Evaluating Walkable Streets with a 3D Stated Preference Survey

A collaboration between UTTRI, Esri Canada, OCAD U & Waterfront Toronto iCity-ORF 3rd Annual Research Day June 22nd, 2018







Gaps

- Most street designs prioritize car travel.
- Urban design guidelines for streetscapes are rarely based on empirical evidence of their relationship to behaviour or psychology or user experience.
- Empirical research on the built-environment correlates of walking and cycling are **dominantly at the neighbourhood scale**.
- Little is known about the trade-offs made between various design attributes.

Relevance



UTTRI

Relevance





UTTRI Based on Ewing & Handy (2009)

Method:

Scope

Attributes at the **street segment level**, for the purpose of **recreational** walking

- Web-based survey:
 - Ask respondents to rate an existing street (revealed preference)
 - Provide them with systematically manipulated options to re-rate (stated preference).
- Visualisation environment: CityEngine + Unity
- Locations: A number of streets at Toronto waterfront & down town

Locations



UTTRI

Attributes



side walk + curb lane + through lanes & transit + curb lane + side walk ☑

Adjacent buildings and land uses





Complete Streets

UTTRI Partially adopted from Rose & Bliemer (2009)





Experimental design



Experimental design: orthogonal design

Scenario	through lane	curb lane	sidewalk	tlane_width	clane_width	sidewalk_width street_width	
King street	t						
1	transit+car+car+transit	none	medium edge+wide clearway	13	0	9.6	22.6
2	car+car	cvcle path+on street parking	medium edge+normal clearway	6	9.4	6.4	21.8
3	car+car	cycle path_one way	narrow edge+normal clearway+outdoor dining	6	4,6	11,2	21,8
4	transit+transit	cycle path_one way	medium edge+wide clearway	7	4,6	9,6	21,2
5	car+car	cycle path_two way	outdoor dining+normal clearway	6	3,8	9,6	19,4
6	car+car+car+car	none	medium edge+normal clearway	12	0	6,4	18,4
7	transit+transit	cycle path two way	medium edge+normal clearway	7	3,8	6,4	17,2
8	transit+transit	none	outdoor dining+normal clearway	7	0	9.6	16.6
9	car+car	none	narrow edge+wide clearway	6	0	8	14
Queens Qu	lav between I ower Ja	arvis & Lower Sherbourne					
1	car+transit+transit+car	on street parking+cycle path	medium edge+normal clearway	13	9.4	6.4	28.8
2	car+transit+transit+car	cycle path one way	outdoor dining+normal clearway	13	4.6	9.6	27.2
3	car+car+car+car	cycle path_two way	narrow edge+normal clearway+outdoor dining	12	3,8	11,2	27
4	car+transit+transit+car	cvcle path two way	medium edge+wide clearway	13	3.8	9.6	26.4
5	car+car	on street parking+cycle path	medium edge+wide clearway	6	9,4	9,6	25
6	transit+car+car+transit	cycle path_two way	narrow edge+wide clearway	13	3,8	8	24,8
Queens Qu	ay between Yonge &	Freeland					
1	car+transit+transit+car	cycle path_two way	medium edge+wide clearway	13	3,8	9,6	26,4
2	car+car	on street parking+cycle path	medium edge+wide clearway	6	9,4	9,6	25
3	transit+car+car+transit	cycle path_two way	narrow edge+wide clearway	13	3,8	8	24,8
4	car+car+car	cycle path_one way	narrow edge+wide clearway	12	4,6	8	24,6
5	car+transit+transit+car	none	narrow edge+normal clearway+outdoor dining	13	0	11,2	24,2
6	transit+car+car+transit	cycle path_one way	medium edge+normal clearway	13	4,6	6,4	24
Villiers Stre	eet Don to Cherry						
1	transit+car+car+transit	on street parking+cycle path	narrow edge+normal clearway+outdoor dining	13	9,4	11,2	33,6
2	transit+car+car+transit	cycle path+on street parking	outdoor dining+normal clearway	13	9,4	9,6	32
3	car+car+car+car	on street parking+cycle path	outdoor dining+normal clearway	12	9,4	9,6	31
4	car+car+car	cycle path+on street parking	medium edge+wide clearway	12	9,4	9,6	31
5	car+transit+transit+car	cycle path+on street parking	narrow edge+wide clearway	13	9,4	8	30,4
6	car+transit+transit+car	on street parking+cycle path	medium edge+normal clearway	13	9,4	6,4	28,8

As a pedestrian, how attractive do you find the street designs below?

Please click on each animation, then rank the scenarios as the 1st, 2nd or 3rd best designs.



- Four Car lanes
- Cycle path (one way)
- Sidewalk 4 m



- Two Car lanes & transit in the middle
- Cycle path (two way)
- Sidewalk 4 m



- Four Car lanes
- Cycle path (one way)
- Sidewalk 4.8 m



Impacts

- Evidence-based design guidelines for walking friendly streets
- Specific guidelines for improvements of pedestrian facilities in Toronto downtown and Waterfront
- Dashboard' platform to visualise and assess various street designs
 → Policy-support commercializable product

Impacts



ŪTTRI

Complete Streets Game launched at TCAT's Complete Streets Forum, May 27, 2013 Photo Credit: Chris Hardwicke





Impacts

A dashboard environment to:

in the

\$54.00 \$34.00 -

in the

-0.0 -6.0

- Visualize
- Quantify
- Assess

the line the line line if a line factor to the line line bears if lineses

0

Provide guidelines





iCity Project Collaboration

Sestion Canada is acting as an industry partner and providing research contribution and consultation

Project Design Stages



Creating a "Digital Twin" of Toronto

 A "digital twin" is a digital replica of physical assets, processes and systems. A digital twin acts as a test-bed for new ideas, where we can run simulations and consider improved, and even radial scenarios without actually impacting the physical world



3D Visualization Workflow



Esri Canada

- Base imagery
- Sidewalk data
- Road centerlines

Toronto Open Data

- Road centerlines
- 3D massing
- Open spaces
- Street trees

Partner Companies

- 3D massing
- Site plans



Toronto's Digital Twin



Complete Street Parameters



Complete Street Modelling in CityEngine



Scenario Models in CityEngine





Street Animations – Unity



Complete Street Survey Implementation



Scenario 1



Scenario 2



Scenario 3

