

Parameters of pedestrians, pedestrian traffic and walking facilities

Report

Author(s):

Buchmüller, Stefan; Weidmann, Ulrich

Publication date:

2006

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000047950>

Rights / license:

In Copyright - Non-Commercial Use Permitted

Originally published in:

IVT Schriftenreihe 132

Buchmueller, Weidmann 132

Schriftenreihe 132

Institut für Verkehrsplanung
und Transportsysteme
Institute for Transport Planning
and Systems

S. Buchmueller, Prof. U. Weidmann

Parameters of pedestrians, pedestrian
traffic and walking facilities

July 2007



Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Parameters of pedestrians, pedestrian traffic and walking facilities

Stefan Buchmueller

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Weidmann

Phone: +41 44 633 66 89

Phone: +41 44 633 31 05

Fax: +41 44 633 10 57

Fax: +41 44 633 10 57

e-mail: buchmueller@ivt.baug.ethz.ch

e-mail: weidmann@ivt.baug.ethz.ch

Institut for Transport Planning and Systems (IVT)

Chair of Transport Systems

ETH Zurich

Wolfgang-Pauli-Strasse 15

8093 Zurich

<http://www.ivt.ethz.ch>

July 2007

Preferred Citation

Buchmueller, S., Weidmann, U. (2006): Parameters of Pedestrians, Pedestrian Traffic and Walking Facilities, IVT-Report Nr. 132, Institut for Transport Planning and Systems (IVT), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1.1	Background	1
1.1.2	Goals	1
1.1.3	Proceeding	1
1.1.4	Contents of this report	2
2	Pedestrians	3
2.1	Dimensions	3
2.1.1	Human body dimensions	3
2.1.2	Dynamic width of walking pedestrians	5
2.1.3	Pedestrians with luggage	6
2.1.4	Pedestrian pairs	8
2.1.5	Handicapped people	9
2.1.6	Body height	11
2.2	Energy consumption	12
2.2.1	Flat walkways	12
2.2.2	Inclined areas	13
2.2.3	Energy consumption on stairs	14
2.3	Walking speed	15
2.3.1	Overview	15
2.3.2	Physical conditions	17
2.3.3	Travel purpose	19
2.3.4	Environmental conditions	19
2.3.5	Walkway attributes	21
2.4	Flow rates	23
2.4.1	Empirical values	23
2.4.2	Flow rates and pedestrian speed	24

3	Principles of pedestrian flows	25
3.1	Walking on flat areas	25
3.1.1	One-directional flow	25
3.1.2	Bypassing pedestrians.....	29
3.1.3	Bi-directional flows	30
3.2	Walking on stairs.....	33
3.3	Escalators.....	34
4	Analysing pedestrian flows in walking facilities.....	38
4.1	Evaluation of pedestrian flows (level of service concept).....	38
4.1.1	Walkways.....	38
4.1.2	Stairs	40
4.1.3	Waiting areas.....	40
4.2	Dimensioning	42
4.2.1	Influence of obstacles	42
4.2.2	Minimum width of walkways	43
4.2.3	Recommended minimum LOS	45
5	Literature	46

Tables

Table 1	Average dimensions of pedestrians for different countries (Crowd Dynamics 2005)	4
Table 2	Proportion of pedestrians with luggage. Values in [%], (Schopf, 1985)	6
Table 3	50%- and 85%-percentiles of pedestrian width depending on luggage. Values in [cm], (Schopf, 1985)	7
Table 4	Relative body height compared to the average in Central Europe (Daamen 2004)	11
Table 5	Mean speed and standard deviation of unimpeded pedestrian flows (Daamen 2004)	15
Table 6	Influence factors on walking speed of pedestrians	16
Table 7	Mean walking speeds for men and women (Daamen 2004)	18
Table 8	Mean walking speeds for different trip purposes (Weidmann 1993)	19
Table 9	Mean walking speeds of pedestrian on inclined areas (Weidmann 1993)	21
Table 10	Mean walking speed of pedestrians on stairs (Weidmann 1993)	22
Table 11	Maximum flow rates for different regions (Daamen 2004)	24
Table 12	Pedestrian densities of unimpeded and jammed pedestrian flows (Daamen 2004)	24
Table 13	Speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)	26
Table 14	Maximum pedestrian flow rates on walkways (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)	28
Table 15	Simulation results for bi-directional pedestrian flows (Blue 1999)	32
Table 16	Maximum pedestrian flow rates on stairs (Weidmann 1993)	34
Table 17	Practical values for capacities of escalators for different travel speeds and intervals (step width 1.0 m; step depth 0.4 m)	36
Table 18	Practical values for capacities of escalators for 1-hour-intervals (step depth 0.4 m; DIN EN 115; [10])	37

Table 19	Description of the level of service concept for walkways (HCM 2000)	39
Table 20	LOS-definitions for walkways (HCM 2000, HBS 2001, Fruin 1971)	39
Table 21	LOS-definition for stairs (HCM 2000, Fruin 1971)	40
Table 22	Description of the levels of service for waiting areas (HCM 2000, [27])	41
Table 23	LOS-definitions for waiting areas (HCM 2000, [27]; HBS, [11]).....	41
Table 24	Shy away distances of obstacles for pedestrians (Daamen 2004, HBS 2001 [11], Knoflachner 1987, Weidmann 1993).....	43
Table 25	Standard and minimum width of 2-lane walkways (SN 640201; [23]).....	44
Table 26	Standard and minimum width of 3-lane walkways (SN 640201; [23]).....	44
Table 27	Minimum level of services for pedestrian facilities (Weidmann 1993, HCM 2000; [27])	45

Figures

Figure 1	Body ellipse of pedestrians (Crowd Dynamics 2005).....	3
Figure 2	Wavering movements of pedestrians during walking (Schopf 1985).....	5
Figure 3	Width of pedestrians considering the luggage (Schopf 1985).....	7
Figure 4	Width of pedestrian pairs (Schopf 1985)	8
Figure 5	Dimensions of handicapped people (Values in mm; Ackermann 1997)	9
Figure 6	Basic dimensions and dynamic required space of wheelchairs (Ackermann 1997)	10
Figure 7	Distribution of body height for adult persons in Central Europe (Weidmann 1993)	11
Figure 8	Relative body height for the adolescence (Weidmann 1993).....	12
Figure 9	Total energy consumption for walking (left curve) and running (right curve) over a distance of 1000 metres (Weidmann 1993)	13
Figure 10	Relative energy consumption for walking on inclined areas; upwards (left) and downwards (right); (Weidmann 1993)	13
Figure 11	Energy consumption for moving upwards on stairs (E_T) compared to walking movement on flat areas (E_E) in function of the horizontal walking speed, (Weidmann 1993)	14
Figure 12	Cumulative curve for normal distributed walking speeds (average = 1.34 m/s; standard deviation = 0.37 m/s).....	16
Figure 13	Correlation between walking speed and age (Weidmann 1993)	17
Figure 14	Correlation between step length and walking speed for walking (left curve) and running (right curve), (Weidmann 1993).....	18
Figure 15	Correlation between walking speed and temperature (Weidmann 1993)	20
Figure 16	Varying walking speed over the day (from 7am to 8pm) regarding the mean value of 1.34 m/s (Weidmann 1993).....	20

Figure 17 Mean horizontal walking speed on inclined areas; inclination in %: upwards (left) and downwards (right); (Weidmann 1993) 21

Figure 18 Deceleration of pedestrians on long stairways (Weidmann 1993) 22

Figure 19 Definition of speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993) 27

Figure 20 Pedestrian flow rates derived from the speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)..... 28

Figure 21 Fundamental diagram for walking pedestrians on flat walkways; variables: walking speed v [m/s], pedestrian density d [P/m^2], flow f [P/sm]; (Weidmann 1993) 29

Figure 22 Movement of bypassing pedestrians (Schopf 1985)..... 30

Figure 23 Minimal distances between bypassing pedestrians (Schopf 1985)..... 30

Figure 24 Capacity loss for bidirectional pedestrian flows in function of the proportion of the directional flows (Weidmann 1993) 31

Figure 25 Required width (share in %) for the pedestrian flow in one direction in bidirectional pedestrian flows (Weidmann 1993) 31

Figure 26 Simulation results of different multidirectional pedestrian flows (Blue 1999)..... 32

Figure 27 Speed-density-relation for pedestrian movement on stairs for both directions (Weidmann 1993) 33

Figure 28 Fundamental diagram for pedestrian flow rates on stairs; variables: horizontal walking speed v_h [m/s], pedestrian density d [P/m^2], flow f [P/sm]; (Weidmann 1993) 34

Figure 29 Occupancy of escalator steps dependent on escalator travel speed (Westphal 1974) 35

Figure 30 Capacity curves for escalators: theoretical values (Curve A), practical values: for 1 min intervals (Curve B) and 5 min intervals (Curve C), (Westphal 1974)..... 36

Figure 31 Specific capacity for escalators depending on the travel speed (Weidmann 1993a) 37

Figure 32 Lateral distances of pedestrians to obstacles under normal conditions (Curve a), under enforcing situations (Curve b), to other pedestrians in enforcing situations (Curve c), (Schopf 1985)..... 42

1 Introduction

1.1.1 Background

In the past walking facilities have been planned and dimensioned with conventional, analytic methods, equally the verification and evaluation of the processes and quality of pedestrian traffic. In recent years pedestrian simulation tools have been developed. These tools are capable of modelling the dynamic processes of pedestrian traffic and pedestrian flows in complicated areas, which was not possible with conventional methods before.

The use of analytic methods as well as the application of pedestrian simulation tools for planning and evaluation of walking facilities require detailed knowledge about parameters of pedestrians, pedestrian traffic and walking facilities.

1.1.2 Goals

This study intends to supply knowledge about parameters of pedestrians, pedestrian traffic and walking facilities. Dimensions of pedestrians and parameters of pedestrian movement were collected. In addition the principles of pedestrian flows in different parts of walking facilities are illustrated. With the level of service concept pedestrian traffic can be analyzed and its quality be measured. Designing walking facilities the different parts of the facility must be dimensioned for the traffic volume and the recommended level of service. At bottle necks minimal width of walkways must be considered.

1.1.3 Proceeding

This study is based on the ivt-report nr. 90 „Transporttechnik der Fussgänger“ (Weidmann 1993). The results of research of the past 13 years were investigated and compared to the earlier found results.

Basically the older cognitions were confirmed by newer literature. In most cases the newer results have let to a wider data pool of previous knowledge. No (serious) discrepancies were determined. New cognitions were found for two- and multidirectional pedestrian flows by application of pedestrian simulation tools. The transfer and use in the planning process of these re-

sults are not yet done. The level of service concept was integrated in different pedestrian traffic standards in Europe and North America with different, norm-specific level values.

1.1.4 Contents of this report

This report is structured as follows:

Chapter 2 examines the attributes of pedestrians, which are relevant for pedestrian traffic. Dimensions of human bodies and characteristics, energy consumption and walking speed of pedestrian movement are listed in details. Additionally, empirical values of pedestrian flows are mentioned.

Chapter 3 describes the principles of pedestrian flows, i.e. the relation between actual walking speed and pedestrian density. This relation is defined by the fundamental diagram, whereof different approaches are mentioned. It is to differentiate between one- and bidirectional flows and pedestrian traffic in different types of walking facilities (flat or inclined walkways, stairs etc.).

Chapter 4 covers the analysis of pedestrian traffic. The level of service concept is introduced including the definitions in different national standards in Europe and North America. Planning values for walking facilities are given using recommended level of services for different types of facilities. Minimum values for dimensions of walking facilities are given in order to avoid or at least reduce bottle necks.

In chapter 5, the references of the investigated publications are listed.

2 Pedestrians

2.1 Dimensions

2.1.1 Human body dimensions

Considering the outline of pedestrians, the typical human body has a width of about 50 cm and a depth of 30 cm. The average body ellipse of an adult person includes a minimum elbowroom for different body postures and is about 60 cm wide and 50 cm deep.




Figure 1 Body ellipse of pedestrians (Crowd Dynamics 2005)

The minimum dimensions of human bodies are varying from country to country depending on racial differences, customs of working and alimentation etc. Typical values for human bodies for different populations are shown in Table 1.

Population		Width [cm]	Depth [cm]	Area (Rectangle) [m ²]	Area (Ellipse) [m ²]
Switzerland	Male	47.50	29.50	0.14	0.11
	Female	45.50	32.50	0.15	0.12
France	Male	51.50	28.00	0.14	0.11
	Female	47.00	29.50	0.14	0.11
Great Britain	Male	51.00	32.50	0.17	0.13
	Female	43.50	30.50	0.13	0.10
Hong Kong	Male	47.00	23.50	0.11	0.09
	Female	43.50	27.00	0.12	0.09
India	Male	45.50	23.50	0.11	0.09
	Female	39.00	25.50	0.10	0.08
Japan	Male	41.00	28.50	0.12	0.09
	Female	42.50	23.50	0.10	0.08
Poland	Male	47.50	27.50	0.13	0.10
	Female	41.00	28.50	0.12	0.09
Sweden	Male	51.00	25.50	0.13	0.10
	Female	42.50	30.00	0.13	0.10
USA	Male	51.50	29.00	0.15	0.12
	Female	44.00	30.00	0.13	0.10
Elderly People	Male	48.00	29.00	0.14	0.11
	Female	41.50	30.50	0.13	0.10
Average		45.58	28.20	0.13	0.10
Maximum		51.50	32.50	0.17	0.13

Table 1 Average dimensions of pedestrians for different countries (Crowd Dynamics 2005)

The average human body over all considered countries has a width of about 45.6 cm and a depth of 28.2 cm.

These values lead to a minimum surface for an average pedestrian (without bulky clothes or luggage) of about 0.10 m², considering the elliptical form of the body. As pedestrian forms are taken as ellipses, they do not fill completely the rectangle (width multiplied by depth), which has an average area size of 0.13 m² and a maximum value of 0.17 m².

2.1.2 Dynamic width of walking pedestrians

While pedestrians are walking their balance point is wavering around an ideal line. Therefore they require more space in cross direction than an immobile person.




Figure 2 *Wavering movements of pedestrians during walking (Schopf 1985)*

The amplitude of the wavering movement reaches 14.1 cm (85%-percentile). Therefore the additional required space during walking in cross-direction amounts about 28.2 cm. This is about 62% of the average width of pedestrians. Therefore, the dynamic width of pedestrians has an average value of about 74 cm.

2.1.3 Pedestrians with luggage

Pedestrian carrying any kind of luggage with them need again more space than pedestrians with empty hands. In public pedestrian facilities only a small part of the pedestrians are walking free of luggage. Observations on urban pedestrian walkways are showing the percentage of Table 2 for people with different kind of luggage or people taking pets or children with them.

		First hand							
		Empty	Small	Middle	Big	Child	Pram	Stick	Dog
Second hand	Empty	25.8	37.1	20.8	1.6	0.7	1.2	0.6	0.6
	Small		2.8	3.3	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.3
	Middle			1.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.2
	Big				0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Child					0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0
	Pram						0.0	0.0	0.0
	Stick							0.0	0.1
	Dog								0.0

Table 2 Proportion of pedestrians with luggage. Values in [%], (Schopf, 1985)

Only 26% of the pedestrians are walking empty-handed, about 58% are carrying a small- or middle-sized piece of luggage. The remaining 16% are charged otherwise.

Table 3 shows the 50%- and 85%-percentiles of pedestrian width of pedestrians taking luggage, pets or children with them.

		First hand							
		Empty	Small	Middle	Big	Child	Pram	Stick	Dog
Second hand	Empty	64	73	73	89	107	63	69	108
		73	81	80	100	120	70	74	122
	Small		75	72	78	107	68	69	108
			83	80	84	120	76	74	122
	Middle			74	85	107	68	69	108
				81	95	120	76	74	122
	Big				79	107	-	-	-
					84	120			
Child					141	97	-	-	
					160	110			
Pram						-	-	-	
Stick							-	108	
Dog								122	
								-	

Table 3 50%- and 85%-percentiles of pedestrian width depending on luggage. Values in [cm], (Schopf, 1985)

Taking the luggage of pedestrians into account, the width of pedestrians is distributed as shown in Figure 3 with a median width of 68.5 cm.




Figure 3 Width of pedestrians considering the luggage (Schopf 1985)

2.1.4 Pedestrian pairs

Pedestrians walking side by side in pairs need more space in lateral direction than just twice the body width. Schopf (1985) examined pedestrian pairs in urban areas and found the following distribution of width.




Figure 4 Width of pedestrian pairs (Schopf 1985)

The mean width of pedestrian pairs in urban areas measures about 123 cm, the 85%-fractile about 137 cm.

2.1.5 Handicapped people

Handicapped people often need more space than normal pedestrians depending on their equipment for moving or escorting persons. People with prams can be considered as „handicapped“ because of their restricted walking speed, their difficulties passing stages and the additional required space. Ackermann (1997) specifies the following dimensions for handicapped people.






Figure 5 Dimensions of handicapped people (Values in mm; Ackermann 1997)


People moving by wheelchair require space for the dimensions of the wheelchair itself and a dynamic additional space for turning.



Normal size wheelchair



Space required by a wheelchair for turning corners



Space required by a wheelchair for maneuvering

Figure 6 Basic dimensions and dynamic required space of wheelchairs (Ackermann 1997)

2.1.6 Body height

The average body height in Central Europe is 178.5 cm for male, 166.0 cm for female persons. The mean value for both gender is 172.3 cm. Body height is Gaussian distributed with a standard deviation of 3.3% of the average value, i.e. +/- 5.9 cm for men and +/- 5.5 cm for women.




Figure 7 Distribution of body height for adult persons in Central Europe (Weidmann 1993)

The average body height is varying for different countries and populations. Table 4 shows differences of body height compared to the mean value of Central Europe.

Country	Relative body height
France	-3%
Italy	-2%
Japan	-6%
Thailand	-8%
Vietnam	-9%

Table 4 Relative body height compared to the average in Central Europe (Daamen 2004)

These values are applicable for the end of the 20th century. Over the last decades in countries with a high living standard the mean body height has been increasing. Assuming equal living conditions body height will be further increasing.

Due to the period of growth body height is also a function of age. Figure 8 shows relative body height for male and female persons during the first two decades of life.




Figure 8 Relative body height for the adolescence (Weidmann 1993)

2.2 Energy consumption

2.2.1 Flat walkways

Pedestrians need energy for moving which has to be provided by physical processes of the human body. Therefore walking speed is limited by the physical capabilities of the individual organism. The energy consumption for moving depends on pedestrian speed and is different for walking and running. The energy minimum for walking is about 274 kJ/km at a walking speed of 1.39 m/s and about 250 kJ/km for running at 3.89 m/s.




Figure 9 Total energy consumption for walking (left curve) and running (right curve) over a distance of 1000 metres (Weidmann 1993)

2.2.2 Inclined areas

On inclined areas energy consumption is very sensitive to the angle of inclination. At a gradient of 12% energy consumption is twice the value for flat areas. For declined areas up to 25% energy consumption is lower than on flat areas.




Figure 10 Relative energy consumption for walking on inclined areas; upwards (left) and downwards (right); (Weidmann 1993)

Combining the correlation between energy consumption and walking speed and the correlation of Figure 10, horizontal walking speed is directly related to the inclination (see section 2.3.5.1).

2.2.3 Energy consumption on stairs

On stairs additional energy has to be expended for the ascending movement. Therefore, total energy consumption for moving on stairs is much higher compared to walking on flat areas.




Figure 11 Energy consumption for moving upwards on stairs (E_T) compared to walking movement on flat areas (E_E) in function of the horizontal walking speed, (Weidmann 1993)

2.3 Walking speed

2.3.1 Overview

The walking speed of individuals in unimpeded pedestrian flows appears to follow a normal distribution with an estimated mean of 1.34 m/s and a standard deviation of 0.37 m/s being calculated as a mean of Table 5. These results correspond to the earlier found values of Weidmann (1993). Under specific circumstances, the distribution can be asymmetric. The median speed in these studies was 1.2 m/s (Fruin 1971).

Source	Mean speed	Standard deviation	Location
	[m/s]	[m/s]	
Crow (1998)	1.40		The Netherlands
Daly et al. (1991)	1.47		UK
FHWA (1988)	1.20		US
Fruin (1971)	1.40	0.15	US
Hankin & Wright (1958)	1.60		UK
Henderson (1971)	1.44	0.23	Australia
Hoel (1968)	1.50	0.20	US
Institute of Transportation Engineers (1969)	1.20		US
Knoflacher (1995)	1.45		Austria
Koushki (1988)	1.08		Saudi-Arabia
Lam et. al. (1995)	1.19	0.26	Hong Kong
Morrall et al. (1991)	1.25		Sri Lanka
Morrall et al. (1991)	1.40		Canada
Navin & Wheeler (1969)	1.32		US
O'Flaherty & Parkinson (1972)	1.32	1.0	UK
Older (1968)	1.30	0.30	UK
Pauls (1987)	1.25		US
Roddin (1981)	1.60		US
Sarkar & Janardhan (1997)	1.46	0.63	India
Sleight (1972)	1.37		US
Tanariboon et al. (1986)	1.23		Singapore
Tanariboon & Guyano (1991)	1.22		Thailand
Tregenza (1976)	1.31	0.30	UK
Virkler & Elayadath (1994)	1.22		US
Young (1999)	1.38	0.27	US
Estimated all average	1.34	0.37	

Table 5 Mean speed and standard deviation of unimpeded pedestrian flows (Daamen 2004)




Figure 12 Cumulative curve for normal distributed walking speeds (average = 1.34 m/s; standard deviation = 0.37 m/s)

The specific walking speed for pedestrians is determined by a lot of influencing factors. Some of them are listed in Table 6 and described in details in the following chapters.

Physical conditions of pedestrians	Cultural and racial differences (Section 2.3.2.1) Age (Section 2.3.2.2) Gender (Section 2.3.2.3) Body Height/Step Length (Section 2.3.2.4) Handicaps Luggage
Travel Purpose	(Section 2.3.3)
Environmental Conditions	Temperature (Section 2.3.4.1) Weather Daytime (Section 2.3.4.2)
Walkways attributes	Inclined Areas (Section 2.3.5.1) Stairways (Section 2.3.5.2) Escalators (Section 2.3.5.3)

Table 6 Influence factors on walking speed of pedestrians

2.3.2 Physical conditions

2.3.2.1 Cultural and racial differences

Most of the studies about pedestrians have been performed in Northern America, Europe and Asian countries. Walking behaviour in Northern America and Europe appears to be similar, whereas walking behaviour in Asian countries is significantly deviant.

Taking the studies of Table 5 the following mean speeds can be derived: 1.41 m/s for European countries, 1.35 m/s for the US, 1.44 m/s in the Australian study and 1.24 m/s for the Asian countries.

2.3.2.2 Age

Walking speed is closely related to the physical capabilities of the pedestrian. Therefore, walking speed differ with the age of pedestrians. In fact, several studies (Daamen 2004) report an average walking speed for people over 60 of 1.06 m/s and a larger variance than for adults.

Only one author reports a speed-curve over all ages (Weidmann 1993) shown in Figure 13. This curve comports to the curve of physical capability.




Figure 13 Correlation between walking speed and age (Weidmann 1993)

2.3.2.3 Gender

Men’s walking speed is about 10.9% higher than the walking speed of women according to Weidmann (1993).

Source	Men	Women
	[m/s]	[m/s]
Weidmann (1993)	1.41	1.27
Hoel (1968)	1.55	1.45

Table 7 Mean walking speeds for men and women (Daamen 2004)

The walking speed differences between men and women could be explained by the specific physical characteristics, which lead to larger step lengths and higher step frequencies for men.

The differences between the found values may be caused by different trip purposes. The values of Hoel (1968) are based on a data collection in a business district in Philadelphia.

2.3.2.4 Body height

A correlation between body height and walking speed is evident, but no data could be found. If we take into account, that body height and step length are correlated variables, walking speed can be derived from Figure 14.




Figure 14 Correlation between step length and walking speed for walking (left curve) and running (right curve), (Weidmann 1993)

2.3.3 Travel purpose

According to the travel purposes, different walking speeds can be measured as shown in Table 8. These values are based on only few measurements and the level of walking speed is significantly lower than the values in section 2.3.1. If we assume an equal share for each travel purpose the calculated mean value is 1.2 m/s. In order to obtain comparable values, the values of walking speeds are standardized to the mean value of 1.34 m/s (third column of Table 8).

Travel purpose	Walking speeds [m/s]	Standardized values [m/s]
Business districts	1.45	1.61
Commuters	1.34	1.49
Shoppers	1.04	1.16
Leisure	0.99	1.10
Overall average	1.20	1.34

Table 8 Mean walking speeds for different trip purposes (Weidmann 1993)

Other studies found free walking speeds for commuters of 1.5 m/s and for students of 1.75 m/s (see Daamen 2004).

In pedestrian flows with different travel purposes, the standard deviation of walking speed increases up to 0.5 – 1.0 m/s (Daamen 2004).

2.3.4 Environmental conditions

2.3.4.1 Temperature

The physical capabilities of the human organism is a function of the environmental temperature, air humidity and the heat emission of the human body. Several studies were performed to analyze a possible correlation between temperature and walking speed. The results are combined to the curve of Figure 15.




Figure 15 Correlation between walking speed and temperature (Weidmann 1993)

2.3.4.2 Daytime

Walking speed is probably influenced by the actual daytime corresponding to the varying physical capability of pedestrians over the day. There were only few studies performed about this correlation. Figure 16 shows a hypothesis for walking speed over the day.




Figure 16 Varying walking speed over the day (from 7am to 8pm) regarding the mean value of 1.34 m/s (Weidmann 1993)

2.3.5 Walkway attributes

2.3.5.1 Inclination of walkways

With an inclination of walkways walking speed of pedestrians is varying. In upward direction pedestrians are getting slower. Downwards, for declinations below 20%, walking speed is increasing. Inclinations over 20% are seldom used for walkways. For this field of application, stairs, escalators or elevators are used instead of.




Figure 17 Mean horizontal walking speed on inclined areas; inclination in %: upwards (left) and downwards (right); (Weidmann 1993)

Inclination	Walking direction					
	Upward			Downward		
	V_{actual} [m/s]	$V_{\text{horizontal}}$ [m/s]	V_{vertical} [m/s]	V_{actual} [m/s]	$V_{\text{horizontal}}$ [m/s]	V_{vertical} [m/s]
0%	1.34	1.34	0.00	1.34	1.34	0.00
5%	1.29	1.29	0.06	1.40	1.38	0.07
10%	1.20	1.19	0.12	1.41	1.40	0.14
15%	1.10	1.07	0.16	1.42	1.40	0.21

Table 9 Mean walking speeds of pedestrian on inclined areas (Weidmann 1993)

2.3.5.2 Stairs

Stairs are used to connect different levels of walking facilities, especially in cases where ramps would be too steep or the required space for ramps is not available. Typical angles of inclination for stairs are between 30° and 45°.

Walking speeds on stairs are lower than on walkways, notably in both directions. The mean **horizontal** walking speed on stairs decreases to 46% in upward and 52% in downward direction compared to the free-flow speed on flat walkways.

	V _{actual} [m/s]	V _{horizontal} [m/s]	V _{horizontal,rel} [%]	V _{vertical} [m/s]	V [steps/s]
Upward	0.682	0.610	46	0.305	1.97
Downward	0.776	0.694	52	0.347	2.24

Table 10 Mean walking speed of pedestrians on stairs (Weidmann 1993)

Different studies found that walking speed is going down with increased length of stairways.




Figure 18 Deceleration of pedestrians on long stairways (Weidmann 1993)

In case of big level differences in walking facilities stairs are amended or replaced by escalators or elevators.

2.3.5.3 Escalators

Escalators are used instead or as amendment of stairways to provide more comfort and/or to connect higher level differences. Typical escalators have a inclination angle of 30°. The maximum inclination in Europe is restricted to 35° (EN 115; [10]).

The inner width of escalators starts at a minimum of 600 mm and goes up to 1000 mm, which represents a two-lane-stair and allows bypassing of pedestrians. The steps are about 400 mm deep.

Most escalators are operated with a travel speed of about 0.5 m/s. Other common travel speeds are 0.65 m/s or 0.75 m/s, which is the maximum value according to EN 115.

At both ends of escalators horizontal runout areas of 800 – 1200 mm (2 or 3 steps long) have to be placed. They ensure a smooth passage between walkways and escalators.

2.3.5.4 Moving walkways

Moving walkways are providing more pedestrian comfort for long walking distances. They can be placed horizontal or can have an inclination up to a maximum of 12°.

For normal cases maximum travel speed for moving walkways is restricted to 0.75 m/s. It can be increased up to 0.9 m/s, if the inner width is lower than 1000 mm and horizontal runout areas have a minimum length of 1600 mm.

2.4 Flow rates

2.4.1 Empirical values

The flow rate is defined as number of persons passing a section within a period of time and is measured in [P/sm]. The maximum flow rates measured in pedestrian flows are varying with different countries. In Asia pedestrian flows of about 1.50 P/ms are observed. These values exceed those in American or European facilities caused by smaller Asian body buffer zones and shorter headway distances.

Region	Maximum flow rates
	[P/ms]
Asian countries	1.48 – 1.53
Europe, America	1.00 – 1.29

Table 11 Maximum flow rates for different regions (Daamen 2004)

The European and American values are corresponding to the maximum flow rates derived from speed-density-relations (see section 3.1.1, 3.2).

2.4.2 Flow rates and pedestrian speed

The flow rate depends on the speed-density-condition in the respective pedestrian flow. Pedestrians can choose their preferred walking speed at low pedestrian volumes, i.e. if pedestrian density is lower than approximately 0.5 P/m^2 (unimpeded pedestrian flow). Under more crowded conditions pedestrian density and walking speed are correlated variables (see section 3.1). With increased pedestrian density the walking speed of pedestrians is declining.

Under normal conditions, pedestrians intend to avoid physical contacts. But at pedestrian densities higher than $3.0 - 3.5 \text{ P/m}^2$ this isn't possible anymore. In waiting areas, where pedestrians can choose their waiting position, densities between 2.0 and 2.9 P/m^2 can be observed.

At densities over 5.0 P/m^2 people can hardly move. But if pedestrians are forced, much higher densities can be reached. The maximum pedestrian density can be derived from the minimum dimension of the human body. The minimum body surface of an average pedestrian measures about 0.15 m^2 , which leads to a maximum density of 6.7 P/m^2 .

In literature the following different values for unimpeded and jammed pedestrian flows can be found.

Source	Unimpeded flows	Jammed flows
	Pedestrian density [P/m ²]	Pedestrian density [P/m ²]
Fruin (1971)	< 0.5	> 5.0
Pauls (1987)	< 0.5	4.0 – 5.0
Pushkarev & Zupan (1975)		2.5 – 5.0
Sarkar & Janardhan (1997)		> 4.2
Weidmann (1993)	< 0.5	> 5.4

Table 12 Pedestrian densities of unimpeded and jammed pedestrian flows (Daamen 2004)

3 Principles of pedestrian flows

3.1 Walking on flat areas

3.1.1 One-directional flow

In unimpeded flows pedestrians can choose their walking speed freely unattending to other pedestrians. The values of free-flow speed can be observed. At densities higher than 0.5 P/m^2 the walking speed of pedestrians is decreasing. At a densities over 5 P/m^2 pedestrians can hardly move.

The relation between walking speed and pedestrian density was described through the Kladek formula by Weidmann (1993).

$$v(d) = v_0 \cdot \left[1 - e^{-1.913 \cdot \left[\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{d_{jam}} \right]} \right] \quad (1)$$

v : walking speed [m/s]
 v_0 : free-flow walking speed [m/s]
 d : pedestrian density [P/m^2]
 $d_{jam} = 5.4 \text{ [P/m}^2\text{]}$

Other authors used linear or exponential formulas, two- or three-regime approaches to describe speed-density-relation.

Source	Location	Relation
Fruin (1971a)	Peak-hour flows at commuter bus terminal	$v = 1.43 - 0.35d$ $f = 1.43d - 0.35d^2$ $f = 4.08v - 2.86v^2$
Older (1968)	Shopping streets	$v = 1.31 - 0.34d$ $f = 1.32d - 0.34d^2$ $f = 3.85v - 2.94v^2$
Sarkar & Janardhan (1997)	Calcutta Metropolitan transfer area	$v = 1.46 - 0.35d$ $f = 1.46d - 0.35d^2$ $f = 4.17v - 2.86v^2$
Tanariboon et al. (1986)	Singapore	$v = 1.23 - 0.26d$ $f = 1.23d - 0.26d^2$ $f = 4.73v - 3.85v^2$
Virkler & Elayadath (1994)	Pedestrian tunnel after University of Missouri football games	$d < 1.07 [P/m^2]$ $d > 1.07 [P/m^2]$ $v = 1.01 \exp(-d/4.17)$ $v = 0.61 \ln(4.32/d)$ $f = 4.17 v \ln(1.01/v)$ $f = 4.32 v \exp(-v/0.61)$ $f = 1.01 d \exp(-d/4.17)$ $f = 0.61 d \ln(4.32/d)$
Weidmann (1993)	Kladek formula	Equation 1
Variables: v: walking speed [m/s], d: pedestrian density [P/m ²], f: flow [P/ms]		

Table 13 Speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)

The formulas of Table 13 are derived from measurements in different pedestrian facilities. They were performed in everyday situations, where people aren't forced to walk at a certain speed. The differences in the described formulas are based on different measurement situations (location, pedestrian attributes, trip purposes).




Figure 19 Definition of speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)

Out of the speed-density-relation, the pedestrian flow rate can be calculated with Equation 2.

$$f = d \cdot v(d) \quad (2)$$

f : pedestrian flow [P/ms]
 d : pedestrian density [P/m²]
 v : walking speed [m/s]

For the speed-density-relations of Table 13 the resulting pedestrian flow rates are shown in Figure 20.




Figure 20 Pedestrian flow rates derived from the speed-density-relations (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)

Out of the pedestrian flow curves the maximum flow rate, the corresponding walking speed and pedestrian density can be read off.

	Maximum pedestrian flow rate	Corresponding walking speed	Corresponding density
	f_{max} [P/ms]	v_{fmax} [m/s]	d_{fmax} [P/m ²]
Fruin	1.46	0.72	2.04
Older	1.26	0.65	1.93
Sarkar & Janardhan	1.52	0.73	2.09
Tanariboon et al.	1.45	0.61	2.37
Virkler & Elayadath	0.97	0.61	1.59
Weidmann	1.22	0.70	1.75

Table 14 Maximum pedestrian flow rates on walkways (Daamen 2004, Virkler & Elayadath 1994, Weidmann 1993)

These values of maximum flow rates represent the theoretical capacity of walkways under normal conditions.

Taking the kladek-formula (Weidmann 1993) the following diagramm shows the relation between speed, density and pedestrian flow for an average free-flow walking speed of 1.34 m/s.




Figure 21 Fundamental diagram for walking pedestrians on flat walkways; variables: walking speed v [m/s], pedestrian density d [P/m²], flow f [P/sm]; (Weidmann 1993)

Starting with a pedestrian density of nearly 0 P/m², people are walking with free-flow speed. With increased pedestrian density pedestrians are slowing down due to reduced headway distances. Nevertheless, the pedestrian flow rate is still increasing. So far, the flow is stable and no congestion occurs. At a density of about 1.75 P/m² the maximum pedestrian flow rate is reached. This condition represents the capacity of the walking facility. If more pedestrians arrive, density increases further, but the flow rate is going down again. The pedestrian flow gets unstable and congestion occurs.

3.1.2 Bypassing pedestrians

Schopf (1985) studied the process of bypassing pedestrians. At the beginning of this ordinary, frequent situation there are two pedestrians approaching each other. At a certain distance they sidestep off the ideal line. After bypassing, they return back on the ideal line (see Figure 22).




Figure 22 Movement of bypassing pedestrians (Schopf 1985)

Figure 23 shows the distribution of the minimal lateral distance between bypassing pedestrians.




Figure 23 Minimal distances between bypassing pedestrians (Schopf 1985)

3.1.3 Bi-directional flows

In bi-directional pedestrian flows there are in addition to the density-related effects interactions between bypassing pedestrians leading to a capacity loss for the walkway.




Figure 24 Capacity loss for bidirectional pedestrian flows in function of the proportion of the directional flows (Weidmann 1993)

In case of equal flows in both directions (50%/50%), a small loss of capacity of about 4% occurs. The capacity loss increases, if the percentage of the weaker pedestrian stream gets lower. For a directional ratio of 10%/90%, a loss of 14.5% was observed. This phenomenon could be explained by the following consideration: Studies showed that the smaller pedestrian stream in bi-directional pedestrian flows needs relatively more space as shown in Figure 25. Therefore less space remains for the bigger stream leading to the capacity loss.




Figure 25 Required width (share in %) for the pedestrian flow in one direction in bidirectional pedestrian flows (Weidmann 1993)

In recent studies pedestrian simulation tools were used to model multi-directional pedestrian flows. The above described phenomenon was confirmed by the simulation models, which provided the following results.




Figure 26 Simulation results of different multidirectional pedestrian flows (Blue 1999)

The maximum flow rates of the simulation results are shown in Table 15.

Pedestrian flows	Maximum flow rates	Capacity loss
	[P/ms]	[%]
Uni-directional flow	1.47	
Bi-directional (50%/50%)	1.33	-9.1
Bi-directional (90%/10%)	1.28	-12.5

Table 15 Simulation results for bi-directional pedestrian flows (Blue 1999)

The results of the empirical measurements and the simulation for bi-directional pedestrian flow with a directional ratio of 90%/10% were of the same size. There is a capacity loss of about 12% to 14%.

In case of equal flows in both direction the resulting capacity loss is varying from 4% to 9%. The particular capacity loss depends on the separation of the pedestrian streams. In case of well separated streams in opposite directions the capacity loss is lower than with disperse streams. In everyday situations in pedestrian facilities the level of separation is influenced by many pedestrian- or facility-specific factors and has to be quantified for the particular situations.

3.2 Walking on stairs

For walking movements of pedestrians on stairs the speed-density relation for walkways can be adapted to a fundamental diagram for stairways. Equation 3 describes the horizontal walking speed on stairs in upward direction, Equation 4 in opposite direction.

$$v_{h,up} = 0.610 \cdot \left[1 - e^{-3.722 \cdot \left[\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{5.4} \right]} \right] \quad (3)$$

$$v_{h,down} = 0.694 \cdot \left[1 - e^{-3.802 \cdot \left[\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{5.4} \right]} \right] \quad (4)$$

$v_{h,up}$: horizontal speed in upward direction [m/s]
 $v_{h,down}$: horizontal speed in downward direction [m/s]
 d : pedestrian density [P/m^2]




Figure 27 Speed-density-relation for pedestrian movement on stairs for both directions (Weidmann 1993)

Using the speed-density-relation of Figure 27 and Equation 2, the pedestrian flow rates on stairways can be defined.




Figure 28 Fundamental diagram for pedestrian flow rates on stairs; variables: horizontal walking speed v_h [m/s], pedestrian density d [P/m²], flow f [P/sm]; (Weidmann 1993)

Evaluating the maximum pedestrian flow rates for both directions separately, the capacity of stairways can be derived.

Direction	Maximum pedestrian flow rate	Corresponding walking speed	Corresponding density
	f_{max} [P/ms]	v_{fmax} [m/s]	d_{fmax} [P/m ²]
Upward	0.85	0.38	2.23
Downward	0.98	0.44	2.23

Table 16 Maximum pedestrian flow rates on stairs (Weidmann 1993)

3.3 Escalators

Pedestrian behaviour on escalators is different from that on stairways. Most of them are using escalators without moving. Therefore, capacity of escalators is restricted (only) by the attributes of the facility.

$$c = v_{esc} \cdot \cos \alpha \cdot b_{st} \cdot d \quad (5)$$

c : escalator capacity [P/s]
 v_{esc} : travel speed of the escalator [m/s]
 α : inclination angle of the escalator [-]
 b_{st} : step width [m]
 d : pedestrian density [P/m²]

$$d = \frac{P_{st}}{b_{st} \cdot a_{st} \cdot \cos \alpha} \quad (6)$$

P_{st} : number of pedestrians per step [P]
 a_{st} : depth of escalator steps [m]

Combining Equation 5 and 6 the capacity of escalators is defined as Equation 7.

$$c = \frac{P_{st} \cdot v_{esc}}{a_{st}} \quad (7)$$

Equation 7 suggests that capacity of escalators is linear increasing with the travel speed. But studies in real-life situations (Westphal 1974) showed that the number of pedestrians per step is decreasing with higher travel speeds of escalators. This is the result of the inflow conditions at the beginning of escalators or the lacking acceptance of high travel speeds by the users of escalators. The following analyses are valid for two-lane-escalators with a width of 1.0m, which is the most common type.




Figure 29 Occupancy of escalator steps dependent on escalator travel speed (Westphal 1974)

Due to this effect, there is an optimal travel speed for escalators, where the capacity limit is reached.




Figure 30 Capacity curves for escalators: theoretical values (Curve A), practical values: for 1 min intervals (Curve B) and 5 min intervals (Curve C), (Westphal 1974)

Interval	Travel speed [m/s]	Capacity		Occupancy of steps
		[P/h]	[P/s]	[P/step]
1-min-Interval	0.50	8900	2.47	1.98
	0.73	10650	2.95	1.62
5-min-Interval	0.50	8000	2.22	1.78
	0.71	9300	2.58	1.46

Table 17 Practical values for capacities of escalators for different travel speeds and intervals (step width 1.0 m; step depth 0.4 m)

Out of the Curve C of Figure 30 the curve for the specific capacity shown in Figure 31 can be derived.




Figure 31 Specific capacity for escalators depending on the travel speed (Weidmann 1993a)

For long-term-intervals, e.g. one hour, the influence of inflow conditions is getting more and more important. For a 1-hour-interval the values of Table 18 should be used for capacity calculations.

Step width [m]	Travel speed [m/s]	Capacity		Step occupancy [P/step]
		[P/h]	[P/s]	
0.6	0.50	3600	1.00	0.80
	0.65	4400	1.22	0.75
	0.75	4900	1.36	0.73
0.8	0.50	4800	1.33	1.07
	0.65	5900	1.64	1.01
	0.75	6600	1.83	0.98
1.0	0.50	6000	1.67	1.33
	0.65	7300	2.03	1.25
	0.75	8200	2.28	1.21

Table 18 Practical values for capacities of escalators for 1-hour-intervals (step depth 0.4 m; DIN EN 115; [10])




4 Analysing pedestrian flows in walking facilities

4.1 Evaluation of pedestrian flows (level of service concept)

To evaluate the quality of traffic conditions for pedestrians and to control the layout and dimensions of pedestrian facilities the level of service (LOS) concept can be applied. Recent standards define 6 quality levels from A to F. They are representing comfort levels for the user of infrastructure and are based on pedestrian densities. For different parts of the infrastructure specific LOS definitions exist.

4.1.1 Walkways

In the following table there is a description of levels A to F for walkways according to the Highway Capacity Manual (2000; [27]).

Level of Service	Description of the walkway conditions	
A	At LOS A, pedestrians move in desired paths without altering their movements in response to other pedestrians. Walking speeds are freely selected, and conflicts between pedestrians are unlikely.	
B	At LOS B, there is sufficient area for pedestrians to select walking speeds freely, to bypass other pedestrians, and to avoid crossing conflicts. At this level, pedestrians begin to be aware of other pedestrians, and to respond to their presence when selecting a walking path.	
C	At LOS C, space is sufficient for normal walking speeds, and for bypassing other pedestrians in primarily unidirectional streams. Reverse-direction or crossing movements can cause minor conflicts, and speed and flow rate are somewhat lower.	




D	At LOS D, freedom to select individual walking speed and to bypass other pedestrians is restricted. Crossing or reverse-flow movements face a high probability of conflicts, requiring frequent changes in speed and position. The LOS D provides reasonably fluid flow, but friction and interaction between pedestrians is likely.	
E	At LOS E, virtually all pedestrians restrict their normal walking speed, frequently adjusting their gait. At the lower range, forward movement is possible only by shuffling. Space is not sufficient for passing slower pedestrians. Cross- or reverse-flow movements are possible only with extreme difficulties. Design volumes approach the limit of walkway capacity, with stoppages and interruptions to flow.	
F	At LOS F, all walking speeds are severely restricted, and forward progress is made only by shuffling. There is frequent, unavoidable contact with other pedestrians. Cross- and reverse-flow movements are virtually impossible. Flow is sporadic and unstable. Space is more characteristic of queued pedestrians than of moving pedestrian streams.	

Table 19 Description of the level of service concept for walkways (HCM 2000)

Standards of level-definitions for the US and for Germany and definitions of Fruin (1971) are listed in Table 20.

Level of Service	Highway Capacity Manual (2000), [27] [P/m ²]	Handbuch für Bemessung von Strassenverkehrsanlagen (2001), [11] [P/m ²]	Fruin [P/m ²]
A	< 0.18	< 0.10	< 0.31
B	0.18 – 0.27	0.10 – 0.25	0.31 – 0.43
C	0.27 – 0.45	0.25 – 0.40	0.43 – 0.71
D	0.45 – 0.71	0.40 – 0.70	0.71 – 1.11
E	0.71 – 1.33	0.70 – 1.80	1.11 – 2.00
F	> 1.33	> 1.80	> 2.00

Table 20 LOS-definitions for walkways (HCM 2000, HBS 2001, Fruin 1971)

4.1.2 Stairs



For pedestrian flows on stairways there are adapted LOS-definitions in the Highway Capacity Manual (2000) and by Fruin (1971). The defined pedestrian densities on each quality level are higher than for walkways (see Table 21).

Level of Service	Highway Capacity Manual (2000)	Fruin (1971)
	[P/m ²]	[P/m ²]
A	< 0.53	< 0.53
B	0.53 – 0.63	0.53 – 0.72
C	0.63 – 0.91	0.72 – 1.08
D	0.91 – 1.43	1.08 – 1.54
E	1.43 – 2.00	1.54 – 2.69
F	> 2.00	> 2.69

Table 21 LOS-definition for stairs (HCM 2000, Fruin 1971)

4.1.3 Waiting areas

For waiting and queuing situations and areas specific levels of service have to be applied. The conditions at each quality level are described in Table 22.

Level of Service	Description of the walkway conditions	
A	Standing and free circulation through the queuing area is possible without disturbing others within the queue.	
B	Standing and partially restricted circulation to avoid disturbing others in the queue is possible.	





C	Standing and restricted circulation through the queuing area by disturbing others in the queue is possible; this density is within the range of personal comfort.	
D	Standing without touching is possible; circulation is severely restricted within the queue and forward movement is only possible as a group; long-term waiting at this density is uncomfortable.	
E	Standing in physical contact with others is unavoidable; circulation in the queue is not possible; queuing can only be sustained for a short period without serious discomfort.	
F	Virtually all persons within the queue are standing in direct physical contact with others; this density is extremely uncomfortable; no movement is possible in the queue; there is potential for panic in large crowds at this density.	

Table 22 Description of the levels of service for waiting areas (HCM 2000, [27])

Level of Service	Highway Capacity Manual (2000) [P/m ²]	Handbuch für Bemessung von Strassenverkehrsanlagen (2001) [P/m ²]
A	< 0.83	< 1.00
B	0.83 – 1.11	1.00 – 1.50
C	1.11 – 1.67	1.50 – 2.00
D	1.67 – 3.33	2.00 – 3.00
E	3.33 – 5.00	3.00 – 6.00
F	> 5.00	> 6.00

Table 23 LOS-definitions for waiting areas (HCM 2000, [27]; HBS, [11])

4.2 Dimensioning

4.2.1 Influence of obstacles

In pedestrian facilities it can be observed that pedestrians are walking in a certain lateral distance to obstacles or boundaries (walls, balustrade etc.). In everyday situations pedestrians intend to keep these lateral distances at a certain value, which depend on the type of obstacle. These distances are decreasing in enforcing situations (see Figure 32).




Figure 32 Lateral distances of pedestrians to obstacles under normal conditions (Curve a), under enforcing situations (Curve b), to other pedestrians in enforcing situations (Curve c), (Schopf 1985)

The lateral distances are varying with different kind of objects.

Object	Distance	Source
	[cm]	
Concrete walls	30 – 45	CROW (1998)
	45	De Neufville & Grillot (1982)
	50	HBS (2001)
	15	Pauls (1987)
	40	Van Soeren (1996)
	25	Weidmann (1993)
Metal walls	20	Weidmann (1993)
Shop windows	100	HBS (2001)
Fence, plantings	60	HBS (2001)
Single obstacles	40	Van Soeren (1996)
	10	Weidmann (1993)
Handrail of stairways	0	HBS (2001)
	30	Weidmann (1993)
Platform edges	80	Van Soeren (1996)
Distance to roadways	35	Weidmann (1993)

Table 24 Shy away distances of obstacles for pedestrians (Daamen 2004, HBS 2001 [11], Knoflachner 1987, Weidmann 1993)

These shy away distances will have to be deducted from the width of walkways for dimensioning or for level of service evaluations.

4.2.2 Minimum width of walkways

To choose or to check the minimum width of walkways, the regime (number of lanes) and the dimension of pedestrians have to be taken in account. Pedestrians require beyond the static width (see section 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.5) additional space for the dynamic width (see section 2.1.2). In case of opposite pedestrian flows the bypassing distances have to be added (see section 3.1.2). Around obstacles or near boundaries the shy away distances should be appended (see section 4.2.1).

In the following sections the minimum width of walkways are calculated according to the SN-Norms (SN 640201; [23]). The width of walkways is composed by the width of the different, intended lanes, which are determined by the static width of pedestrians and the additional, dynamic and safety width on both sides of each lane.

4.2.2.1 Minimum width of 2-lane walkways

The width of 2-lane-walkways is laid out on the bypassing incident of two pedestrians (one person with luggage, the other one without luggage).

	Lane 1: Pedestrian with luggage		Lane 2: Pedestrian without luggage		Total width [m]
	Basic width	Addition for dynamic and safety width	Basic width	Addition for dynamic and safety width	
	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	
Standard	0.80	0.40	0.60	0.40	2.20
Minimum	0.80	-	0.60	-	1.40

Table 25 Standard and minimum width of 2-lane walkways (SN 640201; [23])

The standard width for a 2-lane walkway should be 2.20 m. The minimum width of 1.40 m should only be used on short section near bottle necks. Pedestrians would have to reduce walking speed bypassing other pedestrians.

In pedestrian facilities used by many travellers (e.g. railway stations, airports), the most common bypassing incident will be pedestrians with luggage in both directions (basic static width of 80 cm). Therefore the total width of such walkways should be at least 2.40 m.

Additionally the specific shy away distances will have to be added to the walkway width.

4.2.2.2 Minimum width of 3-lane walkways

The following dimension of 3-lane-walkways is laid out on the bypassing incident of three pedestrians (one person with luggage, the other two without luggage).

	Lane 1: Pedestrian with luggage		Lane 2: Pedestrian without luggage		Lane 3: Pedestrian without luggage		Total width [m]
	Basic width	Additional width	Basic width	Additional width	Basic width	Additional width	
	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	
Standard	0.80	0.40	0.60	0.40	0.60	0.40	3.20
Minimum	0.80	-	0.60	-	0.60	-	2.00

Table 26 Standard and minimum width of 3-lane walkways (SN 640201; [23])

The standard width for a 3-lane walkway should be 3.20 m. The minimum width of 2.00 m should only be used on short section near bottle necks. Pedestrians would have to reduce walking speed bypassing other pedestrians.

In pedestrian facilities used by many travellers (e.g. railway stations, airports), the most common bypassing incident will be pedestrians with luggage in both directions (basic width of 80 cm). Therefore the total width of such walkways should be at least 3.60 m.

Additionally the specific shy away distances will have to be added to the walkway width.

4.2.2.3 Minimum width of bottle necks (single lane)

At bottle necks (most narrow passages for pedestrians) a minimum width of 1.0 m should be kept. This allows passing pedestrians with luggage or wheelchairs.

The length of such bottle necks in walking direction should be kept at a very minimum in order to avoid dead-locked pedestrians or congestion at the inflow of bottle necks.

4.2.3 Recommended minimum LOS

For dimensioning or evaluating pedestrian facilities minimum level of services can be used to verify pedestrian comfort. For short term periods a higher level of service (lower comfort) can be tolerated than for long term intervals.

	Minimum Level of Service	Density	Walking speed	Flow rate
		[P/m ²]	[m/s]	[P/ms]
Walkways				
Normal	B	0.22	1.34	0.30
Rush hour	D	0.58	1.27	0.74
Bottle necks	E	1.02	1.05	1.07
Stairs			(up / down)	(up / down)
Normal	B	0.58	0.61 / 0.69	0.35 / 0.40
Rush hour	D	1.31	0.54 / 0.62	0.71 / 0.81
Bottle necks	E	2.12	0.40 / 0.46	0.85 / 0.98
Waiting Areas				
Normal	B	0.87	-	-
Short-term	D	2.50	-	-

Table 27 Minimum level of services for pedestrian facilities (Weidmann 1993, HCM 2000; [27])

5 Literature

- [1] Ackermann et. al. (1997): Behindertengerechte Verkehrsanlagen, Planungshandbuch für Architekten und Ingenieure, Düsseldorf, 1997
- [2] AlGadhi, S.A.H. et. al. (2001): A speed-concentration relation for bi-directional crowd movements, In: Schreckenberg, M., Sharma, S.: Pedestrian and Evacuation Dynamics, p. 3-20, Springer, Berlin, 2001
- [3] Alrutz, D., Bohle, W. et. al. (1999): Flächenansprüche von Fussgängern; Berichte der Bundesanstalt für Strassenwesen (bast), Verkehrstechnik Heft V71; Hannover, 1999
- [4] B+S Ingenieur AG, Lanz, R. et. al. (2005): Dimensionierung von Fussgängerflächen von Haltestellen des strassengebundenen öffentlichen Verkehrs, Forschungsauftrag VSS 1998/187, Vereinigung Schweizerischer Strassenfachleute (VSS), Bern 2005
- [5] Blue, V.J., Jeffrey. L.A. (1999): Modeling Four-Directional Pedestrian Flows, Transportation Research Record 1710, Washington D.C., 1999
- [6] Boesch, H. (1986): Der Fussgänger als Kunde, Beobachtungen zum Komplex Bevölkerungsbewegung, Fussgängerdistanzen, Kundendichte, Parkplätze und öffentlicher Verkehr; Bericht Nr. 58 zur Orts-, Regional- und Landesplanung, Institut für Orts-, Regional- und Landesplanung, ETH Zürich; Zürich, 1986
- [7] Brög, W., Erl, E. (1999): Kenngrössen für Fussgänger- und Fahrradverkehr; Berichte der Bundesanstalt für Strassenwesen (bast), Verkehrstechnik Heft M109; Hannover, 1999
- [8] Crowd Dynamics Ltd. (2005): Graphic - Levels of Service; www.crowddynamics.com Cumbria, 2005
- [9] Daamen, W. (2004): Modelling passenger flows in public transport facilities; PhD, Trail Thesis Series, 2004/6, The Netherlands TRAIL Research School, Delft, 2004
- [10] Deutsches Institut für Normung (2005): DIN EN 115; Sicherheitsregeln für die Konstruktion und den Einbau von Fahrtreppen und Fahrsteigen (Entwurf); Deutsche Fassung prEN 115:2005; Berlin, 2005

- [11] Forschungsgesellschaft für Strassen- und Verkehrswesen (2001): Handbuch für die Bemessung von Strassenanlagen, HBS; 2001
- [12] Fruin, J. J. (1971): Designing for Pedestrians: A-Level-Of-Service Concept; Highway Research Record, Nr. 355, S.1-15, Highway Research Board, Washington D.C., 1971
- [13] Fruin, J. J., Benz, P.B. (1984): Pedestrian Time-Space Concept for Analyzing Corners and Crosswalks; Transportation Research Record, Nr. 959, S. 18-24, Washington D.C., 1984
- [14] Hoogendoorn, S. P., Daamen, W. (2005): Pedestrian Behavior at Bottlenecks; Transportation Science Vol. 39, No. 2, p. 147-159, Washington D.C., 2005
- [15] Khisty, C. J. (1994): Evaluation of Pedestrian Facilities: Beyond the Level-of-Service Concept; Transportation Research Record Nr. 1438, p. 45-50, Washington D.C., 1994
- [16] Khisty, C. J. (1994): Pedestrian Cross Flows in Corridors; Transportation Research Record Nr. 847, p. 54-57, Washington D.C., 1994
- [17] Knoflacher, H. (1995): Fussgeher- und Fahrradverkehr, Planungsprinzipien; Böhlau Verlag, Wien; Wien, 1995
- [18] Knoflacher, H. (1987): Verkehrsplanung für den Menschen; Wirtschaftsverlag Orac, Wien; Wien, 1987
- [19] Rapp Ingenieure und Planer (1993): Indikatoren im Fussgängerverkehr; SVI-Forschungsauftrag 45/90; Zürich, 1993
- [20] Sarkar, S. (1993): Determination of Service Levels for Pedestrians, with European Examples; Transportation Research Record No. 1405; Washington D.C., 1993
- [21] Schopf, J. M. (1985): Bewegungsabläufe und Qualitätsstandards für Fussgänger, Radfahrer und Kfz-Verkehr; Dissertation an der Fakultät für Bauingenieurwesen, TU Wien; Wien, 1985
- [22] Schweizerischer Verband der Strassen- und Verkehrsfachleute VSS (2003): Geometrisches Normalprofil; Allgemeine Grundsätze, Begriffe und Elemente; Schweizer Norm SN 640200a; Zürich, 2003
- [23] Schweizerischer Verband der Strassen- und Verkehrsfachleute VSS (1992): Geometrisches Normalprofil; Grundabmessungen und Lichtraumprofil der Verkehrsteilnehmer; Schweizer Norm SN 640201; Zürich, 1992

- [24] Schweizerischer Verband der Strassen- und Verkehrsfachleute VSS (1992): Geometrisches Normalprofil; Erarbeitung; Schweizer Norm SN 640202; Zürich, 1992
- [25] Seyfried, A. et. al. (2005): The Fundamental Diagram of Pedestrian Movement Revisited, Central Institute for Applied Mathematics, Research Centre, Jülich, 2005
- [26] Transportation Research Board (1985): Highway Capacity Manual; Special report number 209, National Academy of Sciences; Washington D.C., 1985
- [27] Transportation Research Board (2000): Highway Capacity Manual, HCM 2000; National Research Council; Washington D.C., 2000
- [28] Transportation Research Board (2000): Pedestrians and Bicycles 2000, Safety and Human Performance, Transportation Research Record No. 1705; Washington D.C., 2000
- [29] Transportation Research Board (2003): Pedestrians and Bicycles 2003, Safety and Human Performance, Transportation Research Record No. 1828; Washington D.C., 2003
- [30] Virkler, M. R., Elayadath, S. (1994): Pedestrian Speed-Flow-Density Relationships; Transportation Research Record No. 1438, Washington D.C., 1994
- [31] Weidert, J.-L. (2000): Behindertengerechter öffentlicher Strassenraum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Geh- und Sehbehinderter; IVS-Schriften Band 8, Institut für Verkehrssystemplanung, TU Wien, Wien, 2000
- [32] Weidmann, U. (1993): Transporttechnik der Fussgänger, Transporttechnische Eigenschaften des Fussgängerverkehrs, Literaturlauswertung; Schriftenreihe des IVT Nr. 90; Zürich, März 1993
- [33] Weidmann, U. (1993a): Der Fussgänger im Strassenverkehr, Geschwindigkeit und Leistungsfähigkeit; Zeitschrift Der Nahverkehr, Nr. 6/1993; Zürich, März 1993
- [34] Westphal, J. (1974): Leistungsfähigkeit fester Bahnsteigtrepfen im Berufsverkehr der Deutschen Bundesbahn; Österreichische Ingenieur-Zeitung, 17. Jg. 11: 377-385