

Windermere Villas Conservation Area Consultation Statement

April 2026

Commented [RA1]: @Rose Lord @Helen Hooper does this need the "Annex X" title on it?

Commented [HH2R1]: Yes it does—just add a header then copy and tweak template content

Introduction

- 1 Windermere Villas Conservation Area is a proposed new Conservation Area on the eastern shore of Windermere. If adopted, the designation will help guide development to conserve and enhance the area's special interest. This statement summarises consultation on the proposed boundary, Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, and explains how the feedback received informed the revised proposals.

Early engagement

- 2 Prior to the formal consultation period in autumn 2025, informal briefings were undertaken with Bowness and Windermere Town Council, Cartmel Fell Parish Council and a number of businesses within the proposed boundary.

Formal Consultation - Stage One

- 3 Formal consultation on the Conservation Area designation took place between 26th September and 26th October 2025 in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.
- 4 Consultation consisted of an online survey asking specific yes/no questions about the proposed boundary and assessment of special interest, alongside an opportunity for consultees to submit further written comments. A total of 88 responses were received to the online survey and a further 10 written responses were received by email.
- 5 The feedback received through the consultation was reviewed by officers, and a report was taken to Park Strategy and Vision Committee in November 2025 (Annex 4) recommending a revised conservation area boundary and a targeted consultation on the amended proposals.

Commented [SR3]: can you include a link to November report please

Formal Targeted Consultation – Stage Two

- 6 The targeted consultation, undertaken between December 2025 and March 2026, included Bowness & Windermere Town Council, Cartmell Fell Parish

Council, business owners who had responded directly to the initial consultation, and landowners affected by the proposed additions to the boundary.

- 7 Written consultation responses and the Authority’s response are set out below. Overall, the targeted consultation showed broad support for the revised boundary. Most responses welcomed the amendments made following the earlier consultation, including the inclusion of Belle Isle, albeit objections to its inclusion by the landowner has been submitted. A further issue raised, again by landowners, relates to the extent of the boundary around Windy Hall Road.
- 8 Following review of the representations received, a further amendment is proposed to remove Cockshott Wood from the proposed conservation area boundary.

Organisation	You Said	We Did
Bowness and Windermere Town Council	Welcome the inclusion of some of the changes they suggested. Query why the Pattinson Estate behind the Glebe, off the A592 has not been included?	The Pattinson Houses on Lake Gardens have some local heritage value, but the area is not considered to demonstrate the special architectural or historic interest required for inclusion within the Windermere Villas Conservation Area. It may be appropriate to consider this area separately as part of

		any future review of the Bowness Conservation Area.
Cartmel Fell Parish Council	No comments to make on the revised boundary.	No response required
National Trust	Pleased to see Belle Isle being incorporated within the proposed Windermere Villas Conservation Area- that adjustment will lift the value of the designation.	No response required
Windermere Marina Village	We welcome the Authority having taken account of Windermere Marina Village's comments and concerns and agree that the revised boundary provides a more logical and robust boundary for the proposed Windermere Villas Conservation Area. We do, therefore, support the proposed amendment to the boundary.	No response required
Winander Leisure Ltd and Windermere Aquatic Ltd	No objections to the proposed boundary.	No response required
Resident within the proposed CA	Question why the boundary doesn't extend across the lake and include the western shore.	The western shore contains some recognised villas, but it does not have the same concentration of villas and villa landscape as the eastern shore and is predominantly

		<p>woodland and agricultural land. Conservation area designation is not generally the appropriate means of protecting this wider landscape. However, if adopted, the western shore will form part of the setting of the conservation area, and the impact of development on that setting will be a material consideration.</p>
<p>Resident within the proposed CA</p>	<p>Questions why the boundary extends so far to the east of the lakeshore?</p>	<p>The boundary includes the principal villas and their associated villa landscapes. To include villas such as Blackwell, it must extend eastwards beyond the lakeshore. It also follows defined plot and boundary features, rather than cutting across individual sites.</p>

<p>Resident within the proposed CA</p>	<p>Questions why Windy Hall Road, Brackenrigg and Linthwaite House are now excluded?</p>	<p>On review, the land to the south and east of Windy Hall Road was not considered to contain buildings of sufficient architectural or historic interest to justify inclusion within the conservation area. With the exception of Knott End and Laurus Bank, none of the existing dwellings appear on the 1948 OS map. While the area has some positive features, it is not considered to merit inclusion. If adopted, it will nonetheless form part of the setting of the conservation area, and the impact of development on that setting will remain a consideration. Brackenrigg and Linthwaite House</p>
--	--	---

		were not previously included within the proposed boundary.
Resident within the proposed CA	There must be a carve out for marinas and other commercial activity as for example the Windermere marina Village does not have any villas and is made up of properties that have been built probably from 1980 onwards. Therefore, I cannot see how these are connected with the aim of the conservation plan.	Windermere Marina Village and The Glebe have been removed from the proposed boundary as these areas do not contain sufficient historic or architectural interest to warrant inclusion.
Resident within the proposed CA	The proposed boundary includes properties to the west of the B5360 but not the east, so therefore does not include most of the houses at Bellman Ground (so the listed farm house is excluded). And if the road and surroundings is deemed to be part of the vista and from which the vista can be enjoyed, then why only include one side.	The land to the east of the B5360 is predominantly pastoral, with former farmsteads surrounded by pastureland. The conservation area is focussed upon the eastern shore area where the concentration of villas and villas inspired properties are located.
Residents of Windy Hall Road, Old Bellfield	Windy Hall Road and Old Bellfield residents request that the boundary is amended to include all of Windy Hall Road as initially proposed.	On review of the entire boundary, the land to the south and east of Windy Hall Road was not

	<p>Support for the original Windy Hall Road boundary has been specifically registered more than once in the consultation notes.</p> <p>No objections to this part of the original boundary have been registered in any Annexes to the meeting 25th November.</p> <p>No comments were made regarding this area at the meeting on 25th November.</p> <p>Windy Hall Road has been subjected to intensive overdevelopment.</p> <p>The Windy Hall hillside provides an important, open, harmonious backdrop to Old Belfield as well as the conserved, listed farm and pastures below.</p> <p>This low lying area must also be protected from any further overbearing, overscaled, dominating development looming behind and overhead.</p> <p>The hill is clearly seen from the lake and lakeshore providing a welcome, balanced landscape of buildings nestled in context alongside nature and wildlife.</p>	<p>considered to contain buildings of sufficient architectural or historic interest to justify inclusion within the conservation area.</p> <p>With the exception of Knott End and Laurus Bank, none of the existing dwellings appear on the 1948 OS map.</p> <p>While the area has some positive features, it is not considered to merit inclusion.</p> <p>The appraisal has highlighted a recent development on Windy Hall Road which is felt to be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The respondents are correct in identifying the importance of</p>
--	---	---

		<p>this area as a backdrop to Old Belfield and Bordriggs Farm and any new development must have due regard to the setting of these listed buildings and the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The environs of Windy Hall Road form part of the setting of the conservation area, and the impact of development on the setting of all designated heritage assets must be taken into account alongside Local Plan policies and the adopted Design Code.</p>
<p>Resident within the proposed CA</p>	<p>[The inclusion of Cockshott Wood and Belle Isle is unjustified and unnecessary] for the following reasons:</p> <p>Cockshott Wood – Cockshott Wood lacks special historic interest and its inclusion within the boundary risks devaluing the proposed designation as a whole. The inclusion of land</p>	<p>The building known as Cockshott Wood is not considered to have the special architectural or historic interest</p>

- Commented [RA4]:** @Rose Lord @Stephen Ratcliffe @Julie Wood did we receive a long objection? Wondering if we need to include the full submission or a more detailed summary of tis as an annex to this consultation statement? Is there a risk / angle for legal challenge if we have not presented the representation to members?
- Commented [RA5R4]:** Julie's response...Provided we have accurately summarised all the concerns raised, there should be no difficulty.
- Commented [SR6R4]:** Rob- We have a detailed and comprehensive objection from Belle Isle and would prefer it is included in its entirety
- Commented [RA7R4]:** @Rose Lord @Stephen Ratcliffe Julie feedback...If going to include in full why? Why are we treating it differently to other responses?

Are they the only respondent who are a property owner within the proposed extension area for example?

Are we being consistent with these responses to the consultation statement from November (which appears to include more text provided in full)
- Point is we need to be able to demonstrate consistency, with parity in the process of reviewing / publishing responses. Have to justify why we might be treating a response differently.
- Commented [RA8R4]:** Further question from Julie...Have we given members all the information they need to make an informed decision? Does it summarise the main points succinctly should do the trick.
- Commented [SR9R4]:** Understand now that we need to eb consistent with all representations but can we give a far fuller summary of Belle Isle please

	<p>which lacks demonstrable special architectural or historic interest risks diluting the purpose of Conservation Area designation and is contrary to paragraph 204 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Belle Isle – Belle Isle is already subject to the highest level of protection for a heritage asset. Therefore, inclusion in a Conservation Area is unnecessary.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided demonstrating that Belle Isle or Cockshott Wood make a positive contribution to the specific character or appearance of the Windermere Villa Conservation Area, nor that their inclusion is necessary to preserve or enhance that character.</p> <p>The Authority has not demonstrated spatial coherence, functional relationship, or area-based character linking these sites with the Windermere villa frontage, nor shown that existing heritage protections are insufficient to manage change.</p>	<p>required for inclusion within the conservation area, and the revised boundary has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>The inclusion of Belle Isle is considered justified for the reasons set out in Annex 6.</p> <p>The overlap of conservation area, listed building and registered park and garden designations is lawful and appropriate, and conservation area designation also provides additional protection for trees that contributes to the wider character of the area.</p>
--	--	--

Conclusions and recommendations

- 9 Following the targeted consultation, the proposed boundary has been reviewed and amended to remove the property known as Cockshott Wood. This change reflects the feedback received regarding the contribution that this property makes to the special interest of the area and the conclusion that the building does not possess the special architectural or historic interest required for inclusion within the conservation area.

- 10 Having considered the representations received regarding Windy Hall Road, it is concluded that this area should not be included within the proposed conservation area boundary. However, its contribution to the setting of the conservation area, and how the impact of all developments on the setting of the conservation area are assessed will be addressed through minor changes to the appraisal and management plan.

- 11 The consultation responses demonstrate strong support for the inclusion of Belle Isle within the conservation area, and the case for its inclusion is well evidenced. Taking account of all representations received, the proposed designation is considered to be justified and should proceed on the basis of the area's special architectural and historic interest, in accordance with Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.