



PERCEPTION OF THE URBAN POOR ON HOUSING DELIVERY BY GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS IN OGUN STATE, NIGERIA

Odekunle, J.F , Akindele, D.B , Akinola, O.

Abstract:

Problems associated with population increase and urbanisation has culminated to serious deficiencies in both quantity and quality of housing provision in most urban areas of Nigeria. Consequently, making the urban poor whose livelihood cannot support owning a house the most vulnerable. In essence, this study evaluates the perception of the urban poor on housing delivery by government institutions in Ogun state, using Ifo LGA as a reference point. This study was complemented with the review of literature relating to housing provision/delivery. Both the purposive and systematic random sampling method was adopted for the purpose of this study, whereby only five (5) locations were conveniently selected by the researcher namely; Ilepa, Onihale, Pakoto, Kajola and Akute area, using the predominance of residential buildings and population as a criteria of selection. Out of the 100 questionnaires administered to the household heads, 92 questionnaires were correctly filled and returned. Findings from the analysis revealed that the major reasons for poor housing provision/delivery in the study area are: lengthy administrative procedure of securing title documents, failure to involve people during the planning process of most housing schemes, provision of housing is directed alone to the “middle and high-income” class and poor economic situation with the weighted mean values (WTM) of 4.00, 3.99, 3.92 and 3.90 respectively. Government should rally the related organisations, institutions and agencies to make available motivations, such as land use restructurings, grants, building materials cost discount programmes and tax reduction status that will ensure increased housing provision.

1. INTRODUCTION

Housing has been universally acknowledged as one of the basic needs for man’s survival. Housing goes a long way to determine not only the social standard of a man but also that of a nation and a community (Eni, 1998, Ezirim, 2005). Importantly, housing depicts the economic situation of a nation as it is directly related to man’s welfare and affluence. Generally, the supply and demand for housing take place in a housing market. It has become increasingly glaring that most of the urban population live in dehumanising housing environment while those that have access to average housing do so at abnormal cost. According to Onibokun (1986) and Nubi (1991), rent in major cities of Nigeria is about 60% of an average workers disposable income. This is far higher than the 20-30% recommended by United Nations (see table 2).

In a developing clime like Nigeria, the housing problem basically relates to quantitative and qualitative deficiencies. On the supply side, various government strategies in the past have been formulated towards overcoming the enormous shortage through several housing reform programmes (Makinde, 2013). Despite these past efforts, housing continues to be a mirage to ordinary Nigerian, especially for the urban poor. Presently, there are various mass housing delivery programmes such as the affordable housing scheme that utilise the public-private partnership effort and numerous private finance initiative models that could only provide for about 3 % of the required stock. This suggests the need for a holistic solution in approaching the problem. While the quality of the existing stock is also under a heavy study in terms of design and desired functions including

satisfactory liveable neighbourhood, 87% of the existing stocks are accumulations which are frameworks that do not meet the minimum quality requirement (Olayiwola 2005 and Daramola 2004 as cited in Makinde, 2013).

The right to adequate housing that is safe, secure, healthy, available and inexpensive is enshrined in the Habitat Agenda the global call on human settlement and shelter (UN Habitat2001), regardless of social or economic status. According to Pison Housing Company (2010) as cited inMakinde(2013), there are about 10.7 million houses in Nigeria. Irrespective of the policies, organisations and regulations which the Nigerian government has put in place since independence in 1960, there is still a shortage of housing, especially for the low-income section. The Federal Mortgage Bank of Nigeria (FMBN), which is answerable for the provision of mortgages to low-income earners through the National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF), has operational and financial capability restraints that limit its efficiency. With this, the few low-income earners who own their houses usually obtain land and build incrementally with their funds, while the high-income house-owners buy with money, or mortgage finance, usually pay back over a maximum period of 10 years (Enuenwosu 1985; Falegan 1980 and Akinlusi 2007).

A major short coming has been with ownership rights under the Land Use Act 1978, which confers ownership of all land to the Governors of each state and is a substantial deterrent to housing and housing investment in Nigeria. In actual fact, this right of occupancy is endorsed with a Certificate of Occupancy issued to the recipient. This often delays and adds significant costs to the registration process (Agbola 1987). An additional task in delivering affordable housing to low- and middle-income households is the affordability gap. Though some households attain affordability with additional informal income, this is not counted in loan origination procedures. Additional major issues affecting housing in Nigeria include inadequate access to finance, slow administrative procedures and the high cost of land registration and titling (Vuyisani 2003). The Nigerian housing sub-divisions need intervention in all aspects to ensure that it functions efficiently. One way to achieve this is through the introduction of inventive products like housing microfinance, which have been effectively adopted in other countries with similar macroeconomic indices (Olayiwola 2005 and Okupe 2002).

Adebayo (2005) stated that due to physical development and population growth with the subsequent serious shortage of housing provision, successive Nigerian governments have not done credibly well in the provision of housing, except for formulation of housing policies. The Nigerian federal government's housing policy was directed towards delivery of low-cost housing on a large scale, with the numerous states having related policies, and providing core housing and walk-up flats. The government also established satellite towns and government employee, high-rise apartments. The execution of these projects contributed greatly to housing delivery system. It has emerged that this housing approached was not sustainable over time due to the absence of a post-implementation strategy, as an integral part of the procurement and management system (Federal Republic of Nigeria 1991). Nevertheless, most of the housing schemes rolled out by successive government in Nigeria has somewhat failed to give preference to the urban poor, whose livelihoods cannot support owning their own house.

It is pathetic that most of the housing units meant to service the low income earners still finds their ways to the hands of the rich, leaving the urban poor with slum and squatter settlements. Also, most often, due to a combination of factors, such as corruption and inefficiency in public housing delivery, most housing units come at a price far beyond the financial capacity of the target group. Moreover, according to Mabogunje, Harday and Mistra (1978), the process of direct government construction of house, even when subsidized, results in the product being priced well beyond the purchasing capacity of the majority of urban residents.

It is worth mentioning that current evidence from the Central Bank of Nigeria shows that the microfinance policy in Nigeria is being updated to allow full-scale housing microfinance business models. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to evaluate the perception of the urban poor on housing delivery by government

institutions in Ogun state, using Ifo LGA as a reference point. The methodology adopted for the study includes interviews and analyses of data collected during the field investigations/survey. These investigations were complemented with review of literature relating to housing delivery. The data required for this study were obtained primarily from both primary and secondary sources.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Housing demand and supply

Housing demand is the number of dwelling units that are actually needed by the people at a particular point in time, while housing supply is the number of residential units that are provided by the key players in the accommodation provision.

2.1.1 Housing need and effective demand

There is a gap in knowledge between requirement for housing and the ability to obtain the preferred housing type, which result in an effective request crisis for affordable housing in the country. Although it is clear there is a housing shortfall, it is fundamental to know that people can only obtain what they can meet the expense. Affordable housing to low and middle-income households is the affordability gap. This is defined as the difference between the required monthly mortgage repayments on the least expensive house and the 33% (an industry standard as recommended by the International Labour Organisation) that can be deducted from the total salary of a potential homeowner. The gap affects 52% of the population or 65 million households. While some households achieve affordability with supplementary, informal income, this is not counted in loan origination procedures. Affordability analysis shows that low-income earners can afford housing units at N2 million (\$13,333.33). Analysis of the stock of dwelling units helps to understand affordability. As at 1991, the total dwelling units in Nigeria was estimated at 15.2 million and more than 70% was in tenement rooms (called face-me-I-face-you). Unfortunately, there is no more recent data available. Since 2006, government intervention has been through public-private partnership (PPP) programmes (Daramola 2004). Prior to this, government was directly involved in constructing housing units. Housing demand is higher in the urban areas, which is about 40% of the population (Enhancing Financial Innovation and Access 2008).

2.1.2 Housing demand

Housing demand can be explained as the willingness and ability of housing consumer to pay for a particular dwelling depending upon such consumer's incomes, house type, location preferences and local prices (Welsh, 2002) at a particular given time period. The main determinant of the housing demand is household composition while other factors include consumer's income, housing price, cost and availability of credit, consumer preferences or taste and investor preferences (Olatubara, 2007). In the same vein, housing demand is influenced by several economic factors, such as increased economic activity that has led to increased demand for labour and rural-urban migration. The result is that there are 14 million units of housing deficit in the country. This is about a hundred percent increase when compared to the deficit in 2001. There has been an intractable gap between government's supply efforts and actual achievement over the years, worsened by a population growth from about 42 million in 1960 to more than 151 million in 2010. Supply of housing units in Nigeria can be viewed from the formal and the informal sectors. The formal refers to supply from the private sector and the various elements of the public sector (Enhancing Financial Innovation and Access 2008).

2.1.3 Housing supply

Various authorities have offered strategies for improving housing delivery in Nigeria. Fasakin (1998) suggested the co-operative housing model; Oduwaye (1998) advocated a simple land allocation system; Omole (2001) suggested an affordable financing model and Igbino (2009) encouraged commercialising housing support services for the poor and low income. The 1991 Housing Policy estimated that 720,000 housing units would be built each year, but current estimates show that Nigeria needs an average of one million housing units a year to replenish decaying housing stock and also meet rising demand. The 1991 policy further indicated that not less than 60 % of the new houses would be built in urban centres throughout the country (Federal Republic of Nigeria 1991). A study by Onibokun (1985) showed that 20 % of most buildings in the urban areas of Nigeria were more than 25 years old. The same study confirmed that over 65 % of houses were in the urban areas and that 90 % of rural areas were developed by informal, individual efforts. Despite several housing policies and successive administrations, not much impact has been made by the federal government in affordable housing supply. At the state level, the housing corporation model has been used by the state governments in an attempt to deliver affordable housing (Aribigbola 2008).

2.2 Need for affordable housing

Rapid growth in population creates demand pressure towards shelter and efficient supply and distribution of basic utilities and services for the city dwellers. In most of our urban centres, the problem of housing is not only restricted to quantity but to the poor quality of available housing units, the effect which is manifested in overcrowding of houses. Nigeria is perhaps the fastest urbanising country in the African continent. One of the most important challenges facing the country is the provision of affordable housing. As more and more Nigerians make towns and cities their homes, the resulting social, economic, environmental and political challenges need to be urgently addressed (Ajanlekoko 2001 and Raji 2008 as cited in Makinde, 2013).

The housing situation in Nigeria puts existing housing stock at 23 per 1,000 inhabitant. Housing deficit is put at 15 million houses, while N12 trillion will be required to finance the deficit (Mabogunje 2003, 2004). This is about 4 times the annual national budget of Nigeria (Federal Housing Authority (FHA) 2007). Home prices and rents, on the other hand, have grown ahead of general inflation. Making matters worse, the composition of homes for sale and rent on the market has been inexorably shifting towards very expensive home (Nubi 2008). The National Rolling Plan of 1990–1992 estimated housing deficit at 4.8 million. The 1991 housing policy estimated that 700,000 housing units are to be built each year if housing deficit is to be cancelled. In spite of a series of government policies towards housing delivery, one thing that is clear is that there exist a gap between housing supply and demand (Olomolaiye 1999; Agbola 1998; Adegeye and Dittoh 1985).

Historically, housing unit is treated as product hence the need for quality if it is to pair well and perform desirably in the market, but quality in construction industry suffers significant difficulty as it passes through extreme pressure driven by cost minimisation rather than value maximisation. Research has shown that 75% of urban housing is situated in slum conditions (urban development policies in Nigeria 1988), and indeed, the quality of the housing is poor and clearly an affront to human dignity. As part of effort to increasing qualitative housing for the masses in the country, the federal government of Nigeria (2004) pledged to adequately fund research pertaining to the manufacture and the use of local materials in the sector, with the aim of providing 40,000 houses, to at least 1,000 per state before year 2007 (Olutah 1997; Agbola and Olatubara 2003).

Housing delivery in Nigeria is provided by either the government or Private sector, but despite federal government access to factors of housing production, the country could at best expect 4.2% of the annual requirement. Substantial contribution is expected from other public and private sectors. It should be

acknowledged that private sector developers account for most of urban housing (Federal Office of Statistics 1983). The production of housing in Nigeria is primarily the function of the private market; approximately 90% of urban housing is produced by private developers. Due to housing demand created by rural–urban migration, which account for 65% of urban population growth, the fixed supply of urban land, and inflation of rental and housing ownership cost (Taylor 2000). Unfortunately, the private sector is saddled with numerous problems which make supply always fall far short of demand and lower production quality (Nubi 2008). The problem of qualitative housing has been a concern for both the government and individuals. Appreciating these problems, both public and private sector developers make effort through various activities to bridge the gap between housing supply and demand, but the cost of building materials, deficiency of housing finance arrangement, stringent loan conditions from mortgage banks, government policies among other problems have affecting housing delivery significantly in Nigeria (Raji 2008; Bichi 1997 and Daramola 2004).

With different Policies and user solutions that are abound for the purpose of reducing quantitative housing deficiency. It could be possible to solve the problem if housing were used only for shelter needs. However, in addition to serving as a shelter, housing is also a produced commodity, consumer good, assurance for families, means used for reproducing social relations and an investment tool protecting the value of money against inflation. Moreover, it is important that house is a building block in its relations with its environment, mutual interaction and increasing the quality of its environment when it is considered as part of the city. In this context, it can be accepted that a large housing stock is available today as a result of new presentation forms and production processes with a high volume of housing production. However, the existence of this stock shows that the housing policies are planned depending mostly on production (Okupe 2002).

2.3 Housing delivery

Agbola (2004) described housing delivery as a combination of many interrelated process influenced and affected by exogenous and endogenous variables. He said it is a system that allocates housing to households in a given country irrespective of class and location. It consists of the production of new housing units, renovation of existing ones and the distribution of new and old houses to all consumers. Therefore, housing delivery comprises a collection of production mechanisms, regulatory and administrative devices by which housing services and provides to the consumers. The component of the delivery systems includes: land and infrastructure, construction technology, labour and management, building materials, finance, distribution methods and monitoring and evaluation.

2.3.1 Current housing delivery approach in Nigeria

In 2003, the federal government also established the Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and proposed a housing reform, in view of the fact that there were not many affordable houses in Nigeria. There was an illusion that houses were available. But most of them were high-priced. There is a need for legislation to be amended substantially to bring their provisions in line with the new housing regime. The touchstone in such reviews is to reduce red-tape and ensure that various legislations are compatible with demands of a free and robust market economy (Mabogunje 2004 as cited in Makinde, 2013). The period 2003–2004 witness a housing policy that recognised the private sector on the driving seat of housing delivery in the country, the key features of this policy include the placement of the private sector in a pivotal position, for the delivery of affordable houses, on a sustainable basis; assignment to government of the responsibility for the development of primary infrastructure for new estate development; and review the amendment of the Land Use Act to ensure better access to land and speedier registration and assignment of title to developers. Others are the development of a secondary mortgage market, involving the FMBN and the establishment of a new mortgage regime, under the NHF, to facilitate more favourable mortgage terms and a five-year tax holiday for developers (Enhancing Financial Innovation and Access 2008).

2.4 An overview of public housing delivery strategies/programmes in Ogun State

Globally, the implementation of every social programme follows defined strategies. Consequently, the outcome of such programmes depends on the strategies used in their implementation. It is for this reason that this section examines the different housing delivery strategies used in the implementation of the public housing in this State. Housing delivery strategies in this study refers to the activities, events, processes or functions employed in the transformation of housing policies, programme objectives, human and material resources into housing units and related services. They include the different approaches used in realizing the objectives of public housing in the State.

Previous investigations revealed that five housing delivery strategies, namely: government-assisted core housing, shell stage, turnkey (build and sell), Public-Private Partnership, and site-and services were used in public housing in Ogun State. However, the distinguishing feature of the four different strategies is basically the level of involvement of public housing agencies and householders in the development of the housing units. Whereas, householders participate in the structural development of the housing units in the core housing strategy, they are involved in the finishing work of housing units in the shell stage strategy. On the contrary, householders are not involved in the development of housing units in the turnkey and PPP housing delivery strategies. Although the PPP delivered completed housing units as in the turnkey strategy, the former entailed greater involvement of private sector organisations than in the latter strategy. It is therefore on the basis of level of involvement of home buyers and public housing agencies that these four housing delivery strategies were classified and assessed in this study.

2.5 Guiding principles for implementation of housing delivery

The successful resolution to housing delivery situation will require a comprehensive approach, which mobilises and harnesses the combined efforts of the private and public sectors as well as civil society. Therefore, according to Makinde, (2013), the following guiding principles are essential for providing support for implementation of the housing delivery.

i. Standards

Planning standards are necessary to develop safe, disaster resistant and quality housing, especially to core need households who are particularly vulnerable to the effects of natural hazards.

ii. Affordability

Housing must remain affordable in order to meet the satisfaction of all households, particularly those with a “core need”. This is especially important since land and house prices, rent and construction costs have risen more rapidly than real incomes, thus reducing the housing options of low-income households. In addition, households’ access to financing is a critical component of housing affordability, particularly in view of the eligibility criteria of many lending agencies.

iii. Partnering

The mobilisation and harnessing of the combined resources, efforts and initiatives of public and private sectors, community organisations, civil society and the international community, is essential to housing all citizens. The contribution and commitment of the skills, labour, creativity, knowledge, and financial and other resources of all these stakeholders is critical to facilitate an enabling environment to house all citizens (Daramola 2004).

iv. Sustainability

It is absolutely essential for the housing delivery process to be implemented on a sustainable basis, paying due regard to social, historical, economic and ecological concerns. Consequently, it is important that short-term housing solutions do not undermine the opportunities for future generations to circumvent the viability of any long-term interventions aimed at sustainable growth. Environmental, economic, fiscal, social, cultural, financial and political sustainability are imperative to facilitate an effective housing delivery process. Sustainability is necessary to satisfactorily meet the requirements of all citizens throughout their lifetime.

v. Empowerment and self-sufficiency

Housing does not only fulfil the basic need of shelter, but also plays a vital role in the economic and social health of the Nation. Economic growth and prosperity enhances the creation of integrated communities and fosters a sense of pride, which could encourage family self-sufficiency. The greater the ability of the household to be self-sufficient; the less the anticipated input or responsibility of government to support that household: In particular, housing represents a major asset for both the homeowner and the island as a whole. Since housing is often the single largest investment for most households, investment in housing is potentially the most fundamental pillar for extended social and economic expansion. Increased home equity contribution and consequently total household wealth is essential for national prosperity.

vi. Efficient land use

The small and hilly land resource base demands increasing efficiency in land use in order to maximise the number of housing units and foster the provision of infrastructure in a cost-efficient manner.

vii. Housing information management

An effective and transparent housing market can only be achieved through proper and effective housing information. In particular, pertinent information on the socio-economic status of households is necessary in developing meaningful strategies to address the housing situation. The collection and dissemination of housing data and information are imperative for proper decision making and analysis of existing and planned interventions.

viii. Desirability and variety

The provision of a wide variety of housing solutions is necessary to facilitate choice, as well as consumer desirability. Housing solutions extend beyond the provision of houses and must therefore be sensitive towards the issue of desirable housing within communities where people want to live. It involves home extension, improvement and repairs; provision of serviced lots; evolutionary housing, such as core units, starter houses, foundations and slab; infrastructure upgrades; provision of health care services, child care centres and other social facilities and opportunities for employment.

ix. Priority areas for action

In implementing the recommendations, focus will be placed on eight priority areas for action. These priority areas will form the basis for designing the strategic interventions required to implement the housing delivery. These priority areas involve the development of strategies or approaches to: improve the availability of land for housing, minimise the costs of housing infrastructure, reduce rural–urban migration, increase consumer-focussed housing, increase mechanisms for financing low-income households, strengthen the legislative and administrative framework for housing delivery, increase the participation of private sector, increase the efficiency of house production, determine the human, technical and financial resources required for

implementation of housing policy and develop an effective information system to support decision making in housing delivery.

2.6 Key constraints of housing delivery in Nigeria

According to Makinde (2013) an analysis of the existing housing situation has revealed that there are several constraints facing the sector. Some of the critical issues which will need careful consideration and prioritisation in the formulation of a national housing policy are:

i. Unavailability of land for housing

The relatively small size of the land resource base coupled with its historical and current pattern of ownership presents a serious constraint to housing. At every focus group discussion held in the various communities, the high price of land was identified as one of the major constraint to housing production. Therefore, land availability problem appears to be critical and deserving of special consideration. In particular, the various policy makers will need to address the challenge of improving the supply of affordable housing given a small finite land resource base. Consistent with the draft Land Use Policy, specific strategies and action plans relating to government's acquisition of available lands within communities will need to be examined in order to create housing land banks and consequentially focus on the needs of their residents. The acquisition of lands within communities for residential purposes should also be viewed within the sociological context of maintaining the community's cultural base (Aribigbola 2008).

ii. High cost of infrastructure

Another deterrent to housing production by both the private and public sectors is the high investment cost of land infrastructure particularly where the development is distant from existing infrastructure. The developer fully bears the high investment cost of provision of water and road infrastructure to a new site, without future benefits for connections made off these infrastructures to other sites by other individuals or developers. This high cost of infrastructure significantly influences the final price of the serviced land and ultimately, the cost of housing to the consumer. Therefore, there is a need to firstly re-examine the high initial cost of land infrastructure cost and secondly to develop a common approach for the provision of utilities to housing developments. The cost of infrastructure accounts for about 25 – 30% of housing expenditures. It is a main factor in the delivery of inexpensive housing. Authority has ignored this area and developers now deliver same, thus increasing the cost of houses. This is obvious in many gated residential communities across the populace, where the contractor provides autonomous electrical energy, water treatment plant, sewage plants, access roads to the estate, etc. (Pison Housing Company 2010).

iii. Increasing rural-urban migration

Rural–urban drift has not only placed a significant strain on the supply of housing, but has also resulted in severe traffic management problems. Indeed, the expressed demand for multi-family (apartment) housing in city is significant. Therefore, the recent proposals by central government to undertake renewal of some cities must be integrated within the proposed housing policy insofar as the housing aspects are concerned. At the macroeconomic level, a major challenge is the needed to promote economic development policies that will reduce the rate of urbanisation by providing more employment opportunities in rural areas (Aribigbola 2008).

iv. Inadequate finance mechanisms for low-income housing

While a review of the housing credit sector indicates a reasonable supply of financial institutions, access by low-income households appears to be limited. In particular, households in the poorest income excluded from the formal credit sector. This is partly due to inflexible eligibility criteria for borrowing which involve steady

income streams and land security. Therefore, appropriate mechanisms for financing low-income households must be leveraged, with particular emphasis on more realistic eligibility criteria and lower interest rates. Additionally, the institutional mechanism for administering low-interest finance to low-income households should be revisited. Given the fact that housing is one of the key basic human rights, attention is required with respect to the housing needs of the most vulnerable. While some housing assistance is provided through the government housing incentives, the mechanism for accessing these incentives remains largely unstructured. As a result, the benefits could be unintentionally diverted to higher-income groups. Therefore, it is important that clear incentive regimes be developed to specifically target low-income households. In that regard, there is a need for strategies and action plans to gather information on the socio-economic characteristics and geographic distribution of the poorest income quintile. More importantly, the specific allocation of funds through the annual national budgeting system is required for a focussed approach to affordable housing for low-income households (Anugwom 2005).

v. Inadequacy of administrative and legislative framework

The situational analysis of housing delivery has revealed a highly disproportionate production of “low-income” housing during the last 10 years. Therefore, the public sector housing delivery institutions should urgently consider strategies for increased delivery of affordable housing to the low income, including beneficiaries of subsidies and the indigent. However, any national housing strategy and action plan should consider the development of methods which will enable the effective recovery of capital and recurrent cost from the beneficiaries of subsidised housing. Additionally, strategies need to be considered for the efficient and effective management of existing public rental housing to ensure financial sustainability of the public sector housing delivery system. Housing policy will need to reconsider rationalisation of all public and quasi-public organisations to ensure the efficient delivery of housing to all consumers. In that regard, attention should be given to the reestablishment of an institutional mechanism to facilitate continual dialogue among the various agencies and projects involved in housing, particularly for low-income households (Aribigbola 2008).

vi. Cumbersome regulatory approval process

The lengthy and complicated regulatory approval process hinders efficiency within the housing delivery system. While certain measures instituted by the government are necessary, they tend to lengthen the regulatory process for obtaining planning approvals for land sub-division. In particular, the extensive delay caused by government referral agencies with respect to planning approvals has serious cost implications for private developers and ultimately, adversely affects in the final price to housing consumers (Ebie 2004).

vii. Lack of integrated planning in housing programmes

In the absence of an explicit national development plan, housing sub-divisions simply involve the provisions of sites and services, houses and the allocation of a portion of land as an open space. This has resulted in the need for residents to travel relatively far distances to access services such as day care, transportation and shopping facilities. Therefore, the need for integrated planning of housing projects, whereby residents are provided with a full set of community facilities, is paramount in the development and sustainability of neighbourhoods. Essentially, government’s planning agencies should play a more proactive role in the housing development process. Housing requirements should therefore be continuously assessed in terms of needs and their prioritisation, to influence national zoning plans and the creation of integrated development plans.

viii. Inadequacy of housing information system

The deficiency of information, which has also been expressed on several previous occasions, is cause for deep concern since the formulation of any successful housing policy must be based on a reliable housing information

system. Therefore, it is essential that financial and human resources be allocated to facilitate the development of a comprehensive, accessible up-to-date and transparent database on the housing market. Moreover, a database with qualitative and quantitative information on housing will also serve to measure the performance of the proposed NHP against established targets.

ix. Limited private sector involvement

The analysis of the housing situation has confirmed that private sector involvement has always been minimal, particularly in the production of low-income housing. There is also an absence of public-private sector partnerships in housing delivery. This situation exists despite several efforts by government, particularly in the form of fiscal incentives. The relatively high cost of undeveloped land, strict requirements and the cumbersome regulatory approval process are some of the deterrents posited for the low level of private sector involvement. Therefore, strategies should be developed to promote increased involvement of the private sector as well as to address the issue of public-private sector partnerships in the provision of housing with particular attention to low-income groups (Daramola 2004 and Ebie 2004).

x. Inefficiency of house construction

With materials and labour inputs representing almost equal proportions of the cost of house building, it is critical that these two production factors be affordable, readily available and efficiently utilised. In particular, attention is required in the development of strategies and action plans that would encourage the availability and utilisation of building materials, particularly from indigenous resources. In terms of contracting, the low entry barrier of the construction industry, lack of a regulatory body, absence of mandatory standards together with the non-existence of a legally binding building code has contributed to the general poor performance of contractors. This has been reflected in lengthy construction durations and poor quality of house building. Thus, in order to ensure that the proposed housing policy is all embracing, it is essential that construction quality management be appropriately addressed. In that regard, capacity building through training, registration and licensing of housing contractors and the enactment of the Building Code should be considered. This of course must be developed against the need for improved competitiveness within the environment and globalised economy (Ebie 2004).

3. MATERIALS AND METHOD

3.1 Brief description of the study area

Ifo is a Local Government Area in Ogun State, Nigeria. Its headquarters are in the town of Ifo, which falls between 6°49'00" N and 3°12'00" E. It has an area of 521 km² and a population of 524,837 according to the 2006 census. Ifo is connected to nearby Lagos by a railway that was completed in 1899, with a length of 77 kilometres (48 miles). Roads connect it to Lagos as well as Abeokuta, Ilaro, Shagamu, Itori, and Ketu. Nearby major towns include Igbusi, Ilepa, Onihale, Pakoto, Kajola, Seriki, Coker, Ibogun, Lambe, and Akute; all of which constitute their own Local Council Development Area with their own traditional rulers (Obas). Together these areas make up Ifo Division. Ifo Division has a large industrial area containing several factories. The town of Ifo itself is home to branches of several established Nigerian banks. Ifo is the fastest growing market hub of the Ogun metropolis, owing in part to increasing influxes of people from surrounding towns and villages of Ifo, who are attracted by the town's proximity to Lagos.

3.2 Methodology

The study generated data from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data was obtained through questionnaire administering by the researcher. The questionnaire contained the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents and other questions bordering on their perceptions on housing delivery by government institution in Ogun state. On the other hand, the secondary data were sourced from journals, periodicals, government agencies and internet.

However, because of the humongous nature of the population (524,837, according to the 2006 Census) the purposive sampling method was adopted, whereby only five (5) locations were conveniently selected by the researcher namely; Ilepá, Onihale, Pakoto, Kajola and Akutearea, using the predominance of residential buildings and population as a criteria of selection. The sampling elements (target respondents/buildings) were conveniently chosen by the researcher from those who were household heads (owners/occupiers) of residential buildings in the study area. This method helps to ensure simplicity and thorough coverage of the study area. Thus, to determine the sample frame for this study, according to Fasakin, (2000) the average household size of most high density urban settlements in developing countries, including Nigeria is 7, therefore the household heads in Ifo will be 524,837 divided by 7 = 74,976. However, using Taro Yamane's formula to determine the sample size for this study:-

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where: **n** = sample size, **e** = error of confidence, **N**= sample frame (population)

This research adopted a confidence level of 90%, an allowable error of within +/- 10% of the true prevalence, with the sample frame chosen for the owners/occupiers. The sample size for the owners/occupiers who were household heads is 100 (sample size). Precisely, only residential buildings selected for the study during the reconnaissance survey, whereby (20) buildings in each location were chosen. Here, the systematic random sampling technique was used to select the building to be sampled at an interval of 3 buildings in each of the selected locations.

More so, since the study is largely behavioural in nature, the analysis method adopted was qualitative and descriptive. Likert scale is, therefore adopted to measure the intensity or degree of satisfaction or agreement by the respondents to a claim that describes a situation, phenomenon, item, or treatment (Asika, 1991; Okoko, 2008). The questionnaire was designed to seek the opinion of the residents on the level of agreement/disagreement with housing delivery on a 5- points Likert scale using 1 for strongly disagreed (SD), 2 for disagreed (DA), 3 for neutral (N), 4 for agreed (A) and 5 for strongly agreed (SA). However, the generated data for this study was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 23). The descriptive technique (simple percentage and weighted mean tables) was used to analyse the generated data.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Of all the 100 administered questionnaire on the socio-demographic characteristics and the perception of the respondents regarding public housing provision/delivery, 92 questionnaire was retrieved from the respondents (correctly filled and completed), the questionnaire retrieval level indicates a return rate of 92%. This percentage was considered adequate for the analysis based on the assertion by Moser and Kalton (1971) as cited in FarisAliMustafa, (2017), that the result of a survey could be considered biased and of minimal value if the return

rate was lower than 30–40%. In essence, the data analysis is based on the response from the 92 retrieved questionnaires from respondents. Table 1 below shows the analysis of the rate of questionnaires retrieval.

Table 1: The sampled locations in Ifo LGA

Locations	Number of questionnaires administered	Number of questionnaires retrieved	Percentage of retrieved questionnaires
Ilepa	20	18	90
Onihale	20	17	85
Pakoto	20	19	95
Kajola	20	18	90
Akute	20	20	100
Total	100	92	92

Source: Authors' Field Work, (2021)

Table 2 below spells out analysis bordering on the socio-demographic information of the respondents. The analysis on respondents' gender revealed a preponderance of male (60.9%) than female (39.1%). This is not spurious as share population of men in core areas of developing economy are household heads who engage in artisanship and trading businesses outside the neighbourhood to supplement family income, while the wives engage in home petty trading. As regards the age structure and the marital status, respondents who were between 41 – 50 years and those who were married accounted for 37% and 74% respectively.

Most of the respondents were working in various formal and informal enterprises, either within the residential corridors or outside the neighbourhood along major routes in the study area and other areas in Lagos and Abeokuta. A large proportion of the residents engaged in informal enterprises (artisan and trading). Majority are artisans (32.6%) and traders (28.3%) who engaged in private businesses, while others are pensioners and civil servants respectively. The situation further explain why majority of the residents settle for employment in the informal sector, which is a flexible and low capital form of employment that do not require special skills unlike formal employments. The informal sector accounts for about 72% of non-agricultural jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa, while it contributes to roughly 60% of urban jobs (ILO, 2002; UN-Habitat, 2008). Meanwhile, very small proportion of the respondents (8.7% and 4.3%) engaged in other occupation and unemployed respectively.

Findings shows that majority of the respondents (49% and 33.6%) of the respondents had the sample sizes of between 2 – 4 and 5 – 7, respectively. This analysis clearly shows that the area is a high density settlement. Importantly, as regards the monthly income of respondents, vast majority of the sampled respondents (53.2%) indicated they earned between ₦20,000 – ₦40,000, while those respondents whose income level is below ₦20,000 accounted for the lowest income level is 7.6%. This implies that most of the respondents were considerably low-income earners whose livelihoods cannot support personal savings to own their own houses. Majority of the sampled respondents (53.2%) answered “no” to whether their rents are affordable or not. This analysis corroborates the assertion by Onibokun (1986) and Nubi (1991) that rent in major cities of Nigeria is about 60% of an average workers disposable income, which is far higher than the 20 - 30% recommended by United Nations. More so, as regards the rents paid for the accommodation respondents resides in shows that 33.7% respondents paid between ₦2,000 – ₦7,000, while 30% respondents paid between ₦8,000 – ₦13,000 for their apartments, while 70.6% respondents were tenants in their various residential buildings. Lastly, most of the respondents (40.2%) occupy the Tenement (face-to-face) type of building, while 34.8% respondents occupy self-contain apartments. From the personal interview with some of the respondents, majority of them indicated they would prefer a befitting house if government can provide it for them at an affordable price.

Table 2: Socio-economic attributes of the sampled respondents

Questionnaire Parameters	Variables	Freq.	%
Gender	Male	56	60.9
	Female	36	39.1
	Total	92	100
Age structure (years)	Below 20	2	2.2
	21 – 30	11	12
	31 – 40	28	30.4
	41 – 50	34	37
	51 – 60	13	14.1
	Above 61	4	4.3
	Total	92	100
Marital status	Single	6	6.5
	Married	68	74
	Divorced	5	5.4
	Separated	1	1.1
	Widowed	12	13
	Total	92	100
Occupational structure	Unemployed	4	4.3
	Trading	26	28.3
	Artisan	30	32.6
	Civil servant	11	12
	Pensioner	13	14.1
	Others	8	8.7
	Total	92	100
Household size	1	12	13
	2 – 4	45	49
	5 – 7	31	33.6
	8 – 10	3	3.1
	Above 10	1	1.1
	Total	92	100
Monthly income (₹)	Below 20,000	7	7.6
	20,000 – 40,000	49	53.2
	41,000 – 60,000	17	18.5
	61,000 – 80,000	8	8.7
	Above 81,000	11	12
	Total	92	100
Rent affordability	Yes	26	28.3
	Undecided	17	18.5
	No	49	53.2
	Total	92	100
Monthly Rent (₹)	Less than 2,000	2	2.2
	2,000 – 7,000	31	33.7
	8,000 – 13,000	28	30.4
	14,000 – 19,000	14	15.2
	20,000 – 25,000	6	6.5
	26,000 – 31,000	3	3.3

	32,000 and above	8	8.7
	Total	92	100
Occupancy Status	Owner-occupier	18	19.6
	Rented	65	70.6
	Inherited	6	6.5
	Others	3	3.3
	Total	92	100
Building Type	Tenement (Room)	37	40.2
	Self-contain	32	34.8
	2/3 bedroom flat	21	22.8
	Duplex	2	2.2
	Total	92	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, (2021)

As indicated in table 3 below, the perceptions of respondents on housing provision/delivery in study area with the weighted mean values of 4.00, 3.99, 3.92, 3.90, 3.77, 3.65, 3.47, 3.35, 3.14 and 22.8. Therefore, by ranking, the reason for poor housing delivery in the study area are: lengthy administrative procedure of securing title documents, the people were not part of the planning process of housing schemes, provision of housing is directed to the “middle and high-income” group, poor economic situation, more involvement of private sector, regulatory approval process hinders effective housing delivery, the problem of taxes and fees on housing provision and development in Nigeria is huge, inadequate housing finance mechanisms targeting the urban poor, unavailability and high price of land and government inefficiency in the provision of low cost housing, respectively.

It is, therefore crystal clear that the major reasons for poor housing provision/delivery in the study area are: lengthy administrative procedure of securing title documents, people were not part of the planning process of most housing schemes, housing provision is directed alone to the “middle and high-income” groups and poor economic situation. This further has adverse effects on the liveability pattern of the residents.

Table 3: Perceptions of respondents on housing provision/delivery

Questionnaire parameters	SD	DA	N	A	SA	WTM	±STD	Rank
Lengthy administrative procedure of securing title documents deterred housing delivery	2(2.2%)	8(8.7%)	10(10.9%)	40(43.5%)	32(34.8%)	4.00	1.005	1 st
The people were not part of the planning process of housing schemes	3(3.3%)	10(10.9%)	8(8.7%)	35(38.0%)	36(39.1%)	3.99	1.104	2 nd
Provision of housing is directed to the “middle and high-income” group	6(6.5%)	2(2.2%)	21(22.8%)	27(29.3%)	36(39.1%)	3.92	1.141	3 rd
Poor economic situation bedevilled housing development	4(4.3%)	12(13.0%)	10(10.9%)	29(31.5%)	37(40.2%)	3.90	1.196	4 th
Involvement of private sector to boost housing delivery in Ogun state	2(2.2%)	14(15.2%)	12(13.0%)	39(42.4%)	25(27.2%)	3.77	1.080	5 th
Regulatory approval process hinders effective housing delivery	2(2.2%)	15(16.3%)	18(19.6%)	35(38.0%)	22(23.9%)	3.65	1.084	6 th
The problem of taxes and	5(5.4%)	18(19.6%)	13(14.1%)	41(44.6%)	15(16.3%)	3.47	1.143	7 th

fees on housing provision and development in Nigeria is huge

Inadequate housing finance mechanisms targeting the urban poor	7(7.6%)	13(14.1%)	27(29.3%)	31(33.7%)	14(15.2%)	3.35	1.133	8 th
Land unavailability and high price of land	16(17.4%)	21(22.8%)	6(6.5%)	32(34.8%)	17(18.5%)	3.14	1.419	9 th
Government inefficiency in the provision of low cost housing	39(42.4%)	14(15.2%)	20(21.7%)	12(13.0%)	7(7.6%)	2.28	1.337	10 th
Valid N (listwise)	92							

KEY:SD= strongly disagreed, DA= disagreed, N= neutral, A= agreed, SA= strongly agreed, WTM= Weighted Mean and STD= Standard Deviation; SD = 1, DA = 2, N = 3, A = 4, SA = 5

Source: Authors' Field Work, (2021)

5. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

From the foregoing, this study x-rayed the shortcoming of previous policies by government to address housing provision/delivery, especially to the urban poor in Nigeria, with special focus on Ifo local government area of Ogun state. Despite government's inability to meet the housing need, the low-income group have not been able to access housing in some form. However, the rate and scale of housing provision and supply is minimal compared to the housing need, thereby leading to a high deficit. Essentially, findings from the analysis revealed that the major reasons for poor housing provision/delivery in the study area are: lengthy administrative procedure of securing title documents, failure to involve people during the planning process of most housing schemes, directing housing provision alone to the "middle and high-income" class and poor economic situation of the country. However, in view of the aforementioned, this study highlighted the following recommendations:

- i. Government should swiftly intervene by initiating housing reforms and provide incentives that will expand the scope of delivery of housing co-operatives for all income groups.
- ii. It is essential that equality and fairness in terms of access to housing be pivotal in the implementation of the housing policy particularly with respect to gender, youth, age, indigent, physical disability and socio-economic status.
- iii. Government should rally the related organisations, institutions and agencies to make available motivations, such as land use restructurings, grants, building materials cost discount programmes and tax reduction status that will ensure increased housing provision in the appropriate price bracket.
- iv. The CBN, FMBN, Housing Finance Professionals Association of Nigeria (HOFPAN) and Mortgage Bankers Association of Nigeria (MBAN) should gear up collaborations for Capacity building and knowledge gap to institutionalise training leading to the certification of professionals in the mortgage and housing finance sectors.
- v. Housing microfinance should provide small, short-term loans to match step-by-step housing construction that the lower-income group can pay for.
- vi. Government and other stakeholders should ensure the people are integral part of the planning process of any housing program, to ensure its functionality and success.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, A. A. (2005). Sustainable construction in Africa. *Agenda 21 positional paper*.
- Adegeye, A. S., and Dittoh, J. S. (1985). *Essentials of agricultural economics impact*. Ibadan: Publishers Nigeria Limited.
- Agbola, T. (1987). Institutional constraints on housing development: The urban areas of Nigeria, the landuse decree and the building plan approval process. *Habitat International*, 11(2), 113–120.
- Agbola, T. (1998): The Housing of Nigerians: A Review of Policy Development and Implementation. *Research Report*, 14, Development Policy Centre, Ibadan.
- Agbola, T. and Olatubara, C. O. (2003). Private sector driven housing delivery (in Nigeria): Issues, constraints, challenges and prospects. A *lead paper* presented at the 2nd annual national workshop on private sector driven housing delivery in Nigeria, University of Lagos, Lagos, 30th–3rd July.
- Ajanlekoko, J. A. (2001). Sustainable housing development in Nigeria. The financial and infrastructural implication presented at the international conference on spatial information for sustainable development, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Akinlusi, A. (2007). Mortgage facilities; a Panacea for mass housing development. A *paper* presented at Nigerian Institute of Building conference, Lagos, November, 13. 9–16.
- Aluko, B. T. (2002). Urban housing for low income earners in cities of Lagos state: The land question: *Proceedings* of a national conference on the city in Nigeria, faculty of environmental designs and management, ObafemiAwolowo University,. 288–294.
- Anugwom, E. E. (2005). Privatization of workers housing provision: The national housing fund scheme in Nigeria for African training and research centre in administration for development.
- Aribigbola, A. (2008). Housing policy formulation in developing countries: Evidence of programme implementation from Akure, Ondo State Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 23(2), 125–134. Kamla-Raj.
- Bichi K. M. (1997). Housing finance in the context of vision 2010. *Housing Today*. *Journal of the Housing Cooperation of Nigeria*, 4, 30–35.
- Central Bank of Nigeria (2008). *Annual report*.
- Chamberlain, S. P. (2005). Ameliorating housing deficit in Nigeria. The Role of Primary and Secondary Mortgage Institutions and the Capital Market.
<http://nigeriaworld.com/feature/publication/peterside/072005.html>.
- Daramola, S. A. (2004). Private Public participation in Housing delivery in Nigeria. *Paper* presented at a business luncheon organised the Royal Institute of Surveyors (RIS) in Chinese restaurant, Palmgroove, Lagos. 15, April, 2004.

- Ebie, S. P. (2004). Statutory component(s) on housing policy; legislative and regulatory requirements of the new housing policy. *Housing Today*, 4(8), 6–9.
- Enuenwosu, C. E. (1985). The federal mortgage bank of Nigeria: Its objectives and future prospects. *Central Bank of Nigeria Bullion July–September, 1985*. 20–25.
- Falegan, S. B. (1980). Problems and prospects of the federal mortgage bank of Nigeria. *Central Bank of Nigeria Bullion April–June, 1980*. (pp. 32–36).
- Fasakin, J. O. (1998). Cooperative housing; the concept, experience and applicability to Nigeria's socio economic milieu'. Seminar paper presented at the Federal University of Technology, Akure.
- Federal Government of Nigeria. (2004). National housing policy draft, Abuja.
- Federal Office of Statistics. (1983). *Social statistics in Nigeria*. Lagos: FOS.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1991). National housing policy federal ministry of works and housing.
- Igbinoba, R. (2009). Investment Opportunities in Housing Development in Africa. Pison Housing Company Ltd. IGICA International Conference, Abuja, Nigeria. *Book of Proceeding*. 178–184. <http://www.kfint.com/igica/files/IGICA%20Proceedings>.
- Jibril, I. (2009). Squatter resettlement/relocation programme in Abuja, Nigeria and the issue of land title security. *FIG Conference paper Eilat, Isreal*.
- Kihato, M. (2009). Scoping the Demand for Housing Microfinance in Africa: Status, Opportunities and Challenges (December 3, 2009). Finmark Trust. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1517715> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1517715.68>
- Makinde O. O. (2013). Housing delivery system need and demand. *Environ Dev Sustain* 16:49–69.
- Mabogunje, A. L. (2003). The new mass housing and urban development policy: Social and economic impact. Being text of a public service *lecture* delivered to the top echelons of the federal civil service. Abuja, Nigeria. September 30.
- Mabogunje, A. (2004). Housing delivery problems in Nigeria. *Punch*, Wednesday, May, 2002.
- Moser C.A., Kalton G. (1971). *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. Heinemann Educational, UK (1971).
- National Bureau of Statistics. (2007): The middle class in Nigeria; analysis of profile, determinants and characteristics (1980–2007).
- Nubi, O. T. (2000). Housing finance in Nigeria: Need for Re-engineering. Ideal Habitat Cooperative Housing Initiative. Available at www.housingfinance.org/pdfstorage/Africa. Accessed 14 July 2012.
- Nubi, O. T. (2008). Affordable housing delivery in Nigeria; The South African Foundation *International Conference* and exhibition. Cape Town, .1–18.

- Nubi, T. O., and Omirin, M. M. (2007). The role of primary mortgage institutions in housing delivery. *Housing finance international*, 21(5), 52–56.
- Okonkwo, O. (1999). *Mortgage Finance in Nigeria*. Esquire Press Limited.
- Okupe, O. (2002). Problem of real estate developers in Nigeria. A paper presented at a workshop organised by the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors. Abuja.
- Olayiwola, L. M. (2005). Public housing delivery in Nigeria: Problems and challenges. A paper presented at the ‘World congress on housing transforming housing environments through the design’ September, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Olomolaiye. (1999). Rural housing in Nigeria; concept, problems and functional approach. *Journal of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners*, IV and V, 20–30.
- Olutah A. O. (1997). The house: Accessibility and development - A critical evaluation of the Nigerian situation: *Proceedings of National symposia on Housing in Nigeria*; Obafemi Awolowo University Ile Ife., 312–317.
- Omole, F. K. (2001). *Basic issues in housing development*. Ondo: Femo Bless Publishers.
- Pison Housing Company. (2010). Overview of the housing finance sector in Nigeria. Commissioned by EFInA and FinMark, Finmark Trust . 1. 15–20).
- Raji, O. (2008). Public and private developers as agents in urban housing delivery in sub-Saharan Africa. The situation in Lagos state. *Humanity of Social Sciences Journal*, 3(2), 143–150.
- UN Habitat. (2001). National Trend in Housing Production Practices Nigeria: United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. 4. 60–69. <http://www.chs.ubc.ca/archives/files/HS-313.pdf>.
- Urban development Policies in Nigeria. (1988). Planning, housing and land policy. A report of the Centre for Economic Research on Africa. December, 2008, pp. 1–12.
- Vuyisani, M. (2003). Preview of housing finance systems in four different African countries: South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana and Tanzania.
- World Bank. (2000). *Nigeria financial Sector Review 3: Non-Bank Financial Institutions and Markets*.