CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION:

Man has created his existence space to satisfy his inner psychological need. From the very early day to the present day it has happened over and over again to bring order and meaning into his surrounding where man lives. Conversely man's existence is dependent upon the meaningful and coherent environmental image or existential space. Giving order to environment implies that architecture controls or regulates the relation between man and his environment. It therefore participates in creating a livable environment, that is a meaningful form for the activities of man.

In this study, defining of space, brought in to discussion was the relationship between man and space around him. Man's living space was the result of his action when he strove to convert his schemata in symbolic way into very compexed physical situations.

Space in its broadest sense, comprise three basic concepts; the space as the place itself; the three-dimensional space and space – time relationship which includes man's perception. As far as man is concerned, space – time relationship is the most important aspect in defining his living space, thus space is understood as a dimension of one's existence.

Several such strategies can be identified in designing spaces with good results. One of the ways to substantiate this is to examine the existing situation. The domestic environment is a very familiar situation and which can be identified vast differentiations according to culture, religion, race, living pattern etc. As a primary step towards this, several types of living environments and domestic spaces were selected from the Sri Lankan context and were analyzed from a broader view according to the theoretical framework.

Specifically the study concludes that in the traditional rural villages, the spaces were entirely defined by the people, their clans and also their activity patterns. Almost all the demarcations represent the symbolic meanings. Invisible boundaries were mostly employed and it could be easily applied throughout the clan. The simplicity is the major character within those settlements.

But within the contemporary rural village it can be seen that there exist today slight differences, since there are no clans, or settlements like 'gamgoda'. Instead of the community living, people today live in separated dwelling spaces, which are physically bounded by fences or half walls. Invisible demarcations are still employed but not

individually, together with physical elements. The inner spaces are differentiated physically but remain to maintain the relationship with the exterior environment.

In the urban single housing situation, all activities are limited with in a small plot of land and bounded with clear, permanent, physical boundaries. Spaces are highly differentiated by using the physical setting largely. Thus the complexity can be highly experienced throughout the dwelling space.

However in the urban apartment-housing situation, the boundary, of the dwelling unit are almost entirely defined by the typical physical demarcations. Thus, it could be experienced that this leads to monotonous spatial differentiation within each dwelling. It does not have a chance to change the physical setting to interpret the identity of each family like other situations. Therefore, defining of space is done almost entirely by the semi- fixed and non- fixed (object) elements.

In general, the study concludes that, the contemporary living spaces, specially in urban situation, are much more brutal and strugglesome for the inhabitants. It is therefore necessary to participate in creating in successful living spaces and defining these spaces as livable inner environments. This is indeed a major task for the architect. It is much more important to identifying the defining elements- not only as a physical barrier or as a object itself, but also as a element to define a space to be a space for a particular activity, which propagate with out clearly indicated forces.

From this dissertation it comes in to picture that, the possibilities of the elements, making them in single function rather than the multi- functions. It is identified that, the elements were more serving in number of purposes other than the one.
E.g.

Element	Primary	Secondary
1.walls	space defining	structural
2.floor	space defining(elevated platform)	functional
3.steps	functional(to reach the other level)	functional(siting)
4. Windows	functional(to get light+ ventilation)	space defining
5.doors	functional (to enter + exit)	space defining(by - location)
6.furtiture	functional	space defining
7.objects	symbolic	functional(in some - cases)

etc.

Now it begins to remove many of those dual purposes and begin to use things limited in to one purpose and to use the things specialized into one aspect in that single purpose.

E.g. In the past,

i. walls and columns were primarily used for structural purposes. Due to the technological modification, it begin to use as a separation of one purpose to another only.(e.g. Al curtains)

ii. the window was used also as a space defining element with its' wide sill, but now it has been trancefomed as a functional element to get light and ventilation.

These multi-purposes oriented functions were incorporated with the symbolic orientations

But today most of these things are done by separate elements. There is a tendency to happen these removable of certain objects or their potentials, and it does not lead to have a good result. This situation has to be changed and the full potentials of the elements have to be utilized with their all possibilities to create a more meaningful environment. Those are the possibilities, which are really speaking.

Otherwise, could it be that always spaces are defined with its enwrapper- walls, floor, ceiling, and activity treated separately. How can they be incorporated with the patterns created by human actions/ activities? As far as, not only does the setting itself inversely define the space, can't it be with an object. (like Mies Vander Rohe's Barcelona pavilion). These are questions to ask?

Therefore it is clear that, there is a need to be conscious of those transformation of the spaces. The architect will be in a better position to define the domestic space more meaningfully and sensitively if only he is well aware of the dwelling practices and the operations of spatial definition in the domestic environment. As the first step for that, this dissertation provides a provoking thought, to be executed boldly and with a vision .

REFERENCES:

1. Alexander, Christopher (1977) - A Pattern Language, Oxford University Press, London

2. Alexander, Christopher (1979) - The timeless way of building, Oxford University Press , New York ,U.S.A.

3. Antoniades , C. Antony (1980) - Architecture and Allied Design. Ken dall / Hunt Publishing Company, U.S.A.

4. Canter, D. (1977) - The Psychology of place , Architectural Press, London.

5. Ching Francis D.K. - Architecture : form , space and order. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York

6. Cooper, C. - House as Symbol of self. Designing for Human Behaviour Jon Lang (1904), Hutchinson & Ross, Inc .U.S.A

7. Dissanayake , J.B. (   ) - The monk and the peasant. State Printing corporation. Colombo 02, Sri Lankan.

8. Duncan, J.S. (1981) - Housing and Identity, Cross – Cultural perspective. Croom Helm Ltd, London.

9. Fridman, A, Pile . J.E. & Wilson , F. (1970) - Interior design , Elsevier science publication, New York.

10. Lawrence, R.J. (1987) - Housing, Dwelling and Homes, John wiles & Sons, Briton.

11. Lorrie, M. (1988) - Living in small space. James and Hudson Ltd. London.

12. Meiss, Pierre Von, (1986) - Elements of Architecture. Press Polytechniques Romandes. Switzerland.

13.   Oliver, M. (1977)   -   <u>Psychology of the House</u>, Thames and Hudson, London

14.   Oliver, P. (1987)   -   <u>Dwellings: The Huses across the World,</u> Oxford phaidon Press. London.

15.   Oliver, P. (1975)   -   <u>Shetter, Sign and Symbole,</u> Berrie & Jenkins Ltd, London

16.   Rapoport, A.   -   Australian aborigines and the Definition of Place, <u>Shetter. Sign and Symbol</u> by Oliver, P. (1975)

17.   Rapoport, A . (1969)   -   <u>House, form and culture,</u> Prentice hall, Inc, Englewood cliffs.

18.   Rapoport , A. (1977)   -   <u>Human Aspects of urban form,</u> Pergaman press , oxford

19.   Rapoport, A. (1982)   -   <u>Meaning of the Built Environment,</u> Sage publications, beverly hills. California. U.S.A.

20.   Relph, P. (1976)   -   <u>Place and placelessness.</u> Pino Ltd, London

21.   Sommer, R. (1969)   -   <u>Personal space,</u> Prentice Hal international , Inc . London

22.   Tuan, Y. (1977)   -   <u>Space and Place,</u> Edward Arnolda, London.

23.   Wilson, F. (1984)   -   <u>A Graphic Survey of Perception and Behaviour for the Design Professions.</u> Van Nostrand Reinhold company, Inc, U.S.A.

24.   Withold , Ryloczymski, (1986)   -   <u>Home,</u> Heinemann, London.