



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Harris, Ella and Brickell, K. and Nowicki, M. (2020) Door locks, wall stickers, fireplaces: Assemblage Theory and home (un)making in Lewisham's temporary accommodation. *Antipode* , ISSN 0066-4812. (In Press)

Downloaded from: <http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/32489/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.



**Door Locks, Wall Stickers, Fireplaces: Assemblage Theory
and Home (Un)Making in Lewisham's Temporary
Accommodation**

Journal:	<i>Antipode</i>
Manuscript ID	ANTI-05-18-P-0096.R2
Manuscript Type:	Paper
Keywords:	precarity, homemaking, homelessness, materiality, assemblage, affect

Door Locks, Wall Stickers, Fireplaces: Assemblage Theory and Home (Un)Making in Lewisham's Temporary Accommodation

Introduction

Whatever you have in your rooms think first of the walls for they are that which makes your house and home, and if you do not make some sacrifices in their favour you will find your chambers have a kind of makeshift, lodging-house look about them...

- William Morris delivering a 1882 lecture about wallpaper and 'The Lesser Arts of Life'

In a cupboard, in a flat purpose-built as temporary accommodation, sits a large roll of Laura Ashley[i] wallpaper. The wallpaper, like its owner Gemma, is waiting; waiting for a much wished-for "permanent" home. Here, though, there are rules against fixing anything to the walls, and, even if these were relaxed, it would be a waste of expensive wallpaper to decorate a flat granted to her for a maximum of two years. *"It's gonna sit there and it's gonna wait until I get my permanent place"*, Gemma told us, *"and then I cannot wait to get it up...it's only been in the box for like the last 4 years, but it will be up"*. In the meantime, stick-on wall decorations, what she calls *"little touches"*, serve as markers of a home that cannot be fully realised at PLACE/Ladywell, a much lauded social housing development where she and other homeless families live on an interim site in Lewisham, South East London.

The conception and development of PLACE/Ladywell, the UK's first 'pop-up village' is borne out of a now-chronic housing crisis characterised by limited genuinely affordable housing stock, increasing numbers of people living in the poorly-regulated private rented

1
2
3 sector, and skyrocketing levels of homelessness. At the same time as increasing precarity
4 in the private rental sector, social housing stock has deeply diminished. While in 1970
5 there were 157,026 local authority housing completions across the UK, by 2004 this had
6 dropped to just 140, and recent data for 2016 showed 3,305 completions (Wilcox et al
7 2018). One of the outcomes of this has been a rise in the number of families living in
8 emergency bed and breakfast accommodation (Wilson and Barton, 2019). In the face of a
9 growing temporary accommodation emergency and a national government unwilling to
10 invest in large-scale social housing construction, local authorities are pioneering creative
11 ways of improving affordable and temporary housing provision. In the case of Lewisham
12 Council, this has meant returning to, and modernising, post-World War II solutions of
13 using prefabricated construction methods to build cheaply and at speed (AUTHORS,
14 2019).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
PLACE/Ladywell was designed by the world-renowned architecture firm Rogers Stirk
Harbour + Partners (RSHP) and has been widely acclaimed by both City Hall and the media
since its completion in 2016 (NewLondonArchitecture, 2017; Kollwe, 2016; Gavron, 2017;
Marrs, 2017).[iii] The development's modular design is seen as proof of concept that non-
traditional building methods and the flexible re-adaption of vacant space can alleviate
housing crisis. Currently, PLACE/Ladywell occupies the site of the former Ladywell Leisure
Centre. The building is expected to move to another site – hence its 'pop-up' moniker -
when the land it currently occupies is developed for longer-term use.

The development consists of 24 two-bedroom flats – each with an open-plan
kitchen/living room and private balcony - across three floors, with the ground floor units
rented commercially. The first 23 (one flat remains a show-room) families to live in
PLACE/Ladywell were selected according to several criteria, such as people deemed to
have a strong need to be in Lewisham, and those not in rent arrears or seen to be making
a sufficient effort to pay overdue rent. Rent paid by PLACE/Ladywell tenants varies

1
2
3 according to their income, up to a maximum £265 per week according to one resident. It
4 is planned that original residents will be housed there for a maximum of two years, after
5 which there will be a second intake. This model relies on residents successfully bidding
6 for permanent social housing within this two-year period (AUTHORS, 2019).
7
8
9
10

11
12 Drawing on research conducted across 2016-17, we explore residents' experiences of
13 living, temporarily, in PLACE/Ladywell and do so through fixtures and fittings[ii] - wall
14 stickers, a door lock and a fireplace – which emerged in our interviews as central to
15 participant stories of homemaking. Despite their seeming banality, fixtures and fittings,
16 we argue, offer a material, politicised, and lively means of studying the attempted and
17 thwarted production of home by residents living in PLACE/Ladywell. As Speer (2018: 11)
18 writes, 'homelessness can be seen as the condition of having no fixed location and being
19 continually forced to move between sites'. While the 'pop-up' model of PLACE/Ladywell
20 reproduces rather than addresses this condition, our research examined how residents
21 nonetheless assert their right to dwell there through these fixtures and fittings.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 We conducted interviews with seven residents in their flats. Key stakeholder interviews
34 were also conducted with PLACE/Ladywell's architects, Lewisham Council and local MPs.
35 Interviews focused on residents' prior housing biographies, journeys into homelessness,
36 and their hopes and aspirations regarding future homes. All participants had young
37 families with two or more children, and the majority were the (female) heads of single-
38 parent households. All had become homeless as a consequence of eviction from the
39 private rented sector: be that due to landlords raising rents or selling properties, or
40 unexpected unemployment leaving them unable to pay the rent.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 We spent time with residents in their flats, exploring their experiences of and opinions on
51 PLACE/Ladywell as well as of the accommodation they had previously lived in. Given that
52 PLACE/Ladywell is temporary accommodation, we were interested in whether, and if so
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how, it improved residents lives while they waited to be housed permanently. We
4 recruited participants, with prior permission from Lewisham Council, through door
5 knocking and posting flyers at PLACE/Ladywell. For increased anonymity all names and
6 identifying details have been changed.
7
8
9
10

11
12 A key conceptual mark of our paper is rooted in its use of assemblage thinking to
13 understand homemaking under these time-limited and constrained circumstances. In the
14 next section we outline how we advance work in geography on assemblage and how we
15 foster dialogue with work on critical geographies of home and vital materialism. The
16 research and analysis presented thereafter is divided into three sections, one for each
17 fixture and fitting. The conclusion brings together our reflections on their status as vital
18 elements in negotiations between fixity and impermanence in temporary
19 accommodation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Figure 1: Exterior of PLACE/Ladywell (Photograph by Author, 2017)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Assemblage thinking and materialities of home

Objects and materials have long been understood as central in the construction of home and in processes of dwelling (McFarlane, 2011; Miller, 2010; Miller, 2008). Through the exploration of three examples - the door lock, wall stickers, and a fireplace - we consider these fixtures and fittings as lively elements of assemblages of homemaking and 'unmaking' (AUTHOR, 2014a; AUTHOR, 2014b), elements that can assist in both territorializing and deterritorializing spaces in order to enable or disable the production of home. Rather than decentring human agency and accountability, we show how they

1
2
3 can exacerbate, but also contest, unequal power balances between human agents; here,
4 homeless families living in PLACE/Ladywell, the architects that designed it, and Lewisham
5 Council who commissioned and manage the property. As such, we consider homemaking
6 as experienced in an environment where making a durable sense of home is
7 unambiguously discouraged. Emphatically impermanent, both in terms of how long
8 residents can stay and in how long the building itself will remain in situ, PLACE/Ladywell
9 is not designed as a long-term home. It has been argued that disasters such as
10 earthquakes 'prompt explicit engagements with the city as a material and social
11 assemblage' including 'at the level of intimate experience' (Angell, 2014, p. 676), making
12 'relations between people and their landscape' especially 'self-conscious' and 'active'
13 (Dawdy, 2006, 720 in Angell 2014). We argue that the same is true of the slow crisis of
14 homelessness; a disaster situation in which there is heightened sensitivity to the capacities
15 of materials and objects to afford or deny homemaking, as well as to the politicized
16 distribution and governance of those materials by human actors.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 We suggest that the door lock, wall stickers and fireplace were so significant to our
33 participants because they are objects which require, and are mobilized, to generate fixity.
34 Dwelling for McFarlane (2011), is a process of assemblage; the territorialization of objects
35 and spaces into a relatively stable configuration that enables domestic life to take place.
36 Assemblages require fixity to hold their elements together, the less fixed relations
37 between elements are, the more precarious the assemblage and the more easily it can be
38 deterritorialized; unmade. We show through these three examples that all relate to
39 attempts to fix things in place, how they are part of both processes of territorialization
40 and deterritorialization of PLACE/Ladywell as home, key elements in contestations over
41 the right to dwell in temporary accommodation. They have, therefore, political potencies
42 and affordances that require academic study. In this regard, the paper advances
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assemblage thinking and its connection to scholarship on critical geographies and
4 materialities of home in three main ways.
5
6
7

8 First, the paper positions the domestic as a politicised and contested assemblage of
9 persons and 'things' that warrants greater attention in the uptake of assemblage thinking
10 in geography. Geographers have long argued that the home and acts of homemaking are
11 intrinsically political, affected and shaped by governance practices and rhetoric, and
12 actively impacting wider politics (Blunt & Dowling, 2006; AUTHOR, 2011; 2012; 2020). In
13 this paper we understand homemaking as the suturing of social relationships, identities,
14 and materialities; a 'pattern of regular doings, furnishings and appurtenances,' which
15 fashion and reproduce the domestic (Douglas, 1991, p. 290). Through these doings, the
16 home is understood as a key site which anchors senses of belonging and through which
17 selfhood is constituted and performed (Jacobs and Smith, 2008). Homemaking is also a
18 process that 'continues and consolidates itself with each event of significance that adds
19 to the sense of home by overcoming the obstacles which might diminish it' (Dayaratne &
20 Kellett, 2008, p. 66) As Pilkey writes in his exploration of the homemaking practices of
21 older gay men in London, 'the accumulation and arrangement of objects at home are
22 materialisations of our ongoing construction of subjectivity: these objects are physical
23 realisations of personal meanings and interpersonal social relations' (1143). They are also
24 materially imbued practices of political significance. As Fernandez Arrigoitia has explored
25 in relation to lifts and stairs in a public housing block in Puerto Rico, the material
26 components of home have political significance, 'with a history and role to play in
27 producing certain experiences, sensations, ideas and therefore actions (or inactions)
28 regarding public housing at a number of different intersecting scales.' (2014: 188). In the
29 context of public, emergency, and other forms of housing that have become disassociated
30 with normative understandings of 'home', the materiality of housing becomes a
31 component in the delegitimisation of residents' rights to home. For the residents of the
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Puerto Rican block, the affective outcome of decaying lifts and stairwells was the
4 reinforcement of a system of assemblage whereby social housing tenants, and working-
5 class people more widely, are understood as less deserving of home, and thus their
6 precarious housing conditions constructed as legitimate.
7
8
9
10

11
12 In this context, the paper argues that the denial of, or control over, homemaking objects
13 and materials can undermine the construction and maintenance of identities and senses
14 of self-worth for homeless families. If affective life is 'always-already mediated; emergent
15 from specific material arrangements' then we argue that affective experiences of precarity
16 and stigma emerge from the constrained assemblages of homemaking at
17 PLACE/Ladywell. Further, we argue that these constraints are politically motivated,
18 amounting, here, to a denial of rights for those in emergency accommodation to make
19 home that stems from, and plays into, a broader discouragement and stigmatization of
20 social housing tenancies in the contemporary political climate. As Speer (2018: 200)
21 concurs, 'Ideology and material practice are interdependent, and the material condition
22 of homelessness is deeply imbricated with the condition of being ideologically
23 disregarded by society'. For inhabitants of temporary accommodation then, the
24 regulation of domestic life can (re)produce stigmatizing representations of homeless
25 families as inept and 'revolting' (Tyler, 2013). This has the additional potential to enact an
26 ideologically driven denial of homemaking against families who have 'failed' to secure
27 housing in the private market, therefore valorising constraints to their expressions of
28 home (AUTHOR 2017; Speer 2017). Working to challenge 'the common assumption that
29 being homeless is the opposite of being domestic', Fraiman (2017: 158) writes that
30 homelessness is 'less the absence of domesticity than a fragmented manifestation of it –
31 domesticity in pieces, shattered under the pressure of homelessness'. Much like her work
32 which speaks to homemaking 'hampered and partial but still being done', our paper looks
33 to the impeded and obstructed assemblage of home undertaken by residents in
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 PLACE/Ladywell. Working from the premise that assemblages are always, to varying
4 degrees, precarious, (Delanda, 2002) we consider how the assemblage of home is
5 especially precarious in temporary accommodation. Homes made in PLACE/Ladywell are
6 assemblages in disequilibrium, where attempts to fix elements together come up against
7 the prevailing force of impermanence. As Lancione (2016: 371) comments from his work
8 on homelessness in Turin, Italy, there is a clear value in looking at the everyday
9 assemblages of 'life at the margins'. Just as geographers have looked to 'the different
10 practices people employ to stay put' (Lees et al 2018: 349), our paper focuses on those
11 used by residents to assert the right to fixity 'in the meanwhile'.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 It should be noted that whilst the lack of fixity in domestic settings is not unique to
23 formerly homeless people in temporary accommodation, the experiences recounted to us
24 by PLACE/Ladywell residents are nonetheless indicative of how housing markets establish
25 a 'hierarchy of permanence' that determine who has the right to modify their domestic
26 surroundings. For example, Soaita and McKee (2019) have recently documented how
27 private renters in the UK experience the destabilising effects of impermanence, including
28 restrictions on decorating practices and living with broken objects. The authors highlight
29 the impact of this destabilisation of renters' ability to construct and secure a sense of
30 home in inherently temporary settings. However, we argue that this lack of fixity is
31 experienced all the more acutely by formerly homeless families, who alongside this
32 experience of material impermanence are forced to live with compounding precarities
33 and stigmatisation, which over time exacerbates their capacity to be affected by housing
34 precarity and material elements of home (un)making.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 Our second contribution to assemblage thinking, which builds links with critical
50 geographies and materialities of home, is the argument that the fixtures and fittings of
51 home and their assemblage have affective capacities which are **activated and/or mobilised**
52 in situations of struggle and resistance and which require scholarly attention. Since the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'material turn' in the social sciences (Whatmore, 2006) academics have explored the
4 'vitality' (Bennett, 2004) and potential 'disobedience' (Flood & Grindon, 2014) of objects
5 which are significant to political processes and events (Bennett, 2010; Tolia-Kelly, 2012).
6 This includes recognition of the importance of objects and materials in the making,
7 remaking, and unmaking of unequal urban environments (McFarlane, 2011). For
8 McFarlane, objects and materials are gathered in urban settings in order to enact
9 'dwelling' as 'a form of urban assembly' (McFarlane, 2011, p. 650). **An important element**
10 **of the dwelling process is how material components of homemaking activate capacities**
11 **of human subjects to be affected. Sometimes these generate affects of comfort and**
12 **security linked to ideal versions of home or, conversely, as in our research, affects of**
13 **discomfort and precarity.** Following McFarlane, we understand homemaking as an act of
14 assemblage that 'can be stabilised (territorialised or reterritorialised) or destabilised
15 (deterritorialised)' (653) through the ways that **material** elements of the assemblage
16 interact **with capacities to be affected in people.**

17
18
19 **Importantly, thinking about affective capacities as a key part of assemblages of**
20 **homemaking in PLACE/Ladywell enables us to understand why elements of the fixtures**
21 **and fittings in the properties activate feelings of trauma in our participants that**
22 **stakeholders - namely Lewisham Council - struggle to understand or anticipate. While**
23 **affects are often talked about as collective conditions (Anderson, 2016, 4) this does not**
24 **mean that capacities to affect and be affected are uniform. Affects are 'collectively formed'**
25 **(Anderson, 2016, 9), that is to say, formed through relations that extend beyond an**
26 **individual subject, but different subjects develop different capacities to be affected**
27 **depending on their position within those relations. In Deleuzian thought, affects are**
28 **virtual; unactualized capacities of a system to affect and be affected by other systems**
29 **(DeLanda, 2002, pp. 71-72). Significantly, as virtual properties, affects are *historical*, not**
30 **fixed or innate but produced through ongoing processes. In relation to PLACE/Ladywell's**
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 residents, this helps us to understand how, via their traumatic housing biographies, they
4 have developed capacities to be strongly affected by other elements of housing
5 assemblages, in a way that those without such intense experiences of housing precarity
6 have not.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Clearly, then, the materialities of home have political potency. Critics of Bennett's vision
13 of 'thing power' have accused her political ecology of things of generating a 'systemic
14 blindness concerning the inequalities, asymmetries and hierarchies enacted in vital
15 materializations' (Lemke, 2018). Puar (2017: 26) too has questioned the value 'of investing
16 in notions of vibrant matter without concomitant attention to the material conditions of
17 the production of that matter'. We agree that attention to the vitality of objects can run
18 the risk of a-politicizing situations if it foregrounds the 'contributions of nonhuman actors'
19 (Bennett, 2010, p. x) in ways that reduce the accountability of human actors. Avoiding this
20 depoliticization, we highlight how the vitality of objects can play into or be mobilized
21 against contestations over homemaking between unequally positioned human agents,
22 who, as outlined above, have different historically produced capacities to affect and be
23 affected. In solidarity with emerging feminist critiques of assemblage uptake in
24 geography, it is important that 'assemblages that produce, mobilize, and
25 maintain...bodies' differential symbolic-material status' are better foregrounded in
26 geographical knowledge-making (Kinkaïd, 2019: 4) and in the home specifically. In the
27 paper, we consider how the attempts of residents to territorialize the flats in
28 PLACE/Ladywell as a home are enacted through, and made difficult by, objects and
29 materials that the building's stakeholders provide them with or prohibit them from using.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Thirdly, we show how homemaking can reject and resist these inequalities through rule
50 bending or breaking. As well as referring to how residents accommodate restrictions over
51 their homemaking capacities, we explore homemaking as an intimate form of activism
52 which defies the rationality of temporary housing providers that homeless domesticities
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are 'out of place'. As Anderson has argued, 'even if a body's 'affective charge' is
4 constituted through the repetition of past contexts and actions, there is nevertheless
5 always a 'slight surprise' to affective life. For a body's affects are never fully determined,
6 there is always an openness to them' (2016: 16). As such, while the past experiences of
7 PLACE/Ladywell residents have produced a capacity to feel precarity intensely, this can
8 also be channeled or transfigured into acts of defiance and protest that seek to generate
9 and affirm new affective capacities, such as the capacity to feel at home. As Vasudevan
10 has iterated in relation to occupation and protest camps, objects deemed 'out of place' -
11 be that the tent in a public square, or the homely fireplace in temporary accommodation,
12 have the political potency to 'come together to assemble alternative lifeworlds and
13 articulate new forms of contentious politics' (2015: 332). This again speaks to Deleuze and
14 Guattari's assertion of territorialisation and deterritorialization as politicized processes
15 (Deleuze & Guattari, 2003). For residents of PLACE/Ladywell to territorialize a temporarily
16 allocated property by assembling a home, however precarious, within it, is a political act
17 that resists, and asserts the contingency of, current material and ideological
18 configurations of the UK's housing economy, and within this, asserts the capacity (and
19 legitimacy) of PLACE/Ladywell's residents to feel at home.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **The Bedroom Door Lock: assembling private space in the home**

39
40
41 As has been widely discussed, those requiring access to social housing are increasingly
42 framed as 'abject, deviant citizens, struggling financially as a consequence of their
43 individual moral degeneracy, rather than through any failure on the part of the state'
44 (AUTHOR, 2017, p. 123; Tyler, 2013). Social tenants are commonly portrayed as
45 'scroungers', greedily taking up public resources due to a lack of willingness to put in the
46 work required to secure private housing. This is, of course, a discourse that conveniently
47 forgets the conditions that make private tenancies or purchases impossible and/or
48 undesirable, including the dire shortage of affordable private housing, falling wages (in
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 real terms), rising underemployment and labour precarity, the prevalence of insecure,
4 short-term contracts in the private rental market, and the pervasively poor standards of
5 privately rented housing (AUTHOR, 2017).
6
7
8
9

10 The framing of social housing tenants as 'under-performing' or failed citizens undergirds,
11 we argue, their infantilization by those who provide and govern social housing, and
12 temporary housing in particular. It justifies a trade of welfare for autonomy, where those
13 who are seen to have failed to provide for themselves, and therefore need to be 'rescued'
14 by the state, are deemed to have proven themselves to be inadequate (neoliberal) adults,
15 thereby forfeiting the rights to the autonomy that others enjoy. In this section we explore
16 the infantilization of residents in temporary accommodation and, specifically, how this
17 infantilization is enacted and mediated through objects, or the lack of them.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We specifically explore how the absence of a bedroom door lock in a flat in
28 PLACE/Ladywell precludes the ability of one woman to maintain her personal life. While it
29 is inarguably of an unusually high standard for temporary accommodation and allows
30 residents far greater home-making capacities than found elsewhere, we show how
31 regulations around seemingly minor and innocuous material dimensions of
32 PLACE/Ladywell still enact a harmful denial of privacy and autonomy. This is especially so
33 of materialities at boundary points which take on heightened significance in home
34 unmakings (AUTHOR, 2014; Burrell, 2014). As Bodnar describes the home comprises a
35 'graduated privateness', ranging from semi-public areas like porches and gardens, to
36 areas like living rooms which guests are invited into, through to rooms such as bedrooms
37 and bathrooms which offer privacy to individual members of households (Bodnar, 2015).
38 Assembling these internal borders and boundaries is an important element of
39 homemaking, offering fixity to the rhythms and patterns of daily life as well as (potentially)
40 to positionalities of residents within the home (e.g. in the hierarchies implied in who gets
41 the master bedroom, or their own private bathroom). As we outlined earlier in the paper,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 whilst we do not claim that such barriers to fixity are unique to homeless families, we
4 argue that the impacts are heightened through compounding experiences of
5 stigmatisation and entrenched narratives of homeless people being undeserving of rights
6 to privacy and autonomy within the home.
7
8
9
10

11
12 **Before moving to PLACE/Ladywell Barbara had been moved around multiple temporary**
13 **accommodations after being evicted from private rental housing.** She has two young
14 children, one of whom has learning difficulties. Barbara was relieved to have been
15 housed in PLACE/Ladywell, and commented that it was much better quality, and much
16 more spacious, than past accommodation. Prior temporary accommodation had been
17 dirty, with crowded communal facilities, and only one bedroom she shared with her
18 children. Almost all her things had had to be placed in storage making it difficult to
19 keep her children occupied in a small room with few possessions. In PLACE/Ladywell,
20 she had been able to bring her belongings out of storage and, to a certain extent,
21 unpack, radically improving her quality of life. **Barbara however expressed disbelief and**
22 **frustration that residents were granted tenancies for only a couple of years: “I don't see**
23 **the point [of moving us again], when you have people that are homeless, and children**
24 **you've just given a lovely new place”.** In Barbara's interview there was a continuous sense
25 that the property had the capacity to generate affects of security and joy but that those
26 were undermined by the temporariness of its provision as well as by restrictions over her
27 ability to make adaptations.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Certain features of the flat were proving problematic. Perhaps most significantly for
46 Barbara, she had been told by the building manager, as had all the other residents, that
47 she couldn't drill any holes or make any, even very minor, changes to the doors or fittings
48 - including not being allowed to put a lock on her bedroom door. After trying to explain
49 her need for this to the housing manager, the sentiment was that *“they're not having*
50 *it...they're really strict...they say it is going to ruin the structure and everything”*. She was
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 told she would need to foot the bill for removing the lock when she left, a cost which
4 made her anxious. This one restriction had a significant impact on Barbara's personal life.
5 Because one of her children has learning difficulties, they were liable to burst into
6 Barbara's room at any time and so, without a lock on the door, it was impossible to
7 guarantee the privacy needed to have romantic and/or sexual partners. This seemingly
8 minor detail, a missing door lock, therefore prevented Barbara from developing
9 relationships during her stay in PLACE/Ladywell. This restriction activated already
10 heightened capacities to be affected by stigma in Barbara, formed across her past
11 experiences of inadequate and constrictive housing. However, Barbara also felt unable to
12 violate the rule, because of an equally heightened capacity to be affected by economic
13 insecurity, which made her worry about the costs of infringing it. She explained further,
14 "...and I've actually been getting some advice about whether I could get, like, a little bolt
15 instead, but I don't want them to say, afterwards they'll say, 'oh you have a bill'".
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The lack of a door lock prevented the territorialization of the flat as a space that could
31 enable privacy, thereby undermining Barbara's capacity for adult relationships. The
32 financial penalty that territorialization demanded was an anxiety too far. The undermining
33 of Barbara's love life in this way resonates with Jeyasingham's discussion of how physical
34 alterations to public toilets reduced opportunities for sex between men (Jeyasingham,
35 2010). For Jeyasingham, objects and materials in public toilets 'come to be key parts of
36 sexual encounters', providing, for example, hygienic environments, or 'different degrees
37 of seclusion' that organise 'the erotic potential of indistinct and changing boundaries
38 between public and private (312).' In this account, objects and materials are 'vibrant' in
39 that their affective affordances can enable or disable capacities in human actors for sexual
40 interactions to take place. In both these examples, the undermining of the sex lives of
41 certain subjects is enacted not through explicit legislation but through activating
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 particular affordances of objects and materials in order to generate assemblages that
4
5 disable those capacities in human actors.
6
7

8 Restrictions on visitors are common in temporary accommodation. Weisman has explored
9
10 how, in homeless shelters 'Few visitors are permitted, and when they are there is no place
11
12 to entertain them, be they a relative, friend or lover' suggesting 'that homeless people do
13
14 not need privacy, self-expression, friendship and sexual relations, or at least that these
15
16 needs should not be taken seriously' (Weisman, 1992, p. 78). For Weisman, this lack of
17
18 autonomy granted to homeless families explains why 'housing for the homeless is referred
19
20 to as a "shelter", meaning a roof over your head, rather than a "home", which implies
21
22 autonomy and emotional as well as material support" (78). Yet, although PLACE/Ladywell
23
24 is framed, by Lewisham Council and RSH+P as a 'home' for its residents, autonomy
25
26 remains lacking. PLACE/Ladywell offers residents some autonomy over what they can do
27
28 and who they can have in their flats. However, the refusal of a door lock for Barbara
29
30 exposes how residents' autonomy remains curtailed even in this comparatively liberating
31
32 setting. As such, its absence shows how rights to privacy and respect are being infringed
33
34 through the devaluation and denigration of certain people, relationships, and living
35
36 arrangements (Brown, 2015).
37
38

39 Scholars studying other instances and forms of temporary accommodation, including
40
41 homeless shelters and subsidised housing projects for the homeless in the USA (Choi &
42
43 Snyder, 2008; DeWard & Moe, 2010; Speer 2017) and refugee reception centres in the
44
45 Netherlands (Van der Horst, 2004) have argued that restrictions over the autonomy of
46
47 residents lead them to feel infantilized. Van der Horst argues that one of the key elements
48
49 missed in relation to the meanings of home is autonomy as residents are stripped of many
50
51 of the 'taken for granted privileges of adult life' (43). In reception centres and homeless
52
53 shelters this is often enacted through processes including 'checks of tidiness', the
54
55 allocation of vouchers and pocket money, or the provision of restricted options over food
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and drink which carry “the presumption that one is incapable of regulating one’s own
4 affairs’ (DeWard & Moe, 2010, p. 120). While no such rules are enforced in
5 PLACE/Ladywell, the retraction of autonomy remains present, enacted through objects, or
6 their absence, as in the case of Barbara’s missing door lock. The lack of a door lock means
7 that, for Barbara, even though she has been housed in PLACE/Ladywell for up to two years,
8 life remains on hold as she is unable to develop this aspect of her personal life. The simple
9 refusal of a door lock means that her ‘taken for granted privileges of adult life’ are
10 compromised because she lives in temporary accommodation.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Barbara’s dilemma speaks to a wider issue exacerbated by the UK’s housing crisis, whereby
21 the autonomy, or lack thereof, that adults possess relates directly to their tenure status.
22 For a homeowner, putting a lock on a door is something that can be done without second
23 thought, yet for social housing tenants, and indeed many renters, these kinds of taken for
24 granted privileges are not always available. This creates a two-tier system within which a
25 person’s ability to govern their personal life is determined by the kind of housing they
26 have access to, which structures the materials and objects they are able to engage in
27 assemblages of homemaking, and how they are able to do so. As Barbara’s experience
28 shows, restrictions over materials and objects of homemaking are also restrictions over
29 the capacities of residents, because removal of those objects is a removal of the
30 affordances they provide to people. Inequality is therefore felt and lived in the everyday,
31 as objects, or missing objects, such as the door lock, enact disenfranchisement and
32 infantilization, serving as reminders to residents of PLACE/Ladywell that they are
33 subservient to those providing their housing.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Slippery Surfaces: Deterritorializing senses of home**

50
51
52 Social housing is no longer seen as an appropriate setting within which to make long term
53 homes in the UK. As AUTHOR has explored elsewhere, contemporary housing policy does
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not recognise that 'a dwelling provided by welfare is as much a home as one that has
4 been purchased by an individual on the free market' (2017, p. 135). In this section, we
5 argue that this is reflected in both the design of temporary housing and in expectations
6 over its upkeep. Specifically, we do so through an examination of walls.
7
8
9

10
11
12 As well as objects, the material substances and surfaces around us have an affective
13 power, shaping how we feel in our surroundings. For example, Watson has explored how,
14 as part of an urban environment, water can 'generate particular passions, attachments
15 and a sense of belonging' and can enrol 'bodies in new connections, socialities, alliances
16 and politics' (Watson, 2017). In specific relation to the Lidos in Hampstead Heath, London,
17 she argues for the importance of water, as an 'immersive' substance, in generating senses
18 of belonging in the local area. Contrary to this, the surfaces surrounding residents in
19 PLACE/Ladywell seemed designed to deny belonging and refute efforts at attachment.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Wall hangings and fixings are commonly understood as central to the production of
30 home. Parrott has explored how in settings where residents *don't* want to feel at home,
31 for example in psychiatric units, they tend to resist encouragement to put things on the
32 walls in order to 'assert that the institution is a temporary place' (Parrott, 2005). Burrell
33 (2014) reports too of how residents of a particular Leicester neighbourhood divest
34 themselves of objects, 'exiling' them into storage to enhance the feeling that they will
35 leave for a better home at some point in the future (Burrell, 2014). Conversely, many of
36 the families we interviewed at PLACE/Ladywell would have liked to make changes to the
37 walls of their accommodation in order to create a more adequate sense of home for
38 themselves. Gemma interpreted the rules against wall fixtures and hangings as an attack
39 on the ability of residents to make home in PLACE/Ladywell and suggested that the
40 spacious store room built into each flat was intended as a place for them to put their
41 possessions *instead* of having them around the house and on the walls as one normally
42 would. She explained;
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
"So we was told, nothing on the walls, like nothing... I said to the property manager, so basically you want us to leave everything in the boxes, is that what that room's for, that little cupboard, you want everything stacked up in there? And basically they just said "Yeah."

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
Gemma had indeed ended up using the store- room to keep things with which to decorate her imagined future home, including a roll of Laura Ashley wallpaper which she had bought to decorate her former, privately rented, home. Gemma was somewhat relieved that she hadn't gotten around to putting it up immediately, as a week after buying it her landlord evicted her to sell the property after 12 years of her living there. She explained what happened next,

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
'I was like oh no, this couldn't have happened at a worse time, yeah and that was it really so I ended up being homeless, I didn't really understand the procedure, I went down [to the council office] and they said basically we can't do anything until the actual day you're out...which for me was like ludicrous cause I was like what do I do then, what do I do with my contents of a three bedroom house and a garage? I don't understand.'

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Gemma went on to describe her tears on eviction day as she asked her local authority to be re-housed. For 18-months Gemma moved from one 'disgusting' emergency accommodation to the next, and was told that her belongings could be kept in a warehouse they would provide. Concerned about the security of her belongings given how many years it had taken to 'build up nice things' and describing herself as 'very OCD' in their care, she was also vexed about its perceived lack of cleanliness. This she said, 'just threw me off the edge, so I said no, I'm not gonna do that'. Her dad luckily

1
2
3 stepped in to pay the £400/month for her belongings to be put in a private storage
4 facility which offered insurance.
5
6
7

8 Gemma has been reunited with her belongings at PLACE/Ladywell. She told us, however,
9 how she'd love to be able to use her wallpaper to create a 'feature wall' in the
10 PLACE/Ladywell flat, *'like, to make it more homely, but obviously we can't'*. Here, the ability
11 to put up her wallpaper is, for Gemma, a marker of a permanent family home and her
12 inability to do so in PLACE/Ladywell reiterates her awareness of its temporary allocation
13 to her and her family. These strict regulations regarding decoration were enforced despite
14 the fact that PLACE/Ladywell's architect told us he had designed the walls of the flat to be
15 easily 'popped-off' and replaced in order to facilitate customisation. This highlights a
16 conscience decision on the part of Lewisham Council to diminish residents' ability to fix
17 themselves, in this case literally, and imprint their identities on the walls of
18 PLACE/Ladywell.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The prohibition of nails had led many residents in PLACE/Ladywell to turn to stick-on
32 solutions. In compensatory attempts to make the walls of the flats homely, multiple
33 families had decided to decorate using wall stickers given they couldn't hang frames on
34 the walls. Gemma had put up a wall sticker expressing her love for her family. Another
35 resident, Scott, had also bought *'those sticky picture things'* as he went on to explain,
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *"...well the thing is we've been told we're not allowed to put any pictures up on the*
43 *walls, we're not allowed to make any holes, but we went out and got those sticky*
44 *picture things...we've done stuck up a couple of pictures and what not. So instead of*
45 *having the walls as a completely blank canvas, you know like you want it to feel like*
46 *home."*
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Scott's family had spent the last five years moving from temporary accommodation to
54 temporary accommodation across South London, including in hostels. He had been
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *"pasted from pillar to post really"* and had endured multiple encounters of living in one-
4 roomed accommodation which *"which was full of rats"* and another where *"my daughter*
5 *was sleeping and the mouse was right there next to her"*.
6
7
8
9

10 The stickers in each flat expressed, although very differently, the ethos of the homes they
11 were decorating to counter the *"blank space"* they were given but restricted from
12 decorating as they wished. Scott's sticker, placed in the kitchen, read 'Today's Menu Has
13 Two Choices: TAKE IT or LEAVE IT', which played into Scott's humorous self-representation
14 as a stressed dad to a young family. Gemma's sticker read 'My Kids & Me Forever' and
15 was placed above some decorative flowers, embellishing the homely, comforting
16 atmosphere she had tried to produce throughout the flat. Both however spoke to the
17 clear desire to make home. Gemma, for example, had also creatively hung decorative
18 accessories on existing fixtures that expressed love and evoked home for her (Figure 2).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Figure 2: 'Love makes a house a home' decorative accessory in Gemma's flat
30
31 (Photograph by Author, 2017)
32
33



1
2
3 The importance placed on decorative items like this by residents emphasizes the
4 significant role of affective capacities in strengthening ties between elements of
5 assemblages. They strengthen emotional attachments between residents and the building
6 they are making home in.
7
8
9
10

11
12 The highly personalised wall stickers, in particular, provided a popular compromise for
13 decorating the flats in PLACE/Ladywell because they could be peeled off the walls at the
14 end of tenancies, ensuring residents wouldn't incur fines. The peeling off of the stickers
15 would be especially easy because the walls of PLACE/Ladywell are in fact designed to be
16 wipe-clean and therefore not easily damaged or marked. This design feature is pragmatic
17 and convenient for a building designed to be deconstructed and moved potentially
18 multiple times and to house multiple rounds of tenants during its lifespan. However it
19 also, we argue, exacerbates residents' sense of being of place in the building, not wanted
20 there nor intended as its permanent residents. As Cresswell has argued, objects in public
21 space work to create a 'normative landscape' which designates 'what is right, just, and
22 appropriate' (Cresswell, 1996, 8) and PLACE/Ladywell's wipe-clean walls suggest to
23 residents they are not invited to make home there. One resident even described feeling
24 almost like the walls were resisting her attempts to decorate, explaining her battle trying
25 to hang up pictures with sticky hooks (rather than the banned nails) that she would put
26 up repeatedly, only for them to fall down again. The slippery surfaces of PLACE/Ladywell
27 left residents unable to literally attach things to the walls and therefore unable to fully
28 attach, emotionally, to the flats as home. Angell (2014), in her discussion of assemblages
29 of home and housing in Istanbul's earthquake-prone urban environment, has shown how
30 in places at risk of disaster there is heightened sensitivity to the capacities of materials
31 and their potentials to unmake home, for example, to the possibility that 'bad concrete'
32 could cause a building to collapse. Similarly, PLACE/Ladywell residents demonstrate a
33 heightened sensitivity to the materials of the building because of their housing precarity
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and are acutely affected by how those materials afford or deny their capacity to make
4 home. Gemma's 'Love makes a house a home' (Figure 2) decorative accessory cradled on
5 her temperature monitor could also be removed without any trace, or damage to the
6 walls, when she left.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Theorizations of assemblage highlight the metastability of any given configuration
13 (Delanda, 2002; Anderson & McFarlane, 2011). All assemblages are precarious, open to
14 be deterritorialized (Delanda, 2002) but some assemblages are more stable than others.
15
16 What determines the stability of an assemblage is the strength of the attractions and
17 connections between components. In PLACE/Ladywell, assemblages of homemaking are
18 especially precarious because of the weakness of the ties between components of the
19 building and the objects residents have brought with them. The building itself, as a
20 mobile, modular building, is designed *against* fixity; here we see how the materiality of
21 the walls resist attempts by residents to fix possessions in place. McFarlane and Anderson
22 have explored how assemblages can 'claim' territory, holding 'heterogeneous parts'
23 together (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011). However, here attempts to claim territory are
24 thwarted by materials deployed in the building of PLACE/Ladywell. As Angell (2014)
25 elaborates, sensitivity to materiality in such crisis contexts also exposes the 'politics of
26 responsibility' embedded in urban assemblages. When assemblages become or are
27 precarious, questions are raised about the valuations explicit in how 'good' and 'bad'
28 materials have been distributed, and the power imbalances enacted through who gets to
29 make decisions regarding those materials and their distribution. In PLACE/Ladywell, the
30 valuations and power balances are clear; residents have been allocated materials by
31 stakeholders who have a vested interest in undermining their attempts at durable
32 homemaking, given their plans to move both the tenants and the building in the near-
33 term future.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 As well as not affording the fixing of decorations in place, the wipe-clean walls at
5 PLACE/Ladywell deterritorialized assemblages of homemaking through their affective
6 force. The wipe-clean walls made some residents of PLACE/Ladywell anxious about being
7 perceived as dirty. Tyler (2013) has shown how social groups deemed to be abject are
8 framed as 'revolting' in contemporary society. She details revulsion as an aesthetic and
9 emotional reaction that naturalizes what are in fact moral and social judgements and thus
10 reinforces social hierarchies. She explores how certain stigmatized groups, such as asylum
11 seekers, travellers and gypsies are figured as being unclean and, drawing on Douglas's
12 definition of dirt as 'matter out of place', thus deemed undeserving of inhabiting certain
13 spaces. In PLACE/Ladywell, expectations over the cleaning of the properties, reiterated by
14 the wipe-clean walls, made residents self-conscious of their stigmatized positionality as
15 homeless people, also commonly represented as dirty. As Anderson has argued,
16 representations have affective force (2016). In PLACE/Ladywell, this was mediated via the
17 wipe-clean walls and Gemma also experienced it through the materiality of other spaces
18 she encountered in the process of becoming homeless, for example in the fact that the
19 council thought it acceptable for her belongings to be stored in a dirty warehouse facility.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Many of the residents in PLACE/Ladywell expressed their anxieties regarding trying to
37 keep the flats clean. Grace wondered "*how other people are maintaining this white, in*
38 *other people's flats, I don't know!*". Scott said that on moving in he had "*turned round and*
39 *said to them, I've got three young kids, there's no way white walls are staying white walls*"
40 but had then been relieved to find that the walls were wipe-clean, although he still worried
41 that he wouldn't be able to leave the place as it was when they moved in. Scott was
42 convinced that the managers at PLACE/Ladywell were judging the standards of cleanliness
43 that the residents could maintain and that it was '*a test to see how clean you keep your*
44 *house*' which would impact on '*where they place you*' [when allocating permanent
45 housing]. Scott had internalized a sense of shame about his own dirt, expressed, for
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 example, in an embarrassment that the only route to the bins was via the front gate,
4 meaning he had to take the rubbish out in public. He was also critical of others in the
5 building who he deemed not to be upholding the required standards and would therefore
6 be less favourably judged than himself and his family when permanent housing was
7 allocated. He said;
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 *"My neighbour just down the stairs they've literally trashed their house, there's a hole*
15 *in the wall there, this door's off, that door's off, like.... I'm not saying my house is the*
16 *greatest but I've got three young kids so it's hard to keep a place tidy but literally as*
17 *you walk in here to walking in down there looks like a crack house, here looks like a*
18 *family home, you know what I mean?"*
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 If, for Tyler, subjects internalize and reproduce stigmas attached to them then it is clear
26 that Scott has internalized the sense that homeless families are judged for being dirty, not
27 only using it to scrutinize his own flat but to judge his neighbours. While feeling like the
28 requirement to keep white walls clean is a big ask of families with young children, he tries
29 his best to comply with these rules, cleaning, as he describes '24/7' and using wall stickers
30 rather than hangings to make the flat feel homely without breaking any rules.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Scott's frantic cleaning aims to prevent any trace of himself and his family being left in
39 the property in order to secure the best chance of them being housed in appropriate
40 permanent accommodation. Trying to become 'invisible' is a common theme in work on
41 homelessness. Datta, in her work on homelessness and materiality, has described how the
42 physical structure of a homeless shelter in Phoenix was designed to be 'invisible' after it
43 faced opposition from local people who felt it would threaten business (Datta, 2005, p.
44 541). Similarly, but on the scale of people rather than buildings, Williams has described
45 how homeless women try to make their presence in temporary accommodation less felt
46 so as to avoid being judged by staff. Williams writes that one woman 'goes as far as to
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 borrow laundry soap from her husband, who does not live at the shelter and from whom
4 she separated due to his physical abuse, so that the staff will not think she has used too
5 much of the shelter soap' (Williams, 1996, p. 107).
6
7
8
9

10 Similarly to the accounts described above, the walls in PLACE/Ladywell encourage
11 residents to be 'invisible' in their own (temporary) homes, by leaving no trace of
12 themselves. The wipe-clean walls signify to residents that they and the homes they wish
13 to make are 'revolting', and that their presence must be minimized as much as possible.
14 Or, to frame the situation through Douglas's characterisation of dirt as matter out-of-
15 place, residents are encouraged to feel that they and their homes are dirt, that they are
16 undesirable, out of place subjects and that any trace of their presence left in the building
17 will be penalized. Residents' internalisation of the stigma surrounding them is reflected in
18 their homemaking practices, as in their attempts to make home using wall stickers or
19 stick-on hangers they also comply with the rules in the flats and with the normative
20 expectations that their presence should be minimally visible and ultimately erasable from
21 the building. These attempts at invisibility are enacted by weakening relationships
22 between people and places, ensuring that relations between them leave as little trace as
23 possible. This necessarily weakens the assemblage itself, lessening the degree to which
24 human and non-human elements are entrained.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **The Fireplace: Activating Latent Capacities**

42
43

44 Temporary accommodation, following Tyler, can be classed as a space of abjection, a
45 'border zone' (Tyler, 2013: 41) simultaneously inside and outside the 'body politic proper'.
46 Temporary housing is a liminal space, not, as we have argued, accepted as a space of
47 homemaking, but framed as a waiting space for those currently outside of the neoliberal
48 housing market (who it is hoped will be later placed or replaced into it) and therefore also
49 understood as outside of (neoliberal) society. The last two sections have explored how
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the liminal status of temporary accommodations' inhabitants is reiterated through
4 furnishings, including how material features inhibit their autonomy and agency, preclude
5 their ability to make home and reinforce stigmatizing representations. In these instances,
6 the affordances of objects and materials deterritorialize assemblages of homemaking,
7 undermining efforts to produce a domestic environment. In this section however, we
8 move on to explore how a fireplace, erected by Gemma in her PLACE/Ladywell flat,
9 enables her to defiantly assert the value of her home and herself, constituting a refusal to
10 be relegated to the 'meanwhile' space-time that PLACE/Ladywell, as a building, occupies.
11 Here Gemma actualises the political potencies of objects to do so. As detailed previously,
12 residents of PLACE/Ladywell had been forbidden from making any holes in the walls of
13 the flats. As well as precluding hanging pictures, this also meant that no furnishings could
14 be nailed to the walls. However, Gemma, while accommodating these rules to some extent
15 (for example by not putting up her wallpaper) saw them as unreasonable and had decided,
16 in defiance of the instructions, to screw a much loved fireplace into one of the walls of the
17 living room (albeit with plans to use Polyfilla to later cover up the holes created).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 3: Gemma's fireplace at PLACE/Ladywell (Photograph by Author, 2017)



Before visiting Gemma we had already heard about her fireplace in the media. It had gained much attention from journalists and architects who had visited her flat, partly through an appreciation of its aesthetics and partly, perhaps, in comedic appreciation of Gemma's bold decorative move in a property that, designed as emergency accommodation for homeless families, people weren't expected or encouraged to decorate. Gemma was pleased that people had been commenting on her fire place, boasting that *"Everybody said it just makes the room....the fire place does make the room, doesn't it, and I'm very proud."*

Gemma had originally bought the fireplace for the house she had rented long-term before being made homeless. She had bought it cheap but worked hard to refurbish it, describing how she had *"fitted the back myself...made the hearth, the bottom half, rubbed it down, painted it, bought the mirror."* Having the fireplace in PLACE/Ladywell was very important for Gemma in terms of continuity with her old home and she had felt sad about the idea of leaving it in the storage cupboard, along with the wallpaper, to wait for a future

1
2
3 property. As she commented, the PLACE/Ladywell flat *"was a blank space and in my*
4 *previous house I had also lived in a blank space"* that was not conducive to feeling
5 *"homely"*.
6
7
8
9

10 As DeWard and Moe have argued, being able 'to construct and maintain a sense of self-
11 worth' within the context of temporary accommodation 'may be critical for survival'
12 (DeWard & Moe, 2010), but comes under threat when women are required to live by rules
13 that undermine their autonomy. They outline the struggles of women to assert their
14 agency within such regulated environments, detailing how any resistance to the
15 regulations is often read as an act of insanity, on the assumption that only somebody
16 mentally unsound would refuse to comply with what are seen as reasonable and basic
17 rules. However, we argue that small acts of defiance, such as Gemma's insistence on
18 putting her fireplace up in PLACE/Ladywell, are, as Deward and Moe suggest, important
19 avowals of self-worth.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The last two sections explored how limitations on homemaking are linked to the stigma
32 faced by certain demographics, who are seen as less deserving of homemaking
33 opportunities. Here, Gemma refuses to be stigmatized. Rather than anxiously complying
34 with the expectations of how the flats should be kept, as Scott, for example, does, she is
35 defiantly proud of the alternations she has made. The fireplace is a way for Gemma to
36 assert that she will not be made transient and that her home will be made within what
37 space and time she has. The 'thing power' (Bennett, 2004) of the fireplace, its power in
38 asserting Gemma's intentions to make home in the flat, is clear from the reactions it
39 received from the media. Its potency lies in its ability to bring out capacities in the
40 PLACE/Ladywell flats that were not meant to be activated. In Deleuzian accounts of
41 assemblage, virtual properties refer to a system's real but un-activated capacities,
42 capacities that can be made actual by bifurcations of that assemblage. As we have seen,
43 the PLACE/Ladywell flats are emphatically positioned as temporary accommodation, their
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 capacity to become durable homes systemically undermined through their materialities
4 and the rules surrounding them. Yet Gemma's addition of the fireplace, defiantly nailed
5 into the wall, activates and exposes the capacity that the flats *do* have to become home
6 and in doing so demonstrates that refusals of that capacity are ideological. The media
7 were fascinated by Gemma's fireplace precisely because it claimed a capacity for
8 homemaking that had been disallowed and in doing so revealed the deliberate nature of
9 that prohibition.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 But if 'disobedient objects' are most commonly ones that have been re-appropriated 'and
19 turned to a new purpose' (Flood & Grindon, 2014, p. 15), so that what is radical is, in part,
20 the subversion of a things designated use, then, contrary to this, Gemma's fireplace is
21 radical precisely because it is fulfilling its intended purpose - decorating and warming a
22 home (her fireplace serving as an electric heater as well as decoration). Using a fireplace
23 the way it should be used, to create home, is in this context a radical act, because, in
24 appearing inappropriate, it exposes the restrictions enacted on PLACE/Ladywell residents.
25 As Angell writes, following Bennett, things and objects become 'political matter' when
26 'recognized and discursively mobilized' a within a system of meaning. The vibrancy of
27 Gemma's fireplace unfolds within a system of meaning that it illuminates and contests
28 (Angell, 2014).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 What is at stake here is the right to make home as an integral dimension of the right to
42 agency over ones' environment and forming the emotional and legal foundations from
43 which to participate in civic life. For Rolnik, special housing rapporteur for the UN, "the
44 right to adequate housing has to be understood as a gateway to other rights, it is a
45 condition that has to be fulfilled in order to ensure the exercise of belonging in all its
46 aspects" (Rolnik, 2014). In this vein, Gemma's defiant homemaking can also be read as an
47 assertion of her rights and value as a human being and of her 'belonging' in London.
48 While other residents, as discussed in the section above, clean anxiously, conforming to
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 expectations that they will leave no trace of themselves in the building, Gemma does not
4 shy away from asserting that she belongs, albeit temporarily, in PLACE/Ladywell, by
5 erecting a fireplace, an object strongly symbolic of a home that is fixed and stable. Indeed,
6 scholars have explored how fireplaces have historically served as both aesthetic and
7 emotional centrepieces of domestic space, including by providing a mantelpiece on which
8 to display and arrange markers of "self...home and family" (Hurdley, 2006), such as the
9 ornaments and pictures that Gemma has positioned above the fireplace. As Rolnik
10 suggests, being able to feel at home seemed to underscore an ability to exercise other
11 rights for Gemma who was vocal about her treatment after being made homeless, and
12 had managed to be moved to PLACE/Ladywell following numerous discussions with her
13 MP.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Tyler writes that 'the politics of the abject is a counter-spatial politics, which attempts to
27 reclaim the spaces and zones of abjection as radical sites of revolt' (Tyler, 2013, p. 41). As
28 argued, temporary accommodation can be seen as an 'internal border zone' where people
29 live who are 'excluded from the body of the state' because of their perceived failures at
30 securing housing within a neoliberal housing economy, into which it is hoped they will
31 subsequently enter. However, abjection, for Tyler, can also be a political positionality from
32 which those excluded can reassert their rights to participate in society via a reclamation
33 of space. She writes that the 'the politics of the abject is a counter-spatial politics which
34 attempts to reclaim the spaces and zones of abjection as radical sites of revolt' (Ibid). Read
35 through this assertion, Gemma's fireplace can be seen as an act of transgressive place-
36 making (Giorgi & Fasulo, 2013) and as a radical reclamation of PLACE/Ladywell. Although
37 designated a liminal space, within which residents should *wait* for a home that will
38 supposedly reintegrate them into society, Gemma repurposes PLACE/Ladywell as a site of
39 affirmation for her *current* and un-provisional status as a resident and citizen of London,
40 refusing to be a 'temporary person' just because she is in temporary housing.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

By bringing together thinking in assemblage theory and critical material geographies of home in this paper, we have examined how fixtures and fittings mediate the politics of homemaking and unmaking amongst families living in temporary accommodation. We have shown how stigmas related to the neoliberalisation of housing are reproduced through the material infrastructures of temporary social housing, as rules over the contents and upkeep of such properties reinforce the infantilization of those not fulfilling expectations of private ownership or rental. **In mobilising assemblage theory we have attended to how capacities to affect and be affected are 'differentiated' (Anderson, 2016, 11), 'emerging from and expressing specific relational configurations, whilst also becoming elements within those formations' (11). Specifically, we have shown how the unequal positioning of subjects within London's housing system govern their capacities to be affected by non-human elements of homemaking assemblages, and in particular to experience stigma via material elements of homemaking.** We have also considered how everyday objects, such as a fireplace, can be deployed in acts of defiance to such stigmatizing forces. Attending to their vitality, we have demonstrated how the affordances of objects can be activated to enable certain territorializations and deterritorializations of space, thereby enabling or disabling processes of homemaking under challenging circumstances.

What is clear from the stories of families in PLACE/Ladywell is that a lack of control over the fixtures and fittings they need to make home does significant damage to people's sense of self. The stories in this paper expose how the precarity of being homeless is lived not just through the spatio-temporalities of moves and displacements from and between properties, but through the micro space-times of everyday life; of interactions with objects, or indeed, their absence. In exploring these items, a door lock, wall stickers, and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

fireplace, we have shown how inequalities within the neoliberal housing system are enacted through precarious assemblages of homemaking. Despite residents' attempts to fix assemblages of home into stable configurations, the senses of home they manage to create remain precarious. We have argued that this is due to a politicized, ideologically driven distribution and governance of materials that deprives people in temporary accommodation of their capacities to make home effectively. We have also demonstrated that political potencies of objects and materials can be activated to both entrench and resist such valuations; acting as vital elements of negotiations between fixity and impermanence in temporary accommodation.

Bibliography

Anderson, B, 2016, *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*, Durham, Ashgate

Anderson, B. & McFarlane, C., 2011. Assemblage and Geography. *Area*, 43(2), pp. 124-127.

Angell, E., 2014. Assembling Disaster: Earthquakes and urban politics in Istanbul. *City*, 18(6), pp. 667-678.

Beauregard, R., 2015. We Blame the Building! The Architecture of Distributed Responsibility. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

Bennett, J., 2004. The Force of Things: steps toward an Ecology of Matter. *Political Theory*, 32(3), pp. 347-372.

Bennett, J., 2010. *Vibrant Matter*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Blunt, A. & Dowling, R., 2006. *Home*. London, New York: Routledge.

Bodnar, J., 2015. Reclaiming Public Space. *Urban Studies*, 52(12), pp. 2090-2140.

1
2
3 Brown, G., 2015. Marriage and the Spare Bedroom: Exploring the Sexual Politics of
4 Austerity. *ACME*, 14(4).

5
6
7 Burrell, K., 2014. Spilling Over from the Street. *Home Cultures*, 11(2).

8
9
10 Choi, N. G. & Snyder, L., 2008. Voices of Homeless Parents: The Pain of Homelessness
11 and Shelter Life. *Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment*, 2(3), pp. 55-77.

12
13
14 Datta, A., 2005. "Homed" in Arizona: The Architecture of Emergency Shelters. *Urban*
15 *Geography*, 26(6), pp. 536-557.

16
17
18 Dayaratne, R. & Kellett, P., 2008. Housing and home-making in low-income settlements:
19 Sri Lanka and Colombia. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 23(1), pp. 53-70.

20
21
22 Delanda, M., 2002. *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. London, New York:
23 Bloomsbury.

24
25
26 Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F., 2003. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*.
27 London: Continuum.

28
29
30 DeWard, S. & Moe, A. M., 2010. "Like a Prison!": Homeless Women's Narratives of
31 Surviving Shelter. *The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 37(1), pp. 115-134.

32
33
34 Douglas, M., 1991. The idea of home: A kind of space. *Social Research* , 58(1), pp. 287-
35 307.

36
37
38 Fernandez Arrigoita, M. 2014. *Unmaking Public Housing Towers: The Role of Lifts and*
39 *Stairs in the Demolition of a Puerto Rican project*, *Home Cultures*, 11(2): 167-196.

40
41
42 Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G. & Wilcox, S., 2017. *The homelessness monitor:*
43 *England 2017*, London: Crisis .

44
45
46 Flood, C. & Grindon, G., 2014. *Disobedient Objects*. London: Harry N. Abrams.

47
48
49 Gavron, N., 2017. *Homes&Property*. [Online]. Available at:
50 [https://www.homesandproperty.co.uk/property-news/factorybuilt-homes-could-be-the-](https://www.homesandproperty.co.uk/property-news/factorybuilt-homes-could-be-the-answer-to-londons-property-crisis-so-why-the-delay-a113486.html)
51 [answer-to-londons-property-crisis-so-why-the-delay-a113486.html](https://www.homesandproperty.co.uk/property-news/factorybuilt-homes-could-be-the-answer-to-londons-property-crisis-so-why-the-delay-a113486.html). [Accessed 28 11
52 2017].
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Giorgi, S. & Fasulo, A., 2013. Transformative Homes: Squatting and furnishing as sociocultural projects. *Home Cultures*, 10(2), pp. 111-133.

Hurdley, R., 2006. *Dismantling mantelpieces: consumption as spectacle and shaper of self in the home*. Cardiff: s.n.

Jeyasingham, D., 2010. Building heteronormativity: the social and material reconstruction of men's public toilets as spaces of heterosexuality. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 11(4), pp. 307-325.

Kinkaid, E. 2019. Can assemblage think difference? A feminist critique of assemblage geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* Online First

Kollewe, J., 2016. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/dec/14/london-uk-housing-crisis-lewisham-pop-up-homes-ladywell-development>. [Accessed 28 11 2017].

Lancione, M. 2016. Racialised dissatisfaction: homelessness management and the everyday assemblage of difference, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41(4): 363-375.

Lees, L., Annunziata, S. & Rivas-Alonso, C., 2018. Resisting Planetary Gentrification: The Value of Survivability in the Fight to Stay Put. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108(2), pp. 346-355.

Lemke, T., 2018. An Alternative Model of Politics? Prospects and Problems of Jane Bennett's Vital Materialism. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 35(6), pp. 31-54.

Lewisham, 2017. *Lewisham.gov.uk*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.lewisham.gov.uk/inmyarea/regeneration/lewishamtowncentre/Pages/placeladywell.asp>. [Accessed 28 11 2017].

Marrs, C., 2017. *ArchitectsJournal*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/use-prefabs-to-tackle-londons-housing-crisis-mayor-urged/10022963.article>. [Accessed 28 11 2017].

McFarlane, C., 2011. The city as assemblage: dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Volume 29, pp. 649-671.

1
2
3 Miller, D., 2008. *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.

4
5
6 Miller, D., 2010. *Stuff*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

7
8 NewLondonArchitecture, 2017. *New London Architecture*. [Online]. Available at:
9 <http://www.newlondonarchitecture.org/whats-on/new-london-awards/new-london-awards/awards-winners-2016> [Accessed 28 11 2017].

10
11
12 Parrott, F., 2005. 'It's Not Forever' The Material Culture of Hope. *Journal of Material Culture*, 10(3), pp. 245-262.

13
14
15
16
17 Pilkey, B., 2014. Queering heteronormativity at home: older gay Londoners and the negotiation of domestic materiality. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 21(9), pp. 1142-1157.

18
19
20
21 Puar, J., 2017. *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Durham: Duke University Press.

22
23
24
25
26 Rolnik, R., 2014. Place, inhabitation and citizenship: the right to housing and the right to the city in the contemporary urban world. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 14(3), pp. 293-300.

27
28
29
30
31 Sharma, S., 2014. *In the Meantime, Temporality and Cultural Politics*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

32
33
34
35 Soaita, A. & McKee, K., 2019. Assembling a 'kind of' home in the UK private renting sector. *Geoforum*, Volume online first.

36
37
38
39
40 Tolia-Kelly, D. P., 2012. The geographies of cultural geography III: Material geographies, vibrant matters and risking surface geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(1), pp. 153-160.

41
42
43
44
45 Tyler, I., 2013. *Revolting Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*. London, New York: Zed Books.

46
47
48
49
50 Van der Horst, H., 2004. Living in a reception centre: the search for home in an institutional setting. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 21(1), pp. 36-46.

51
52
53
54
55 Vasudevan, A. 2015. The autonomous city: Towards a critical geography of occupation, *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(3): 316-337.

56

57

58

59

60

1
2
3 Watson, S., 2017. Liquid passions: bodies, publics and city waters. *Social and Cultural*
4 *Geography*, pp. 1470-1197.
5

6
7 Weisman, L. K., 1992. *Discrimination By Design: A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made*
8 *Environment*. Illinois: University of Illinois.
9

10
11 Whatmore, S., 2006. Materialist returns: practising cultural geography in and for a more-
12 than-human world. *Cultural Geographies*, 13(4), pp. 600-609.
13

14
15 Wilcox, S., Perry, J., Stephens, M. & Williams, P., 2018. *UK Housing Review*, London:
16 Chartered Institute of Housing and Heriot-Watt University.
17

18
19 Williams, J. C., 1996. Geography of The Homeless Shelter: staff Surveillance and Resident
20 Resistance. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic*
21 *Development*, 1, 25(1), pp. 75-113.
22

23
24
25 Wilson, W. & Barton, C., 2019. *Households in temporary accommodation (England)*, s.l.:
26 House of Commons Briefing Paper Number 02110.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 [i] Laura Ashley is a chain of shops which sells clothes and interior decorations that are
40 characterised by Romantic English designs often with a nostalgic feel to them. [ii] There
41 are no set definitions for what constitutes a fixture or a fitting, but generally a fixture is
42 understood to be any item that is bolted to the floor or walls, and a fitting to be any item
43 that is free standing or hung by a nail or hook.
44
45
46

47
48 [iii] See <https://www.rsh-p.com/projects/place-ladywell/> for further detail about the
49 development and a video on how it was manufacture. The video also includes a tour of
50 inside one flat before a residents moved in.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 1: Exterior of PLACE/Ladywell (Photograph by Author, 2017)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 2: 'Love makes a house a home' decorative accessory in Gemma's flat (Photograph by Author, 2017)



Figure 3: Gemma's fireplace at PLACE/Ladywell (Photograph by Author, 2017)

1066x1422mm (72 x 72 DPI)