This is a repository copy of *Unhoming, trauma and waiting: the post-Grenfell building safety crisis in England*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/204062/

Version: Published Version

Article:
Preece, J. orcid.org/0000-0002-9713-5344 and Flint, J. orcid.org/0000-0001-6272-9575 (2024) Unhoming, trauma and waiting: the post-Grenfell building safety crisis in England. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 48 (1). pp. 94-110. ISSN 0309-1317

https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13213

Reuse
This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Check for updates

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH
DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.13213

– UNHOMING, TRAUMA AND WAITING: The Post-Grenfell Building Safety Crisis in England

JENNY PREECE AND JOHN FLINT

Abstract

In this article we seek to advance our understanding of unhoming in a population not previously perceived to be vulnerable to such processes. We examine the particular forms of trauma in an emergent space of urban marginality, which has arisen through the fracturing of longstanding citizen–state relations and the rupturing of habitual orientations to home in a world that had hitherto been knowable and predictable. In this article we highlight the centrality of waiting in experiences of unhoming, which act as a mechanism of domination over a group newly subject to a specific manifestation of marginality; this mechanism has particular significance for understanding the differentiated dynamics of urban displacement. In this article we utilize interviews with 31 residents of residential flats in England living in buildings affected by fire safety defects, identified following the 2017 Grenfell Tower fire disaster in London in which 72 individuals died. We argue that research on urban dispossession needs to be attentive to distinctive processes and consequences of—and resistance to—unhoming. The experiences of newly affected populations unmask the underpinning precarity and unequal power relations of housing-based urban citizenship.

Introduction

Disasters in building safety within homes for multiple occupancy have occurred around the globe and include the 2020 Abbco Tower fire in the UAE, the 2021 Surfside building collapse in the USA and the 1968 Ronan Point disaster in England. In 2017, the Grenfell Tower fire in London resulted in the largest loss of life in a residential building fire in the UK since the second world war. The subsequent government inquiry has uncovered significant failings in the manufacturing, construction and regulatory sectors (Moore-Bick, 2019), which led to a national building safety crisis characterized by problems associated with the use of flammable materials in building construction and renewal. Thousands of buildings have been identified as being at risk, resulting in remediation costs of millions of pounds per building (Wilson, 2021). Many leaseholders[1]—who have been described as 'owners yet tenants' (Cole and Robinson, 2000)—are tied to their homes until buildings have been assessed and repaired. They therefore face years of enforced immobility owing to a fluctuating and untested legislative landscape, and uncertainty and inequalities around liability to pay

We wish to thank research participants for their open engagement with a challenging research topic at a time when they were living through what was often a very difficult experience. We are grateful for the ongoing engagement of the UK Cladding Action Group and William Martin in publicizing the research to affected communities. We also acknowledge the assistance of Jamie Redman, Ryan Powell, Selamawit Robi and other colleagues with whom we have discussed the different iterations of the ideas presented here. The comments of three anonymous IJURR reviewers enabled us to improve the manuscript, and we are grateful for their engagement with the ideas presented here and for their suggestions for further literature. Finally, we acknowledge funding through the UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence (Economic and Social Research Council grant number ES/P008852/1).

1 Leasehold tenure in England is common when purchasing dwellings (such as flats) in buildings for multiple occupancy. While many leaseholders equate purchasing a lease with ownership, leasehold tenure actually confers the right to live in a given dwelling for the period specified in the lease (often around 125 years) and in line with the terms written into that lease. After this period, the lease may be renewed (at a cost to the leaseholder). The building is not owned by the leaseholder but by a freeholder, who typically collects ground rents and other charges from leasehold occupants. While leaseholders do not own the building, they are generally liable for the cost of repairs through an annual service charge, again in line with the specification of the lease for that building.

© 2023 THE AUTHORS. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH* PUBLISHED BY JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD ON BEHALF OF URBAN RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

for work. While flammable cladding is a problem internationally—notably Australia (Oswald *et al*., 2022; 2023)—wellbeing impacts on residents have arguably been less severe because of differences in building ownership and governance, a risk-based and centralized taskforce approach and a different approach to funding (Apps, 2019). By contrast, the slow, piecemeal and atomized English response has incubated a crisis that has widespread and severe effects on people's mental wellbeing, disrupts life pathways and traps individuals in a chronic state of limbo (Martin and Preece, 2021; Preece, 2021).

We draw out the impact on leaseholders of living with these building safety problems with the aim to widen understandings of differentiated dynamics of dispossession and its affective impacts (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021). We analyse the specific mechanisms through which material and symbolic aspects of home are damaged or destroyed (Baxter and Brickell, 2014) and show how these unhoming processes generate distinctive forms of trauma for a new population not previously subject to forces of urban marginalization. In this article we identify the centrality of waiting, in its affective impacts and as a technique of domination, which results in the construction of a newly dispossessed group by disrupting the power and status hitherto afforded by housing occupation. We conceptualize leaseholders as a group subject to a new marginality relative to their previously held social position, attending to the different forms that marginalization takes and focusing on its subjective and emotional aspects (Mowat, 2015). Therefore, the subjective experience of marginalization is held in relation with past experiences and the disruption of anticipated futures. While traditionally, the focus of marginalization has been on the more extreme edges of urban life, attempts to rethink marginalization encourage a blurring of boundaries and an understanding of the heterogeneous contexts and relationships through which the margins are constituted (Lancione, 2016). This promotes a focus on many different lives and the processes through which marginal subjects are created through and with urban life. While many participants in this research may not have historically been understood or positioned as marginal subjects, it is precisely the disruption to habitual ways of living and being that constructs a subjective, felt position of new marginality.

The building safety crisis ruptures the historically embedded and deeply held sociocultural ideal within English culture of home as permanent, comfortable and 'keeping us physically, emotionally and ontologically safe' (King, 2008: 138), while also providing a spatial and social 'anchorage of the self' (Hatcher *et al*., 2019). In dominant ideologies, some forms of home are endorsed while others are marginalized (Blunt and Dowling, 2006); in England this is often expressed through tenure. The building safety crisis dramatically disrupts the long established identification of homeownership as a valorized form of housing occupation in England associated with enhanced ontological security, financial advancement and governmental approval and protection. This framing is premised on the class-imbued attribution of desired personal characteristics of responsibility, financial prudence and hard work to homeowners and leaseholders (contrasting with those living in rented homes) (Flint, 2003). Consequently, a popular understanding of homeownership as providing the site and space for the enactment of independence, agency and personal progression is produced. The growing population of individuals purchasing flats often believe they are accessing the perceived advantages of ownership despite the leasehold system constraining autonomy in reality (Cole and Robinson, 2000). It is, therefore, the unhoming occurring for this particular group that makes the connections between the emergent personal housing crisis and its situation within a wider urban crisis of housing dispossession so acute.

Scholars have long noted the ways in which home can be unmade, challenging the equivalence of home with haven (Watson and Austerberry, 1986), instead finding unhomeliness (Ortega-Alcázar and Wilkinson, 2021), harm (Gurney, 2023) and the 'unhome' (McCarthy, 2018). Unhoming literatures coalesce around groups with existing experiences of marginalization and misrecognition, including individuals displaced

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

by gentrification, urban regeneration and eviction (Lees *et al*., 2008; Maqsood and Sajjad, 2021; Watt, 2021; Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021), those experiencing domestic violence (Brickell, 2014; Pain, 2014) and refugees and migrants (Darling, 2011; Nethercote, 2022). In this article we build on these studies by identifying how the trauma of unhoming occurs in a population subject to a sudden crisis that strips the haven from home, while simultaneously symbolically and financially displacing these individuals from a relatively coveted position in the space of positions (Bourdieu, 1993) within the English housing system and its enhanced social status. In addition, we argue that although prolonged periods of waiting for access to housing, citizenship or other services are common in the operation of domination over poorer groups at the urban margins (Auyero, 2021; Watt, 2021), waiting has particularly distinctive affects in emergent spaces of marginality.

In the sections that follow we set this research within the wider context of literatures on unhoming, displacement, trauma and waiting. We then outline the methods used, followed by a discussion of three key mechanisms for this emergent form of unhoming: the collective mental harms of direct proximity to life-threatening risk, chronic waiting between an alienating present and unattainable future, and symbolic unanchoring from the societal affiliations, status and identity derived through property purchase.

Unhoming and urban trauma

Home exists as both a material and affective space (Blunt and Dowling, 2006). It is imbued with cultural and ideological meaning involving longstanding associations with freedom, privacy and autonomy, yet its familiarity and comfort has always existed in dialectic, predicated on the control, exclusion and invisibility of other social and material elements that can be rendered visible in times of crisis (Kaika, 2004). The unmaking of home, damaging its material or imaginary components (Baxter and Brickell, 2014: 134), may therefore be precipitated by making visible previously hidden elements, creating feelings of discomfort. Like homing (Boccagni, 2022), unhoming recognizes the dynamic and varied nature of home and the ways in which wider structural forces can be fundamental to the unmaking of home (Baxter and Brickell, 2014). In this article we reflect on the unmaking of home in different ways, attending to the 'personal and political, inside and outside, private and public' (Handel, 2019: 1051), the 'lived and felt realities of housing insecurity' (Vasudevan, 2022: 1539) and the displacement of affective capabilities (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021).

The destruction of home can result from physical and symbolic processes, for example, living through urban insecurity, marginality and eviction (Handel, 2019; Lancione and Simone, 2021; Maqsood and Sajjad, 2021), the 'emplaced displacement' of gentrification (Wynne and Rogers, 2021) and urban renewal (Watt, 2021), or the demolition of home amid the persistence of the physical house (Handel, 2019). This means attending to the ways in which individuals inhabit dispossession and the 'rhythms of endurance' that play out through everyday experiences (Lancione and Simone, 2021). Unhoming can also be complicated by considering more than direct, physical displacement (Rozena, 2022), namely, thinking of unhoming as a form of violence that reaches 'out from the household to the street, neighbourhood and the city beyond' (Elliot-Cooper *et al*., 2020: 498). This perspective involves thinking of processes of (un)homing as multi-scalar, working at levels from the individual human body to the nation state (Blunt and Dowling, 2006).

The building safety crisis offers a new and significant example of the way in which vulnerability to fire can precede dispossession, acting as both an imminent and chronic condition of disaster (Tadiar, 2021: 1112). Unlike other cases, however, this is an emplaced condition, in which fire risk renders populations physically trapped. The crisis demonstrates the way in which trauma is both a manifestation and driver of unhoming,

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

as individuals contend with 'a psychological effect of violence that may have distinct consequences a long way down the line, but may also underpin an ongoing relational dynamic between abuser and abused' (Pain, 2019: 388). Pain (*ibid*.) draws on the example of coalfield communities to argue that it is necessary to place the emotional and intimate realms at the heart of processes of urban dispossession to understand how chronic urban trauma becomes collectively hard-wired into places. Such collective dynamics are central to the building safety crisis, but rather than being embedded in neighbourhoods, such trauma is enmeshed in the materiality of particular building types.

In this article we attend to 'the different affective and emotional registers of displacement and dispossession and the un-making of home spaces' (Brickell *et al*., 2017: 11), offering a novel case study of in situ displacement that expands our understanding of the operation of unhoming. Such a perspective encourages a wide understanding of home, encompassing impacts on dwelling, the relationality and materiality of the home and a more political understanding of home/house within regimes of power (Handel, 2019). This understanding is apt in a homeownership society such as England, because the unanchoring of home can also be the unanchoring of the self (Atkinson, 2015; Hatcher *et al*., 2019), unravelling the symbols and societal relations through which the self was previously constructed. By rupturing hitherto taken-for-granted ways of being and knowing—the 'practical sense' (Bourdieu, 1990) acquired through the everyday inhabitation of social space (Allen, 2007)—we can see that a new spoiled identity takes root (Allen *et al*., 2007). The case of the building safety crisis therefore adds to understandings of the differentiation and stratification of displacement within urban populations (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021), since leaseholders—unlike the urban poor—have generally not previously been subject to longstanding mechanisms of urban marginalization. This makes the enforced waiting that is such a prominent element of the building safety crisis—and its associated sense of abandonment—more profound, suggesting a need to explore this space of suspended action, inbetween-ness or liminality (Lancione and Simone, 2021) and its incubation of new marginality.

Modalities of waiting

Living through a prolonged crisis has implications for the way in which people make and unmake their sense of home. As in the case of the collective trauma associated with deindustrialization, in which places are subject to incremental dispossession (Pain, 2019), the building safety crisis is in many respects a 'slow crisis' characterized by forms of 'attritional violence' (Nixon, 2011) that unfold over time through small happenings. As we show in this article, leaseholders often describe being in limbo, making manifest the relationship between time and power and enabling analysis of the operation of power through 'adjourning, deferring, delaying, raising false hopes, or, conversely, rushing, taking by surprise' (Bourdieu, 2000: 228). Sharma (2014: 138) captures these processes through the concept of power-chronography, highlighting temporality as a key relation of biopower, which operates unevenly among populations. Sharma argues that there has been more focus on the pace of time, particularly its speeding up, than on how citizens might be constituted *in* time. This is particularly salient for understanding the way in which waiting—slowing down time and weakening autonomy over its management—has reconstructed leasehold subjects to reveal 'the social and relational contours of power in its temporal forms' (Sharma, 2014: 14).

Despite the acknowledged importance of understanding experiences of 'lived time' (Sharma, 2014), Simone (2007: 97) argues that different modes of waiting in urban areas dominated by stories of mobility are under-explored. The building safety crisis can be situated within diverse modes of 'chronic waiting', including refugees at borders (Bhatia and Canning, 2021) and residents of regeneration schemes (Watt, 2021). An understanding of these diverse modes of waiting provides insight into affective

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

governance (Jeffrey, 2008) and the biopolitics of time (Sharma, 2014), in which leaseholders dwell in a lasting state of transience and temporariness (Bauman, 2002).

Crucially, the pain of this waiting reflects engagement in social life, and the expectations that individuals have of present and future (Hage, 2009a). Such expectations are intimately connected to the home, because processes of homing are driven by broader values and aspirations relating to security, identity and success, which are often temporally oriented towards the future (Boccagni, 2022). Through the unmaking of home these expectations are eroded (Preece *et al*., 2020), revealing the pain of failing to fulfil the home's image in relation to broader cultural and emotional economies (Handel, 2019). This unmaking ruptures ingrained social 'rules of the game' (Bourdieu, 2000), because the role of housing and ownership in securing a particular future—the ideology of homeownership (Ronald, 2008)—has been undermined. The potential loss of home and of the future life and position this assures causes widespread trauma and damage to symbolic life because of the role of homeownership within wider society. The trauma for leaseholders is acute precisely because they believed themselves to be enacting and embodying the form of housing pathway reified in English societal and governmental discourses.

Although waiting may appear to be a passive modality, there are also 'many cases where agency oozes out of waiting' (Hage, 2009a: 1). Inhabiting marginality and dispossession can therefore be a productive space, with opportunities for building solidarity (Maqsood and Sajjad, 2021), albeit with differential potentialities for mobilization (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021). The building safety crisis has generated a new politics of waiting, offering potential to attend to 'the rich plurality of the social forms that waiting takes … and the social and political relations that shape and flow from it' (Hage, 2009a: 2). Waiting and its uncertainty is, therefore, a key underlying mechanism of unhoming, because lack of policy action has undermined individuals' sense of status and the recognition they had previously come to expect from the state. However, as we demonstrate in the section on 'symbolic unanchoring', it also offers a space of potential for the emergence of new solidarities through collective resistance to the dislocating effects of the crisis.

Methods

The research on which this article is based explored the multi-dimensional impacts of living with building safety problems. To build a picture of individual and collective experiences that had not previously been explored in England, we used semi-structured interviews. This approach enabled broad consideration of the dimensions of home and social life that may be unmade through the building safety crisis, and the flexibility to explore different types of impacts and uncover the underlying mechanisms of homing/unhoming. Interviews were carried out in June and July 2021 with 31 leasehold residents of buildings affected by post-Grenfell Tower fire safety problems. Participants lived in a range of cities and building types. At the time of research, the policy context was fluid; legislation was working through the UK Parliament, and although there was some government funding for fixing building problems, this applied to cladding defects only, and to tall buildings above 18 metres high (Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee, 2021). A loan scheme for lower buildings was proposed but later scrapped.

An online screening survey was distributed publicly by a leasehold campaign group, the UK Cladding Action Group, enabling us to draw a sample across different characteristics. Altogether 253 respondents completed the survey, indicating their interest in participating in an interview. A stratified random sample was taken across different characteristics, such as age, household structure and building height. Although in the screening survey we asked respondents about key areas of impact, this was not used for selection purposes, as there was very little differentiation, i.e. most respondents

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

reported that all areas of impact were of high importance. The composition of the sample is outlined in Table 1. It was not possible to match the sample to population characteristics, mainly because there are no official data on leaseholders as a distinct population group in England. However, participants were drawn from urban areas that are typically younger, more ethnically diverse and recorded growth in single-person households. The sample aimed to achieve a split in individuals based in the Greater

TABLE 1 Participant characteristics

	N
Gender	
Male	14
Female	17
Age	
25–34	8
35–44	13
45–54	5
54+	5
Ethnicity	
White British, English, Welsh, Scottish, N. Irish	23
White Irish	2
White other	2
Asian/Asian British	2
Mixed other	2
Household structure	
Lives alone	11
Lives with spouse/partner	10
Lives with spouse/partner and child(ren)	8
Lives with other family members	2
Currently living in the affected property	
Yes	28
No	3
Region	
Greater London	18
East of England	4
North West	3
South East	2
South West	1
West Midlands	2
Yorkshire and Humber	1
Tenure	
Leaseholder	21
Shared owner (part rent, part leasehold)	10
Building height	
18 metres+	14
11–18 metres	17
Length of residency	
Up to five years	13
Six years+	18

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

London area and other regions, because while London has many affected buildings owing to its size, stock type and pace of development, there are affected buildings around the country.

During our research period, there were restrictions on social contact in England owing to the Covid-19 pandemic, therefore interviews were conducted using online meetings. Given existing evidence of the mental health impact of living with building safety problems (UK Cladding Action Group, 2020), the research used enhanced safeguards, including a distress protocol and qualitative mood checks before and after the interview (see Preece, 2021). Interviews were typically about an hour long, and all participants were offered a £25 shopping voucher.

Interviews were based on a topic guide through which we sought to understand people's stories so far in relation to building safety problems, and the different areas of their life that were affected. Interviews were audio recorded and written transcripts were edited for anonymity; all participants were given pseudonyms. A long list of themes was compiled, covering issues raised by participants. A second stage of analysis situated relevant codes within a coding framework, which included concepts relating to trauma, home/loss and wider affiliations/orientations. Transcripts were then re-coded to develop a hierarchy of codes underneath broader themes.

Trauma as a collective experience

Processes of unhoming need to be situated within the context of trauma and mental harm participants experienced. Trauma manifested as constant worrying, lack of concentration, anxiety, depression and suicidal feelings. George (age 25–34, Cambridge), for example, recalled that 'in January time I started to just think about chucking myself off of my balcony'. The impacts of living with building safety problems were difficult to compartmentalize, spreading so that 'all the other positive things in your life just fall away' (Steve, 35–44, London). Laura (25–34, Manchester) described living with 'everyday anxiety, stress, guilt' revealing the affective impacts of the crisis in generating feelings of self-blame. Thomas explained his struggle to rationalize what was happening to him, likening it to the experience of a physical assault:

> Your brain is trying to search for an answer or to rationalize how this could happen, it's similar to any kind of trauma … If you've been subjected to some sort of violence … your brain searches for an answer as to why that would happen, but there is no answer because it's not your fault (Thomas, 45–54, London).

While trauma may be conventionally understood in many fields as an individualized experience, what we learn from the building safety crisis is that there is a strong collective component to the operation of urban trauma. This research shows that rather than being embedded within a defined geographical place (see Pain, 2019), trauma exists across spatial boundaries to impact a population that has leasehold tenure in common. This is important because—as will be shown in the section on 'symbolic unanchoring'—rather than an isolating and dislocating force, this collective, disembedded trauma can also be built upon as a platform to resist the negative affective impacts of the crisis.

Several dimensions were driving traumatic outcomes. For some, fear of fire was a pervasive driver of mental harm, which demonstrates the impact of living close to unrelenting environmental danger (Auyero, 2021). This multi-sensory experience highlights that home unmaking is sensed, perceived, felt, smelt, touched and heard (Baxter and Brickell, 2014: 138). Anna (35–44, Southampton) described her anxiety at smelling a barbeque from a neighbouring balcony: 'there was this waft of barbecue … I'm sitting there thinking "this is my own home, I shouldn't be on constant alert" … I feel perpetually stressed'. The impact of the building safety crisis can therefore be located

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

within the dwelling, and the ways in which the material environment has reconstructed home as a place of unsafety and mental harm. This was exacerbated by Covid-19 and 'stay home' orders:

> When it was that severe lockdown you're surrounded by the thing that's dragging you down. Your home is supposed to be a place of respite from the challenges of the world, and I think for everybody involved in this it's the opposite of that; it's the cause of your problems and that's awful (Michael, 35–44, London).

Moments of crisis reveal the 'domestic uncanny' (Kaika, 2004)—the way in which the ideal construction of the home as safe, controllable and free from anxiety—is predicated on the exclusion of natural and social process, which are in fact embedded in the materiality of the dwelling. Fire breaks, insulation and cladding seek to control fire, water and temperature, but the features designed to create the controllable sphere of the home had been exposed, defamiliarizing the familiar as these 'protective' materials become transmitters of risk. Trauma resulted in some individuals being forced to move from their home, leaving it empty or sometimes renting it out. However, fear of fire was a differentiated experience. Those living on lower floors often described escape plans, expressing their ability to get out of the building by a range of means. This may contribute to a different judgement of risk, indicating that verticality is a relevant factor in the emotions associated with home and its unmaking (Baxter, 2017).

Indeed, for most participants, fear of fire was not the primary driver of trauma. It was much more common for mental harm to stem from the potential financial impacts of remediation works, particularly because uncertainty and lack of government action affected financial health, anticipated futures and life planning. For example, Anna (35–44, Southampton), speaking about her suicidal feelings, reported that 'it felt like life had stopped'. It is important to elucidate the significance of waiting and uncertainty as mechanisms of unhoming, because in a population that had hitherto experienced relative autonomy over the spatio-temporal unfolding of their lives, the unhoming experienced can be both wider and deeper, precipitating a profound dislocation from society and its institutions. This temporal dimension of trauma and marginalization is manifested in the processes and consequences of enforced waiting, to which we now turn in this article.

Chronic waiting, uncertainty and loss of autonomy

The day-to-day bureaucracy that is at the heart of people's experiences of the building safety crisis is not always recognized as a form of violence. However, the sense of being in limbo, at the whim of an unresponsive policy environment, was central to many narratives; it reconstructed (leasehold) citizens, revealing the contours of temporal power (Sharma, 2014). This outcome is significant for a population that had generally been less exposed to the temporal biopolitics of governmental bureaucracies, in contrast to historically marginalized urban residents (see e.g. Auyero, 2012). Leaseholders' loss of autonomy often manifested in their inability to enact certain life choices, particularly relating to residential/geographical mobility. The production of waiting was especially severe for those who actively wanted to move, demonstrating the ways in which the building safety crisis can produce different temporalities depending on those whom it affects (Singer *et al.*, 2019).

The temporal dimension is key, because for people who are trapped and waiting, unhoming grows over time and can enmesh more and more areas of life. Wynne and Rogers (2021: 403) argue in relation to possible displacement from gentrifying neighbourhoods that uncertainty adds to alienation from place as attachments are put on hold because people do not know how long they will remain. King (2004: 179) similarly argues that 'for dwelling to work as we would like it to, we have to be able to

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

exercise some control; we need to be able to make choices'. Temporal uncertainty in the building safety crisis reveals the actions that are forestalled through waiting, resulting in residents experiencing alienation less in relation to neighbourhood, and more in relation to possible futures.

Steve (35–44, London) explained that 'I'm not making any plans to do anything … because I'm frozen'. This 'freeze' could affect numerous life transitions—from retirement plans and work-related relocation to having children:

> We want to start a family, so we need the space … I don't know how long we might be trapped here for … I don't have the luxury of time to play with … what if we can't move from here? … There are all these questions and I can't do anything about it (Ellen, 25–34, Hertfordshire).

The waiting leaseholders experience can therefore be seen as a boundary condition between present and future—the manifestation of tension between a world they cannot leave and a future they cannot immediately enter (Rundell, 2009). Participants' inability to follow normalized biographical pathways has resulted in their lives existing in parallel to the 'temporal realities' that were perceived to govern society more widely. It is at this point of interruption that the space of waiting manifests (Singer *et al*., 2019: 1), forcing a process of recalibration to a changed and changing sense of future (Sharma, 2014) and sometimes leaving individuals in a life they no longer recognize or identify with, as can be seen in other moments of adjustment to the impasse created by the 'crisis ordinary', for example, in the emerging gulf between aspired housing outcomes and those that can be achieved (Berlant, 2011).

Waiting in the building safety crisis is a mode of living that generates mental harms. Hannah, who was taking anti-depressants, struggled to come to terms with the loss of control:

> You're stuck and there's literally nothing you can do about it. You have to work so hard and expend so much personal energy in coming to terms with that and finding ways to tell your brain that it's okay, just so you don't go into a spiral of despair. But you have to do it to stay afloat … You can't just roll over and die, even though some days I wake up and think that would be the easy option (Hannah, 35–44, London).

Many leaseholders, while not having been physically displaced, had been displaced from the life they felt they would otherwise have been leading. Ed (35–44, London) felt that he was living with 'a wasted future … I can't leave anymore … The bigger danger is to … my future life, rather than me thinking I'm going to burn down'. Many of those affected were experiencing a moment of rupture between their current and future lives, which they struggled to reconcile with the identities, social positions and aspirations that had previously structured the world around them as a knowable and navigable entity (Allen, 2007):

> You build a life for yourself around a certain set of assumptions, and so you make choices based on those assumptions … But now the whole … life-image-story, whatever, has been turned on its head … I'd set up a life for myself in a certain way and now that's been completely changed … I don't feel I'm investing in something so that I can reap the benefits of that … The future, that's been taken away (Richard, 54+, London).

Richard's waiting mirrors that of the 'never ending degeneration' (Watt, 2021: 400) some residents in redevelopment programmes experienced, which can run decades

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

behind schedule, making the resumption of mundane and predictable dwelling a permanent mirage. This aligns with Wilhelm-Soloman's (2021: 978) account of the deferred emergency of eviction resistance, in which individuals experience a condition of 'permanent liminality'. What is different for leaseholders is the way in which this rupture occurs within a population that had been valorized by societal narratives for the very flexibility, mobility and liquidity (Bauman, 2000) they are no longer able to enact. This has resulted in leaseholders' profound sense of unhoming and not belonging, revealing that home is not just something that unfolds in the present, but is intimately connected to a belief in the security of future trajectories, which—when threatened—reconfigured what home means in the present. The shared significance of dwelling and remembering that which we can no longer gain access to (yet cannot replace) gives rise to trauma (King, 2004), which is particularly acute in a society in which ownership is associated with self-reliance, self-governance and status (Flint, 2003).

The personal sense of loss of control, and a derailing of a planned future aligned with social norms, is acutely manifested in direct interactions with others. Personal encounters are therefore a key element through which dissonance with socially constructed norms are experienced, as Laura (25–34, Manchester) describes: 'There's a feeling of embarrassment … because I'm … trying to go to Mum and Baby groups and stuff in areas that I don't live … I feel embarrassed to say, "oh, no, I live in a flat in [area]", because I'm trying to live the life that I'd planned for us'. Laura's agency within an overall condition of 'stuckedness' represents a rejection of the community of being 'stuck' (Hage, 2009b), but also vividly exemplifies the gulf between individual expectations and the possibilities for their realization. Laura is trying to live the future life she had planned while also being stuck, the affective outcome of this being her embarrassment (Bourdieu, 2000). Other negative affects were generated from seeing others 'like them' seeming to continue along planned trajectories with relative ease. As Beth explained: 'when I see other people going through these really important milestones in life, I am really happy for them, but it really shines a magnifying glass on your own situation … you just start thinking like you failed' (Beth, 35–44, London). This experience of not 'matching up' to others therefore becomes a source of social pain (Allen, 2007; Allen *et al*., 2007).

The unhoming that leaseholders experienced was not the result of a singular, spectacular act, but occurred through a series of smaller happenings that unfolded over time (Elliot-Cooper *et al*., 2020). Waiting while others moved on, for example, created feelings of jealousy, unfairness and injustice. Others expressed the guilt of disrupted life pathways and the embarrassment of negotiating conditions of 'stuckedness'. All these micro-events had affective outcomes that contributed to the unravelling of home. As Singer *et al*. (2019: 5) argue, 'existential waiting … keeps the waiting subject in a state of constant surveillance, insecurity, and self-criticism'. Many individuals used self-descriptors such as small, powerless and little, revealing the embodied experience of subordination through waiting (see, for example, Auyero, 2012). This unravelling of home was entwined with a broader process of disconnection from a secure position within, and relationship to, society and the state through a form of symbolic unanchoring.

Symbolic unanchoring

Sharma (2014: 13) argues that within contemporary theorization on the politics of time there has been a more substantive focus on the pace and speed of time, rather than how citizens are constituted in time. The preceding discussion showed that the drawn-out process of waiting, which has been characteristic of the building safety crisis, is a core part of unhoming. However, feelings of unhoming extend far beyond the dwelling and point to the reconstitution of a group of citizens through the exercise of this temporal power. The unmaking of home is therefore as much about loss of identity, belonging and value within society as it is about the loss of a safe dwelling, with individuals experiencing

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

a form of 'unanchoring' (Atkinson, 2015) in relation to wider affiliations with society and state. This is particularly driven by the symbolic position of home and ownership in England as a marker of success and future security (Preece *et al*., 2020).

Leaseholders have commonly perceived government inaction in relation to building safety problems to devalue property purchase as a symbol of success, creating negative affects and driving unhoming. As Laura (25–34, Manchester) explained, 'I just don't understand why our government just sit and do nothing … it has massively changed how I view the world'. Waiting therefore becomes a boundary position in which individuals are held in limbo by the (in)action of nation states (Rundell, 2009), which can provoke a range of damaging negative affects such as anxiety and anger. Abandonment by government undermines belonging by disrupting the sense of being at home within a broader 'taken-for-granted' system with knowable and understood rules, norms and expectations, as Lucas explains:

> It is your home and I think so much of who you are as a person you're wrapped up in … that sense of achievement, that sense of accomplishment, self-worth … It's the Englishman's castle … It shouldn't be but like your relationship status, your job, where you're going, where you live and what you're doing, it's all kind of wrapped up into how you feel (Lucas, 35–44, London).

As the piecemeal nature of policy making failed to deliver an unambiguous route out of the crisis for those affected, the symbolic unanchoring leaseholders experienced has grown. This attends to Rozena's (2022: 6) claim in relation to the wider neighbourhood post-Grenfell, that betrayal by the state is integral to experiences of home unmaking, creating geographies of injustice that are fostered by state policies.

Leaseholders' experiences as a result of the building safety crisis eroded trust, not only in the building industry, but in government and institutions that had previously been perceived as stable and secure. Thus, Lucas described his changed orientation to the world around him and his perception of previously secure foundations being destabilized as being replaced with shifting sand:

> It's almost like being unplugged a little bit from the matrix … You see the government saying all this stuff … it's all just … propaganda … You expect certain standards to be in play and I think that's what's really done the damage … like, everything is built on sand … I don't trust anybody really now … in terms of this system (Lucas, 35–44, London).

This sense of unreality was mirrored by Kate (54+, Manchester), who described the way the crisis 'took the blinkers off and made me realize that the world I thought I lived in isn't … We're run by the governments, run by … commerce for the benefit of commerce … I had faith before. I don't now. I had hope before. I don't now'. These narratives reveal the depth of disruption to previously perceived 'rules of the game' (Bourdieu, 2000). Many participants positioned homeownership as a demonstration of their adherence to wider social norms such as hard work and self-reliance. Yet, having trusted that this would secure their future lives, participants now perceived these rules to be a fiction, breaking the social contract. As Richard (54+, London) explained, 'you save up, you buy a property … I've never taken unemployment benefit; I've played the game'. As he argued:

> You kind of over-extend yourself with the mortgage because you feel like you're investing in something … All I do is, I work to pay the mortgage for something that may actually be valueless. It just feels like you start having an existential crisis about what's the point of life really, I mean what am doing? (Richard, 54+, London).

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

The broader identity crisis that the building safety crisis has precipitated for many therefore differs markedly from other situations of housing displacement such as gentrification and estate regeneration. Richard described existing in a place of perpetual temporariness, having 'started decorating, then basically stopped, so for three years … all the furniture has got sheets over and there's a ladder—I've just not done anything, because what's the point?'. The active home making that helps to construct the imperfect home into a secure and comfortable domain (Handel, 2019) is therefore disrupted through the unmasking of the uncanny in the domestic, which introduces feelings of unease and discomfort (Kaika, 2004). As Bourdieu (2000: 225) identified, there are certain conditions that imply an assured future, such as occupying a given social position. This set of assurances or guarantees is usually hidden from view, but forms the basis for enacting a particular set of behaviours that are oriented towards the fulfilment of this future. The building safety crisis unmasked the fragility of these social positions, to which the achievement of homeownership is often central. The crisis thrust individuals into a new marginality—a border position in which their life is held in stasis while the symbolic signs of success that had hitherto been a marker of an assured future are stripped away. It is for this reason that the disassociation leaseholders experience is so profound; it is experienced as a moment of gradual unmasking in which the previously stable social order has been recast around them, resulting in a world that is no longer recognizable.

Studies of unhoming, and of the slow violence of the state in housing regeneration and gentrification, have generally attended to populations who are more marginalized and often already have considerable experience of misrecognition by official bodies and the state. As Pain (2019) argues, psychological violence by the state operates through the entrenched misrecognition of communities and presumptions of their disposability (see McKenzie, 2015). For leaseholders in the building safety crisis, however, this was often a new experience, and they struggled to reconcile it with their own biographies, trajectories and self-perception. These individuals had been socialized into a different set of habitual dispositions than, for example, those described in Auyero's (2012) engagement with the urban poor's daily encounters with the state. If over time the urban poor accumulated a shared understanding of how state agencies work, limiting the thoughts and actions open to them in obtaining resources (Auyero, 2012: 62), newly marginal leaseholders had acquired a different set of habits and dispositions that were at odds with the bureaucratic processes now structuring their lives. This suggests that for this group, a crisis of citizen–state dynamics is a core feature of an unhoming that has both depth and breadth. As Julie argues:

> I am reasonably articulate, I can make points very forcefully, I can write a good letter, I can do all of those things … yet no matter how much I try and bring those skills and talents that I've got, it makes no difference. And that is a very strange feeling, because generally I've managed to pull my life around or do things to make a difference … It has changed the way I see myself very much (Julie, 54+, Chelmsford).

The political capital that individuals previously relied upon no longer has the same power; simultaneously they have found themselves cast adrift in a 'signposted universe' (Bourdieu, 2000: 225) in which enduring signals have been rewritten. While many individuals viewed themselves as previously relatively advantaged, they now found themselves in a world 'full of injunctions and prohibitions … profoundly differentiated especially according to the degree to which it offers stable chances, capable of … fulfilling stable expectations' (Bourdieu, 2000: 225). While many participants noted that they had not been particularly 'political' before this experience, having experiences denied and their voices unheard could create new political subjectivities, in which

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

affected individuals come together to seek a just outcome to the crisis (see, for example, Vasudevan, 2022). Leaseholders frequently aligned their experiences with other scandals in which groups had suffered symbolic violence by the state through the loss of pensions, wrongful conviction and denial of citizenship, as Tim explained:

> I always felt, you know, I'm middle class, I'm a homeowner … I'm going to be okay … You see the WASPI women [Women Against State Pension Inequality], you see Windrush, and the post office workers scandal, and it's like, hang on, there's people in this country who have been fighting for justice for decades. Even when justice comes, it's too little too late. This is the country we live in. My wife actually wants to leave the country (Tim, 45–54, London).

Many regarded the management of the building safety crisis as getting 'to really fundamental things … in this country … about the way things work' (Rose, 54+, London). It exposed 'such a seismic failure of all institutions' (Chris, 35–44, London) that some described the experience as 'kind of like living in a surreal parallel universe, none of it really seems real' (Sarah, 25–34, London). This sensation was shared by others, as Kate (54+, Manchester) explained: 'everything I believed in was a lie. It was all a facade', the result being 'there is nothing left that's real, nothing'. In conditions of crisis, the societal facade has been torn away to expose individuals to a new marginality. Hannah (35–44, London) argued that 'it's made me think twice about remaining in the UK … When our parents pass away, we will happily move out of this country … There's no values here. There's no society. It's literally been systematically destroyed, and this government has probably accelerated that more than any government'. Feelings of resentment and place mourning draw attention to conditions of injustice (Atkinson, 2015). The mourning leaseholders experience is not so much from the loss of a knowable place in the sense of their neighbourhood—the feelings residents have who remain in gentrifying places—as rather a loss of their symbolic place within wider society.

And yet the extent of the disruption to individuals' present and future lives—and the dislocation that has been caused to their sense of home, value and belonging—has also given rise to a collective movement emanating from the shared experience of crisis that may provide an alternative source of value. This movement highlights unhoming as a dynamic and nuanced process that can also create the conditions for the re-embedding of identities and a sense of 'rehoming'. As Mariam (25–34, London) explained, 'it does help knowing that there are other people that are in the same situation that are all trying to do something to get out of it'. Ed (35–44) believed that this knowledge generated a stronger sense of community: 'If anything, it's brought us closer together. It's made more of a community of the estate. Previously … everyone … tended not to know each other'. Bao (45–54, Ipswich) had also found value in engaging with campaign groups, explaining that 'it felt natural to reach out to them … I wasn't expecting much, but … they basically took me in. Took me in, and now I'm part of them'. Surviving marginalization has therefore enabled the formation of new solidarities for individuals seeking to generate change (Maqsood and Sajjad, 2021). However, it is also true that the change demanded, to some extent, stems from a desire to regain the certainties and securities that property ownership had been seen as affording. Therefore, while community organizing and campaigning is often overtly political, the case perhaps also coheres with others in which the change that is sought is in fact a reassertion of the state's power to reaffirm the rights associated with good citizenship (see, for example, Vasudevan, 2021).

Even as home is being unmade, the collective space in which individuals lead their suspended lives has been vital to re-embedding identities. While it is common to consider the inhabitation of a 'spoiled identity' as an individualized experience—i.e. how an individual manages the pain of their social othering (Allen, 2007)—the collective experience of new marginality in the building safety crisis has also been a

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

mechanism of resistance that provides important balance to the lived experience of unhoming. This sense of collectivity suggests a need to explore the relationality of homing, or perhaps 'rehoming', and its vertical and horizontal inter-group dynamics (Auyero, 2012; Boccagni, 2022). Prolonged dispossession and displacement can diminish (or 'depotentiate') the capacity of residents to organize (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021) because of affective consequences, such as being exhausted by prolonged struggle (Vasudevan, 2022). However, prolongation and waiting can also facilitate resistance, because the durability of acts of dwelling are themselves resistance to embedded insecurity (Handel, 2019). Waiting is therefore not synonymous with an absence of action, but an 'active, conscious, materialized practice in which people forge new political strategies' (Jeffrey, 2008: 957). This view calls into question its success as a 'strategy of domination' (Auyero, 2012: 15) in a population for which politics has been seen as a (relatively) accessible space of collective change.

Conclusion

Where does engagement with questions of trauma and waiting take us in understanding the operation of unhoming? While displacement—physical and symbolic (Lees *et al*., 2008; Maqsood and Sajjad, 2021; Watt, 2021; Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021; Wynne and Rodgers, 2022)—has been regarded as a key driver of urban unhoming, the building safety crisis in England complicates 'displacement in place' by widening understandings of the differentiated dynamics of dispossession and its affective and geographical impacts (Wilhelm-Soloman, 2021). Exploring unhoming in a population that has not previously been viewed as susceptible to displacement owing to individuals' relatively advantaged status reveals how unhoming operates in part through the traumatic experience of new marginality and the chronic waiting and uncertainty that characterizes individuals' experiences. Affected leaseholders are marginalized from the fiscal and legal mechanisms required to operate within the housing system, and their circumstances are marginalized by the lack of political urgency to rectify their situation. As in the case of other marginalized groups, these processes are underpinned by discourses that undermine the legitimacy of their claims and focus on personal deficiency rather than structural systematic failure. The conceptual development of these mechanisms of unhoming opens up connections to the experience of other conditions of prolonged crisis or 'crisis ordinary' (Berlant, 2011). The problems explored here are an extreme example of forced adjustment in expectations and curtailed agency related to home, yet it is also possible that the widening gap between adherence to normative homeownership ideals and the possibility of their realization will spark wider crises in citizen–state relations through the betrayal of citizenship via property holding. The profound dislocations and resulting trauma that leaseholders experience are therefore symptomatic of longer-running crises that widen spaces of marginality as more individuals are unable to attain the future life they had planned for.

Our research confirms that waiting is often central to processes of urban dispossession. Waiting is acute, as loss of autonomy and power unmask individuals' new inability to make key life choices. It is also chronic, as its impacts grow over time. Hope is eroded through successive, inadequate policy proposals, and many individuals have come to feel a sense of guilt, shame, loss and abandonment. While many participants regard the material problems of their dwelling as significant, and it is important for safety failings to be resolved, the financial precarity and loss of autonomy resulting from inadequate government support is often the more significant driver of a wider crisis. In part, the crisis can be attributed to the role of home in constituting identities (Blunt and Dowling, 2006). The sense of dislocation and rupture that many participants described is a manifestation of their alienation from and the destabilization of a sphere they had hitherto perceived to be secure. It therefore makes manifest the violence from institutions of government that were central to the construction of the home and its

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

varied meanings in the first place (Kaika, 2004). Although there have been additional policy developments since we conducted our research, such as legislation designed to financially protect some leaseholders, significant gaps and uncertainties remain, and action to fix buildings remains a slow and atomized process.

While waiting may be made possible by an orientation to futures (Simone, 2007), the slow violence of the present can also destroy possible futures. The trauma many participants expressed suggests that there will be long-lasting consequences, not only for individuals' own lives, but also for their future relationship with the state and with others in positions of power. This exemplifies Pain's (2019) argument that urban trauma must be understood as an *ongoing dynamic* between abuser and abused. For many of those affected, the building safety crisis is the beginning of a fundamental reshaping of the relationship between citizen and state, a 'moral injury' (Sherman, 2015) with far-reaching consequences that will likely outlast the specific safety defects present in buildings.

Our research suggests that chronic waiting has ruptured taken-for-granted ways of being and knowing acquired through the everyday inhabitation of social space (Allen, 2007). While Sharma (2014: 138) demonstrates that populations are constantly required to recalibrate to fit the 'temporal expectations' of different institutions and relationships, in the building safety crisis it is notable that the biopolitical exercise of time through waiting is at odds with relatively stable societal norms and expectations for 'successful' self-governance and citizenship (Flint, 2003). This means that recalibration is not possible without abandoning previously held temporal expectations associated with mobility and autonomy, and entails the inhabitation of a new spoiled identity (Allen *et al*., 2007). Our research captures individuals at the point of grappling with living through a seemingly unliveable condition, in which the inhabitation of their previous life is impossible. The unhoming they experience is therefore associated with a range of losses that relate not so much to material changes in the home or neighbourhood, as is commonly seen during gentrification, as to multi-scalar changes that extend from within the dwelling to wider social and symbolic anchors of identity and belonging. Yet such losses and their intensity are not always readily recognized by others outside the community (see, for example, Tadiar, 2021).

The crisis has exposed the biopolitical investment by the state (Jeffrey *et al*., 2011) in a particular form of urban citizenship through property ownership. Governments have long divided the population through differential investment, and an individual's capacity to feel at home has always been shaped by unequal access to underpinning resources and opportunities, including those of societal recognition (Boccagni, 2022). What is perhaps less common is the shift of a population from a relative position of investment and advantage to one of relegation and vulnerability. Walters (2004) identified a shift to a new form of 'domopolitics' in which the state becomes governed as a home (based on emotion and belonging) rather than as a household (through political economy). Our research indicates that, in understanding the contemporary governance of the urban housing crisis in England, the centrality of emotion (see also Pain, 2019) and the deterioration of a sense of belonging to one's own home is intrinsically linked to a reconfiguration of belonging within the sociocultural and political constructs of citizen–state relationships. The trauma of this unhoming also reveals the fragility of these constructs and the precarity of groups who suddenly become subject to narratives and processes of dispossession long applied to more established marginalized urban populations. This experience of trauma was reflected in the sense of unreality and a world recreated anew expressed in many narratives.

The sociopolitical implications of this new marginality are yet unclear (Singer *et al*., 2019), but they potentially appear to differ markedly from Auyero's (2012) study of waiting among the urban poor in Argentina, in which uncertainty and arbitrariness seemingly produced compliance and subordination. Rather, building safety campaigns

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

have drawn collective value and recognition from within the crisis, to spark forms of political resistance that demonstrate that waiting remains a variegated experience. This response offers potential for collective solidarity and a recognition of the self in others, which reduces the power of negative affects such as self-blame, failure and guilt and offers the foundations of resistance to the conditions from which it was created. Many leaseholders continue to campaign for a comprehensive settlement that can ensure safe buildings while protecting those affected from the cost of repairs, as well as calling for a more fundamental reform of the leasehold system.

Jenny Preece, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN, UK, jenny.preece@sheffield.ac.uk

John Flint, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK, john.flint@sheffield.ac.uk

References

Allen, C. (2007) *Crime, drugs and social theory: a phenomenological approach*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Allen, C., R. Powell, R. Casey and S. Coward (2007) 'Ordinary, the same as anywhere else': notes on the management of spoiled identity in 'marginal' middle-class neighbourhoods. *Sociology* 41.2, 239–58.

Apps, P. (2019) The cladding crisis down-under: what we can learn from the response to Grenfell in Australia. *Inside Housing*, 22 November [WWW document]. URL https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/insight/the-cladding-crisis-down-under-what-we-can-learn-from-the-response-to-grenfell-in-australia-64164 (accessed 19 April 2023).

Atkinson, R. (2015) Losing one's place: narratives of neighbourhood change, market injustice and symbolic displacement. *Housing, Theory and Society* 32.4, 373–88.

Auyero, J. (2012) *Patients of the state: the politics of waiting in Argentina*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Auyero, J. (2021) Taking Bourdieu to the shantytown. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 45.1, 176–85.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid modernity*. Polity, Cambridge.

Bauman, Z. (2002) *Society under siege*. Polity, Cambridge.

Baxter, R. (2017) The high-rise home: verticality as practice in London. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41.2, 334–52.

Baxter, R. and K. Brickell (2014) For home (un)making. *Home Cultures* 11.2, 133–43.

Berlant, L. (2011) *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Bhatia, M. and V. Canning (eds.) (2021) *Stealing time: migration, temporalities and state violence*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Blunt, A. and R. Dowling (2006) *Home*. Routledge, London.

Boccagni, P. (2022) Homing: a category for research on space appropriation and 'home-oriented' mobilities. *Mobilities* 17.4, 585–601.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The logic of practice*. Polity, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, P. (1993) *Sociology in question*. Sage, London.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian meditations*. Polity, Oxford.

Brickell, K. (2014) 'Plates in a basket will rattle': marital dissolution and home 'unmaking' in contemporary Cambodia. *Geoforum* 51 (January), 262–72.

Brickell, K., M.F. Arrigoitia and A. Vasudevan (2017) Geographies of forced eviction: dispossession, violence, resistance. In K. Brickell, M.F. Arrigoitia and A. Vasudevan (eds.), *Geographies of forced eviction*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Cole, I. and D. Robinson (2000) Owners yet tenants: the position of leaseholders in flats in England and Wales. *Housing Studies* 15.4, 595–612.

Darling, J. (2011) Domopolitics, governmentality and the regulation of asylum accommodation. *Political Geography* 30.5, 263–71.

Elliott-Cooper, A., P. Hubbard and L. Lees (2020) Moving beyond Marcuse: gentrification, displacement and the violence of un-homing. *Progress in Human Geography* 44.3, 492–509.

Flint, J. (2003) Housing and ethopolitics: constructing identities of active consumption and responsible community. *Economy and Society* 32.3, 611–29.

Gurney, C.M. (2023) Dangerous liaisons? Applying the social harm perspective to the social inequality, housing and health trifecta during the Covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 23.2, 232–59.

Hage, G. (2009a) Introduction. In G. Hage (ed.), *Waiting*, Melbourne University Publishing, Melbourne.

Hage, G. (2009b) Waiting out the crisis: on stuckedness and governmentality. In G. Hage (ed.), *Waiting, Melbourne University Publishing*, Melbourne.

Handel, A. (2019) What's in a home? Toward a critical theory of housing/dwelling. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 37.6, 1045–62.

Hatcher, D., E. Chang, V. Schmied and S. Garrido (2019) Exploring the perspectives of older people on the concept of home. *Journal of Ageing Research*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/2679680

Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee (2021) *Cladding remediation—follow-up. Seventh Report of Session 2019–2021*, House of Commons, London.

Jeffrey, A., C. McFarlane and A. Vasudevan (2011) Rethinking enclosure: space, subjectivity and the commons. *Antipode* 44.4, 1247–67.

Jeffrey, C. (2008) Waiting. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26.6, 954–58.

Kaika, M. (2004) Interrogating the geographies of the familiar: domesticating nature and constructing the autonomy of the modern home. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28.2, 265–86.

King, P. (2004) *Private dwelling: contemplating the use of housing*. Routledge, London.

King, P. (2008) *In dwelling: implacability, exclusion and acceptance*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Lancione, M. (2016) *Rethinking life at the margins: the assemblage of contexts, subjects and politics*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Lancione, M. and A. Simone (2021) Dwelling in liminalities, thinking beyond inhabitation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 39.6, 969–75.

Lees, L., T. Slater and E. Wyly (2008) *Gentrification*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Maqsood, A. and F. Sajjad (2021) Victim, broker, activist, fixer: surviving dispossession in working class Lahore. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 39.6, 994–1008.

Martin, W. and J. Preece (2021) Understanding the impacts of the UK 'cladding scandal': leaseholders' perspectives. *People, Place and Policy* 15.1, 46–53.

McCarthy, L. (2018) (Re)conceptualising the boundaries between home and homelessness: the unheimlich. *Housing Studies* 33.6, 960–85.

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

McKenzie, L. (2015) *Getting by: estates, class and culture in austerity Britain*. Policy Press, Bristol.
Moore-Bick, M. (2019) Grenfell Tower inquiry: phase 1 report overview. *Report of the public inquiry into the fire at Grenfell Tower on 14 June 2017*. Grenfell Tower Inquiry, London.
Mowat, J. (2015) Towards a new conceptualisation of marginalisation. *European Educational Research Journal* 14.5, 454–76.
Nethercote, M. (2022) Racialized geographies of home: property, unhoming and other possible futures. *Progress in Human Geography* 46.4, 935–56.
Nixon, R. (2011) *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press, London.
Ortega-Alcázar, I. and E. Wilkinson (2021) 'I felt trapped': young women's experiences of shared housing in austerity Britain. *Social & Cultural Geography* 22.9, 1291–306.
Oswald, D., T. Moore and S. Lockrey (2022) Combustible costs! Financial implications of flammable cladding for homeowners. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 22.2, 225–50.
Oswald, D., T. Moore and S. Lockrey (2023) Flammable cladding and the effects on homeowner wellbeing. *Housing Studies* 38.3, 403–22.
Pain, R. (2014) Seismologies of emotion: fear and activism during domestic violence. *Social and Cultural Geography* 15.2, 127–50.
Pain, R. (2019) Chronic urban trauma: the slow violence of housing dispossession. *Urban Studies* 56.2, 385–400.
Preece, J. (2021) *Living through the building safety crisis: impacts on the mental wellbeing of leaseholders*. UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, Glasgow.
Preece, J., J. Crawford, K. McKee, J. Flint and D. Robinson (2020) Understanding changing housing aspirations: a review of the evidence. *Housing Studies* 35.1, 87–106.
Ronald, R. (2008) *The ideology of homeownership: homeowner societies and the role of housing*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Rozena, S. (2022) Displacement on the Lancaster West Estate in London before, during, and after the Grenfell fire. *City* 26.1, 6–27.
Rundell, J. (2009) Temporal horizons of modernity and modalities of waiting. In G. Hage (ed.), *Waiting*, Melbourne University Publishing, Melbourne.
Sharma, S. (2014) *In the meantime: temporality and cultural politics*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
Sherman, N. (2015) *Afterwar: healing the moral wounds of our soldiers*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
Simone, A. (2007) Waiting in African cities. In M. Sorkin (ed.), *Indefensible space: the architecture of the national insecurity state*, Routledge, New York, NY.
Singer, C., R. Wirth and O. Berwald (2019) Introduction. In C. Singer, R. Wirth and O. Berwald (eds.), *Timescapes of waiting: spaces of stasis, delay and deferral, Brill, Rodopi*, Leiden and Boston, MA.
Tadiar, N. (2021) Thresholds. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 39.6, 1111–28.
UK Cladding Action Group (2020) Cladding and internal fire safety: mental health report 2020 [WWW document]. URL https://www.leaseholdknowledge.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/UKCAG-MENTAL-HEALTH-REPORT-2020.pdf (accessed 17 September 2023).
Vasudevan, A. (2021) Between appropriation and occupation: the spatial politics of 'squatting' in East Berlin. *Urban Geography* 42.9, 1230–51.
Vasudevan, A. (2022) Tenant trouble: resisting precarity in Berlin's Märkisches Viertel, 1968–1974. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 111.16, 1537–52.
Walters, W. (2004) Secure havens, safe borders, domopolitics. *Citizenship Studies* 8.3, 237–60.
Watson, S. and H. Austerberry (1986) *Housing and homelessness: a feminist perspective*. Routledge, London.
Watt, P. (2021) *Estate regeneration and its discontents*. Policy Press, Bristol.
Wilhelm-Soloman, M. (2021) Dispossession as depotentiation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 39.6, 976–93.
Wilson, W. (2021) *Leasehold high-rise blocks: who pays for fire safety work*. House of Commons Briefing Paper, London.
Wynne, L. and D. Rogers (2021) Emplaced displacement and public housing redevelopment: from physical displacement to social, cultural, and economic replacement. *Housing Policy Debate* 31.3–5, 395–410.

14682427, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.13213 by Test, Wiley Online Library on [09/10/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License