



Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee
21 October 2026

Dear Marcelina Rejwerska

COMMENTS ON LISTED BUILDING CONSENT PL/26/1308 12 RUSSELL STREET

Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) object to listed building consent PL/26/1308, 12 Russell Street.

This listed building consent partially resolves the issues raised in an enforcement notice. We have not had sight of this notice except in so far as it is referenced in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement.

1. SUMMARY

- Reading CAAC welcome the proposed partial rectification of the inappropriate works carried out without listed building consent.
- We object to the proposed re-instatement of the previously removed timber first floor windows
- The front elevation as proposed (drawing 1201-05-10) conflicts with statements in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement.
- Additional improvements to the facade could be made.

2. HERITAGE

2.1 We welcome the proposed rectification of the inappropriate works carried out without listed building consent. The Management Plan which accompanies the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road CA appraisal (Table 2, page 188) mentions 'The need for improved enforcement for listed building and conservation area infractions.'

2.2 We note that the rectification works requested as cited in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement (HDAS) include replacing the first floor windows with six over six pane, sliding sash windows.

2.2 The terrace which includes No 12 is pictured c1844-47 in fig 6.3.7b on page 78 of the appraisal; unfortunately, the image is not clear enough to distinguish the fenestration.

2.3 Although the enforcement notice and the Drawing 1201-05-10 show six over six pane, sliding sash windows the HDAS states that the first floor windows will be replaced by the timber windows which were removed when replacing them with UPVC windows. The applicant justifies this by saying 'their reuse retains earlier timber joinery from the building rather than introducing new replacement windows'. We agree that in principle that it is sensible, from a conservation point of view, that replacing the removed timber windows will be an improvement over incorrectly installed UPVC windows. However, there is no evidence, in the way of photographs, to demonstrate that the removed wooden windows are 'original' and from a date prior to the listing of No 12 in 1978. The applicant should prove, by way of photographs, or evidence that the planning officer is content with, that this is the case.

2.4 The brochures provided for the basement door and the casement windows for the dormers are too general and so the actual selection of the style of windows and door (without glazing) should be secured by condition. It is totally inappropriate for the applicant to propose a modern-looking door with glazing for the building. The door should reflect the history of the building rather than being one that would be installed on a modern property.

3. OTHER MATTERS

3.1 The replacement flue is a minor matter to be addressed. We would like to see the drainage pipes that cross the facade moved so that they do not blight the front elevation. We note that the brickwork appears to have been stained by overflowing water from the pipes.

3.2 The application deals with unauthorised works to the front elevation of a listed building. The rear elevation should also be inspected for unauthorised works.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 This application should be rejected for the reasons stated above

Your sincerely

Evelyn Williams
Chair Reading CAAC
On behalf of Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee
43 Milman Road
Reading
RG2 0AZ