Reading in Political Economy

Volume 60 · Issue 2 · 2026
Pages 1428–1431

ISSN 0079-9874 (Print) · e-ISSN 0305-814X (Online) politonomia.org.ua/rpe

Airport Terminal Architecture and Passenger Flow

Prof. Astrid Vestergaard

Chair of Nordic Folklore at the Department of Cultural Studies, Aarhus University, Denmark.

Received: 24/06/2026 | **Accepted:** 06/10/2026 | **Published:** 18/11/2026

ABSTRACT

This paper examines airport terminal architecture and passenger flow through a multidisciplinary architectural lens. It considers legibility, security, accessibility, waiting, and operational efficiency, while linking design choices to user experience, environmental performance, material responsibility and project delivery. The discussion synthesises established architectural literature, design guidance and recognised standards rather than presenting a new empirical survey. It argues that context-sensitive analysis, inclusive design, coordinated technical decisions and post-occupancy evaluation are essential to credible architectural outcomes. The paper concludes with practical directions for design teams and identifies the need for project-specific evidence before generalising strategies across climates, building types or communities.

Keywords: architecture, design process, built environment, legibility, security, accessibility, waiting, and operational efficiency, sustainability, human-centred design.

Introduction: The built environment is shaped by social needs, environmental conditions, available resources, cultural expectations and technical possibilities. In the context of airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, these influences must be considered together rather than as isolated design variables. The topic is important because architectural decisions affect the daily experience of occupants as well as energy use, material demand, accessibility and the long-term adaptability of places. A thoughtful approach therefore begins by defining the needs of users, understanding the site and identifying the consequences of alternative design choices.

2. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

A clear conceptual foundation helps connect architectural intention with practical decisions. For airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, the relevant ideas include legibility, security, accessibility, waiting, and operational efficiency. These concepts are not merely theoretical labels: they shape the way designers interpret context, establish priorities and assess whether a proposal responds to real conditions. Historical precedents and contemporary research can help distinguish durable principles from short-lived fashions. The design team should also recognise that the same strategy may produce different results in different climates, cultures, building types and institutional settings.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance

How to cite: Vestergaard (2026). Airport Terminal Architecture and Passenger Flow. Reading in Political Economy, 60(2), 1428–1431.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Reading in Political Economy.

and lived experience inform each other.

3. SITE AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Site analysis is a necessary starting point because a building never operates independently of its surroundings. Orientation, topography, solar exposure, prevailing winds, rainfall, neighbouring structures, vegetation, access routes and local patterns of use can all influence the appropriate architectural response. In work on airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, contextual assessment should include both measurable environmental conditions and the meanings that communities attach to a place. Early mapping and observation can reveal opportunities and constraints before the form is fixed. This reduces the risk of relying on generic solutions that ignore local conditions.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

4. HUMAN FACTORS AND INCLUSIVE DESIGN

Architecture is ultimately experienced by people with different bodies, ages, abilities, routines and expectations. A user-centred approach to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow therefore requires consultation beyond the design team and client. Interviews, observation, accessibility audits and post-occupancy feedback can expose barriers that drawings alone may not reveal. Clear circulation, legible entrances, appropriate lighting, acoustic comfort, privacy and safe access should be treated as connected aspects of quality. Inclusive design is strongest when it is embedded from the earliest stages instead of being added as a late compliance exercise.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

5. MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION STRATEGIES

Material and construction choices determine much of a project's durability, resource use, cost and visual character. In relation to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, designers should compare options using performance, maintenance requirements, availability, embodied impacts, construction skills and end-of-life possibilities. New technologies can expand design freedom, but their value depends on reliability, repairability and the capacity of local teams to operate them. Specifications should be coordinated with structural, building-services and construction requirements so that an appealing concept can be delivered safely and consistently.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE

Environmental performance should be evaluated across the building life cycle, not only at the moment of completion. Relevant considerations include operational energy, embodied carbon, water demand, indoor air quality, waste, biodiversity and resilience to changing climate conditions. For airport terminal architecture and

passenger flow, passive measures—such as orientation, shading, insulation, thermal mass and ventilation where appropriate—should be assessed before dependence on complex equipment. Modelling and scenario comparisons can support decisions, but results remain sensitive to assumptions, user behaviour and maintenance. Performance targets are most useful when they are specific, measurable and revisited after occupation.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

7. IMPLEMENTATION AND GOVERNANCE

Successful architectural work depends on coordination among planning authorities, clients, consultants, contractors, users and operators. Building codes, fire and life-safety requirements, accessibility rules, heritage controls, procurement conditions and budgets can influence design options from the beginning. In airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, early coordination helps identify conflicts between ambition and delivery capacity. Clear responsibilities, documented decisions, realistic schedules and quality checks reduce the likelihood of costly late changes. Regulation should be treated as a baseline for safety and public responsibility, while the design process should also pursue broader quality and performance goals.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

8. EVALUATION AND DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation is essential because design intentions do not automatically translate into successful outcomes. For airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, useful methods may include energy and daylight simulation, life-cycle assessment, user surveys, observational studies, cost comparisons and post-occupancy evaluation. Each method answers different questions and has limitations; findings should therefore be interpreted in relation to the quality of the data and the context of the project. Future research can improve the evidence base by comparing different building types, climates, user groups and operational conditions. Transparent reporting allows practitioners to learn from both successes and shortcomings.

Applied to airport terminal architecture and passenger flow, design choices should be compared against explicit criteria rather than judged by appearance alone. The project team can establish a baseline, identify the groups most affected, and test options through drawings, models, simulations or consultation as appropriate. Evidence should be recorded with its assumptions and limitations, particularly where projected savings or social benefits are uncertain. A phased process also makes it easier to revise a proposal when new information becomes available. The aim is not to impose a universal formula, but to create a transparent process in which context, performance and lived experience inform each other.

CONCLUSION

This paper has considered airport terminal architecture and passenger flow as a multidisciplinary architectural concern shaped by context, human experience, technical decisions and long-term environmental responsibility. The discussion indicates that stronger outcomes depend on integrating site analysis, inclusive consultation, material and systems coordination, measurable performance goals and post-occupancy learning. No single design gesture can resolve every challenge; instead, the quality of a project emerges from the consistency of decisions across its life cycle. Further evidence from built projects and user experience can refine these recommendations and support more resilient, equitable and adaptable architecture.

REFERENCES

1. Kibert, C. J. (2016). Sustainable construction: Green building design and delivery (4th ed.). Wiley.
2. Neufert, E., & Neufert, P. (2019). Architects' data (5th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
3. Ratti, C., & Claudel, M. (2016). The city of tomorrow: Sensors, networks, hackers, and the future of urban life. Yale University Press.
4. Steemers, K., & Steane, M. A. (Eds.). (2004). Environmental diversity in architecture. Spon Press.
5. U.S. Green Building Council. (2023). LEED v4.1 building design and construction. USGBC.
6. World Green Building Council. (2019). Bringing embodied carbon upfront: Coordinated action for the building and construction sector to tackle embodied carbon. WorldGBC.
7. ASHRAE. (2022). ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2022: Energy standard for sites and buildings except low-rise residential buildings. ASHRAE.
8. Edwards, B. (2014). Rough guide to sustainability (4th ed.). RIBA Publishing.
9. Hall, E. T. (1966). The hidden dimension. Doubleday.

RESEARCH PAPER 052