

(Call-in form contd) Believe the decision may be based on inaccurate or incorrect information (which is identified)

The integrated impact assessment provided did not relate to the decision being taken. The assessment seemed to attempt to address the question of whether a Clean Air Zone should be implemented or not. However the actual decision being taken was whether to amend the (previously) agreed boundaries of the proposed Clean Air Zone. This meant that the impact assessment focused primarily on the positive benefits of introducing a Clean Air Zone and did not address any potential negative impacts of reducing the size of the zone. This is notably significant in relation to Fratton Road where there is a concentration of businesses worked in, and frequented by, ethnic minorities. There is growing evidence of linkages between risk of serious illness from Covid 19, air pollution and disproportionate impacts on minority communities - this is an important topic that should have been addressed as part of the equalities impact assessment.

- Cabinet members repeatedly noting the decision of the boundary being “out of their hands” when in reality the outcome from the decision meeting is to ask the government to remove Kingston Road and Fratton Road from the zones. This implies that it was in their hands as it were and they are giving misleading information to the public.

Believe the decision may have been taken without adequate information (of which the nature has been identified)

- The report did not refer to the potential benefits of a Clean Air Zone for those who work, live and learn in the Fratton Road and Kingston Road area.
- The report did not explore the particular make up of those communities and the potential implications of those social classifications. For example we know that there is a significantly higher incidence of respiratory illnesses in the areas around Fratton Road and Kingston Road - what are the implications of this for reducing the size of the Clean Air Zone?
- The report did not refer to relevant evidence regarding illegal levels of pollution in the areas in question. For example the Assessment of Air Quality - Annual Statement Report 2020 presented to the Cabinet Portfolio Decision Meeting for Environment and Climate change on the 23rd July 2020 made specific reference to dangerous levels of pollution on Fratton Road.
- The report did not detail the public health risks of exposure to nitrogen dioxide. How can decision makers come to an informed position about reducing the size of the Clean Air Zone without reference to the potential negative impacts?
- During their deliberations decision makers repeatedly made reference to the economic case for reducing the size of the Clean Air Zone however it was unclear what the evidence base for this was. There is no reference to the economic case within the published reports.