



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2022,
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Harper, (Chair), Hiller (Vice Chair), A Bond, Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Jones, I Hussain and Rush.

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Matthew Fulcher, Legal, Governance
Alex Woolnaugh, Highways Engineer
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Team Manager

50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sharp and Councillor Iqbal. Cllr Rush attended as substitute.

51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hiller declared a non pecuniary interest on agenda item 3 21/01965/HHFUL - 28 West End Road, Maxey as he knew the applicant and would be speaking on the item.

52. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS WARD COUNCILLOR

There were no declarations of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2021**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

53. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

53.1 20/01113/FUL - THE FORMER STANILAND COURT SITE, WERRINGTON CENTRE

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the 'erection of two, three-storey buildings and one, two - storey building comprising 59 affordable residential units and two retail units, with associated car parking, landscaping and relocation of bus stop'.

Blocks one and two would stand at three storey in height and would comprise entirely of residential units. These two blocks would have an overall floor area of 94m x 17.8m and propose to stand at 10.2m (11.1m including plant) in height utilising a mansard roof with recessed windows. These blocks would comprise a total of 56 residential dwellings over three floors.

Block three would have a floor area of 17.3m x 18.1m and propose to stand at 7.3m in height, also utilising a mansard roof with recessed windows. This building would comprise two retail units and bin storage for both the retail and residential units at ground floor, with three residential dwellings above.

Access for cars and refuse collection vehicles would be from Staniland Way to the north, which was shared with Olympus House, the service yard for Tesco Supermarket and a number of retail units situated within Werrington Centre, as well as the exit to the Tesco Petrol Filling Station.

These buildings would be served by a communal car park, which would provide 75 parking spaces (four of which would be disabled).

To facilitate development, several landscaped areas and a bus stop would be removed. A new bus stop was proposed to be situated along Goodwin Walk, and public realm improvements were proposed within Werrington Centre. Further, the adjacent service yard would be remodelled to facilitate the proposed car park, which would displace 21x staff car parking spaces and a cycle store.

The Officer introduced the report and highlighted the key points in the application. Members were also directed to the update report which contained several revised and additional conditions.

Cllr John Fox, Judy Fox, Stephen Lane, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Ward Councillors expressed concerns about the short notification that was given to prepare for the meeting and about no site visit being conducted. It was therefore requested that the committee gave consideration to the concerns raised and that the proposal should be deferred until the next full planning meeting
- The proposal was the biggest planning application involving residents with many objections.
- There were no known buildings in new Werrington above two high storey flats and therefore was not conducive to the area.
- The application would equally look out of character to the surrounding residential houses by failing to respect the visual character of Werrington's well-established urban area.
- The plans involved such a large area of Werrington and would be detrimental to the whole unique environmental layout that already existed and gave no positive environmental gain.
- There were concerns felt about the loss of the bus terminal which was built to serve bus routes coming from both directions, which also facilitated for any increase of public transport improvement plan, bringing about a much cleaner environment, which complied with the PCC local transport plan to attract more people onto public transport.
- The very busy route served the rural communities, Werrington Centre and beyond. The current terminal gave bus drivers a place to turn round and wait for customers if the driver arrived ahead of the allocated time slot. In the winter months, bus drivers would keep the engines running to warm the coach, which had not presented a problem as they were far enough away from residential houses, to impact on noise pollution and air quality. If the bus terminal was moved to the proposed location, it would present the opposite effect on residential houses.
- Concerns were raised about only one bus stop provision proposed and with the

proximity close to the road. Local school students and the elderly would have to cross the road and there appeared to be no plans for any provision to install controlled crossings.

- It was disappointing that the police comments to the consultation which had stated that because of historical issues in the local Werrington Centre, such as drug dealing and anti-social behaviour, they felt that the pocket park should be removed from the proposals.
- It was felt that placing two further shop units near the Werrington Centre may create an adverse effect and be a detrimental factor to the anti-social behaviour that was being experienced.
- If the application was approved, Werrington would lose several open access points into a shopping centre for both pedestrians and cyclists and this would create an adverse effect on the present environmental landscape and was not perceived as a regeneration of Werrington Centre at all.
- Both proposed buildings being in such proximity to the single storey aspect of Werrington Centre would be unjustifiable oversized and out of character.
- The proposed buildings would not contribute to inclusion and community cohesion illustrated in the layout, the blocks were a customary route to the Werrington shopping centre, which had been designed into the neighbourhood landscape by the Peterborough Development Corporation. Visually, the purposeful symmetrical design through Crowhurst to the centre had been an obvious route for residents and had been for most 40 years. The proposed layout had overridden and disrupted the local context and therefore conflicted with LP 16.
- Up until recently the Highways Authority had always objected to insufficient parking provision insisting the development required 102 parking spaces. The applicant's argument stated that the lack of car use figures for such developments and suggested a ratio of only 0.62 parking spaces per flat and requested a variation of parking stands to be allowed. The applicant's claimed that their current proposal percent of 75 spaces should be sufficient and acceptable. Highways had stated that the parking standards would not differentiate between flats or houses nor private or affordable ownership.
- Parking provisions of policy LP 13 stated that the planning permission for new development within the use classes A,B,C and D1 would only be granted if the proposal was an appropriate and deliverable parking provision. Therefore, the proposal had not allowed for any variation.
- Overspill parking provision in Ploverly and Crowhurst had not been properly assessed, as the dynamics in both roads were everchanging. There had been no safe parking provision in these areas currently and it was confusing as to where the free parking spaces had materialised. Therefore, the overspill parking provision should be disregarded or prevented by condition.
- Concerns were raised about the potential for noise pollution from nearby businesses and electricity substation for future occupiers of the proposed flats.
- Refuse collections would present and issue for residents of the proposed development, and the Council's Waste Officer had objected to the proposal.
- It was not clear why there were two shop units proposed within the application for Werrington Centre as there were already empty shops in the area. In addition, a similar application was refused by the planning committee in 2018 and then after appeal, the inspector's decision was to dismiss it on the grounds that the proposal would impact on the character and appearance of the area and on public safety, so it was uncertain why this application had been any different.
- The Tree Officers had objected to the proposal stating that it was too large for its position and location. In addition, it was felt that the proposal would affect the landscape, including the footpath and highways and would dominate the street scene.
- There would be an obvious issue with regards to the close proximity of the

proposed development and the existing trees as they mature and reached their full growth potential, which seemed to have been downplayed within the application. In addition, the proposed buildings with balconies could affect the future management and pruning of the trees significantly, which had not complied with LP29 and had not offered any amenities spatial grass open space.

- The removal of the large public open space adjacent to Goodwin Walk would mean that there would be nowhere for the children to play and residents to enjoy.
- It was felt that the proposed development would not promote and enhance biodiversity.

Sally Weald, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Werrington Centre was the core of the community that contained schools, a nursery, shops, doctors and dentists and it fulfilled a major social and community purpose.
- The plastic grass, the bare ground and the remains of a derelict toilet block, had made the centre an unpleasant environment.
- Residents deserved better and had given views along with the Neighbourhood Council and Ward Councillors on the proposal.
- There were no three storey flats being built around Werrington Centre and the proposal would overwhelm the area if the application was approved.
- The application had not taken on the points raised by the Planning Inspector at appeal.
- Over 150 people would be deposited into a tired and run-down shopping centre without any satisfactory open space and greenery. In addition, the Werrington Centre had been set at medium risk for antisocial behaviour.
- The development should provide a benefit for the City and include much needed social housing. It should also provide benefits to the current residents living in and around a neglected shopping centre.
- Many of the residents were disappointed by the withdrawal of the landscaping plans as a result of being deemed by the police, to attract anti-social behaviour. The current landscape was also inefficient and had attracted anti-social behaviour.
- Investment was needed in Werrington Centre and not Cuckoo's Hollow as proposed.
- Werrington was distant from the City Centre and employment areas and people need to travel by car to get to work.
- Half of the proposed flats would have two bedrooms, which could require two cars to travel to places of employment.
- The current parking arrangements had been subject to anti-social behaviour and was at times, used to full capacity with no parking enforcement measures in place. It was felt that parking standards should be introduced for the Werrington Centre car park.
- Crowhurst Way and Skaters Way would experience an over concentration of parking as a result of the proposed development. This could cause parking problems for current residents who were already subject to congested parking in the area.
- It was essential that the parking proposals were fully consulted with current residents in order to find a solution to the issues already being experienced in the area.
- It was appreciated that rejuvenation was required for the Werrington Centre, however, appropriate consultation should focus on the issues raised such as parking, the removal of the pocket park to provide landscaping.
- The proposal had addressed the City Council's demand for low-cost housing; however, it was the wrong size building in the wrong place. In addition, there

needed to be a more effective compensation package for current residents to accept future development proposals for the area.

Kate Wood, agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The sites comprised of two areas, one which was vacant land where Staniland and Court office building had been demolished and then along with the bus turn around area the bus stop which was to be moved South along Goodwin Walk.
- The proposed bus route would sit at the end of a widened walking route to and from the Werrington Centre and Stagecoach had not objected to the proposed location.
- The proposal contrasted with the commercial buildings deliberately due to the non-commercial use being proposed. The proposal was lower in height than the office building at Olympus house, despite being three stories.
- The applicant had worked with officers for several years on the scheme including at pre application stage when the initial proposal was for a taller building with 92 flats. The proposal had been reduced overtime to 59 following the submission of the planning application in August 2018.
- At 100% affordable, the application represented a unique opportunity to make up part of a significant shortfall in the City area for housing.
- The applicant sent a letter to all Committee Members, which been attached to the agenda. The letter outlined how the applicant had responded to initial objections in particular setting the buildings back further from the trees on Goodwin Walk and widening the route between the centre and the bus stop.
- The rest of the proposal would serve two new shops and the addition of CCTV and lighting, and Members were asked to note that the shops were currently let.
- Parking and access issues had been resolved with the Highways Officers, with parking provided at one space per flat plus 25% for visitors. Highway Officers agreed that this would be appropriate given that the development of one and two bed units.
- Some of the units would be reserved for the over the 55 population. In addition, the applicant's transport consultant had carried out additional survey work at the request of the Highway Officers and there had been capacity to accommodate the traffic.
- There was no requirement for any overspill parking and certainly no need to park as far away as Crowhurst and Ploverly. Officers had also required that the section 106 agreement included provision to make traffic regulation orders if it transpired that overspill parking occurred.
- The pocket park had not been removed from the application and the Committee was asked to consider whether it should be, given the police objection. Despite the police objection to the pocket park, a significant amount of section 106 agreements would contribute towards work on existing open spaces and the allotments.
- The applicant had secured Athene communications to carry out a major consultation exercise several years ago and in Werrington Centre itself. There was significant consultation and the responses led to the application that was presented in August 2020. In addition, there was a meeting with Local Councillors and the Neighbourhood Council to talk through the scheme. Furthermore, a tour of the Werrington Centre was attended with two of the Local Councillors. Residents and neighbours had also been kept informed throughout the pre-application and application process.
- Although the Ward Councillors were against the application despite the

consultation undertaken, there had to be a balance found for all parties to provide a financially viable scheme, which supplied the right amount of affordable housing and meet the Section 106 fees.

- The applicant would agree to accept a condition to provide EV charging points in the car park.
- As part of the negotiations with Highways Officers, there was sufficient parking included within the application and overspill parking had only been suggested should there be a need if the anticipated requirement had not completely accommodated the parking prediction.
- There would be 75 parking spaces to accommodate all units plus 25, which was the Council parking standard.
- Buses would be able to access the bus stop, but they would take a different route which Stagecoach had been consulted about. Stagecoach raised no concerns, and the change would be accommodated within their routing systems.
- The proposal would not take away public transport opportunities as the bus stop was only just moving along from its current location and close to the Werrington Centre for people to access their property. In addition, a condition for a travel plan would be required to encourage new residents to use public transport, walk and cycle where possible, which would complement the current sustainable location.
- The agent agreed that the travel plan should be implemented before residents move into the proposed units.
- There had been a condition imposed on the application in relation to the rubbish disposal storage which meant that residents would not be expected to drag their bins around a service yard. In addition development would not be permitted until the applicant had agreed changes to the bin storage requirements with the Council.

The Planning and Environmental Planning Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Condition 25 of the report sought to secure that Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points would be provided, and for the avoidance of doubt five percent of the parking bays must be EV.
- The Council had to adhere to the adopted planning policies in relation to EV charging points, however, Officers could ask the applicant post resolution to provide additional EV bays, or the Committee may choose to amend the Condition 25 as they saw fit through any proposal.
- The Civic Society had raised objections, which included concerns about height, massing and scale of the development.
- Members were advised that the provision of less parking spaces for the proposal had been acceptable because the applicant had provided robust and comprehensive evidence to demonstrate that the onsite parking provision was acceptable. Furthermore, the evidence provided had been presented from the current census data for car ownership levels for flats across the country and additional data of parking habits around Peterborough.
- The Local Highways Authority had not differentiated between the different tenures of property and that an exceeded lower parking requirement had been accepted.
- The applicant had moved the development in light of the proximity of trees on Goodwin Walk following concerns. Therefore, Planning Officers felt that there had been sufficient breathing room to prevent undue pressure on the proposed development.

- The on-site parking provision was adequate for the proposed development and there should be no need for any off-site parking. Furthermore, the purpose of the two additional surveys, which, included the supermarket had provided reassurance that should there be any overspill this would present an acceptable impact.
- The LHA had suggested that as a failsafe, monies for a TRO to be secured if there was an overflow parking issue in the future, however, Planning Officers had not felt that the request would fit the tests that contributions must meet in terms of being secured under the Town and Country Planning Act. Furthermore, a TRO required consultation, and would not guarantee installation of double yellow line parking restrictions. Therefore, there was no legal mechanism to be able to secure TRO monies through a section 106 agreement.
- Members were advised that the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), pooled monies for use for certain aspects as set out in the PCC community infrastructure levy and the SPD. There were certain elements relating to infrastructure contributions that were not included in the CIL which included things like affordable housing, public open space and any other site-specific matters that need to be secured through a financial contribution. In this instance, policy LP21 related to new developments and the provision of public open space, and as none was provided on the site, an off-site contribution had instead been secured. Furthermore, the Council's Public Open Space Officer had made recommendations as to where the monies should be spent based upon where the greatest demand would be as a result of the people moving into the proposed homes. Therefore, a specific pot of money had been based on a quote for 49 replacement trees and this had met the requirements of LP29.
- The development could not be reliant on the Tesco's car park.
- A TRO option had only been considered due to the service yard that Tesco's staff used, and the assumption was that they were more likely to park in surrounding streets rather than vehicles resulting from the proposed development.
- The lack of amenity was appropriate and a recreation ground to the west of the proposed development would be sufficient to provide residents with an outdoor space.
- Officers were comfortable with the evidence provided to support the proposal of reduced parking spaces.
- Members were advised that they could request a pot of money to secure the implementation of a TRO in the future if necessary.
- One hundred percent of the proposed properties would be offered as affordable tenure.
- Members felt that the application was on balanced, however shared some of the concerns raised.
- Some Members felt the car parking seemed acceptable, however there had been very strong objections to the application despite the proposed accommodation being offered as affordable.
- The S106 should be spent in the locality and in Werrington Centre and compensate the loss of amenity for current residents.
- A travel plan should be in place before any residents moved into the proposed units.
- There was a high demand for social affordable housing in the City, however it was felt that the application had not accommodated an appropriate level of parking. In addition, it was felt that a lower number of accommodation units should be considered for the area.
- There were currently two apartments in the area that had caused several issues, therefore an additional development would not be appropriate.

- The representation by the Local Councillors was very strong and should be given the appropriate consideration.
- Although a deferral of the decision was discussed to allow for a site visit, however, Members were content that they could reach a decision without one.
- Members felt that the proposed development seemed oversized.
- The amenity had not seemed sufficient for 100 residents that would reside in the proposed development.
- The community opposition was considered very strongly against the proposed development.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the officers recommendations and approve the application. Following a vote, (3 for, 6 against) the motion was **DEFEATED**.

A motion was proposed and seconded to refuse the officers recommendations and **REJECT** the application. Following a vote, the Committee **RESOLVED** (6 for, 2 against, 1 abstention to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Members felt that the application was not acceptable for the following reasons:

- Design, size and massing on the character of the area:
The proposed development, by virtue of its design, size and massing, would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Insufficient car parking:
The proposed development would provide for only 75no. parking spaces which falls below the adopted minimum parking standards for the mix of dwelling/unit sizes proposed. Whilst evidence has been submitted by the Applicant to justify this reduced parking provision, this is not accepted. As such, the proposal would not provide parking which sufficiently meets the need generated by the development and is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Insufficient amenity space for future occupants:
The proposed development would not provide future occupiers with any private or semi-private outdoor amenity space in which their day-to-day living needs could be met. In addition, public open space is not located in a sufficiently close proximity for this deficiency to be mitigated. As such, the proposal would not afford future occupiers with an acceptable level of amenity and it is therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

3:16PM - At this point the Committee took a break.

53.2 21/01745/HHFUL - JUBILEE HOUSE, FIRST DRIFT, WOTHORPE

The Committee received a report, which sought the benefit of planning permission to raise the roof level of the existing dwelling to create a first-floor level to accommodate additional living spaces consisting of three ensuite bedrooms and associated internal alterations to the existing layout. The gap between the existing detached garage and the principal elevation would be infilled with a part two-storey development which would abut

the rear wall of the garage.

In addition, the scheme included alterations to the existing double garage from a dual pitch roof to a single pitch roof with two roof lights and the creation of a mezzanine level for a 'Hobby Room'. The proposed roof of the garage would follow the existing dwelling in height and pitch as seen on the north elevation.

The finishing materials would consist of a combination of limestone and cream render, ashlar quoins, aluminium cladding and aluminium powder coated window frames, which would match the existing dwelling.

It was noted that the current application was a re-submission of application reference number 21/00583/HHFUL which was previously withdrawn, and amendments had been secured as part of the application.

The initial proposal submitted had been revised after discussions between the Officers and the Applicant to reduce the scale of the development proposed on its north (principal) elevation as well as a reduction in scale of the windows on the east elevation.

The Development Management Team Manager introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Helen Raymond, agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The dual pitch roof looked a little out of place with the rest of the house being the only one that was dual pitched and much shallower pitched in the main roofs on the house. There had been 49 metres in front of Jubilee House and Terracotta House which was locally listed and 46 metres to the northeast was Tarrants which sat in a 108 metre long plot. Friarfield was located 60 metres and angled obliquely to Jubilee House with a two acre garden with one point two five acre woodland to the southwest.
- There had been mature planting to the east and west boundaries of Jubilee House and the rear garden was at high level above the house floor levels.
- The original house application for Terracotta had planning permission for a double garage to the southern end of the garden, adjacent to Jubilee House garage, however the drawings had not shown the garage. The proposed garage would be one point three metres higher than the floor level of Terracotta House.
- Jubilee House had a basement over the southern side and mezzanine over the central space. The clients had considered extending the mezzanine to accommodate their requirements but felt that the house had more potential, though they had not wanted to lose space in the central location of the property.
- Negotiations with the Planning Officers had taken place to address the concerns raised by Tarrants, so it was believed by the applicant that the issues had been resolved.
- The roof lines had been reduced facing towards Tarrants in order to address the concerns raised.
- The applicant's wished to gain guest accommodation and it was believed that the proposals presented the least impact on the neighbours with provision for a smaller footprint as possible.
- There were no comments from the Ward Councillor in relation to the application.

The Planning and Environmental Planning Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members felt that the property was very interesting, although alien in design, was acceptable for the area.
- The area had been dominated by large housing stock which and it was therefore felt that the application had not looked out of place.
- The proposed design was acceptable and positioned away from the neighbouring properties. In addition, the mature planting would obscure the view.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendation and **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **APPROVE** the planning permission subject to conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, including the setting of a Locally Listed Building and Special Character Area, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP20 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).
- Neighbours surrounding the application site would retain an acceptable standard of amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Parking provision and the safety of the surrounding highways would be retained to acceptable levels, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

At this point Cllr Hiller stood down from the Committee.

52.3 21/01965/HHFUL - 28 WEST END ROAD, MAXEY

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing rear conservatory and replacement with a single storey flat roof extension with roof lanterns and an adjoining timber pergola structure.

The proposed single storey rear extension would project approximately four metres outwards beyond the rear elevation of the house, and the adjoining timber pergola structure approximately 1.9m beyond this. The extension would measure approximately 9.7 metres in width and three metres in height.

The Development Management Team Manager introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Cllr Hiller, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicant had owned the property for 30 years.
- The application was for an Orangerie construction.
- The property was situated within the conservation area of the village and so external alterations were subject to closer scrutiny by planning officers.
- The proposal had the support of the Council's Conservation Officer the support of Maxey Parish Council neighbours and Historic England.
- The extension was larger than the conservatory and would be far more energy efficient, with the use of very high thermal efficiency glass in the roof and bifold doors and underfloor heating.
- An Orangerie was different and more energy efficient than conservatories because of its design.

The Planning and Environmental Planning Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members commented that the proposals were acceptable.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendation and **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **APPROVE** the planning permission subject to conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Maxey Conservation Area would not be unacceptably impacted upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the amenity of surrounding residents, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

CHAIRMAN
1.30 – 3.57 PM