Architectures of disavowal

Abstract
Engaging with scholarship on vertical urbanism, this paper advances an understanding of architectural disavowal to account for the ways that vertical architectures deny their responsibility in causing harm to residential populations. The paper draws on Dionne Brand's notion of disavowal in the vertical city to examine residents' experience of and resistant responses to the harmful effects that vertical developments impose on their daily and nightly lives. In Aldgate, east London, the 13-storey high-rise development, Buckle Street Studio, has caused noise levels to rise, light pollution to intensify, the sky to vanish from sight and daylight to disappear from the flats in the neighbouring block Goldpence Apartments. Drawing on interviews with residents in Goldpence Apartments, the paper documents the extent of these changes and brings attention to the mundane strategies that residents deploy in their attempts to resist the overwhelming sensory invasions and affective intrusions of their homes. By showcasing how residents overturn the affective charge of their new high-rise neighbour/s and refuse – disavow – its force, the paper considers how mundane survival strategies might challenge architectural disavowal in the vertical city and beyond.

Keywords: verticality, high-rise, disavowal, day light**,** light pollution, nuisance

From 782 Wellesley to Buckle Street Studios

In the novel *What We All Long For*, the poet, critic and writer Dionne Brand eloquently draws the reader into the charged lives of a group of young friends who in search of desirous relations and life trajectories, weave their intricate lives into the fabric of Toronto's urban landscape. One of the protagonists, Carla, finds herself haunted by her childhood memories of her mother, Angie, who tragically stepped off the balcony of the tower block she grew up in, 782 Wellesley. Along with her baby brother Jamaal, Carla was removed from the flat and placed in care elsewhere. We join Carla in her early 20'ies on a bike ride where she for the first time since they left re-visits 782 Wellesley, rising above the street:

> 782 Wellesley … stood there indifferent and inhabited by other lives, other worries, other dramas. The building would not register these any more than it had Angie's. 782 Wellesley was built especially for disavowal—it was incapable of nuance or change or attitude. It was innocent. Carla felt a stifling lethargy. Wasn't she just thinking about love? "Draw me a picture of you so I won't forget your face, Mom." Angie had laughed, kissing her. That feature of love, the one that recalled something unadulterated, enjoyable, she no longer remembered it. The flush of pleasure never came on its own. Always the invasive clasp of a wilfulness, as if she loved Angie despite things, not for them. She hated her father because she loved Angie, she loved Jamal because she loved Angie, she loved her friends because she loved Angie, she was a bicycle courier because she loved Angie, she hated policemen and ambulances and bank tellers because she loved Angie… She kept from loving because she loved Angie. She collected nothing like furniture or books because she loved Angie and things would clutter the space between her present self and the self that Angie loved. Carla needed a clear empty path to Angie as a living being. She appeared calm on the outside. She had a cool surface. But the battle to sort out what she could and couldn't love was furious in her… The things that she could touch that reminded her of Angie were few. This building was one. Today it yielded little that could nourish her purpose. (Brand 2005: 110-111)

In this passage, Brand narrates the residential tower block as a building of disavowal because it takes no responsibility for the events that hurled Carla's life into turmoil, and her inner, emotional life into perpetual unrest. 782 Wellesley remains "indifferent" to the "worries" and "dramas" of its current residents just as it remained apathetic towards the events that shattered Carla's life. It was "incapable" of that, it remained "innocent" as if rejecting the events that led to Angie's death; as if denying the trauma that had marked Carla and Jamaal's lives. But the tower block didn't simply start forgetting stuff all by itself: it "was *built* especially for disavowal" (emphasis added), designed for denial, programmed to refuse. As so much social housing built in the 20th century, 782 Wellesley was an innocent architectural pawn in the city authority's housing policies that had the societal effects, over time, of reinforcing segregation and propagating marginalisation of residential communities. The conditions of Angie's life rose beyond her own individual intentionality, it was a

residual product of a systematic character of which the building was the only remaining manifestation. While the consequences weren't immediately visible to Carla – she couldn't read them off the faces of the "other lives" she observed in the block and she, herself, "appeared calm on the outside" maintaining her "cool surface" – she was tortured by the conditions the architecture had imposed on her life ever since. As she finds herself on that sunny day in the shadow of 782 Wellesley, the trauma that it so successfully had buried inside her, suddenly resurfaces from its shadows, reminding Carla that her difficulty to love and desire was bound to this process of historical suppression. As the narrator remarks, to Carla "pleasure never came on its own", it was tied to an emotional debt relation forcing her to love "despite things, not for them". Carla couldn't love or hate anything outside of the shadow of that towering building, an emotive tomb that induced in her a "stifling lethargy". Not only had 782 Wellesley flung her inner emotional life into oblique darkness, but it had denied its very role in doing so; it performs an architectural amnesia that leaves residents traumatised not only by architectural events, but by refusing them the possibility of holding the building – and by extension local and state authorities – accountable for their suffering. In this way, an architecture of disavowal works to double devastating effect: it subjects residents to potentially traumatic events and subsequently denies them control over their emotional lives, their memories and capacities to act on or change them.

And while taking place in Toronto, the capacity of high-rise buildings to disavow is evident across the globe; from Taipei to London and from to Astana to Nairobi, urban scholars have drawn attention to the global proliferation of high-rise developments and their variegated but too-often devastating effects on local communities (Chen 2020; Jacobs 2006; Koch 2016; Smith 2020). By considering the mundane settings of residential communities, scholars have explored how vertical developments shape everyday lives in and around new developments (see Goodman 2020; Murawski 2019; Sheehan 2024; Zubovich 2020) to foreground the resilient practices of those who resist the reductive logics of financialised developments (see Simone 2014, 2023). By focussing on the 13-storey apartment hotel, Buckle Street Studios, built in 2021 in Aldgate, east London, this paper, however, considers the harm that results from nuisance on marginalised residents in the neighbouring building, Goldpence Apartments. Drawing on interviews with affected residents, the paper advances an understanding of architectural disavowal that (better) accounts for the volumetric registers of harm resulting from nuisance in the vertical city. The paper draws upon Brand's (2005) writing on disavowal and reflects upon its wider theoretical potency for urban scholarship as it offers a language that names the structural conditions of disavowal in the vertical city and, in doing so, opens for ways of addressing and subverting the psycho-social effects of vertical development (see Watt 2023).

In the following section, I briefly consider London's recent history of vertical development in relation to wider debates on urban redevelopment and regeneration. I then advance an understanding of architectural disavowal first, by reviewing scholarship on vertical urbanism and high-rise architecture and, second, by drawing attention to the embodied experiences of the residents in Goldpence Apartments as they endure the doubly devastating effects of disavowal. By foregrounding the mundane strategies that residents deploy in their attempts to resist, refuse and ultimately return the affective charge of their new high-rise neighbour/s, the paper considers how survival strategies (might) provide a heuristic for challenging architectural disavowal in the vertical city and beyond.

From Buckle Street Studios to Goldpence Apartments

Sitting on the border of the City of London – home to a forest of 'iconic' skyscrapers crowning London's primary financial heart – the neighbourhood of Aldgate might appear at first unspectacularly low-rise. Yet, it lies within the most populous borough for new high-rise developments in all of London – let alone the country—, making Aldgate undergo an intense process of recent verticalization. Since the turn of the 21st century no less than 200 residential towers have been built across London's 32 boroughs and in time of writing another 550 are under way – either under construction or in planning process – with approximately 35% of these located in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets alone (see NLA 2023).

This clustering of towers in Tower Hamlets is not exactly surprising. A precedent for tall building has been set, in part, by its proximity to the City of London and in part by the development of Canary Wharf in the southern part of the borough, forming the city's *second* financial centre and home to another cluster of 'iconic' skyscrapers. Yet within this context, Buckle Street Studios appears rather inconspicuous, almost understated as its relative low height is swamped by the much taller, recently completed neighbouring buildings: Altitude Point (28 floors), Leman Locke (23 floors), Blakeney Tower (22 floors), Wiverton Tower (26 floors) and Goodman's Fields (four towers varying between 19-23 floors). Yet, Buckle Street Studios is important to understanding the mechanisms of contemporary vertical development and densification of London.

Figure 1. Street view of Goldpence Apartments (left) facing onto the newly completed Buckle Street Studios (right), 2022. Author image ©

The original scheme proposed to erect a 17-storey tower but was refused planning permission by the council in 2015 citing its detrimental impact on the local townscape character, on designated heritage assets, and the "substantial harm to the amenities and living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties through substantial loss of daylight and sunlight, significant loss of outlook, from the overbearing nature of the development including an undue sense of enclosure." (LBTH 2015: 4). In an effort to address the council's concern and minimise the harm, the developer reduced the height of the scheme to 13 stories in a revamped proposal, but only for the council to refuse the scheme in 2017, citing the very same three reasons for refusal as the impact on the neighbouring residents in Goldpence Apartments remained all but the same (LBTH 2017). Despite of the council's second refusal, the developer appealed the decision to the Secretary of State, which triggered a public inquiry in 2019 during which the developer and the council provided legal evidence as to why the reasons for refusal were acceptable or not acceptable. The sunlight and daylight reports highlighted the undue impact that the proposed development would have on residents in Goldpence Apartments: a 7-storey social and affordable housing block sitting a mere 9 meters from the appeal

site and attached at the foot of Altitude Point but separated from it by a so-called 'poor-door' (see Osborn 2014). While the burden of the proposed scheme would fall disproportionally on the shoulders of the residents in Goldpence Apartments, the expert witnesses representing the developer argued that "the light we leave in the flat is no different [to previous levels] in *real experience*". In other words, a numerical drop in light levels was argued not to translate into an embodied, 'real life' experience of light change, and in that sense, the developer's legal team sought to render the building innocent, and thus unaccountable for causing harm.

In his ruling, the planning inspector sided with the developer and granted permission for the development to go ahead, arguing that while it would cause numerical levels to drop below national standards, the effects of these changes would be imperceptible in 'real life' (see Ebbensgaard 2024). Drawing on interviews with three of the affected households in Goldpence Apartments, this paper draws attention to residents' durational experiences of living through the protracted period of planning, demolition, construction, and post-completion to consider the asynchrony between *expected* 'real life' experiences and *actual* lived experiences of the affected residents. Of the 58 households in Goldpence Apartments, 35 are cited in the evidence to be directly affected by the development and 33 households submitted written objections to the planning application. Across a mix of tenure thresholds—the residents comprise both social housing tenants and part-ownership occupiers—the collective objection emphasised not only private concerns over impacts on residents' properties but a shared concern with the deterioration of communal spaces in the surrounding area. The collective objection to the development, argued that it would "take away from our community feel" by adding yet another hotel that "does not in any way meet the residents' needs", which instead would be to provide additional "play areas, parks, community centres and other local amenities".

Resident's collective concerns over the 'loss of community' in the face of financialised housing development speaks directly to the classed dynamics of urban change and renewal in London (see Davidson and Lees 2005; Lewis 2016). As scholars have shown, across the United Kingdom, residents who live in neighbourhoods undergoing processes of regeneration and gentrification are subject to forms of affective displacement (Butcher and Dickens 2016), that demands of them to negotiate the loss of a sense of community (Lewis 2016), home and belonging (Butcher 2010; Sheringham, Ebbensgaard and Blunt 2021). According to Watt (2023), regeneration in London should be considered as a form of "psychosocial degeneration"—that is, a layering of frustrations, stress and anxieties that result from repeated broken promises, from living near building sites and the uncertainties of potential displacement and relocation. The emotional scarring that results from psychosocial degeneration not only draws attention to the adverse effects of urban

change on local communities, but more importantly to the resilience they demonstrate in the face of adversity as they resist gentrification (Lees and Ferreri 2016) and regeneration (Douglas and Parkes 2016). This paper contributes to this work, by drawing attention towards the harmful effects of nuisance caused by Buckle Street Studio, and thus foregrounding the mundane strategies that residents employ as they struggle to endure the slow-scarring effects of financialised urban development.

The household interviews that form the empirical basis for the argument count the following: Resident 1 who together with his partner owns a 25% share in his two-bedroom flat; Resident 2 who similarly owns a 25% share and lives with his wife and their 6-year-old son in their two-bedroom flat; and Resident 3 and 4 who live together with their two sons aged 8 and 10 in a two-bedroom social housing tenancy. While the three households are selected as broadly representative of the residential group objecting Buckle Street Studio, several residents mentioned that some residents were uncomfortable to speak out about their experiences. The collective objection was an attempt on behalf of residents who felt confident in their abilities to engage through the planning process, to speak on behalf of themselves and those who weren't confident. The materials form part of a larger ethnographic study of the ways high-rise developments impact on local communities across east London (see Ebbensgaard 2020, 2022, 2024; Ebbensgaard and Edensor 2020), which includes interviews with 30 resident households, including 23 home interviews, six walk along interviews, 19 follow up interviews, and six collaborative photo projects with residents and the photographer Edu Torres. Two of Torres' photographs feature below to form part of a personal narration of what the embodied experience of living in the shadow of Buckle Street Studio feels like to Resident 1. Yet, before considering the experiences of the residents who deal with the affective charge of their new high-rise neighbour/s, the following section briefly reviews scholarship on high-rise architecture to advance an understanding of architectural disavowal in dialogue with urban scholarship.

Architectures of disavowal: Autistic, dead and zombie architectures

In her critical commentary on the changing architectural landscapes of London since the turn of the 21st century, Maria Kaika (2010) suggests that the function of corporate buildings in urban environments have changed significantly and to detrimental effect. While the iconic buildings of the 20th century signify and successfully narrate the dominance of financial elites in urban centres, corporate towers of the 21st century, she contends, reveals the emergence of a rather insensitively phrased "autistic architectures" in the sense that they demonstrate a "pathological self-absorption and preoccupation with the self to the exclusion of the outside world" (2010: 977). Concerned about their position on the skyline and their

eternal struggle for attention with competing towers, "autistic architectures" are obsessed with their façade – or skin – and with their ability to provide flexible office space to accommodate divergent and shifting demands of urban elites. In this sense, "autistic architectures" distinguish themselves from the 20th-century skyscrapers that ennoble its patrons with virtuous design and architectural details, often inspiring a sense of civic pride in their position within the city by expressing a fundamental "*lack of commitment to employees"* and more importantly *"to the city that hosts the corporate building*." (emphasis in original Kaika 2010: 978).

In this way, Kaika's notion of autistic architecture speaks to wider work on the global circulation of "iconic" architectures, eased by internationally standardised building protocols (Easterling 2014) and resulting in decontextual, serialised vertical cityscapes (Burte 2024; Gassner 2020; Ponzini 2020). And while Kaika situates this kind of architectural solipsism within entrepreneurial and neoliberal urban governance regimes (see also Jones 2009), other scholars foreground the recent influence of libertarian ideologies in shaping built environments. With the somewhat illegible neologism, *libertecture*, Atkinson and O'Farrell give name to architectures that function as "'free' forms" in the sense that they seek to "maximise the freedoms of privileged users, and help to spatially or socially 'break' bonds with state and community actors or institutions." (2023: 7) According to Atkinson and O'Farrell, *libertectures* have seven distinct characteristics[1] that not only manifest the extent to which they are "detached from local culture, history and politics" (2023: 7), but which expose their role in threatening the life worlds of urban residents by compromising social equity and increasing social divisions amongst populations. In this way, theorising emergent architectures as 'autistic' or 'libertecture', is claiming to deepen our understandings of architecture's role in putting urban life forms under increased threat.

The pathological tendencies of architecture to entrench social divisions between the public and the urban elite positions architecture as a mediating device between the public 'life' of cities and the insular lives that pose a threat to that very public liveliness. Or more precisely, they become vehicle for determining the conditions under which the urban life forms are made to 'live' or 'die'. With attention to such latent biopolitical forces of architecture, geographers have been vocal in commenting on and lamenting a worrying trend in cities where residential towers are built, completed and sold, yet, remain somehow uninhabited – a phenomenon that becomes increasingly evident at night, due to the lack of interior illumination (see Ebbensgaard 2022). By bequeathing cities with dark drapes of

[1] 1) Privatised spaces and cities; 2) residential entries and exits to buildings; 3) portal spaces; 4) fiscal lockers and freeports; 5) apeirotopias and digital architectures and elements of the metaverse that connect off-shore accounts; 6) exclaves, such as seasteads or space colonies; 7) necrotectures which are non-habited residential complexes.

"dead windows" (Graham 2016: 200), this new form of residential urbanism characterised by its seeming emptiness, Atkinson (2019) labels "necrotecture". As one of the seven characteristics of libertecture, nectrotectures suck, like vampires, the life blood of our bustling metropolis, leaving the architectural structures like corpses, lifeless and mute. Yet a crucial feature of nectrotecture is that despite their residential absence they remain lucrative investments and thus hold a key function in speculative real estate development. As Simone (2014 : 57) notes with reference to high-rise developments in Jakarta, these "projects exist primarily as claims – claims on space that are calculated to posit significant gains only at some future time". They don't need to be occupied because the owners don't (necessarily) need them to live in, they are 'pure' investments (Atkinson 2019; Graham 2015) or as Soules (2021) suggests, wealth storage boxes that might function as a second or third 'home'. Quoting local councillor Paul Dimbelberg, Soules suggests that "[t]he spectre of new buildings where there are no lights on is a real problem" (Soules 2021, 54) because they don't contribute to the local economy or to the vitality of an urban night bustling with the luminous glow streaming from interior spaces. Instead, they are left in darkness as dead orbs hanging ominously against the over-lit, light polluted night sky.

Yet, as Soules (2021: 51) remarks, because the owners of these residential luxury towers occasionally re/appear, the architectures cannot be characterised as flat out dead, but rather, as half-dead or zombies. The half-life of this kind of "zombie urbanism" or zombie architecture, Soules continues, denotes a kind of perverse success where "Buildings sell out, developers make profits, governments collect fees, and property values often continue to escalate, yet things moving remain not quite alive" (2021: 56) Whether its "'zombie' apartments" (Nethercote 2019: 13), "zombie flats" (McNeill 2020: 825) or ""zombie" estates" (Jenkins 2017), the un-dead phenomenon of residential half-life is contaminating cities across the globe with detrimental effects for public life. Throughout her work with the indigenous Karrabing community in Australia, Elizabeth Povinelli (2016) similarly draws on the figure of the zombie but in order to reference the undying or undead quality of settler colonialism that keeps haunting indigenous land through toxic land contaminations, displacement and denying indigenous populations their rights to make claims to land. While very different in nature, the zombie architectures of late capitalism share with the white settler colonial zombie the tendency to forcefully occupy public or indigenous space and deny populations their rights and diminish their capacities to make claims to or incursions on those spaces.

The speculative high-rise development, however, doesn't just contaminate cities with necro-affects in ways that restrict the public's and marginal communities' access to space. According to Dolores Hayden, the erection of the Modern skyscraper relied upon an exploitative regime of fungible labour – an architecture of

exploitation – where developers' desires to build quickly pressured immigrants and ethnic labourers into working under hazardous conditions or be replaced by the "gangs of out-of-work ironworkers [who] hung about on the streets around job sites" (1977: 109). While the skyscraper embodied a masculine fantasy of progress, power, prosperity and upward social mobility, in reality Hayden argues, it "consumes human lives, lays waste to human settlements, and ultimately overpowers the urban economic activities which provided its original justification" (1977, 108). In this sense, the skyscraper is not only theorised as an architecture of exploitation, but more evidently as an architecture of (racial) erasure; as with the general history of architectural modernity that has omitted influences of peripheral traditions and marginalised cultures, the erection of the skyscraper, Brown suggests relied on "racial erasures … to forget that members of these racial colonies, too, were present at the scene of building" (2020: 217).

By drawing connections between the architectures of accumulation and the "racial colonies" on which they rely, Hayden and Brown shift attention not only to the lives that are consumed *on* site but on those extended geographies of imperial colonies—the exploitative regimes of *off*-site enslavement and resource extraction. Here, Kathryn Yusoff helpfully considers the subterranean mine not as isolated from the cities that are built above ground, but rather as imperative to the emergence of the vertical city. In quoting Aimé Césaire, she draws attention to his "thumb-print and my heel-mark on the backs of skyscrapers and my dirt in the glitter of jewels!" (2021: 6) As the racialised labour forces working construction sites and mines, their names remain unsung in every city built by the Imperial exchanges of raw materials, manufactured goods and enslaved labour, and so Césaire continues: "My name is Bordeaux and Nantes and Liverpool and New York and San Francisco…" (Césaire quoted in Yusoff 2021: 6). As an architecture of erasure, the skyscraper has a double effect; it relies on exploitative regimes of labour ready at hand *on* and *off*-site, and silences their voices, erases their fingerprints and denies them their recognition in building the vertical city; it invites us to see it not as the triumph and engineering marvel of humanity but rather as a tombstone for the lives lost in the process of its construction; it approaches the processes of disavowal insofar that it removes any evidence of exploitation and denies its complicity in deepening social divides across uneven geographies.

Yet, how might an understanding of architectural disavowal advance the ability to better account for the trauma of erasure that high-rise developments bring to urban communities? In psychology, disavowal is understood through the process of denial; denial of one's position in the world relative to others, defined in the America Psychological Association Dictionary of Psychology along the following lines:

> denial *n.* a defense mechanism in which unpleasant thoughts, feelings, wishes, or events are ignored or excluded from conscious awareness. It may take such forms as refusal to acknowledge the reality of a terminal illness, a financial problem, an addiction, or a partner's infidelity. Denial is an unconscious process that functions to resolve emotional conflict or reduce anxiety. Also called disavowal
>
> (APA Dictionary of Psychology)

The refusal to acknowledge the reality in which unpleasant thoughts feelings, wishes or events not only surface but are actively produced through one's own involvement in soliciting them, thus draws attention to the unconscious processes or mechanism of disavowal. Disavowal is the process of forgetting one's complicity in creating unpleasant emotional states in the world, and thus defending the self from the inconvenience of admitting and facing that very uncomfortable truth. To Slavoj Zizek, this kind of 'forgetting' is central to what he terms "fetishist disavowal", by which he means that we tell ourselves: "I know it, but I refuse to fully assume the consequences of this knowledge, so that I can continue acting as if I don't know it." (2009: 46) The fetishization of this unconscious process of denial thus enables subjects to live in worlds that otherwise would be impossible or unbearable.

To Dionne Brand, this kind of refusal to assume responsibility for events is manifest in the tower block 782 Wellesley. Having shaped the conditions under which Carla grew up and her mother fell down, the tower block sticks out as a tombstone in the skyline; as one of the few things that still might enable Carla to 'connect' to her absent mother – to remember and thereby relieve again the "unadulterated, enjoyable" love of Angie's laugh and smile. She comes to 782 Wellesley full of anticipation but quickly realises that the tombstone doesn't carry the names of the people which it dispensed with—the tombstone is "indifferent", "incapable" and "innocent". It is in this way that the tower block performs an architectural amnesia which leaves its past and current residents traumatised not only by architectural events, but by refusing them the possibility of holding the building – and by extension the local and state authorities – accountable for their suffering..

Writing in the wake of the atrocious Grenfell fire, Loretta Ramkissoon (2019: 59) who grew up on the same housing estate and lives in the neighbouring Braithwaite Tower, notes how she had come to resent the conditions that had shaped her upbringing. The middle-class aspirations of British society had stigmatised council estates and their residents throughout her teens making her ashamed of her 'home' while driving local councillors to beautify estate across the country by re-cladding them with deadly building materials. As she notes, "I resented… what I had to compete against in order to survive in my surroundings" (2019: 59), and what in effect she and the survivors of Grenfell still have to fight against to survive the trauma that the fire brought on the wider community. To survive in this hostile

environment of re-cladded tower blocks and stigmatised housing estates, Ramkissoon has had to become resentful of the environment herself.

Brand (2023) similarly reflects on what it means to live in hostile environments. In her recent collection *Nomenclature*, she writes "I am hating living this, I am loving living this. I am turning into someone necessary to live this," (2023), which suggests that in order to live through the viciousness of a hostile world, one has to, somehow, become as vicious and uncaring as the hostile world itself (see Brand 2022). To Brand and Ramkissoon, becoming hostile is the only probable response to surviving in hostile geography, or what in urban studies has been termed 'hostile architecture' (Petty 2016) or 'hostile design' (Nitrato Izzo 2022; Rosenberger 2020). This is not a sentimental call for or expressions of 'hope' (for writings on 'hope' in urban studies, see Amin and Thrift 2002; Harvey 2000), but instead is suggestive of a resistive approach to living *with* and *within* that which is otherwise unbearable (see also Simone 2023). When considered in relation to Watt's (2023) notion of "psychosocial degeneration", the notion of 'becoming hostile' is useful for drawing attention to the resilience of residential communities as they endure the slow-scarring effects of financialised urban development. By developing the notion of an architecture of disavowal, the aim is therefore to bring the silenced and erased voices of residents to the fore but not simply to expose, reveal or render the effects of harm visible. Instead, the aim is to draw flight-lines along the resistive pathways that people take, as they resent and refuse to let their lives be dictated by environmental subjugation. In that sense, the paper draws on the experience of residents to show what it takes to live through the affects of disavowal, to find inspiration in their resistive and resentful practices as they become hostile towards environmental hostility.

Repress and refuse

When construction completed and Buckle Street Studio opened its doors to its first visitors in 2021, few of the residents in Goldpence Apartments had anticipated just how bad their living conditions would become. Take Resident 1:

> Now it's completely dark.
>
> In winter when daylight is shorter, we don't get any sunlight in our home and it makes me feel really depressed. They claimed that we would be able to see the sky from somewhere in our flats, but in reality, that's just not true.
>
> When we sit on our sofa, we cannot see the sky. When we lie in our beds, we cannot see the sky. When we sit at our dining table, we cannot see the sky. The only thing we can see are the buildings next door. We cannot tell whether it's cloudy or sunny, we cannot get a sense of the outside.

When faced with the disabling condition of domestic darkening, the residents in Goldpence Apartments told stories of how they tried to compensate to ensure tenable living situations. Resident 1 continues:

> We bought a lot of lamps to brighten up the place, to make it feel more hopeful and to improve our wellbeing. The lamps in the pots are mainly for our plants; otherwise they would die! The Himalayan salt lamps add light, but they are also supposed to be good for depression and all that, so, I bought a couple and placed them around the flat. And, then we changed the bulbs in the spotlights to brighter ones. In winter, I turn all the lights on and it does make me feel a little better.
>
> But everything is artificial now.

The darkening of the domestic living space has launched Resident 1 and his partner into an artificial elementality. The inability to wake up to a new day and look out the window and know what clothes to wear strips them of any sense of orientation in the world. Eliminating sunlight from their flats and stripping the residents of their ability to see the sky effectively reduces their domestic environments to conditions that approach a basement or bunker. To make their lives bearable under artificial conditions, they redirect their attention from the absent 'real world' 'outside' to their recreated 'inside'—rather than shaping domestic environments *with* or *through* the elemental surrounds, they construct their domestic environs in spite of it. This aligns with Vannini and Taggart's (2013; 2015) claim that grid-tied homes operate in *asynchrony* with the shifting weather and changes in light and darkness. Electric infrastructures alter people's capacities to dwell in synchronicity *with* the shifting weather and the associated natural shifts in light and dark. If, as Ingold (2000, 2005) suggests the weather and therefore daylight isn't an object we see, but rather the medium *through which* we see, light and dark are elemental mediums through which humans become embodied beings not *in* but *of* the world. And so, the residents in Goldpence Apartments are not only robbed off their ability to sense the weather but prevented from enacting their very being in the world.

This shift from real to artificial environments must be considered alongside the developer's claims about accounting for 'real world experiences' in their calculations and simulations of changes in daylight in Goldpence Apartments (see Ebbensgaard 2024). By convincing the planning inspector that the residents' 'real world' wouldn't change in 'real experience'-terms, the developer ironically succeeds in reducing their lives to mere simulation. Property dreams turned to proper nightmares. Whether its salt lamps or dimmable spotlights, Resident 1's 'real world experience' has become eternally mediated, refracted and reflected. As another resident in the block, Resident 2, who lives with his wife and 6-year-old son explains:

> We never used to turn the lights on during the day.

> Now we have to because the hotel is so close and since the construction finished it's just blocked the light. Not 100%, it still comes around the building and reflects in the façade of Leman Locke at certain times of the day. When the sun hits the building at the right angle – at sunrise and sunset, I think – it reflects in the building. It's not an all-day thing that we enjoy throughout the day, it is just these short-lived moments.

In Goldpence Apartments even sunlight is rendered eternally artificial, driving Resident 1 and his partner "crazy", impacting on their mood and their mental wellbeing. Sunlight deprivation not only reduces the body's production of vitamin-D, which boosts the immune system and starves off diseases, but it flattens our circadian rhythm, leading to potentially worsened sleep quality, increased irritation, stress and less ability to focus during the day (Geddes 2019). Resident 2 too noted a shift in his wife's mood, fearing for her future ability to deal with her depression and reoccurring seasonal affective disorder (SAD). As a consequence, they developed a set of coping strategies:

> We try to go out more, to compensate for the lack of sunlight by spending the day outside. And then, I just try forget about it, ignore it.
>
> We try to block out the outside. We keep our blinds closed, so we don't see the building, so we don't notice the building, so we don't have to think about the building.
>
> We have effectively blocked out the existence if the building from our lives.
>
> And then, we adapt to the new situation. We just have to accept that this is the way it is going to be now. The building has gone up and it cannot be taken down. We can't cancel it. We can't demolish it now, so we just try to adapt.

In defiance, Resident 2 and his family resist the overwhelming charge of Buckle Street Studios in two ways: on the one hand they leave their home and abandon the premises in search of light elsewhere, and on the other hand, they deny its existence by shutting it out of their lives, expelling it from the city just as it has expelled them from their home. Their deliberate denial of its existence demonstrates the extent to which residents are forced into a form of sensory amnesia in order to survive—like Ramkissoon (2019) who resents the conditions that shape her life in Braithwaite Tower or like Brand's (2023) protagonist who turns vicious in order to survive in a hostile world, Resident 2 and his family turn their backs on Buckle Street Studios, deny it its existence in order to live with its presence. This is what home-making looks like in hostile geography; in the vertical city, a home never comes alone—as Carla notes (Brand 2005). Residents defiantly re-inhabit the vertical city not *with* Buckle Street Studio but in spite of it. They create intimate living spaces in which they can concentrate, focus and direct attention towards their living companions by drawing curtains and blinds, all in spite of Buckle Street Studios. They install re-

energizing lamps to nurture plant life and their personal wellbeing, in spite of Buckle Street Studios.

Buckle Street Studios is an architecture of disavowal not only because it refuses to take responsibility for condemning neighbouring residents in Goldpence Apartments to an artificial elementality – a simulated lifeworld – but because it forces residents to deny its existence in order to sustain its debilitating effects on their lives. Living in spite of Buckle Street Studios is the only way they can live *with* its overwhelming affective charge, and in this way, the conditions that architectures of disavowal impose on residents in the vertical city approach what Freud (1915) called "repression": when the pain that one endures from an event in one's life is so painful or traumatic that one cannot deal with it in any other way than forget it. Or, with reference to Zizek's (2009) notion of fetishist disavowal, it is the unconscious process of forgetting that one knows, so that one can continue to act as if one doesn't know. Repression and disavowal enables subjects to live in worlds an otherwise unbearable world—they adopt a survival strategy of disavowal in order to survive in architectures of disavowal.

Figure 2. *Sofa* (2022). Edu Torres ©

If the conditions in Goldpence Apartments are unbearable for residents during the day, at night the hostilities intensify. The night brought the negative forces of urban night-life into the homes of residents in the shape of over-

illumination and noise pollution from nocturnal street life, preventing them from rest and sleep. During the period of construction, Resident 1 felt the full force of the powerful bulk lights, flooding the construction site during its time of inactivity, inadvertently forcing his domestic space into undesired activity:

> I wasn't able to sleep because of the spotlights.
>
> When I closed the blinds in our bedroom it just shone straight through, it was so powerful. The spotlights they placed on the crane were directed downwards, towards the building site below but as they progressed with the building work and the tower grew taller, they shone directly into our bedroom.
>
> It was like sleeping in a football stadium.
>
> And it was on the whole night – 24/7 – it was impossible to tell if it was night or day.

Being exposed to high levels of artificial light at night impacts the human body in a number of ways. First, it makes us more alert as it stimulates the release of serotonin and suppresses the release of melatonin (also known as the sleep hormone). The hormonal shifts delays our circadian rhythm, making us fall asleep later and once we do fall asleep it takes longer for us to reach deep sleep, potentially shortening our deep sleep before getting up again. The effects the next morning include fatigue, irritability, lack of focus and increased anxiety (Walker 2018). Second, overexposure to light at night raises our core body temperatures and increases our heart rate which are the critical functions that drop when we fall asleep. By keeping both processes artificially high, the body is prevented from 'falling' into sleep-mode. Studies show, that in urban areas where people are more exposed to outdoor lighting at night people go to bed later, get up later, sleep less, feel more tired during the day and are less satisfied with the quality of their sleep than people from rural counterparts (Ohayon and Milesi 2016). And, as Geddes suggests, while "the changes brought about by light exposure are relatively small and short-lived, the long-term consequences of repeatedly raising them are unknown" (2019: 56).

Once construction completed and the flood-lights ceased to invade, the residents in Goldpence Apartments discovered a new kind of nocturnal invasion. As guests started checking in at Buckle Street Studios, their gazing presence was felt directly by the residents who suddenly felt the full force of exposure. As Residents 3 and 4 explain

> Before, we would leave curtains open all the day because there was no one there, just an empty office block.
>
> Now the privacy has completely gone.

> They have so many windows and when their curtains are open they can see everything. It's not great for the little kids, so now, we not only draw our curtains when we go to bed, but also in the day.
>
> We are thinking of changing the layout in the bedrooms. We want to move the beds away from the windows and place the wardrobes closer to them instead, so they block the view a bit.

When the conditions of the night approaches those of the day and the day in turn approaches those of the night, it comes at a cost. The nauseating overturning of day and night creates an affective debt relation, a deficit in which the sensory costs of vertical development are paid by neighbouring residents. The negative affects of overexposure – whether that is *towards* light pollution or *from* the interrogating gaze of neighbouring inhabitants – render the domestic sphere and its inhabitants vulnerable towards the hostile invasions of the emergent vertical landscape. In urban studies, environmental hostility has been explored in relation to the issuing of laws, redesign of space and policing of places to control who can use urban space and under what terms. From homeless spikes and anti-skateboard knobs, and from ultraviolet lighting to sleep-less benches, the introduction of "defensible design" or "hostile design" is aimed to "shape user experience…. for the purpose of closing off particular usages" (Rosenberg 2020: 135; see also Nitrato Izzo 2022; Petty 2016). Hostility therefore refers to the process through which the built environment closes down the 'conditions of possibility' (cf. Foucault). When Buckle Street Studios is read against the grain of "hostile design," it emerges as a vertical dimension of hostility that refuses residents to experience and thus inhabit the vertical city in ways that are meaningful for them and enables them to lead meaningful lives.

In addition to light pollution and overlooking, Resident 3 and 4 noted the unexpected change in noise levels resulting from the changing morphology of the surroundings. The completion of Buckle Street Studios has created a narrow but tall corridor between the two buildings that captures and echoes noises, enhancing the nocturnal noisescapes that emerged from largely disturbing, unwanted behaviour:

> Since Buckle Street Studios were built, the gap between our buildings has created like a tunnel that echoes sounds and increases the noise.
>
> You don't really notice it during the day, but at night, if someone shouts below it's as if they are inside our flat. In the summer when we keep windows open for ventilation, they keep us awake: We hear lots of shouting and music, that wakes us up in the middle of the night, sometimes at 3 or 4 o'clock.
>
> Over by Blakeney Tower there's a small park with seating – they often sit out there – and if they shout you can hear the echoes all the way in here.
>
> We are all normal residents who need to get up and work the next day. A lot of us have kids who need to sleep, or some are elderly who might be more vulnerable.

With the completion of Buckle Street Studios the ensuing intensification of the soundscape immediately around their flat has channelled the city's night life into the homes of neighbouring residents. Similarly, the furnishing of public spaces with seating and pocket gardens invite nocturnals to linger and incidentally disrupt the somnolent population. So, whether it's through light pollution or sound pollution, the intensification of nocturnal sensibilities as a result of the completion of Buckle Street Studios has transformed the vertical city into a space of continuous disturbance.

In response, the residents in Goldpence Apartments adjust their living patterns in spite of Buckle Street Studios. They draw their curtains and close their windows in spite of Buckle Street Studios. They rearrange their furniture and redecorate their flats, in spite of Buckle Street Studios. In addition to the previously mentioned examples of denial, these acts of adjustment attempt to resist the persistent intrusion of their intimate, domestic sphere. This kind of adjustive resistance is part of a *coping strategy* that enables residents in Goldpence Apartments to lead meaningful lives under otherwise debilitating conditions. Yet, if coping strategies include turning one's eyes away from the erased outdoors towards the artificially created indoors, the attempt to flee one's home and deny the existence of imposing buildings, or sealing the permeable apertures of the home to keep the nocturnal city on the doorstep, they appear as little more than *survival strategies*. Home-making in hostile geography is cynical like that; in the vertical city, residents are forced to disavow their negative embodied experienced in order to survive in a hostile environment.

Figure 3. *Negative imprint* (2022). Edu Torres ©

While we might read survival strategies as little more than defeat in the face of rampant speculation in the property market, residents refused to succumb to any such defeatism. Their survival strategies are evidence of the kinds of attitudes that are necessary to survive hostile environments. Take Resident 1, who in the face of churning hotel guests has taken a more confrontational approach:

> When guests check-in on floors above ours, they can look directly down and into our flat and see what we are doing.
>
> We used to draw curtains but I asked my partner: "Why? Why do we surrender to them? We should challenge them, this is our property and we should never close them. If they want to watch us naked, go ahead, I dare them to watch…"
>
> So, we leave the curtains open and *we* watch *them* instead.
>
> If they look, we just stop up and stand in the window, staring back at them. We can see they often feel embarrassed and then close their curtains.
>
> If they are not happy with that, they can always ask for another room. I noticed that they haven't put visitors on the sixth floor for a while. I'm not sure if its because they complain about me in my boxers, but we don't have that many anymore.

As Resident 1 returns the voyeuristic gaze, he imprints himself on the hotel guests' retina; he imprints himself on the building just as it has imprinted itself on him. By

refusing to submit to their overlooking, Resident 1 steps into their line of sight, he defiantly puts his body on the line, sacrificing his privacy to maintain a feeling of control over his domestic and emotional life. To Resident 1 and his partner, this is not some game they play for fun, they are not fooled into thinking that they are somehow part of a 'cosmopolitan' window-play, some kind of voluntaristic voyeurism. There is no time for sentimentality in hostile geography (cf. Brand 2022). In the vertical city, residents become hostile towards environmental hostility, they abandon the hope that somehow neighbouring speculators, landlords or tenants are well-intended "good people", because how can they when they are forced to pay with self-sacrifice? By daring neighbours to look, Resident 1 and his partner show us how to repay the affective debt relation with affective debt, how to return the refusal of hostile design with refusal—they return the voyeuristic gaze with defiance in order to neutralise its impact on themselves. They perform a politics of redress or refusal; redressing the overwhelming affective charge of the new high-rise neighbours and refusing to let their lives be dictated by the disenfranchising forces of speculative real estate.

Yet, in the context of hostility, where architectural disavowal is returned with disavowal one might question if residents remain caught inside a loop of affective warfare. As Resident 2 and his wife deny the existence of Buckle Street Studios by turning their back on it, Resident 1 and his partner defy its incursion by turning towards it; from turning away to turning towards, the residents of Goldpence Apartments are sucked into a sensory vortex of self-sacrifice. Their attempts to re-inhabit the vertical city on their own terms, however defiant they might be, rely on the will and capacity to carve out volumes of meaningful habitability in the surrounding city. Without making territorial claims, their newfound volumes of possible habitability extend—or fracture–the private sphere of their homes so that intimate life increasingly takes place across an extended geography, but without ever cancelling the incursion Buckle Street Studios makes into their private sphere. If you put your body on the line in hostile environments, you *will* get caught in the affective fire line; you cannot neutralise the debilitating effects of disavowal by sacrificing the self. But it might be the starting point from where to shift the terms of engagement in the everyday politics of habitability. As performed by the residents in Goldpence Apartments, disavowal might be a starting point, a pivot, from where to intervene into the vertical and horizontal—one might say volumetric—politics that recondition life in the vertical city.

Conclusions

This paper shows how in London the desire of property developers to lift new residencies into the sun-kissed sky, relies on the inverse process of burying existing residential communities in shade. As light is removed from existing homes, the

living spaces of already marginalised residents approach those of underground bunkers—even if you live on the fifth, sixth or seventh floors. The removal of direct sunlight reaching inside the home, the elimination of views of the sky, the loss of long-held vistas or views, the invasion of artificial light throughout the night, and the intrusion of noise and sounds are all evidence of how financialised vertical development cast marginalised residential communities in a sensory debt relation—turning property dreams of developers into proper nightmares for residents.

To conceptualise the process through which vertical development advances unabated with little accountability for the harm they cause on local populations, the article develops the notion of disavowal. Architectural disavowal marks a form of environmental hostility that throughout the paper is traced in the affective shifts that the new high-rise development, Buckle Street Studio, produces in the surrounding milieu, forcing neighbouring residents to inhabit the city not in concert with their new-rising neighbours but in spite of them. This speaks directly to work in urban studies that documents affective, temporal and psychological forms of displacement as a result of urban regeneration in London (Butcher 2010; Butcher and Dickens 2016; Sheringham, Ebbensgaard, Blunt 2021; Watt 2016). Yet, in drawing attention to the politicized nature of elemental shifts in the vertical city, architectural disavowal draws renewed interest not just to the spatial dimensions of nuisance and harm but to the vertical, or more correctly, to the volumetric dimensions of nuisance and harm. In bringing volume to harm and trauma, the paper speaks to wider urban scholarship on verticality, which exposes the harmful effects of high-rise construction and development across distended geographies (Brown 2020; Hayden 1977; Yusoff 2021). Rather than focussing on the physical removal or eviction of residents (Burte 2024; Ghertner 2015), the segregation and confinement of migrant communities (Sheehan 2024), the literal collapse of tower blocks (Smith 2020) or the deliberate targeting of high-rise buildings in urbicidal wars (Ebbensgaard, Murawski, Woodcraft and Zubovich 2024), the paper explores a softer form of harm that operates on sensory and affective planes (see Ebbensgaard 2024), but which takes on a fully volumetric form. Buckle Street Studios is an architecture of disavowal because it condemns its neighbouring residents in Goldpence Apartments to live in an artificial elementality, a sensorially deprived volume that is carved out of and detached from the wider urban elementality. At its most elusive, financialised property developments like Buckle Street Studios instil affective shifts in their surrounding environment that unsettle neighbouring residential populations by reducing their sensory life worlds to mere collateral damage.

It is in this way that we might understand the spatio-temporal dimensions of disavowal along the lines of what Simone refers to as the "surrounds" by which he means not just the peripheral volumes that surround buildings, neighbourhoods or entire cities, but rather "a more generalised process of unsettlement" (2023: 7). With

attention drawn to the processes through which populations become unsettled in space, in their homes, Simone seeks to foreground the momentary "rehearsals of experimental ways of living that circumvent debilitating extraction, surveillance, and capture" (2023: 6). Similarly, by giving space to the silenced voices of residents who endure the process of disavowal in the shadow of Buckle Street Studio, this paper both exposes, reveals or renders the effects of harm visible and, in so doing, draws flight-lines along the resistive pathways that people take as they resent and refuse to let their lives be dictated by environmental subjugation. In drawing attention to the resilient practices of those who live through processes of intense vertical development, the paper speaks to wider work on verticality that foregrounds resistive everyday experiments – from Nairobi (Goodman 2020) to Jakarta (Simone 2014) and from Delhi (Ghertner 2015) to Santiago (Sheehan 2024). However defiantly they might resist the incursions that Buckle Street Studios makes into the intimate sphere of their homes, the residents in Goldpence Apartments are caught up in an affective loop of continuous self-sacrifice. The residents' disavowal of the overwhelming affective charge of Buckle Street Studios rehearse experiments in vertical living that might shift the terms of engagement in the vertical city. Their resistant practices not only enabling them to endure the slow-scarring effects of financialised urban development, but also, might tear into the volumetric politics of financialised development in ways that re/condition life in the vertical city.

References

Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2002). *Cities - Reimagining the Urban*. Bristol: Polity Press.

Atkinson, R. (2019). Necrotecture: Lifeless Dwellings and London's Super-Rich. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *43*(1), 2–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12707

Atkinson, R., & O'Farrell, L. (2023). Libertecture: A catalogue of libertarian spaces. *Urban Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980231181323

Brand, D. (2023) *Nomenclature: New and Collected Poems*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Brand, D. (2022) Between the covers Dionne Brand Interview, in Between the Covers. Retrieved from https://tinhouse.com/transcript/between-the-covers-dionne-brand-interview/ Accessed Monday 23 October 2023

Brand, D. (2005). *What We All Long For*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Brown, A. (2020). Erecting the Skyscraper, Erasing Race. *Race and Modern Architecture*, 203–217. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cwbg7.15

Brown, A. (2017). *The Black Skyscraper*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Burte, H. (2024). Mumbai's differential verticalisation: The dialectic of sovereign and technical planning rationalities. *Urban Studies*, *61*(4), 706–725. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980231192822

Butcher, M. (2010). From "fish out of water" to "fitting in": The challenge of re-placing home in a mobile world. *Population, Space and Place*, *16*(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.575

Butcher, M., & Dickens, L. (2016). Spatial Dislocation and Affective Displacement: Youth Perspectives on Gentrification in London. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *40*(4), 800–816. https://doi.org/10.1

Davidson, M., & Lees, L. (2005). New-build "gentrification" and London's riverside renaissance. *Environment and Planning A*, *37*(7), 1165–1190. https://doi.org/10.1068/a3739

Easterling, K. (2014). *Extrastatecraft: the power of infrastructure space*. Verso.

Ebbensgaard, C. L. (2024). Light violence at the threshold of acceptability. *Urban Studies*, *61*(4), 669–686. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211067938

Ebbensgaard, C. L. (2022). Towers for the night. In S. Sumartojo (Ed.), *Lighting Design in Shared Public Spaces,* pp. 173-194. Routledge: New York and London.

Ebbensgaard, C. L. (2020). Light infrastructures and intimate publics in the vertical city. *Urban Geography*, *43*(5), 735–754. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1850001

Ebbensgaard, C. L., Murawski, M., Woodcraft, S., & Zubovich, K. (2024). Introduction: Verticality, radicalism, resistance. *Urban Studies*, *61*(4), 619–635. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980231216884

Ebbensgaard, C. L., & Edensor, T. (2020). Walking with light and the discontinuous experience of urban change. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* vol. 46, pp. 378-391. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12424

Freud, S. (1915). Repression. Standard Edition, vol 14. Hogarth, London, pp 141-158.

Gassner, G. (2020). *Ruined Skylines Aesthetics, Politics and London's Towering Cityscape*. Routledge.

Geddes, L. (2019). *Chasing the sun: The new science of sunlight and how it shapes our bodies and minds*. London: Wellcome Collection.

Ghertner, A. (2015). *Rule By Aesthetics: World-Class City Making in Delhi*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199385560.001.0001

Goodman, Z. (2020). "Going vertical" in times of insecurity: Constructing proximity and distance through a Kenyan gated high-rise. *Focaal*, *2020*(86), 24–35. https://doi.org/10.3167/fcl.2020.860103

Graham, S. (2015). Luxified skies. *City*, *19*(5), 618–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1071113

Harris, A. (2015). Vertical urbanisms. *Progress in Human Geography*, *39*(5), 601–620. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514554323

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope*. University of California Press.

Hayden, D. (1977). Skycraper Seduction/Skyscraper Rape. *Heresis*, *2*(1), 108–115.

Hubbard, P., & Lees, L. (2018). The right to community?: Legal geographies of resistance on London's gentrification frontiers. *City*, *22*(1), 8–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2018.1432178

Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2005). The eye of the storm: Visual perception and the weather. *Visual Studies*, *20*(2), 97–104.

Jenkins, S. (2017). Simon Jenkins: If we keep on building towers, empty London will be a grim reality. *Evening Standard*. https://www.standard.co.uk/comment/comment/simon-jenkins-if-we-keep-on-building-towers-empty-london-will-be-a-grim-reality-a3512541.html Accessed Monday 23 October 2023

Kaika, M. (2010). Architecture and crisis: re-inventing the icon, re-imag(in)ing London and re-branding the City. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *35*(4), 453–474. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00398.x

Kaika, M. (2011). Autistic architecture: the fall of the icon and the rise of the serial object of architecture. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *29*(6), 968–992. https://doi.org/10.1068/d16110

Lees, L., & Ferreri, M. (2016). Resisting gentrification on its final frontiers: Learning from the Heygate Estate in London (1974–2013). *Cities*, *57*, 14–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2015.12.005

Lewis, C. (2016). 'Regenerating community'? Urban change and narratives of the past. *Sociological Review*, *64*(4), 912–928. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12418

Lewis, C. (2017). Turning houses into homes: Living through urban regeneration in East Manchester. *Environment and Planning A*, *49*(6), 1324–1340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17694360

London Borough of Tower Hamlets (2015). Decision Notice: Refusal of Planning Permission. PA/15/01141. 11 December 2015. London.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets (2017). Decision Notice: Refusal of Planning Permission. PA/16/03552. 15 November 2017. London.

McNeill, D. (2020). The volumetric city. *Progress in Human Geography*, *44*(5), 815–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519863486

Murawski, M. (2019). *The Palace Complex: A Stalinist Skyscraper, Capitalist Warsaw, and a City Transfixed*. Indiana University Press.

Nethercote, M. (2019). Melbourne's vertical expansion and the political economies of high-rise residential development. *Urban Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018817225

New London Architecture. (2023). *Sustainable Skylines: London Tall Building Survey 2023*.

Nitrato Izzo, V. (2022). Law and hostile design in the city: Imposing decorum and visibility regimes in the urban environment. *Onati Socio-Legal Series*, *12*(3), 522–539. https://doi.org/10.35295/OSLS.IISL/0000-0000-0000-1306

Ohayon M. M., Milesi C. (2016) Artificial Outdoor Nighttime Lights Associate with Altered Sleep Behavior in the American General Population. Sleep. Jun 1;39(6):1311-20. doi: 10.5665/sleep.5860. PMID: 27091523; PMCID: PMC4863221.

Osborne, H. (2014). Poor doors: the segregation of London's inner-city flat dwellers. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/jul/25/poor-doors-segregation-london-flats

Petty, J. (2016). The London Spikes Controversy: Homelessness, Urban Securitisation and the Question of 'Hostile Architecture.' *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, *5*(1), 67. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v5i1.286

Ponzini, P. (2020). *Transnational Architecture and Urbanism Rethinking How Cities Plan Transform and Learn*. Routledge.

Povinelli, E. A. (2016). *Geontologies: a requiem to late liberalism*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-2007-015

Ramkissoon, L. (2019). Which Floor? In K. de Waal (Ed.), *Common People: An Anthology of Working-Class Writers* (pp. 55–64). Unbound.

Rosenberger, R. (2020). Hostile Design And The Materiality Of Surveillance. *Relating to Things*, 135–150. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350124288.ch-007

Sheehan, M. (2024). Everyday verticality: Migrant experiences of high-rise living in Santiago, Chile. *Urban Studies*, *61*(4), 726–742. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980221114206

Sheringham, O., Ebbensgaard, C. L., & Blunt, A. (2021). 'Tales from other people's houses': home and dis/connection in an East London neighbourhood. *Social and Cultural Geography*, *24*(5), 719–737. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1965197

Simone, A. (2014). *Jakarta: Drawing the city nearer*. Minneapolis and London: Minnesota University Press.

Simone, A. (2023). *The Surrounds: Urban Life within and beyond Capture*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Smith, C. (2020). Collapse fake buildings and gray development in nairobi. *Focaal*, *2020*(86), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.3167/fcl.2020.860102

Soules, M. (2021). Icebergs, Zombies, and the Ultra Thin: Architecture and Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century. Princeton Architectural Press.

Vannini, P., & Taggart, J. (2013). Domestic lighting and the off-grid quest for visual comfort. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *31*(6), 1076–1090. https://doi.org/10.1068/d17412

Vannini, P., & Taggart, J. (2015). Solar energy, bad weather days, and the temporalities of slower homes. *Cultural Geographies*, *22*(4), 637–657. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474013516406

Walker, M. (2017). *Why We Sleep: The New Science of Sleep and Dreams*. Allen Lane.

Watt, P. (2023). Fear and loathing in north London: Experiencing estate regeneration as psychosocial degeneration. *Sociological Review*, *71*(2), 351–369. https://doi.org/10.1177/00380261231152038

Yusoff, K. (2021). Mine as paradigm. Survivance (Eds. Axel, N., Barnd, N. B., Black Quantum Futurism, Bremner, L., Hirsch, N., Lokko, L., Sepie, A. J., Therrien, T. C.) *e-Flux Architecture*. Retrieved from: https://www.e-flux.com/architecture/survivance/381867/mine-as-paradigm/

Žižek, S. (2009). *Violence*. Profile Books.

Zubovich, K. (2020). *Moscow Monumental: Soviet Skyscrapers and Urban Life in Stalin's Capital*. Princeton University Press.