

# **Downstairs, Upstairs: The Division of Domestic Space Between Domestic Workers and Super-Rich Employers in London**

Matt Reynolds

**Affiliation:** Department of Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science

**Contact Details:** [m.f.reynolds@lse.ac.uk](mailto:m.f.reynolds@lse.ac.uk)

## **Author biography:**

Matt Reynolds is a research student at the London School of Economics and Political Science within the Department of Sociology and a volunteer for Kalayaan, the domestic worker charity. His thesis in progress is focusing on cleaning, security, and the moral ordering of space in twenty-first-century Britain.

## **Abstract:**

London's affluent neighborhoods are often reported as places where employers infringe migrant domestic workers' rights. Much has been written on both the wealthy's influence on cities and on domestic workers' lack of rights, yet few have connected these literatures. In this article, I explore one of the UK's most expensive addresses, Eaton Square, through contemporary and historical planning documents, to unearth a legacy of segregation masked by tactics to avoid public scrutiny. Through interviewing staff at Kalayaan, a charity that supports and advocates for domestic workers, and analyzing their survey data, I find that explicit segregation is being replaced by boundary erasure, with workers sleeping in communal areas and family members' bedrooms, with little or no access to the city outside. The article questions the conflation of the physical house and social home that is regularly assumed, and argues for domestic workers' human right to privacy to be enabled, rather than restricted, by spatial and legislative means.

**Keywords:** domestic workers; super-rich; domestic space; home; human rights.

## **List of figures and tables:**

Figure 1 - Eaton Square, nos. 86-101, photo by the author.

Figure 2 – Basement (left) and 1<sup>st</sup> Mezzanine Floor (right), 23A Eaton Square, 1937. City of Westminster Archives, 26929.

Figure 3 – Consented Upper ground Floor Plan (the former 1<sup>st</sup> Mezzanine floor is half a level lower than the entrance, to the right), 23A Eaton Square, 2013. Westminster City Council, planning document.

Figure 4 – Consented Lower Ground / Upper Basement Plan (the former Basement is to the left), 23A Eaton Square, 2013. Westminster City Council, planning document.

Figure 5 - Excerpt of lower ground floor plan, 118 Eaton Square (2014) from planning document, Westminster City Council.

Table 1: Count of bedrooms by designated users within Eaton Square’s twenty-two £10 million+ properties, information taken from most recent planning drawings from Westminster City Council’s online planning portal as of July 2019.

## **Downstairs, Upstairs: The Division of Domestic Space Between Domestic Workers and Super-Rich Employers in London**

### **Introduction**

The urban studies of the Chicago School in the 1920s divided the city into zones identified by class and race, and focused on the macro “ecology” of cities in terms of Darwinian territorial disputes between different zones.<sup>1</sup> However much subsequent scholars have challenged the Chicago School’s logic with more nuanced accounts of urban life, conflicts between households or neighborhoods still dominate the literature, from suburbanization through to gentrification. As a result, the discipline has neglected society’s “cellular form” – the individual household – and failed to consider interior layouts or intra-household conflict.<sup>2</sup> With Thomas Piketty’s *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* highlighting the increasing predominance of private wealth, Mike Savage suggests that studies of inequality shift their focus from the “public sphere” to the family.<sup>3</sup> I agree, but suggest in this paper that these studies extend the “family” to include domestic workers, as per the word’s Roman etymology.<sup>4</sup>

With rising global inequality, affluent families in the Global North are increasingly outsourcing their housework, with millions of domestic workers – predominantly women from the Global South – leaving their home countries to work in wealthy cities through what Rhacel Parreñas terms the “international division of reproductive labour.”<sup>5</sup> Existing “elite studies” in sociology and geography, though invaluable, tend to work at a city or neighborhood scale, with domestic workers rarely mentioned, and if they are, only in passing.<sup>6</sup> There is also a large body of literature across gender studies, development and law exploring domestic workers and their lack of rights.<sup>7</sup> These studies are also vital, but their focus is often global or national in scope and is seldom linked to planning or real estate markets. Through analyzing both architectural spaces and the ways in which domestic workers inhabit them, my research strives to bring these disciplines together to explore domestic work at multiple scales.

If, as Piketty believes, we are moving towards nineteenth century levels of wealth inequality, is the “upstairs, downstairs” dynamic of architectural segregation between employers and employees also returning?<sup>8</sup> Going beyond Henri Lefebvre’s public-focused cry for a “right to the city,” how much of a “right to the home” do domestic workers have within their employers’ private households?<sup>9</sup> And, to what extent do architects and planners enable or constrain this right?

London, the “Alpha City” of global wealth, provides the ideal location to address these questions. UHNWIs (ultra-high net worth individuals, those who own \$30m+ of assets) congregate in an area from Chelsea in the west up to Hampstead in the north which estate agents term “Super-Prime” London, where properties sell for more than £10m.<sup>10</sup> Though overseas domestic workers are harder to locate, charities and journalists often refer to them living in these very same wealthy neighborhoods.<sup>11</sup>

## **Methodology**

When choosing an appropriate methodology, it became clear why a research gap existed: domestic workers and the super-rich are two of the hardest populations to access. This is due, respectively, to workers’ fear of deportation by the Home Office and to the wealthy’s desire to detach themselves from “politics, public space and public culture.”<sup>12</sup> As a result, to find out about the conditions for domestic workers, in June 2019 I interviewed representatives from Kalayaan, a charity which supports individuals

who enter the UK on Overseas Domestic Worker visas; in its own words, it “works with migrant domestic workers in the UK to improve and to help them access their rights.”<sup>13</sup> For the super-rich, I began in June-July 2019 by interviewing some of the planning “intermediaries” who facilitate their detachment from the public realm, six individuals comprising architects and planning consultants who have worked on projects in London’s wealthiest neighborhoods . Next, I identified Eaton Square (Figure 1) as a case study where the super-rich and domestic workers were likely to share domestic space. Created by “Master Builder” Thomas Cubitt between 1826 and 1855, Eaton Square is simultaneously remarkable and unremarkable. Cubitt’s biographer describes how he arranged the houses “in the way usual in all London houses of the period,” yet the square is now recognized as “the exemplar” of “power embodied in stone and stucco” with 22 “super-prime” properties sold for over £10m between 1995 and 2019.<sup>14</sup> Using Westminster Council’s online planning portal I analyzed the latest available planning documents for each of these 22 properties. I employ a similar method to Sophie Baldwin, Elizabeth Holroyd and Roger Burrows’ study of luxury London basements which systematically coded each room on the floorplans of a large number of planning applications for the building of residential basement developments constructed between 2008 and 2017, to identify the kind of development that was taking place.<sup>15</sup> My own analysis captured the type of rooms (bedrooms, kitchens, etc.) and whether they were designated for certain users (“Guest bedroom,” “Staff toilet,” etc.). I then compared these with historical floorplans from the City of Westminster Archives, estate agent literature, Land Registry data, Council Tax valuation data, and ethnographic observation of the properties’ exteriors from the public realm, to see how use and users had changed. Finally, Kalayaan gave me access to aggregate data from their registration surveys which ask domestic workers about their living and working conditions.

### **Dead Space?**

There is often a perception that the super-rich leave their luxurious houses vacant.<sup>16</sup> Rowland Atkinson describes this as “necrotecture:”

“Empty homes owned by the city’s wealthiest, left unoccupied for investment purposes or as the mere trappings of status ... dead residential space, or necrotecture, brings attention to the level of waste and overconsumption by the rich in increasing contrast to the divided city below.”<sup>17</sup>

Yet, as Luna Glucksberg highlights, these households are not left empty but staffed

almost constantly, a tradition unbroken since historical elites' seasonal migrations between town and country:

“The houses in this category are not rented out, but they are not empty either given the constant presence of staff ... the British elite have always inhabited London on a seasonal basis, with various other estates in the countryside and abroad used in the course of the year. In fact, many still do today.”<sup>18</sup>

It is easy to see why these houses appear dead, however, as the staff may not be visible. From April 2016 to March 2018, 70% (n=151) of Kalayaan's clients were not allowed out of the house independently.<sup>19</sup> According to the charity's caseworkers, “they get told that in the UK it's dangerous ... that it's not safe to talk to people outside of the family” and “when they go out in public spaces, they're told not to talk to people except the children.”<sup>20</sup>

Eaton Square is divided by gender like Pierre Bourdieu's Kabyle house, “fundamentally defined from the outside ... as the place from which men come out.”<sup>21</sup> Uniformed male porters are visible patrolling the “public” realm of Eaton Square, the legacy of a tax on male servants from 1777 to 1852 which converted them into a display of luxury.<sup>22</sup> Their role as conspicuous status symbols is confirmed also by the continuity of their presence, with estate agents boasting in their literature of staff “who patrol the square 24 hours a day.”<sup>23</sup> Female domestic workers, on the other hand, are kept hidden within the “private” interior, as Livia Barbosa described in the architectural positioning of domestic workers' accommodation in Brazil.<sup>24</sup> They are also often “on call” through the night for caring responsibilities, according to Kalayaan, and often work 15-hour shifts with no day off. The porters on the night shift also work long and anti-social hours, but they do so according to formal labour contracts. Virginia Mantouvalou has highlighted how the informality of domestic work is legally constructed through a set of clauses in employment law which exclude from its regulations work done by a non-family member but who is, apparently, “treated as a family member.”<sup>25</sup>

The title of this paper refers to *Upstairs, Downstairs*, a television drama series broadcast in the 1970s which portrayed servant-family relations in an Edwardian townhouse near to Eaton Square. The phrase has since become metonymic for the era's domestic segregation. In “Figures, Doors and Passages” architectural historian Robin Evans charts the emergence of this phenomenon, from the sociable “matrix of connected

rooms” of sixteenth century Italy through to the socially-segregated passages of nineteenth century England, typified by Robert Kerr’s *How to Plan English Residences*, which mandates that “servants and family... [should be] ...kept clear of each other.”<sup>26</sup> Every time I mentioned *Upstairs, Downstairs*, my architect and planning consultant interviewees explained how the contemporary configuration of family and staff compared to that era. They claimed that former servants’ quarters in the attics now house the family, relegating domestic workers to the basement. Certainly, only one of the 22 super-prime properties’ floor plans in Eaton Square shows a designated staff space above the ground floor (a “nanny room” beside the “boys’ bedroom”).

If the servant’s quarters in the attic have been lost, the division of workers by gender, on the other hand, appears to have been maintained. Charles Booth, as part of his late nineteenth-century London-wide survey of poverty, wrote that: “men...lodged in the basement” and “women ... at the top of the house.”<sup>27</sup> In several cases the male domestic workers’ living spaces on Eaton Square have barely moved in over a hundred years. At number 95 for instance, the townhouse has been split up since the Edwardian era, though the basement has remained as staff accommodation, a “Butler’s bedroom” in 1911 and a “Caretaker’s flat” now.<sup>28</sup> This property is directly owned by the Grosvenor Estate, and my interviewees confirmed that the caretakers are employed by the estate rather than any individual household.<sup>29</sup>

While Eaton Square’s male domestic staff have not moved far and continue to work through the night, their independent accommodation removes them partially from the paternalistic servant-master relationship. They have both time and space away from their employers. Female domestic workers, on the other hand, have migrated from the attic yet remain within the walls of the “family home.” My study involved trying to identify their location.

### **“Served” and “Servant” Spaces**

As part of my analysis of floor plans submitted in recent planning applications, I counted the instances of different types of bedroom and whether they were designated for certain intended users such as family, guests or staff. “Master bedrooms” predominate, as Table 1 illustrates. In its most neutral meaning, a master is a person or thing having control or authority. However, the term is often gendered, referring to a

patriarch, and racialized, as a white employer of servants or slaves of color. Though today's London super-rich are more nationally and ethnically diverse than in the nineteenth century, race remains highly relevant since most overseas domestic workers in the UK are Filipino, Indian and Indonesian women, as part of the broader "international division of reproductive labour."<sup>30</sup> Qualitatively, these master bedrooms match the term's superior status; they are almost always the largest bedrooms in the household, with multiple windows providing light and ventilation, while the bedrooms designated for staff are usually relegated to the dark and airless basement or "lower-ground floor."

Table 1 poses two unanswered questions. Firstly, why do 15 of Eaton Square's super-prime properties have no designated staff bedrooms? According to previous research and my interviewees, most staff live in the properties they serve.<sup>31</sup> Secondly, why did seven properties feel the need to designate them at all? The architects and planning consultants I talked to confirmed that there is no law or regulation compelling architects or planners to label staff bedrooms on their drawings. According to one, it is a question of "tactics:"

"It's sometimes just tactics in a planning sense ... the council don't want to see a basement with any self-contained properties ... the council could say "you've got two dwellings, so you've got to register it for council tax" ... I think some architects or clients don't contain it because I think they're just overly nervous ... You don't need any permission for it in planning terms so why bother showing, which I suppose is logical."<sup>32</sup>

Case law corroborates this anxiety; in Hampstead (another super-rich neighborhood), an appeal against staff accommodation having its own council tax code was made on the grounds that it was a "grand dwelling," but it failed because "the door and its positioning indicate that it has been constructed with a sufficient degree of privacy to be regarded as self-contained."<sup>33</sup>

Eaton Square contains similarly ambiguous boundaries between domestic spaces. Number 63, previously divided into three maisonettes, is now one household with a single tax code. However, the estate agents selling this property claimed it contained "separate staff accommodation."<sup>34</sup> As with the other basement staff bedrooms, number 63's staff accommodation has "independent" access, though unlike the aforementioned

caretaker's flat at number 95 (which has its own separate council tax code) they are still connected to the "family home." Similarly, number 23A has no designated staff bedroom on the council-approved plans, yet "staff accommodation" appears in promotional material.<sup>35</sup> The developers of 23A, Candy & Candy, are most famously associated with the One Hyde Park development, which boasts of its "clarity between 'served' and 'servant' spaces," a term derived from Louis Kahn's obsession with medieval castles.<sup>36</sup> A planning intermediary told me, sounding troubled, that One Hyde Park was the first time they had seen a building "so overt in terms of front and back of house."<sup>37</sup> In 1937 (Figure 2), 23A Eaton Square's four staff bedrooms were on the "1st mezzanine", half a floor up from the Basement, with windows looking out onto Eaton Mews.<sup>38</sup> In 2013 (Figures 3 and 4), those former staff bedrooms on what is now labelled the "Consented Upper Ground Floor," but is half a floor down from the entrance, have been replaced by a garage, study and storage area (Figure 3). On the "Consented Lower Ground / Upper Basement" (Figure 4) (labelled "Basement" in 1937, the left-hand side of Figure 2) the likely, though undesignated, staff bedroom is in the former pantry, its small window obscured by the lightwell stair used for the staff's separate access. The super-rich's inanimate cars now have better light and ventilation than their human domestic workers.

likely

### **A Room of One's Own**

There is no definitive evidence that domestic workers have been mistreated in Eaton Square. However, according to Kalayaan, the difficulty of pinpointing where mistreatment takes place is deliberate. When a worker comes to them for support, the charity registers their personal details and asks them about their living and working conditions. In doing so, they have found that employers purposefully withhold information from domestic workers, including their address. Additionally, many of Kalayaan's clients either did not sign, or did not receive, the employment contract required as part of their entry clearance application to the UK and many of those who did sign a contract did not fully understand what they were signing or have time to read it. This Home Office form is relevant since it refers not only to a guaranteed minimum wage, but also to accommodation "that meets UK building requirements and health and safety standards" including "a private unit or a room ... equipped with a lock and a



safety bolt from within the room.”<sup>39</sup> However, employers are only required to promise these conditions, not to substantiate them with evidence, and the Home Office only carries out checks if mistreatment has been reported.

From April 2016 to March 2019, 60% (n=229) of Kalayaan’s clients were not given a room of their own, often sleeping on the floor beside children so that they can be “on call” for caring responsibilities at any time. Others slept in communal areas like living rooms, kitchens and utility rooms, or shared bedrooms with another worker, as suggested by the twin beds in the basement of 118 Eaton Square (Figure 5). These are examples of the type of discrimination observed by Judith Rollins, in which domestic workers are treated as “invisible” or “non-persons” by their employers.<sup>40</sup> If the Home Office required employers to substantiate evidence of suitable accommodation, a cursory review of this floor plan would rule out its suitability as a “private unit.” As Bridget Anderson has pointed out, the binary model of public and private fails to conceptualize the complexities of the live-in domestic worker.<sup>41</sup>

The psychological toll of abuse and mistreatment reported by Kalayaan challenges Erving Goffman’s theory of self-presentation, which proposes that people can easily switch between public performances in “front regions” (e.g. in the living room, among guests) and authentic private selves in “back regions” (e.g. in bedrooms).<sup>42</sup> Instead, it substantiates Bourdieu’s theory of the habitus, that individuals carry their dispositions with them across physical space, and experience symbolic violence when they feel out of place:

“A Portuguese maid in the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement of Paris obviously does not have the same chance as her employer of appropriating the goods and services offered in this district ... one can physically occupy a locale without inhabiting it properly if one does not dispose of the means tacitly required for that, beginning with the proper habitus.”<sup>43</sup>

Beyond the psychological impact of an “improper” habitus – the “wrong” disposition for the situation – domestic workers are also forced to inhabit improperly the luxurious spaces in which they find themselves. During the 2016-2019 period mentioned above, 38% (n=223) of Kalayaan’s clients did not even have a bed of their own, often sleeping on floors without sufficient bedding to stay warm. These situations were not usually necessitated by a lack of space, with Kalayaan reporting that “sometimes there are spare

rooms in the property, but they're not allowed to use them.”<sup>44</sup> It is as if, rather than wholly “dead” households generating inequality at a neighborhood or urban scale, we have “dead rooms,” Atkinson’s “necrotecture” rescaled to the domestic sphere.<sup>45</sup>

Unannounced property inspections, Kalayaan told me, could be effective at improving domestic workers’ living conditions by capturing the worker in their normal working and living conditions, and not affording the employer opportunity to hide evidence of exploitation. However, inspections of the private realm were resisted by the wealthy elite in the Edwardian era and continue to be so in the twenty-first century.<sup>46</sup> Trying to reconcile them with Article 8 of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights uncovers a paradox:

- “1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.
2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law ... for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”<sup>47</sup>

Currently, the only inspections carried out in private households are led by existing evidence of worker abuse. If households with no evidence of abuse receive unannounced inspections, then their human right to “private and family life” has been infringed. With the super-rich’s 24-hour security and fortified architecture, evidence of abuse is easy to hide.<sup>48</sup> As Natalie Sedacca has highlighted, Article 8 relies on the same figurative and inadequate public / private dichotomy that Anderson criticizes.<sup>49</sup>

### **Private Houses and Family Homes**

Article 8 of the Human Rights Act appears to enshrine the social value of home in law, though lawyers tend to give preference to the quantifiable, material object, the house.<sup>50</sup> By conflating “private” and “family” life, the law assumes that the physical “house” and the social “home” of the nuclear family are one and the same. Domestic workers are made invisible.

The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors tells us that:

- “There is no statutory definition of the term ‘bedroom’ in the UK. The term is used to describe a room used for sleeping in and where you would expect to find a bed or other such piece of furniture designed for sleeping on.”<sup>51</sup>

Yet in the case law involved in the legal ruling in Hampstead, mentioned above, intended to uphold the separate tax code given to a mansion's basement staff accommodation, the actual use of the accommodation is disregarded:

“Having closely examined all of the evidence the Panel found that when using the objective “bricks and mortar” test and disregarding the intention and use, actual or prospective, a separate area capable of use for separate living was apparent.”<sup>52</sup>

Here we see that, in British regulations and law, there is confusion as to how the space of the home should be defined – by the way it is used, or by its physicality – and indeed whether it should be defined at all.

These conflation and confusions render meanings obscure, yet ultimately point towards the fact that architecture itself, in its very materiality, is a form of regulation, albeit less explicit than legislation. As Sarah Schindler argues, a law preventing entry to a space is clearly draconian, while “an architectural feature that has the same effect ... is often viewed as innocuous” or “prepolitical” although potentially longer-lasting.<sup>53</sup>

Accordingly, the enduring impact of architectural regulation on domestic workers' welfare was foreseen back in 1916:

“The problem of accommodation is, like so many building problems, largely a bequest from the past. Employers as well as servants suffer from the amazing domestic architecture of two and three generations ago.”<sup>54</sup>

In Eaton Square, it is through considering architecture as “innocuous” and “prepolitical” that employers, the Home Office, planning authorities and architects all evade responsibility for preventing the abuse of domestic workers.<sup>55</sup>

## **Conclusion**

To return to my original question – are we seeing a resurgence of the “Upstairs, Downstairs” domestic segregation of Edwardian Belgravia? In the case of Eaton Square, the answer is complicated. Correlating with Piketty's observation that the successive world wars of the twentieth century created an exceptional period of wealth equality, the 1940s saw the Grosvenor Estate split up Thomas Cubitt's grand townhouses into flats.<sup>56</sup> Today, with rising private wealth, one of my interviewees described how these houses are now “being put back together.”<sup>57</sup> Since 2003, at least 39 flats and maisonettes on Eaton Square have been amalgamated into larger properties. As

I have described above, these larger households are reintroducing live-in domestic staff and, just as in the past, male staff patrol outside while female staff are hidden within. However, the enforced segregation between “staff quarters” and “the family” has now been reversed to reach, in some cases, another extreme – the complete erasure of privacy, in which there are workers who lack their own room, even their own bed. Though the “physical space” of the house and the “social space” of the home frequently correspond, Bourdieu warns against the “trap” of assuming this to be the case.<sup>58</sup> Studies of so-called “elite neighborhoods” must not assume that all their residents are “elite,” since this fails to acknowledge the live-in domestic workers whom I have described. Calling for a “right to the city” is a noble aim, but urban studies must go beyond analyzing the contestation of space between households when examining this right, and include the contestation of space *within* households.

Robin Evans concludes “Figures, Doors and Passages” with a potential solution for resolving intra-household conflict; he suggests a return to the sixteenth century’s “matrix of connected rooms” which “draws people towards others” and “recognizes passion, carnality and sociality.”<sup>59</sup> Written in 1978, the piece is fitting for the time, when feminist scholars had shifted emphasis from the paid domestic worker to the housewife, for whom they demanded wages.<sup>60</sup> Breaking down barriers within domestic space was undoubtedly appealing in this context. For the twenty-first century domestic worker, however, my study demonstrates the perils of removing barriers between employer and employee. While Robert Kerr’s nineteenth-century desire for class segregation seems abhorrent, his understanding of domestic workers’ need for privacy is worth revisiting:

“The family constitute one community: the servants another. Whatever may be their mutual regard and confidence as dwellers under the same roof, each class is entitled to shut its door upon the other and be alone.”<sup>61</sup>

Domestic workers, and the charities that work with them, are already fighting hard for basic human rights; architects and planners must also play their part. We have already seen the building industry pressured to improve sustainability and construction workers’ labor conditions, so there is clearly scope for change.<sup>62</sup> If, as mentioned above, architects can use “tactics” to hide staff accommodation and help their clients pay less council tax, I believe that they could quite easily create spaces that enable live-in

domestic workers' freedom and dignity – at the very least, their own bed, their own room, a locked door, and their own key.

### **Acknowledgements:**

I would like to thank everyone at Kalayaan for their invaluable input to the study and to Virginia Mantouvalou for introducing us. Thank you also to my interviewees, to the helpful staff at City of Westminster Archives and to everyone who took the time to provide advice and comments – the anonymous peer reviewers, Diana Periton, Katharina Borsi, Roger Burrows, Rosie Cox, Luna Glucksberg, Kath Scanlon, Don Slater and Helen Lewandowski.

### **Notes**

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie, *The City* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1925).

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1972 [1884]), 129.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014); Mike Savage, "Piketty's challenge for sociology," *British Journal of Sociology* 65, no. 4 (2014), 602.

<sup>4</sup> Engels, *The Origin of the Family*, 121.

<sup>5</sup> Parreñas defines "reproductive labour" as "the labor needed to sustain the productive labor force...household chores; the care of elders, adults, and youth; the socialization of children; and the maintenance of social ties in the family." Rhacel Salazar Parreñas, *Servants of Globalization: Migration and Domestic Work* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015), 29.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Anna Minton, *Big Capital: Who is London For?* (London: Penguin Books, 2017), 12.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Mary Romero, Valerie Preston, and Wenona Giles, eds., *When Care Work Goes Global: Locating the Social Relations of Domestic Work* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

<sup>8</sup> Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*.

<sup>9</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *Writings on Cities* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996).

<sup>10</sup> Rowland Atkinson, *Alpha City: How London Was Captured by the Super-Rich* (London: Verso, 2020); Knight Frank, "Super Prime Market Insight, Autumn 2020," <https://content.knightfrank.com/research/185/documents/en/super-prime-london-report-autumn-2020-7511.pdf> (accessed October 19, 2021).

- 
- <sup>11</sup> See e.g. Sophie McBain, “The Maid Slaves: How Wealthy Visitors to Britain Trap Servants in their Homes,” *The New Statesman*, February 14, 2017.
- <sup>12</sup> Virginia Mantouvalou, “‘Am I Free Now?’ Overseas Domestic Workers in Slavery,” *Journal of Law and Society* 42, no. 3 (2015): 347; William Davies, “Elites Without Hierarchies: Intermediaries, ‘Agency’ and the Super-Rich,” in *Cities and the Super-Rich: Real Estate, Elite Practices, and Urban Political Economies*, ed. Ray Forrest et al. (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 34-35.
- <sup>13</sup> See Kalayaan’s website, <http://www.kalayaan.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/> (accessed 20 May 2022).
- <sup>14</sup> Hermione Hobhouse, *Thomas Cubitt: Master Builder* (London: Macmillan, 1971), 141; Atkinson, *Alpha City*, 68; H.M. Land Registry, *Price Paid Dataset*.
- <sup>15</sup> Sophie Baldwin, Elizabeth Holroyd and Roger Burrows, “Luxified Troglodytism? Mapping the subterranean geographies of plutocratic London,” *arq: Architectural Research Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (2019).
- <sup>16</sup> See e.g. Nick Fagge and Jake Simon Wallis, “Abandoned Mansions on Grenfell Tower’s Doorstep,” *The Daily Mail*, June 17, 2017.
- <sup>17</sup> Rowland Atkinson, “Necrotecture: Lifeless Dwellings and London’s Super-Rich,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43, no. 1 (2018): 10.
- <sup>18</sup> Luna Glucksberg, “A View from the Top: Unpacking Capital Flows and Foreign Investment in Prime London,” *City* 20, no. 2 (2016): 249.
- <sup>19</sup> Here, and later, “n=” refers to the total number of individuals who responded to each question. Though the statistics throughout refer to the same time period (and individuals), this number varies since not every individual answered every question.
- <sup>20</sup> Interview with Kalayaan July 18, 2019.
- <sup>21</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre, “The Berber House or the World Reversed,” *Social Science Information* 9, no. 2 (1970): 179.
- <sup>22</sup> Cox, Rosie, *The Servant Problem: Domestic Employment in a Global Economy* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2006), 78.
- <sup>23</sup> Knight Frank, “20 Eaton Square,” [https://media.onthemarket.com/properties/3843665/doc\\_0\\_0.pdf](https://media.onthemarket.com/properties/3843665/doc_0_0.pdf) (accessed October 26, 2021).
- <sup>24</sup> Livia Barbosa, “Domestic Workers and Pollution in Brazil,” in *Dirt: New Geographies of Cleanliness and Contamination*, ed. Ben Campkin and Rosie Cox (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012), 25-33.
- <sup>25</sup> Virginia Mantouvalou, “Legal Construction of Structures of Exploitation,” in *Philosophical Foundations of Labour Law*, ed. Hugh Collins et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 200.

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Robin Evans, “Figures, Doors and Passages,” in *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays*, ed. Pamela Johnston (London: Architectural Association Publications, 1996), 55-91; Robert Kerr, *The Gentleman’s House; Or, How to Plan English Residences, from the Parsonage to the Palace* (London: John Murray, 1865), 68.
- <sup>27</sup> Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896) Vol. 8, 228.
- <sup>28</sup> 27125 - 95 Eaton Square SW1 (London: City of Westminster Archives, 1911).
- <sup>29</sup> Interview with planning intermediary, July 1, 2019.
- <sup>30</sup> UK Home Office, *Immigration Statistics year ending September 2020, Entry Clearance Visas – Applications and Outcomes*, 2020; Rhacel Salazar Parreñas, *Servants of Globalization*.
- <sup>31</sup> Ramidus Consulting Limited, “The Prime Residential Market in Westminster,” <https://www.westminster.gov.uk/media/document/ev-h-012---prime-residential-market-in-westminster> (accessed October 23, 2021).
- <sup>32</sup> Interview with planning intermediary, July 11, 2019.
- <sup>33</sup> Dwelling in London N2, Re Valuation Tribunal (2015) R.V.R. 157.
- <sup>34</sup> Sotheby’s, “7 bedrooms House for Sale – Eaton Square, Belgravia, London SW1W,” <https://www.sothebysrealty.co.uk/enb/sales/detail/204-l-82888-lon180021/en-sw1w> (accessed July 25, 2019).
- <sup>35</sup> Candy & Candy, “Million Dollar Homes – London Luxury to Buy, ” <https://www.slideshare.net/MercyHomesUK/candy-nov> (accessed July 25, 2019).
- <sup>36</sup> Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners, “One Hyde Park,” <https://www.rsh-p.com/projects/one-hyde-park/> (accessed January 10, 2021); David B. Brownlee, *Louis I. Kahn: In the Realm of Architecture* (Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art, 1993).
- <sup>37</sup> Interview with planning intermediary, July 3, 2019.
- <sup>38</sup> 26929 – 23A Eaton Square SW1 (London: City of Westminster Archives, 1937).
- <sup>39</sup> UK Home Office, *Immigration Rules, Appendix 7: Overseas Workers in Private Households*, 2019.
- <sup>40</sup> Judith Rollins, *Between Women: Domesticity and Their Employers* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1985), 207-32.
- <sup>41</sup> Bridget Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour* (London: Zed Books, 2000).
- <sup>42</sup> Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin, 1971), 109-40.
- <sup>43</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, “Social Space and the Genesis of Appropriated Physical Space,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42, no. 1 (2018): 111.
- <sup>44</sup> Interview with Kalayaan, July 18, 2019.
- <sup>45</sup> Atkinson, “Necrotecture: Lifeless Dwellings and London’s Super-Rich.”

- 
- <sup>46</sup> Christina V. Butler, *Domestic Service: An Enquiry by the Women's Industrial Council* (London: E. Bell and Sons., 1916), 45; Einat Albin and Virginia Mantouvalou, "The ILO Convention on Domestic Workers: From the Shadows to the Light," *Industrial Law Journal* 41, no. 1 (2012).
- <sup>47</sup> Incorporated into British law via UK Legislation. *Human Rights Act 1998*.
- <sup>48</sup> Rowland Atkinson and Sarah Blandy, *Domestic Fortress: Fear and the New Home Front* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).
- <sup>49</sup> Natalie Sedacca, "Migrant domestic workers and the right to a private and family life," *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 37, no. 4 (2019); Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*.
- <sup>50</sup> Lorna Fox, "The Idea of Home in Law," *Home Cultures* 2, no. 1 (2005).
- <sup>51</sup> Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, "What is a bedroom?" <https://www.ricsfirms.com/glossary/what-is-a-bedroom/> (accessed January 10, 2021).
- <sup>52</sup> *Corkish (LO) v. Wright and Hart* (2014) England & Wales High Court 237, cited in: *Dwelling in London N2, Re Valuation Tribunal* (2015) R.V.R. 157.
- <sup>53</sup> Sarah Schindler, "Architectural Exclusion: Discrimination and Segregation Through Physical Design of the Built Environment," *The Yale Law Journal* 124, no. 6 (2015): 2024, 1934.
- <sup>54</sup> Butler, *Domestic Service*, 44.
- <sup>55</sup> Schindler, "Architectural Exclusion," 1934.
- <sup>56</sup> Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*; Brian Masters, *The Dukes: The Origins, Ennoblement and History of 26 Families* (London: Pimlico, 2001), 317.
- <sup>57</sup> Interview with planning intermediary, June 16, 2019.
- <sup>58</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, "Social Space and the Genesis of Appropriated Physical Space," 109.
- <sup>59</sup> Robin Evans, "Figures, Doors and Passages," 88-90.
- <sup>60</sup> Ann Oakley, *Housewife* (London: Penguin Books, 1976); Silvia Federici, *Wages against Housework* (Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1975).
- <sup>61</sup> Kerr, *The Gentleman's House*, 68.
- <sup>62</sup> Leslie Sklair, *The Icon Project: Architecture, Cities, and Capitalist Globalization* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017), 220-4.

## References

Albin, Einat and Virginia Mantouvalou. 2012. "The ILO Convention on Domestic Workers: From the Shadows to the Light." *Industrial Law Journal* 41, no. 1: 67-78.



---

Anderson, Bridget. 2000. *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*. London: Zed Books.

Atkinson, Rowland. 2018. "Necrotecture: Lifeless Dwellings and London's Super-Rich." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43, no. 1: 2-13.

Atkinson, Rowland. 2020. *Alpha City: How London Was Captured by the Super-Rich*. London: Verso.

Atkinson, Rowland and Sarah Blandy. 2017. *Domestic Fortress: Fear and the New Home Front*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Baldwin, Sophie, Elizabeth Holroyd and Roger Burrows. 2019. "Luxified Troglodytism? Mapping the subterranean geographies of plutocratic London." *arq: Architectural Research Quarterly* 23, no. 3: 267-82.

Barbosa, Livia. 2012. "Domestic Workers and Pollution in Brazil." In *Dirt: New Geographies of Cleanliness and Contamination*, edited by Ben Campkin and Rosie Cox, 25-33. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.

Booth, Charles. 1896. *Life and Labour of the People in London*. 9 vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1970. "The Berber House or the World Reversed." *Social Science Information* 9, no. 2: 151-70.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 2018. "Social Space and the Genesis of Appropriated Physical Space." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42, no. 1: 106-14.

Brownlee, David B. 1993. *Louis I. Kahn: in the Realm of Architecture*. Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art.

Butler, Christina V. 1916. *Domestic Service: An Enquiry by the Women's Industrial Council*. London: E. Bell and Sons.

---

Candy & Candy. 2014. "Million Dollar Homes – London Luxury to Buy, " Mercy Homes UK, <https://www.slideshare.net/MercyHomesUK/candy-nov> (accessed July 25, 2019).

City of Westminster Archives. 1911. *27125 - 95 Eaton Square SW1*.

City of Westminster Archives. 1937. *26929 - 23A Eaton Square SW1*.

Corkish (LO) v. Wright and Hart. 2014. England & Wales High Court, 237.

Cox, Rosie. 2006. *The Servant Problem: Domestic Employment in a Global Economy* London: I.B. Taurus.

Davies, William. 2017. "Elites Without Hierarchies: Intermediaries, 'Agency' and the Super-Rich," in *Cities and the Super-Rich: Real Estate, Elite Practices, and Urban Political Economies*, edited by Ray Forrest et al., 19-38. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dwelling in London N2, Re Valuation Tribunal (2015) R.V.R. 157.

Engels, Friedrich. 1972. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Evans, Robin, 1996. "Figures, Doors and Passages," in *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays*, edited by Pamela Johnston, 55-91. London: Architectural Association Publications.

Fagge, Nick, and Jake Simon Wallis. 2017. "Abandoned mansions on Grenfell Tower's doorstep." *The Daily Mail*, June 17.

Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages against Housework*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Fox, Lorna. 2005. "The Idea of Home in Law." *Home Cultures* 2, no. 1: 25-49.

---

Glucksberg, Luna. 2016. "A view from the top: unpacking capital flows and foreign investment in prime London." *City* 20, no. 2: 238-255.

Goffman, Erving. 1971. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin.

Hobhouse, Hermione. 1971. *Thomas Cubbit: Master Builder*. London: Macmillan.

HM Land Registry. *Price Paid Dataset*.

Kerr, Roger. 1865. *The Gentleman's House; Or, How to Plan English Residences, from the Parsonage to the Palace*. London: John Murray.

Knight Frank. 2017. "20 Eaton Square," [https://media.onthemarket.com/properties/3843665/doc\\_0\\_0.pdf](https://media.onthemarket.com/properties/3843665/doc_0_0.pdf) (accessed October 26, 2021).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

McBain, Sophie. 2017. "The maid slaves: how wealthy visitors to Britain trap servants in their homes." *The New Statesman*, February 14.

Mantouvalou, Virginia. 2015. "'Am I Free Now?' Overseas Domestic Workers in Slavery." *Journal of Law and Society* 42, no. 3: 329-357.

Mantouvalou, Virginia. 2018. "Legal Construction of Structures of Exploitation," in *Philosophical Foundations of Labour Law*, edited by Hugh Collins et al., 188-204. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Masters, Brian. 2001. *The Dukes: The Origins, Ennoblement and History of 26 Families*. London: Pimlico.

Minton, Anna. 2017. *Big Capital: Who is London For?* London: Penguin Books.

- 
- Oakley, Ann. 1976. *Housewife*. London: Penguin Books.
- Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie. 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2015. *Servants of Globalization: Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Piketty, Thomas. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ramidus Consulting Limited. 2014. "The Prime Residential Market in Westminster." <https://www.ramidus.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Westminster-City-Council-Prime-Resi-Research-Report-14-07-22-Rev1.pdf> (accessed October 23, 2021).
- Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners. "One Hyde Park," <https://www.rsh-p.com/projects/one-hyde-park/> (accessed January 10, 2021).
- Rollins, Judith. 1985. *Between Women: Domesticity and Their Employers*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Romero, Mary, Valerie Preston and Wenona Giles, eds. 2014. *When Care Work Goes Global: Locating the Social Relations of Domestic Work*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Savage, Mike. 2014. "Piketty's challenge for sociology." *British Journal of Sociology* 65, no. 4: 591-606.
- Schindler, Sarah. 2015. "Architectural Exclusion: Discrimination and Segregation Through Physical Design of the Built Environment." *The Yale Law Journal* 124, no. 6: 1934-2024.
- Sedacca, Natalie. 2019. "Migrant domestic workers and the right to a private and family life." *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 37, no. 4: 288-310.

---

Sklair, Leslie. 2017. *The Icon Project: Architecture, Cities, and Capitalist Globalization*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sotheby's. 2019. "7 bedrooms House for Sale – Eaton Square, Belgravia, London SW1W," Sotheby's Realty, <https://www.sothebysrealty.co.uk/enb/sales/detail/204-l-82888-lon180021/en-sw1w> (accessed July 25, 2019).

UK Home Office. *Immigration Rules, Appendix 7: overseas workers in private households*.

UK Home Office. *Immigration Statistics year ending September 2020, Entry Clearance Visas – Applications and Outcomes*.

UK Legislation. *Human Rights Act 1998*.