

## REFERENCES

1. Bize, R., Johnson, J. A., & Plotnikoff, R. C. (2007). Physical activity level and health-related quality of life in the general adult population: a systematic review. *Preventive medicine*, 45(6), 401-415.
2. Cain, K.L., Millstein,R.A., Sallis,J.F., Conway,T.L., Gavand , K.A., Frank ,L.D., Saelens ,B.E., Geremia,C. M., Chapman,J., Adams,M.A., Glanz,K. and King A.C.(2013) Contribution of streetscape audits to explanation of physical activity in four age groups based on the Microscale Audit of Pedestrian Streetscapes (MAPS).
3. Calman, K. C. (1984). Quality of life in cancer patients--an hypothesis. *Journal of medical ethics*, 10(3), 124-127.
4. Cerin, E., Owen,N., Leslie, E., Toit, L., Coffee,N., Frank, L.D., Bauman,A.E., Hugo, G., Saelens, B.E., & Sallis, J.F. (2007). Neighborhood Walkability and the Walking Behavior of Australian Adults. *Preventive Medicine*; 33(5).
5. Dalton, R. J. (2004). *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies: The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. OUP Oxford.
6. Dayarathna ,R.(2009) An Insight into the Asian Streets: Streets in Sri Lanka and their Transformations, *Built environment Sri Lanka*. Vol.09-10.
7. Dayarathna,R. and Senanayaka, N.(2002) Towards understanding the Asian Streets : A socio-spatial typology of streets and their Transformations in Sri Lanka in proceedings of Great Asian Streets Symposium “ Public space 2002”. Singapore: National University of Singapore.
8. Dayarathna,R.(2011) Towards transforming Colombo to a ‘walkable’ city: policies and strategies. *Built Environment Sri Lanka*,09 (10),pp01-02.
9. Doi,Kii and Nakanishi (2008).Planning and quality of life: the case of Canebera,Austrailia. Past ,Present and Future workshop.[www.slideshare.net](http://www.slideshare.net).
10. Dumbaugh, E. and Li,W.(2010) Designing for the Safety of Pedestrians,Cyclists, and Motorists in Urban Environments, *Journal of the American Planning Association*,77(1),pp.69-88, DOI: 10.1080/01944363.2011.536101.
11. Duncan ,D.T., Jared A., John W., Steven J. M. and Steven L. G.(2011). Validation of Walk Score for Estimating Neighborhood Walkability: An Analysis of Four US Metropolitan Areas. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 8, pp.4160-4179;

12. Duncan,D.T., Aldstadt,J., Whalen,J., Melly,S.J., Steven, L. and Gortmaker (2012).Space, race and poverty: Spatial inequalities in walkable neighbourhood amenities? *Demographic research*. 26(17, pp. 409-448.
13. Evdorides, H. (2001). Safe mobility: the cornerstone of IRF'S reflections on improvement in road safety. International road federation.
14. Fabian,H., Gota,S., Mejia,A., Leather,J. and Mejia,A.(2010) Walkability and Pedestrian Facilities.
15. Fernando, N.(2000) An analysis of the changing character of an urban street. A Case Study of Galle Road Colombo, *Built Environment Sri Lanka*, Colombo. Sri Lanka.
16. Frank,L.D.,Chair B., Devlin,A., Johnstone,S. and Loon,J.V.,(2010).Neighbourhood Design, Travel, and Health in Metro Vancouver: Using a Walkability Index Executive Summary UBC Active Transportation Collaboratory.
17. Hagen, M.V.(2006) Economic value of walkability. *Transpotation Research Record*,1828.pp11
18. Hanlon, J.O. and Scott, J.(2010) Healthy Communities:The Walkability Assessment Tool: Institute for Public Administration ,University of Delaware.
19. Hanlon,J.O. and Scott,J. (2010). The Walkability Assessment Tool. Healthy communities in Asian Cities: State and Issues.*Times of India*.
20. Johnston,B.D.(2008) Planning for child pedestrians : Issues of Health, safety and Social Justice, *Jopurnal of Urban Design*: 13(1),pp141-145.
21. Krambeck, H.(2006). The global walkability index. Talk the walk and walk the talk. Department of civil and environmental engineering and department of urban studies and planning . Massachusetts institute of technology. Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
22. Litman, T.(2009) Economic value of walkability , Victoria Transport Policy Institute.
23. Lynch K.,(1960) The Image of the City. Cambridge: Massachussettes. MIT press.
24. Manaugh, K. and El-Geneidy,A. (2011) Validating walkability indices: How do different households respond to the walkability of their neighborhood? *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*,16(4),pp. 309–315.

25. Newmann, P.(2011) Walking in Historical and international Context: What is the Role of Walking in cities for 21<sup>st</sup> century economics, Paper presented at the walking the 21<sup>st</sup> century conference held in Perth.
26. Norris, P. (2011) *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
27. Norris, P. (Ed.)(1999) *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic government*. OUP Oxford.
28. Pikora, T.J., Giles-Corti,B., Knuiman, M.W., Bull, F.C., Jamrozik, K., Donovan, R.J., 2006. Neighborhood environmental factors correlated with walking near home: using SPACES. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 38, 708e714.
29. Pivo,g. and Fisher,j.d.(2010) The walkability premium in commercial real estate investments: *Real Estate Economics*.
30. Rogers,S.H.,Halstead,J.M.,Gardner,K.H. and Carlson,C.H.(2010). Examining walkability and social capital as indicators of quality of life at the municipal and neighbourhood scales. *Applied Research Quality of Life*.6:pp.201-213.
31. Saelens, B.E., salis, T.F., Frank,L.D. (2000b) Environmental correlates of walking and cycling: Findings from the transportation, urban design and planning literatures. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 25(2), 80-91.
32. Su,M.,Tan,Y.Y.,Liu,Q.M.,Ren,Y.J.,Kawachi,I.,Li,L.M. and Lv,J.(2014).Association between perceived urban built environment attributes and leisure-time physical activity among adults in Hangzhou, China.
33. Sung, H.G.,Go,D.H. and Choi,C.G. (2013) Evidence of Jakob's Street life in the great Seoul city: Identifying the association of physical environment with walking activity of streets: *Cities*.(35) pp.164-173.
34. Warburton, D. E., Nicol, C. W., & Bredin, S. S. (2006). Health benefits of physical activity: the evidence. *Canadian medical association journal*, 174(6), 801-809.
35. World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research (2009).

## **APPENDICES**

## Questionnaire

## An examination of the contextual differences of the Walkability

Date:

Sheet No:

<b>A. Personal Information :</b> (Please Put “√” on the relevant cage)				
1. Age	Below 15	<input type="checkbox"/>	46-60	<input type="checkbox"/>
	15-30	<input type="checkbox"/>	Above 60	<input type="checkbox"/>
	31-45	<input type="checkbox"/>		
2. Sex	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>	Female	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ethnicity	Sinhala	<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Tamil	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Education level	Primary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	G.C.E. A/L	<input type="checkbox"/>
	G.C.E. O/L	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tertiary education	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Income level (monthly)	0 – 25,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	25,000-50,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
	50,000 – 75,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	Over 75,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Employment:	Professionals	<input type="checkbox"/>	Labor	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Administrative	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Business	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B. People’s Expectation:** (Please Put “√” on yes / no and give reasons)

1. Do you feel safe while walking on the streets in this area? (yes / no)
What are the reasons?

2. Do you feel comfortable while walking on the streets in this area? (yes / no)
What are the reasons?
3. Do you feel convenience while walking on the streets in this area? (yes / no)
4. What are the reasons?

**C. People's Satisfaction:**

**C<sub>1</sub>. Satisfaction on Safety:-**

01. How would you rate your satisfaction for **Safety while walking on the sidewalk?**

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

02. How would you rate your satisfaction for **Safety at crossings?**

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

03. How would you rate your satisfaction for **street lights**?

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

**C2. Satisfaction on Comfort:-**

04. How would you rate your satisfaction for **smoothness of the surface**?

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

05. How would you rate your satisfaction for **cleanliness of the surface**?

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

06. How would you rate your satisfaction for **drainage facilities in the side walk**?

<b>1</b>	Dissatisfied	<b>3</b>	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	<b>5</b>	Satisfied
<b>2</b>	Somewhat dissatisfied	<b>4</b>	Somewhat satisfied		

**C3. Satisfaction on Convenience:-**

07 How would you rate your satisfaction for **materials covered the side walk?**

1	Dissatisfied	3	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	Satisfied
2	Somewhat dissatisfied	4	Somewhat satisfied		

08. How would you rate your satisfaction for **enough width of the sidewalk?**

1	Dissatisfied	3	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	Satisfied
2	Somewhat dissatisfied	4	Somewhat satisfied		

09. Do you think the **crossings are located at proper places?**

1	Dissatisfied	3	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	Satisfied
2	Somewhat dissatisfied	4	Somewhat satisfied		

10. How would you rate your satisfaction for **free of obstructions on the sidewalk?**

1	Dissatisfied	3	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	Satisfied
2	Somewhat dissatisfied	4	Somewhat satisfied		

11. How would you rate your satisfaction for **shade?**

1	Dissatisfied	3	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	Satisfied
2	Somewhat dissatisfied	4	Somewhat satisfied		

## Perceived attributes regarding walkability on different urban spaces

Domain	Bambalapitiya	Maharagama	Baththaramulla	Delkanda
Safety	Lot of vehicles on the road	Not safe crossing	Undulate surface	No street lights
	Crossing signals not working properly	No bus bays	Darkness-Thieves	More crowded
	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	No guard rails	Not safe crossings
	Due to always Under constructions	Due to venders pedestrian have to walk on street	No Safe crossings	Can damage by obstructions
	Due to vehicles parked on sidewalks pedestrian have to walk on roads	Due to always Under constructions		Since not having a pavement can met with vehicles
	Branches of trees can fall	No proper sidewalk		Damage by obstructions
Comfortable	Not Clean	Not smooth surface	Damaged drainage cover	Goods are on the road
	Time allocated for pedestrian is not enough	Very noisy	Material not comfortable	Vehicles are parked
		Damaged drains	Obstructions	Sound
		No safety fence everywhere	No attractions	Undulate surface
		Full of sidewalk bazaars		Not safety crossings

		No safe crossings		Traffic
		Pavement vendors	Undulate surface	Obstructions
		Not clean		No guard rails
		Vehicles are parked on sidewalk	Not proper drainage	Not proper drainage
		No Dustbins		Not Clean
Convenience	High pedestrian traffic	No smooth surface	No source of water	No disable infrastructure
	Colour lights are not working properly	crossings are not at proper places	Damaged drainage cover	No drinking water facilities
	Obstructions	High noise	No disable infrastructure	No shade
	No shade	Not proper drainage	Finishing is not comfortable	Side walk covered by vehicles
		No disable infrastructure	No boards contain next bus halt and	No toilet facilities
			No relaxing places- Bench, trees	Width is not enough to walk
		Narrow side walks	Not enough width	Goods in the sidewalk
		No shade	No shade	No drainage facilities
		Damaged sidewalk	No toilet facilities	Not paved
	No source of water		No shade	

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by age on safety, comfort and convenience  
in Maharagama .

Age	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
15-30	Street lights	No proper sidewalk	Have a pavement	Not clean	Crossings are located at proper places	Narrow side walks
	crowdedness	Not safe crossings	Sidewalks are clean	Dusty	Have drainage facilities	No smooth surface
	Safety fence	Susseptibility to accidents due to venders	Some areas have guard rails	Full of sidewalk bazaars	No any damages on the sidewalk	Damaged drains and cover slabs
		Due to always under constructions		Not smooth surface	Enough shops, cafes, transport services	Under constructions
			Fresh air	Very noisy	Well paved	No shade
			Have street lights	Vehicles are parked	Enough width	
			Having a pavement			

31-45	No thieves	Many vehicles and vendors may lead to accidents	Less obstructions	Block by vendors	Have crossings	No adequate width
	No crime		Having a pavement	Damaged drains	Crossings are located at proper places	No shade
	Crowded		Sidewalks are clean			No drainage facilities
	Easy accessible		Smooth sidewalks			No dustbins
46-60		Due to vendors		Not smooth surface		Not proper drainage
		Due to crowdedness can		No safety fence		Not enough space to walk
		happen accidents		Not safety crossings		No drinking water facilities
						No dustbins
>60		No bus bays		Pavement vendors		Not enough width
				Vehicles are parked		No disable infrastructure
				Not clean		No drainage

						facilities
						crossings are not located at proper places

Appendix IV.

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by Gender on safety, comfort and convenience in Maharagama .

Gender	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Male	Street lights	No bus bays	Have a pavement	Block by vendors	Crossings are located	Narrow side walks
	crowdedness	No proper sidewalk	Sidewalks are clean	No safe crossings	Have drainage facilities	No disable infrastructure
	No thieves	Susseptibility to accidents due to vendors		Full of sidewalk bazaars	Enough shops, cafes, transport service	No drinking water facilities
	Easy accessible	Not safe crossings	Fresh air	Not smooth surface	Well paved	No drainage facilities
	Safety fence		Have street lights	Very noisy	Enough width	No dustbins
			Toilet facilities	Vehicles are parked		No shade
				Damaged drains		Branches of trees can fall
				Not clean	No any damages on	No smooth surface

					the sidewalk	
				Dusty		
Female	No thieves	Many vehicles and vendors may lead to accidents	Have street lights	Not smooth surface	Have crossings	Not proper drainage
	No crime	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Having a pavement	Vehicles are parked on the sidewalk	Crossings are located at proper places	No shade
		Due to always Under constructions	Sidewalks are clean	Not safety crossings	Good drainage system	No dustbins
			Not Clean			

Appendix V

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by Ethnicity on safety, comfortable and convenience in Maharagama .

Ethnicity	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Sinhala	Street lights	No bus bays	Toilet facilities	Block by venders	Crossings are located at proper places	Narrow side walks
	crowdedness	Susseptibility to accidents due to venders		No safe crossings	Have drainage facilities	No disable infrastructure
	No thieves	No proper sidewalk	Some areas have guard rails	Not clean	Have crossings	No drinking water facilities
	No crime	Not safe crossings	Have street lights	Not smooth surface	No any damages on the sidewalk	Damaged drains and cover slabs
		Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Fresh air	Very noisy	Good drainage system	Not proper drainage
			Smooth sidewalks	Vehicles are parked	Enough shops, cafes, transport services	No dustbins
				Damaged drains	Well paved	
				Dusty	Enough width	No shade

Tamil	Safety fence				Well paved	No dustbins
	Crowded		Having a pavement		Enough width	
Muslim	Crowded	Due to vendors pedestrian have to walk in roads	Less obstructions	Vehicles are parked		No shade
	Easy accessible			Not Clean		Not enough width
				Not safety crossings		
						No drainage facilities

Appendix VI

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by Level of Education on safety, comfort and convenience in Maharagama .

Level of education	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Primary	Street lights		Toilet facilities		Enough width	No drinking water facilities
	crowdedness		Having a Pavement		Covered drainage	
G.C.E.O/L	Having Policeman		Having a Pavement		Enough width	
	Have crossings		Guard rails		Well paved	
G.C.E.A/L	No thieves	Due to venders pedestrian have to walk on the streets	Having a pavement	No safe crossings	Have crossings	Not enough width
	No crime	No bus bays	Some areas have guard rails	Full of sidewalk bazaars	Crossings are located at proper places	Not proper drainage
	Have street lights	Due to crowdedness can	Sidewalks are clean	Not smooth surface	Have drainage facilities	crossings are not located at

		happen accidents				proper places
			Fresh air	Not clean	No any damages on the sidewalk	No shade
				Vehicles are parked	Well paved	
				Block by venders	Enough width	
				Dusty		
				No safety fence		
Tertiary	Huge population	No proper sidewalk	Sidewalks are clean	Full of sidewalk bazaars	Good drainage system	Damaged drains
Education	Safety fence	Not safe crossings	Smooth sidewalks	Not smooth surface	Enough shops, cafes, transport services	No adequate width
	Easy accesssible	Many vehicles and venders may lead to accidents	Have street lights	Very noisy	Well paved	No shade
		Due to always	Having a pavement	Block by venders	Enough width	No drainage

		Under constructions				facilities
			Less obstructions	Damaged drains		No dustbins
				Not Clean		
				Not safety crossings		

Appendix VII

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by Level of Income on safety, comfort and convenience in Maharagama .

Level of Income	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
0-25000	Street lights	No bus bays	Have a pavement	Pavement vendors	Have crossings	No drinking water facilities
	crowdedness	Susseptibility to accidents due to venders	Sidewalks are clean	Not safety crossings	No any damages	No disable infrastructure
	No crime	Due to always Under constructions	Fresh air	Not Clean		No dustbins
	No thieves					
25000-50000	No thieves	Many vehicles and venders may lead to accidents	Having a pavement	No safe crossings	Crossings are located at proper places	Not enough width
	No crime	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Separated area to walk	Not clean	Have drainage facilities	No smooth surface
	Huge population		Sidewalks are clean	Full of sidewalk bazaars	Enough shops, cafes,	No shade

					transport services	
			Smooth sidewalks	Not smooth surface		
			Some areas have guard rails	Very noisy		
				Block by venders		
				No safety fence		
50000-75000	Safety fence	No proper sidewalk	Less obstructions	Full of sidewalk bazaars	Well paved	Damaged drains
	Crowded	Not safe crossings	Having a pavement	Not smooth surface	Enough width	Very narrow sidewalks
	Easy accesssible	Due to venders pedestrian have to walk on roads		Vehicles are parked		Not proper drainage
		No bus bays		Block by venders		crossings are not located at proper places
				Damaged drains		No shade
				Not safety crossings		No dustbins
				Dusty		
>75000	No crime	Due to	Separated	Not clean	Have	No smooth

		crowdedness can	area to walk		drainage facilities	surface
		happen accidents				
	Crowded	Not safe crossings	Toilet facilities	Not smooth surface	Enough width	Very narrow sidewalks
	Street lights	No bus bays		Pavement vendors	Have crossings	Narrow side walk

Appendix VIII

Perceived attributes regarding walkability by Employment on safety, comfortable and convenience in Maharagama .

Employment	Safety		Comfortable		Convenience	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Professionals	Street lights	No proper sidewalk	Have a pavement	Full of sidewalk bazaars	No any damages on the sidewalk	Narrow side walks
	crowdedness	Not safe crossings	Sidewalks are clean	Not smooth surface	Enough shops, cafes, transport services	Damaged drains and cover slabs
	No thieves	Susseptibility to accidents due to venders	Less obstructions	Very noisy	Crossings are located at proper places	No drainage facilities
	No crime	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Some areas have guard rails	Dusty	Have drainage facilities	
	Easy accessible	happen accidents	Separated area to walk	No safety fence	Well paved	
		Due to always	Fresh air	Not safety crossings	Enough width	
		Under		Not		

		constructions		Clean		
Admin	No thieves	Due to venders pedestrian have to walk on the streets	Have street lights	No safe crossings	Have crossings	Not enough width
	No crime		Having a pavement	Not clean	Well paved	No smooth surface
	Safety fence			Full of sidewalk bazaars	Enough width	No shade
	Crowded			Block by venders		
Labour	No crime	Due to crowdedness can happen accidents	Have guard rails	Dusty	Have drainage facilities	No drinking water facilities
	Easy accessible		Separated area to walk	No safety fence	Well paved	High noise
	Safety fence	Many vehicles and venders		Full of sidewalk bazaars	Enough width	No shade
	No thieves		Sidewalks are clean	Pavement venders	Good drainage system	Not enough width
				Not smooth surface		No disable infrastructure

Private			Sidewalks are clean	Not clean	Good drainage system	Not enough width
Business	No thieves	No bus bays				
		Many vehicles and venders	Smooth sidewalks	Not smooth surface		No drinking water facilities
		may lead to accidents	Toilet facilities	Not safety crossings		Not proper drainage
						No dustbins
						No shade

Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the age groups in  
Maharagama Area

Attribute	Age	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	15-30	5.90%	29.40%	35.30%	23.50%	5.90%
	31-45	10.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	
	46-60		100.00%			
	Above 60		50.00%	50.00%		
	Total	6.70%	33.30%	33.30%	23.30%	3.30%
Safety at crossings	15-30	29.40%	5.90%	29.40%	11.80%	23.50%
	31-45	10.00%	40.00%	30.00%	20.00%	
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60	100.00%				
	Total	30.00%	16.70%	26.70%	13.30%	13.30%
Smoothness	15-30	5.90%	11.80%	17.60%	41.20%	23.50%
	31-45	20.00%		10.00%	50.00%	20.00%
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60		100.00%			
	Total	13.30%	13.30%	13.30%	40.00%	20.00%
Free of Obstructions	15-30	17.60%	11.80%	29.40%	23.50%	17.60%
	31-45	30.00%		10.00%	20.00%	40.00%
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60		100.00%			

	Total	23.30%	13.30%	20.00%	20.00%	23.30%
Cleanliness	15-30	29.40%		17.60%	41.20%	11.80%
	31-45	30.00%		20.00%	50.00%	
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60	100.00%				
	Total	36.70%		16.70%	40.00%	6.70%
Street lights	15-30	23.50%		29.40%	47.10%	
	31-45		30.00%	30.00%	40.00%	
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60	100.00%				
	Total	23.30%	10.00%	26.70%	40.00%	
Shade	15-30	52.90%	35.30%	11.80%		
	31-45	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%		
	46-60		100.00%			
	Above 60		100.00%			
	Total	36.70%	40.00%	23.30%		
Surface Material	15-30		11.80%	17.60%	35.30%	35.30%
	31-45	20.00%			60.00%	20.00%
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60		100.00%			
	Total	10.00%	13.30%	10.00%	40.00%	26.70%
Drainage	15-30	11.80%		23.50%	35.30%	29.40%
	31-45	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60		100.00%			
	Total	16.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	23.30%

Width of the	15-30	29.40%		5.90%	41.20%	23.50%
sidewalk	31-45	40.00%	10.00%		30.00%	20.00%
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60		100.00%			
	Total	33.30%	10.00%	3.30%	33.30%	20.00%
Location of	15-30	23.50%	11.80%		11.80%	52.90%
crossings	31-45	30.00%	20.00%	30.00%	20.00%	
	46-60	100.00%				
	Above 60	100.00%				
	Total	33.30%	13.30%	10.00%	13.30%	30.00%

## Appendix X

Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the Gender in  
Maharagama area

Attribute	Gender	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	Female		50.00%	37.50%	12.50%	
	Male	9.10%	27.30%	31.80%	27.30%	4.50%
	Total	6.70%	33.30%	33.30%	23.30%	3.30%
Safety at crossings	Female	12.50%	12.50%	50.00%	25.00%	
	Male	36.40%	18.20%	18.20%	9.10%	18.20%
	Total	30.00%	16.70%	26.70%	13.30%	13.30%
Smoothness	Female	12.50%		25.00%	37.50%	25.00%
	Male	13.60%	18.20%	9.10%	40.90%	18.20%
	Total	13.30%	13.30%	13.30%	40.00%	20.00%
Free of Obstructions	Female	25.00%		25.00%		50.00%
	Male	22.70%	18.20%	18.20%	27.30%	13.60%
	Total	23.30%	13.30%	20.00%	20.00%	23.30%
Cleanliness	Female	23.10%	15.40%		53.80%	7.70%
	Male		17.60%	41.20%	23.50%	17.60%
	Total	10.00%	16.70%	23.30%	36.70%	13.30%
Street lights	Female	12.50%			50.00%	37.50%

	Male	27.30%	13.60%		18.20%	40.90%
	Total	23.30%	10.00%		26.70%	40.00%
Shade	Female	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%		
	Male	31.80%	45.50%	22.70%		
	Total	36.70%	40.00%	23.30%		
Surface Material	Female	12.50%		12.50%	50.00%	25.00%
	Male	9.10%	18.20%	9.10%	36.40%	27.30%
	Total	10.00%	13.30%	10.00%	40.00%	26.70%
Drainage	Female	12.50%		25.00%	25.00%	37.50%
	Male	18.20%	18.20%	18.20%	27.30%	18.20%
	Total	16.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	23.30%
Width of the sidewalk	Female	25.00%		12.50%	37.50%	25.00%
	Male	36.40%	13.60%		31.80%	18.20%
	Total	33.30%	10.00%	3.30%	33.30%	20.00%
Location of crossings	Female	37.50%		37.50%	25.00%	
	Male	31.80%	18.20%		9.10%	40.90%
	Total	33.30%	13.30%	10.00%	13.30%	30.00%

## Appendix XI

Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the Ethnicity in  
Maharagama

Attributes	Ethnicity	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	Sinhala	4.50%	27.30%	40.90%	22.70%	4.50%
	Tamil	50.00%			50.00%	
	Muslim		75.00%		25.00%	
	Total	6.70%	33.30%	33.30%	23.30%	3.30%
Safety at crossings	Sinhala	31.80%	9.10%	22.70%	18.20%	18.20%
	Tamil	100.00%				
	Muslim		75.00%	25.00%		
	Total	30.00%	16.70%	26.70%	13.30%	13.30%
Smoothness	Sinhala	18.20%	18.20%	4.50%	31.80%	27.30%
	Tamil				100.00%	
	Muslim			25.00%	75.00%	
	Total	13.30%	13.30%	13.30%	40.00%	20.00%
Free of Obstructions	Sinhala	27.30%	9.10%	13.60%	18.20%	31.80%
	Tamil		100.00%			
	Muslim	25.00%		25.00%	50.00%	
	Total	23.30%	13.30%	20.00%	20.00%	23.30%

Cleanliness	Sinhala	36.40%		18.20%	36.40%	9.10%
	Tamil				100.00%	
	Muslim	25.00%		25.00%	50.00%	
	Total	36.70%		16.70%	40.00%	6.70%
Street lights	Sinhala	22.70%	13.60%		31.80%	31.80%
	Tamil					100.00%
	Muslim				25.00%	75.00%
	Total	23.30%	10.00%		26.70%	40.00%
Shade	Sinhala	22.70%	50.00%	27.30%		
	Tamil	100.00%				
	Muslim	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%		
	Total	36.70%	40.00%	23.30%		
Surface Material	Sinhala	13.60%	18.20%		31.80%	36.40%
	Tamil				100.00%	
	Muslim			25.00%	75.00%	
	Total	10.00%	13.30%	10.00%	40.00%	26.70%
Drainage	Sinhala	22.70%	9.10%	18.20%	31.80%	18.20%
	Tamil		50.00%		25.00%	25.00%
	Muslim	16.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	23.30%
	Total	16.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	23.30%
Width of the sidewalk	Sinhala	22.70%	13.60%		36.40%	27.30%
	Tamil				100.00%	
	Muslim	75.00%		25.00%		
	Total	33.30%	10.00%	3.30%	33.30%	20.00%

Location of crossings	Sinhala	27.30%		13.60%	18.20%	40.90%
	Tamil	100.00%				
	Muslim	50.00%	50.00%			
	Total	33.30%	13.30%	10.00%	13.30%	30.00%

## Appendix XII

Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the Level of  
Education in Maharagama Area

Attributes	Level of Education	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L			25.00%	50.00%	25.00%
	G.C.E.A/L		5.90%	5.90%	35.30%	52.90%
	Tertiary			11.10%	33.30%	55.60%
	Total			3.30%	10.00%	36.70%
Safety at crossings	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L			50.00%		50.00%
	G.C.E.A/L	17.60%		11.80%	52.90%	17.60%
	Tertiary	11.10%			33.30%	55.60%
	Total	13.30%		13.30%	40.00%	33.30%
Smoothness	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L		50.00%	50.00%		
	G.C.E.A/L		17.60%	5.90%	52.90%	23.50%
	Tertiary	22.20%	11.10%	11.10%		55.60%
	Total	6.70%	20.00%	13.30%	30.00%	30.00%
Free of Obstructions	Primary					

	G.C.E.O/L		50.00%		50.00%	
	G.C.E.A/L		17.60%	11.80%	35.30%	35.30%
	Tertiary	33.30%	11.10%	11.10%	11.10%	33.30%
	Total	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Cleanliness	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L		50.00%	50.00%		
	G.C.E.A/L		11.80%	23.50%	47.10%	17.60%
	Tertiary	33.30%	11.10%	11.10%	33.30%	11.10%
	Total	10.00%	16.70%	23.30%	36.70%	13.30%
Street lights	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L					100.00%
	G.C.E.A/L			17.60%	47.10%	35.30%
	Tertiary	11.10%		11.10%		77.80%
	Total	3.30%		13.30%	26.70%	56.70%
Shade	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L		25.00%	75.00%		
	G.C.E.A/L	23.50%	35.30%	41.20%		
	Tertiary	22.20%	66.70%	11.10%		
	Total	20.00%	43.30%	36.70%		
Surface Material	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L				50.00%	50.00%
	G.C.E.A/L			5.90%	58.80%	35.30%
	Tertiary	22.20%			22.20%	55.60%
	Total	6.70%		3.30%	46.70%	43.30%
Drainage	Primary					

	G.C.E.O/L			50.00%		50.00%
	G.C.E.A/L	11.80%	11.80%	23.50%	41.20%	11.80%
	Tertiary	33.30%		22.20%	33.30%	11.10%
	Total	16.70%	6.70%	26.70%	33.30%	16.70%
Width of the sidewalk	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L				50.00%	50.00%
	G.C.E.A/L		17.60%		35.30%	47.10%
	Tertiary	33.30%		22.20%		44.40%
	Total	10.00%	10.00%	6.70%	26.70%	46.70%
Location of crossings	Primary					
	G.C.E.O/L	50.00%	50.00%			
	G.C.E.A/L	23.50%		23.50%	35.30%	17.60%
	Tertiary	22.20%	22.20%	22.20%	22.20%	11.10%
	Total	26.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	13.30%

### Appendix XIII

Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the Level of income in Maharagama

Attributes	Level of Income	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	0-25000			11.10%	44.40%	44.40%
	25000-50000		9.10%	9.10%	27.30%	54.50%
	50000-75000			16.70%	33.30%	50.00%
	Over 75000				50.00%	50.00%
	Total			3.30%	10.00%	36.70%
Safety at crossings	0-25000			33.30%	44.40%	22.20%
	25000-50000	27.30%			36.40%	36.40%
	50000-75000	16.70%			33.30%	50.00%
	Over 75000			25.00%	50.00%	25.00%
	Total	13.30%			13.30%	40.00%
Smoothness	0-25000		33.30%		33.30%	33.30%
	25000-50000		27.30%	36.40%	18.20%	18.20%
	50000-75000	33.30%			33.30%	33.30%
	Over 75000				50.00%	50.00%

	Total	6.70%	20.00%	13.30%	30.00%	30.00%
Free of Obstructions	0-25000		44.40%		22.20%	33.30%
	25000- 50000	9.10%	18.20%	9.10%	54.50%	9.10%
	50000- 75000	33.30%				66.70%
	Over 75000			50.00%	25.00%	25.00%
	Total	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Cleanliness	0-25000		44.40%		55.60%	
	25000- 50000	9.10%	9.10%	27.30%	27.30%	27.30%
	50000- 75000	33.30%		33.30%	33.30%	
	Over 75000			50.00%	25.00%	25.00%
	Total	10.00%	16.70%	23.30%	36.70%	13.30%
Street lights	0-25000				33.30%	66.70%
	25000- 50000	9.10%		36.40%	9.10%	45.50%
	50000- 75000				33.30%	66.70%
	Over 75000				50.00%	50.00%
	Total	3.30%		13.30%	26.70%	56.70%
Shade	0-25000	55.60%	11.10%	33.30%		
	25000- 50000	54.50%	9.10%	36.40%		
	50000- 75000	16.70%	33.30%	50.00%		

	Over 75000	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%		
	Total	43.30%	20.00%	36.70%		
Surface	0-25000				66.70%	33.30%
Material	25000-50000				45.50%	54.50%
	50000-75000	33.30%			50.00%	16.70%
	Over 75000			25.00%		75.00%
	Total	6.70%		3.30%	46.70%	43.30%
Drainage	0-25000		11.10%		33.30%	55.60%
	25000-50000	27.30%	9.10%	45.50%	18.20%	
	50000-75000	33.30%		16.70%	50.00%	
	Over 75000			50.00%	50.00%	
	Total	16.70%	6.70%	26.70%	33.30%	16.70%
Width of the sidewalk	0-25000		11.10%		44.40%	44.40%
	25000-50000	9.10%	18.20%	9.10%	18.20%	45.50%
	50000-75000	33.30%				66.70%
	Over 75000			25.00%	50.00%	25.00%
	Total	10.00%	10.00%	6.70%	26.70%	46.70%
Location of crossings	0-25000	33.30%			44.40%	22.20%
	25000-50000	18.20%	27.30%	27.30%	9.10%	18.20%
	50000-	50.00%		33.30%	16.70%	

	75000					
	Over 75000		25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	
	Total	26.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	13.30%

Table 4.23 Levels of satisfaction for different walkability attributes across the Level of employment in Maharagama Area

Attributes	Employment	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied
Safety While walking	Professionals			27.30%	72.70%	
	Administration		14.30%	28.60%	57.10%	
	Labor					
	Business	8.30%	16.70%	50.00%	25.00%	
	Total	3.30%	10.00%	36.70%	50.00%	
Safety at crossings	Professionals				72.70%	27.30%
	Administration	14.30%			28.60%	57.10%
	Labor					
	Business	25.00%		33.30%	16.70%	25.00%
	Total	13.30%		13.30%	40.00%	33.30%
Smoothness	Professionals	18.20%	9.10%	18.20%	27.30%	27.30%
	Administration			28.60%	42.90%	28.60%
	Labor					
	Business		41.70%		25.00%	33.30%
	Total	6.70%	20.00%	13.30%	30.00%	30.00%
Free of Obstructions	Professionals	27.30%	9.10%	9.10%	27.30%	27.30%
	Administration		14.30%		42.90%	42.90%
	Labor					

	Business		33.30%	16.70%	25.00%	25.00%
	Total	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Cleanliness	Professionals	27.30%	9.10%	9.10%	45.50%	9.10%
	Administration		14.30%	42.90%	28.60%	14.30%
	Labor					
	Business		25.00%	25.00%	33.30%	16.70%
	Total	10.00%	16.70%	23.30%	36.70%	13.30%
Street lights	Professionals	9.10%		9.10%	27.30%	54.50%
	Administration			14.30%	28.60%	57.10%
	Labor					
	Business			16.70%	25.00%	58.30%
	Total	3.30%		13.30%	26.70%	56.70%
Shade	Professionals	27.30%	36.40%	36.40%		
	Administration	57.10%	42.90%			
	Labor					
	Business	33.30%	50.00%	16.70%		
	Total	36.70%	43.30%	20.00%		
Surface Material	Professionals	18.20%			45.50%	36.40%
	Administration				42.90%	57.10%
	Labor					
	Business			8.30%	50.00%	41.70%
	Total	6.70%		3.30%	46.70%	43.30%
Drainage	Professionals	36.40%		9.10%	36.40%	18.20%
	Administration	14.30%	28.60%	42.90%	14.30%	
	Labor					

	Business			33.30%	41.70%	25.00%
	Total	16.70%	6.70%	26.70%	33.30%	16.70%
Width of the sidewalk	Professionals	27.30%			27.30%	45.50%
	Administration				42.90%	57.10%
	Labor					
	Business		25.00%	16.70%	16.70%	41.70%
	Total	10.00%	10.00%	6.70%	26.70%	46.70%
Location of crossings	Professionals	18.20%	9.10%	18.20%	54.50%	
	Administration	14.30%	28.60%	14.30%		42.90%
	Labor					
	Business	41.70%	8.30%	25.00%	16.70%	8.30%
	Total	26.70%	13.30%	20.00%	26.70%	13.30%

