



Local elections 2018

The TUSC results

Report

Summary points – page 3

Introductory overview – page 5

A note on statistical methods – page 9

Table One: Council ward results ‘league table’ – page 10

Table Two: Regional breakdown of the full results:

London – page 11

Northern – page 13

North West – page 14

Southern – page 15

South West – page 15

West Midlands – page 16

Yorkshire & Humberside – page 17

Clive Heemskerk
TUSC National Election Agent
May 7th 2018

Summary points

- The Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition (TUSC) stood a total of 111 council candidates in 33 authorities in the local elections held on May 3rd, contesting 101 wards. TUSC also stood a candidate in one of the five Mayoral elections taking place on the same day.
- This was the most selective local election stand that TUSC has taken in its eight-year history, following the general re-calibration of its electoral policy after Jeremy Corbyn's welcome victory as Labour leader in September 2015.
- There was not a single TUSC candidate on May 3rd standing in a direct head-to-head contest with a Labour candidate who had been a consistent public supporter of Jeremy Corbyn and his anti-austerity policies.
- The scrutiny process applied by the TUSC national steering committee and the component parts of the TUSC coalition, including the Socialist Party and the RMT transport workers' union, ensured that TUSC only stood candidates against right-wing Labour councillors and candidates.
- The Labour candidates in the seats contested by TUSC included 32 councillors who had publically backed the leadership coup attempt against Jeremy Corbyn in summer 2016, signing a national Open Letter of support for the right-wing challenger Owen Smith.
- Labour councillors with TUSC candidates standing against them included six council leaders and over 15 council cabinet members, responsible for implementing the Tories' austerity agenda in the councils that they lead.
- There were 31 Labour-led councils in which TUSC contested seats on May 3rd. These councils had voted for around half a billion pounds of further cuts to local jobs and services in their 2018-19 budget-setting meetings earlier this year. The councillors who supported this could not be seen as 'anti-austerity councillors' in any definable way.
- The stand-out result for TUSC was the victory of national steering committee member Keith Morrell, one of the three Putting People First group of anti-cuts councillors that sits on Southampton council. Keith was re-elected with a 46.9% share of the vote in his Coxford ward, up from 42.7% when he first stood independently in 2014 after his expulsion from the Labour Party the previous year.
- The next best score was recorded in Kirklees council's Crosland Moor & Netherton ward, with TUSC polling 701 votes for a 14.2% share. The other TUSC candidate in Kirklees polled 285 votes, 6.4%, in Ashbrow ward. Both candidates are key organisers of the Hands Off Huddersfield Royal Infirmary campaign which has conducted a two-year long struggle to stop the closure of the hospital's A&E department.
- The best performance in a single council was achieved in Waltham Forest, with TUSC polling 2,841 votes across the 12 wards (out of 20) contested there. In neighbouring Newham council four TUSC candidates polled 634 votes, targeting councillors who have refused to back the struggle against school academisation plans in the East London borough.
- In just under one fifth of the wards it contested TUSC polled five percent or more of the vote. The mean average vote for TUSC council candidates overall was 3.7%.

- In nearly one-third of the council wards TUSC contested on May 3rd, the Liberal Democrats – supposedly on the ‘road to recovery’ – were either outpolled by TUSC or they could not find a candidate to stand.
- There was a Green Party candidate in 81 of the 101 wards contested by TUSC (in all of which, as explained, the Labour candidate was an opponent of Jeremy Corbyn and his anti-cuts policies). Significantly, the Greens were able to exploit their national profile as a radical alternative to right-wing Labour to achieve a second place finish in 21 of these seats.
- Without the same media profile it was creditable that TUSC was able to outpoll the Greens in seven head-to-head contests – as well, of course, as the 20 wards where the Greens had insufficient local support to get a candidate onto the ballot paper.
- The total number of votes received for all TUSC candidates on May 3rd was 14,073, comprised of 13,345 votes for the council candidates and the 728 votes polled by TUSC’s candidate for the mayor of Tower Hamlets, UNISON NEC member Hugo Pierre (standing in a personal capacity).
- Including the results from this year’s more selective stand, just under 380,000 votes have now been cast for TUSC’s 100% anti-austerity socialist platform since the formation of our coalition in 2010.

Overview

This year's local elections took place on Thursday May 3rd, with contests in the 32 London boroughs and a further 119 English Metropolitan borough councils, unitary authorities and district councils. There were also mayoral elections in Watford and the London boroughs of Hackney, Lewisham, Newham and Tower Hamlets and a 'Metro-Mayor' election for the new South Yorkshire 'Sheffield City Region' combined authority area.

The Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition (TUSC) stood 111 council candidates in these elections, in 101 wards across 33 local authorities, as well as a candidate for the mayor of Tower Hamlets.

Overall TUSC candidates won a total of 14,073 votes. The stand-out result was the victory of TUSC national steering committee member Keith Morrell, who was re-elected to Southampton city council with a 46.9% share of the vote in his Coxford ward. Full details of the results achieved are given in the statistical tables that follow this introductory overview.

A selective stand

This was the most selective local election stand that TUSC has taken in its eight-year history, following the general re-calibration of our electoral policy after Jeremy Corbyn's welcome victory as Labour leader in September 2015.

A debate was opened in November last year when the TUSC national steering committee agreed to organise a conference for February 2018 with the main session to be headed 'Building support for Jeremy Corbyn's anti-cuts policies in the 2018 local elections'. This was advertised as including the question of whether or not socialist anti-austerity candidates should stand in May.

At the conference platform speakers from the component parts of the steering committee participated in the debate – the TUSC Individual Members' representative Roger Charles, the Socialist Party's deputy general secretary Hannah Sell, and the RMT transport workers' union. A letter of invitation to speak had been sent to the RMT general secretary Mick Cash when the conference was announced in November but in the event national president Sean Hoyle and national executive member Paul Reilly were present from the union.

The outcome of the conference debate was to support resolutions encouraging candidates – but not “against consistent public supporters of Jeremy Corbyn and his anti-austerity policies” (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17389/15-02-2018/tusc-conference-sets-parameters-for-may-election-challenge>).

The successful resolutions recognised that the TUSC national steering committee had been correct not to authorise candidates to stand in the 2017 general election, in which the working class had an opportunity to change the government and put Jeremy Corbyn into Number Ten. This was from the position of TUSC having been the sixth-biggest party on the ballot paper in the 2015 general election.

But local elections are not the same as a general election, which is about determining who forms the government at a national level. The issue in local elections on the other hand should be about how councils can expand or at least defend local public services provision – and, in doing so, best use their still considerable powers to resist the drive for cuts and privatisation coming from Westminster. A defiant stand by even a handful of councils of using council reserves and borrowing powers to refuse to make the cuts, as campaigned for by TUSC, could be the catalyst to bring down the Tories.

But that is not the position of those defenders of capitalism within the Labour Party – Labour's right-wing – who predominate not just among MPs but in local council Labour Groups too. They

willingly carry out the Tory government's austerity agenda. It was councillors from this camp, the conference agreed, that TUSC candidates were to stand against on May 3rd.

A rigorous process

The scrutiny process applied by the TUSC national steering committee and the component parts of our coalition, including the Socialist Party and the RMT, ensured that TUSC only stood candidates against right-wing Labour councillors and candidates.

Every potential candidate seeking the legally-necessary Certificate of Authorisation to appear on the ballot paper under the TUSC name was required to complete an application form. This included requests for information on who the Labour candidate was in the ward to be contested; what efforts had been made to discuss the possibilities of joint action against austerity with the Labour candidate rather than stand in the local elections; and the main outlines of the council Labour Group's budget proposals for 2018-19.

These application forms were then circulated to every member of the TUSC national steering committee for scrutiny. This gave the opportunity for any member of the committee, or any constituent organisation, to object to a particular candidacy, which would mean that a Certificate of Authorisation would not be issued.

Some prospective TUSC candidacies were queried through this process. Acting on comments received that Labour candidates in a number of seats were not in fact on the right of the party, the RMT general secretary Mick Cash contacted the TUSC national election agent to relay the concerns raised.

In two of the seats the prospective TUSC candidates had already withdrawn, after the Labour candidates had belatedly contacted them to explain their position on Jeremy Corbyn and their preparedness to resist council cuts. In the other seats mentioned – where the Labour candidates included a member of the Blairite Progress group, public supporters of Yvette Cooper, Andy Burnham and Owen Smith in the 2015 and 2016 Labour leadership elections, and council cabinet members supporting cuts budgets – the information given in reply to Mick Cash was sufficient to result in the TUSC candidacies going ahead.

In total, the Labour candidates in the seats contested by TUSC included 32 councillors who had publically backed the leadership coup attempt against Jeremy Corbyn in summer 2016, signing a national Open Letter of support for the right-wing challenger Owen Smith. They included the Labour candidate in Grimsby's Yarborough ward, who was suspended from the Labour Party during the election after the local paper revealed that in 2016 he had tried to defect to the Tories following Jeremy Corbyn's re-election! (See <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17398/15-04-2018/grimsby-local-paper-reveals-labour-candidate-tried-to-defect-to-the-tories>)

Overall, as far as it is reasonably possible to know, there was not a single TUSC candidate on May 3rd standing in a direct head-to-head contest with a Labour candidate who had been a consistent public supporter of Jeremy Corbyn – and, most importantly, the anti-austerity policies which had won him the Labour leadership and which lay behind the massive surge in support for Labour in last year's general election.

Words or actions: the Labour councils' record

There were 31 Labour-led councils in which TUSC contested seats on May 3rd. Like all other councils they had set their budgets for the 2018-2019 financial year in February or March. What did they do to put Jeremy Corbyn's anti-austerity message into action in the run-up to this year's elections?

The 31 councils control combined budgets of just under £30 billion pounds. At the end of the previous financial year they had held £3.4 billion in useable 'General Fund reserves' – which can be spent on non-housing services – and £1.9 billion in Housing Revenue Account and Capital Receipts reserves (see the TUSC report on the financial position of all Labour-led councils, *How much reserves have they got?*, at <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/402.pdf>. A 43-page TUSC briefing pack showing how these can be used to resist austerity, *Preparing a No Cuts People's Budget*, published in early 2016, is also available at <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/355.pdf>)

Despite having these billions of pounds of resources available, the 31 Labour-led councils in which TUSC contested seats voted for around half a billion pounds of further cuts to local jobs and services in their 2018-19 budget-setting meetings, in some instances actually adding to their reserves. How in any definable way can those who made such decisions be described as 'anti-austerity councillors'?

A distinction could be made between an individual 'backbench' councillor and those occupying council cabinet positions. In 2016 the right-wing used their entrenched position in the party structures to make it a new disciplinary offence for a Labour councillor to "support any proposal" to set an unbalanced budget or to "vote against or abstain on a Labour Group policy decision on this matter".

In passing, the fact that a rule change that attempts to bind Labour councillors to back cuts budgets was introduced under Jeremy Corbyn's leadership is illuminating. It illustrates just how far there is to go before Labour overturns the political and organisational legacy of Tony Blair's 'New Labour' and is really transformed into a genuine anti-austerity party. Backbench councillors who oppose austerity should be prepared to defy the local Blairites and appeal to Jeremy Corbyn to intervene in support.

But the position regarding the Labour candidates who faced a TUSC challenge on May 3rd was clear. They included six council leaders – in Birmingham, Manchester, Newcastle, Gateshead, Waltham Forest and Tower Hamlets (the directly-elected mayor) – and over 15 council cabinet members. In Merseyside TUSC stood candidates against two members of the Liverpool City Region Transport Authority, responsible for trying to introduce Driver Only Operation (DOO) on Merseyrail and push safety-critical guards off the trains (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17394/06-04-2018/mersey-tusc-candidates-take-up-the-fight-to-keep-the-guards-on-our-trains>). There can be no question about the responsibility of these Labour candidates for implementing the Tories' austerity agenda in the councils that they lead.

And the other Labour candidates had also made their position clear in their responses to local TUSC supporters. In all the seats contested by TUSC the only candidates who pledged to put Jeremy Corbyn's anti-austerity policies into practise in the town hall were those from TUSC.

Protest outlets

This undermining of Jeremy Corbyn's anti-austerity message by what Labour councillors are doing on the ground had its effect on May 3rd.

The resolutions agreed at February's TUSC conference made the point that "to allow the Blairites to go unchallenged generally is to allow them to build their authority, which they will then use in the future to sabotage anti-capitalist policies under a Jeremy Corbyn-led government".

"To allow them to go unchallenged in local councils in particular", the resolution went on, "allows them additionally to undermine the possibility of winning a Corbyn government, by creating a vacuum for other forces to fill (including UKIP still) and re-enforcing the scepticism of many working class voters which saw rising abstentionism over the New Labour years, that 'politicians are all the same'." This warning was borne out on May 3rd, firstly in the generally low turnout for these elections but also in the performance of the Greens.

Nationally the Green Party made gains at the expense of right-wing Labour. This was confirmed by the experience of TUSC candidates locally.

There was a Green Party candidate in 81 of the 101 wards contested by TUSC (in all of which, as explained, the Labour candidate was an opponent of Jeremy Corbyn and his anti-cuts policies). Significantly, the Greens were able to exploit their national profile as a radical alternative to right-wing Labour to achieve a second place finish in 21 of these seats. The real record of the Greens of acquiescing to austerity, when they led Brighton council from 2011-2015 and where they have participated in coalitions in other local councils, is not widely known.

In that situation, without the same media profile, it was creditable that TUSC was able to outpoll the Greens in seven head-to-head contests – as well, of course, as the 20 wards where they had insufficient local support to get a candidate on the ballot paper: in Newham in East London, Preston, Birmingham, Grimsby, Plymouth, Gateshead, and two working class wards in Knowsley and Halton in Merseyside with TUSC candidates.

In some areas, like Grimsby, it was UKIP – still – that was able to position itself as the voice of protest against right-wing Labour, a warning for the future. The Liberal Democrats, while they made some recovery, were less able to capitalise on the local anger at right-wing Labour councils – in nearly one-third of the wards TUSC contested, the Lib Dems were either outpolled by TUSC or they could not find a candidate to stand.

But in a situation where Labour is still so clearly two-parties-in-one, with many local ‘Labour’ candidates standing more ferociously against Jeremy Corbyn than they do the Tories, the resulting vacuum can be indeed be filled by other forces. The task is still there to make sure that politicians of all party labels who do not oppose capitalism and its inevitable austerity agenda are not left unchallenged.

Future debates

Following the defeat of the 2016 coup by Labour's right-wing to unseat Jeremy Corbyn the TUSC national steering committee opened up a discussion on what needed to be done within the Labour Party to consolidate Jeremy's position and how TUSC should respond in the new situation. Different positions were put forward for consideration by the various components of the TUSC steering committee, published on the TUSC website (at <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/387.pdf>).

Two things that were clear however were, firstly, that TUSC would continue its campaign for Labour councils to join the resistance to the Tories' austerity agenda; and secondly, that responsibility for challenging alleged ‘Labour’ representatives who implemented Tory policies did not rest with TUSC alone. With Jeremy Corbyn's re-affirmed mandate, the argument was made, it could also be accomplished from within the Labour Party if the will was there.

But two local election cycles later, and after two more rounds of Labour councils setting cuts budgets, it is clear that this has still not been done. There must be – there will be – a new debate on how to ensure that the working class has a vehicle for political representation when Labour's parliamentary and council representatives are still overwhelmingly from the camp of the Blairite right-wing.

Including the results from this year's more selective stand, just under 380,000 votes have now been cast for TUSC's 100% anti-austerity socialist platform since the formation of our coalition in 2010. Whatever the outcome of the discussions within TUSC and its component parts on the way forward now, it has established its part in that wider debate.

A note on statistical methods

The results tables include a figure for the percentage of the vote won by TUSC in each council ward contested.

How this figure is worked out is straightforward in a contest for one seat – the percentage figure for the TUSC candidate being the percentage of all the votes cast.

But what about multi-seat contests where two or three councillors are elected from the same ward? Particularly, for example, where the council only publishes the votes cast for each candidate but not the turnout, or the size of the electorate? How to present such results, particularly where a party fields just one candidate in a two or three-seat contest, is a controversial question of psephology, the social science of election analysis.

TUSC has now been using the same method to calculate votes in multi-seat wards since 2011, which has the advantage of allowing a comparison across different year's election results.

In an example from the elections of that year, in Leicester's Rushey Mead ward the single TUSC candidate polled 272 votes, ahead of one Liberal Democrat candidate but behind the other two. It was a fact that 4.9% of the 5,524 people who voted in Rushey Mead used one of their three votes for TUSC. But they actually cast a total of 13,917 votes (which meant incidentally that 2,655 potential votes were not used). So how should TUSC's share of support in the ward be calculated? It could have been presented as a percentage of the total votes cast, 1.9%, and some councils do present the figures in this way. On the other hand, if all the ward's candidates' votes were presented as a percentage of the 5,524 actual voters, the total number of votes would be 300%.

So the method used is to record the TUSC vote (or the highest TUSC vote in a multi-seat ward with more than one TUSC candidate) as a percentage of the aggregate of the highest votes of all the parties contesting the ward, the highest vote being taken as a maximum expression of a particular party's support.

In the Rushey Mead example there wasn't much deviation from the percentage of ballots cast method. The aggregate of the highest Labour vote (2,789), the highest Independent (1,039), the Tories' highest vote (861), the top Lib Dem vote (556), and TUSC's 272 votes, came to a total of 5,517. On this calculation, TUSC again polled 4.9% in the ward.

This method is neither a 'correct' nor 'incorrect' way of presenting the support there for TUSC. It is just another method, with its limitations openly acknowledged.



Elections 2018:

TUSC council ward results ‘league table’

Below is a league table of all the results of five percent or more achieved by TUSC candidates in the local council elections on May 3rd.

Nineteen TUSC candidates reached this benchmark, out of the 101 wards contested by TUSC in the scheduled local elections. The mean average vote for TUSC council candidates overall was 3.7%.

The results are listed in percentage order, giving the votes won by the TUSC candidate (the highest placed where applicable) and with the percentage vote in parentheses (see Note on Statistical Methods on how this was calculated in multi-seat wards).

	Local authority	Ward	Vote
1	Southampton	Coxford	1,595 (46.9%)
2	Kirklees	Crosland Moor & Netherton	701 (14.2%)
3	Coventry	St Michaels	350 (12.8%)
4	Gateshead	High Fell	174 (10.7%)
5	Knowsley	Shevington	156 (10.0%)
6	Halton	Halton Brook	106 (8.6%)
7	North East Lincolnshire	Yarborough	168 (8.3%)
8	Newham	East Ham South	255 (7.2%)
9	Waltham Forest	Hoe Street	281 (6.7%)
10	Waltham Forest	High Street	297 (6.4%)
11	Kirklees	Ashbrow	285 (6.4%)
12	Lewisham	Rushey Green	253 (6.2%)
13	Leeds	Gipton & Harehills	357 (6.1%)
14	Waltham Forest	Markhouse	230 (5.9%)
15	Liverpool	Kirkdale	149 (5.9%)
16	Waltham Forest	William Morris	229 (5.7%)
17	Waltham Forest	Lea Bridge	214 (5.4%)
18	Coventry	Radford	163 (5.4%)
19	Newcastle-upon-Tyne	Kenton	138 (5.2%)



Elections 2018: Regional breakdown of TUSC results

Listed are the votes received by every candidate in the wards contested by TUSC on May 3rd, with a percentage of the vote figure also given for the TUSC candidate (see Note on Statistical Methods on how this was calculated in multi-seat wards).

London

Tower Hamlets

Mayoral election	Hugo Pierre	Lab 37,619; PATH 13,113; Aspire 11,109; Con 6,149; LD 5,598; Green 3,365; TUSC 728 (0.9%) <i>First preference votes cast 77,681</i>
------------------	-------------	---

Hackney

Hoxton East & Shoreditch (three seats)	Chris Newby	Lab 1,530; Lab 1,411; Lab 1,230; Green 355; Green 298; Green 233; LD 194; Con 193; LD 193; LD 191; Con 174; Con 153; TUSC 88 (3.7%) <i>Aggregate vote 2,360</i>
Stoke Newington (three seats)	Mick Cotter	Lab 2,605; Lab 2,581; Lab 2,111; Green 991; Green 748; Green 627; LD 446; LD 305; LD 299; Con 232; Con 184; Con 167; TUSC 88 (2.0%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,362</i>

Haringey

Seven Sisters (three seats)	Karen Tate; Nick Auvache; David Kaplan	Lab 2,306; Lab 2,225; Lab 2,121; Con 441; Con 429; Con 400; Green 399; Green 287; Green 272; LD 155; LD 151; TUSC 130 (3.8%); TUSC 124; LD 119; TUSC 118 <i>Aggregate vote 3,431</i>
-----------------------------	--	--

Hounslow

Hounslow Central (three seats)	John Viner	Lab 2,402; Lab 2,392; Lab 2,211; Con 804; Con 793; Con 697; Green 387; LD 270; Green 259; Green 228; Polska 168; Polska 163; Polska 152; TUSC 81 (2.0%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,112</i>
Hounslow South (three seats)	Sukhmani Sethi	Lab 2,175; Lab 1,926; Lab 1,784; Con 1,107; Con 1,084; Con 1,045; Green 421; LD 350; Green 339; Green 255; TUSC 58 (1.4%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,111</i>

Lambeth

Stockwell (three seats)	Lisa Bainbridge; Steve Nally	Lab 2,107; Lab 1,828; Lab 1,778; LD 598; Green 592; Con 521; Con 505; Con 469; Con 433; Green 433; LD 405; LD 373; Green 352; TUSC 72 (1.8%); TUSC 40;
-------------------------	------------------------------	---

Polska 37
Aggregate vote 3,927

Lewisham

Brockley (three seats) Ellen Kenyon Peers Lab 2,606; Lab 2,448; Lab 2,040; Green 1,457; Green 1,260; Green 911; WEP 542; LD 322; Con 318; Con 302; LD 295; Con 242; LD 202; **TUSC 74 (1.4%)**
Aggregate vote 5,319

Rushey Green (three seats) Tracey Edwards; Andy Beadle; Steve Rumney Lab 2,285; Lab 2,063; Lab 2,041; Green 529; Green 429; Con 362; LD 339; Polska 339; Con 280; Con 275; **TUSC 253 (6.2%)**; LD 253; LD 233; Green 109; **TUSC 82; TUSC 74**
Aggregate vote 4,107

Merton

Abbey (three seats) Piero Miloro Lab 1,476; Con 1,446; Lab 1,409; Con 1,399; Con 1,383; Lab 1,323; LD 547; LD 464; **TUSC 77 (2.2%)**
Aggregate vote 3,546

Newham

East Ham South (three seats) Mary Finch Lab 2,784; Lab 2,471; Lab 2,286; Con 508; Con 496; Con 466; **TUSC 255 (7.2%)**
Aggregate vote 3,547

Forest Gate South (three seats) Lois Austin Lab 2,540; Lab 2,510; Lab 2,485; Green 600; Con 416; LD 387; Con 371; Con 357; LD 344; LD 284; **TUSC 158 (3.9%)**
Aggregate vote 4,101

Royal Docks (three seats) James Ivens Lab 1,421; Lab 1,315; Lab 1,292; Con 504; Con 452; Con 372; Ind 360; LD 320; CPA 156; **TUSC 94 (3.3%)**
Aggregate vote 2,855

Wall End (three seats) Hannah Sell Lab 2,911; Lab 2,885; Lab 2,633; Con 701; Con 693; Con 627; CPA 169; **TUSC 127 (3.2%)**; CPA 118
Aggregate vote 3,908

Southwark

Bermondsey North (three seats) Gary Kadinsky LD 1,744; LD 1,570; LD 1,550; Lab 1,155; Lab 1,109; Lab 1,051; Con 452; Con 394; Con 368; Green 331; Green 229; UKIP 121; **TUSC 62 (1.6%)**
Aggregate vote 3,865

Waltham Forest

Cann Hall (three seats) Claire Laker-Mansfield Lab 1,993; Lab 1,971; Lab 1,958; LD 726; LD 682; LD 574; Green 434; Con 178; Con 167; Con 167; **TUSC 67 (2.0%)**
Aggregate vote 3,398

Cathall (three seats) Scott Jones Lab 1,996; Lab 1,887; Lab 1,863; Green 320; LD 231; Con 219; LD 205; Con 194; LD 194; Con 153; **TUSC 76 (2.6%)**
Aggregate vote 2,892

Chapel End (three seats) Kevin Parslow Lab 2,272; Lab 2,187; Lab 1,986; Green 712; Con 495; Con 459; LD 430; Con 429; LD 293; LD 279; **TUSC 153 (3.8%)**
Aggregate vote 4,062

Grove Green (three seats) Sarah Sachs-Eldridge Lab 2,052; Lab 2,047; Lab 1,997; LD 897; LD 725; LD 623; Green 456; Green 416; Con 247; Con 216; Con 200; **TUSC 128 (3.4%)**
Aggregate vote 3,780

High Street (three seats) Nancy Taaffe; Marvin Hay Lab 2,629; Lab 2,354; Lab 2,160; Green

		804; LD 374; LD 361; LD 358; Con 303; TUSC 297 (6.4%) ; Con 289; Con 263; Ind 259; TUSC 242 <i>Aggregate vote 4,666</i>
Hoe Street (three seats)	Paul Bell	Lab 2,409; Lab 2,222; Lab 2,219; Green 736; Con 395; Con 357; Con 355; LD 350; LD 348; LD 290; TUSC 281 (6.7%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,171</i>
Lea Bridge (three seats)	Martin Reynolds	Lab 2,313; Lab 2,131; Lab 2,036; Green 660; Con 408; Con 262; LD 252; LD 240; Con 222; TUSC 214 (5.4%) ; LD 175; Polska 97 <i>Aggregate vote 3,944</i>
Leyton (three seats)	Cedric Gerome	Lab 2,122; Lab 2,114; Lab 1,943; LD 1,253; LD 1,167; LD 1,162; Con 192; Con 190; Con 176; Polska 96; TUSC 85 (2.3%) <i>Aggregate vote 3,748</i>
Leytonstone (three seats)	Mark Best; Marijerla Ratnaseelan; Theo Sharieff- Winston	Lab 2,218; Lab 2,168; Lab 2,132; Green 628; Con 425; LD 358; LD 338; Con 338; Con 335; LD 252; TUSC 119 (3.2%) ; TUSC 97; TUSC 75 <i>Aggregate vote 3,748</i>
Markhouse (three seats)	Ben Robinson	Lab 2,173; Lab 2,075; Lab 2,064; Green 625; LD 379; Con 354; Con 335; Con 286; LD 250; TUSC 230 (5.9%) ; LD 203; Polska 106 <i>Aggregate vote 3,867</i>
William Morris (three seats)	Paula Mitchell; Ken Douglas	Lab 2,429; Lab 2,286; Lab 2,283; Green 743; Con 315; Con 303; Con 288; LD 280; LD 259; TUSC 229 (5.7%) ; TUSC 187 <i>Aggregate vote 3,996</i>
Wood Street (three seats)	Linda Taaffe; Lee Hawksbee	Lab 2,496; Lab 2,333; Lab 2,262; Green 612; Con 510; Con 479; Con 438; LD 359; LD 248; LD 242; TUSC 184 (4.4%) ; TUSC 172 <i>Aggregate vote 4,161</i>

Northern

Gateshead

Chowdene	Marika Smith	Lab 1,299; LD 380; Con 376; UKIP 112; Green 97; TUSC 33 (1.4%) <i>Votes cast 2,301</i>
Deckham	Norman Hall	Lab 1,229; Con 346; LD 131; Green 125; TUSC 71 (3.7%) <i>Votes cast 1,904</i>
High Fell	Sean Doherty	Lab 1,067; Con 271; TUSC 174 (10.7%) ; LD 107 <i>Votes cast 1,624</i>
Low Fell	Elaine Brunskill	LD 1,615; Lab 1,073; Con 341; Green; TUSC 32 (1.0%) <i>Votes cast 3,201</i>
Ryton, Crookhill & Stella (two seats)	Ros Cooper	Lab 1,425; Lab 1,291; LD 1,263; LD 905; Con 233; UKIP 194; Con 183; Green 152; TUSC 53 (1.6%) <i>Aggregate vote 3,320</i>

Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Arthur's Hill (three seats)	Daniel Gilmore	Lab 1,215; Lab 1,203; Lab 1,171; Green 191; Con 106; Con 97; Con 79; TUSC 77 (4.7%) ; LD 60; LD 48; LD 36
-----------------------------	----------------	---

Kenton (three seats)	Oisín Gourley	Aggregate vote 1,649 Lab 1,445; Lab 1,443; Lab 1,386; LD 427; Con 426; Con 414; LD 412; LD 322; Con 315; Green 213; TUSC 138 (5.2%) Aggregate vote 2,649
----------------------	---------------	---

North West

Halton

Halton Brook	Stephen Armstrong	Lab 882; Con 135; TUSC 106 (8.6%) ; LD 105 Votes cast 1,228
--------------	-------------------	--

Knowsley

Shevington	Neill Dunne	Lab 1,402; TUSC 156 (10.0%) Votes cast 1,558
------------	-------------	--

Liverpool

Kirkdale	Roger Bannister	Lab 2,094; TUSC 149 (5.9%) ; Green 104; Con 103; LD 76; Lib 23 Votes cast 2,541
----------	-----------------	--

West Derby	Ann Walsh	Lab 2,243; Con 278; Lib 274; LD 260; Green 107; TUSC 48 (1.5%) Votes cast 3,204
------------	-----------	--

Manchester

Crumpsall (three seats)	Grace Donaghey	Lab 2,783; Lab 2,644; Lab 2,517; Con 399; Con 303; Green 298; Con 263; LD 206; UKIP 148; Ind 138; TUSC 104 (2.6%) Aggregate vote 4,076
-------------------------	----------------	--

Harpurhey (three seats)	Jack Metcalf	Lab 1,773; Lab 1,656; Lab 1,464; Con 408; Con 329; Green 285; Con 279; TUSC 118 (4.6%) Aggregate vote 2,584
-------------------------	--------------	---

Miles Platting & Newton Heath (three seats)	Bridget Taylor	Lab 1,969; Lab 1,953; Lab 1,769; UKIP 297; Con 276; Green 268; Con 250; Con 212; TUSC 115 (3.9%) Aggregate vote 2,925
--	----------------	---

Preston

Fishwick	Tom Costello	Lab 734; Con 152; LD 65; TUSC 26 (2.7%) Votes cast 977
----------	--------------	--

Salford

Eccles	Matt Kilsby	Lab 1,748; Con 638; Green 185; LD 169; UKIP 134; TUSC 23 (0.8%) Votes cast 2,902
--------	-------------	---

Winton	Sally Griffiths	Lab 1,323; Con 417; Green 129; UKIP 116; LD 53; TUSC 46 (2.2%) Votes cast 2,091
--------	-----------------	--

Wirral

Bidston & St James	Warwick Roberts	Lab 1,866; Con 303; Green 119; LD 92; TUSC 84 (3.4%) Votes cast 2,464
--------------------	-----------------	--

Upton	John Murray	Lab 2,289; Con 1,125; Green 265; LD 166; TUSC 89 (2.3%) Votes cast 3,934
-------	-------------	---

Rock Ferry	Mark Hazlehurst	Lab 1,800; Con 267; Green 158; LD 112; TUSC 66 (2.7%) Votes cast 2,403
------------	-----------------	---

Southern

Basingstoke & Deane

Brighton Hill North	Mick Butler	Lab 452; LD 440; Con 353; TUSC 25 (2.0%) <i>Votes cast 1,270</i>
Norden	Mayola Demmenie	Lab 1,183; Con 428; LD 89; Ind 68; TUSC 36 (2.0%) <i>Votes cast 1,804</i>

Reading

Whitley	Neil Adams	Lab 1,412; Con 527; LD 126; Green 106; TUSC 30 (1.4%) <i>Votes cast 2,201</i>
---------	------------	---

Southampton

Bargate	Diane Cook	Lab 1,668; Con 827; LD 204; Green 184; TUSC 63 (2.1%) <i>Votes cast 2,946</i>
Coxford	Keith Morrell	1,595 (46.9%) ; Lab 958; Con 559; LD 103; Green 101; Ind 82 <i>Votes cast 3,398</i>
Freemantle	Peter Packwood	Lab 1,704; Con 1,484; LD 217; Green 185; Ind 167; TUSC 28 (0.7%) <i>Votes cast 3,785</i>
Peartree	Declan Clune	Con 1,725; Lab 1,579; LD 219; Green 142; TUSC 44 (1.2%) <i>Votes cast 3,709</i>
Portswood	Nick Chaffey	Lab 1,587; LD 923; Con 851; Green 348; TUSC 31 (0.8%) <i>Votes cast 3,740</i>
Woolton	Sue Atkins	Lab 1,495; Con 1,161; Green 148; LD 141; TUSC 109 (3.6%) <i>Votes cast 3,054</i>

South West

Plymouth

Devonport	Roxy Castell	Lab 1,893; Con 934; UKIP 159; LD 116; Green 99; Ind 84; TUSC 22 (0.7%) <i>Votes cast 3,307</i>
Efford & Lipson	Sam Taylor-Wickden	Lab 1,940; Con 997; Green 158; LD 97; TUSC 40 (1.2%) <i>Votes cast 3,232</i>
St Budeaux	Andy White	Lab 1,458; Con 1,189; Ind 165; LD 93; TUSC 57 (1.9%) <i>Votes cast 2,962</i>
St Peter & The Waterfront	Ian Groeber	Lab 1,981; Con 1,232; LD 221; Green 157; TUSC 41 (1.1%) <i>Votes cast 3,632</i>
Southway	Nik Brookson	Lab 1,838; Con 1,359; LD 217; TUSC 79 (2.3%) <i>Votes cast 3,493</i>
Sutton & Mount Gould	Ryan Aldred	Lab 2,102; Con 910; LD 209; TUSC 80 (2.4%) <i>Votes cast 3,301</i>

West Midlands

Birmingham

Acocks Green (two seats)	Eamonn Flynn	Lab 2,249; LD 1,857; LD 1,737; Lab 1,521; Con 525; Con 329; Green 201; TUSC 71 (1.4%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,903</i>
Bournbrook & Selly Park (two seats)	Sam Witts	Lab 1,884; Lab 1,773; LD 476; Con 423; LD 413; Con 411; Green 266; Green 123; TUSC 82 (2.6%) <i>Aggregate vote 3,131</i>
Bourneville & Cotteridge (two seats)	Clive Walder	Lab 2,809; Lab 2,505; Con 2,065; Con 1,899; Green 410; Green 371; LD 284; LD 194; TUSC 41 (0.7%) <i>Aggregate vote 5,609</i>
Brandwood & Kings Heath (two seats)	Bill Murray	Lab 3,395; Lab 3,350; Con 1,122; Con 829; Green 658; LD 479; Green 392; LD 293; Ind 95; TUSC 78 (1.3%) <i>Aggregate vote 5,827</i>
Castle Vale	Kristian O'Sullivan	Con 731; Lab 640; LD 35; TUSC 34 (2.4%) <i>Votes cast 1,440</i>
Hansworth Wood (two seats)	Rachel Jenkins	Lan 2,606; Lab 2,509; Con 693; Con 679; Green 283; LD 245; LD 200; TUSC 134 (3.3%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,025</i>
Perry Barr (two seats)	Corintha Ward	LD 2,957; LD 2,398; Lab 1,997; Lab 1,662; Con 361; Con 190; TUSC 78 (1.5%) <i>Aggregate vote 5,283</i>
Shard End	Mark Andrews	Lab 911; Con 371; LD 66; Green 61; Ind 61; TUSC 28 (1.9%) <i>Votes cast 1,498</i>
Stockland Green (two seats)	Ted Woodley	Lab 2,536; Lab 2,259; Con 726; Con 686; LD 238; LD 148; TUSC 127 (3.5%) <i>Aggregate vote 3,627</i>
Weoley & Selly Oak (two seats)	Nick Hart	Lab 2,080; Lab 2,035; Con 1,885; Con 1878; Green 410; LD 329; LD 274; TUSC 77 (1.6%) <i>Aggregate vote 4,781</i>

Coventry

Henley	Michael Morgan	Lab 1,709; Con 896; UKIP 232; Green 228; TUSC 60 (1.9%) <i>Votes cast 3,125</i>
Lower Stoke	Rob McArdle	Lab 2,206; Con 760; UKIP 262; Green 214; LD 184; TUSC 131 (3.5%) <i>Votes cast 3,758</i>
Radford	Dave Anderson	Lab 1,951; Con 561; Green 169; TUSC 163 (5.4%) ; UKIP 158 <i>Votes cast 3,002</i>
St Michaels	Dave Nellist	Lab 1,952; TUSC 350 (12.8%) ; Con 275; Green 146 <i>Votes cast 2,723</i>
Sherbourne	Isla Windsor	Lab 1,460; Con 959; Ind 307; Green 285; Ind 193; TUSC 91 (2.8%) <i>Votes cast 3,295</i>

Nuneaton & Bedworth

Abbey	Paul Reilly	Lab 1,018; Con 394; Ind 228; Green 145; TUSC 59 (3.2%) <i>Votes cast 1,844</i>
-------	-------------	--

Exhall	Eileen Hunter	Con 1,060; Lab 825; Ind 110; Green 67; TUSC 42 (2.0%) <i>Votes cast 2,104</i>
Kingswood	Catherine Mossey	Lab 685; Con 592; Green 91; TUSC 41 (2.9%) <i>Votes cast 1,409</i>
Wem Brook	Bernadette O'Toole	Lab 872; Con 435; Ind 206; Green 67; TUSC 26 (1.6%) <i>Votes cast 1,606</i>
Rugby		
Benn	Marian Wakelin	Lab 966; Con 366; LD 150; Green 117; TUSC 76 (4.5%) <i>Votes cast 1,675</i>
Wolston & The Lawfords	Pete McLaren	Con 1,174; Lab 533; Green 201; TUSC 79 (3.9%) <i>Votes cast 2,007</i>
Worcester		
St John	Mark Davies	Lab 942; Con 479; Green 88; LD 77; UKIP 52; TUSC 32 (1.9%) <i>Votes cast 1,670</i>

Yorkshire

Bradford

Bowling & Barkerend	Ian Slattery	Lab 3,193; LD 397; Con 309; TUSC 115 (2.8%) ; Green 101 <i>Votes cast 4,115</i>
---------------------	--------------	---

Kirklees

Ashbrow	Nicola Jackson	Lab 2,490; Con 1,231; TUSC 285 (6.4%) ; Green 239; LD 196 <i>Votes cast 4,423</i>
Crosland Moor & Netherton	Mike Forster	Lab 2,328; Con 1,176; TUSC 701 (14.2%) ; LD 242; UKIP 213; Green 194; Ind 98 <i>Votes cast 4,939</i>

Leeds

Armley (three seats)	Rob Hooper	Lab 2,747; Lab 2,632; Lab 2,447; Green 732; Con 657; Con 565; Green 545; Con 522; LD 387; Ind 261; Ind 184; TUSC 175 (3.4%) <i>Aggregate vote 5,143</i>
Gipton & Harehills (three seats)	Iain Dalton	Lab 4,020; Lab 3,797; Lab 3,524; Con 411; Green 394; LD 370; TUSC 357 (6.1%) ; Con 323; Ind 269; Con 218 <i>Aggregate vote 5,821</i>
Headingley & Hyde Park (three seats)	James Ellis	Lab 3,126; Lab 2,999; Lab 2,694; Green 1,270; Green 643; Green 576; LD 488; WEP 394; LD 351; LD 276; Con 205; Con 201; Con 191; TUSC 78 (1.4%) <i>Aggregate vote 5,561</i>

North East Lincolnshire

Freshney	Val Pow	Con 878; Lab 793; UKIP 180; Green 83; TUSC 17 (0.9%) <i>Votes cast 1,951</i>
Heneage	Val O'Flynn	Lab 996; Con 681; UKIP 322; TUSC 46 (2.2%) <i>Votes cast 2,045</i>
Park	Julian Best	Con 1,012; Lab 814; LD 788; UKIP 146; Green 108; TUSC 33 (1.1%) <i>Votes cast 2,901</i>

West Marsh	Dave Mitchell	Lab 510; Ind 210; Con 163; UKIP 122; TUSC 21 (2.0%) <i>Votes cast 1,028</i>
Yarborough	Kieran Barlow	Con 956; Lab 690; UKIP 207; TUSC 168 (8.3%) <i>Votes cast 2,021</i>
Sheffield		
Gleadless Valley	Keith Endean	Lab 2,126; Green 1,715; LD 396; Con 334; UKIP 263; TUSC 78 (1.6%) <i>Votes cast 4,912</i>
Hillsborough	Roan James	Lab 2,191; Green 967; LD 610; Con 584; UKIP 277; TUSC 51 (1.1%) <i>Votes cast 4,680</i>
Manor Castle	Alistair Tice	Lab 1,626; Green 508; Con 332; Yorkshire 268; LD 152; TUSC 64 (2.2%) <i>Votes cast 2,950</i>
Park & Arbourthorne	Liz Morton	Lab 1,688; Con 588; Green 499; LD 333; TUSC 140 (4.3%) <i>Votes cast 3,248</i>
Southey	Jeremy Short	Lab 1,601; Con 377; UKIP 322; Green 279; LD 217; TUSC 46 (1.6%) <i>Votes cast 2,842</i>
Walkley	Victoria Wainwright	Lab 2,316; Green 1,593; LD 594; Con 418; Yorkshire 183; WEP 162; TUSC 56 (1.1%) <i>Votes cast 5,322</i>
Wakefield		
Wakefield East	Mick Griffiths	Lab 1,918; Con 594; Green 183; TUSC 135 (4.6%) ; LD 124 <i>Votes cast 2,954</i>