CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Role of Public–Private Partnerships in the Delivery of Affordable Housing in Lagos State, Nigeria

A. O. Ogunkoya, J. O. Akinyele

Department of Civil Engineering, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Published November 2026

Abstract

This study examined the role of Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) in providing affordable housing in Lagos State, Nigeria. The analysis was restricted to the first objective of a broader survey of PPP housing delivery. A quantitative survey was conducted among housing-development professionals and stakeholders across Ikorodu, Kosofe, Lagos Island, Eti-Osa and Ibeju-Lekki. Of 600 questionnaires distributed, 500 valid responses were obtained, representing an 83.3% response rate. Twelve indicators of the perceived role of PPPs were analysed using mean scores, relative importance indices and rankings. Respondents rated the contribution of PPPs to housing-sector growth highest (mean = 4.38), followed by improved project financing and faster housing delivery (4.36 each), and sustainable urban housing development (4.35). Conversely, the direct increase in housing delivery (1.37), encouragement of private investment (1.73) and improved access to land (2.36) received comparatively low scores. The results suggest a gap between the perceived enabling contributions of PPPs and their direct housing-supply outcomes. The study concluded that PPPs provide valuable financing, coordination and development mechanisms but require stronger land-access arrangements, private-sector participation and performance monitoring to translate these benefits into affordable housing units.

Keywords: Affordable housing; housing delivery; Public–Private Partnerships; project financing

1 Introduction

Affordable housing presents challenges in rapidly urbanising cities where the demand for suitable dwelling exceeds the scope of traditional delivery arrangements. Lagos State is under continual pressure due to urban population growth, land limitation, infrastructure requirements and the cost of development. Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) have accordingly been viewed as a way of engaging capital, expertise and implementation capability in the housing sector (Ibem, 2011; Olatunji and Olusanya, 2022).

PPPs are agreements between public authorities, and private organisations, in which both parties take on roles regarding a particular infrastructure or service. In housing, the public sector may provide land, infrastructure, policy support and regulatory coordination, while private partners offer finance, technical expertise and construction capacity. This may yield benefits such as better resource mobilization, project coordination and delivery acceleration, depending on contract and risk structuring (Grimsey and Lewis, 2004; Hodge and Greve, 2017).

The relevance of PPPs to affordable housing is not determined by the volume of development initiatives taken. A partnership may enhance a project's financing or construction, but not produce housing that is available to target low- and middle-income households. Literature on Nigerian

housing policy indicates the need to separate an institution's promise from its housing outcome (Ibem, 2011; Adewale & Babalola, 2023).

Land availability and the cost of servicing its development are also central to PPP housing delivery. Developers may experience delays in land acquisition, planning approval and infrastructure provision. These may limit the effectiveness of private capital, even where partnership arrangements enhance coordination. Research on Nigerian implementation of PPP has also discussed financing and institutional challenges on the scale and continuity of housing projects (Ahmed et al., 2023; Hussain and Alabi, 2024).

Another important consideration is the difference between a housing-sector growth and an affordable housing supply growth. Investment, project initiation and growth of development institutions may indicate a more active housing market, but these developments do not resolve affordability and supply deficits. Hence, an assessment of specific roles attributed to PPPs is necessary to identify what partnerships perform well and where their contribution is limited (Okeke and Eze, 2023; Ezekiel et al., 2024).

The study explored the role of PPPs in the provision of affordable housing in Lagos State. Unlike the overall assessment of all dimensions of performance of a PPP, this paper addresses only the first objective of a larger study. Twelve role indicators relating to financing, housing-sector growth, speed of delivery, collaboration, innovation, sustainability, access to land and direct housing supply were considered. The findings are discussed in relation to the literature and their implications on policy and construction project management.

1.1 Statement of the research problem

Despite the adoption of PPP arrangements in housing development, it is uncertain if the benefits perceived by industry stakeholders translate into a significant increase in affordable housing delivery. Discussions often stress access to private finance, faster execution and better coordination, while the direct role of partnerships in housing supply is less clear. This distinction is important as successful mobilization of investment and expertise is not equivalent to delivering sufficient affordable dwellings. Hence, the study explored stakeholder assessments of specific roles performed by PPPs in Lagos State, identifying areas of relative strength and weakness.

2 Literature review

2.1 Concept of Public–Private Partnerships in housing

Public–Private Partnerships combines public responsibilities with private finance, construction and management expertise. Their organisational forms vary depending on the allocation of development responsibilities, financial exposure, land rights and operating obligations. Grimsey and Lewis (2004) stressed the significance of contractual design and financing in infrastructure partnerships; Hodge and Greve (2017) stressed performance evaluation against public objectives. Applied to housing, these observations suggest that merely having a PPP arrangement is not evidence of affordable housing output.

2.2 PPPs and housing financing

The financial role of PPPs is in its potential to supplement limited public budgets and project investment. Financing mechanisms can improve a project's ability to start or complete, but their

affordability outcomes depend on the cost of capital, payment structures and obligations assigned to private partners. Ahmed et al. (2023) discussed the opportunities and constraints of partnership-based housing finance in Nigeria; Hussain and Alabi (2024) explored financing and risk-allocation considerations. These present a basis for assessing respondents' views on the financing contribution of PPPs.

2.3 PPPs, delivery efficiency and collaboration

PPPs can create mechanisms that coordinate land, design, construction, finance and approvals across public and private institutions. This coordination may reduce delays and enable the use of specialised project expertise. Despite this potential, contractual complexity, weak institutional capacity and uncertainty on responsibilities can constrain implementation (Johnson and Otunola, 2024). The need to examine delivery efficiency separately from direct housing supply is evident; faster delivery on an individual project may co-exist with a limited overall expansion of affordable housing.

2.4 Land access, innovation and sustainable housing

Land availability and site infrastructure strongly influence the feasibility of housing development. Public participation can help address acquisition and planning constraints; private-sector expertise can introduce construction methods intended to improve efficiency. Adewale and Babalola (2023) considered the policy environment for PPP housing; Olatunji and Olusanya (2022) discussed the prospects and challenges of housing delivery through partnerships. The extent to which these potential contributions are realised needs empirical examination.

2.5 Empirical perspective and research gap

Ibem (2011) examined the policy and practice of PPP housing provision in Nigeria, highlighting the context in which collaborative delivery arrangements emerged. Ezekiel et al. (2024) considered PPP housing development in Lagos, including affordability and access concerns. Although the literature presents important contextual insight, the relative performance of different PPP roles cannot simply be assumed uniform. Hence, this manuscript evaluates twelve indicators from the Lagos survey to distinguish highly rated enabling roles from weakly rated direct supply outcomes.

3 Methodology

The study employed a quantitative cross-sectional survey design. The study area encompassed Ikorodu, Kosofe, Lagos Island, Eti-Osa and Ibeju-Lekki Local Government Areas of Lagos State. Respondents were professionals and stakeholders involved with housing development and PPP projects. Purposive and stratified sampling procedures were used. A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed and 500 valid questionnaires returned, giving a response rate of 83.3%.

The analysis was limited to the twelve questionnaire statements measuring respondents' perception of the role of PPPs in affordable housing delivery. Responses were summarised using mean scores, relative importance indices (RII) and rankings. For the five-point scale, RII values corresponded to the mean divided by five. No inferential test or causal estimate was reported for these indicators. Hence, findings are interpreted as respondents' ratings, not independent project-output measures.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Role of Public–Private Partnerships in providing affordable housing

This section presents the findings on the role of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) in providing affordable housing. The analysis examines respondents' perceptions of the contributions of PPPs to housing delivery, affordability and accessibility. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Role of Public–Private Partnerships in providing affordable housing (n = 500).

S/N	Statement	Mean	RII	Ranking
1	PPPs have increased housing delivery in Lagos State.	1.37	0.274	12th
2	PPP arrangements encourage private sector investment in housing development.	1.73	0.346	11th
3	PPPs improve access to land for housing projects.	2.36	0.472	10th
4	PPPs enhance housing infrastructure development.	2.99	0.598	9th
5	PPPs contribute to reducing housing deficits in Lagos State.	3.55	0.710	8th
6	PPPs improve project financing for housing developments.	4.36	0.872	2nd
7	PPPs facilitate faster housing project delivery.	4.36	0.872	2nd
8	PPPs improve collaboration between government and private developers.	4.15	0.830	5th
9	PPPs encourage innovation in housing development.	4.14	0.828	6th
10	PPPs support sustainable urban housing development.	4.35	0.870	4th
11	PPPs improve the availability of affordable housing units.	3.94	0.788	7th
12	PPPs contribute significantly to housing sector growth in Lagos State.	4.38	0.876	1st
	Grand Mean / Average RII	3.48	0.695	

Note: RII = mean/5; five-point scale.

4.2 Interpretation of the findings

PPPs were rated most favourably for their contribution to housing-sector growth, with a mean of 4.38 and RII of 0.876. This result suggests that respondents associated partnerships with broader development activity in the Lagos housing sector. It does not, however, establish the number of additional affordable units produced. The distinction between perceived sector growth and measurable housing output is important when assessing public-policy effectiveness.

Improved project financing and faster housing project delivery both recorded means of 4.36 (RII = 0.872), sharing second position. The findings indicate that respondents recognised the ability of partnerships to mobilise financial and technical resources and facilitate project implementation. This is consistent with the financing and institutional rationale discussed by Grimsey and Lewis (2004) and Ahmed et al. (2023). However, the study did not compare actual project schedules or financing costs between PPP and non-PPP developments.

Support for sustainable urban housing development recorded a mean of 4.35 (RII = 0.870), followed by improved government–developer collaboration (4.15; RII = 0.830) and encouragement of innovation (4.14; RII = 0.828). These responses suggest that partnerships were regarded as useful organisational mechanisms for bringing stakeholders together and facilitating improvements in housing

development practice. The results accord with the view that institutional coordination is central to PPP performance (Hodge and Greve, 2017; Johnson and Otunola, 2024).

Improved availability of affordable housing units was rated at 3.94 (RII = 0.788), while contribution to reducing housing deficits received 3.55 (RII = 0.710). These moderate-to-favourable scores were nevertheless below those for financing, speed and sector growth. The difference suggests that the perceived benefits of PPPs may be more evident in the delivery process than in the scale of housing available to households. It also reinforces concerns raised in the literature about the relationship between partnership activity and affordability outcomes (Ibem, 2011; Okeke and Eze, 2023).

The lowest ratings concerned improved access to land (2.36; RII = 0.472), encouragement of private-sector investment (1.73; RII = 0.346) and direct increases in housing delivery (1.37; RII = 0.274). These findings are particularly significant because they qualify the more positive assessments of financing and growth. Respondents could simultaneously view PPPs as helpful for financing individual schemes while perceiving insufficient expansion of private investment and total housing supply. The findings should not be treated as contradictory: the indicators capture distinct dimensions of performance.

The overall mean of 3.48 and average RII of 0.695 indicate a mixed assessment across the twelve indicators. Strong ratings for several enabling functions were offset by low ratings for direct housing supply, investment stimulation and land access. Since the survey measured stakeholder perceptions, these findings cannot establish that PPPs caused any particular change in the quantity or affordability of housing delivered. They nevertheless identify priorities for further project-level evaluation.

4.3 Discussion in relation to existing literature

The prominence of project financing and delivery speed supports the established rationale for PPP arrangements as mechanisms for combining public authority with private resources. Ibem (2011) discussed the emergence of PPPs within the constraints of conventional Nigerian housing provision. Similarly, Olatunji and Olusanya (2022) identified partnership arrangements as a possible response to challenges in housing delivery. The present findings refine this argument by showing that stakeholders assigned higher ratings to financing and delivery processes than to direct increases in housing supply.

The low rating for private-sector investment is notable because investment mobilisation is commonly presented as a central advantage of PPPs. The result may indicate that the existence of a partnership framework is insufficient to overcome commercial risks or institutional obstacles faced by investors. Hussain and Alabi (2024) discussed the importance of financing structures and risk allocation, while Johnson and Otunola (2024) addressed regulatory and institutional challenges. The survey results do not establish which obstacle is responsible, but they indicate that investment participation warrants more focused investigation.

The low assessment of land access likewise suggests that public-sector participation has not necessarily resolved the practical difficulties of assembling and servicing sites for housing development. Land is a foundational input into housing delivery, and delays or costs associated with access can constrain project feasibility. The finding highlights the need for stronger links between PPP policy and land-administration processes (Adewale & Babalola, 2023).

Finally, the gap between sector growth and direct housing delivery suggests that performance frameworks should distinguish investment activity, construction efficiency and actual affordable

housing outputs. A project may be completed more quickly without substantially changing the affordability or quantity of units available to lower-income households. Future assessments would therefore benefit from verified project completion records, unit prices, beneficiary income data and comparisons with alternative procurement models (Ezekiel et al., 2024; Okeke and Eze, 2023).

5 Conclusion and recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

The study examined the role of Public–Private Partnerships in providing affordable housing in Lagos State using the first-objective data from a survey of 500 respondents. PPPs received strong ratings for housing-sector growth, project financing, faster delivery, sustainable urban housing development, collaboration and innovation. However, respondents rated direct increases in housing delivery, stimulation of private investment and improved land access substantially lower. The findings therefore suggest that the perceived institutional and financial benefits of PPPs have not translated uniformly into the expansion of affordable housing supply. Because the evidence consists of stakeholder ratings, the findings describe perceptions rather than measured causal effects on housing output.

5.2 Recommendations

1. Lagos State agencies should establish measurable housing-output targets in PPP agreements, including completed units, delivery dates and affordability criteria, so that sector growth can be assessed against actual supply outcomes.
2. Government should improve access to suitable, serviced land through transparent allocation procedures, early infrastructure planning and clear development responsibilities for public and private partners.
3. PPP frameworks should be strengthened to attract credible private investment through predictable approvals, transparent procurement and appropriate allocation of financial and construction risks.
4. Project monitoring should distinguish financing mobilisation and construction speed from the actual delivery and affordability of completed units. Future studies should use verified project records to test the relationships suggested by the survey.

References

[1] Adewale M, Babalola A (2023). Public–Private Partnerships and housing policy reforms in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction and Urban Development*, 9(1), 34–52.

[2] Ahmed A, Dogara S, Saleh M (2023). Financing affordable housing through public-private partnerships in Nigeria: Opportunities and constraints. *Journal of Housing Policy and Research*, 15(2), 45–63.

[3] Ezekiel F, Folashade O, Abdulrasheed A (2024). Evaluating affordability and access in PPP housing projects in Lagos. *Journal of Housing Studies in Africa*, 7(2), 112–135.

[4] Grimsey D, Lewis MK (2004). Public–private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance. *Edward Elgar Publishing*, Cheltenham.

[5] Hodge G, Greve C (2017). Public-private partnerships: An international performance review. *Public Administration Review*, 77(4), 553–565.

[6] Hussain M, Alabi T (2024). Risk allocation and financing structures in Public–Private Partnership housing projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Infrastructure Finance and Policy*, 6(1), 55–72.

[7] Ibem E (2011). Public-private partnerships in housing provision in Nigeria: Policy, practice, and prospects. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 26(2), 123–138.

[8] Johnson A, Otunola B (2024). Institutional and regulatory challenges in implementing PPP housing projects in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Development*, 12(1), 89–107.

[9] Okeke C, Eze U (2023). Affordability concerns in PPP-led housing developments in Lagos State. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment in Africa*, 5(2), 66–83.

[10] Olatunji AO, Olusanya CA (2022). Public–private partnership and housing delivery in Nigeria: Challenge and prospects. *Journal of Construction and Project Management*, 14(2), 45–60.