

<b>Name of Review: Railways</b>
<p><b>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To investigate what level of service would be best for Maidstone.</li> <li>• Look at quality of rolling stock on Maidstone services.</li> <li>• Look at the quality of stations and car parking facilities.</li> <li>• Look into whether commuters travel out of Maidstone to access rail services from a location offering more efficient services, in particular rural stations in the Borough.</li> <li>• Identify reasons for service cuts.</li> <li>• Identify to what extent there are problems with the service, and to what extent there is an issue with perception.</li> <li>• Provide evidence to support lobbying.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What equality issues will need to be considered as part of the review – giving consideration to the 6 strands:</b> Age Gender Race Sexual orientation Faith Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility and suitability of rail services for disabled residents, the elderly and people with young children.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Which witnesses are required?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member for Environment.</li> <li>• Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy.</li> <li>• Councillor Malcolm Robertson, Member Transport Champion for the Council</li> <li>• South Eastern Trains</li> <li>• "Keep Our Trains" campaign group (<a href="http://www.keepourtrains.com">www.keepourtrains.com</a>)</li> <li>• MPs</li> <li>• Nigel Whitburn, Community Development Manager, Actions with Communities in Rural Kent.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public, consultation. *</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to the Kent Messenger "Trains: Maidstone Deserves Better" campaign</li> <li>• Take a train journey between Maidstone and London and speak with service users.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What information/training is needed?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usage statistics for services to be cut.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suggested time for review and report completion date</b></p> <p>2-3 months</p>
<p><b>How does the review link to council priorities?</b></p>

A place to achieve, prosper and thrive.
<p><b>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</b></p> <p>1 <i>Provides 'critical friend' challenge to executive policy-makers and decision-makers</i></p> <p>2 <i>Enables the voice and concerns of the public</i></p> <p>3 <i>Is carried out by 'independent minded governors' who lead and own the scrutiny role</i></p> <p>4 <i>Drives improvement in public services</i></p> <p>2 – Response to public concern over service cuts. 4 – Lobby provider to improve service.</p>
<p><b>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</b></p>

\* What do you know about the equality groups and the make-up of the people using the service or in the area? Qualitative and quantitative information

Think of the wider 'community' including people who possibly do not currently use the service but could or should.