Revista Infoacceso
e-ISSN 2311-7605 (Online)
infoacceso.org/index.php/ri

Volume 13 · Issue 3 · 2026
Pages 3391–3394

Biophilic Design and Human Well-Being in Buildings

Elena Rostova

Faculty of Philosophy, Saint Petersburg State University (Russia)

Received: 11/03/2026 | **Accepted:** 01/07/2026 | **Published:** 11/11/2026

***Abstract*—**This paper examines biophilic design and human well-being in buildings through a multidisciplinary architectural lens. It considers nature-connected spaces, sensory experience, health, and environmental quality, 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, nature-connected spaces, sensory experience, health, and environmental quality, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, the relevant ideas include nature-connected spaces, sensory experience, health, and environmental quality. 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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.

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 biophilic

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Revista Infoacceso.

design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings, 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 biophilic design and human well-being in buildings 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. Groat, L., & Wang, D. (2013). Architectural research methods (2nd ed.). Wiley.

2. Jones, D. L. (2008). Architecture and the environment: Bioclimatic building design. Laurence King Publishing.

3. Mostafavi, M., & Leatherbarrow, D. (1993). On weathering: The life of buildings in time. MIT Press.

4. Rasmussen, S. E. (1959). Experiencing architecture (2nd ed.). MIT Press.

5. Schumacher, P. (2009). Parametricism: A new global style for architecture and urban design. Architectural Design, 79(4), 14–23.
6. United Nations. (2016). New Urban Agenda. United Nations.
7. World Health Organization. (2018). WHO housing and health guidelines. World Health Organization.
8. ASHRAE. (2020). ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2020: Thermal environmental conditions for human occupancy. ASHRAE.
9. Deplazes, A. (Ed.). (2005). Constructing architecture: Materials, processes, structures. Birkhäuser.

RESEARCH PAPER 005