Cost of Urban Rental Housing and its Implications on Home Ownership Drive of Middle and Low-Income Earners in Lagos State, Nigeria

*Oloke Olayinka Clement[1], Ajibola Mayowa Olusola[1], Iroham Osmond Chukwuemeka[1],**

[1]Department of Estate Management, College of Science and Technology,
Covenant University Ota, Ogun State Nigeria

*Corresponding Author e-mail: c_yinkaoloke@yahoo.com

Abstract

The quantitative and qualitative housing challenges especially among the middle and low income groups in Nigeria have continued to constitute a source of concern to all. Over the years, different studies have examined the situation and attributed the problem to the inability of government to provide housing en-masse, lack of access to capital, low income and high costs of procurement of available ones. This study advances knowledge by focussing on renters and taking a closer look at the overall cost of rental housing and its effect on renter to owner's efforts. Renters' population is on the increase in major urban centres with reduced capacity for home acquisition. This study examines household spending pattern, identifies other costs incidental to rental housing consumption and how they affect renters' home acquisition drives'. Questionnaires were administered to 750 renters randomly selected from three local government areas in Lagos State. Data collected were subsequently analysed with descriptive tools such as tables, percentages, relative importance index and a 5-point likert scale. It was discovered that apart from rent, other costs incidental to rental housing consumption significantly reduces renters' savings capacity. The study therefore suggests that these other costs be examined critically and treated appropriately. They could be stabilised, subsidized, eradicated or totally shouldered by the government.

Key words: renters, rental housing, home ownership, savings, urban, income

1.0 Introduction

Housing is recognised world-wide as one of the basic necessities of life and a pre-requisite to survival of man (Onibokun, 1983; United Nations, 1992; Salau, 1990). Ademiluyi (2010) describe housing as a place of shelter, refuge, comfort, security and dignity. The author also noted that a house provides the physical framework in which human, social, economic, and cultural resources are realised, enriched, and integrated. Adequate shelter remains an essential requirement for survival, integration and development of man and his environment. According to Chatterjee (1981), housing is a complex product that is crucial for national development in terms of both economy and welfare. Chatterjee (1981) examines the macro and microeconomics significance of housing and concludes that in macroeconomics, housing constitutes an important source of national capital formation, employment generation and income production. In microeconomic terms, housing constitutes a significant component of household consumption and savings.

Chatterjee (1981) notes that expenditure on housing, on the average, accounts for between one-seventh and one-fifth of all consumer expenditures in developing countries and constitutes one of the primary objectives for savings. Ibem (2010) opines that housing has been the single most important asset for every individual and owning one is the dream of every individual household.

Obviously for the failure of government led initiatives toward housing provision, housing market in Nigeria has been dominated by both formal and informal private sectors in recent times. Olatubara, (2007), estimates private sectors' contribution at about 80 per cent of the total supply of housing. Henshaw (2010) however observes that the housing units produced by the private sectors are usually out of the reach of the low income families. The author further noted that access to housing units produced by the private sector is left entirely to the price system guided by the interaction of demand and supply. Arimah (1997) and Udechukwu (2008) further identify other important factors as income level while Ojo and Ighalo (2008) identify sourcing of loans from financial institutions. Impliedly, the procurement of housing among urban middle and low income groups is not only dependent on the level of their income but strongly connected to their consistent saving/repayment capability. It is therefore not surprising that the resultant scenario is the increasing renters' population and overcrowding of available housing units.

Renters' population constitutes critical segment of urban population and the successful transition of urban renters to home owners is directly linked to affordability and access to finance. Uroko (2012), remarks that Nigeria has a very disturbing housing situation with only 10.7 million housing stock; 10 percent home-ownership level; about 5.5 percent annual urbanisation rate, and a staggering 16 million housing units deficit. Peterside (2007) also estimates the current housing deficit at between 12million and 16million units and that about 80 percent of Nigerians, representing 134million persons of the 167million population live in rented accommodations (Alagbe, 2011). In 2009, Lagos State Ministry of Housing estimates the State's annual housing needs to be 224,000 housing units (Jibunoh, 2009) while housing demand in the State alone is currently estimated to be approximately 2.17 million. In Nigeria, available statistics show that about 87% of the total household population in Nigeria lives in rented apartments and in Lagos State alone, about 60% of residents are tenants (Jibunoh, 2009).

2.1 Cost of Rental Housing

Oftentimes, the cost of occupying rental housing is obfuscated with rent. Rent is a fixed (though reviewable) sum paid by a lessee to the lessor as a consideration for the occupation of the subject property by the lessee. There are other costs incidental to the occupation of the property and these may include security costs, maintenance costs, utilities, neighbourhood charges, property taxes and such, the bulk of which sometimes are passed to the occupant. Cost of rental housing differs from cost of home ownership as all the costs associated with land acquisition, development and infrastructure are excluded. Housing consumption goes beyond structural attributes to include environmental, neighbourhood and accessibility (location) attributes (Kamali, Hojjat and Rajabi 2008). Nicholls (2002) identifies two more attributes that determine property value in addition to the above as community and time-related attributes.

The consumption of these attributes is in two parts and ultimately determines the quality of house procured. The rent recognises the superiority of tenure of the lessor while the second include the more frequent expenditures incidental to occupation. Thus the cost of rental housing can be expressed as

$$Rc = f\{R + Mc + Tx + S + Nc + U + Tr\} \qquad (1)$$

and where financed with loan, the expression becomes;

$$Rc = f\{R + Mc + Tx + S + Nc + U + Tr + Lr + I\} \qquad (2)$$

Where Rc = Cost of rental housing,

      R = Actual rent

Mc = Maintenance costs

Tx = Tax incidents

S = Security costs

Nc = Neighbourhood charges

U = Utilities

Tr = Transport costs

Lr = Loan repayment

I = interest and accompanying charges

2.12 Rental Housing Affordability

Feldman (2002) opines that a rental unit is unaffordable if a household has to spend more than 30% of its income on it. Using this approach the author examines the proposition that affordability problem is confined to households with very limited financial resources. The author examined data from the USA and found that in the event that rent is reduced significantly, majority of renters would still live in rental units considered unaffordable. Feldman (2002) concludes that shelter costs take up most of the income of renters. Belsky, Goodman and Drew (2005) in measuring the nation's rental housing affordability problems in America are of the view that households spending more than 30% are cost burdened and those spending more than 50% are labelled severely cost burdened. According to Ndubueze (2009), rent-to-income ratio measures rental-housing affordability. It is the ratio of the median annual rent of a dwelling unit in relation to the median annual household income of renters. The model suggests that affordable rental-housing should cost no more than a certain percentage (usually about 25-30%) of household's monthly income. The author however observes that the ratio has a tendency to record as 'affordable' when a household consumes less than the minimal socially accepted standard of housing in favour of more non-housing consumption.

In the opinion of Aribigbola (2011), housing is considered 'affordable' to a household if the rent is no more than 30 percent of its income. The study asserts that the 30 percent spent on housing leaves little for all necessities for low income families but is adequate for middle income earners. The author considered households that spend more than 30% of their income on housing as being cost burdened and may have difficulties affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care.

The Chartered Institute of Housing (1992) identified four key variables determining whether accommodation is affordable or not. These variables are:

(a) Rent levels which will have an impact on the ability of a tenant to afford accommodation.

(b) Household income.

(c) The type of household (i.e. family makeup, whether couple, single parent, elderly, etc)

(d) Whether the household is eligible for housing benefits.

In sum, "housing affordability" according to the Australian Housing and Research Institute (AHURI, 2004) refers to the capacity of households to meet housing costs while maintaining the ability to meet other basic costs of living. According to Housing and Urban Development (HUD) standards, the population is divided into "very low income" (below 50% of the median income), "low income" (below 80%) and "moderate income" (81–120%). "Affordable housing" generally therefore, means housing priced to cost not more than 30 percent of the income at each income level (Aribigbola, 2008).

2.13 The Interaction of Household Income, Rent and Savings

The major cause of housing affordability problem has always been attributed to low income. Sources of household income could be one or combination of the following: (i) self employment, (ii) paid employment

and (iii) part-time engagement. There is significant divergence in the pattern of income from each source. However, to categorise earnings and harmonise indices, all sources are resolved to average annual income. Regardless of the source and the amount, all income eventually dissolves into disposable and non-disposable income. This is presented as follows;

$$I_H = C_H + S_H \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (3)$$

$$C_H = Rc + \acute{R}c \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (4)$$

 Where

I_H represents (renter's) household income

C_H = Household consumption/disposable income

S_H represents household savings

Rc represents cost of rental housing

$\acute{R}$c represents essential non-housing costs of feeding, clothing, domestic chores, medicals etc

Apparently, the disposable income goes into the costs of housing and essential non-housing items. Since savings represents the non-disposable part of the household income, it is expected that affordability index has significant influence on what is eventually reserved and this has a direct bearing on mortgage repayment capability of a household in its home ownership drive. Arising from expression (1) & (2), it is observed that cost of rental housing compose the pre-determined, fixed part called rent and the infrequent costs items. Where the case is housing burden with no significant improvement in income, household savings capacity would be greatly reduced with the long run implication of reduced renter to owner transition. This observation is examined in the subsequent analysis.

3.0 Research Method

Data for this study were obtained from the economic, social and demographic background of households as well as indices of housing characteristics such as costs, rents, size and quality. The data set were collected using structured questionnaire purposely administered to different ranks of renters across three local government areas randomly selected from each of the three administrative divisions of Lagos Metropolis between March and May 2013.

In all, a total of 750 questionnaires were administered on renters' household in the city through research assistants engaged for the purpose. Data were collected via face-to-face interview where possible. In addition, other relevant materials and data were extensively sourced from published sources such as journal articles, newspaper, textbooks and internet among others. Data were subsequently presented with frequency tables, charts and percentages while the significance of the variable items of cost of rental housing determined with mean ranking and relative importance index.

4.0 Results and Discussion

4.1 Rate of Response

Questionnaires were administered to two hundred and fifty renter's household from each of the three Local Government Areas selected to represent each administrative division in Lagos Metropolis.

Table 1: Rate of Response and Duration of Renter's Status

LGAs	Response rate		Duration in years		
	No Returned	Not Returned	Below 15	Between 15-30	Above 30
Ojo	241	9	86	97	58
Mushin	245	5	103	85	57
Eti-Osa	227	23	72	112	43
Total	713	37	261	294	158
Percentage	**95%**	**5%**	**37%**	**41%**	**22%**

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

The rate of response and duration of status as renter as shown in Table 1 show that out of the 750 questionnaires distributed, a total of 713(95%) were retrieved and this shows adequate level of response. Moreover, a total of 261(37%) have been a renting for up to 15 years, 294(41%) have been renting between 15 and 30years while 158(22%) have been renting for more than 30years.

4.2 Household Characteristics

Data provided by respondents regarding various items on income, family size, age, source of income were collated and presented in the table 2

Table 2: Respondents' Household Characteristics

Income per month			Age			Family size			Source of income		
Range (N)	Freq	%	Range (years)	Freq	%	No of Persons	Freq	%	Job type	Freq	%
7,500-60,000	349	49	**24-35**	159	22	**1-4**	196	28	**Public**	280	39
60,000-120,000	201	28	**36-45**	277	39	**5-8**	315	44	**Private**	311	44
121,000-240,000	116	16	**46-55**	194	27	**9-12**	131	18	**Self**	86	12
241,000 & above	47	7	**56 & Above**	83	12	**13 & Above**	71	10	**Aid**	36	5
Total	**713**	**100**		**713**	**100**		**713**	**100**		**713**	**100**

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

Table 2 shows important indices on housing characteristics such as monthly income, age distribution, family size and source of income. It shows 49% of the respondents earn between N7,500 and N60,000 monthly and followed by 28% that make between N60,000 and N120,000 income per month. Also, 471(66%) of respondents are within the prime age of 36 and 55years while 44% has between 5-8 persons and 28% between 1-4 persons. However, it is observed that aside common sources of household income which could be public, private or self employment, some household are on support from organizations. This category of people constitute 36(5%) of the respondents.

Table 3: Respondent's Desire to Own a House

In order to ascertain the renters' disposition or willingness to own a house and their choice location, data was collected and presented as follows.

Desire to own a house		Location		
Yes	No	Lagos	Outside Lagos	Undecided
713	0	452	187	74
100%	**0%**	**64%**	**26%**	**10%**

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

Since the survey focus is on renters' population, it is important to establish their desire for home acquisition. Response shows that 100% of the respondents actually desire to own a house although not necessarily in Lagos State. 452(64%) desires to own in Lagos, 187(26%) desires to own outside Lagos State while 74(10%) are undecided as regards where they would want the house located. This shows that the renters appreciate that owning a house is more beneficial than being a renter.

Table 4: Costs of Rental Accommodation

Costs of Rental Housing	Local Government Areas			Frequency	**Percentage (%)**
	Ojo	Mushin	Eti-Osa		
Rent	229	235	213	677	**95%**
Maintenance	187	193	137	517	**73%**
Taxes	76	46	93	215	**30%**
Security	153	238	216	607	**85%**
Neighbourhood charges	211	163	219	593	**83%**
Utilities	241	245	227	713	**100%**
Transport costs	218	213	203	634	**89%**
Loan & Interest	37	0	56	93	**13%**

Source: Authors Field Analysis 2013

In table 4, respondents were able to identify other cost incidents in their respective locations. The table shows that 677(95%) of respondents are directly responsible for payment of rent, 517(73%) pay for maintenance of the rented apartments, 215(30%) bear the burden of taxes such as tenement rates, land use charge or infrastructure development costs. Aside rent, other items that has high level of cost incidence include transport cost to places of work indicated by 643(89%), security indicated by 607(85%) and neighbourhood charges indicated by 593(85%) of respondents.

Table 5 Renter's Identification of Cost of Accommodation

Cost of rental housing	Percentage of annual income spent on different items of cost associated with rental accommodation								Total
	0-0.9	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-30	31-45	45-60	60-75	
Rent	-	-	39	58	204	295	81	-	**677**
Maintenance	155	291	71	-	-	-	-	-	**517**
Taxes	57	72	86	-	-	-	-	-	**215**
Security	115	178	151	163	-	-	-	-	**607**
Neighbourhood charges	338	192	63	-	-	-	-	-	**593**
Utilities	51	294	255	113	-	-	-	-	**713**
Transport costs	-	29	46	87	188	284	-	-	**634**
Loan & Interest	-	-	59	34	-	-	-	-	**93**

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

In an attempt to understand household expenditure on various items of cost of rental housing, respondents were requested to indicate the proportion of their income that is spent on the items indicated. Table 4 shows the response 301(42%) actually spend between 6% and the 30% affordability benchmark on rent while 376(53%) spend between 30-60% annually. Other items that carry substantial portion of renters income is transportation to places of work with 362(51%) spending above 30% of their income. However, other items of cost incident to rental housing such as maintenance, taxes, and neighbourhood charges have spending between 1-5% of their annual income.

Table 6: Household Spending Pattern

Income spent (%)	Rent		Other housing costs		Non-housing essentials		Retirement plan & insurance		Raining day reserve		Home acquisition reserve	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
None	36	5%		-	-	-	107	15%	96	14%	164	23%
1-5	-	-	-	-	-	-	417	58%	486	68%	397	56%
6-15	97	14%	117	16%	-	-	189	27%	131	18%	152	21%
16-30	204	29%	373	52%	496	70%	-	-	-	-	-	-
31-45	295	41%	223	32%	217	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
46-60	81	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above 60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**713**	**100**	**713**	**100**	**713**	**100**	**713**	**100**	**713**	**100**	**713**	**100**

Source: Authors's Field Analysis 2013

Apart from those items that constitute the costs of rental housing, households were also requested to indicate whether they make provision toward house acquisition. Household spending pattern indicated covers rent, other housing costs, non-housing essentials such as feeding, clothing, healthcare, domestic chores etc, retirement plan and insurance, raining day reserve as well as home acquisition reserve. Response shows that household spending on retirement and insurance, raining day reserve and home acquisition plan is very low.

It is observed that some of the respondents could barely make provision for retirement/insurance, raining day reserve or home acquisition plan. Actual provision for these items ranges between 1-15% as revealed in table 6.

Table 7: Household Target and Actual Savings Plan

Income Range	Target home savings			Actual home savings			
	1-15%	16-30%	Above 30%	0-5%	6-10%	11-15%	Above 15%
7,500-60,000	153	196	-	317	32	-	-
60,000 – 120,000	79	122	-	168	33	-	-
121,000-240,000	37	56	23	64	52	-	-
241,000 & above	22	16	9	12	19	16	-
Total	**291 (41%)**	**390 (55%)**	**32 (4%)**	**561 (79%)**	**136 (19%)**	**16 (2%)**	-

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

In table 7, attempt was made to ascertain the planned allocation and actual savings of the income group of renters. About 291(41%) of the various income level planned to save between 1-15% of their income for house acquisition while 390(55%) planned 16-30%. Only 32(4%) budgeted above 30% on home acquisition. However, the table further shows that many respondents did not make the planned savings target. 561(79%) could only save between 0-5%, 136(19%) could save between 6-10% while only 16(2%) could save between 11-15%.

Table 8: Significance of Items of Cost of Rental Accommodation

Costs of rental housings	Weights					**Total**	**RII**
	5	4	3	2	1		
Rent	1,185	1,240	219	186	0	**2,830**	**3.969**
Other housing costs	1,090	1,386	0	214	46	**2,736**	**3.837**
Non-housing essentials	955	672	282	312	104	**2,325**	**3.260**
Retirement & insurance plan	0	872	0	818	86	**1,776**	**2.491**
Raining day reserve	505	604	195	646	73	**2,023**	**2.837**

Source: Author's Field Analysis 2013

Households were also requested to rank based on the extent of the influence of costs of rental housing as well as other non-housing expenditure on house acquisition savings. Form the analysis of responses, rent has the highest level of influence with relative importance index of 3.969 and closely followed by other costs associated with housing with relative importance index of 3.837 and non-housing essentials with relative importance index of 3.260.

5.0 Results and Discussion

The rising trend of renters' population and the costs of rented accommodation prompted this study. Respondents' desire for home ownership and period of status as home renter were first established. It was gathered that all the respondents desires to own a house though not necessarily in Lagos State. Majority 452(64%) however desires to have their house in Lagos State. This affirms that most renters in the cities acknowledge that home ownership has more advantages over rented accommodation and desire to own. It was also gathered that majority of the respondents earn their income from 311(44%) private employment, followed by the 280(39%) in public employment and the 86(12%) that are self engaged in different form of activities. It was however observed that some household are on support from private organizations. Table 4 shows that majority of respondents across the three local government areas acknowledge the incidence of other costs on their rented accommodation apart from rent. Analysis of data in table 5 show that some respondents spend as high as 45% of their income on transport to places of work, 15% on utilities and security and 10% on maintenance, taxes and neighbourhood charges. Respondents indicated that the community sometimes charge residents to procure or repair transformer, electricity pole, street lighting system, roads and drainage clearance. By implication, apart from rent, other items which are often paid for at more frequent times eventually push renter's home affordability beyond limit and negatively affect their savings toward house acquisition.

Respondents were also requested to show the pattern spending of their income and this is contained in Table 6. Analysis of data shows that savings some renters hardly save while 397(56%) save between 1-5% of their income and 152(21%) save between 6-15% of the income. This savings level was further clarified to ascertain whether it constitutes the renters savings target. Table 7 reveals that 291(41%) planned to save between 1-15% of their income, 390(55%) planned to save between 16-30% while 32(4%) planned to save above 30% of their income toward home acquisition.

Finally, respondents were requested to rank in order of significance of impact on savings for house procurement among the respondents. Table 8 shows that rent has the highest level of influence with relative importance index of 3.969, closely followed by other costs associated with housing with relative importance index of 3.837 and non-housing essentials with relative importance index of 3.260. Some of the respondents also indicate that the reserve for unplanned demands also affect what could have gone into savings for home procurement.

6.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has examined rent and other costs associated with rental housing and found that these costs contribute significantly to the overall cost of rental housing in urban centres. It is also observed that these costs draw sizable chunk of renter's income and have significant effect on renters' savings toward home procurement. Leading the pack includes expenditure on transportation to places of work, security, utilities, neighbourhood charges, taxes and maintenance costs. It is therefore suggested that government should come to the aide of the renters by critically examining each of the cost items and treat them appropriately. Lagos State Government recently enacted Lagos State Rent Control Edict, 2011 that makes it a law for rent to be paid annually. Government should ensure that property owners comply with this law. The equivocal tone of the tenement rates law which makes an occupant to be primarily liable for the payment of land use charges have virtually shifted the burden on innocent renters in some communities. (Part 6, Section 36(1) of the Lagos State Tenement Rates Law Chapter T2.). It is suggested that renters are adequately sensitized on their rights and obligations and conscious steps are taken toward recovery where this has happened. This would reduce if not totally eliminate such sharp practices.

Furthermore, where occupants are subjected to unnecessary neighbourhood charges ought to be borne by the government, local authority or government agencies, such practices should be completely eradicated and transferred to the appropriate party. This also demands timely response to the need of such neighbourhood by the government. Government is also advised to make more effort towards the provision of steady electricity, pipe borne water and pocket friendly waste disposal facilities across the State. Greater responsibility is on the government to provide security to the people and the community at large. Government should therefore boost the States' security apparatus especially at the neighbourhood level. Government's efforts at making transport fare affordable in Lagos State through the Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) scheme are highly commended. However, more neighbourhoods should be linked to the BRT to maximize the benefits of the scheme.

References

Abumere, S. (1987). Urbanization and Urban Decay in Nigeria. In: Onibokun A. G., Olokesusi, F., & Egunjobi, L. (eds). *Urban Renewal in Nigeria.* Ibadan: NISER/CURP

Adeagbo, D. (1997). *Nigerian Housing.* In: Philips, A.O. and Titilola, S.O (eds). Nigeria in 2010. Ibadan: NISER.

Ademiluyi, I. A. (2010). Public Housing Delivery Strategies in Nigeria: A Historical Perspective of Policies and Programmes. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Volume 12, No.6*

Ademiluyi, I. A. and Raji, B. A. (2008). Public and Private Developers as Agents in Urban Housing Delivery in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Situation in Lagos State. *Humanity & Social Sciences Journal 3 (2): 143-150,*

Agbola, T. (1998). The Housing of Nigerian: A Review of Policy Development and Implementation. Research Report No. 14, Development Policy Centre, Ibadan.

Alagbe, O. A. (2011). Enhancing Sustainable Housing Development in Nigeria Using Compressed Stabilized Laterite Bricks. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection Vol.1 No.3*

Aribigbola, A. (2008). Housing Policy Formulation in Developing Countries: Evidence of Programme Implementation from Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. *J. Hum. Ecol., 23(2)*

Aribigbola, A. (2011). Housing Policy Formulation in Developing Countries: Evidence of Programme Implementation from Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. J. Hum. Ecol., 23(2): 125-134

Arimah, B. (1997). The Determinants of Housing Tenure Choice in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Urban Studies* , 105-124.

Australian Housing and Research Institute (AHURI): Measuring Housing Affordability. AHURI Research and Policy Bulletin Issue 45 (2004)

Belsky, E. S., Goodman, J., and Drew, R. (2005). *Measuring the Nation's Rental Housing Affordability Problems.* Harvard University: Joint Center for Housing Studies.

Chartered Institute of Housing (1992). *Rent Levels, Rent Structures and Affordability: A Guide for Local Authorities and Housing Associations.* Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry

Chatterjee, L. (1981). Housing Development in Nigeria. From the Department of Geography, Boston University. Occasional Paper Series, Agency for International Development, Office of Housing

Egunjobi, L. (1999). Our Gasping Cities, An Inaugural Lecture. University of Ibadan, U. I. Press, Ibadan.

Feldman, R. (2002). The Affordable Housing Shortage: Considering the Problem, Causes and Solutions. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Banking and Policy Working Paper 02-2.

Henshaw, G. (2010). The Role of Private Sector in the Provision of Affordable Housing to the Public. Lecture presented to the Nigerian Society of Engineers, C.R.S Branch, on its 2010 workshop.

Ibem, E. O. (2010). An Assessment of the Role of Government Agencies in Public-Private Partnerships in Housing Delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries, Vol. 15(2)*, 21-26

Jibunoh, N. (2009). The State of Lagos Housing Market Published by Roland Igbinoba Real Foundation for Housing and Urban Development (RIRFHUD)

Kamali, K. M., Hojjat, S. A., and Rajabi, A. (2008). Studying Noise Effect on Property Valuation

Mabogunje, A. (2003). Welcome Address at the Stakeholders Forum on Strategies for enhancing Domestic production of Building Materials for Mass Housing Development in Nigeria. Held at NICON Hilton Hotel, Abuja, 24th September 2003.

Ndubueze, O. J. (2009). *Urban Housing Afffordabilty and Housing Policy Dilemmas in Nigeria.* A Thesis Submitted to the University of Birmingham for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Nicholls, S. (2002). Does Open Space Pay? Measuring the Impacts of Green Spaces on Property Values and the Property Tax Base, College Station, TX, Texas A&M University, Ph.D Dissertation

Ojo, O., and Ighalo, J. I. (2008). Factors Affecting Borrowers' Choice of Housing Loan Package in Southwestern Nigeria. *Housing Finance International, December*, 38-43

Olatubara, C.O. (2008). The Dynamics of Households. Residential Choice in Nigeria: The Fifteenth Faculty Lecture. Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Onibokun, A.G. (1983). Housing Needs and Responses: A Planner's View. *Journal of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners.* 11(1&2)

Peterside, C. S. (2007). Ameliorating Housing Deficit in Nigeria: The Role of Primary and Secondary Mortgage Institutions and the Capital Market. http://www.nigeriaworld.com.

Salau, A. T. (1990). The Environmental Context of Urban Housing-Public Services and Infrastructural Facilities in Nigerian Urban Centres. In: Onibokun P. (ed.). *Urban Housing in Nigeria.* Ibadan: NISER

Udechukwu, C. E. (2008). Obstacles to Individual Home Ownership in Nigeria. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis, Vol 1 (2)*, 182-194.

Uroko C. (2012). Concerns mount as 134 million Nigerians pay rent. Monday 25 June 2012 retrieved from http://www.businessdayonline.com/NG/index.php/news/76-hot-topic/40074-concerns-as-134m-nigerians-live-as-tenants

United Nations. (1992). Promoting Sustainable Human Settlement Development, Chapter 7. In *Earth Summit Agenda 21, The United Nations Programmes of Action from Rio.* UN Department of Public Information, New York.