

BOROUGH OF WATFORD

**EVALUATION OF ELECTION
PILOT SCHEMES 2000**

**Evaluation carried out by Steven
Lake on behalf of the Association of
Electoral Administrators**

Introduction

The Watford Borough Council is a district authority with an electorate of 60,620. It is geographically compact, covering an area of 2144 hectares. For Borough Council electoral purposes, it is divided into twelve wards, each returning three members. One third of the Council retires each year, one member per ward. There are no parishes in the Borough, and therefore there are no parish council elections. The wards and their electorates are as follows (figures are for the register of electors as first published which are used throughout this report for the sake of consistency):

Callowland	5016
Central	5016
Holywell	5101
Leggatts	5195
Meriden	5407
Nascot	5079
Oxhey	4786
Park	4994
Stanborough	5094
Tudor	4604
Vicarage	5196
Woodside	5132
<i>Total</i>	<i>60620</i>

The Borough was the subject of a periodic electoral review, which came into effect at the elections on 6 May 1999. On that date, the whole Council was elected for the first time using the new ward structure. Therefore, comparisons with previous elections are not strictly possible. However, turnout statistics for the previous elections are attached as Appendix A to this report.

The Borough undertook four pilot voting schemes. They were approved under the Borough of Watford (Pilot Schemes) Order 2000, and were;

- Mobile Ballot Box
- Early Polling
- Alteration of Polling Day
- Free Delivery of Election Address.

The simultaneous introduction of four schemes made it difficult to evaluate the effect of each individual scheme, as each impacted on the other.

The timetable for the election commenced two days after the date for which the timetable for ordinary elections would ordinarily have started. This was to allow for the polling being held on Saturday and Sunday 6 and 7 May instead of Thursday 4 May in accordance with the existing legislation.

The Returning Officer issued 685 postal votes including postal proxies. I was advised that this was fairly average for Watford. Approximately 70 permanent postal voters in residential care homes temporarily suspended their postal votes to allow them to vote via the mobile ballot box.

A number of polling station locations had to be changed because of the change from voting on a Thursday to the subsequent weekend. For some electors, these changes were unwelcome as they had to travel further to the new polling station to which they had been assigned. This was the cause of some adverse comment.

Mobile Ballot Box

The Order enabled electors at residential care homes, residential accommodation provided by the local authority under section 2(1) of the National Assistance Act, and sheltered accommodation to vote at their premises. The voting was in person, using a ballot box brought to the premises by, or on behalf of, the returning officer on 4 or 5 May 2000.

The returning officer identified thirty premises suitable for the mobile ballot box, and they were visited by his staff on Thursday 4 May 2000. Five teams of two visited the premises at pre-arranged times which had been notified to the residents in advance. The smallest number of residents was 5, the largest 128. The minimum length of time spent at any of the premises was 25 minutes, the longest was 2 hours 45 minutes.

The polling staff set up polling stations in common rooms and other communal facilities. They also visited the rooms of those voters unable to use the communal facilities.

In each home, the staff used a set procedure following notes provided by the returning officer. They:

- (a) Briefed the person in charge of the home about the procedure and any assistance required;
- (b) Displayed a copy of the requirements of secrecy;
- (c) Set up the room with an area to ensure the secrecy of the ballot;
- (d) Ensured that the statutory notices were displayed inside and outside of the polling station.

Electors followed the same procedure as they would have done in a normal polling station. Guidance was given to the staff to ensure that they did not influence the voters in any way, as the electors were primarily the elderly who may have required assistance in voting. The normal rules about votes marked by the presiding officer applied to the mobile ballot box, and the relevant forms were provided for completion.

Although candidates, agents and mobile voting agents were able to be in the room used as a polling station, there was no political activity surrounding the mobile ballot box. One candidate did visit one of the polling stations to ask how the procedure was working.

Where the polling staff had to visit the room of the elector, the ballot box, stamping instrument, register of electors, book of ballot papers etc. were taken to ensure that the same process could be followed as in a normal polling station. For some in this category, there was no possibility of them voting under normal circumstances, and the mobile ballot box provided a welcome opportunity to cast their vote.

Some residents retained their postal votes, but about 70 suspended their postal votes to be able to use the mobile ballot box facility. The majority of those interviewed were regular voters, however, some who were not habitual voters took the opportunity to vote because of the convenience of the ballot box being in their place of residence.

Major factors on the usage of the mobile ballot box appeared to be the time of day that it visited the premises, the level of fitness of the residents, and the enthusiasm of the head of the home to encourage the residents to use their vote.

In homes which were visited early in the day, most residents were still there. Where events such as coffee mornings were usually held on a Thursday, residents were used to staying in and were therefore available to vote. Where there was no pattern of such events on a Thursday, there was more likelihood of residents going out.

When the premises catered for the fit elderly, they were also more inclined to be away from home. Some of the residents are still in employment, and were out at work when the mobile ballot box visited their premises. The turnout levels in premises catering for the frail elderly were much higher. The overall total of votes cast was 414 and this was divided among the wards as follows:

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>%</i>
Callowland	0	0.00
Central	35	0.70
Holywell	43	0.84
Leggatts	55	1.06
Meriden	15	0.28
Nascot	93	1.83
Oxhey	45	0.94
Park	31	0.62
Stanborough	0	0.00
Tudor	18	0.39
Vicarage	23	0.44
Woodside	56	1.09
<i>Total</i>	<i>414</i>	<i>0.68</i>

All of those using the mobile polling station, whether they usually visited their local polling station or had a postal vote, preferred the opportunity to vote in person at their home. They were prepared to forego the continuation of their postal vote if the facility was to continue.

The support of the head of the home made a difference to the attitude of the residents. Although all were supportive, some actively encouraged the residents to vote, whereas others took a more neutral stance. Generally they thought it was an excellent idea, although the comment was made that it had created some additional work for the heads of homes in explaining the concept to their residents and dealing with the suspension of postal votes.

The percentage turnout of 55.57% of those eligible to vote (i.e. discounting those who had already used the early voting facilities or retained their absent votes) indicated that the scheme was appreciated by a majority of residents, although some wanted to retain their right to visit a polling station to cast their vote. Of the overall total of all of the 933 electors registered to vote at the premises in question, this represented a turnout of 44.37%. Research at polling stations on polling days showed that a number of the electors had exercised their right to vote in the traditional way.

Politically the initiative was supported by all of the local politicians who were interviewed. There was some concern that, if the initiative did not continue in the future at all levels of election, the work done in the past by the Council and political parties to encourage residents to apply for permanent postal votes would be lost.

Costs

The additional costs of this initiative were primarily for staffing (including travelling) and additional printing of ballot papers. There were also costs involved in writing to each of the 933 residents eligible under the scheme. Assuming the total cost was £2,000, the cost per voter was over £4.00. In terms of elector convenience, this could be considered to be reasonable.

Direct staffing costs were £50 per person = £500 + mileage of £33

Early Polling

The Order made provision for a polling station to be established on 27, 28 and 29 April 2000. The polling hours on those days were to be from 8.00am to 9.00pm each day. The polling station was to be available to electors of all wards for which polling was being held.

The polling station was established in a unit at the ASDA Hypermarket in North Watford. This was not central to the town, but had sufficient parking. Other premises could, possibly, have been used, but the shortage of time available made this the only possible option. The unit used was not ideal, as the majority of the public visiting the Hypermarket did not have to pass it. The disabled access was superb, as the Hypermarket had motability facilities and provided wheelchairs for use by disabled people.

The polling station was staffed by different people on each of the days. Each day, the station was controlled by a supervisor, and there were 14 staff to assist in the conduct of the poll. Staff not only issued ballot papers and carried out the normal polling station routines, but they had to encourage electors to come to the polling station.

A total of 2315 electors voted at the polling station. This was spread over the three days with 778 on Thursday, 809 on Friday and 728 on Saturday. This represented a turnout of 3.72% of the total electorate. The electors came from the following wards:

Ward	27 April 2000	28 April 2000	29 April 2000	Total	%
Callowland	46	50	56	152	3.03
Central	18	17	31	66	1.32
Holywell	26	23	10	59	1.16
Leggatts	97	117	127	341	6.56
Meriden	113	119	91	323	5.97
Nascot	48	56	38	142	2.78
Oxhey	30	25	13	68	1.42
Park	30	30	29	89	1.78
Stanborough	169	146	116	431	8.46
Tudor	87	91	102	280	6.08
Vicarage	6	15	15	36	0.69
Woodside	108	120	100	328	6.39
<i>Total</i>	<i>778</i>	<i>809</i>	<i>728</i>	<i>2315</i>	<i>3.52</i>

A separate ballot box was used for each day that voting took place. Ballot papers for all wards were placed in the same ballot box. Each night, after the close of poll, the ballot box was sealed and ballot paper accounts were completed for each of the wards. The sealed ballot box was returned to the Town Hall where it was stored in the strong room until the opening of the early voters' ballot box on Wednesday 3 May 2000 immediately following the initial opening of the postal voters' ballot box.

The ballot boxes were opened on Wednesday 3 May 2000. The ballot papers were sorted, face down, into the constituent wards. The totals balanced with the ballot paper accounts for each ward on each day. The papers were then placed in sealed

ballot boxes in preparation for the count following the close of the polls on Sunday 7 May 2000. The verification of the three ballot boxes took a total of 1 hour and 10 minutes. No candidates or agents were present during the opening of the ballot boxes. The sealed ballot boxes were stored in a locked committee room in Watford Town Hall until the commencement of the count on Sunday evening.

Only one political party had tellers present outside the polling station, and no candidates appointed polling agents. Some of the candidates at the election visited the polling station, but generally, political activity was low.

As can be seen from the above, the location of the polling station attracted a far larger number of voters from immediately around the Hypermarket than from further afield.

A random survey of voters was undertaken over the three day period. For most electors (78%), the early polling station was more convenient than their normal polling station. For those where it was not more convenient, the early polling station was used because the voters happened to be in the store and it relieved them of the necessity of going out to vote during the following weekend, or they used the facility instead of applying for a postal vote. The change of venue of a number of polling stations, due to weekend voting, resulted in a number of electors using the early polling station as the new polling station was less convenient than that previously used.

However, the overwhelming majority of voters using the early polling facility were regular voters. They used the facility because they happened to be shopping in the ASDA store, or were going to be unable to attend their designated polling station on the normal polling days. From the survey, no more than 3% of those voting did so because of the polling station at ASDA and would not have voted in the ordinary course of events. The moving of polling from Thursday to the following Saturday and Sunday prompted some electors to take advantage of the early voting facility, the reasons given being that they were either away or working at the weekend. The shortened polling hours (8am to 6pm) were also cited as a reason why the early voting facility was used as voters could not get back from their places of work within the voting hours. The issue of weekend voting raised some objections from electors using the early voting facility.

It was noticeable that the majority of electors using the early polling station brought their poll cards with them. This reinforced the perception that those using the facility were not random electors, attracted on the day, but were making a conscious choice in advance of leaving home to shop.

For most electors, the poll card was the prime source of information about early voting. However, following the publication of the local free newspaper, The Watford Observer, which carried a front-page story about early voting and the visit of the Prime Minister to the polling station, the number of electors attending due to the Press increased considerably.

Most electors at the early polling station were of the view that there should be more such stations to enable fuller and more equitable coverage. However, concerns were raised at the cost of providing the early polling station.

The waiting time at the polling station was usually very short. It was noticeable that electors were unwilling to wait for the opportunity to vote. At times, even the shortest queue raised a complaint and potential electors walked away. This was not the fault of the staff or the system, but at times there were up to eight electors wanting to vote.

Some electors, although using the facility, were concerned about the security of the ballot box during the period between voting and the count which was to be held ten days later.

A number of local politicians were also interviewed to ascertain their views. They all supported the early voting pilot, although it was suggested that there were too many days allowed for early voting. From their canvassing, they were aware that electors knew about the possibility to vote early. Some thought that it might affect the outcome of the election in some wards, whereas others thought that it would not do so.

The scheme did not appear to attract many younger electors to vote.

On the question raised by electors that a number of different venues should be used, there would be difficulties in marking the register of electors. It would require each venue to be linked to the other via a computer link to ensure that no elector voted more than once. The software to undertake this further step could be available, but would need to be fully tested before it was implemented in an election situation.

Several electors from the adjoining Three Rivers District Council area asked if they were able to use the early voting facility, and were disappointed that it did not cover their area. However, they were very supportive of the convenience that early voting provided to the electors of Watford.

Costs

The cost of providing the early polling station was, primarily, the cost of staffing together with the printing and distribution of leaflets and other promotional material. ASDA kindly provided the shop unit without charge, and this reduced the overall costs. It is estimated that the total cost amounted to £10,800. This has to be set against the number of voters using the facility. The cost per elector was therefore in excess of £4.00. It is a matter of judgement as to whether this would represent good value for money if it was to be considered as part of a best value regime. However, in terms of voter convenience, the scheme is very successful and worthy of continued support.

Conclusions

From the survey, and observation of voters, the process appeared to attract few new or casual voters. A large number, possibly in the region of 2/3rds, came with poll cards. There is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of voters involved found the availability of the early voting polling station a useful facility, but they were generally electors who would have voted at their normal polling station.

It is possible that, as electors see the early polling station in operation, more could be attracted to use it. However, it will be more for the convenience of existing electors than attracting new voters.

Weekend Voting

The Order permitted the Council to hold polling on Saturday 6 May and Sunday 7 May 2000. Thirty-nine polling stations were established in the twelve wards. Six were new stations because of difficulties in securing the normal stations for weekend use.

The voting on the Saturday produced the following turnout percentages (including mobile votes):

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>%</i>
Callowland	5016	380	7.58
Central	5016	844	16.83
Holywell	5101	357	7.00
Leggatts	5195	497	9.57
Meriden	5407	453	8.38
Nascot	5079	635	12.50
Oxhey	4786	633	13.23
Park	4994	776	15.54
Stanborough	5094	424	8.32
Tudor	4604	597	12.97
Vicarage	5196	458	8.81
Woodside	5132	544	10.60
	60620	6598	10.88

The Sunday turnout figures were:

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>%</i>
Callowland	5016	360	7.18
Central	5016	682	13.60
Holywell	5101	460	9.02
Leggatts	5195	626	12.05
Meriden	5407	357	6.60
Nascot	5079	550	10.83
Oxhey	4786	611	12.77
Park	4994	653	13.08
Stanborough	5094	482	9.46
Tudor	4604	563	12.23
Vicarage	5196	529	10.18
Woodside	5132	483	9.02
	60620	6356	10.48

The weather on the Saturday was hot and sunny, and this may have been a consideration in the turnout figures. The Sunday weather was similar, and this may also have affected turnout as this was the warmest weekend of the year and electors may have opted to make use of their leisure time away from the Borough or in ways which could have militated against their being able to attend at a polling station.

Overall, there was little difference in the turnout between Saturday and Sunday. There was some variation between Wards, but again, there was nothing particularly significant.

Electors were surveyed over the two days by way of a simple questionnaire, and general discussion. Polling station staff were also asked for their observations and to report any views that had been expressed to them.

Although the majority of electors normally voted, there were a number for whom weekend voting afforded an opportunity to vote in person that was not otherwise available. There were some electors who supported Saturday voting, but objected to the polling being held on the Sunday. Nearly all Saturday voters supported polling being held over two days, and many preferred the option of the normal Thursday together with the subsequent Saturday. The Sunday voters generally supported weekend voting, and the issue of which days did not arise. For many voters, the change of days resulted in them forgetting that the election was being held. The effect of all other ordinary elections in England being held on the preceding Thursday may have contributed to this. The Borough Council continued to provide publicity throughout the two days with an advertising lorry being driven round the area reminding electors of weekend voting.

For nearly all electors, the issue of convenience to voters was important. There was widespread support for the Council's initiative of making voting as easy as possible. Where electors supported the retention of weekend voting, they also expressed the view that the early voting opportunity should be retained to allow those who were away at the weekend to be able to vote.

There was a small percentage of voters for whom weekend voting provided the first opportunity to vote in person. They had not bothered to apply for absent votes in the past, and were therefore new to the system.

There were some advantages to weekend voting in administrative terms, especially the ability to use schools without disrupting the school day. However, this was offset to a certain degree because of the lateness of the approval to the pilot which meant that schools had already made their plans.

For many electors, the tradition of voting on Thursdays was cited as a reason for being opposed to change. There was a disparity of view on after work voting on Thursdays, for some electors it was the most convenient time as it did not disrupt their free time too much. For others, the opportunity to vote at the weekend meant that they did not have to go out again on a Thursday when they were tired.

Many voters were in the older age group, and the choice of day was not really relevant. They were not constrained by the day, unless they had prearranged social activities, mainly visiting family members for whom the weekend was their only free time.

There were again few young voters. The change to weekend voting did not appear to encourage many new voters to vote at the polling stations.

On the question of voting hours, the electors were generally satisfied that there was sufficient time for them to vote over the two day period, although there were some who supported longer opening hours both at the weekend, and for Thursday voting. The latter is due, in part, to the fact that there are a large number of commuters in Watford, and they would find longer hours more convenient.

Costs

The additional cost of weekend voting amounted to approximately £30,000, of which £24,000 was for staffing and £6,000 for the hire of polling stations. Some electors, whilst in favour of two day voting, were concerned that it should only continue if there was a significant increase in turnout to justify the additional costs.

Conclusions

On initial analysis of the turnout figures, the success of weekend voting may appear questionable. However, it may need to be repeated a number of times before the electorate becomes accustomed to the change. There is a danger however, that with the 2001 elections being for the Herfordshire County Council and Parliament, the impetus gained for the pilot will be lost if the voting in the Borough for those two elections reverts to Thursdays. In fact, it may cause more confusion and irritation to the electorate if the voting days are subject to continual change.

Free Delivery of Election Address.

The Order permitted the Borough Council to provide free delivery of election material, in a single postal delivery, for all candidates. This facility was not to count against the candidates' election expenses.

The overwhelming majority of electors interviewed at both the early voting facility and on polling days had received the literature from the candidates. Nearly all of those who received the literature advised that it did not affect whether they voted, or the candidate for whom they cast their vote.

This initiative was not supported by all candidates questioned. There was a view that the parties should arrange their own literature distribution, and the circularisation of political material was not the role of the local authority.

Costs

The total delivery costs were £7555.31 (7p per leaflet delivered).

Conclusions.

It had little effect in increasing turnout, and was not widely used by electors to inform themselves of the policies of the respective candidates. Where it was so used, the very few electors found it invaluable, especially new voters. There was a comment from electors new to the area that they would have welcomed personal canvassing from the candidates to enable them to ask questions.

Administration

The administration of the election created a number of difficulties for the Returning Officer. These included:

- the requirement to have a different official mark on each day of the election;
- the necessity to have a different mark on the register of electors, used in the polling station, for each day of the election;
- security for early voting, postal and mobile ballot boxes together with the ballot boxes used on the Saturday;
- the writing of instructions for polling staff in respect of each of the pilots;
- the requirement to have extra ballot boxes and other equipment; and
- the necessity to employ staff at weekends for polling station and counting duties.

The Returning Officer devised different marks for each of the days that voting took place. In all, seven different official marks were used. It is questionable whether, at the count, had someone introduced a ballot paper with a different official mark, it would have been noticed. This brought into question the validity of the purpose of the official mark. Although only one ballot paper was rejected for want of the official mark, it highlighted the fact that a ballot paper was rejected at a time when the Borough Council was doing all it could to encourage electors to take part in the democratic process.

The various marks on the register did not appear to cause any problems. The marks used were:

Early Voting - Thursday	T
Early Voting - Friday	F
Early Voting - Saturday	S
Mobile Voting	M
Saturday	-
Sunday	*

Although the marks used were necessary to overcome potential challenges, and were clear, there could have been a potential problem with the use of “F” as it also denoted an overseas elector. However, this problem did not arise in practice, and the options selected worked well and the polling staff all understood the marks to be used. The Registers were well controlled throughout the process, and there appeared to be little opportunity, if any at all, for double voting. The use of different register markings was proved when one elector who had used an early voting polling station presented himself at the normal polling station having forgotten that he had voted over a week earlier.

Security for the early voting ballot boxes was initially provided in the Council strong room. This was sufficient, although a number of staff potentially had access to the room. Subsequently, the boxes were locked in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall. Given the number of boxes involved, this was the best option available to the Returning Officer. There were some concerns about the security issue, and also the risk of fire etc. If possible the boxes should be stored in future in a more secure environment such as the Police Station. The boxes were sealed, and seal numbers

recorded to ensure that the boxes were not tampered with. This part of the exercise ensured that the boxes were correctly dealt with, thus overcoming some of the comments made about security by electors.

The need to write clear and concise instructions for staff was of paramount importance. All staff received clear guidance on the procedures to be followed, and there did not appear to be any difficulties in the guidance notes produced. The need for additional ballot boxes and other equipment was an additional cost, which fell on the Borough Council.

There was adequate and well thought out equipment supplied to polling station staff, including those in the early polling station and those responsible for mobile voting. New forms had to be prepared to record the statistics at the various stages, and again these were well designed, easy to use and worked well.

Although staffing could have been a problem, there were sufficient volunteers to enable the Council to have adequate staff available for all of the days when voting, and counting, were taking place. The staff were well trained and well supervised. The staff involved were supportive of the attempts being made by the Borough Council, and were happy to work on the days chosen for polling.

Publicity

The Borough Council undertook an extensive publicity campaign to reach as many electors as possible in the weeks preceding the election. In addition to the poll card sent to every elector, the Council, publicised the election by:

- a front page article in Issue 23 of Watford Today, the Council's newspaper which is delivered to every household in the Borough;
- advertisements in the local media;
- posters on display at public establishments;
- an admobile which toured the Borough encouraging electors to vote;
- leaflets handed out at ASDA to advise electors that the early voting station was available;
- a letter to every elector, delivered with the pollcard; and
- interviews with the local media, before and during the election process.

The total cost of all of the publicity was in the region of £9,000.

Turnout

The overall turnout for the election was 26.99%. The breakdown on a ward basis is shown in Appendix A attached. There was no direct correlation between the number of early voters in a ward, and the eventual turnout.

If the figures are adjusted to the number of electors eligible to vote (60274), the turnout increases to 27.15%. This remains below the national average.

Reading Borough Council, a reasonable comparator with Watford, had a turnout of 26.37% (27524 of an electorate of 104372) voting on the usual Thursday. Against this, the Watford percentage looks to be acceptable.

Conclusions

Despite the best endeavours of the Borough Council, the overall turnout for the election was 26.99%. There was a great deal of publicity for early voting and the weekend polling days. With the opportunity to vote on five days, together with the normal availability of postal and proxy votes, very few (if any) electors would have been disadvantaged by the pilots and the overwhelming majority had considerably more opportunity to cast their vote than ever before. In total, polling stations were open to all electors for 59 hours over five days.

The factors which might have affect the turnout were:

- the good weather over the weekend period;
- the effect of all of the other ordinary elections being held on the preceding Thursday;
- the publicity surrounding the London Mayoral and Assembly elections adding to the confusion of electors about the day of elections;
- electors forgetting the change of day;
- the general nature of the electors, many of whom are commuters, who are more likely to vote at their local polling stations on the way to, or from, work during a week day; and
- the value that working people put on their weekend leisure time.

There was no evidence that electors complained about not being able to vote because of the change of days, so the factors creating the decreased level of turnout were not caused by the pilots. Furthermore, the figures from the General Election held on 1 May 1997 suggest that polling day on a Thursday, using the normal polling stations albeit with longer opening hours, can generate a turnout of 74%.

Of the local politicians questioned, some thought that compulsory voting would be the best way to increase turnout, the concept of total postal voting was also favoured. It was also suggested that four-yearly all-out elections for the whole council would overcome the lack of interest shown by electors in the 2000 elections.

The value of the official mark needs to be re-examined as it served little practical purpose as none of the counting staff would have been able to recognise whether a ballot paper had a valid official mark or not.

Appendix A

Election Date	7 May 2000	10 June 1999	6 May 1999	7 May 1998	1 May 1997	2 May 1996	4 May 1995
National Average	29%	23.0%	31.2%	28.2%	71.4%	34.2%	38.4%
Borough Council Average	26.99%	0%	36%	31%	74%	35%	39%
Callowland	18.22%	0%	26%	21%	0%	25%	31%
Central	33.79%	0%	37%	31%	0%	34%	42%
Holywell	18.78%	0%	26%	20%	0%	25%	30%
Leggatts	30.13%	0%	38%	34%	0%	33%	34%
Meriden	22.69%	0%	30%	28%	74%	28%	33%
Nascot	29.65%	0%	36%	27%	73%	32%	37%
Oxhey	29.96%	0%	42%	40%	0%	38%	37%
Park	32.00%	0%	41%	37%	0%	45%	48%
Stanborough	27.17%	0%	36%	32%	0%	43%	38%
Tudor	32.80%	0%	39%	30%	0%	35%	47%
Vicarage	21.29%	0%	34%	31%	0%	41%	41%
Woodside	28.57%	0%	41%	36%	0%	46%	45%
County Council Average	0%	0%	0%	0%	73%	0%	0%
Callowland Leggatts	0%	0%	0%	0%	72%	0%	0%
Central Oxhey	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%	0%	0%
Meriden Tudor	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%
Nascot Park	0%	0%	0%	0%	76%	0%	0%
Vicarage Holywell	0%	0%	0%	0%	68%	0%	0%
Woodside Stanborough	0%	0%	0%	0%	74%	0%	0%
Parliamentary	0%	0%	0%	0%	74%	0%	0%
European Parliamentary	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Election Date	7 May 2000	10 June 1999	6 May 1999	7 May 1998	1 May 1997	2 May 1996	4 May 1995

Appendix B

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Electo rate</i>	<i>Sat Turnout</i>	<i>Sat %</i>	<i>Sun Turnout</i>	<i>Sun %</i>	<i>Early Total</i>	<i>Early %</i>	<i>Mobile Turnout</i>	<i>Mobile %</i>	<i>Postal Turnout</i>	<i>Postal %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total %</i>
Callowland	5016	380	7.58	360	7.18	152	3.03	0	0.00	22	0.44	914	18.22%
Central	5016	844	16.83	682	13.60	66	1.32	35	0.70	68	1.36	1695	33.79%
Holywell	5101	357	7.00	460	9.02	59	1.16	43	0.84	39	0.76	958	18.78%
Leggatts	5195	497	9.57	626	12.05	341	6.56	55	1.06	46	0.89	1565	30.13%
Meriden	5407	453	8.38	357	6.60	323	5.97	15	0.28	79	1.46	1227	22.69%
Nascot	5079	635	12.50	550	10.83	142	2.78	93	1.83	86	1.69	1506	29.65%
Oxhey	4786	633	13.23	611	12.77	68	1.42	45	0.94	77	1.60	1434	29.96%
Park	4994	776	15.54	653	13.08	89	1.78	31	0.62	49	0.96	1598	32.00%
Stanborough	5094	424	8.32	482	9.46	431	8.46	0	0.00	47	0.92	1384	27.17%
Tudor	4604	597	12.97	563	12.23	280	6.08	18	0.39	52	1.13	1510	32.80%
Vicarage	5196	458	8.81	529	10.18	36	0.69	23	0.44	60	1.15	1106	21.29%
Woodside	5132	544	10.60	483	9.02	328	6.39	56	1.09	55	1.07	1466	28.57%
Total	60620	6598	10.88	6356	10.48	2315	3.52	414	0.68	680	1.12	16363	26.99%