Committee:	Cabinet	**Date:**	
Title:	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2024/25 Q4 & Year End Performance Update	Thursday, 19 June 2025	
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
Report Author:	Angela Knight, Director of Business Performance and People	**Key decision:**	
	aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk	No	
	Paula Evans, Contract, Performance and Risk Manager		
	pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk		

Summary

1. This report presents members with 2024/25 Q4 (January-March) and Year End performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).

2. Overall, there is an improvement in performance levels when analysing both Q4 2024/25 against Q3 2024/25 and Year End data for 2024/25 against 203/24 outturns.

3. The CCIs were identified to enable the Corporate Management Team and Members to focus on key areas of performance across the council.

4. As in previous reports, obtaining data for Q4 benchmarking comparisons against other Local Authorities has not been possible due to limited availability of information. Therefore, Q3 benchmarking data is presented as a separate analysis exercise.

5. Performance trends have been highlighted and analysed to identify where improvement may be needed particularly when comparing against other 'statistical nearest neighbour' authorities.

Recommendations

6. None. The report is for information only.

Financial Implications

7. There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

8. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report:

   None.

Impact

9.

Communication/Consultation	Reviewed by Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Informal Cabinet Board (ICB)
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Corporate Core Indicators

10. The Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) have been developed to provide focus on key service provision areas across the authority. They include a number of new indicators which have not been previously reported on thus limiting some of the analysis that can be completed for them.

11. Of the 30 indicators identified, a total of 28 indicators have Q4 outturn data reported (CCI 07 has yet to have suitable measures identified and agreed for monitoring purposes and CCI 08 is annually reported). 29 of the 30 have Year End outturn data (for CCI 07 the same applies as for Q4 reporting).

12. Please note that the data for the Housing Health and Safety compliance indicators are from the council's previous contract with Norse which ended on the 31 March 2025.

13. Where relevant supporting performance notes have been entered against each indicator for both Q4 and YE outturns. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data; this is set out in detail at Appendix A.

14. When reviewing the indicators, the following should be noted:

- Indicators ending with (max) means a **_higher_** outturn is good performance
- Indicators ending with (min) means a **_lower_** outturn is a good performance

15. Overall, the statuses for the 28 indicators where both Q3 and Q4 data is available, shows that performance levels have improved from Q3 outturns as shown in Table 1 below:

- for Q4 there are **16** at green status (achieving or exceeding target), **6** amber (within 10% of target) and **6** red (over 10% off target)

- in Q3 there were **13** at green status, **8** amber and **7** red

Table 1: Q4 Corporate Core Indicator status and trend results

Status	Q3	**Q4**	Short Trend			Long Trend		
✅	13	**16**	⬆	**14**	50%	⬆	**17**	61%
🔺	8	**6**	⬇	7	25%	⬇	8	28%
🛑	7	**6**	▬	7	25%	▬	3	11%
	28	**28**		**28**	100%		**28**	100%

16. Further analysis of Q4 indicates that there are **14** indicators trending as improving in performance against target for the short trend with **7** indicators declining and also **7** with no change.

    For the long trend there are significantly more indicators,**17**, trending as improving than those declining, **8**, with **3** having no change.

17. For the 24 indicators that can be compared for 2023/24 and 2024/25 Year End outturns, there is an overall improvement in performance levels with **13** indicators at green status (achieving or exceeding target), **7** amber (within 10% of target) and **4** red (over 10% off target).

18. At the March Cabinet meeting the proposals for the CCI targets for 2025/26 were presented. It was approved to remove the safeguarding indicator as due to staff turnover it will never be able to reach the target. Training is provided periodically to ensure that new staff receive the training.

Table 2: YE Corporate Core Indicator 2024/25 status vs 2023/24

Status	YE 2023/24	%	**YE 2024/25**	%
✅	12	50%	**13**	54%
🔺	5	21%	**7**	29%
🛑	7	29%	**4**	17%
	24	100%	**24**	100%

19. Detailed CCI Q4 and Year End performance information is available in the supporting appendix document A.

Benchmarking

20. In addition to reporting against internal performance indicator targets and performance, an external benchmarking exercise is conducted on a quarterly basis so that comparative data can be analysed.

21. Due to the limited availability of up-to-date data, the comparison is made using the previous quarters outturns. This report therefore details the analysis from using data from Q3 2024/25 and is attached as Appendix B.

22. The benchmarking group used for the purposes of this report represents Uttlesford District Council's statistical near neighbours (SNN), as identified in the annual Financial Resilience Index produced by CIPFA (see table below). We also include Braintree District Council as it is a relatively comparable geographical near neighbour.

Table 2: Statistical Near Neighbours as identified in CiPFA's Annual Resilience Index

Authority	Area km² (2021)	Population (2022)
Uttlesford	641.18	92,578
Harborough	591.78	100,481
Winchester	660.97	130,268
Tandridge	248.19	88,707
Vale of White Horse	577.62	142,116
South Cambridgeshire	901.63	165,633
Sevenoaks	369.2	121,106
Tonbridge and Malling	240.14	133,661
Waverley	345.17	130,063
South Oxfordshire	678.53	151,820
Hart	215.27	100,910
Test Valley	627.58	132,871
Tewkesbury	414.42	97,000
Mole Valley	258.32	87,769
East Hampshire	514.44	127,319
Bromsgrove	216.97	100,076

23. The Nearest Neighbours Model is determined by 40 different metrics across a wide range of social-economic indicators and is designed to help interpret results and deep dive into how the statistical differences between other authorities arises.

24. As there were no other formal benchmarking groups identified at the time of formalising the CCI suite, these were thought to be a good starting point on which to build benchmarking knowledge. It should be noted that this group of SNN is a very close match to the comparative data available on the LG Inform platform, Value for Money Profiles.

25. The benchmarking data contained in this report and the detailed information in Appendix B has been obtained directly from equivalent performance officers in the SNN authorities and/or published data on their authority websites.

26. At the time of producing this report, 11 of the 15 CiPFA statistical near neighbours, and Braintree DC, had published performance data, two organisations have temporarily stopped publishing performance information (whilst they review what and

how they publish) and two organisations did not publish any performance information at all.

27. For this quarters benchmarking exercise, there are up to 12 authorities benchmarked for some indicators, with an average of 6 authorities benchmarked per available indicator.

   Please note: Where data could only be obtained for one other local authority within the group, the indicator has not been analysed.

28. **Q3 2024-25 Retrospective Benchmarking Table**

   The following table represents UDC's Q3 performance for 11 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.

   UDC's performance was better than, or the same as, the benchmarked average for four indicators and below the average for seven indicators (although it is very close to the average, within 1%, for three of those).

   Note: The average performance for each indicator is based on the mean average of all the authorities where their data has been used in the calculation. Data for an individual authority will be excluded if it is classified as an outlier (outside of the expected performance range) due to exceptional or unknown circumstances.

   Table 3: UDC's Q3 performance for 11 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator	Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
3	**CCI 05** Percentage of information governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) responded to within due date	89%	**81%**
4	**CCI 06** % of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council	94%	**98%**
12	**CCI 09** % of Council Tax collected	84%	**84%**
11	**CCI 10** % of Non-domestic Rates Collected	83%	**83%**
3	**CCI 11** Current tenant rent arrears as a percentage of the annual rent debit (excluding HB adjustment)	2%	**3%**
7	**CCI 22** % of invoices paid within 30 days	96%	**94%**
4	**CCI 23** Council Housing: Average re-let time in days (all re-lets including time spent in works)	48 days	**75 days**
11	**CCI 24** Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications	92%	**91%**

10	**CCI 25** Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications	85%	**70%**
7	**CCI 26** % of appeals upheld for Major Applications	5%	**4%**
11	**CCI 28** % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	45%	**49%**

29. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q3 2024/25 is available in Appendix B.

Risk Analysis

25.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
If performance indicators do not meet quarterly/annual targets then areas such as customer satisfaction and statutory adherence to government led requirements could be affected leading to a loss in reputation for the Council.	2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target. Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.	3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.	Performance is monitored by CMT, and Cabinet on a quarterly basis. Short and long term analysis is carried out to identify performance trends, this supports the appropriate action/improvement plans to be put in place to address issues.

1 = Little or no risk or impact
2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.