

LB Don/27/1998

LANDMARKS IN URBAN LANDSCAPE
A STUDY OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION FOR
IMAGIBILITY OF PLACES
AND LEGIBILITY OF URBAN ENVIRONMENT

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA



පුස්තකාලය
මොරටුව විශ්ව විද්‍යාලය, ශ්‍රී ලංකාව
මොරටුව

69332

um
Thesis
coll.

72'98"
712

JANAKA OPANAYAKA
M.Sc. (ARCHITECTURE)-1998
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA
MORATUWA
SRI LANKA

69332

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is pleasure to express my sincere gratitude to the people who have helped in the preparation of this Dissertation.

I am grateful to:

Dr. L. S. R. Perera, Senior lecturer, Department of Architecture
University of Moratuwa, for his guidance, advice, encouragement,
and valuable criticism

Archt. Kapila Dharmadana, Lecturer, Department of Architecture,
University of Moratuwa for his guidance, advice, encouragement,
and valuable criticism

Archt. Somasundaram Muruganandan for his valuable suggestions
at the conceptual stage

Dr. D. P. M. Emmanuel, Dr. D. Waduge and Archt. Prasanna Kulathilaka
for their suggestions and advice at various stages

Wasantha, Athula, Prasadh, and Janitha Mallee for their assistance

At last ^{not} but the least to my parents and family members for their patience and
support



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

Janaka Opanayaka

2nd July 1998

ABSTRACT

The variety of an environment is mainly created by the hierarchical relationship of the fabric of that environment. So a variety in an order is a essential component to it to be comfortable to a society to experience.

We experience rural neighborhoods, urban nodes, highly congested built fabrics, shanty settlements etc. Every location, generate a clue in our mind, thus stimulating interactions. Intensity of that clue help us to recognise that location. For that imagination we use various landmarks of that environment. It may be doorknob or a stone mark, on the roadside to sophisticated buildings.

So this is a study of *landmarks*, their characteristics in order to understand their contribution to Imageability and legibility of urban environment.

In the study, two basic characteristics of *landmarks* are identified as physical attributes and associatioanl attributes. Physical attributes mainly contributes to the visibility of the object and also give a symbolical meaning attached to it.

Associational attributes mainly contributes to a out come of 'experience', 'feeling', and 'participation' to have a very clear sense of the place.

In every context these two characteristics involves to built up 'mental pictures' in the minds of its inhabitants.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgement | |
| Abstract | |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| 0.1 The study | 01 |
| 0.2 The need for the study | 01 |
| 0.3 Objective of the study | 02 |
| 0.4 Limitation of the study | 03 |
| 0.5 Method of the study | 03 |
| CHAPTER ONE: IMAGEABILITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT | |
| 1.1 Environmental perception and image | 04 |
| 1.2 The image | 05 |
| 1.3 Environmental image and its components | 05 |
| 1.3.1 Identity | 06 |
| 1.3.2 Structure | 07 |
| 1.3.3 Meaning | 07 |
| 1.4 study of notions about city structure | 07 |
| 1.4.1 legibility of and environment | 08 |
| 1.4.2 Meaning associated with physical environment | 13 |
| 1.5 Imageability of a place | 16 |
| 1.6 Imageable structure and landmarks | 17 |
| 1.6.1 How the imageable structure is determined | 18 |
| 1.7 Summary | 19 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LANDMARKS AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS | |
| 2.1 Landmarks; their contribution to a legible environment | 20 |
| 2.2 Characteristics and nature of landmarks | 21 |
| 2.2.1 Physical attributes of landmarks | 21 |
| 2.2.1.1 Architectural attributes of landmarks | 22 |
| 2.2.1.2 Position or locational attributes of landmarks | 24 |
| 2.2.1.3 Latent characteristics of landmarks | 25 |
| 2.2.2 Associational attributes of landmarks | 25 |
| 2.2.2.1 Religious cosmic association | 26 |
| 2.2.2.2 Association of rituals festivals and ceremonies | 26 |
| 2.2.2.3 Cultural social and political association | 27 |
| 2.2.2.4 Historical association | 28 |
| 2.3 Role of landmarks | 29 |
| 2.4 Types of landmarks | 29 |
| 2.5 Summary | 31 |

CHAPTER THREE: APPLICATION OF THE THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING TO REALISTIC SITUATION AND ITS ANALYSIS

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 3.1 | Introduction | 32 |
| 3.2 | Basis for examination | 32 |
| 3.3 | Aims to the study | 33 |
| 3.4 | Example one Kandy Dalada Maligawa and its immediate context | 35 |
| 3.4.1 | General history of Kandy | 35 |
| 3.4.2 | City structure | 35 |
| 3.4.3 | Sociocultural institutions | 36 |
| 3.4.4 | Observation on imageability based on inference from questionnaire findings | 37 |
| 3.4.5 | Analysis and inferences | 42 |
| 3.5 | Example two Kurunagala town context | 45 |
| 3.5.1 | General history | 45 |
| 3.5.2 | City structure | 45 |
| 3.5.3 | Observation on imageability based on inferences from questionnaire findings | 46 |
| 3.5.4 | Analysis and inferences | 48 |
| 3.6 | Example three Galle Fort and immediate context | 50 |
| 3.6.1 | General history | 50 |
| 3.6.2 | City structure | 50 |
| 3.6.3 | Observation imageability based on inferences from questionnaire findings | 51 |
| 3.6.4 | Analysis and inferences | 54 |
| 3.7 | Example four Colombo-Fort and immediate context | 56 |
| 3.7.1 | General history | 56 |
| 3.7.2 | City structure | 56 |
| 3.7.3 | Observation on imageability based on inferences from questionnaire findings | 58 |
| 3.7.4 | Analysis and inferences | 60 |
| 3.8 | Conclusion | 61 |
| | CONCLUSION | 62 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 65 |
| | APPENDIX | 67 |