

The Impossible Trinity of Human Space Usage between Home, Workplace and Amenity

Shizhen Wang (UCL)

Stanimira Milcheva (UCL)

August 6th, 2024

Abstract

We propose an impossible trinity of human space usage between home, workplace, and amenity in this paper to explain mobility pattern changes and shifts in demand for space during COVID-19. We developed detailed time usage and location visit profiles for 60,131 people in England and Wales by analyzing about 120 million cell phone location and timestamp records on March 2020 and March 2021. We found that both at-home time and amenity visits increased during COVID-19, while workplace visits decreased. Individual visits to different locations are determined by three key factors: individual preference measured by pre-pandemic location visit frequency, time constraints influenced by work-from-home, and space accessibility. We also find that work from home improves equality of individual amenity usage between people of different incomes: low-income and middle-income people saw an 8% and 4% increase in additional amenity visits, respectively, compared to high-income people during the pandemic.

Keywords: Mobility, At home time, Workplace visits, Amenity, Cell phone Location, Work from home

Shizhen Wang (corresponding author), shizhen.wang.21@ucl.ac.uk ; Stanimira Milcheva, s.milcheva@ucl.ac.uk;
All authors are at the Bartlett School of Sustainable Construction, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place,
London, England WC1E 7HB.

The COVID-19 period has seen significant changes in human mobility patterns and shifts in demand for space, with the decrease in workplace visits (Glaeser, 2022) and increase in time spent at home (Gamber et al., 2022). Recent research also suggests that households and businesses are relocating from city centers to suburban areas (Ramani and Bloom, 2022; Gupta et al, 2022). However, there has been a lack of research on how individuals' lives change concerning location visits and time spent. It is unclear whether individuals benefit from WFH-related mobility pattern changes. Our research aims to fill this gap. In this paper, we developed detailed time usage and location visit profiles for 60,131 people in England and Wales by analyzing about 120 million cell phone location and timestamp records from March 2020 and 2021. Unlike previous research aggregating human visits over different periods or specific types of locations, we measured individual-level time and visits across different locations before and during COVID-19, offering a clear picture of how individual lives changed during the pandemic. We found that with the decrease in workplace visits from 4 days to 2 days per week, at-home time increased from 15.2 hours to 17.4 hours per day, and amenity visits increased from 14.2 to 18.8 times per week.

To explain this pattern change, we propose a model: the Impossible Trinity of Human Space Usage between Home, Workplace, and Amenity, to explain how people allocate time and visits across different types of locations. Specifically, we argue that individuals actively allocate time and visits across home, workplace, and amenities, as they need to be in certain locations within a period. As the total time available in a day or week is limited, there is an impossible trinity of space usage between these places. During the COVID-19 period, human time and visits shifted closer to home and amenities, as WFH enabled people to visit workplaces less frequently, thus shifting away from workplaces. Our model suggests that the saved time and commuting costs from WFH are relocated to both home and amenities, which is the key to understanding the mobility pattern change.

We further analyzed the factors that determine human space visit allocation. We found three key factors: individual preference (measured by pre-pandemic time spent and visits to specific locations), location accessibility, and WFH-related time constraints. Specifically, we found that people who spent more time at home (or visited workplaces or amenities more frequently) continued to do so during the pandemic after one whole year. An increase in space accessibility, such as the number of rooms at home (or accessible amenities near one's home), also leads to an increase in the usage of that type of space. Finally, WFH-related time constraints also matter. We found that individuals with higher WFH potential (Dingel and Neiman, 2020) significantly increased their at-home time during the pandemic, while the impact on workplace and amenity visits was negative.


Finally, we analyzed the amenity usage of people from different income groups. We found that high-income people visited amenities more than low- and middle-income people, likely due to having more time from shorter commuting distances and living in high-amenity density areas. However, during COVID-19, low-income and middle-income people saw an 8% and 4% increase in amenity visits, respectively, compared to high-income people, resulting in a phenomenon where high- and low-income individuals visited amenities at similar rates. In other words, WFH improved equality in amenity usage among people of different incomes. The increase in amenity visits for low- and middle-income individuals was more significant in consumer-related places, such as eating and drinking establishments, attractions, and retail stores, suggesting an increase in their welfare due to WFH.

Results

General Mobility Pattern Change

We developed individual-level time usage and location visit profiles for 60,131 people in England and Wales by analyzing about 120 million cell phone location and timestamp records from March 2020 and 2021. We found that with the decrease in workplace visit frequency (WVF) from 4 days to 2 days per week, at-home time increased from 15.2 hours to 17.4 hours per day, and amenity visits increased from 14.2 to 18.8 times per week. For amenity visits, we identified six major kinds: eating and drinking, attractions, health, public infrastructure, retail, and transport. These visits increased from 4.2 to 4.8 times per week. A distribution of individual levels of these variables is given in Fig 1. It shows that a certain group of people have a WVF near 0, suggesting that they work from home full-time, while others continue to visit their workplace (identified with pre-pandemic cell phone location data from a year ago) but with lower frequency. For at-home time and amenity visits, the distribution curve shifts to the right, although the distribution pattern remains similar. The summary statistics details of visits and other data used in the paper are given in Table 1. We also found that about 12% of individuals moved to a new home. Two graphs related to amenity visit structure and home moves are provided in the appendix.

Figure 1: Individual Mobility Variable Distribution




Notes: This graph shows the individual level mobility variables distribution of 60 131 people in England and Wales in 2020 March and 2021 March (at home time, workplace visits frequency, logarithm value of total amenity visits and logarithm value of amenity visits).

Impossible Trinity of Human Space Usage


We propose an impossible trinity of human space usage between home, workplace, and amenity, as people can only show up in one location at a given time. To present this trinity, we use a ternary plot to illustrate the relocation of these space usages during the pandemic. We develop this graph with the following steps: First, we calculate the average value of home, workplace, and amenity visits in each local authority district (LAD) to make it easier to present the data. Then, we calculate the standardized value of these three variables for two separate periods. Finally, we calculate the share of each type of space usage for different LADs and present it on a ternary graph (Prieto-Curiel and Ospina, 2024), which is given in Fig 2. It shows that in most cities, people moved far away from workplaces and closer to amenities and home, providing an overall picture of how individuals relocated their time during the pandemic. People living in larger cities (especially in London) had more amenity visits both before and during the pandemic.

Figure 2 Impossible Trinity of Human Space Usage between Home, Workplace and Amenity

A. 2020 March



B. 2020 March



Notes: This graph presents the time and visits relocation of different LAD in UK before and during COVID-19, the space usage share are estimated from the cell phone location data of 60 131 people in England and Wales.

Determine of Place Visits

We propose a model to explain how individuals spend time and allocate visits across different places. We consider three key factors: individual preference, time constraints, and accessibility to space. The first two factors represent the demand for space, while the last one represents the supply. We use pre-pandemic time usage or visit frequency as the measurement of preference. For time constraints, which are mainly influenced by WFH, we use WFH potential as a measurement. For accessibility to space, we use the average number of rooms and the number of different amenity locations in the LSOA where one's home is located during the pandemic. For workplace visits during the pandemic, we follow previous research to develop a workplace visits model, which consists of pre-pandemic workplace visits and WFH potential.


Fig 3 presents the WFH potential and workplace visit frequency before and during the pandemic. The regression results of the WVF model are shown in Table 1, where the individual-level WVF is the outcome variable. The column shows that pre-pandemic WVF is positively correlated with WVF during the pandemic. In other words, people who went to the workplace more frequently before the pandemic continued to do so during the pandemic. The average number of cars in the LSOA where one lives is positively correlated with WVF, while commuting distance to the workplace is negatively correlated. It also shows that people with high WFH potential (who are more able to work from home) visited the workplace less frequently. People who moved homes experienced an additional 1.3 days per week decrease in WVF compared to those who did not. We also estimate the WVF model for people who moved homes and those who did not. The results are given in Tables 2 and 3. The results are similar, but pre-pandemic WVF has a much larger influence on WVF during the pandemic for people who lived in the same place.

Table 1 Workplace Visits Frequency Determinants

	(1) Whole Sample	(2) Home Move 0	(3) Home Move 1
wvf 2020 March	0.674*** (0.007)	0.761*** (0.007)	0.232*** (0.017)
car numbers	0.276*** (0.028)	0.380*** (0.031)	-0.029 (0.059)
log commuting distance	-0.353*** (0.007)	-0.461*** (0.008)	0.242*** (0.018)
wfh potential	-0.223** (0.093)	-0.162 (0.100)	-0.641*** (0.223)
home move	-1.314*** (0.027)		
Constant	0.043 (0.067)	-0.257*** (0.070)	0.051 (0.177)
Observations	60,131	52,338	7,793
R-squared	0.244	0.283	0.033
Region fixed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Error cluster MSOA	Yes	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1


Fig 3 WFH potential and Workplace Visits Frequency



Notes: This graph shows the binsactter of WFH potential and WVF in 2020 and 2021 March.

Figure 4 At Home Time, Amenity Visits Frequency and Pre-pandemic value

A. At home time



B. Amenity Visits Frequency




Fig 4 shows the correlation between at-home time and amenity visit frequency (AVF) before and during the pandemic, both values displaying a positive correlation. We also present the AVF of different types with their pre-pandemic values in the appendix. We analyze the factors determining at-home time and AVF, with the results given in Table 2 and Table 3. The results show that for each additional hour of pre-pandemic at-home time, at-home time during the pandemic increases by 0.5 hours. People with higher WFH potential will spend more time at home (Jiang et al., 2022). For amenity visits, a 1% increase in pre-pandemic amenity visits results in a 0.4% increase in AVF. People with higher amenity access get more visits (Abbiasov et al., 2023).

Table 2 At Home Time Determinants

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Whole Sample	Home Move 0	Home Move 1
at home time 2020 March	0.520*** (0.005)	0.551*** (0.005)	0.341*** (0.014)
room numbers LSOA	0.225*** (0.024)	0.286*** (0.025)	-0.097 (0.075)
wfh potential	1.342*** (0.154)	1.199*** (0.157)	2.257*** (0.503)
home move	-1.113*** (0.048)		
Constant	8.173*** (0.147)	7.468*** (0.150)	10.782*** (0.485)
Observations	60,131	52,338	7,793
R-squared	0.208	0.217	0.071
Region fixed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Error cluster MSOA	Yes	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3 Amenity Visits Frequency Determinants

	(1)	(3)	(4)
	Whole sample	Home Move 0	Home Move 1
log avf 2020 March	0.400*** (0.004)	0.425*** (0.005)	0.250*** (0.012)
amenity number LSOA	0.079*** (0.004)	0.070*** (0.004)	0.122*** (0.010)
wfh	-0.199*** (0.031)	-0.163*** (0.032)	-0.286*** (0.084)
home move	0.007 (0.008)		
Constant	0.638*** (0.020)	0.634*** (0.021)	0.686*** (0.059)
Observations	60,131	52,338	7,793
R-squared	0.164	0.178	0.100
Region fixed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Error cluster MSOA	Yes	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Amenity Usage Equality

We present the amenity visit frequency of different income groups in Fig 5. It shows that high-income people visited amenities more frequently before the pandemic, especially individuals who live in areas with the highest 10% household income. During the pandemic, the amenity visits of everyone increased (Lee et al., 2023), and the AVF curve also flattened. Low-income people experienced the most significant increase in AVF, which increased the equality of amenity consumption. We provide graphs of the amenity visit frequency of different types and income groups in the appendix. We added two dummy variables, income-high and income-low, in our AVD model. The results are given in Table 4. Column 1 shows that low-income and middle-income people experienced an 8% and 4% additional increase in amenity visits compared to high-income people, suggesting that WFH improved equality in amenity usage.

Fig 5 Income and Amenity Visits Frequency




Table 4 Amenity Visits Frequency Determinants with Income Group

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Outcome	AVD	Amenity 1	Amenity 2	Amenity 3	Amenity 4	Amenity 5	Amenity 6
Income high	-0.041*** (0.007)	-0.021*** (0.006)	-0.013*** (0.004)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.029*** (0.006)	-0.029*** (0.007)	0.001 (0.003)
Income low	0.044*** (0.007)	0.016*** (0.006)	0.009** (0.004)	-0.000 (0.006)	0.013** (0.006)	0.043*** (0.007)	0.006* (0.003)
wfh control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Home move control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
lagged visits control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Amenity access control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R-squared	0.165	0.176	0.150	0.181	0.156	0.176	0.135
Region fixed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Error cluster MSOA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 For amenity type developed from OS Map Classification: 1 eating and drinking, 2 attractions, 3 health, 4 public infrastructure, 5 retail, 6 transport

Discussion

In this research, we measured individual-level time usage and location profiles for 60,131 individuals in England and Wales during COVID-19. We further developed a model to explain space usage and found that individual preferences for certain locations remained stable, while WFH-related time constraints and accessibility to space also mattered. We compared amenity visit frequency equality during COVID-19 and, consistent with recent research on student isolation (Cook, Currier, and Glaeser, 2022), found that high-income individuals visited more amenities. However, during the pandemic, low- and middle-income individuals were able to visit amenities more frequently, especially places related to consumption such as eating and drinking, attractions, and retail. There has been debate on the changes brought by WFH. Bloom et al. (2024) show that hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance, while Delventhal et al. (2022) show that workers who are able to WFH benefit most from this process due to saved commuting costs. However, these people tend to be high-income, which might further increase inequity. Research by King and Long (2024) suggests that WFH induced larger decreases in morning travel time, and individuals who continue to commute will benefit from lower time costs of commutes due to decreased urban congestion levels. Our research shows that WFH improved amenity usage equity among different income groups, providing new evidence on how WFH shapes post-pandemic cities and urban life. However, the commuting process between different places (Prieto-Curiel and Ospina, 2024) could be considered in future research.

Methods

Mobility Variable

we use a location-based mobility analysis approach, focusing on identifying the main locations an individual visits within a month and estimating the time they spend there (Wang et al., 2023). We first build a time usage matrix of each person in different location within the two months separately, the procedure for deriving individual-level mobility variables from cell phone location data is outlined below. First, we count the total number of days and hours that an individual has appeared, which are denoted as $showed\ days_i$ and $hours_{max}$, respectively. Then, we calculated the time spent by an individual at each location. When a person appears in multiple locations, we evenly distribute the unit of time (which is one hour) spent across those locations.

Then, we can obtain a matrix representing the hourly time allocation in different locations (referred to as the Individual Hourly Time Allocation in Different Locations, IHL matrix). The rows of the matrix correspond to each hour, ranging from $hour_{h1}$ to $hour_{hmax}$, while the columns of the matrix represent the different locations, labelled $location_{l1}$ to $location_{lmax}$.

$$IHL_{p\ hour\ location} = \begin{pmatrix} t_{p\ h1\ l1} & \dots & t_{p\ hx\ l1} & \dots & t_{p\ hmax\ l1} \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ t_{p\ h1\ ly} & \dots & t_{p\ hx\ ly} & \dots & t_{p\ hmax\ ly} \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ t_{p\ h1\ lmax} & \dots & t_{p\ hx\ lmax} & \dots & t_{p\ hmax\ lmax} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then we defined the location where individuals spent most of their time as "home" and used the MSOA or LSOA level demographic variables as individual-level variables (Gupta et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2024; Cook et al., 2024). The location where they spent the most time outside of home during the pre-pandemic period was defined as the "workplace". For other visits, we defined them as amenity visits (Abbiasov et al., 2022). We calculated the amenity visits of different kinds (from Ordnance Survey Map) by calculating the grid-level number of different place-weighted visits to determine our amenity visits (Couture et al., 2022).

Reference

- Abbiasov T, Heine C, Sabouri S, et al. The 15-minute city quantified using human mobility data[J]. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2024, 8(3): 445-455.
- Abbiasov T, Sedov D. Do local businesses benefit from sports facilities? The case of major league sports stadiums and arenas[J]. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 2022: 103853.
- Bloom N, Han R, Liang J. Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance[J]. *Nature*, 2024: 1-6.
- Cook C, Currier L, Glaeser E. Urban mobility and the experienced isolation of students[J]. *Nature Cities*, 2024, 1(1): 73-82.
- Couture V, Dingel J I, Green A, et al. JUE Insight: Measuring movement and social contact with smartphone data: a real-time application to COVID-19[J]. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2022, 127: 103328.
- Delventhal M J, Kwon E, Parkhomenko A. JUE Insight: How do cities change when we work from home?[J]. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2022, 127: 103331.
- Dingel J I, Neiman B. How many jobs can be done at home?[J]. *Journal of Public Economics*, 2020, 189: 104235.
- Dong, Lei, et al. "Defining a city—delineating urban areas using cell-phone data." *Nature Cities* 1.2 (2024): 117-125.
- Gamber W, Graham J, Yadav A. Stuck at home: Housing demand during the COVID-19 pandemic[J]. *Journal of Housing Economics*, 2022: 101908.
- Glaeser E L. Reflections on the post-Covid city[J]. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 2022, 15(3): 747-755.
- Gupta A, Mittal V, Peeters J, et al. Flattening the curve: pandemic-induced revaluation of urban real estate[J]. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2022, 146(2): 594-636.
- Gupta, A., Mittal, V., Peeters, J., & Van Nieuwerburgh, S. (2022). Flattening the curve: pandemic-induced revaluation of urban real estate. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 146(2), 594-636.
- Jiang Y, Laranjo J R, Thomas M. COVID-19 lockdown policy and heterogeneous responses of urban mobility: Evidence from the Philippines[J]. *PloS one*, 2022, 17(6): e0270555.
- Kim J, Long D. Working from home, commuting time, and intracity house-price gradients[J]. *Journal of Regional Science*, 2024.
- Lee K O, Mai K M, Park S. Green space accessibility helps buffer declined mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence from big data in the United Kingdom[J]. *Nature Mental Health*, 2023, 1(2): 124-134.
- Prieto-Curiel R, Ospina J P. The ABC of mobility[J]. *Environment International*, 2024, 185: 108541.
- Ramani A, Bloom N. The Donut effect of COVID-19 on cities[R]. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 2021.
- Wang S, Milcheva S, Szumilo N. What Do We Learn from Mobile Phone Location Data about Mobility and Housing During Covid-19[J]. Available at SSRN 4674302, 2023.

Appendix

Table 5 Summary Statics of Selected Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
at home hours 2020	15.284	2.914	8.723	22.292
at home hours 2021	17.432	3.540	7.763	23.573
wvf 2020	3.941	1.252	1.556	6.563
wvf 2021	2.148	2.315	0.000	7.000
avf 2020	4.213	3.341	0.333	36.400
avf 2021	4.794	4.140	0.233	48.222
avf total 2020	14.258	5.627	3.938	47.250
avf total 2021	18.870	8.386	2.947	59.889
home move	0.130	0.336	0.000	1.000
work from home potential	0.362	0.095	0.102	0.960

Notes: the observation is 60 131, all data at individual level.

Table 6 Different Types of Amenity Visits Frequency Determinants

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Amenity 1	Amenity 2	Amenity 3	Amenity 4	Amenity 5	Amenity 6
log avf 2020 March	0.425*** (0.005)	0.394*** (0.007)	0.479*** (0.006)	0.428*** (0.005)	0.445*** (0.005)	0.407*** (0.010)
amenity number LSOA	0.063*** (0.003)	0.033*** (0.002)	0.061*** (0.004)	0.066*** (0.004)	0.054*** (0.003)	0.030*** (0.002)
wfh	-0.136*** (0.027)	-0.017 (0.018)	-0.097*** (0.026)	-0.136*** (0.026)	-0.171*** (0.030)	-0.055*** (0.014)
home move	0.010 (0.007)	-0.006 (0.005)	-0.014** (0.007)	0.002 (0.007)	0.024*** (0.008)	-0.003 (0.004)
Constant	0.112*** (0.013)	0.040*** (0.008)	0.120*** (0.013)	0.102*** (0.014)	0.271*** (0.016)	0.055*** (0.006)
Observations	60,131	60,131	60,131	60,131	60,131	60,131
R-squared	0.176	0.149	0.181	0.155	0.175	0.135
Region fixed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Error cluster MSOA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 For amenity type developed from OS Map Classification: 1 eating and drinking, 2 attractions, 3 health, 4 public infrastructure, 5 retail, 6 transport

Figure 6 Different kinds of Amenity Visits Frequency





Figure 7 Share of People Moved Home to New Area



Notes: Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) are made up of groups of Output Areas (OAs), usually four or five. They comprise between 400 and 1,200 households and have a usually resident population between 1,000 and 3,000 persons. Middle layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs) are made up of groups of Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs), usually four or five. They comprise between 2,000 and 6,000 households and have a usually resident population between 5,000 and 15,000 persons. For LAD, there are 6,904 wards in England and 762 in Wales. There are two regions in our sample: England and Wales.

Figure 8 Different Kinds of Amenity Visits Frequency and Pre-pandemic Value




Figure 9 Different Kinds of Amenity Visits Frequency with Income

