

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Committee: | Cabinet | Date: |
| Title: | Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2025/26 Q2 Performance Update | Tuesday, 16 December 2025 |
| Portfolio Holder: | Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council | |
| Report Author: | Paula Evans, Head of Contract, Performance & Risk pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk | Key decision: No |

Summary

1. This report presents members with 2025/26 Q2 (July-September) performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).
2. Overall performance levels are comparable when analysing Q2 2025/26 against Q1 2025/26, however both short and long-term trends are showing improvement.
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, Q2 benchmarking comparisons against other Local Authorities has not been possible due to limited availability of information. Therefore, Q1 2025/26 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. For the 2025/26 performance reporting year, there are 39 indicators being monitored.

11. The increase in indicators from the 2024/25 reporting year (30 indicators) is predominantly related to the introduction of the Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) and relate to Housing activities across various Service Areas. A number of the monitored indicators have been placed in the CCI suite to ensure the highest level of scrutiny and governance to support the TSM external inspection regime.

Performance Summary

12. Of the 39 indicators identified, a total of 35 indicators have Q2 outturn data reported. Reasons for the 4 indicators without Q2 data are as follows:




Table 1: Indicators without Q2 data

| PI: | PI Title | Service Area: | Reason: |
|--------|--|---------------------------|---|
| CCI 08 | Resident Satisfaction | Consultation | PI is annually reported |
| CCI 37 | % Planned maintenance program delivered within agreed schedule | Housing Property Services | Indicators will not have data available until later in the year |
| CCI 38 | % Planned maintenance program delivered within agreed budget | | |
| CCI 39 | Regeneration plans or alternative solution in place for Alexia and Parkside Q2 | | |

13. Where relevant, supporting performance notes have been entered against each indicator for Q2 outturns. Officers are encouraged to include information as to how performance can be maintained/improved as relevant.
14. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data through short and long-term trend analysis. This is set out in detail in Appendix A.
15. 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

16. Indicator status definitions are as follows:










Table 2: Indicator status definitions

| Status | Definition |
|---|---|
|  | Indicator achieving or exceeding target |
|  | Warning – indicator performing within 10% of target |
|  | Alert – indicator performing over 10% off target |

17. Overall, the statuses for the 35 indicators where Q2 2025/26 data is available, shows that performance levels are generally comparable across all three statuses from Q1 2025/26 outturns, with slightly more indicators being analysed for Q2, as shown in the summary and Table 2 below:

- for Q2 there are **20** (57%) at green status, **5** (14%) amber and **10** (29%) at red
- in Q1 there were **20** (61%) at green status, **5** (15%) amber and **8** (24%) red.

Table 3: Q1 Corporate Core Indicator (CCI) status and trend results

| Status | Q1 2025/26 | Q2 2025/26 | Short Trend | | | Long Trend | | |
|---|------------|------------|---|-----------|-----|---|-----------|--|
|  | 20 | 20 |  | 16 | 47% |  | 16 | |
|  | 5 | 5 |  | 8 | 22% |  | 12 | |
|  | 8 | 10 |  | 11 | 31% |  | 3 | |

18. Q2 short trend analysis for the **35** indicators that can be analysed indicates that there are **16** indicators trending as improving in performance against target, **8** indicators declining and **11** with no change.

19. With regards to long trend, for the **31** indicators that can be analysed, again more indicators are trending as improving **16**, than those declining **12**, with **3** having no change. Please note that 4 indicators do not have a long trend analysis available as they haven't been in existence and monitored for enough time to date.

20. Detailed CCI Q2 performance information is available in the supporting Appendix document A.

Benchmarking

21. 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.

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 Q1 2025/26 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 4: Statistical Near Neighbours as identified in CIPFA's Annual Resilience Index

| Authority | Area km ² (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 |

| Authority | Area km ² (2021) | Population (2022) |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 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, 12 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 11 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.

Q1 2025-26 Retrospective Benchmarking Table

28. The following table represents UDC's Q1 performance for 18 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.
29. UDC's performance was better than, or the same as, the benchmarked average for **11** indicators (highlighted in the table below) and below the average for **7** indicators (although it is very close to the average, within 1%, for three of those).
30. **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 5: UDC's Q1 performance for 18 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 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| General Indicators: | | | | |
| 4 | CCI 05 | % Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days (max) | 94% | 81% |
| 4 | CCI 06 | % of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council (max) | 86% | 89% |

| No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked | Performance Indicator | | Benchmarked Performance Average | UDC's Performance |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| 11 | CCI 09 | % of Council Tax collected (max) * | 29% | 29% |
| 11 | CCI 10 | % of Non-domestic Rates Collected (max) * | 30% | 29% |
| 5 | CCI 22 | % of invoices paid within 30 days (max) | 96% | 95% |
| 11 | CCI 24 | Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications (within 13 - 16 weeks with EIA or including any Extension of Time) (max) | 90% | 100% |
| 11 | CCI 25 | Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications (within 8 weeks or including any Extension of Time) (max) | 85% | 87% |
| 7 | CCI 26 | % of Appeals upheld for Major Applications (min) | 6% | 4% |
| 11 | CCI 28 | % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (max) | 49% | 51% |
| <i>Housing Indicators:</i> | | | | |
| 3 | CCI 11 (b) | Housing Operations: Current rent and service charge arrears as a % of the annual rent debit (min) | 2% | 3% |
| 4 | CCI 13 | Housing Property Services: Gas Safety - % of domestic dwellings on programme with valid LGSR gas safety certificate (max) | 100% | 100% |
| 3 | CCI 14 | Housing Property Services: % properties compliant with Carbon Monoxide and smoke detector regulations (max) | 99% | 100% |
| 3 | CCI 15 (a) | Housing Property Services: Asbestos Management - % Risk Assessments in date | 100% | 100% |
| 3 | CCI 18 | Housing Property Services: Lift Safety - % lifts with an-in date safety inspection (LOLER) (max) | 100% | 100% |
| 3 | CCI 23 | Council Housing: Average re-let time in days (all re-lets including time spent in works) (min) | 53 days | 82 days |

| No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked | Performance Indicator | | Benchmarked Performance Average | UDC's Performance |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| 3 | CCI 34 | Housing Property Services: % Responsive emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max) | 88% | 67% |
| 3 | CCI 35 | Housing Property Services: % Responsive non-emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max) | 77% | 44% |
| 3 | CCI 36 | Housing Property Services: % of customers satisfied with responsive repairs (transactional) (max) | 87% | 90% |

31. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q1 2025/26 is available in Appendix B.

Risk Analysis

32.

| 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.