

# RESPONSIVENESS OF URBAN LANDSCAPE AND FLYOVERS

E.A.T.Suresh

 University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.  
A Dissertation Submitted To The Department Of Architecture Of The University Of Moratuwa  
In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Degree Of  
Master Of Science In Architecture

Faculty of Architecture

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

95735

## Table of Contents

### I. List of figures

### II. Introduction

Table of Contents

Observations and topic explanation

Criticality and intension

Scope and limitations

Method of study

### Chapter 1- Understanding the Urban-Landscape

1.0 Urban Landscape and Architecture	01
1.1 Factors affecting the emergence of the cities and its structure	02
1.1.1 Physical factors	02
1.1.2 Social factors	06
1.1.3 Economic factors	09
1.1.4 Psychological factors	11
1.2 Elements of the Urban Landscape	13
1.2.1 Channels/ access ways	15
1.2.2 Demarcations	17
1.2.3 Segments	18
1.2.4 Nodes	19
1.2.5 Landmarks	21
Chapter 2- Evolution of the Urban Landscape	23
2.1 Evolution of the Urban Landscape.	26
2.1.1 Society	31
2.1.2 Urban Built Mass	36

2.1.3 Urban non Built Spaces	39
2.1.4 Functions/ Activities	
2.1.5 Expressions	45
Chapter 3- Responsiveness of Urban Landscape	
3.0 Responsiveness	50
3.1 Responsiveness of Urban Landscape	53
3.1.1 Environmental Responsiveness	53
3.1.1.1 Permeability	54
3.1.1.2 Variety	56
3.1.1.3 Legibility	58
3.1.1.4 Robustness	61
3.1.1.5 Visual Appropriateness	63
3.1.1.6 Richness	64
3.1.1. 7 Personalization	66
Chapter 4- Case Study-Analysis of the Responsiveness of Flyover, Demetagoda	
4.1 Role Plays by the Flyover in the Urban Context	68
4.1.1 Urban location	68
4.1.2 Figure of the Flyover	75
4.1.3 How it Functions	76
4.1.4 Expressions	77
4.2 Responsiveness of the Demetagoda Flyover on its Landscape.	78
4.2.1 Analysis- Permeability	78
4.2.2 Analysis- Variety	80
4.2.3 Analysis- Legibility	82
4.2.4 Analysis- Robustness	83
4.2.5 Analysis- Visual Appropriateness	86
4.2.6 Analysis- Richness	89
4.2.7 Analysis- Personalization	91
Conclusion	95
Bibliography	97

### Declaration

I declare that this dissertation represents my own work, except where due acknowledgement is made, and that it has not been previously included in a thesis, dissertation or report submitted to this university or to another institution for a degree, diploma or other qualification.

### *UOM Verified Signature*



Suresh, E.A.T. Sri Lanka.  
Electronic Theses & Dissertations

### *UOM Verified Signature*

*Handwritten signature*

Internal tutor

Dr. Harsha Munasinghe,  
Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Architecture,  
University of Moratuwa.



## **Acknowledgement**

To understand and to compile relevant information in producing this dissertation the help and encouragement I receive from everyone, loves me indebted to them and I gratefully acknowledge their support and guidance.

- Prof. Samitha Manwadu, Head of the Department, University of Moratuwa, for the opportunities that he made for me to understand this subject area.
- Dr. Harsha Munasinghe, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Architecture, for his valuable guidance on research and resources till the completion of the dissertation.
- Eng./Landscape. Susira Udalmatte, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape Division, University of Moratuwa, for the guidance and resources.
- Eng. Rohitha Swarna, Deputy Director, RDA, for his kind corporation on resources.
- Dr. Uperndra Rajapaksha, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Architecture, University of Moratuwa, for the opportunities made from the 5th year.
- Arch. Damith de Silva, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Architecture, University of Moratuwa, for the opportunities made from the 5th year.
- My friends who had been very influential in the development of the dissertation through helpful criticism, guidance and equipments.
- My parents and my sister who encouraged me in every struggle to realize this.



**Table of Contents**

<b>I. List of figures</b>	I
<b>II. Introduction</b>	X
Observations and topic explanation	X
Criticality and intension	XI
Scope and limitations	XII
Method of study	XII
<b><u>Chapter 1- Understanding the Urban-Landscape</u></b>	
<b>1.0 Urban Landscape and Architecture</b>	01
<b>1.1 Factors affecting the emergence of the cities and its structure.</b>	02
1.1.1 Physical factors	02
1.1.2 Social factors	06
1.1.3 Economic factors	09
1.1.4 Psychological factors	11
<b>1.2 Elements of the Urban Landscape</b>	13
1.2.1 Channels/ access ways	15
1.2.2 Demarcations	17
1.2.3 Segments	18
1.2.4 Nodes	19
1.2.5 Landmarks	21
<b><u>Chapter 2- Evolution of the Urban Landscape</u></b>	
<b>2.1 Evolution of the Urban Landscape.</b>	23
2.1.1 Society	26
2.1.2 Urban Built Mass	31
2.1.3 Urban non Built Spaces	36
2.1.4 Functions/ Activities	39
2.1.5 Expressions	45



**Chapter 3- Responsiveness of Urban Landscape**

<b>3.0 Responsiveness</b>	50
<b>3.1 Responsiveness of Urban Landscape</b>	53
3.1.1 Environmental Responsiveness	53
3.1.1.1 Permeability	54
3.1.1.2 Variety	56
3.1.1.3 Legibility	58
3.1.1.4 Robustness	61
3.1.1.5 Visual Appropriateness	63
3.1.1.6 Richness	64
3.1.1.7 Personalization	66

**Chapter 4- Case Study-Analysis of the Responsiveness of Flyover, Demetagoda**

<b>4.1 Role Plays by the Flyover in the Urban Context</b>	68
4.1.1 Urban location	68
4.1.2 Figure of the Flyover	75
4.1.3 How it Functions	76
4.1.4 Expressions	77
<b>4.2 Responsiveness of the Demetagoda Flyover on its Landscape.</b>	78
4.2.1 Analysis- Permeability	78
4.2.2 Analysis- Variety	80
4.2.3 Analysis- Legibility	82
4.2.4 Analysis- Robustness	83
4.2.5 Analysis- Visual Appropriateness	86
4.2.6 Analysis- Richness	89
4.2.7 Analysis- Personalization	91
<b>Conclusion</b>	95
<b>Bibliography</b>	97

**List of Illustrations**

1. **Fig1.** Grand channel Venice and the buildings as a response the channel; Sigiriya on top of the rock and Kandy protected by the forest and mountains and water.-**p.3**
2. **Fig2.** Grande Axis, Paris-Grand Arch, the Axis and La Defence, -**p.3**
3. **Fig3.** a. Painting of Berlin 1756, b. Painting of Vienna 1873 c. East Berlin 1952-57, shows that the people were moved gradually out of the streets as the landscape changed.-**p.4**
4. **Fig4.** Different types of viaducts on the urban landscape.-**p.5**
5. **Fig5.** Change of Nuremberg through time.-**p.6**
6. **Fig6.** Extended arcades of the shop houses in Munster, Germany-**p.7**
7. **Fig7.** Urban Landscape influenced by the Modern Movement concepts.-**p.8**
8. **Fig8.** Modern Movement landscapes-**p.8**
9. **Fig9.** Today's social attitude, Togetherness, Peace and Equity-**p.9**
10. **Fig10.** Landscape of Pettah, Fort and Demetagoda, clearly shows the economic influence on urban landscape-**p.10**
11. **Fig11.** Landscapes of Berlin and Munster, Germany-**p.10**
12. **Fig12.** Layout of the Polonnaruwa kingdom right to the reservoir-**p.11**
13. **Fig13.** Picture of ancient Indian port cities, Chinese cities and European cities-**p.12**
14. **Fig14.** Thailand, Malaysia and Colombo-**p.13**
15. **Fig15.** Krier's argument; Conceptual sketch-**p.13**
16. **Fig16.** Kostof's argument; conceptual sketch-**p.14**
17. **Fig17.** Lynch's argument; conceptual sketch-**p.14**
18. **Fig18.** Connection channel to the urban neighbourhood-**p.15**
19. **Fig19.** Channels vary with the width; some are narrower some are wider-**p.16**
20. **Fig20.** Channels which connects two significant points with a start and an end, Seigessallee, Berlin, Grand Axis of France from Louver to the Grand Arch.-**p.16**





21. **Fig21.** An active and a live path dedicated for pedestrians to perform as they want in east London, and the paved lines of the Place D'Yoville, France emphasise directional quality. **-p.17**
22. **Fig22.** The edges are created by water in Boston, dominant buildings in Moscow and the buildings against water in New York. **-p.17**
23. **Fig23.** The edge; **-p.17**
24. **Fig24.** Demarcations exist above in the urban landscape; Britain, Frankfurt, Bangkok, Frankfurt. **-p.18**
25. **Fig25.** Different segments in the urban landscape created by parking, buildings and the vegetation. **-p.18**
26. **Fig26.** Different characters of different segments in the urban landscape, Echelon Square; High-Rise District, Fort the Colonial expression. **-p.19**
27. **Fig27.** Node; **-p.19**
28. **Fig28.** Successful Node; **-p.20**
29. **Fig29.** Nodes with no functional significance; **-p.20**
30. **Fig30.** Landmarks as they highlight the points of references. **-p.21**
31. **Fig31.** Landmarks with a meaning; **-p.21**
32. **Fig32.** Landmarks; Personalised detail, A significant Gateway, Frankfurt Tur, Berlin, A Door hanger, Contrasting Façade, Berlin. **-p.22**
33. **Fig33.** Landmarks; **-p.22**
34. **Fig34.** Different urban landscapes and activities; **-p.23**
35. **Fig35.** Activities defined by the surrounded expression; **-p.24**
36. **Fig36.** Kandyan urban landscape derived with the procession; **-p.25**
37. **Fig37.** Evolution; **-p.25**
38. **Fig38.** The Temple of Tooth Relic is more dominant in the Kandyan landscape and it is forced to be. **-p.26**
39. **Fig39.** Urban landscape created where people wanted to treat people, early cities more with gathering spaces, then the humans were trapped in between the built masses, later the landscape was more functional oriented. **-p.26**
40. **Fig40.** Conflict of the Black and the White skins-**p.27**
41. **Fig41.** Evolution of the Galle Fort landscape; **-p.28**

42. **Fig42.** Different boundaries on urban landscape, Perceptual boundaries of the urban edge, Breaking of the social boundaries, Merge of the ethnic boundaries. -p.28
43. **Fig43.** Change of the man and the urban landscape -p.29
44. **Fig44.** The corridors are widened to improve the sense of the street in "SAHASPURA" development where people ride and even play in those.- p.30
45. **Fig45.** Contemporary human needs efficient connectivity which dominates the landscape. -p.31
46. **Fig46.** Viaducts and the urban context-p.31
47. **Fig47.** Evolution of the urban landscape; Brompton road London, 1880 and 1930- change of the built mass are identical. -p.32
48. **Fig48.** Picture to compare the different built masses prior to buildings in different eras. -p.32
49. **Fig49.** Less expressive and too geometric dumb landscape of modern movement. -p.34
50. **Fig50.** Demolition of the buildings as society rejects them due to less responsiveness. -p.34
51. **Fig51.** The plan of the garden city concept. -p.34
52. **Fig52.** Flexible built forms and built masses on contemporary urban landscape-p.35
53. **Fig53.** Different viaducts create different forms in the urban landscape. Historical Britain, Thailand, Seattle. -p.35
54. **Fig54.** Different types of urban non built spaces; Abandoned spaces in Huston, Recreational spaces in Netherlands, Urban sculptural landscape in Munster, Germany. -p.36
55. **Fig55.** Change of the urban non built spaces with the evolution; More natural, Prominence for the vehicles more stress on spaces. -p.37
56. **Fig56.** Urban non built spaces are animated by an identical built form in the context; Centre Pompidou, Paris, HSBC- Hong Kong -p.38
57. **Fig57.** British museum, Grand Court, UK-p.38





58. **Fig58.** Effect of the viaducts on urban non built space; it creates an over head edge to demarcate a boundary of the space which is not necessary but make the ambience of a congested space. -**p.39**
59. **Fig59.**Change of the man made context prior to function; The railway and other modes of transportation, Expansion of activities; exposure of the exhibition space and Seattle viaduct with and without in the landscape. -**p.40**
60. **Fig60.** Flow of the functions across the landscape from public to private; Main boulevard- Paris, St. Marks street-New York. -**p.40**
61. **Fig61.**Negative and positive effects of activities on urban landscape, Community activities like recreation and celebrations enhance the quality of the urban landscape while vehicle movement destroys it. -**p.41**
62. **Fig62.** Negligence of man on nature; Living in harmony with nature, Grabbing the properties of nature clearing the ground, Dominate in the context and Challenge with the technology. -**p.41**
63. **Fig63.** Negligence of man and the urban landscape towards each other, Old ladies lost their way in the middle of the roads, Congested activities in nodes, Promote mobility abandoned with no people, New York -**p.42**
64. **Fig64.** Stress of the people is symbolical in urban landscape by activities, sometimes it is an art; Insane on traffic lights, Unauthorised personalization of public spaces. -**p.42**
65. **Fig65.**Activities in the manmade landscape, On road exhibition spaces, Definition to the natural context; central park, New York, Urban piazza; Del Compo, Siena, Italy. -**p.43**
66. **Fig66.** Adaptation of the people to the stressed activities in the urban context, Way side eating spaces, Stay and chat by the side of heavy traffic, Don't walk means walking in New York . -**p.43**
67. **Fig67.** Activities and the efficiency through viaducts; Double viaduct accommodates the vehicles and trains, monorail in Bangkok, Freeway above many traffic layers. -**p.44**

68. **Fig68.** Different sections of the landscape through the flowing of activities with viaducts -p.44
69. **Fig69.** Expression of safety in different historical landscapes; -p.45
70. **Fig70.** Picture to show the developing connectivity in the urban landscape-p.45
71. **Fig71.** Urban landscape in the industrial era; Emergence of industries- Yorkshire, Turbine factory-Berlin, Poor housing in industrial era, Roads didn't welcome people but encourage more vehicles. -p.46
72. **Fig72.** Corbusier designed city, Chandigar, and building done by Kenzo Tange. -p.47
73. **Fig73.** Post modern landscape was more expressive and celebrated the difference than the monotony. -p.48
74. **Fig74.** Contemporary urban landscape with skyline difference, Elements and their expressions of prestige, Economical stability and power-p.48
75. **Fig75.** Bangkok more towards functional efficiency and Munster with residential expressions -p.49
76. **Fig76.** Different flyovers with different expression; Solid steady, More dynamic, Merging with the landscape-p.49
77. **Fig77.** Political responsiveness of a community and the social responsiveness on left over spaces. -p.50
78. **Fig78.** Social responsiveness; Restrictions, Rejections, Recreation51
79. **Fig79.** Different environments accepted by many people say those are more responsive towards people-p.52
80. **Fig80.** Different levels of permeability, less permeable and more permeable spaces-p.54
81. **Fig81.** Visual and the Physical permeability-p.55
82. **Fig82.** Physical permeability guaranteed of visual permeability, though when it is physically obstructed visual permeability can be gained-p. 56
83. **Fig83.** Variety, Form, Functions and Expressions-p.57



84. **Fig84.** Variety can be easily gained by encouraging variety of the functions so visual elements as well as physical elements will celebrate it easily. -p.57
85. **Fig85.** Perceiving the structure or organization in mind 58
86. **Fig86.** Legibility of the Eiffel tower as a landmark, Louvre museum located in the grand axis -p.59
87. **Fig87.** Pettah streets with different functions and different identities. -p.59
88. **Fig88.** Path enclosure to gain legibility; path enclosure will create a direction to follow with a character in mind. -p.60
89. **Fig89.** Public robust space in the urban landscape, Urban squares where people engage in many activities, The streets where people gather and enjoy. -p.61
90. **Fig90.** Building morphology and robustness-p.62
91. **Fig91.** Passive and Active Robustness and Hard and Soft Robustness-p.62
92. **Fig92.** Subjective ness of the Visual Appropriateness, -p. 63
93. **Fig93.** Visual appropriateness of the form matters with the legibility of the function housed in, high-rises legible in the context but not its function. -p.64
94. **Fig94.** Richness -p.64
95. **Fig95.** Different levels of richness achieved in the facades of Notraddame Church in Paris. Less Rich, Rich and More Rich-p.65
96. **Fig96.** Richness; Visual riddles, visual complexities and meaning-p.66
97. **Fig97.** Personalization; Creation or conversion to a own belonging space-p.66
98. **Fig98.** Change of the practical facilities may sometimes negative, Remedial personalization by the streets, Parks and people-p.67
99. **Fig99.** Different modes of creating personalized spaces; Ignoring the environment, Backing and avoiding each other, sharing the spaces.-p.67
100. **Fig100.** Layout map of the context-p.68
101. **Fig101.** Land use map; Demetagoda flyover and surrounding. -p.69



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.

Electronic Theses & Dissertations

www.lib.mrt.ac.lk





102. **Fig102.** Two spaces connected by the flyover; **-p.70**
103. **Fig103.** Typical section across the flyover and a section across the baseline; zoning of the activities **-p.70**
104. **Fig104.** Shanty developments and the commercial activities; the density is high due to the land prices, the commercial activities are varied from small shop to the multi storied commercial functions. **-p.71**
105. **Fig105.** Dominating usage of the Railway; their Sheds, Tracks, Administration and Factory. **-p.71**
106. **Fig106.** The Luxury Apartment Building; the landmark of the context which is over governed by the flyover. **-p.72**
107. **Fig107.** Pedestrian paths; by the heavy traffic, vehicles are a threat, setbacks as design considerations-**p.72**
108. **Fig108.** Special block of land with many activities; Land use, Commercial activities, Religious and Residential **-p.73**
109. **Fig109.** The paths at the both side of the flyover at the ground level, the access path to the luxury residential apartment and the path at the opposite side of it. **-p.73**
110. **Fig110.** Layout and the connectivity of the neighbourhood context off the flyover **-p.74**
111. **Fig111.** Sections **-p.75**
112. **Fig112.** Section a cross the luxury apartment looking Demetagoda. **-p.76**
113. **Fig113.** Different functions of the flyover; **-p.76**
114. **Fig114.** Different expressions of the flyover; **-p.77**
115. **Fig115.**Merged Land Use map, Layout and the connectivity of the neighbourhood context off the flyover-**p.78**
116. **Fig116.** Visual and the physical barrier created by the flyover which reduces the contacts of landscape visually and physically. Therefore the permeability of the context is damaged. **-p.79**
117. **Fig117.** Solid barriers and the voids for visual contacts through the supportive structure of the flyover-**p.79**
118. **Fig118.** Physical and the visual berries created by the heavy traffic functions over the flyover and on the ground level as well. **-p.80**

119. **Fig119.** Typical activity flow of the landscape cross the flyover, section looking towards Demetagoda -**p.80**
120. **Fig120.** The activities at the edge of the curb can be penetrated in to the space under the flyover in terms of improving variety and the interconnection, but it has been neglected because the under space is not well treated. -**p.81**
121. **Fig121.** Flyover with no variation, Set back of the building as a urban response, when there is no set back more tension and isolated. So people hardly stay in such spaces. -**p.82**
122. **Fig122.** The pedestrian, vehicle segregation; discourage legibility, The as a Landmark; improves the legibility of the landscape. -**p.83**
123. **Fig123.** Legibility is encouraged; -**p.83**
124. **Fig124.** Railway station is hiding in the landscape with no significance in its use, The vehicles damage the legibility; the street is inaccessible and hiding in the urban landscape. -**p.84**
125. **Fig125.** Activities; Railway passenger, Residential, Religious, Commercial and Community. -**p.84**
126. **Fig126.** Connection of the activities and the space under the flyover; small scale trading, commercial activities in the surrounding with no attachment with the flyover, leftover space under the flyover. -**p. 85**
127. **Fig127.** The edge of the payment is creating an activity barrier which reduces the flow of the activities. -**p.85**
128. **Fig128.** Directionality of the flyover reduces the robustness; the solid ramp which inclines, the overhead edge runs, the narrow paths at the both side of the flyover. -**p.86**
129. **Fig129.** Form of the flyover is easily graspable, the elements consisting in the form-**p.87**
130. **Fig130.** The built forms of the existing context and the contrasting structure of the flyover. The religious buildings have lost the hierarchy of their spaces. -**p.87**
131. **Fig131.** Inclinations, Declinations and the Intermediate columns of the flyover. -**p.88**

132. **Fig132.** The change of the column heights, The leftover spaces created and the visual disturbances from the interiors. **-p.88**
133. **Fig133.** Distance and the angle of viewing; Distance is very less to observe the flyover as its height, and the viewing angle is very less as the mobility is very high but the pedestrians are viewing it perpendicularly. -  
**p.89**
134. **Fig134.** The texture of the concrete; the column and the ramp ending wall with the striped carved in the vertical direction. **-p.90**
135. **Fig135.** Concrete on the ramp wall; **-p.90**
136. **Fig136.** The structure of the flyover; The space created with column structure, The solid ramping unit, the space under the flyover. **-p.91**
137. **Fig137.** Layout of the poetical spaces of human activities and the kind of personalization in those **-p.92**
138. **Fig138.** Personalization of the spaces is hard due to congestion of traffic and pedestrian movement. The space under the flyover is abandoned. -  
**p.93**
139. **Fig139.** Personalization is disturbed, Socially important spaces of the urban landscape and the flyover are conflicting with activities and even with scale and form. **-p.93**
140. **Fig140.** Visual and noise disturbance to residential spaces discourage the personalization and improve more stress. **-p.94**