) | centroid - corner distance deviation of building (Q3) | perimeter of building (Q3) | width of street profile (Q2) | circular compactness of building (Q2) | reached area by tessellation contiguity (Q1) | perimeter of building (Q2) |
| Local urbanity | importance name | 0.034 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.028 | 0.025 equivalent rectangular index of building (Q1) | 0.02 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q2) | 0.018 squareness of building (Q3) | 0.017 area of building (Q2) | 0.017 centroid - corner distance deviation of building (Q3) | 0.016 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.016 perimeter of building (Q3) | 0.015 area of building (Q1) |
| Dense residential neighbourhoods | importance name | 0.101 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q2) | 0.094 | 0.082 area of building (Q3) | 0.054 Population (Q3) | 0.051 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.045 area of building (Q2) | 0.044 perimeter of enclosure (Q1) | 0.035 orientation of enclosure (Q2) | 0.034 perimeter of building (Q3) | 0.023 area of enclosure (Q1) |
| Disconnected suburbia | importance name | 0.037 local proportion of cul-de-sacs of street network... | 0.03 | 0.029 local meshedness of street network (Q3) | 0.028 equivalent rectangular index of building (Q1) | 0.026 circular compactness of building (Q1) | 0.023 Population (Q1) | 0.021 elongation of building (Q2) | 0.018 reached area by neighbouring segments (Q2) | 0.017 area covered by edge-attached ETCs (Q3) | 0.015 circular compactness of building (Q2) |
| Dense urban neighbourhoods | importance name | 0.024 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.021 | 0.021 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q2) | 0.02 perimeter of building (Q3) | 0.019 Population (Q3) | 0.018 squareness of building (Q3) | 0.016 centroid - corner distance deviation of building (Q3) | 0.016 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.016 equivalent rectangular index of building (Q1) | 0.015 Workplace population [Other] (Q2) |
| Regional urbanity | importance name | 0.107 centroid - corner distance deviation of building (Q2) | 0.084 | 0.082 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q3) | 0.066 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.04 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.039 perimeter of building (Q3) | 0.034 area of building (Q2) | 0.029 Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and...] | 0.018 corners of building (Q3) | 0.016 centroid - corner distance deviation of building (Q1) |
| Metropolitan urbanity | importance name | 0.115 equivalent rectangular index of building (Q2) | 0.088 | 0.082 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q2) | 0.071 corners of building (Q2) | 0.065 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.058 Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and...] | 0.05 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.049 squareness of building (Q3) | 0.029 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.021 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q1) |
| Concentrated urbanity | importance name | 0.111 area of building (Q1) | 0.087 | 0.081 Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and...] | 0.072 Workplace population [Financial, real estate, ...] | 0.06 Workplace population [Other] (Q2) | 0.051 Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and...] | 0.047 Workplace population [Manufacturing] (Q2) | 0.039 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.03 Land cover [Non-irrigated arable land] (Q1) | 0.019 |
| Hyper concentrated urbanity | importance name | 0.128 covered area ratio of ETC (Q2) | 0.1 | 0.077 Workplace population [Other] (Q2) | 0.076 Workplace population [Distribution, hotels and...] | 0.071 covered area ratio of ETC (Q1) | 0.06 Workplace population [Manufacturing] (Q3) | 0.055 centroid - corner mean distance of building (Q2) | 0.047 perimeter of building (Q2) | 0.045 openness of street profile (Q2) | 0.026 NDVI (Q3) |
| | importance | 0.154 | 0.144 | 0.102 | 0.082 | 0.079 | 0.075 | 0.07 | 0.055 | 0.031 | 0.027 |

Comparison

Spatial signatures are unique as a classification method, limiting the potential validation. Therefore, we rather present a comparison of signatures and ancillary datasets capturing conceptually similar aspects of the environment. We compare the signatures with four of such datasets, each focusing on a different classification perspective, but all related to our classification to a degree when we can assume there will be a measurable level of association between the two:

- WorldPop settlement patterns of building footprints (2021)¹⁰
- Classification of Multidimensional Open Data of Urban Morphology (MODUM) (2015)⁷
- Copernicus Urban Atlas (2018)⁴⁵
- Local Climate Zones (2019)⁴⁶

Comparison approach

All datasets, spatial signatures and those selected for a comparison contain a categorical classification of space linked to their unique geometry. The first requirement to be able to compare data products is to transfer their information to the same geometry. We take two approaches for this step, depending on the dataset we are comparing the signatures with: an interpolation of one set of polygon-based data to another (input to ETCs); or the conversion of spatial signatures to the raster representation matching an input raster, which is computationally more efficient when one of the layers is already a raster. The second step is a statistical comparison of two sets of classification labels, one representing spatial signature typology and the other comparison classes. We use contingency tables and Pearson's χ^2 test to determine whether the frequencies of observed (signature types) and expected (comparison types) labels significantly differ in one or more categories. Furthermore, we use Cramér's V statistics⁴⁷ to assess the strength of the association.

WorldPop settlement patterns of building footprints

WorldPop settlement patterns of building footprints dataset aims to derive a typology of morphological patterns based on a gridded approach with cells of 100x100m, and building footprints. Authors measure six morphometric characters linked to the grid cells and use them as input for an unsupervised clustering algorithm leading to a six-class typology. As the classification is dependent on building footprints, grid cells that do not contain any information on the building-based pattern are treated as missing in the final data product. For the comparison, this *missing* category is treated as a single class. It is assumed that the top-level large scale patterns detected by the WorldPop method and spatial signatures will provide similar results. However,




Figure 6. Contingency table showing frequencies (in %) of WorldPop classes within signature types.

there will be differences caused by the inclusion of function in spatial signatures, higher granularity of both initial spatial units and the resulting classification (6 vs 19 classes).

Signature typology is rasterized and linked to the WorldPop grid. The resulting contingency table is shown in Figure 6. There is a significant relationship between two typologies, $\chi^2(114, N = 22993921) = 13341832, p < .001$. The strength of association measured as Cramér's V is 0.311, indicating moderate association. The contingency table shows that WorldPop classes tend to be linked to groups of signature types of a similarly degree of urbanity. A WorldPop class 15 is "undefined" due to the lack of building footprints in the area, therefore overlapping a large portion of signatures. The difference between classifications is likely driven by two main aspects - one is the different number of classes. We can see that WorldPop classes tend to cluster within a limited number of signature types and vice versa. The only exception is allocation of signature types into classes 4 and 6, which seems to heavily overlap. That is possibly caused by the second aspect - inclusion of function. Both classes 4 and 6 tend to be outside of city centres but still within urban areas. While it is the footprint-based form that is driving the difference between them, signatures in the same area are often distinguished by function and varies access to amenities and services.

MODUM

Multidimensional Open Data Urban Morphology (MODUM) classification describes a typology of neighbourhoods derived from 18 indicators capturing built environment as streets, railways or parks, linked to the Census Output Area geometry. The classification identifies 8 types of neighbourhoods. Compared to the WorldPop classification, MODUM takes into account more features of the built environment than building footprints, which makes it conceptually closer to the spatial signatures. However, it is still focusing predominantly on the form component, although there are some indicators that would be classified as function within the signatures framework (e.g. population). The MODUM method uses a different way of capturing context compared to the signatures, which leads to some classes being determined predominantly by a single character. For example, the *Railway Buzz* type forms a narrow strip around the railway network, which is an effect signatures avoid. MODUM typology is available only for England and Wales. Therefore the comparison takes into account only ETCs covering the same area. The classification is linked to the ETC geometry is based on the proportion (the type covering the largest portion of ETC is assigned). The resulting contingency table is shown in Figure 7. There is a significant relationship between two typologies, $\chi^2(152, N = 13067584) = 13938867, p < .001$. The strength of association measured as Cramér's V is 0.300, indicating




Figure 7. Contingency table showing frequencies (in %) of MODUM classes within signature types.

moderate association of very similar levels we have seen above. The contingency table indicates similar relationships, where a single MODUM class overlaps a group of signature types. However, the groups tend to be well defined and formed based on the similarity of types. Signature types are minimally present in MODUM classes driven by a single character (*Railway Buzz*, *Waterside Settings*, *High Street and Promenades*), suggesting the more balanced weight of characters.

278 Copernicus Urban Atlas

279 Copernicus Urban Atlas is the least similar of the comparison datasets. It is a high-resolution land use classification of functional
 280 urban areas derived primarily from Earth Observation data enriched by other reference data as OpenStreetMap or topographic
 281 maps. Its smallest spatial unit in urban areas is 0.25 ha and 1 ha in rural areas, defined primarily by physical barriers. It
 282 identifies 27 predefined classes using the supervised method. The majority of urban areas is classified as urban fabric further
 283 distinguished based on continuity and density resulting in six classes of the urban fabric. The classification does not consider
 284 the type of the pattern or any other aspect. Furthermore, it does not take into account what signatures call *context* as each
 285 spatial unit is classified independently, which in some cases leads to the high heterogeneity of classification within a small
 286 portion of land. Signatures take a different approach. Consequently, it is expected that the similarity between the two will be
 287 limited. Urban Atlas is available only for functional urban areas (FUA), leaving rural areas unclassified. Comparison then
 288 applies to FUAs only. The classification is linked to the ETC geometry based on the proportion (the type covering the largest
 289 portion of ETC is assigned). The resulting contingency table is shown in Figure 8. There is a significant relationship between
 290 two typologies, $\chi^2(450, N = 8396642) = 5229900, p < .001$. The strength of association measured as Cramér's V is 0.186,
 291 indicating a weak association. The contingency table shows the difference in the aim of spatial signatures and that of Urban
 292 Atlas with a majority of signatures being linked to a few of Urban Atlas classes. Within relevant classes, we see a tendency
 293 of signature types to cluster within Urban Atlas classes based on the level of urbanity, albeit not as strong as in the previous

294 two cases. The main reason behind such a large difference are the aims of both classifications. While the Copernicus Urban
295 Atlas attempts to capture land cover, resulting in a large number of non-urban classes, spatial signatures are aimed at urban
296 environment with 13 out of 16 classes covering primarily urbanised areas.

297 Local Climate Zones

298 Local climate zones (LCZ) are conceptual classes originally designed to support study of urban climate as temperature. It
299 consists of 17 classes of which 10 can be classified as urban and 7 and natural ones. In the context of Great Britain, the dataset
300 used in this study does not contain 2 of them, *Lightweight low-rise* and *Compact highrise* as they are not present in the British
301 landscape. The datasets produced by⁴⁶ released LCZs in a 100 meters grid based on the 2016 data. As the LCZs are remotely
302 sensed in this case, authors report overall average accuracy of 80 %. As a conceptual classification aimed to cover all possible
303 types of primarily urban climate zones globally, LZCs may not be optimal when looking into a single country with specific
304 history of urban development. This is further indicated by classes that are missing. It is therefore likely that large parts of
305 British cities will fall into only a few of LCZ classes, while being represented by a much larger number of signature types.

306 Signature typology is rasterized and linked to the LCZ grid. The resulting contingency table is shown in Figure 9. There is
307 a significant relationship between two typologies, $\chi^2(225, N = 16203338) = 18467242, p < .001$. The strength of association
308 measured as Cramér's V is 0.276, indicating a modest to weak association, close to values we've seen in first two cases. As
309 expected, urban signature types are clustered primarily within *Compact midrise* and *Open lowrise* LCZs, while non-urban
310 signatures mostly fall into the *Low plants* LCZ.

311 The difference between signatures and LCZs can be accounted to two aspects. One, as we've seen before is the inclusion
312 of function in spatial signatures, differentiating e.g. LCZ's *Open lowrise* into many signature types. The other is data-driven
313 nature of signatures compared to conceptual LCZs, where differences in signature types are below the resolution capability of
314 simple matrix composed of density and compactness levels. On the other, it is encouraging to see that most of signature types
315 fall predominantly in a single LCZ class, suggesting that while both classifications are built differently, they are able to capture
316 similar large-scale patterns in cities.

317 Summary

318 None of the comparisons shows more than a moderate association, but since none of the comparison datasets is aiming to capture
319 the same conceptualization of space as spatial signatures do, such a result is expected. The moderate association with both
320 WorldPop settlements patterns and MODUM is reassuring as both are conceptually closer to signatures than the Urban Atlas
321 (especially in their unsupervised design). Urban Atlas, though very different in its aims and methods, still shows a measurable
322 association, which we interpret as sign that the key structural aspects forming cities are captured by both. The comparison
323 exercise suggests that general patterns forming cities are shared among signatures and existing typologies. Signature types tend
324 to form groups when we look at their relation to comparison classes and it is not uncommon that a single signature type is
325 present in multiple groups linked to different classes. However, all these groups tend to be formed based on the similarity and
326 illustrate the granularity of the presented classification compared to existing datasets, allowing us to distinguish, for example,
327 five types of signature types forming town an city centres.

328 Usage Notes

329 The released data product follows widespread standards for geographic data storage and should be easy to integrate with other
330 data and methods by researchers wanting to reuse it. However, due to the density of signature geometry (resulting from the
331 detailed ETCs), it may be needed to simplify the geometry for a smoother interactive experience on machines with limited
332 resources.

333 Replication of the analysis optimally requires at least a single computational node with a large amount of RAM (+100GB)
334 due to the size of the input data and detail on which signature characterization is computed. It is also recommended to revisit the
335 state of the development of related software packages, notably momepy⁴⁸, libpsal⁴⁹, tobler³⁷ and dask-geopandas
336 as they may soon offer more efficient drop-in replacements of the custom code used to produce this dataset.

337 Code availability

338 The source code used to produce this dataset is openly available in a GitHub repository at
339 https://github.com/urbangrammarai/spatial_signatures and in the form of a website on <https://urbangrammarai.xyz>. Code is
340 organized in a series of Jupyter notebooks and have been executed within the `darrivas:gds_dev:6.1.50` Docker container,
341 unless specified otherwise in the individual notebooks.




Figure 8. Contingency table showing frequencies (in %) of Urban Atlas classes within signature types.




Figure 9. Contingency table showing frequencies (in %) of Local Climate Zones within signature types.

342 References

- 343 1. Arribas-Bel, D. & Fleischmann, M. Spatial Signatures - Understanding (urban) spaces through form and function. *Habitat*
344 *Int.* **0**, 0 (2022).
- 345 2. Fleischmann, M. & Arribas-Bel, D. Classifying urban form at national scale - The British morphosignatures. *Proc. XXVIII*
346 *Int. Semin. on Urban Form* [10.17868/strath.00080527](https://doi.org/10.17868/strath.00080527) (2022).
- 347 3. Arribas-Bel, D., Green, M., Rowe, F. & Singleton, A. Open Data Products: a framework for creating valuable analysis-ready
348 data. *J. Geogr. Syst.* **23**, 497–514, [10.1007/s10109-021-00363-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10109-021-00363-5) (2021).
- 349 4. HM Government. Levelling Up the United Kingdom. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/levelling-up-the-united-kingdom> (2022). London: The Stationery Office.
- 350 5. Stewart, I. D. & Oke, T. R. Local climate zones for urban temperature studies. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **93**, 1879–1900
352 (2012).
- 353 6. Angel, S., Arango Franco, S., Liu, Y. & Blei, A. M. The shape compactness of urban footprints. *Prog. Plan.* **139**, 100429,
354 [10/gg638j](https://doi.org/10/gg638j) (2020).
- 355 7. Alexiou, A., Singleton, A. & Longley, P. A. A Classification of Multidimensional Open Data for Urban Morphology. *Built*
356 *Environ.* **42**, 382–395, [10/gddwsn](https://doi.org/10/gddwsn) (2016).
- 357 8. Taubenböck, H. *et al.* A new ranking of the world's largest cities—do administrative units obscure morphological realities?
358 *Remote. Sens. Environ.* **232**, 111353 (2019).
- 359 9. Brodsky, I. H3: Uber's hexagonal hierarchical spatial index. Available from Uber Eng. website: <https://eng.uber.com/h3/> [22 June 2019] (2018).
- 360 10. Jochem, W. C. & Tatem, A. J. Tools for mapping multi-scale settlement patterns of building footprints: An introduction to
362 the R package foot. *PloS one* **16**, e0247535, [10/gh7sjr](https://doi.org/10/gh7sjr) (2021).
- 363 11. Araldi, A. & Fusco, G. From the street to the metropolitan region: Pedestrian perspective in urban fabric analysis:. *Environ.*
364 *Plan. B: Urban Anal. City Sci.* **46**, 1243–1263, [10.1177/2399808319832612](https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808319832612) (2019).
- 365 12. Gil, J., Montenegro, N., Beirão, J. N. & Duarte, J. P. On the Discovery of Urban Typologies: Data Mining the Multi-
366 dimensional Character of Neighbourhoods. *Urban Morphol.* **16**, 27–40 (2012).
- 367 13. Hamaina, R., Leduc, T. & Moreau, G. Towards Urban Fabrics Characterization Based on Buildings Footprints. In *Bridging*
368 *the Geographic Information Sciences*, vol. 2, 327–346, [10.1007/978-3-642-29063-3_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-29063-3_18) (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg,
369 Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012).
- 370 14. Bobkova, E., Berghauer Pont, M. & Marcus, L. Towards analytical typologies of plot systems: Quantitative profile of five
371 European cities. *Environ. Plan. B: Urban Anal. City Sci.* **239980831988090**, [10/ggbgsm](https://doi.org/10/ggbgsm) (2019).
- 372 15. Kropf, K. Plots, property and behaviour. *Urban Morphol.* **22**, 5–14 (2018).
- 373 16. Fleischmann, M., Feliciotti, A., Romice, O. & Porta, S. Morphological tessellation as a way of partitioning space:
374 Improving consistency in urban morphology at the plot scale. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* **80**, 101441, [10.1016/j.comenvurbssys.2019.101441](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comenvurbssys.2019.101441) (2020).
- 376 17. Ordnance Survey. OS Open Roads (2020).
- 377 18. Ordnance Survey. OS OpenMap - Local (2020).
- 378 19. Ordnance Survey. OS Open Rivers (2020).
- 379 20. Ordnance Survey. Strategi (2016).
- 380 21. Dibble, J. *et al.* On the origin of spaces: Morphometric foundations of urban form evolution. *Environ. Plan. B: Urban*
381 *Anal. City Sci.* **46**, 707–730 (2019).
- 382 22. Fleischmann, M., Romice, O. & Porta, S. Measuring urban form: Overcoming terminological inconsistencies for a
383 quantitative and comprehensive morphologic analysis of cities. *Environ. Plan. B: Urban Anal. City Sci.* **239980832091044**,
384 [10/ggngw6](https://doi.org/10/ggngw6) (2020).
- 385 23. Fleischmann, M., Feliciotti, A., Romice, O. & Porta, S. Methodological foundation of a numerical taxonomy of urban
386 form. *Environ. Plan. B: Urban Anal. City Sci.* **23998083211059835** (2021).
- 387 24. Sneath, P. H., Sokal, R. R. *et al.* *Numerical taxonomy. The principles and practice of numerical classification.* (Freeman,
388 San Francisco, 1973).

- 389 25. Hallowell, G. D. & Baran, P. K. Suburban change: A time series approach to measuring form and spatial configuration.
390 *The J. Space Syntax* **4**, 74–91 (2013).
- 391 26. Vanderhaegen, S. & Canters, F. Mapping urban form and function at city block level using spatial metrics. *Landsc. Urban
392 Plan.* **167**, 399–409, [10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.023) (2017).
- 393 27. Schirmer, P. M. & Axhausen, K. W. A multiscale classification of urban morphology. *J. Transp. Land Use* **9**, 101–130,
394 [10.5198/jtlu.2015.667](https://doi.org/10.5198/jtlu.2015.667) (2015).
- 395 28. Steiniger, S., Lange, T., Burghardt, D. & Weibel, R. An Approach for the Classification of Urban Building Structures
396 Based on Discriminant Analysis Techniques. *Transactions GIS* **12**, 31–59, [10.1111/j.1467-9671.2008.01085.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9671.2008.01085.x) (2008).
- 397 29. Basaraner, M. & Cetinkaya, S. Performance of shape indices and classification schemes for characterising perceptual shape
398 complexity of building footprints in GIS. *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.* **31**, 1952–1977, [10.1080/13658816.2017.1346257](https://doi.org/10.1080/13658816.2017.1346257) (2017).
- 399 30. Hamaina, R., Leduc, T. & Moreau, G. A New Method to Characterize Density Adapted to a Coarse City Model.
400 In *OpenStreetMap in GIScience*, 249–263, [10.1007/978-3-642-31833-7_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31833-7_16) (Springer International Publishing, Berlin,
401 Heidelberg, 2013).
- 402 31. Hijazi, I. *et al.* Measuring the homogeneity of urban fabric using 2D geometry data. *Environ. Plan. B: Plan. Des.* 1–25,
403 [10.1177/0265813516659070](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265813516659070) (2016).
- 404 32. Boeing, G. A multi-scale analysis of 27,000 urban street networks: Every US city, town, urbanized area, and Zillow
405 neighborhood. *Environ. Plan. B: Urban Anal. City Sci.* **219**, 239980831878459, [10.1177/2399808318784595](https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808318784595) (2018).
- 406 33. Caruso, G., Hilal, M. & Thomas, I. Measuring urban forms from inter-building distances: Combining MST graphs with a
407 Local Index of Spatial Association. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **163**, 80–89, [10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.03.003) (2017).
- 408 34. Feliciotti, A. *RESILIENCE AND URBAN DESIGN: A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF RESILIENCE IN
409 URBAN FORM*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow (2018).
- 410 35. Lowry, J. H. & Lowry, M. B. Comparing spatial metrics that quantify urban form. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* **44**,
411 59–67, [10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2013.11.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2013.11.005) (2014).
- 412 36. Porta, S., Crucitti, P. & Latora, V. The network analysis of urban streets: A primal approach. *Environ. Plan. B: Plan. Des.*
413 **33**, 705–725, [10.1068/b32045](https://doi.org/10.1068/b32045) (2006).
- 414 37. eli knaap *et al.* pysal/tobler: Release v0.8.2, [10.5281/zenodo.5047613](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5047613) (2021).
- 415 38. Webber, R. & Burrows, R. *The predictive postcode: the geodemographic classification of British society* (Sage, 2018).
- 416 39. Lage, J. P., Assunção, R. M. & Reis, E. A. A minimal spanning tree algorithm applied to spatial cluster analysis. *Electron.
417 Notes Discret. Math.* **7**, 162–165 (2001).
- 418 40. Bação, F., Lobo, V. & Painho, M. The self-organizing map, the geo-som, and relevant variants for geosciences. *Comput. &
419 geosciences* **31**, 155–163 (2005).
- 420 41. Wolf, L. J. Spatially-encouraged spectral clustering: a technique for blending map typologies and regionalization. *Int. J.
421 Geogr. Inf. Sci.* **35**, 2356–2373 (2021).
- 422 42. Schonlau, M. The clustergram: A graph for visualizing hierarchical and nonhierarchical cluster analyses. *The Stata J.* **2**,
423 391–402, [10.1177/1536867X0218972](https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X0218972) (2002).
- 424 43. Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Commun. Stat.* **3**, 1–27, [10.1080/03610927408827101](https://doi.org/10.1080/03610927408827101)
425 (1974). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03610927408827101>.
- 426 44. Davies, D. L. & Bouldin, D. W. A cluster separation measure. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis machine intelligence*
427 224–227 (1979).
- 428 45. European environment agency (EEA). Urban Atlas (2018).
- 429 46. Demuzere, M., Bechtel, B., Middel, A. & Mills, G. Mapping europe into local climate zones. *PloS one* **14**, e0214474
430 (2019).
- 431 47. Cramér, H. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics (PMS-9), Volume 9* (Princeton university press, 2016).
- 432 48. Fleischmann, M. momepy: Urban morphology measuring toolkit. *J. Open Source Softw.* **4**, 1807, [10.21105/joss.01807](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01807)
433 (2019).
- 434 49. Rey, S. J. *et al.* The pysal ecosystem: Philosophy and implementation. *Geogr. Analysis* (2021).
- 435 50. Arribas-Bel, D. gds_env: A containerised platform for geographic data science, [10.5281/zenodo.4642516](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4642516).

436 **Acknowledgements**

437 (not compulsory)

438 M.F. and D.A. kindly acknowledge funding by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council through the project
439 "Learning an urban grammar from satellite data through AI", project reference ES/T005238/1.

440 **Author contributions statement**

441 M.F. and D.A. designed the method, M.F. conducted the experiments, M.F. and D.A. analysed the results. M.F. and D.A. wrote
442 and reviewed the manuscript.

443 **Competing interests**

444 The authors declare no competing interests.

445 **Figures & Tables**