Housing Flexibility in Abuja Federal Capital Territory: Feedback for Policy and Practice

*UNAH, M. O.¹, IBRAHIM, Y. B.² and MAKERA, I. U.³

 ^{1, 2} Department of Architecture, Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Bayero University Kano
 ^{3.} Department of Architecture, Waziri Umaru Federal Polytechnic Birini Kebbi
 *Corresponding author: unahkay@yahoo.com

Abstract

Housing flexibility and it determinant used of space transformation in domestic household has been on the rise in residential housing, and the Apo scheme resettlement scheme of the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) Abuja is used as an empirical study. The possibility of using the external space of this dwelling configuration in multiple ways are determined by the flexible nature of the various prototypes. The modification and adoption to sustainable changing requirements of this functional housing are more present lately, as most occupant have taken the advantage in proving multiple design dwelling. The aim of this research is to appraise the validity of housing flexibility by determinacy as an architectural response to social-economic changes in housing need in Abuja. The core of this study uses both qualitative and quantitative techniques of data analysis, and were presented using the relevant descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The study finds out that most of the occupants expressed satisfaction with the flexibility nature of the houses by providing more living spaces either by connecting with more interior dwelling units or by means of attaching extra residences (family) units. It recommends with a view to its introduction in future housing developments policy has been carried by Government in recent time.

Keywords: Apo-Abuja, Housing flexibility; Resettlement scheme; Transformation; Spatial Determinacy.

Introduction

The establishment of Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja in 1976 enacted the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) with the responsibility of planning, developing the city with it infrastructures, and subsequently managing it growth (International Planning Associates IPA, 1979). This development brought about the displacement of indigenous aborigine resettlement housing inhabitant and schemes. The government of Mallam Nasir Ahmed El Rufai as the minister of Federal Capital Territory (FCT) in 2005 commenced the construction of resettlement houses, with Apo being a pilot project. The delivery of large scale proto-type core housing scheme in the Federal Capitals City and it satellite towns have been existing government policies and practices that had supported the public housing approach in housing delivery system in the FCT. FCDA in its technical known –how has designed and supervised this housing prototypes with it intending flexible for change, which allows the occupant / residents carry out transformation of their dwelling units.

Although, this residential building lacked adequate use of spaces to accommodate large family, but has the predetermine function of spatial determinacy configuration flexibility of defining the use of the domestic spaces to carter for features and the growing variety of user needs. Schneider and Till (2007) as cited in Agatangelo (2015) posit "flexible housing as housing that can adjust to changing needs and patterns, both social and technological". This changing needs can be personal, practical or technological, and the changing patterns may be demographic, economic or environmental. This needs according to Tipple et al. (2004) changes as result of housing transformation carried out in the form of alterations, extension, modification, or addition to the original forms, extent and patterns of their buildings including their immediate environment carried out by the residents after allotment. Adegbehingbe (2012) opined transformation of houses as a common determinant in government housing estates across Nigeria, which posit Apo resettlement housing scheme as one of such case to deal with.

Aduwo and Ibem (2017) posit housing flexibility as the transform-ability of housing that involved physical and spatial alteration or addition, modification or extension of any part of existing residential building or its immediate surroundings by the residents. The constant modification of this resettlement housing scheme (Unah, 2022). Amongst other needs has contributed to the deserved changed in housing skyline with it rapid expansion which has continue to increase social needs and density of the built environment (Unah, 2019). It can take the forms of materials or space alteration/ addition or both. This definition is used in this study as opt by Groák (1992) that define housing flexibility by modifying the physical form of the building; by joining, splitting, extending, and merging spaces. Therefore, the biggest challenge in the built environment today is the rapidly changing needs and requirements carried out on buildings as a flexible structure and spatial configuration to be able to meet rapidly changing demands (Estaji, 2017).

It was on this premise that this study is set to fill the gap that currently exists in housing literature by appraised housing flexibility in Apo resettlement scheme Abuja. The specific objectives of the study were to: (a) examine each housing floor plan topology as modified by the users, (b) Identify the type of transformation carried out in the different zones of the layout and what type of building Structures where transformed.

Literature Review

Housing flexibility usually occurs in buildings used in whose spatial configuration has been studies in the past. Nguluma (2003), posit housing flexibility as the transformation of houses basically to address the changes and embrace the variables of physical alterations, extension and possibly renewal of part or whole of buildings. However, Unah (2022) study aver evidence on the housing-related changed attributes preferred by the homeowner's modification and the needed housing transformation taking place has been envisaging by the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) and this development has harness and improved the quality of life for the residents of the area. The concept of flexibility in the context of architectural housing is introduced under two topics: this as posited by Schneider & Till, (2007) "evolving conditions of the vernacular" and the "external pressures that have prompted housing designers and providers to develop alternative design solutions, including flexible housing". Hill (2003) opined that flexibility has many meaning nuances, but that it originally refers to the accommodation of changing relationships between events, contexts, and the use of space, while (Albostan, 2009) claimed that flexibility either evolves and improves from the experience of traditional tendencies in housing design or appears as a new design tendency which follows the outward forces of the twentieth century.

Housing flexibility is identified as a planning choice in the design phase of domestic architecture; either both in terms of construction and social use, or designed for change over its lifetime. Flexibility as widely accepted in today's social housing is an issue that has been considered on different levels to be a solution to housing needs (Seyed et al., 2015). Although, throughout eastern architecture, the designing of flexible floor plans has been experimented since 1920, particularly the Netherlands which has a long and ongoing tradition to which great architects such as Rietveld, Stam, Van Doesburg, Van den Broek, Van Tijen, Habraken, Hertzberger and Van Eyck made their innovative contributions (Seyed et al., 2015). Arjmandi, Tahir, Che-Ani, Abdullah, & Usman (2010) posit flexibility as a feature of creating different types of space for different functions; which implies that these houses intend to fulfil inhabitants' requirements in accordance with their lifestyle that increases their general satisfaction (Zandiyeh, Mehdi; Eghbali, Seyed rahman; Hesari, 2012).

Housing flexibility is a dwelling layout configuration that offers the in-built opportunity for adaptability that required changing patterns, both socially and technically. Aduwo and Ibem (2017), Aduwo, Ibem, and Opoko (2013) opt the adjustments may take different forms such as revision of housing needs and aspirations or improvement of housing conditions into conformity with users' aspirations or needs and adaptation. These changing demands may be technological (e.g. the updating of old services), practical (e.g. the onset of old age) or personal (e.g. an expanding family). The changing patterns might be demographic, environmental or economic ones. Hence, flexible housing undertakes all of the housing development process enabling different physical arrangements. Schneider & Till (2005) opted that the incorporation of flexibility into housing design allows architects the illusion of designing their control over the building in the future, beyond the period of their actual responsibility for it flexibility in domestic architecture allows its' inhabitants to take part in the design process of the different possibilities of using their living space. Flexibility, as a helpful and effective method, has been utilized in different architecture spaces to reach functional efficiency. It has a comprehensive function in architecture that can be defined by open plans and sections, and by portable and changeable elements. Flexibility as an initial solution, in today's modern social housing, is a subject that has been employed in different levels throughout different time periods. The Dutch architect Hertzberger (1991) posit that when flexibility became

the catchword, it was the panacea to cure all of the illnesses of architecture.

Material and Methods

Abuja the Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory (FCT) is located in the middle of the country with a land area of about 8,000 km2 of which the actual city (i.e. Municipal) occupies 250sq km. The federal capital territory is bounded on the North by Kaduna state, on the West by Niger state on the East and South-east by plateau state, and on the south-west by Kogi state. It lies within latitude 90 25'N and 90 20'N of the equator and longitude 50 45'E and 70 39'E [16]. It was created in Abuja on 3rd Feb.1976 through the promulgated Federal Capital Territory decree no. 6, 1976 mainly due to the growing unsuitability of Lagos as Nigeria's Federal Capital City as result of the problem of peripheral location, dual and conflicting role as both federal and state capital, acute shortage of land space for and inadequacies expansion. for infrastructural development among other reasons since the late 1960's. This paper covers Apo resettlement scheme as a housing dwelling in Abuja, which comprises of five (5) zones, A, B, C, D and E (figure 2). This 5 zone entirely make up the total 876 housing units situated on the 400 hectares (Table 1). The resettlement scheme accommodates 877 units of residential houses (FCDA, 2017). This comprises 384 units of one-bedroom bungalow apartments, 398 units of twobedroom bungalow apartments, 90 units of three and 4 units of four bedroom detached bungalows for the resettlement of three communities that were displaced.

The study uses both qualitative and quantitative techniques, where data were sourced using well-structured questionnaire, observation schedule walk-through and sketching of the floor plan of the buildings. A total of 250 questionnaires representing about 28.51% of the total number of 876 housing units in the resettlement scheme were administered to respondents from each of the 5 zones. A total of 186 questionnaires (74.40%) were retrieved and used as valid response. Likert scale was used to rate

residents' perception on a four-point scale, adequately provided=4, provided=3, fairly provided=2 and not provided=1. Each response was coded as follow: Not significant = 1, Less significant = 2, and =3 and Most significant =4 are scale used to determine degree of significant impact of respondents with building transformation (see Table 3). Data were presented using the relevant descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The sum of Weight Mean, Standard Deviation and Relatively Important Index (R.I.I) were analysis and ranked accordingly. Thus: Relative Importance Index (R. I. I.) (3n3+2n2+1n1)/3N.

Each coded response was multiplied by number of respondents, which gave the Weighted Value (WV). The Summation of the Weighted Values (Σ WV) was divided by number of respondents (n) to arrive at each component Mean Weighted Value (MWV). The Summation of the Weighted Values (Σ WV) was divided by number of respondents (n) to arrive at each component Mean Weighted Value (MWV). The Mean of Mean Weighted Value (MWV) was then obtained by dividing Summation of Mean Weighted Value (Σ MWV) by total number of infrastructure or building elements (y) surveyed in the study. This gave the overall conditions. Thus, MWV = Σ WV/n, where n = population of respondents. Overall condition = Mean of MWV = Σ MWV/y, y = total number of variables.

Table 1: show the housing scheme resettlement of three communities; Apo, Akpanjanya and Garki. The villagers were allocated their residential plots as distributed Garki Gbagyi (780), Gbagyi Hausa (450), and Apo (39) while Akpanjanya (201) plots respectively. The distribution of houses allocation also shows in Table 1: indicates that Garki Gbagyi (181), Gbagyi Hausa (102) Apo (21) while Akpanjanya (80) units of one (1) bedroom bungalow respectively. The same applied to two bedroom bungalows: Garki Gbagvi (226), Gbagyi Hausa (123), Apo (10) while Akpanjanya (40) units respectively. Three bedroom is evidences in same sequenc: Garki Gbagyi (48), Gbagyi Hausa (30) Apo while Akpanjanya (2)(90) units respectively.

| S/NO | Village | No of | Houses Allocation | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------|----------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | Name | Plot | 1 Bedroom | 2 Bdrm. | 3 Bdrm. | 4 Bdrm. | Total | | | | |
| | Garki Village | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Gbagyi | 780 | 181 | 226 | 48 | 1 | 456 | | | | |
| | Hausa | 456 1236 | 102 283 | 123 349 | 30 78 | 1 2 | 256 712 | | | | |
| 2 | Аро | 39 | 21 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 34 | | | | |
| 3 | Akpanjanya | 201 | 80 | 40 | 10 | 1 | 131 | | | | |
| 4 | Total | 1,476 | 384 | 399 | 90 | 4 | 877 | | | | |

Table 1: Houses Allocation at Apo Resettlement.

Source: Dept. of resettlement and Compensation (FCDA, 2017)



Figure 2: The Landuse plan of Apo resettlement scheme Source: Urban and Regional Planning Department FCDA, Abuja (2017).

| Village Allocatio | Zone | Roof identificatio | Questionn aires | Question naires | Housing Topologies | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|-----|------------------|---------|-------------------|----|--|--|
| n Name | | n | distribute | Retrieve | 1 Bedi | oom | 2 Bed | room | 3 Bedroom | | | |
| | | colour | d | d (%) | questionnair e giving collect | | questi e | ionnair | questionnair e | | | |
| | | | | | | | giving collec | ç t | giving collect | | | |
| Garki Gbagyi | А | Green roof | 70 | 47 (67.14) | 25 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 15 | 12 | | |
| | В | Average beige | 70 | 58 (82.86) | 25 | 21 | 30 | 27 | 15 | 10 | | |
| Gbagyi Hausa | С | Blue | 53 | 35 (66.04) | 20 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 10 | | |
| Аро | D | Green | 22 | 14 (63.63) | 10 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Akpanjan ya | Е | Average beige | 35 | 22 (62.86) | 15 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 2 | | |
| Total | | | 250 | 186 | 95 | 75 | 103 | 75 | 52 | 36 | | |

Table 2: Characteristics of the respondents who participated in the survey

Source: author field research 2019

NOTES: One Bedroom total questionnaires giving=95, Two Bedroom total questionnaires giving=103 3 Bedroom total questionnaires giving=52 (Total=250).

One Bedroom total questionnaires collect=75, Two Bedroom total questionnaires collect=75, Three Bedroom total questionnaires collect=36 (Total=186)

Study Findings

Adequate knowledge of the methods adopted by the resident to effect transformation is important in improving understanding of process involved in the alteration of the physical and spatial attributes of the housing adaptability investigated. Result in Table 2 shows the characteristics of the respondents who participated in the survey. The spatial distribution of the population occupying the resettlement scheme are analysis thus: Garki Gbagyi indigenes occupied Zone -A and B, which from the site inventory are provided with Green and average beige Aluminums Roof Covering sheet., Garki Hausa indigene occupied Zone -C, with Blue Aluminum Roofing sheet, Apo indigenes occupied zone D, with Green Roof while the indigene of Akpanjanya were settled at Zone E with Average beige roof identification. It is evident from this result that (186) representing around 74.40% of the respondents in the survey whose questionnaires were retrieve/collected and used for data analysis, while 64 respondents which is about 25.60% of them were not retrieved.

Discussion

Table 3A: the analysis of building structure transformation in core Garki Gbagyi Zone A and B of the resettlement housing, which involved in the alteration if the physical and attributes the spatial of housing determinacy. This was revealed in their order relative importance index as well as being interpreted according to Table 2: Guide to degree of significant impact of variable with most and less transformation. Table 3A,3Band 3C presented the respondents mean score for each variable was calculated as shown in table 3A and they decision on the variable was based on the range of score stated in the interpretation of the Likert scale of four (4). The variables were then ranked between 1st and 12th as shown in table 3A, 3B and 3c respectively.

Tropical Journal of the Built Environment (TJOBE) Vol. 3 No. 2 December 2022

| Degree of Significant Impact | Rating using Summation of Mean Weighted Value (ΣMWV) | Interpretation |
|------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Most significant | 0.80-0.89 | High present |
| significant | 0.60-0.79 | present |
| Less significant | 0.40-0.59 | less present |
| Less significant | 0.40-0.59 | less present |

Table 3: Guide to degree of interpretation

Source: Fieldwork survey, 2019.

| Table S.a. Dunung Su uctures Transformation |
|---|
|---|

| Ada | ptable Flexibility | GARKI GBAGYI | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|------------------|
| Variable 1: Building Structure Transformation | | | Rating HPI (x1) | g and V PI (x2) | Veighte MI (x3) | d Value NI (x4) | es SW | V MWV | Std. D. | R.I.I | Rank |
| 1 | Extra one bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 22 | 27 | 45 | 92 | 579 | 3.112 | 0.0167 | 0.778 | 2 ND |
| 2 | Modification of living room interior space | 186 | 54 | 42 | 38 | 52 | 460 | 2.473 | 0.0132 | 0.618 | 8 TH |
| 3 | Semi-detached self-contained | 186 | 15 | 25 | 48 | 101 | 613 | 3.295 | 0.0177 | 0.823 | 1 ST |
| 4 | Introduction of dining space interior | 186 | 39 | 54 | 61 | 32 | 458 | 2.462 | 0.0132 | 0.615 | 9 TH |
| 5 | Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 52 | 85 | 27 | 12 | 461 | 2.478 | 0.0133 | 0.619 | 7 TH |
| 6 | Extra one bdrm. interior introduction | 186 | 40 | 38 | 62 | 46 | 486 | 2.612 | 0.0140 | 0.653 | 4 TH |
| 7 | Modification of building facades | 186 | 20 | 84 | 40 | 42 | 476 | 2.559 | 0.0137 | 0.637 | 5 TH |
| 8 | Attached one-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 20 | 69 | 45 | 52 | 501 | 2.693 | 0.0144 | 0.673 | 3 RD |
| 9 | Attached two bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 32 | 61 | 56 | 37 | 470 | 2.526 | 0.0135 | 0.631 | 6 TH |
| 10 | Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction | 186 | 35 | 67 | 54 | 30 | 451 | 2.424 | 0.0130 | 0.606 | 10 TH |
| 11 | Modification of building entrances porch | 186 | 61 | 65 | 35 | 25 | 396 | 2.129 | 0.0114 | 0.532 | 11 TH |
| 12 | Modification of Roof | 186 | 70 | 81 | 25 | 4 | 347 | 1.865 | 0.0100 | 0.466 | 12 TH |

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

Table 3A, reveals that Semi-detached selfcontained was indicated as the most impact of adaptable housing flexibility being transformed on the study area with (MWV= 3.295) and ranked 1st (R. I. I. = 0.823) has degree of significant impact as "High Present". Extra one bedroom unit attachment (MWV=3.112) rank 2nd (R.I. I=0.778) Attached one-bedroom bungalow (MWV= 2.693) and ranked 3^{rd} (R. I. I. = 0.673), and while Extra one bdrm. interior introduction (MWV= 2.612) and ranked 4th (R. I. I. = 0.653) and Modification of building facades (MWV= 2.559) and ranked 5^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.637), Attached two bedroom unit attachment (MWV= 2.526) rank 6th (R.I. I=0.631), Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow (MWV= 2.559) and ranked 7th (R. I. I. = 0.619), Modification of living room interior space (MWV=2.473) rank 8th (R.I. I=0.618), Introduction of dining space interior (MWV= 2.462) and ranked 9th (R. I. I. = 0.615), Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction (MWV=2.424) rank 10th (R.I. I=0.606), has degree of significant impact as

"Present". Modification of building entrances porch (MWV= 2.129) rank 11^{th} (R.I. I=0.532) and Modification of Roof (MWV= 1.865) and ranked 12^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.466) has "less present" significant impact respectively.

Table 3B, indicated the most impact of adaptable housing flexibility being transformed on the study area with Modification of living room interior space (MWV= 3.322) and ranked 1st (R. I. I. = 0.830Semi-detached two-bedroom 2^{nd} bungalow (MWV=3.279) rank (R.I.I=0.819) has degree of significant impact as "high Present". Extra one bedroom unit attachment (MWV= 3.107) and ranked 3^{rd} (R. I. I. = 0.776), Introduction of dining space interior (MWV= 3.016) and ranked 4^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.754) Semi-detached self-contained (MWV= 2.897) and ranked 5th (R. I. I. =0.724), Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction (MWV= 2.860) rank 6th (R.I. I=0.715), Modification of building facades (MWV= 2.838) and ranked 7^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.709). Extra one bdrm. interior introduction (MWV=2,725) rank 8th (R.I. I=0.681), Attached one-bedroom bungalow (MWV= 2,688) and ranked 9^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.672). Attached two bedroom unit attachment (MWV=2.672) rank 10th (R.I. I=0.668), has degree of significant impact as "Present", while Modification of building entrances porch (MWV= 2.672) rank 11th (R.I. I=0.530) and Modification of Roof (MWV= 2.080) and ranked 12^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.520) has "less present" significant impact respectively.

Table 3C, Also indicated the most impact of adaptable housing flexibility being transformed on the study area with Modification of living room interior space (MWV= 3.580) and ranked 1st (R. I. I. = 0.895) Semi-detached two-bedroom 2^{nd} (MWV=3.494) rank bungalow (R.I.I=0.873) Extra one bdrm. interior introduction (MWV= 3.446) and ranked 3rd (R. I. I = 0.861) and Extra one bedroom unit attachment (MWV= 3.241) and ranked 4th (R. I. I. = 0.810) has degree of significant impact as " high Present". Other with significant impact as "Present" are: Semidetached self-contained (MWV= 3.139) and ranked 5th (R. I. I. =0.784).

Modification of building entrances porch (MWV= 2.838) rank 6th (R.I. I=0.709), Modification of building facades (MWV= 2.822) and ranked 7^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.705), one-bedroom Attached bungalow (MWV=2.784) rank 8th (R.I. I=0.696), Attached two bedroom unit attachment (MWV= 2.661) and ranked 9^{th} (R. I. I. = bdrm. 0.665), Extra two Interior introduction (MWV=2.494) rank 10th (R.I. I=0.623), Introduction of dining space interior (MWV= 3.564) rank 11th (R.I. I=0.564) and Modification of Roof (MWV= 2.247) and ranked 12^{th} (R. I. I. = 0.561). Akpanjanya located at zone E has the highest transformation of adaptable utilization of this spatial determinacy as shown in the table respectively.

Table 3b: Building Structures Transformation

| Ada | ptable Flexibility | | | | APO | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|-------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Vari | able 1: Building Structure Transformation | | Rat | ing and V | Veighted V | alues | SWV | MWV | Std. D | R.I.I | Rank |
| | | N | HPI (x1) | PI (x2) | MI (x3) | NI (x4) | | | | | |
| 1 | Extra one bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 18 | 30 | 52 | 86 | 578 | 3.107 | 0.0160 | 0.776 | 3 RD |
| 2 | Modification of living room interior space | 186 | 12 | 15 | 60 | 99 | 618 | 3.322 | 0.0178 | 0.830 | 1 ST |
| 3 | Semi-detached self-contained | 186 | 20 | 25 | 95 | 46 | 539 | 2.897 | 0.0557 | 0.724 | 5 TH |
| 4 | Introduction of dining space interior | 186 | 10 | 32 | 89 | 55 | 561 | 3.016 | 0.0162 | 0.754 | 4 TH |
| 5 | Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 18 | 25 | 30 | 113 | 610 | 3.279 | 0.0176 | 0.819 | 2^{ND} |
| 6 | Extra one bdrm. interior introduction | 186 | 25 | 35 | 92 | 34 | 507 | 2,725 | 0.0146 | 0.681 | 8 TH |
| 7 | Modification of building facades | 186 | 35 | 25 | 61 | 65 | 528 | 2.838 | 0.0152 | 0.709 | 7 TH |
| 8 | Attached one-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 30 | 52 | 50 | 54 | 500 | 2,688 | 0.0144 | 0.672 | 9 th |
| 9 | Attached two bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 25 | 45 | 82 | 34 | 497 | 2.672 | 0.0143 | 0.668 | 10 th |
| 10 | Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction | 186 | 20 | 72 | 38 | 56 | 532 | 2.860 | 0.0153 | 0.715 | 6 TH |
| 11 | Modification of building entrances porch | 186 | 54 | 75 | 35 | 22 | 395 | 2.672 | 0.0114 | 0.530 | 11 th |
| 12 | Modification of Roof | 186 | 59 | 72 | 36 | 19 | 387 | 2.080 | 0.0111 | 0.520 | 12 TH |

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

Table 3c: Building Structures Transformation

| Adap | table Flexibility | AKPANJANYA | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|-------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Variable 1: Building Structure Transformation | | | Rat | ing and V | Veighted V | alues | SWV | MWV | Std. D | R.I.I | Rank |
| | | N | HPI (x1) | PI (x2) | MI (x3) | NI (x4) | | | | | |
| 1 | Extra one bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 10 | 15 | 81 | 80 | 603 | 3.241 | 0.0174 | 0.810 | 4 TH |
| 2 | Modification of living room interior space | 186 | 9 | 15 | 21 | 14 | 666 | 3.580 | 0.0192 | 0.895 | 1 st |
| 3 | Semi-detached self-contained | 186 | 15 | 20 | 75 | 76 | 584 | 3.139 | 0.0168 | 0.784 | 5 TH |
| 4 | Introduction of dining space interior | 186 | 11 | 17 | 14 | 44 | 663 | 3.564 | 0.0191 | 0.564 | 11 TH |
| 5 | Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 14 | 20 | 12 | 40 | 650 | 3.494 | 0.0187 | 0.873 | 2 ND |
| 6 | Extra one bdrm. interior introduction | 186 | 14 | 18 | 25 | 129 | 641 | 3.446 | 0.0185 | 0.861 | 3 RD |
| 7 | Modification of building facades | 186 | 17 | 39 | 90 | 40 | 525 | 2.822 | 0.0151 | 0.705 | 7 TH |
| 8 | Attached one-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 25 | 41 | 69 | 51 | 518 | 2.784 | 0.0149 | 0.696 | 8 TH |
| 9 | Attached two bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 35 | 51 | 42 | 58 | 495 | 2.661 | 0.0143 | 0.665 | 9 th |
| 10 | Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction | 186 | 42 | 50 | 54 | 40 | 464 | 2.494 | 0.0134 | 0.623 | 10 TH |
| 11 | Modification of building entrances porch | 186 | 15 | 21 | 18 | 132 | 528 | 2.838 | 0.0152 | 0.709 | 6 TH |
| 12 | Modification of Roof | 186 | 45 | 78 | 35 | 28 | 418 | 2.247 | 0.0120 | 0.561 | 12 TH |

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

| Infras | tructure | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--------------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|--------------|------------------|
| Variable 1: Building Structure Transformation | | | GARKI GBAGYI | | APO | | AKPANJANYA | | | | RANKING |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Ν | SWV | MWV | SWV | MWV | SWV | MWV | ΣMWV | ΣMWV | |
| 1 | Extra one bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 579 | 3.112 | 578 | 3.107 | 603 | 3.241 | 9.461 | 3.153 | 1 ST |
| 2 | Modification of living room interior space | 186 | 460 | 2.473 | 618 | 3.322 | 666 | 3.580 | 9.375 | 3.129 | 2 ND |
| 3 | Semi-detached self-contained | 186 | 613 | 3.295 | 539 | 2.897 | 5.84 | 3.139 | 9.582 | 3.194 | 3 RD |
| 4 | Introduction of dining space interior | 186 | 458 | 2.462 | 561 | 3.016 | 663 | 3.564 | 9.042 | 3.014 | 4 TH |
| 5 | Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 461 | 2.478 | 610 | 3.279 | 650 | 3.494 | 9.251 | 3.083 | 5 TH |
| 6 | Extra one bdrm. interior introduction | 186 | 486 | 2.612 | 507 | 2.725 | 641 | 3.446 | 8.783 | 2.927 | 6 TH |
| 7 | Modification of building facades | 186 | 476 | 2.559 | 528 | 2.838 | 525 | 2.822 | 8.219 | 2.739 | 7 TH |
| 8 | Attached one-bedroom bungalow | 186 | 501 | 2.693 | 500 | 2.688 | 518 | 2.784 | 8.165 | 2.721 | 8 TH |
| 9 | Attached two bedroom unit attachment | 186 | 470 | 2.526 | 497 | 2.672 | 495 | 2.661 | 7.859 | 2.619 | 9 TH |
| 10 | Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction | 186 | 451 | 2.424 | 532 | 2.860 | 464 | 2.494 | 7.778 | 2.592 | 10 TH |
| 11 | Modification of building entrances porch | 186 | 396 | 2.129 | 395 | 2.123 | 5.28 | 2.838 | 7.090 | 2.363 | 11 TH |
| 12 | Modification of Roof | 186 | 347 | 1.865 | 387 | 2.080 | 418 | 2.247 | 6.192 | 2.064 | 12 TH |
| | Total ΣMWV | = | 30.628 | 31.48 | 4 | 36.31 | • | - | | | |
| $GARKI GBAGYI Mean of \Sigma MWV = 30.628 / 12 = 2.55$ $APO \qquad Mean of \Sigma MWV = 31.484 / 12 = 2.62$ $AKPANJANYA \qquad Mean of \Sigma MWV = 36.31/12 = 3.02$ | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4.0: Mean Score, Standard Deviation of Adaptable Physical Transformation

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

The result of the analysis in table 4 reveal the respondents with Housing flexibility resulting from adaptable physical transformation. This show that Akpanjanya has the highest number of transformation, it has first six (6) building structures variable of Mean weighted Value (MWV) all above 3.00. This is followed by Apo, which has four (4) variable ranked above 3.00 and Garki with only one (1) MWV. This analysis was also shown in Table 3A, 3 Band 3C respectively. Among the twelve (12) variables examined using the decision rule for research in Table 2. Thus the table 4, shows the rating of summation score for (Mean weighted Value, Σ MWV), this include (1) Extra one-bedroom unit attachment with a (Σ MWV =3.153), (2) Modification of living room interior space $(\Sigma MWV = 3.129)$, (3) Semi-detached selfcontained ($\Sigma MWV = 3.194$) (4) Introduction of dining space interior ($\Sigma MWV = 3.014$) and (5)Semi-detached two-bedroom bungalow (Σ MWV =3.083) all "Highly present" with Most Significant impact and rating Summation of Mean Weighted Value of 0.80-0.89 transformable adaptable flexibility. However, this is followed by Extra one bdrm. interior introduction $(\Sigma MWV = 2.927)$, Modification of building facades (Σ MWV =2.739), Attached onebedroom bungalow ($\Sigma MWV = 2.721$), Attached two bedroom unit attachment $(\Sigma MWV = 2.619)$, Extra two bdrm. Interior introduction (ΣMWV =2.592) and of building Modification entrances porch(Σ MWV =2.363) all "Present" with Significant Impact and rating Summation of Mean Weighted Value of 0.60-0.79. Finally only Modification of Roof has (SMWV =2.064) with Less significant and rating Summation of Mean Weighted Value of 0.40-0.59 respectively. Thus indicating these variables were perceived to be "Less present" by the respondents.

Conclusion

Housing flexibility as identified by the dwellers of these Abuja residents as part domestic architecture design whose planning choice has been utilized both in terms of functional construction. This is an integral part of housing adaptability for change over its lifetime. The many solutions to housing needs and demand for different types of spaces for different functions intend to fulfil inhabitants' requirements in accordance with their lifestyle that increases their general satisfaction for attachment of extra units. The aspiration of this home owner demand has been met by the Federal Capital Development Authority which allows the occupant/residents carry out transformation of their dwelling units due to the flexible nature of the houses.

The study finds out that most of the occupants expressed satisfaction with the flexibility nature of the houses and the adaptability of space that has been greatly improved on. This either by providing more living spaces or by connecting with more interior dwelling units as means of attaching extra residences (family) units. The study view differently from other pervious literature that housing developer built houses that are rigid and are confound to be expensive and without the privilege for the masses to carry out modification as aspired, which is not sustainable on the long run due to their strict prototype development. It recommends with a view to its introduction in future housing developments policy and a re-think on housing flexible designs on the part of planners and architects for possibilities incorporating more dwelling units in future by residents as the need arises.

Reference

- Agatangelo, S. M. (2015) Housing Flexibility by Spatial Indeterminacy: The Case of the Casa De las Flores in Madrid. International Journal of Architectural Research, Archnet-IJAR, Volume 9 - Issue 2 - July 2015 -(04-19) – Regular Section
- Adegbehingbe, V.O. (2012) Evaluation of involvement of built environment professionals in Housing Transformation processes in three government housing estates in South-Western, Nigeria in: Laryea, S., Agyepong, S.A., Leiringer, R. and Hughes, W. (Eds) Procs 4th West Africa Built Environment Research

(WABER) Conference, 24-26 July (Abuja, Nigeria, 2012):83-89.

- Aduwo, E.B.; Ibem, E. O. and Akunnaya P. Opoko, P. (2013) Residents' Transformation of Dwelling Units in Public Housing Estates in Lagos, Nigeria: Implications for Policy and Practice International Journal of Education and Research Vol. 1 No. 4
- Aduwo, E. B. and Ibem, E.O. (2017) Housing Transformation in Government Constructed Residential Estates in Lagos Nigeria International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, Vol. 6, 8, ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714 www.ijhssi.org PP.13-22.
- Arjmandi, H., Tahir, M., Che-Ani, A., Abdullah, N. A., and Usman, I. M. (2010) Application of Transparency to Increase Day-Lighting Level of Interior Spaces of Dwellings in Tehran
 A Lesson from the Past. Selected topics in power systems and remote sensing, 297–307.
- Croxton, (2003) Architectural Record. 2003, in Estaji, E. (Eds) A Review of Flexibility and Adaptability in Housing Design. International Journal of Contemporary Architecture" The New ARCH "Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 37–49.
- Estaji, H. (2017) A Review of Flexibility and Adaptability in Housing Design. International Journal of Contemporary Architecture" The New ARCH "Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 37–49
- Groák, S. (1992) The idea of building: thought and action in the design and production of buildings.: E & FN Spon, London. In Estaji, E. (Eds) A Review of Flexibility and Adaptability in Housing Design International Journal of Contemporary Architecture" The New ARCH "Vol. 4, No. 2,
- Graham, P. (2005) Design for adaptability an introduction to the principles and basic strategies. The Royal Australian Institute of Architects, 2005. GEN66.
- Habraken, N. J. (1972) Supports: an alternative to mass Housing. Architectural Press London.IN

- Hertzberger, H. (1991) Lessons for students in architecture. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, pp. 146-149.
- Moffat, S. and Russell, P. (2001) Assessing the Adaptability of Buildings, in Annex 31, Energy-Related Environmental Impact of Buildings. 2001, IEA Annex.
- Nguluma H. M. (2003) Housing Themselves Transformations, Modernization and Spatial Qualities in Informal Settlements in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Built Environment Analysis Stockholm.
- Tipple, A.G., Owusu, S.E., Pritchard, C. (2004) User-initiated extensions in government-built estates in Ghana and Zimbabwe: Unconventional but effective housing supply. Africa today. 51 (2), 2004, 79-105Forty, A. (2000). Words and buildings: A vocabulary on Modern Architecture. London: Thames & Hudson, pp. 143-148.
- Seyed, R. H. R., Ali, N. E., Ezequiel, U. G. and Antonio, A. A. (2015) Flexible Housing: The Role of Spatial Organization in Achieving Functional Efficiency. International Journal of Architectural Research, Archnet-IJAR, Vol.9, 2 - (65-76) – Regular Section,
- Schneider, T., & Till, J. (2007) Flexible housing in Seyed, R. H. R., Ali, N. E., Ezequiel, U. G. and Antonio, A. A. (Eds) Flexible Housing: The Role of Spatial Organization in Achieving Functional Efficiency. International Journal of Architectural Research,
- Shabani, M. M., Tahir, M. M., Shabankareh, H., Arjmandi, H., & Mazaheri, F. (2011) Relation of Cultural and Social Attributes in Dwelling, Responding to Privacy in Iranian Traditional House. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 6(2), 273–287.
- Schneider, T. and Till, J. (2007) Flexible housing: Taylor & Francis.
- Unah, M.O. (2019) Residential housing redevelopment and its impact on Asokoro district of Abuja, Nigeria 1st International Conference on Sustainable Infrastructural Development IOP Conference Series:

Materials Science and Engineering 640(2019) 012011 doi:10.1088/1757899X/640/1/012011

- Unah, M.O. (2022) Housing Modification as Predictors for Residential Satisfaction in Apo Resettlement, Abuja Nigeria. *International Journal* of Architecture, Arts and Applications. Vol. No.3, pp. 130-140. Doi: 10.11648/j.ijaaa.20220803.15
- Wendelien, L. D. and. Hofland, I.C.M (2005)Flexibility, how to accommodate unknown future housing requirements, XXXIII IAHS World Congress on Housing Transforming Housing Environments through Design September 27-30, Pretoria, South Africa.