

Drawing the Line: A Legal Geography of Street Art in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Tom Ward

Department of Human Geography, Uppsala University, Sweden

tom.ward@kultgeog.uu.se.

Abstract

This article presents the findings of a small study that examines how and why the London Borough of Tower Hamlets introduced a policy in 2019 to distinguish between graffiti and street art. In doing so, this study adopts the theoretical vocabulary of legal geography to intervene in debates concerning the distinction between graffiti and street art. The research begins by outlining East London as a site of empirical interest, before defining several concepts in legal geography that are argued to be of analytical use for graffiti and street art scholars. The methodology of the study is presented before describing the results: that street art is selectively retained in Tower Hamlets because it valorises and decorates property where graffiti is considered to threaten the dominance of property in the spatial imagination of the law. As such, legal geography is presented as a critical tool to interrogate the instrumentalisation of policies, like that in Tower Hamlets, that seek to regulate what can be termed street art.

Keywords

graffiti, street art, legal geography, urban semiotics, property, urban management

1. Introduction: To buff or not to buff?

“Last month, Tower Hamlets agreed to a new policy to protect street art while also allocating £400,000 to tackle offensive graffiti. Which of course begs the question: which is which?”

Fishwick 2019: 1

East London. Once a place associated with jellied eels and cries of ‘Get outta my pub!’, mention it now and few connotations are as striking as street art. Places like Shoreditch, Hackney, Hoxton and Brick Lane are synonymous with street art, muralism and herds of tourists with camera phones to hand. Truthfully, the local significance of the artistic scene is longstanding: aided greatly by the large number of cheap, low-rise buildings, artists flocked to the area in the 1980s and 1990s, graffiti writers particularly

taking advantage of local dereliction as a place to write and develop style (Ross 2016). While the early 2000s saw a significant attempt by the Greater London authorities to crack down on graffiti (London Assembly 2002), street art has since emerged as a distinct practice to graffiti and somewhat defines the urban landscape of the East End.

However, while the street art scene has blossomed into somewhat of a local industry (see Evans 2016; Andron 2018b), new efforts are being made to regulate the production of street art in East London. Where graffiti and street art began as unstructured forms largely illegal in nature, playful and critical of the urban form (Wacławek 2011), they are now coming under greater scrutiny and regulation, the two terms even distinguished in local policy. In 2017, Hackney Council launched a Graffiti Policy, outlining that not

all graffiti needs to be removed in the borough – some of it may be street art. Two years later, Tower Hamlets Council adopted a Graffiti and Street Art Policy (hereafter GSAP), effectively performing the same function: illicit surface interventions should be erased, but if they qualify as ‘street art’, defined in the policy by a set of aesthetic criteria, then it can remain (Tower Hamlets Council 2019a). With reference to the Hackney policy, Rafael Schacter (2019) has termed this tactic passive affirmation, such that the form, street art, is legitimised through the suspension of its removal where graffiti continues to be removed.

For urban creativity scholars this raises significant questions, most pressingly: how can a policy distinguish between graffiti and street art? Wading into the street art and graffiti debate is notoriously muddy territory. While Peter Bengtson (2014) reminds us that street art is constantly in a state of flux, others have stressed that street art is not always illegal but usually self-authorized, as Blanché (2015) explains, referring to the implicit claim to the city that street artists are making. Equally, Posters (2020) emphasises the political challenge to urban space that street art presents, while Waclawek (2011: 73) specifies the ‘capitalist construction of space’ that street art and graffiti take aim at. Though this is only a glimpse of the work that attempts to make sense of the terms ‘street art’ and ‘graffiti’, what’s clear is that both terms remain contested and unstable in their definition. Given the liveliness of this debate in the scholarly sphere, analysing the attempts of a Greater London borough council to define street art present an opportunity to scrutinise the position of local authorities with respect to this set of discussions.

The focus of this article is thus a small study conducted remotely in August 2020 that attempted to answer the question: following the introduction of the GSAP, how is street art in Tower Hamlets produced? Here ‘produced’ refers to the discursive and semiotic construction of the term ‘street art’. The article begins with a brief discussion of legal geography and some key terms in the field that, it is argued, are pertinent for scholars of graffiti and street art to draw upon when explaining the complexity of the relationship between street art and the law. Next follows a discussion of the methodology, an outline of its limitations,

and a description of the results of the study. Finally, the vocabulary of legal geography is employed to analyse the results, offering an analysis of how the GSAP distinguishes street art from graffiti and accounting for some of the reasoning behind this distinction. As such, the article argues that legal geography is critical for street art scholars to draw upon in this context because it offers an account of how street art is valorised and graffiti criminalised in Tower Hamlets, and calls for further research that adopts legal geography to scrutinise contemporary street art policies.

2. Legal Geography as Theoretical Toolkit

Understanding how Tower Hamlets Council removes graffiti and retains street art demands attention to both the space in which street art is produced and the authority that governs its retention – that is, attention to both space and law. Legal geography is a field that does exactly this: emerging from geographical work that drew upon critical developments in socio-legal studies in the 1980s, legal geography has come to define itself largely by the dogma that law and space are co-constituted, that is, that law uses space to govern, and space, in turn, acts upon law (Orzeck and Hae 2020). Legal geographers are interested in tracing the spatiality of legal processes, concepts, and ontologies (Bennett and Layard 2015), examining where and how space is required by, and integral to, the operation of law – they are ‘spatial detectives’ (Bennett and Layard 2015), forensically examining legal cases, trials and institutions to account for the ways in which spatial concepts are both mobilised by, and come to define, the law (for a review, see Delaney 2015; 2016; 2017). While there is insufficient space for an extensive overview of the field here, several concepts described by legal geographers will now be explored.

Firstly, David Delaney coins the term “nomosphere” to refer to the omnipresent role of law in constituting the ontological status of both subjects and objects; the nomosphere emerges as the ‘cultural-material environs that are constituted by the reciprocal materialisation of the legal and the legal signification of the socio-spatial’ (Delaney 2004: 859). The utility of this concept shouldn’t be underestimated: take street art, for example. A newly painted illegal piece on the side of property owner’s building is defined

by its ontological status in the nomosphere; by its spatial locus on the façade of private property, by its contestation of ownership to this façade expressed by the artist, and by the visibility of this contestation for (presumably) others in the area to see. In short, street art is defined here by both (a) its presence on private property in the street, and (b) the illegal status ascribed by law to this activity. The essence of such an intervention is difficult to capture without acknowledging both law and space; street art is definable by its nomospheric status.

Secondly, and relatedly, Nicholas Blomley argues that 'the construction of that which is deemed law [...] rests on the definition of a violent world of nonlaw' (Blomley 2003: 124). Drawing upon the work of Anthony Giddens, Austin Sarat and Thomas Kearns, he describes the "frontier" as the boundary between law and nonlaw, a boundary that may be 'figurative, temporal [or] spatial' (ibid: 124); this frontier, Blomley argues, casts the 'nonlaw' external to supposedly rational legal governance as violent to disguise the very violence of establishing a frontier. Considering that the GSAP is a policy instrument that also makes a distinction—a boundary between graffiti and street art—the frontier offers a way of conceptualising this distinction in a way that accounts for the GSAP as a spatio-legal resource.

Thirdly, and finally, Blomley adopts the "survey" as a means of expressing the specific spatial configurations and imaginations that law engenders in a particular legal regime (Blomley 2003). In most Western regimes, the survey is defined by private property: an Ordnance Survey map of East London, for example, will be shaped largely by small plots of propertied land, structuring the viewer's imagination of this space. Critically, the use of cadastral maps in this way presents space objectively, an objectivity oriented around the legal production of property. As Blomley explains;

'The abstract space of the survey helps make a world that exists, not as a set of social practices, but as a binary order: individuals and their practices are set against an inert structure. Space is marked and divided into places where people are put. In the process, space is desocialised and depoliticised.'

Blomley 2003: 127

As such, it can be argued that this desocialisation and depoliticisation of space is the very substance that graffiti and street art often resist. In contesting dominant legal regimes of ownership—regimes of private property—illegal street art repoliticises the survey, affirming the role of the street as a space of contestation. Again, law and space are messily entangled in the manifestation of street art.

These three terms—the nomosphere, the frontier, the survey—are particularly generative in accounting for how Tower Hamlets can define street art and graffiti because they articulate, respectively, the spatio-legal complexity of street art; the ways in which street art and graffiti have often been on the 'nonlaw' side of legal regimes governing urban space; and the dominance of property in the spatial imagination of law, a dominance graffiti and street art unsettle. Put simply: the vocabulary of legal geography is pertinent in accounting for the spatio-legal operation of the GSAP.

In the last five years, street art scholarship has increasingly engaged with more nuanced engagements with legality: Flessas and Mulcahy (2018: 237), for example, examine the incommensurability of street art with attempts at legal regulation, for it 'escapes the disciplinary project(s) of modern urbanism(s)'; Castro and Gariso (2021) offer a comparative study of street art management strategies in Portugal, noting how authorities in Lisbon now make the graffiti-street art distinction; and Chang (2019) pays attention to legal walls as methods of controlling and governing the production of street art and graffiti in Singapore, also noting a graffiti-street art distinction. None of these accounts, however, explicitly employ legal geography. Where legal geography is adopted in graffiti and street art scholarship, it focuses on the illegality of street art: Bengtson and Arvidsson's (2014) excellent article on Street Art and Spatial Justice, for example, perceptively works through the spatio-legal nature of the form, identifying visibility as the arena of contestation in which law and street art operate, and suggesting that oscillation between the two constitutes public space. Equally, Sabina Andron's (2018a) use of legal geography engages with notions of

property – for Andron, property is integral to thinking about the position of street art and graffiti in the wider assemblage of urban semiotics. Where this stream of research could be extended, however, is to policies like the GSAP in Tower Hamlets: how is the law actively used to legalise certain aesthetic expressions at the expense of others? While many scholars have succeeded in engaging with the legalisation and retention of street art (e.g. Bloch 2012; Chang 2019; McAuliffe 2012; Young 2014) and others, as described above, have identified the graffiti-street art distinction being made in cities other than London, there is yet to emerge a committed empirical engagement from the legal geography perspective.

3. Methodological Axes

Understanding how the GSAP in Tower Hamlets distinguishes between street art and graffiti presents methodological challenges. Furthermore, the study was conducted during the summer of 2020, when coronavirus restrictions imposed upon social interactions prompted scholars to quickly adapt to remote research, this study being no exception. To perceptively account for the assumptions that underpin the GSAP, a three-pronged approach was adopted, comprised of a policy analysis, semi-structured interviews and a photo elicitation semiotic analysis.

A policy analysis was employed to scrutinise the discourses underpinning the GSAP text, the policy considered a legal text insofar as it performs a legal function (Berūkštienė 2016). Themes in the text were elicited by identifying repeating ideas with coding, before being subject to a critical discourse analysis that scrutinised how street art was constructed in the ‘rhetorical work of the text’ (Rapley 2007: 114). This approach follows existing work in socio-legal studies that considers law a discourse (Niemi-Kielläinen et al. 2007) to analyse the representations that it actively privileges.

Semi-structured interviews were also used, however, to situate the policy analysis within the socio-political context of the GSAP: the policy is not just a text, but a set of material implications. The lead policymaker and the GSAP and local residents were interviewed to, respectively, explore why the GSAP was introduced, and offer an account of

how people who live in Tower Hamlets perceive the graffiti and street art they encounter in their everyday lives. Five interviews were conducted in August 2020 (see Figure 1 for participants) using the online platform Zoom. The lead policymaker was identified via Tower Hamlets Council and local residents, defined as those living within Tower Hamlets, were contacted as a result of ‘snowballing’ thanks to a personal contact.

Interviewee	Length of Interview
Interviewee A: Lead Policymaker	45 minutes
Interviewee B: Local Resident	35 minutes
Interviewee C: Local Resident	45 minutes
Interviewee D: Local Resident	40 minutes
Interviewee E: Local Resident	45 minutes

Figure 1. Table of research participants that took part in the semi-structured interviews for the elements of the study relevant to this article. Residents took part in the photo elicitation as well as the interviews.

Finally, to account for the lack of engagement with visual material and lack of access to the research site in the context of coronavirus restrictions, a derivative of photo elicitation was employed in conjunction with interviews. Photo elicitation involves asking research participants to take photographs before an interview, which are then discussed during the interview to elicit the meanings participants ascribe to the images (Harper 2002; Glaw et al. 2017). Photo elicitation was here employed in a way inspired by Sabina Andron’s (2017) notion of ‘interviewing walls’, and later ‘surface semiotics’ (Andron 2018a), to account for the semiotic conception of street art by residents. To capture

the meaning of 'street art' and 'graffiti' in the view of local people, residents were invited to take photos of what they might consider to be either 'street art' or 'graffiti' before the Zoom interview. Then, during the interview, the images were displayed on the screen and discussed, with respect to their content and composition. The semiotic aspect of this method is evident in the analysis: conceiving of street art and graffiti as signs in the semiotic sense, the two key elements of the sign—signifier and signified—can be elicited. The signifier is evident in the photographs taken by participants, and the signified element of these signs is offered by participants while discussing the signifiers. As such, this method facilitates access to the perception of local residents, grants access to this visual data in a remote context, and offers visual data that is described and interpreted by research participants.

This methodology amounts to a socially constructivist analysis of a policy text to offer a critical engagement with the empirical context: the results should in no way be interpreted as universalist, but as one analytical prism through which to view the regulation of street art and graffiti. Clearly, this is a flawed methodology: while it prevailed in gaining access to the research area and context during a time of remote research, there are limitations to its approach. The sample size for research participants—five—is small, and evidently unrepresentative of the borough of Tower Hamlets as a whole. Furthermore, these interviewees were all residents, interviewed in this way as part of a broader study. Why does it matter what local people think? In this context, it allows an assessment of the extent to which the GSAP represents the views of those living in Tower Hamlets. However, an obvious question remains: what about the people producing street art and graffiti? Artists and writers were interviewed as part of a broader study but their input was not relevant to this aspect of the research; they did not take part in the semiotic photo elicitation exercise, which is an oversight. A more refined method would have expanded the sample size of residents and invited artists and writers also to take part in the semiotic photo elicitation to facilitate a comparison of residents' and artists' interpretation of work, perhaps even extending the sample to lawyers and graffiti removal officials. While this methodology must, therefore, be openly acknowledged

as exhibiting limitations, its value lies in analysing the GSAP both discursively and semiotically to interrogate the construction of what it terms 'street art'.

4. Results: Discursive and Semiotic Construction of Street Art

Discursively, the production of the terms street art and graffiti are largely structured by the notion of property – the GSAP calls upon the Criminal Damage Act 1971 and the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2005 to clarify its position on the removal of graffiti, legally constituting graffiti as a product of property relations, for the act of writing on walls is considered a violation of property ownership. Street art is defined in opposition to this: in a now classic trope, graffiti is erased because it is illegal and street art is subject to a differential scrutiny. This scrutiny is such that where graffiti is not perceived to interfere with property relations, it can be elevated to the status of 'street art', defined thus in opposition to, and mobilised to legitimise the criminalisation of, graffiti.

Property is mobilised in the GSAP to produce this distinction in three primary ways. Firstly, where graffiti requires erasure, street art is beneficial: elevation to 'street art' is a matter of the 'detriment question' (Tower Hamlets Council 2019b: 3). Work deemed 'detrimental'—that is, detrimental to property—is termed 'graffiti' to position it outside of the law and facilitate erasure. Secondly, where graffiti is presented as dirty—as Interviewee A noted, 'some aspects of graffiti just make the place look a mess'—street art is deemed clean, the GSAP designed to 'make decisions about what's supposed to be cleaned and what's not' (Interviewee A). This mirrors well-known discourses of graffiti as pathological (Cresswell 1996), though here such a discourse positions the local retention of street art as a function of property valorisation, for street art can enhance a property by virtue of being clean where graffiti is dirty. Finally, street art is presented as more sophisticated than graffiti – where street art resembled 'a really quite nice picture' (Interviewee A), graffiti is 'just very short scribbles' (Interviewee A), leading to a distinction between the words used to describe the ways in which street art and graffiti interact with buildings. Whereas graffiti is expressed as covering a building, street art is seen to decorate a building, the latter clearly a function of improving property.

Data from the photo elicitation revealed the ways in which residents perceived street art and graffiti on visual terms, as indicated by Figure 2.

Clearly, graffiti is seen to signify a contestation of space, ‘a sort of ownership’, lawlessness, dirtiness, and a claiming of surfaces: *“it’s not necessarily [...] trying to say something, it’s all just... claiming random surfaces with your tag”* (Interviewee E). Street art, on the contrary, signifies aesthetic beauty, work that is *“trying to say something”* (Interviewee E), work with “social meaning” (Interviewee C), work that is technically skilled: *“someone has put effort in, there’s a lot of work behind it, there’s a thinking, a process... it’s quite complicated”* (Interviewee B). This was very much similar to signification of the GSAP: graffiti is claiming space (a contestation of property), whereas street art is complicated and decorative, valorised for its aesthetic qualities. Examples of this data can be evidenced in Figures 3-6.

5. Discussion: Distinguishing Street Art from Graffiti

Analysis of these results, utilising the concepts of legal geography outlined in Section 2, elucidate the ways in which the GSAP makes a graffiti-street art distinction. The discursive analysis illustrates the dominance of property in

defining street art, but in a way that positions graffiti as a threat to property and street art a form of decorating property. Employing Delaney’s (2004) neologism of the nomosphere, here street art is defined by its entanglement in the messy relations between law and space: the ways in which street art decorates a building valorise this property in urban space, emphasising the status of the building as private property. Both law—the status of the building as private property—and space—the existence of the property and the urban area in which it is situated—forge relations with the paint on the wall to define street art in terms a policy like the GSAP can enforce and use pragmatically, in this case to decide what is erased. In short, the nomospheric status of what a tagger, writer or painter puts up on a wall in Tower Hamlets will determine whether it can be termed street art or graffiti.

Furthermore, as described in Section 2, the frontier is a useful way of capturing the distinction made between graffiti and street art in Tower Hamlets. What won’t be erased rests upon the arbitrary definitions of what won’t be deemed to violate property rights as ‘street art’. However, the placing of the frontier *between* street art and graffiti invites further analysis: where graffiti and street art were both once illegal practices grounded in resisting dominant imaginations of the urban form, street art has now been

	Signifier	Signified
Graffiti	Overlapping lines; tags; spray-paint; use of text; throw-ups; high volume of tags; tags on any surface (e.g. van, bollard, wall); illegible text.	Ambiguity over production of the image; lack of understanding concerning why the image is produced; contestation of space (overlapping); ‘claiming’ of surfaces; ‘a sort of ownership’ – connotations of contesting property; dirty and unclean spaces; writing as image; lack of permission – lawlessness.
Street Art	Figurative imagery; social media handles visible; many colours; stenciling; recognizable images; bold and clear-cut lines; very little overlapping of work.	Aesthetic beauty – ‘pretty’ work; work that is ‘trying to say something’ and ‘has social meaning’; humour; value ‘because of the labour behind it’; technically skilled artists.

Figure 2. Overview of semiotic analysis key findings. Signifiers of street art and graffiti are identified from the composition and content of the photographs taken by participants, signifieds are identified from the photo elicitation interviews.



Figure 3. street art; “[...] the technique they used seemed quite different from others I’ve seen around [...] it seems more like a painting, sort of thing, and it’s very colourful... and I think it also has some social meaning behind it. I find it quite cool.”
Source: Interviewee C.



Figure 4. graffiti; “I think [...] purely because of where it’s been situated, I would say it’s an example of graffiti...”. Source: Interviewee B.



Figure 5. street art; “I think [...] it’s figurative, I mean they’re showing something you can recognize as a house, with windows and doors... you don’t have to recognize something for it to be street art rather than graffiti, but this is one of the characteristics of street art.” Source: Interviewee D.



Figure 6. graffiti; “I would definitely say this is graffiti because it’s... it’s just a random, like, public wall and some-one has spray-painted on it...”. Source: Interviewee E.

dislocated from graffiti by a governance agenda that seeks to cast it as distinct from graffiti. In other words, whereas street art and graffiti once 'reclaim[ed] the city by redrawing the frontier' (Blomley 2003: 125), challenging existing relationships between property and urban space, street art now lies on the legal side of this frontier, having been subject to selective retention and thus selective legalisation. Where law once criminalised the practice of street art, it now considers such a practice – on *its* terms – to be decorative, beneficial, and, as the discursive analysis illustrated, clean where graffiti is dirty.

Lacking so far, however, is an explanation of why the GSAP was introduced. What is contributing to this new partial legalisation of street art? Adopting the lens of legal geography, the survey emerges as a crucial tool to explain the graffiti-street art distinction. The survey, as discussed in Section 2, describes the dominance of cadastral ownership in the legal imagination of space. By actively dismissing graffiti and choosing to retain street art, the erased aesthetics are those that more visibly contest the survey: the semiotic analysis clearly indicates that the signifying elements of graffiti are factors such as overlapping and tagging, both of which indicate competing claims to ownership. Indeed, the 'signified' elements of these signifiers included the 'claiming' of surfaces, and a 'sort of ownership' – the claiming of the surface and the claim to ownership is a claim in contention with property, a claim to property, visibly played out in urban space. In contrast, street art was thought to overlap very little, lines were bold and clear cut, and imagery was figurative – participants spoke of how this reflected the value and social meaning of street art, and that it was technically skilled, for example. Coupled with the underlying discourse in the GSAP of street art as clean, here street art can decorate property, and valorise it, because it doesn't appear to contest the spatial claims of property.

Street art is figurative and easy to interpret, it doesn't overlap and thus doesn't immediately present intra-artistic contestations of ownership, and the labour and skill residents spoke of suggest this work has value that, in being easy to recognise and not aesthetically volatile in a way graffiti can be, complements the property on which it is

situated. As such, the survey comes to bear on whether a piece is street art or graffiti, for work that conforms to the survey—that appears to complement and fit alongside or with property, that does not challenge its dominance of the urban form—can remain in Tower Hamlets, whereas work that rejects the survey—that shows no regard to existing claims of ownership, that is not immediately recognisable and is perhaps more visually cluttered—must be erased because of the threat it poses to the legal imagination of space. Street art in Tower Hamlets need not be erased because, it could be argued, it effectively *performs* property (see Blomley 2013).

While this research hopes to contribute to graffiti and street art scholarship the argument that legal geography is a valuable lens through which to explain the contemporary governance of street art in policies like the GSAP, it ultimately raises more questions than it answers. The growth of street art in Tower Hamlets, and East London more broadly, has taken place alongside a growth in a muralism culture that also needs to be analysed: the growth of hand-painted advertising presents challenges to a street art-graffiti continuum and demands further research that will examine how governance regulation like the GSAP might influence this 'symbiosis between streetness and capitalism' (Young 2017: 107). Rafael Schacter (2019: 411), for example, describes the ways in which the street art culture in East London 'functions in an entirely divergent manner to the independent public art of just over a decade ago', clearly alluding to the growth of street art advertising and the increased interest in street art from actors that might not be considered, to use his term, 'independent'. Research in our field must explore how governance strategies like the GSAP are emerging alongside the growth of these new forms on the scene.

Methodologically, as discussed in Section 3, there are also avenues for further research evident in the shortcomings of this study. To better account for how policies like the GSAP, which partially legalises street art, go about selecting the contexts in which work is legal, interviews and photo elicitation with council officers that remove graffiti would contribute to an explanation of the semiotic logic at work by those carrying out the council's policy requests.

Again, as mentioned in Section 3, semiotic photo elicitation with artists would allow for a comparison between the ways in which artists and council officers conceive of the visual language of street art, identifying the reasoning behind, in all likelihood, different conceptions of what defines 'street art'. These methodological adaptations, with an increased sample size, would offer a greater and more accountable range of data to answer the question of how policies like GSAP govern the distinction between street art and graffiti, increasing the rigour of the work.

6. Conclusion

Answering the question of how policies like the GSAP distinguish between street art and graffiti is integral to understanding how local governance policies are intervening in street art culture, for better or worse. In Tower Hamlets, new efforts to separate graffiti from street art can be argued to act as a method of erasing aesthetic interventions that threaten the propriety and ordered logic of the urban form and retaining work—street art—that instead preserves this logic. Regardless of the intention of the authors of these interventions, the discursive and semiotic construction of street art in East London evidences a growing distance between graffiti and street art, a distance now backed by local authority. While this brief study doesn't resolve the tensions that arise from choosing to define street art in a specific way, or offer alternative reasoning to the GSAP, it has sought to broaden the street art-graffiti debate in such a way as to equip scholars with a conceptual vocabulary that expresses the inherent complexity of an aesthetic form that straddles the boundaries of criminality; legal geography is a critical tool in understanding how policies like the GSAP operate and govern street art and graffiti, clarifying the often fuzzy intersection of law and space in our field. Whatever comes next on the East End scene – the growth and change of street art culture, mutation of management policy, or even a failure to witness evidence that Tower Hamlets is implementing the GSAP – the shifting governance landscape must continue to be interrogated by scholars in our community.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to Dr Karenjit Clare and Dr Joanna Kusiak for their advice and support in the early stages of this research in 2020, and especially to Brenna Salkin, for her unwavering support and comments on an earlier draft of the text. All remaining errors are my own.

References

- Andron, S. (2017) 'Interviewing walls: towards a method of reading hybrid surface inscriptions', in Avramidis, K. and Tsilimpounidi, M. (Eds.) *Graffiti and Street Art: Reading, Writing and Representing the City*. London: Routledge, pp. 71-88.
- Andron, S. (2018a) *Graffiti, Street Art and the Right to the Surface: for a Semiotic, Cultural and Legal Approach to Urban Surfaces and Inscriptions*. PhD Thesis. University College London. Available at: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10064450/> [Accessed 24 September 2022].
- Andron, S. (2018b) 'Selling streetness as experience: the role of street art tours in branding the creative city', *The Sociological Review*, 66: 5, pp. 1036-1057.
- Bengtsen, P. (2014) *The Street Art World*. Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell Press.
- Bengtsen, P. and Arvidsson, M. (2014) 'Spatial justice and street art', *Nordic Journal of Law and Social Research*, 1: 5, pp. 117-130.
- Bennett, L. and Layard, A. (2015) 'Legal geography: becoming spatial detectives', *Geography Compass*, 9: 7, pp. 406-422.
- Berūkštienė, D. (2016) 'Legal discourse reconsidered: genres of legal texts', *Comparative Legilinguistics*, 28, pp. 89-117.
- Blanché, U. (2015) 'Street art and related terms – discussion and working definition', *Street Art and Urban Creativity*, 1: 1, pp. 32-39.

- Bloch, S. (2012) 'The illegal face of wall space: graffiti-murals on the Sunset Boulevard retaining walls', *Radical History Review*, 113, pp. 111-126.
- Blomley, N. (2003) 'Law, property, and the geography of violence: the frontier, the survey and the grid', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93: 1, pp. 121-141.
- Blomley, N. (2013) 'Performing property: making the world', *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, 26: 1, pp. 23-48.
- Castro, A. and Gariso, A. (2021) 'Lisbon vs Porto: contrasts in urban public art management', *Street Art and Urban Creativity*, 7: 1, pp. 28-41.
- Chang, T. C. (2019) 'Writing on the wall: street art in graffiti-free Singapore', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43: 2, pp. 1046-1063.
- Cresswell, T. (1996) *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Delaney, D. (2004) 'Tracing displacements: or, evictions in the nomosphere', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22, pp. 847-860.
- Delaney, D. (2015) 'Legal geography I: constitutivities, complexities and contingencies', *Progress in Human Geography*, 39: 1, pp. 96-102.
- Delaney, D. (2016) 'Legal geography II: discerning injustice', *Progress in Human Geography*, 40: 2, pp. 267-274.
- Delaney, D. (2017) 'Legal geography III: new worlds, new convergences', *Progress in Human Geography*, 41: 5, pp. 667-675.
- Evans, G. (2016) 'Graffiti art and the city: from piece-making to place-making', in Ross, J. I. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Graffiti and Street Art*, London: Routledge, pp. 168-182.
- Fishwick, S. (2019) 'Graffiti: street art or vandalism?', *Evening Standard*, 17 April. Available at: <https://www.standard.co.uk/lifestyle/esmagazine/graffiti-art-or-vandalism-london-a4119231.html> [Accessed 24 September 2022].
- Flessas, T. and Mulcahy, L. (2018) 'Limiting law: art in the street and street in the art', *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 14: 2, pp. 219-241.
- Glaw, X., Inder, K., Kable, A. and Hazelton, M. (2017) 'Visual methodologies in qualitative research: autophotography and photo elicitation applied to mental health research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, pp. 1-8.
- Harper, D. (2002) 'Talking about pictures: a case for photo elicitation', *Visual Studies*, 17: 1, pp.13-26.
- London Assembly (2002) *Report of the London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee*, London: Greater London Authority. Available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gla_migrate_files_destination/archives/assembly-reports-environment-graffiti.pdf [Accessed 24 September 2022].
- McAuliffe, C. (2012) 'Graffiti or street art? Negotiating the moral geographies of the creative city', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34: 2, pp. 189-206.
- Niemi-Kiesiläinen, J., Honkatukia, P. and Ruuskanen, M. (2007) 'Legal texts as discourses', in Gunnarsson, Å., Svensson, E-M. and Davies, M. (Eds.) *Exploiting the Limits of Law: Swedish Feminism and the Challenge to Pessimism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 69-88.
- Orzeck, R. and Hae, L. (2020) 'Restructuring legal geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, 44: 5, pp. 832-851.
- Posters, B. (2020) *The Street Art Manual*. London: Laurence King.
- Rapley, T. (2007) *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.

Ross, J. I. (2016) 'London Calling: Contemporary graffiti and street art in the UK's capital', in Ross, J. I. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Graffiti and Street Art*, London: Routledge, pp. 272-287.

Schacter, R. (2019) 'From pollution to purity: the transformation of graffiti and street art in London 2005-2017', in Tilley, C. (Ed.) *London's Urban Landscape: Another Way of Telling*. London: UCL Press, pp. 403-425.

Tower Hamlets Council (2019a) *Tower Hamlets Graffiti and Street Art Policy*, Tower Hamlets Council. Available at: <https://democracy.towerhamlets.gov.uk/documents/s143613/6.3%20Tower%20Hamlets%20Graffiti%20and%20Street%20Art%20Policy.pdf> [Accessed 24 September 2022].

Tower Hamlets Council (2019b) *Appendix 1 – Graffiti and Street Art Policy*, Tower Hamlets Council. Available at: <https://democracy.towerhamlets.gov.uk/documents/s143613/6.3%20Tower%20Hamlets%20Graffiti%20and%20Street%20Art%20Policy.pdf> [Accessed 24 September 2022].

Waclawek, A. (2011) *Graffiti and Street Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Young, A. (2014) *Street Art, Public City: Law, Crime and the Urban Imagination*. Oxford: Routledge.

Young, A. (2017) 'Street art, graffiti and urban aesthetics', in Brown, M. and Carrabine, E. (Eds.) *Routledge International Handbook of Visual Criminology*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 202-214.