

**“So go down town”: simulating pedestrian movement
in town centres**

Mordechay Haklay, David O’Sullivan, Mark Thurstain-Goodwin

CENTRE FOR ADVANCED SPATIAL ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

UNITED KINGDOM

{m.haklay, david.osullivan, mark.thurstain-goodwin}@ucl.ac.uk

Thorsten Schelhorn

INSTITUT FUR UMWELTSYSTEMFORSCHUNG

UNIVERSITAT OSNABRUCK

GERMANY

tschelho@usf.uni-osnabrueck.de

“So go down town”: simulating pedestrian movement in town centres

ABSTRACT: Pedestrian movement models have been developed since the 1970s. A review of the literature shows that such models have been developed to explain and predict macro, meso and micro movement patterns. However, recent developments in modelling techniques, and especially advances in agent-based simulation, open up the possibility of developing integrative and complex models which use existing models as “building blocks”. In this paper we describe such integrative, modular approach to simulating pedestrian movement behaviour. The STREETS model, developed using *SWARM* and GIS, is an agent-based model that focuses on the simulation of the behavioural aspects of pedestrian movement. The modular structure of the simulation is described in detail. This is followed by a discussion of the lessons learned from the development of STREETS, especially the advantages of adopting a modular approach and other aspects of using the agent-based paradigm for modelling.

1. Introduction

In urban space, the central area is often associated with vibrant movement, intensive commercial use and a wide variety of leisure activity. Even in highly

developed economies which have seen a move of business activity to the periphery in recent years, the town centre (or downtown) remains significant to the health of the wider urban system. More often than not the town centre is the social, economic and cultural heart of the town. Furthermore, it has been argued that understanding the movement of people in town centres is an important factor in understanding how they function (Londonomics, 1998; DETR, 1998). Interest in pedestrian behaviour spans the retail industry, emergency services, urban planners and other agencies that operate within the urban environment.

There are a number of possible approaches to simulating and modelling pedestrian movement (Helbing *et al.*, 2001). Most models focus on a specific aspect of pedestrian movement, which can often be distinguished on the basis of geographical scale — from the micro-scale movement of obstacle avoidance, through the meso-scale of individuals planning multi-stop shopping trips, up to the macro-scale of the overall flows of masses of people between places. In the *STREETS* model, presented here, we adopt a holistic, agent-based approach to pedestrian simulation. *STREETS* has been built to enable the integration of various scales of movement in a modular way. This approach potentially enables the relatively straightforward incorporation of lessons learned from the development of any previous pedestrian models or theory into the *STREETS* model. It also differentiates *STREETS* from other models - the approach developed here synthesises existing models and by doing so, offers a test bed for synergetic and cumulative influences between those models. Each agent in the model represents a single pedestrian and operates at multiple scales simultaneously using five behavioural modules, which are distinguished principally by their scale of

operation. The operation of each module can therefore be modified to reflect different theories about the way people move in urban space at the scale on which that module operates, without affecting the operation of modules operating on other scales.

In the next section we outline some other approaches to understanding and predicting pedestrian movement. Our brief survey focuses on approaches that have had a direct influence on *STREETS*. For a more complete review see Helbing *et al.* (2001). Reviewing the current state of the art suggests that in spite of its importance, this field is under-researched. This may be due to the absence of sufficiently powerful computers and suitably rich data sets in the past. In section 3 we provide a brief outline of an agent-based model which retains some of the strengths of earlier models by using rich data sets stored in a geographical information system (GIS). In section 4 we focus on the fundamental development in *STREETS* — the multi-level, modular, behavioural model of agents. We discuss the lessons learned from our work on *STREETS* in section 5 and conclude, in section 6, with some ideas for further development of agent-based models for the simulation of pedestrian environments.

2. Explaining pedestrian movement patterns

Pedestrian activity can be considered to be an outcome of two distinct components — the configuration of the street network or urban space and the location of particular attractions (shops, offices, public buildings etc.) on that network. In order to explore the influence of each of these, it is first necessary to observe and record the movement of pedestrians in city streets. Traditionally, records of

pedestrian movement in the street network have been based on physical counts or time lapse photography work (Helbing *et al.*, 2001). Physical counts involve recording the number of people passing set points, or *gates*, over a set period of time to give an initial sense of flow through the network. Time lapse photography takes this forward by recording the movement of all pedestrians in a defined area and deriving 'trail' diagrams to plot their actual movement. An early attempt to extend these techniques was made by Fruin (1971) who devised the Levels of Service (LOS) indicator. LOS attempts to measure the level of comfort of pedestrians in an urban setting. It quantifies congestion by measuring the flow of pedestrian per unit width of walkway. Six levels of Service are identified from A (free flow with typically less than 23 people per minute per metre of walkway) to F (extreme congestion, more than 82 people per minute per metre of pavement) where progress would be made by means of shuffling.

While these techniques are able to give an indication of the relative intensity of movement in an urban setting, they cannot explain the processes which cause them, and certainly cannot be used to predict future patterns. Arguably, LOS only measures the outcome produced by the current combination of street configuration and attractor locations. It certainly does not make it any easier to disentangle the effects of the two, or to predict the impact of changes in either. The first attempts to investigate the impact of spatial configuration at this scale were in the work of the Centre for Land Use and Built Form Studies at Cambridge University (March and Steadman, 1971; Martin and March, 1972; Steadman, 1983) which focused particularly on some of the problems of applying geometry and other mathematical tools to the description and analysis of the complex layouts typical of large

buildings and urban spaces. Research in this field is still active (see Hillier *et al.*, 1993, Krafta, 1994; 1996). However, configuration is sometimes assigned an almost mystical importance. Some researchers argue that the main *generator* of pedestrian movement is the configuration of the street network itself, and that patterns of movement are largely determined by this configuration, rather than by the distribution of attractors within the network. This is an extreme view, which is difficult to sustain without recourse to *ceteris paribus* arguments. In particular, it ignores the evidence of changing land use patterns on movement rates. The original high street of Gravesend (a small town in the south east of England) for example, is no longer the main shopping location in the town because the port area has been in decline for some years. The actual street configuration has not changed, but the location of shops has, ultimately in response to changing activity patterns of the town's inhabitants (The Urban and Economic Development Group, 1997).

This is not an isolated example, and the importance of attractors in determining patterns of movement in urban systems has long been recognised. "Vehicles do not move about the roads for mysterious reasons of their own. They move only because people want them to move in connection with activities which they (the people) are engaged in. *Traffic is therefore a function of activities. This is fundamental.*" (Ministry of Transport, 1961, our emphasis). These comments apply with equal force to pedestrian traffic.

Usually associated with traffic and retail impact modelling, the use of gravity or spatial interaction techniques has a long history in modelling the relationship between attractions and movement (Foot, 1981; Batty, 1976). These

models use a general formula for the interaction between two locations i and j of the form

$$A_i B_j / f(C_{ij}),$$

where A_i is the population at location i , B_j is some measure of the attraction of facilities at location j (for example retail floor space), and C_{ij} is some measure of the cost or distance from i to j . The form of f is usually described by a number of parameters, and survey data is used to calibrate models based on these techniques. Where C is a distance, it usually represents Euclidean distances on an isotropic plain, or distances between points over road and other transport networks. These models enable prediction of the intensity of interaction between where people start their journeys (the origins) and where they are going (their destinations), and form the basis of many transport planning models. It is possible to distribute such overall flow results across the transport network to predict the intensity of use of different routes, but, in general, this is rarely done at the level of detail required for prediction of pedestrian numbers.

The approaches introduced so far have rarely been successfully applied to modelling pedestrian movement at the scale of buildings and streets (see Kurose *et al.*, 2001). While this can be partly explained by the absence of adequate data at this level of detail, ultimately the underlying assumptions (such as using Euclidean distance or shortest paths through the network in gravity models) are less applicable at small spatial scales. Moreover, they are only suited to modelling general patterns of movement and can never be used to model the movement of individuals.

In recent years, a new modelling approach has been adopted by researchers in Social Sciences — *agent-based modelling*¹. Although the origins of this technique can be traced back to the 1970s, only recently has it become sufficiently mature to have potential as a tool for practical applications. An agent-based model is one in which the basic unit of activity is the agent. Usually a model will contain many agents (at least tens, perhaps many thousands) and its outcomes are determined by the interactions of the agents. Usually agents explicitly represent actors in the situation being modelled, often at the individual level. Broadly speaking an agent is an identifiable unit of computer program code which is *autonomous* and *goal-directed* (Hayes, 1999). Agents are autonomous in that they are capable of effective independent action, and their activity is directed towards the achievement of defined tasks or goals. Although any review of recent computer science literature will reveal other uses of the term ‘agent’, for the purpose of the current discussion this loose definition will suffice. It is important to realise that agents are not necessarily either spatially located or aware, as they are in the *STREETS* model. In many models, spatial mobility is not considered at all, although sometimes the term ‘space’ appears as a metaphor for ‘social distance’. The implications of such models’ outcomes for actual, physical spatial outcomes are not generally considered, because in most agent-based models the researchers’ main concern is understanding how individual behaviour leads to global outcomes in a generic sense, rather than in the modelling of the real world

¹ Arguably, agent-based models are more akin to simulations than to strict models. However, differentiation between the two is problematic, and beyond the scope of the current discussion.

per se. For a critical discussion of agent-based models and their socio-economic applications see O'Sullivan and Haklay (2000).

In the urban and regional planning context — the primary domain of the *STREETS* model — there is considerable interest in applications of agent-based techniques for spatial analysis, geocomputation and Spatial Decision Support Systems (SDSS). For example, Rodrigues and Raper (1999) provide an overview of agent-based systems and consider examples of multi-agent approaches to spatial decision support, GIS user interface development, and information retrieval in large spatial databases. MacGill and Openshaw (1998) present an intriguing multi-agent approach to spatial data analysis. Of more direct relevance to the current context, Helbing and Molnar's (1997) work on small-scale pedestrian models, which simulate human behaviour in crowds and small spaces is noteworthy, as well as the agent based simulation of pedestrian movement of Kerridge *et al.* (2001). Cellular automata models have been developed and proved useful for the simulation of urban traffic (see for example, Esser and Schreckenburg, 1997; Chopard *et al.*, 1995; 1996). However, these do not really fit the agent paradigm and are not considered here.

The most substantial application of agent-based models in the socio-economic domain is the monumental *TRANSIMS* (Beckman, 1997). *TRANSIMS* is a hybrid, lying somewhere between more traditional transport gravitation-interaction models and a full-blown real-time agent-based simulation. It currently models the activities of up to 200,000 individual travellers which is where the model departs from previous transport planning models. Individual travellers, having been 'loaded' into the model, act as autonomous agents, navigating the

network with plans derived according to their socio-economic profile. They are able to change their route from that planned in response to changing road conditions, such as congestion or accidents. Initially developed to model the road-traffic of Albuquerque it is now being applied to other cities in the US .

3. The *STREETS* simulation system

In this section, we provide a brief overview of the structure of the *STREETS* model (see also Schelhorn *et al.*, 1999).

The *STREETS* model is close in approach to *TRANSIMS* but takes as its subject the activities of pedestrians in sub-regional, urban districts. Modelling proceeds in two phases: (i) a ‘pre-model’ which uses socio-economic and other data about the wider metropolitan area to populate the urban centre with a statistically reasonable population of pedestrians; and (ii) an agent-based model to simulate the movement of this pedestrian population around urban district as under the influence of spatial configuration, pre-determined activity schedules, and the distribution of land-uses. The figure below shows the division of data and processing steps between the two phases. It should be noted that this overall structure means that we effectively treat the town centre as a *fixed* and *closed* system with a limited number of fixed (non-pedestrian) entry-points. At the spatio-temporal scale of *STREETS* a fixed town centre configuration is not entirely unreasonable, since the overall configuration and land-uses in the town centre will not change in the course of a single simulated day. However, the model assumes that the town centre is spatially closed and this assumption is hardly realistic. In fact, the model structure we describe may be better suited to the simulation of

building complexes, such as shopping malls or transport termini. Some such environments would also have the advantage that individual behaviours are more clearly goal-directed (think of an airport, for example).

{Figure 1 about here}

In any case, the model is initially loaded with pedestrians which have prescribed activity schedules or *plans*, defined by the analysis and manipulation of rich socio-economic data sets in a GIS setting. These pedestrians are then ‘released’ into the district being modelled as agents who may choose to change their plans in response to their surroundings and the behaviour of other agents. Currently, simple statistical distributions of agents are generated. Each agent has characteristics under two broad categories: *socio-economic*, and *behavioural*.

Pedestrian agents are taken as arriving in the modelled area at pedestrian *gateways*: points where people change transportation mode and start their visit to the town centre on foot. Typical gateways are car parks, on-street parking areas, railway stations, and bus stops. Currently, pedestrian gateways are treated as static elements during the simulation phase (the frequency of bus services is not considered for example). The simplest way to model gateways is to have them ‘release’ pedestrians at a predetermined rate, according to a Poisson distribution. It is anticipated that as the model is developed, gateways might be modelled more fully so that the full variety of observable events is included. For, example the arrival of trains at a station requires a more complex model than a Poisson distribution to capture both the frequency of service, and the tendency of people coming into the town centre by train to arrive in large groups. At the current

configuration, our insistence that all pedestrians arrive from a few gates is unrealistic.

The urban district being modelled is represented using detailed data from a GIS. A number of representations are used:

Vector data of building outlines, classified by general land-use categories — retail and commercial in the first instance.

Raster data representing the *walkability* of all non-building space. Pavements are highly walkable, and roads are less so. This abstraction allows the model to handle some complex issues (such as ensuring that agents walk on pavements rather than in the middle of streets) in a fairly simple and robust way.

Network data representing the street network, and building entrances. The street network is used in the generation of agents' planned routes. Nodes in the street network (including building entrances and gateway locations) are collectively referred to as *waypoints*.

The second (dynamic) phase of *STREETS* was developed completely within the Santa Fe Institute's *Swarm* simulation environment. Processes in the pre-model phase save computation time at runtime and enables the *Swarm* model to focus on the dynamic aspects of the model. A full description of *Swarm* is beyond the scope of this paper, and we refer the interested reader to Minar *et al.* (1996).

STREETS starts by creating a pedestrian *Swarm*, and populating the model with different elements: buildings, the walkability surface and pedestrian agents (with their route plans). Agents are then sent to the pedestrian gateway from which

they will enter the system. Once these parameters have been loaded, a model run can be started.

During a model run, agents are despatched from the pedestrian gateways. Each agent enters the simulated town centre environment with a planned or intended sequence of waypoints along the route up to, and including, their intended destinations. They do not have an explicit encoding of the precise route geometry. The whole simulation can be monitored by an observing *Swarm*, which collects information about the interaction in the model. *Swarm* offers a rich set of tools to develop and extract information from a model run, and those tools may be used to collect statistics about agent movement, the popularity of different buildings under different spatial configurations and so on. Figure 2 shows the user interface of the *STREETS* model during a run. In the graphics window, buildings are represented by polygons, waypoints by circles and pedestrians by dots. The walkability surface is visible as a grey area between the buildings. Information on certain objects can be obtained by a ‘point-and-click’ interface. The window on the top lefthand side controls which layers and objects are drawn, the small window below controls the model run. Monitoring functions are accessed via the PedestrianSwarm window at the right-hand side of the screen.

{Figure 2 about here}

4. The pedestrian agent behavioural model

The first stage of *STREETS* builds agents and their attributes. In the rest of this section, we focus on the way that these characteristics come into play in the second

stage of operation of the model during a dynamic run. Agent attributes can be divided into socio-economic and behavioural characteristics:

Socio-economic characteristics relate to income and gender, and are used to create a planned activity schedule for the agent — that is a sequence of locations which the agent intends to visit once in the town centre. This schedule is refined, at present, using shortest-path determination on a detailed representation of the street network based on waypoints, so that the agent has a pre-determined plan, which defines a route that it intends to take in the model. This route planning technique could be replaced with any other heuristic method (for example the one suggested at Kurose *et al.* 2001) — as it is not intrinsic to the model structure. As a result much of the cognitive work done by agents occurs outside the dynamic run time part of the model, and cognitive maps or similar concepts would be most readily incorporated into the model at this point. The effect of socio-economic data is to populate the model with a variety of agents whose behaviour is likely to be different from each other. For example, more affluent agents are more likely to arrive at gateways in particular parts of the town centre, and are also more likely to include particular types of shops in their plans. In this way *STREETS* integrates the effects of configuration and attractors, on various socio-economic groups.

Behavioural characteristics contribute to the detailed behaviour of agents. Factors include speed, visual range, and fixation. Speed is simply the maximum walking speed of which an agent is capable. Visual range relates to an agent's visual acuity and determines which buildings and other

elements in the environment the agent will ‘see’ and potentially respond to. ‘Fixation’ describes how focused an agent is on following the pre-set activity schedule. Variations in this element allow different, unpredictable behaviours to occur in the dynamic setting. Some agents with high fixation are likely to follow their plan almost exactly, whereas those with low fixation will be easily distracted, visiting shops which they never ‘intended’ to visit, and even dropping whole sections of their original plan. Behavioural characteristics are not directly related to socio-economic factors, but may vary according to the purpose of a visit to the town centre.

In the dynamic operation of the model, agents have five levels of behaviour, programmed as modules, to navigate and find their way in the town centre. These different levels enable the agents to compute separately local movement (the process of moving to the next grid square on the walkability surface — the **Mover** module), medium-range movement (maintaining a proper direction — the **Helmsman** module), and longer range movement (trying to move to the next way-point while avoiding dead-ends — the **Navigator** module). The combination of these modules allows each agent to find its own way from way-point to way-point. The modules mentioned so far, implement deterministic way-finding — movement in space according to a pre-defined plan. To enable interaction between the agents and the surrounding environment, another level of behaviour was introduced to emulate agent ‘recognition’ of the built environment. This module, called the **Chooser**, enables an agent to search the nearby area and to recognise buildings near its route. Periodically, the possibility that a building which an agent has

‘seen’ in this way, will distract the agent from its pre-defined plan is calculated. Any resulting changes to an agent’s plan are managed by the **Planner** module.

Before moving on to explain the functions of the controlling modules in more detail, we first consider how these behavioural modules interact to affect the behaviour of a pedestrian agent. Some of these relationships are depicted in Figure 3. Agent A is moving towards target way-point T. The agent itself represents an additional obstacle to movement on the walkability surface in its current grid square, and also a lesser obstacle on its likely next grid-square, which is determined by its current heading. This is controlled by the **Mover** (the arrow marked M). The **Helmsman** and **Navigator** take care of the general heading towards the target (arrows marked H,N). The agent carries information about its heading, route and other details relating to its movement. The **Chooser** and **Planner** operate in this space and control the agent’s future movements. The visual field is controlled by the **Chooser** and is marked on the walkability surface as a cone marked C.

{Figure 3 about here}

Each behavioural module is a control system, working within a hierarchy of variables at different levels of abstraction. If deviations from a target value of a module’s control variables are too large, the module adjusts target variables of lower level modules. Events — which occur external to the agent when some combination of uncontrolled variables matches given conditions — may trigger further actions by the various modules, so that control variables adapt to the new conditions. Thus, the more abstract goals of the upper levels are decomposed to simple actions by the lowest module. Control and target variables are part of the

state of the agent, noted on a blackboard public to all modules. All modules can access all agent states they need to know and change all states which their task requires them to change. In principle, this architecture allows the existence of more than one module on any level, either competing or complementary. Moreover, modules can be 'left blank' and substituted with a default operation, which just translates output from the layer above into input for the layer below, without change or action.

{Figure 4 at this point}

Together, the modules manage the complex state of the agent as shown in the diagram. This state comprises the following elements:

Route: this includes the whole route, an agent's position on that route (i.e. relative to the next target way-point); its current location in the world; its fixation on its route; its thresholds for evaluating possible new destinations (derived from its socio-economic and behavioural profile); and a threshold for deciding that a target way-point has been reached.

Speed: includes the current, maximum and preferred speeds.

Progress: the progress made towards the next target way-point and the minimum acceptable progress per unit time.

Direction: encompasses the agent's current directional heading and the direction to the next waypoint.

Location: the coordinates of the agents centre point and the agent's size expressed in terms of the effect on the walkability surface of the agent's presence in a grid square.

Vision: describes an agent's visual capabilities expressed as a vision cone with breadth and range into the surroundings. Potential destinations inside the visual cone are considered as potential deviations from the current plan by the **Chooser** module, or as obstacles by the way-finding modules **Mover**, **Helmsman** and **Navigator**.

Time: tracks the agent's time spent in the system and the time available to spend in the system.

Control: reflects the agent's movement state. For example, is the agent active or waiting, moving normally or stuck?

The modules as currently used are presented in Figure 4. The following paragraphs describe their operation in more detail, starting with the low-level operation of the **Mover** and proceeding up to the highest level of the **Planner**. As the model uses the object oriented paradigm, it is important to note that each agent has its own instance of the modules. In each cycle, the agent executes the appropriate modules that are needed at that time.

The **Mover** module

This module moves the agent 'physically' through the environment. It reserves space for the agent in the environment and checks for obstacles like other agents and buildings. Each grid square or 'cell' in the 'world' has a certain capacity, its walkability value, ranging from 0 to 255, where 255 refers to a non-penetrable object, such as a building wall. Values indicate the proportional occupation of that grid-square, so that low values are preferred by pedestrians and high values indicate that a cell is unsuitable for pedestrians — such as the centre of busy roads.

Each agent is also assigned a value representing their own occupancy of a grid cell. Additionally, agents themselves take up space at their anticipated *future* position according to their actual heading and speed. This helps to prevent agent collisions. When the **Mover** tries to place the agent on a new cell, it determines whether there is enough space in that cell (that it is not occupied by too many other agents, or other obstacles). If there is enough space on a cell for an agent to move there, the agent is able to move. As this action is performed, the value in the cell from which the agent moved is also modified. If many agents are attempting to occupy the same or immediately adjacent cells, these cell values will increase, indicating that the area is crowded and less walkable, thus preventing entry. Streets with vehicular traffic and street furniture also take up walkability space.

The **Mover** also places the agent ‘physically’ into the environment when it starts its route, or leaves a building, and removes it when it enters a building or disappears due to its arrival at the end of its planned route (which usually happens at the pedestrian gateway from which the agent originally entered the system). In a normal run, the **Mover** module looks in up to 5 directions, starting from the current heading direction, to determine where the most space is available. It sets the heading to this direction and tries to place the agent at the new location, according to its heading and speed. If a collision is detected, the agent’s speed is set to 0 and it enters the ‘stuck’ state. If there is no collision, the agent continues in the ‘moving’ state and is placed in its new location. If its speed drops below 20cm/sec, its speed is set to 0, and the agent enters the ‘standing’ state.

There are some exceptions from this behaviour: when an agent is ‘stuck’ the **Mover** module looks around all 360 degrees for the best possible heading in terms

of available space in its immediate surroundings, setting the speed to a small value. This may result in erratic movement for some steps, or for as long as the **Navigator** or **Helmsman** modules do not intervene. Eventually though, the agent's progress will be adjudged by the **Navigator** to be insufficient and the agent will be set on a new, hopefully more sensible course.

The **Helmsman** module

At the next level, the **Helmsman** module mediates between the target direction — determined from the absolute location of the current target way-point — and the current best heading on a medium scale, trying to adjust the heading in small steps in the direction of the target. If the agent is far from the target, the **Helmsman** does nothing. As the agent approaches the current target, it evaluates the deviation from the target direction. Large deviations cause it to adjust the agent's current heading. The **Helmsman** also resets the speed and heading of the agent when it is in the 'standing' condition, triggered by the **Mover** module.

The **Navigator** module

Supporting the **Helmsman** at the next level, is the **Navigator**, which also maintains the agent's heading so that it does not deviate too far from the target direction. However, the agent must be allowed to deviate somewhat from the crow's flight heading towards a target so that it can negotiate corners and get out of dead ends. Therefore the controlled variable is the agent's progress towards its current target. Progress is recorded as a moving average of the decrease in the distance to the target co-ordinates in the last few time steps, normalised by the agent's speed. If progress becomes low, the agent may re-orientate itself by looking all around (360

degrees) starting from the target direction, and taking the first direction with sufficient unhindered visible range as a new heading. When this occurs the progress and speed of the agent are reset to their initial values and updated until the target is reached, or progress again becomes low. In normal operation, when progress is good, the **Navigator** module checks if it is possible to walk in the target direction. If so, the **Navigator** sets a new heading; if not, the heading remains unchanged.

These three modules together deal with ‘tactical’ movement — the business of getting to the next point in the route. The remaining two behavioural modules attend to more strategic movement and planning.

The **Chooser** Module

The **Chooser** identifies the next target in the route of the agent. The target can be a way-point like a junction in the street network, or a building or location the agent wants to enter. At every time step the **Chooser** evaluates the position of the agent, assessing if it has reached the current target, by comparing the extent of the target itself and the agent’s threshold for deciding that a target has been reached. Street network way-points have non-zero extents, and this ensures that agents do not need to proceed to the precise geo-location of a road junction (which may be at the centre of a busy road intersection) in order to decide that they have arrived. Since various agents may have different thresholds for this purpose this mechanism produces plausible behaviour at street corners, with different agents ‘cornering’ more or less accurately. When the target is adjudged to have been reached, the agent **Chooser** examines whether it is a location to enter. At a potential ‘entry’

location (such as a shopping destination) the agent state is set to an 'entering' mode and other possible destination objects are not assessed. The **Chooser** also decides how long the agent will stay in this building and sets the agent's state to 'wait' accordingly. At a way-point, the **Chooser** sets the next object on the route as new target, and resets the progress variable.

If an agent is not in 'entering' mode, it is also free to change its route, and the **Chooser** uses the agent's visual field to detect candidate building objects in its immediate surroundings. The visual field's extent is defined by the agents speed and fixation on its task: the higher the speed and fixation, the narrower is the fan of rays which the vision module sends to the environment. Building objects in the field of view are considered by the chooser module as potential new destinations which may be added to the current planned route. Building attributes such as type and general attractiveness are compared to the agent's profile, and if a match is found then the location may be pushed onto the route as a new next destination.

The **Planner** Module

The **Planner** module is not currently implemented. Its current default behaviour sets the agent onto its pre-planned route and allows it to execute until it exits the system. The **Planner's** role is to take care of overall time constraints and route planning. It is envisaged that this module will have an important role when agents deviate significantly from their pre-planned route. The **Planner** module will probably be required to implement a representation of an agent's cognitive map in order to perform this function. This cognitive map would be consulted by

the agent in combination with its current location and visual field to plan sequences of way-points making up routes to alternative locations to those originally planned.

5. *STREETS* in the wider context: modularity and emergence

The development of *STREETS* was sparked by our shared curiosity in agent-based models and their potential uses in spatial analysis and modelling. Beyond the development of the conceptual model which we have described, we have used a wide range of computerised tools and programming languages to connect the various part of the system together to enable the development of *STREETS* over a very short period of time. The development process demonstrated the relative ease of combining the many available data-sets required for the simulation task and suitable for manipulation and analysis in a modern GIS environment. Beyond these immediate and practical lessons, *STREETS* has raised two interesting aspects of agent-based models that will be expanded in this section. First is our modular approach to agent behaviour, which is unique to *STREETS*. Second is the issue of ‘emergent’ social behaviour which agent-based models are commonly hailed as demonstrating.

Modular behaviour

Our approach to agent movement is modular and loosely hierarchical. Although it bears some similarity to cognitive models of movement (especially in terms of the separation between strategic and tactical movement) *STREETS* does not claim to imitate such behaviour, still less represent any particular psychological model of movement. The main purpose of adopting a modular approach is pragmatic,

enabling us to cope with the complex, multi-variate state of the agents in this environment, as well as supporting the implementation of the model in a relatively clear and robust way.

This approach differentiates *STREETS* from many other models of pedestrian movement which treat pedestrians in a less integrated way (Borgers and Timmermans, 1986; Helbing and Molnar, 1997; Hillier *et al.*, 1993). The apparent reason is that these models focus on a specific aspect of pedestrian movement, often at a particular spatial scale. For example, gravity models developed in the 1970s (see Batty, 1976) tend to model the movement of masses of pedestrians at the macro level. Such models rarely consider the specific route taken by the pedestrian or how they get from their origin to their destination in detail. At a medium spatial scale, we find models like Hillier *et al.*'s (1993) 'Space Syntax' which attempts to explain pedestrian movement along streets. In this case there is no consideration about where the pedestrians are coming from, or where they wish to go. Finally, other models offer a very detailed explanation of specific flow patterns at micro spatial scales, such as movement of crowds of pedestrians at a junction (Helbing, 1992).

By contrast, *STREETS* integrates agent behaviour across spatial scales in a more complete manner. As we described earlier, in the first stage of the model, agents' socio-economic attributes are assigned, routes calculated, and agents are provided with 'history'. This 'history' encapsulates both long term trends (like life style) and short term trends (such as a planned route in the town centre). Once a model run ensues, an agent's behaviour develops as the result of interaction between the various levels of movement by the different modules. The integration

of modules provides a “programmable locus” for long-term routing, medium term guidance, micro level movement and overall control. This approach provides the potential for replacing modules, as new ideas and techniques to deal with different scales of movement are developed. For example, the **Mover** may be enhanced by the use of genetic algorithms, such as those currently providing good results in collision detection and avoidance in animal movement simulations (Reynolds, 1994). It is possible to envisage the addition of more modules to this schema. If, for example, a more realistic visualisation were needed (if, for example, *STREETS* was used to provide input to a virtual reality urban scene simulation) it would be possible to develop modules that interact with agent avatars to control the representation of physical movement in the urban space.

Aggregation, emergence, model closure and spatio-temporal scale

Although it is difficult to demonstrate in the static context of a journal article, *STREETS* produces overall aggregate patterns of movement in the pilot study model which are at least ‘plausible’. As soon as the first phases of development were complete, and even though some agent parameters were set arbitrarily (even randomly), the movement of agents on the computer screen seemed intuitively to ‘make sense’. However, it is important to realise that such aggregate patterns of movement are not mysterious or surprising, since the model design has been squarely aimed at producing precisely such plausible behaviour. Can we label such aggregate behaviour and patterns as ‘emergent’ or even ‘self-organising’ in any meaningful sense?

This is a significant question because emergence ‘from the bottom up’ is frequently cited as an important attribute of agent-based models (see Epstein and Axtell, 1996). Emergence is generally seen as unidirectional — since agents are autonomous objects. The focus in the agent-based modelling community on emergence has been criticised by some (see, for example Gilbert, 1995). We are strongly inclined to agree when Castelfranchi (1998) comments, that

“A notion of emergence which is simply relative to an observer [...] or a merely accidental cooperation, are not enough for social theory and for artificial social systems. We need an emerging structure *playing some causal role in the system* evolution/dynamics; not merely an epiphenomenon. [...] Possibly we need even more than this: really *self-organizing emergent structures*. Emergent organisations should reproduce, maintain, stabilize themselves [...]

(page 179, original emphasis).

The one-way notion of emergence often found in agent-based models is most readily understood as an acceptance of the truism that society is nothing more than the aggregate activity of individuals, and this is precisely the subjective emergence which occurs in the *STREETS* model. A more subtle and meaningful possibility, which might occur, given the structure of *STREETS* — although considerable further observational work would be required to confirm it — is that certain types of buildings and streets in the model might be systematically more popular as a result of their locational or configurational properties. An example would be if corner buildings proved to be more frequently visited than neighbouring buildings. However, for such an outcome to be significant in the sense which Castelfranchi demands, would require the model to somehow ‘institutionalise’ the locational

preferences of the pedestrians. One way of doing this would be to introduce building tenants into the model, in the shape of retailers, commercial offices, entertainment businesses and so forth. Presumably, given a sufficiently rich range of tenants, micro-scale land use patterns might emerge in the model, with more successful retailers in particular, able to pay the higher rents demanded for the popular corner sites with frontages on two streets.

The noticeable point here (apart from the significant extra effort which would be required in implementation and testing) is that the spatio-temporal scale of the model would be dramatically altered in such a development, from footsteps along individual routes, to the location decisions of large organisations; and from minutes and seconds, to months and years. It is also evident that the model would have to be opened up to the wider spatio-economic context in which any particular town centre is set, for such a model to be plausible. Competing town centres, demographic factors, suburban business and retail parks would all have to be considered for inclusion, together with developments in the regional economy and transport infrastructure. The difficulties of scaling up from aggregate behaviour at the spatio-temporal micro-scale to the macro-scale of institutional and organisational responses are formidable. In fact they are a compelling argument for models with relatively limited ambitions which may be used to inform decisions at the macro-scale rather than attempt to predict them.

This interdependence between spatio-temporal scale, model closure and aggregate or emergent behaviour seems to us to be a general one (see O'Sullivan and Haklay, 2000). The range of entities which ought to be represented as autonomous agents in a model is strongly affected by the desired range of

application in both time and space of the model under development. The entities represented, and whether there is any hierarchy inside which they act (for example, agents playing roles in institutions, households, firms and so on), are modelling decisions intimately intertwined with issues of scale. This seems to be associated with the fact that the habitual, patterned, aggregate behaviours which may be observed in a model like *STREETS* are one of the key drivers of change at more aggregate levels, and it takes time for actors in any socio-economic setting to recognise the patterns and adjust their individual and collective responses to those patterns. These observations are in keeping with Conte and Castelfranchi's (1995) remarks about the way in which emergence must be understood as occurring through social action via the cognitive processing of events by individuals over time.

6. Further development

It will be clear from the foregoing that there is scope for a great deal of further development of the *STREETS* model. Currently some of the agent navigational behaviour is unreliable, and we hope to use ideas from Helbing and Molnar's (1997) work to improve this aspect of the model. We also hope to incorporate some group behaviours into the model, so that agents might meet with friends, and subsequently move around in groups.

As has been noted, the matching of buildings with agents and the problem of setting values of building attractiveness needs further development and is crucial to making any useful decision support tool from the model. Other work could extend the range of measures which can be extracted from the model runs. With such

additions, a series of experiments to investigate the ways in which configuration and the location of particular popular attractions interact to produce patterns of observed movement, could be undertaken.

Another direction for future developments is a more complete and sophisticated approach to socio-economic variables. This aspect is of special importance in view of the use of pedestrian models in retail planning. One possibility for such development, is to adopt schema similar to the one proposed by Lake (2001) to enable easy alteration of agents' profiles and to experiment with different agent demographics.

What is clear from the work already done is that the agent-based modelling approach is highly applicable to this field. It is also clear that the application of socio-economic and other data to populate such models with representative populations is viable and promises to enhance the prospects for this modelling approach in urban planning more generally.

References

- Batty, M, 1976, *Urban Modelling: Algorithms, Calibrations, Predictions*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- Beckman, R J (ed.), 1997, "The TRansportation ANalysis SIMulation System (TRANSIMS) The Dallas-Ft. Worth Case Study", Los Alamos National Laboratory, *Los Alamos Unclassified Report*, LA-UR-97-4502LANL.
Online at <http://www->

transims.tsasa.lanl.gov/PDF_Files/CaseStudy(990322).pdf accessed 14 June
2000

Borgers, A and Timmermans H, 1986, "A model of pedestrian route choice and
demand for retail facilities within inner-city shopping areas", *Geographical
Analysis* **18**(2) 115-128

Castelfranchi, C, 1998, "Modelling social action for AI agents" *Artificial
Intelligence* **103** 157-182

Chopard, B, Luthi, P O and Queloz, P-A, 1996, "Cellular automata model of car
traffic in a two-dimensional street network", *Journal of Physics A*, **29** 2325-
2336

Chopard, B, Queloz, P-A and Luthi, P O, 1995, "Traffic models of a 2D road
network", presented at *3rd European Connection Machine Users Meeting*,
Parma, Italy. Online at <http://cuiwww.unige.ch/~chopard/Traffic/>

Conte, R, Castelfranchi, C, 1995 *Cognitive and Social Action* (UCL Press, London)

Department of the Environment (DoE), 1996, *Revised PPG6: Town Centres and
Retail Developments*, (Her Majesty's Stationery Office: London)

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR), 1998, *Town
Centres: Defining Boundaries for Statistical Monitoring Feasibility Study*,
(The Stationery Office: London)

Epstein, J M and Axtell, R, 1996, *Growing Artificial Societies: Social Science from
the Bottom Up*, (Brookings Press & MIT Press: Cambridge, MA)

- Esser, J and Schreckenburg, M, 1997, "Microscopic simulation of urban traffic based on cellular automata", *International Journal of Modern Physics*, **8**(5) 1025-1036.
- Foot, D, 1981, *Operational Urban Models*, (Methuen: London).
- Fruin, J, 1971, *Pedestrian Planning and Design*, (Metropolitan Association of Urban Designers and Environmental Planners, Inc: New York).
- Gilbert, N, 1995, "Emergence in social simulations", in *Artificial Societies* eds N Gilbert and R Conte (UCL Press, London), pp 144-156
- Hayes, C C, 1999, "Agents in a nutshell—A Very Brief Introduction", *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, **11**(1), 127-132
- Helbing, D, 1992, "A fluid dynamic model for the movement of pedestrians", *Complex Systems*, **6** 391-415.
- Helbing, D and Molnar, P, 1997, "Self-organization phenomena in pedestrian crowds" in *Self-Organization of Complex Structures: From Individual to Collective Dynamics*, ed. Schweitzer, F, (Gordon & Beach: London).
- Helbing, D, Molnar, P, Farkas, I J, and Bolay, K, 2001, "Self-organizing pedestrian movement", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design* (*this issue*)
- Hillier, B, Penn, A, Hanson, J, Grajweski, T and Xu, J, 1993, "Natural movement: or, configuration and attraction in urban pedestrian movement", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design*, **20**(1) 29-66.

- Kerridge, J, Hine, J, and Wigen, M, 2001, "Agent-based modelling of pedestrian movements: the questions that need to be asked and answered", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design (this issue)*
- Krafta, R, 1994, "Modelling intraurban configurational development", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design*, **21** 67-82.
- Krafta, R, 1996, "Urban convergence: morphology and attraction", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design*, **23** 37-48.
- Kurose, S, Borgers, A W J, and Timmermans, H J P, 2001, "Classifying pedestrian shopping behaviour according to implied heuristic choice rules", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design (this issue)*
- Lake, M, 2001, "the use of pedestrian modelling in archaeology, with an example from the study of cultural learning", *Environment and Planning B: Planning & Design (this issue)*
- Londonomics, 1998, 'Town Centre Performance Indicators & Regeneration Evaluation', Vision for London, Groundwork, London Transport, (London Borough of Camden, London Borough of Havering).
- MacGill, J and Openshaw, S, 1998, "The use of flocks to drive a geographic analysis machine", presented at *Third International Conference on GeoComputation*, School of Geographical Science, University of Bristol, UK.
- March, L and Steadman, P, 1971, *The Geometry of Environment: An Introduction to Spatial Organization in Design*, (RIBA Publications: London).

- Martin, L and March, L (eds), 1972, *Urban Space and Structures*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Minar, N, Burkhart, R, Langton, C and Askenazi, M, 1996, *The Swarm simulation system: a toolkit for building multi-agent simulations* online at <http://www.swarm.org/archive/overview.ps>, accessed on 11 May 2000
- Ministry of Transport, 1961, *Traffic In Towns: A Study of the Long Term Problems of Traffic in Urban Areas: Reports of the Steering Group and Working Group Appointed by the Minister of Transport*, (Her Majesty's Stationery Office: London).
- Mithen, S, 1994, "Simulating prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies" in *Simulating Societies*, Gilbert, N and Doran, J (eds), (UCL Press: London), pages 165-193
- Nagel, K, Beckman, R J and Barrett, C L, 1999, "TRANSIMS for urban planning", Los Alamos National Laboratory Unclassified Report LA-UR-98-4389. Online at http://www-transims.tsasa.lanl.gov/PDF_Files/LAUR98-4389.pdf accessed on 14 June 2000.
- O'Sullivan, D and Haklay, M, 2000, "Agent-based models and individualism: is the world agent-based?", *Environment and Planning A*, **32**(8), 1409-1425
- Reynolds, C W, 1994, Evolution of Corridor Following Behavior in a Noisy World, in *From Animals to Animats 3: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior (SAB94)*, in Eds D Cliff, P Husbands, J-A Meyer, and S Wilson (eds), MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, pages 402-410

Rodrigues, A, Raper, J, 1999, "Defining Spatial Agents", in Eds J Raper and A
Câmara Spatial Multimedia and Virtual Reality, Research Monographs
Series, Taylor & Francis, London, pages 111-129

Schelhorn, T, O'Sullivan, D, Haklay, M and Thurstain-Goodwin, M, 1999,
"STREETS: an agent-based pedestrian model", presented at *Computers in
Urban Planning and Urban Management*, Venice, 8-11 September. Online
at <http://www.casa.ucl.ac.uk/streets.pdf> accessed on 21 June 2000.

Steadman, P, 1983, *Architectural Morphology: An Introduction to the Geometry of
Building Plans*, (Pion Ltd: London).

The Urban and Economic Development Group (URBED), 1997 *Town Centre
Partnerships—a report for The Association of Town Centre Management
and DETR* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London)


FIGURE CAPTIONS


Figure 1 The overall structure of the *STREETS* model.


Figure 2 A screen-shot of the *STREETS* model in operation showing various user accessible controls and displays.

Figure 3 Schematic showing the effects of the different agent control modules. The grid shown is the walkability surface where darker grid squares are less accessible to pedestrians. Agent movement is controlled by five interacting modules (also see figure 4 and the text): the mover (M — the short arrow) controls immediate movement to the next grid square; the helmsman and navigator (H and N — the long arrow) control medium range movement in the direction of the next target on the agent's route (T); and the chooser (C) determines the next target on the route as the visual field changes. The planner module holds the agent's overall planned route through the space.

Figure 4 The interactions between the agent control modules and the agent state variables stored on its 'blackboard'. Note that the vision/perception and control variables effect operations at all of the four lower levels. Aside from these interactions there is a general 'zig-zag' of interaction whereby high level modules control the state variables to which lower level modules respond.







The agent behaviour is controlled by 5 interconnected modules, represented in this diagram.

M - Mover (the short arrow) controls agent local movement.

H - Helmsmen (the longer arrow) controls medium range movement, while the

N - Navigator (the longer arrow) controls the long range movement.

C - Chooser controls the movement towards the next target as well as the visual field

Planner controls the agent's route through the system.

The diagram represents the Walkability surface, which is the main spatial representation in STREETS and the agent's state, with its main components: the route, navigation, timer and other variables.




Figure 4 Interactions between agent behavioural modules via the agent state 'blackboard' and the world