Acta Universitatis Danubius
ŒCONOMICA

An Investigation into Users' Perception and Demand for Sustainable Property in Lagos, Nigeria

Abiola Benjamin Obayomi[1], Stephen Femi Oyeyoade[2], Olutayo Isaac Ayorinde[3], Adedayo Ayodeji Odebode[4]

Abstract: Objectives: This study investigates users' perception and demand for sustainable property development in Lagos, Nigeria, with the aim of identifying critical factors that enhance sustainable development and investment decisions. **Prior Work:** The paper builds on growing research that links sustainable housing with energy efficiency, health promotion, and environmental quality. While existing studies emphasize the technical and economic dimensions of sustainability, fewer have examined how end-users' perceptions shape demand in emerging property markets such as Lagos. **Approach:** Using a snowball sampling technique facilitated by estate surveyors and valuers, questionnaires were administered to end-users of 64 sustainable accommodations over a five-week period. Data was analyzed to establish the relationship between perception and demand. **Results:** Findings reveal that 73.4% of respondents reside in environmentally friendly housing, with cost saving (79.7%), air quality (78.1%), green spaces (78.1%), and water conservation (76.6%) identified as key motivators. A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.735$, $p = 0.001$) confirms the statistical significance of users' perception in influencing demand. **Implications:** The results highlight the need for developers, policymakers, and investors to align strategies with user preferences to foster sustainable property uptake. **Value:** The study offers empirical evidence from Lagos, providing original insights into the role of consumer perception in advancing sustainable property development in emerging markets.

[1] Ph.D. Student, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria, Corresponding author: abibeo@gmail.com.
[2] Lecturer II, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria, E-mail: sfoyeyoade@oauife.edu.ng.
[3] Lecturer I, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria, E-mail: tayoayorinde@yahoo.com.
[4] Associate Professor, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria, E-mail: adedayoodebode@gmail.com.

Keywords: Development; Investment Decisions; Property Markets; Housing

1. Introduction

The subject of users' perception regarding sustainable real estate development is fast becoming a topical issue in the developing world. For a long period, the awareness of sustainable property, especially from the end-users' perspective, is not as pronounced and popular in the developing world, such as Nigeria, as it is in the developed societies. While the global trend towards sustainable property development has gained momentum, understanding the local perceptions and demand for sustainable property is essential for tailoring solutions that resonate with Nigeria's property market. Lagos State, as the economic nerve centre, has a vibrant real estate sector that caters not only to Nigerians but also foreign nationals – who have experienced sustainable real estate in their home countries. The kernels of sustainable real estate include environmental, social, and economic sustainability throughout a property's lifecycle. Usually, the objective of sustainable property is to improve the wellbeing of occupants and/or end-users, thus promoting social responsibility.

The benefits of sustainable property are enormous. For instance, Oladokun and Shiyanbola (2021) opined that it has potential to mitigate the adverse effects of buildings on both human health and the natural environment. These benefits underscore why Oyewole, Komolafe and Gbadegeshin (2021) emphasise the importance of raising awareness among all stakeholders in the built environment regarding sustainable property. It must be noted however that it is doubtful that end-users in the real sector in Nigeria, especially in Lagos, are aware of the benefits of sustainable property development (Komolafe & Gbadegeshin, 2023).

Extant literature on property sustainability in Nigeria, such as Ayodele and Komolafe (2015), Komolafe and Oyewole (2015), Nduka and Ogunsanmi (2015), and Komolafe, Oyewole and Kolawole (2016) did not consider end-users' perception in their studies. This and the analysis of demand for viable sustainable property investment in Lagos State form the focus of this paper. This study is justified because when users' perceptions are understood, stakeholders such as policymakers, developers, and environmental organisations can develop strategies that align with market needs, facilitating broader adoption of sustainable practices in Lagos property market. Insights from this research could help bolster investment in sustainable property in Lagos State and further afield, thus deepening knowledge of sustainable development in the developing world.

1.1. Global Trends in Sustainable Real Estate Development

The principle and idea behind sustainable property development encompasses incorporating sustainability features into building designs and constructions. The increase in sustainable practices, especially in property development, mirrors an important shift towards lessening negative environmental effects while maximising social and economic value. Sustainability in property, known also as green building, going green, and sustainable real estate, has to do with integrating environment-friendly designs, materials, and technologies to reduce the ecological footprint of buildings (Dwaikat & Ali, 2016). This move aligns with wide-ranging societal concerns over the change in climate, scarcity of resources, and most importantly, the pursuit of better and healthier living, as well as conducive working environments.

It is arguable that high-income countries (HICs) have demonstrated progress and increased awareness of sustainability practices (Ratcliffe, Stubbs & Keeping, 2021), while most emerging or low-income countries (LICs) lag behind in sustainability practices (Kongela, 2021; Komolafe & Oyewole, 2020; Razali et al., 2017). Sustainable real estate development offers environmental, social, and economic benefits. A study conducted on behalf of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS, 2005) in North America and the United Kingdom confirmed a positive relationship between buildings with sustainable features and their market values. Such buildings command higher prices, reduce tenant turnover, attract tenants more quickly, and cost less to operate and maintain.

Sustainable development also contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, which are the cause of climate change. Buildings are claimed to account for one-third of all greenhouse gas emissions (Low, Gao & Teo, 2016). As a result, the Paris Agreement on Climate Action, which aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to pre-industrial levels, is especially important for property developers, as well as other stakeholders like local planning authorities, leaseholders, and asset owners (Lovell & Keeping, 2021). Sustainable real estate development is a strategic and inventive alternative to traditional property development, which is still prevalent in some growing markets, including Nigeria. While rich and developing economies have reached an agreement in principle on climate action, they however diverge in their perceptions and approaches to the practical fulfilment of sustainable development needs.

According to Lovell and Keeping (2021), numerous cities are going above and beyond general regulations to create greater criteria for carbon, energy, and climate resilience. For instance, the United Kingdom (UK) government and parliament have set a target of achieving a 100% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 (Ratcliffe et al., 2021). Sustainable development is an important consideration for all stakeholders involved in the property development process, not only for environmental reasons, but also for social and economic reasons (Rattanaprichavej,

2020; Isaac, O'Leary & Daley, 2016). Literature evidence shows the remarkable progress made by most developed economies in developing sustainable buildings and retrofitting existing conventional buildings. This contrasts with the current situation in many developing countries such as Nigeria, where the development industry is more focused on conventional projects.

1.2. Users' Perception of Sustainable Property and Demand in Nigeria

In most developing countries, the sustainable construction market is still largely under-tapped and unsaturated (Eze et al., 2021). Conversely, the low demand could also be attributable to the perception that users have towards sustainable property in general, and other anecdotal matters like high cost of building sustainable property, inadequate skilled experts, lack of building code and regulations, and lack of government support and incentives (Eze et al., 2023). Further corroborating this assertion, Umar, Lembi and Emechebe's (2021) study revealed that despite the growing local and international interest in sustainability, the level of awareness and knowledge of sustainable building materials (SBMs) amongst registered architects in Minna, Nigeria, is still low.

Komolafe and Oyewole (2018) examined the awareness and perception of office property users on green buildings in Lagos, Nigeria. Adopting frequency counts and measures of relative perception index, the study showed that the majority of the users were not aware of green building. Less than thirty percent of the respondents surveyed were aware, and the predominant medium of awareness among these few was through television. This largely suggests that the demand for sustainable property can be impeded if the supposed users are not aware, and this lack of awareness could also discourage potential investors in sustainable property development from venturing into it. Although the study by Oyewole, Ojutalayo and Araloyin (2019) revealed developers' willingness to invest in sustainable estate development to be positive**,** recent study conducted by Komolafe and Gbadegeshin (2023) found that there is a lack of adequate awareness, relevance, market feasibility and economic benefits for the adoption sustainable property features. They posited that on the supply side, there is a willingness to construct with sustainable features, but on the demand (users') side, their enthusiasm did not match up.

An earlier study by Oyewole and Komolafe (2018) on tenants' willingness to pay for green features in office property advocates for relevant agencies to embark on a massive awareness campaign that emphasises the direct benefits of green building. These findings again give credence to why users' perception studies are important for sustainable property development. Oladokun et al. (2010) explored the perception of property developers and tenants on the prospects and difficulties associated with the adoption of green buildings. The study revealed that the

respondents were not willing to adopt green building but believed green building would be desirable in the future. Also, Oyewole, Araloyin and Sani (2012) examined the degree of involvement of Nigerian real estate investors in sustainable (green) property practice. The authors surveyed eighteen property companies in Lagos and found that insignificant attention was given to social and environmental issues in their investment activities. Although the study focused on the Lagos property market, the perception of the tenants who are the occupiers of the investment property was not examined.

Komolafe and Oyewole (2015) examined the estate surveyors and valuers' perception of users' preference for green features in office property in Lagos. The study employed relative preference index and revealed that users preferred most of the green features to conventional building features. However, the study only considered the opinions of real estate practitioners and not the views of the users who were the object of the study. With regards to the factors affecting demand for sustainable property, studies such as Onuoha et al. (2017) have posited that Nigeria is lagging in green building investment despite the huge market potential available in the country. Nurul and Sainul (2013) argued that this scenario may have been because of the uncertainty by developers and tenants of the returns and benefits associated with investment in sustainable property. Apart from the above issues, age and personal income have been adduced as possible factors influencing consumers' willingness to pay for green buildings (Grosskopf, 2003).

A study by Kwame, Hiang and Sharon (2009) revealed that users were not willing to invest in green buildings owing to financial risk. Yau's (2012) study showed that moral and altruistic reasons and economic incentives were the drivers of consumers' willingness to pay for green buildings in Hong Kong. Park et al.'s (2013) study revealed that demand for sustainable property is influenced by consumers' preferences, and these preferences vary based on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics.

Clearly, there is a need to broaden empirical data on users' perception and their demand for sustainable real estate in Lagos, and Nigeria as a whole. This is what this study has sought to achieve. In the section that follows, methods and approaches deployed in the study are laid out.

2. Methods

2.1. Description of the Study Area

Lagos, Nigeria, serves as the study area for this research. As the country's commercial capital and most urbanized city, Lagos is characterized by rapid population growth, high demand for housing, and increasing environmental

challenges. With its estimated population exceeding 20 million, the city faces issues such as congestion, inadequate housing supply, and pressure on infrastructure. These dynamics create a unique context for exploring sustainable property development. The drive toward environmentally friendly housing in Lagos is shaped by rising awareness of energy efficiency, cost-saving needs, and the demand for healthier living environments. This makes Lagos an ideal setting to investigate users' perceptions and demand for sustainable property, particularly as the city continues to experience both urban expansion and market-driven real estate development.

2.2. Data Collection

The research design deployed for this study is descriptive research design. The study also adopted a snowballing technique to draft respondents into the study, with a view to examining their perceptions and demand for sustainable property in Lagos, Nigeria. Through the help of professional estate surveyors and valuers managing some sustainable property, the study was able to recruit sixty-four (64) end-users of sustainable property (residential and commercial) in Lagos State as respondents. A structured questionnaire was administered to the respondents. The sections in the questionnaire that deal directly with users' perceptions and their demand for sustainable real estate are organised using a five-point Likert scale. The use of the Likert scale is because it is advantageous when the goal is to garner results that are explicit and easy to understand (Eka-nayake & Ofori, 2004). The collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions, percentages, and mean scores, were adopted to summarise respondents' perceptions and demand characteristics, while inferential statistics, such correlation analysis, were used to determine users' perception and demand for sustainable property.

2.3. Data Analysis and Discussion

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Age	<40	35	54.7
	40-60	27	42.2
	>60	2	3.1
Gender	Male	40	62.5
	Female	24	37.5
Educational Level	SSCE	1	1.6
	OND/NCE	0	.0
	HND/BSc/MSc/Tech	32	50.8
	MSc/Tech	23	36.5

	PhD	7	11.1
Income Level	<#50,000	2	3.1
	#50,000-#100,000	13	20.3
	100,000-#200,000	26	40.6
	#200,000-#500,000	13	20.3
	Above #500,000	10	15.6
Occupation	Civil Servant	12	18.8
	Private Sector	35	54.7
	Business/Trading	16	25.0
	Others, Please Specify	1	1.6
Type of property occupied	Residential	47	73.4
	Commercial	15	23.4
	Mixed-use	2	3.1

Field Survey, 2025

Table 1 shows the distribution of the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. It is clear that the majority of the respondents are below 40 years (54.7%) followed by those between 40 – 60 years (42.2%), and a few (3.1%) above 60 years. The gender distribution shows higher representation of males (62.5%) compared to their female counterparts (37.5%). The distribution of the respondents' educational levels reveals that majority of the respondents are HND/BSc/B Tech holders (50.8%), followed a by MSc/M Tech holders (36.5%), 11.1% of the respondents are doctorate degree holders, and 1.6% of the respondents are high school certificate holders. The distribution of respondents' income level shows that 39.1% of the respondents earn between N100,00–N200,000 monthly, 20.3% of the respondents earn N50,000–N100,000, 21.9% of the respondents earn N200,000–N500,000, 15.6% of the respondents earn N500,000 while the least group (3.1%) earn less than N50,000. The table also shows that while most of the respondents work in the private sector (54.7%), others work in business/trading (23.4%), civil servants (18.8%) or other occupations (3.1%). Finally, the distribution of the types of property occupied shows that 73.4% occupy residential property, 18.8% occupy commercial property while 7.8% reside in mixed-use property.

2.3.1. Respondents' Perception of Sustainable Property

Table 2 below provides a detailed breakdown of respondents' perceptions regarding sustainable property, highlighting their level of agreement or disagreement. These perceptions are categorised into five levels: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), and Strongly Agree (SA). A closer examination of the responses reveals several important insights.

Table 2. Perception of Sustainable Property

	SD N (%)	D N (%)	N N (%)	A N (%)	SA N (%)
Sustainable property is more environmentally friendly	3 (4.7)	3 (4.7)	17 (26.6)	22 (34.4)	19 (29.7)
Sustainable property helps to reduce energy and water bills in the long-term	0 (0)	7 (10.9)	10 (15.6)	27 (42.2)	20 (31.3)
Sustainable property offers better health and living conditions	3 (4.7)	1 (1.6)	11 (17.2)	20 (31.3)	29 (45.3)
I believe that sustainable property is beneficial to the community	2 (3.1)	7 (10.9)	13 (20.3)	29 (45.3)	13 (20.3)
Sustainable property has a positive impact on property values	5 (7.8)	2 (3.1)	7 (10.9)	29 (45.3)	21 (32.8)

Field Survey, 2025

When asked whether sustainable property is more environmentally friendly, most respondents (64.1%) expressed agreement or strong agreement, while 26.6% remained neutral and a small percentage (9.4%) disagreed. This indicates that most respondents recognise the environmental benefits of sustainable property. This finding is in line with Kibert's (2016) position that sustainable buildings are deliberately designed to reduce their ecological footprint, emphasising energy efficiency, responsible resource use, and environmentally benign materials. Although the notable neutral responses suggest that some individuals may lack a clear understanding of what "environmentally friendly" entails in this context which of course have also been noted by Darko and Chan (2017) who emphasise that a lack of stakeholder knowledge and technical understanding remains a significant barrier to sustainable construction adoption.

On the financial benefits of sustainable property, particularly their ability to reduce energy and water bills in the long term, the responses were overwhelmingly positive. Nearly three-quarters of the participants (73.5%) agreed or strongly agreed, while only 10.9% disagreed and 15.6% were neutral. This strong agreement underscores the perceived economic advantages of sustainable property, which may serve as a significant motivator for their adoption. The study by Eichholtz, Kok and Quigley (2010) found that sustainable buildings not only use less energy but also command higher rents and sale prices, suggesting a dual benefit of reduced operational costs and improved investment performance. Similarly, Dwaikat and Ali (2016) found that while the upfront cost of green construction may be slightly higher, lifecycle cost savings make sustainable buildings more economically viable in the long run.

The health and living conditions provided by sustainable property were considered desirable. Most respondents (76.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that such property offers better health and living conditions, while only a small proportion (6.3%) disagreed. The remaining 17.2% were neutral. This overwhelming positivity reflects the growing recognition of sustainability's potential to enhance wellbeing, likely through features such as improved air quality, natural lighting, and energy-efficient designs. This corresponds with research by Allen et al. (2015), which highlights that sustainable property often features improved indoor air quality, increased natural lighting, and the use of non-toxic materials, all of which contribute to better physical and mental health outcomes. The findings also further reinforce the idea that the design of sustainable property that would be sustainable ought to go beyond environmental and economic considerations to directly affect the occupants' wellness, which is an idea that is gaining recognition in public health and urban planning fields.

Sustainable property' benefits to the broader community also received strong acquiescence. Most respondents (65.6%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement regarding the benefits of sustainable buildings to the community. 20.3% of the respondents were neutral, while 14% disagreed. While many respondents acknowledged the communal advantages of sustainable property, the neutrality observed might have been an outcome of limited understanding or first-hand experience of these benefits at the community level. This situation has been argued in the work of Cole and Jose Valdebenito (2013) who opined that the collective benefits of sustainable urban development may likely manifest over longer periods and are less directly attributable to individual choices. With respect to whether sustainable property positively affects property values, most respondents (78.1%) agreed or strongly agreed. A small percentage (10.9%) was neutral, and an equal proportion disagreed. This finding is substantiated by studies such as Fuerst and McAllister (2011), who demonstrate that sustainable property frequently achieves price premiums in both sales and rental markets which is largely as a result of increased demand from sustainability-conscious buyers, as well as the reduced risk and improved performance associated with energy-efficient buildings. These findings suggest a widespread belief that sustainability adds value to property, reinforcing the idea that sustainable building designs can yield financial and market benefits. Overall, the responses reveal a predominantly positive perception about sustainable property, particularly regarding their environmental friendliness, cost savings, health benefits, and potential to enhance property values. However, the consistent presence of neutral responses across all statements highlights the need for greater awareness and education about the specific benefits of sustainability. Bridging these knowledge gaps could further solidify public support and encourage the adoption of sustainable practices.

2.3.2. Demand for Sustainable Property

Table 3 below provides insights into how respondents rate the importance of various factors influencing their choice of sustainable property. These factors are evaluated across five levels of importance: Not Important (NI), Slightly Important (SI), Moderately Important (MI), Important (I), and Very Important (VI). A detailed analysis of each factor highlights the key considerations shaping respondents' preferences.

Table 3. Rating of Important Factors Influencing Choice of Sustainable Property

	NI N (%)	**SI N (%)**	**MI N (%)**	**I N (%)**	**VI N (%)**
Cost savings on utilities	2 (0.03)	7 (0.11)	4 (0.06)	27 (0.42)	24 (0.38)
Improved indoor air quality	3 (0.05)	1 (0.02)	10 (0.16)	31 (0.48	19 (0.30)
Availability of green spaces (e.g., Parks)	0 (00)	8 (0.13)	6 (0.09)	32 (0.50)	18 (0.28)
Water conservation features	2 (0.03)	4 (0.06)	9 (0.14)	27 (0.42)	22 (0.34)
Reduced environmental impact	14 (0.22)	7 (0.11)	4 (0.06)	18 (0.28)	21 (0.33)

Field Survey, 2025

The findings from the rating of important factors influencing choice of sustainable property by the respondents reveal that economic benefits, health considerations, recreational amenities, resource efficiency, and, to a lesser extent, environmental consciousness are all important factors influencing respondents' interest in sustainable property. The patterns observed align closely with previous research, offering further validation and context to the current study's results. First, the overwhelming importance placed on cost savings on utilities, rated as "Important" or "Very Important" by 80% of the respondents, underscores the central role of financial incentives in motivating sustainable property adoption. This finding is strongly supported by Eichholtz, Kok and Quigley (2010), who found that the financial performance of sustainable property through reduced energy consumption and lower operating costs is a primary driver of their market success. Also in the same light, Dwaikat and Ali (2016) emphasise that while sustainable construction may initially incur higher costs, these are offset over time through significant savings in utilities and maintenance, making economic argument one of the strongest selling points for sustainable property.

Health-related benefits, particularly improved indoor air quality, also featured prominently, with 78% of the respondents rating it as "Important" or "Very Important." This finding reflects a growing body of evidence suggesting that the indoor environmental quality of green buildings has direct implications for occupants' health and wellbeing. Allen et al.'s (2015) study provided strong empirical support for this, showing that occupants of green-certified buildings

experience better air quality, reduced exposure to indoor pollutants, and improved cognitive function, leading to enhanced productivity and overall satisfaction. The emphasis placed by the respondents on indoor air quality in this study mirrors health considerations as integral to sustainable housing choices.

The availability of green spaces also emerged as a critical factor, with 78% of respondents considering it "Important" or "Very Important." The value placed on parks and natural surroundings aligns with findings from Bratman et al. (2019), who argue that access to natural environments significantly enhances mental health, lowers stress, and fosters physical wellbeing. Their research underscores the therapeutic and recreational benefits of green spaces, which not only improve individual quality of life but also contribute to social cohesion within sustainable communities. Also, as seen from the table, water conservation features were also prioritised, with 76% of the respondents rating them highly. This reflects increasing public awareness of the need for resource conservation in the face of climate change and water scarcity. Gleick's (2003) study discusses the importance of sustainable water management strategies, noting that water-efficient technologies and design elements are critical to the future resilience of urban areas. The strong support for water conservation in this study suggests that respondents recognise both the environmental and economic dimensions of responsible water use. Conversely, the importance attached to reduced environmental impact showed more variability. While 61% of the respondents still rated this factor as "Important" or "Very Important," a significant minority (33%) viewed it as less critical ("Not Important" or "Slightly Important"). This mixed perspective is consistent with the findings of an earlier study undertaken by Thøgersen and Ölander (2003), who noted that while individuals may express environmental concern, actual behaviour is often more strongly influenced by immediate personal benefits than by collective environmental outcomes. In other words, while environmental protection may be valued, it is often secondary to more tangible, individual-centric motivations like health and finance. Overall, the study's findings on the rating of important factors influencing choice of sustainable property are in line with a broad consensus in the literature. While collective environmental goals are important, the successful promotion of sustainable property depends largely on highlighting personal benefits such as cost savings, health improvements, and enhanced quality of life. These motivations are the primary levers through which sustainable practices can gain wider acceptance and implementation.

2.3.3. Impact of Perception on Demand for Sustainable Property

Table 4 below presents an evaluation of the relationship between perception and demand for sustainable property. The relationship was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient at 0.05 level of significance. The result is shown below.

Table 4. Test of Relationship between Perception and Demand for Sustainable Property

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	r	p
Perception of Sustainable Property	64	19.45	4.472	0.735	0.001*
Demand for Sustainable Property	64	19.28	4.420		

Field Survey, 2025

The analysis presented in Table 4 above offers valuable insights into how individuals' perceptions influence their demand for sustainable real estate. Descriptive statistics reveal that the mean score for perception of sustainable property is 19.45 with a standard deviation of 4.472. This indicates that, on average, respondents hold a relatively positive perception of sustainable property, though the level of variability suggests differing levels of understanding or appreciation among participants. Similarly, the mean score for demand stands at 19.28, accompanied by a standard deviation of 4.420. The closeness of the two mean values points to a parallel trend between how sustainable property is perceived and the actual level of interest or intention to invest in them. Further analysis using Pearson's correlation coefficient provides more compelling insights. The correlation between perception and demand is reported at 0.735, which denotes a strong positive relationship. More importantly, the p-value associated with this correlation is 0.001, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 threshold. This confirms that the observed relationship is unlikely to be due to chance, therefore reinforcing the validity of the findings. The implication of this strong and significant correlation can be explained in a few ways. It suggests that individuals who hold a favourable perception of sustainable property are more likely to express higher demand for such property. This finding corroborates previous studies in the literature, such as the work of Darko and Chan (2017), who argue that positive perception and awareness are fundamental drivers for the adoption of green buildings.

Similarly, Sayce, Sundberg and Clements (2010) assert that informed perceptions about the environmental and economic benefits of sustainable buildings are closely linked to higher investment interest. Furthermore, Ofori (2007) emphasises the role of public awareness in shaping market behaviour towards green buildings, noting that increased understanding and knowledge often translate into higher demand. Dwaikat and Ali (2016) further affirm that perceptions significantly influence investor behaviour, especially when there is clear communication of the long-term value and performance of sustainable developments. These findings also align with the Capability Approach proposed by Sen (1999), which underscores the role of individual agency and access to information in shaping behaviour. According to this theoretical framework, when individuals are empowered with adequate knowledge and resources, they are better positioned to make informed decisions, such as opting for environmentally sustainable housing options. The analysis demonstrates that perception plays a critical role in shaping demand for sustainable property.

Strengthening public perception through targeted education and outreach could serve as a catalyst for expanding the sustainable property market, thereby contributing to broader environmental and socio-economic goals.

3. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examines users' perception and demand for sustainable property in Lagos, Nigeria. The imperative of sustainability, especially considering the environmental crises globally, remains topical. The multifarious benefits of sustainable buildings, covering personal health outcomes, the need to reverse the current trajectory of the global climate profile, and the priority for sustainable communities, have been foregrounded in this study. The respondents believed that sustainable property is environmentally friendly, while helping to reduce energy and water bills in the long term, offering better health and living conditions, and promoting the overall wellbeing of the broader community.

The study therefore recommends that property developers should focus on marketing strategies that highlight the benefits of sustainable property. This may have effects on their perception, thereby leading to higher demand for sustainable buildings. Policymakers should formulate policies that promote green building and incentivise interested organisations and individuals so as to upscale the construction and demand for sustainable buildings. A more committed effort towards sustainable building intersects with some of the 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) namely Goal 3 (good health and wellbeing) and Goal 11 (sustainable cities and communities).

References

Abolore, A. A. (2012). Comparative study of environmental sustainability in building construction in Nigeria and Malaysia. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences, 3*(6), 951–961.

Allen, J. G., MacNaughton, P., Laurent, J. G. C., & Satish, U. (2015). Green Buildings and health. *Current Environmental Health Reports, 2*(3), 250–258.

Bratman, G. N., Anderson, C. B., Berman, M. G., Cochran, B., De Vries, S., Flanders, J., & Daily, G. C. (2019). Nature and mental health: An ecosystem service perspective. *Science Advances, 5*(7), 0903.

Cole, R. J., & Valdebenito, M. J. (2013). The importation of building environmental certification systems: International usages of BREEAM and LEED. *Building Research & Information, 41*(6), 662–676.

Darko, A., & Chan, A. P. C. (2016). Review of barriers to green building adoption. *Sustainable Development, 25*(3), 167–179.

Dwaikat, L. N., & Ali, K. N. (2016). Green buildings cost premium: A review of empirical evidence. *Energy and Buildings, 110*, 396–403.

Eichholtz, P., Kok, N., & Quigley, J. M. (2010). Doing well by doing good? Green office buildings. *American Economic Review, 100*(5), 2492–2509.

Eze, E. C., Sofolahan, O., & Omoboye, O. G. (2023). Assessment of barriers to the adoption of sustainable building materials in the construction industry of a developing country. *Frontiers in Engineering and Built Environment, 3*(3), 153–166.

Fuerst, F., & McAllister, P. M. (2008). Green noise or green value? Measuring the effects of environmental certification on office property values. *Real Estate Economics, 39*(1), 45–69.

Gleick, P. H. (2003). Global freshwater resources: Soft-path solutions for the 21st century. *Science, 302*(5650), 1524–1528.

Grosskopf, K. R. (2003). Investing in "green" building alternatives: U.S. consumers' willingness to pay. In *The Future of Sustainable Construction* (pp. 1–8).

Isaac, D., O'Leary, J., & Daley, M. (2016). *Property development* (3rd ed.). Macmillan International Higher Education.

Komolafe, M. O., & Gbadegesin, J. T. (2023). Choice behaviour in sustainable property features adoption: A tripartite perspective. *Ibadan Planning Journal, 9*(1–2), 23–36.

Komolafe, M. O., & Oyewole, M. O. (2015). The perception of estate surveyors and valuers on users' preference for green buildings in Lagos, Nigeria. In *Proceedings of the West African Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference* (pp. 863–886).

Komolafe, M. O., & Oyewole, M. O. (2018). Awareness and perception of office property users on green building in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability, 5*(3), 221–230.

Komolafe, M. O., Oyewole, M. O., & Gbadegesin, J. T. (2020). Stakeholders' relevance in sustainable residential property development. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment, 9*(2), 112–129.

Komolafe, M. O., Oyewole, M. O., & Kolawole, J. T. (2016). Extent of incorporation of green features in office property in Lagos, Nigeria. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment, 5*(3), 232–260.

Kongela, S. M. (2021). Sustainability potential awareness among built environment stakeholders: Experience from Tanzania. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation, 41*(2).

Lovell, J., & Keeping, M. (2021). *L'Accord de Paris: A potential game changer for the global real estate industry*. Urban Land Institute Centre for Sustainability. http://uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/21st-Annual-Conference-of-the-United-Nations-Framework-Convention-on-Climate-Change-COP21.pdf.

Low, S. P., Gao, S., & Teo, L. L. G. (2016). Gap analysis of green features in condominiums between potential homeowners and real estate agents. *Facilities, 34*(11/12), 630–648.

McGraw-Hill Construction. (2013). *World green building trends: Business benefits driving new and retrofit market opportunities in over 60 countries.* Smart Market Report. https://www.worldgbc.org.

Nduka, D. O., & Ogunsanmi, O. (2015). Stakeholders' perception of the factors determining the adoptability of green building practices in construction projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science, 5*(2), 1–9.

Nelson, A. (2008). *Globalization and global trends in green real estate.* RREEF Research.

Nelson, A., Rakau, O., & Dorrenberg, P. (2010). *Green buildings: A niche becomes mainstream.* Deutsche Bank Research.

Nurul, A. D., & Zainul, N. A. (2013). Motivation and expectation of developers on green construction: A conceptual view. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, 76*, 4–27.

Nwokoro, I., & Onukwube, H. (2011). Sustainable or green construction in Lagos, Nigeria: Principles, attributes and framework. *Journal of Sustainable Development, 4*(4), 166–174.

Ofori, G. (2000). Greening the construction supply chain in Singapore. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management, 6*(3–4), 195–206.

Oladokun, T. T., & Shiyanbola, R. E. (2021). Sustainable features in commercial real estate in Nigeria. In A. Tiwari & J. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Sustainable real estate in the developing world* (pp. 39–52). Emerald Publishing.

Olaleye, A., Ayodele, T. O., & Komolafe, M. O. (2015). The relevance of green building practice in an emerging market: A perceptual analysis of commercial and industrial building users in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Real Estate, 7*(1), 41–49.

Onuoha, I. J., Aliagha, G. U., Abdul Rahman, M. S., Kalu, I. U., Onyike, J. A., & Okeahialam, S. A. (2017). Green and sustainable commercial property demand in Malaysia and Nigeria. *Journal of Energy Technologies and Policy, 7*(9), 20–32.

Otegbulu, A. C. (2011). Economics of green design and environmental sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Development, 4*(2), 240–248.

Oyewole, M. O., & Komolafe, M. O. (2018). Tenants' willingness to pay for green features in office property. *Nigerian Journal of Environmental Sciences and Technology, 2*(2), 233–242.

Oyewole, M. O., Araloyin, F. M., & Sani, K. S. (2012). Sustainable property investment practice in Nigeria. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Construction and Real Estate Management (ICCREM)* (pp. 635–638). University of Kansas, Kansas City, USA.

Oyewole, M. O., Ojutalayo, A. A., & Araloyin, F. M. (2019). Developers' willingness to invest in green features in Abuja, Nigeria. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment, 8*(3), 206–219.

Ozigbo, I. W., & Nnamani, O. C. (2023). Exploring the barriers to global trends in the real estate development industry: A focus on Nigeria. *International Journal of Civil Engineering, Construction and Estate Management, 11*(3), 56–85.

Park, M., Hargishima, A., Tanimoto, G., & Chun, C. (2013). Willingness to pay for improvement for environmental performance of residential buildings. *Building and Environment, 60*, 225–233.

Ratcliffe, J., Stubbs, M., & Keeping, M. (2021). *Urban planning and real estate development* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Rattanaprichavej, N. (2020). Possibilities and challenges of sustainable condominium development in Thailand: An analysis through the circle of blame concept. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal, 26*(1), 19–40.

Razali, M. N., Yunus, N. M., Zainudin, A. Z., & Mei, J. L. Y. (2017). Sustainable property development by Southeast Asian property companies. *Property Management, 35*(1), 100–126.

RICS. (2005). *Green value: Green buildings, growing assets.* Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.

Sayce, S., Sundberg, A., & Clements, B. (2010). *Is sustainability reflected in commercial property prices? An analysis of the evidence base.* Kingston University. https://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/id/eprint/15747/1/Sayce-S-15747.pdf.

Sen, A. (2000). *Development as freedom.* Oxford University Press.

Thøgersen, J., & Ölander, F. (2003). Spillover of environment-friendly consumer behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23*(3), 225–236.

Umar, I. A., Lembi, J. J., & Emechebe, L. C. (2021). Assessment of awareness of architects on sustainable building materials in Minna, Nigeria. *American Journal of Construction and Building Materials, 5*(2), 50–56.

United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative. (2012). *Responsible property investing: What the leaders are doing.* UNEP FI. http://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/Responsible_Property_Investment_2_01.pdf.

Yau, Y. (2012). Willingness to pay and preferences for green housing attributes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Green Building, 7*(2), 137–152.

Zainul Abidin, N., Yusof, N. A., & Othman, A. A. (2013). Enablers and challenges of a sustainable housing industry in Malaysia. *Construction Innovation, 13*(1), 10–25.