

<b>Committee:</b>	Cabinet	<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, 14 <sup>th</sup> April 2026
<b>Title:</b>	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2025/26 Q3 Performance Update		
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Paula Evans, Head of Contract, Performance & Risk pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk	<b>Key decision:</b>	No

---

## Summary

1. This report presents members with 2025/26 Q3 (October-December) performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).
2. Overall performance levels are slightly lower when analysing Q3 2025/26 status' against Q2 2025/26, with more indicators at an amber or red status but both short-term and long-term trends show the majority of indicators as improving.
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, Q3 benchmarking comparisons against other Local Authorities has not been possible due to limited availability of information. Therefore, Q2 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.

### Performance Summary

11. Of the 39 indicators identified, a total of 36 indicators have Q3 outturn data reported. Reasons for the 3 indicators without Q3 data are as follows:

Table 1: Indicators without Q3 data

PI:	PI Title	Service Area:	Reason:
CCI 08	Resident Satisfaction	Consultation	Outturn data for this indicator is only available when a survey has been conducted. The result of the last survey was reported in Quarter 4 of 2024/25. There are currently no plans to repeat the survey.
CCI 38	% Planned maintenance program delivered within agreed budget	Housing Property Services	Due to issues with Axis Contract no planned programme has been delivered. Works are being carried over to 26/27.

PI:	PI Title	Service Area:	Reason:
-----	----------	---------------	---------

CCI 39	Regeneration plans or alternative solution in place for Alexia and Parkside Q2	Housing Property Services	This project will be a priority for the new Strategic Housing Development Consultant, who joins the council week commencing 16 March 2026. The project will include presenting finalised options for the two sites at the end of Quarter 1 2026-27 and this will be followed by the delivery of these options.
--------	--	---------------------------	--

12. Where relevant, supporting performance notes have been entered against each indicator for Q3 outturns. Officers are encouraged to include information as to how performance can be maintained/improved as relevant.




13. 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.

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. 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

16. Overall, the statuses for the 36 indicators where Q3 2025/26 data is available, shows that performance levels are slightly lower from Q2 2025/26 outturns as shown in the summary and Table 3 below:

- **for Q3 there are 20 (56%) at green status, 3 (8%) amber and 13 (36%) at red**
- in Q2 there were 19 (59%) at green status, 5 (16%) amber and 8 (25%) at red.

Table 3: Q3 Corporate Core Indicator (CCI) status and trend results

Status	Q2 2025/26	Q3 2025/26	Short Trend	Long Trend
--------	------------	------------	-------------	------------

	19	<b>20</b>		<b>14</b>	40%		<b>17</b>	47%
	5	<b>3</b>		<b>12</b>	34%		<b>13</b>	36%
	8	<b>13</b>		<b>9</b>	26%		<b>6</b>	17%

17. Q3 short trend analysis for the 35 indicators that can be analysed indicates that there are **14** indicators trending as improving in performance against target, **12** indicators declining and **9** with no change.

18. For the long trend there are more indicators trending as improving **17**, than those declining, **13**, with **6** having no change from a total of 36.

19. Detailed CCI Q3 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.

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 Q2 2025/26 and is attached as Appendix B.

21. 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 <sup>2</sup> (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 <sup>2</sup> (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

22. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. At the time of producing this report, 13 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), one organisation did not publish any performance information at all and the link for performance report is not working for one other organisation, this has been queried with them.
26. 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.

## **Q2 2025-26 Retrospective Benchmarking Table**

27. The following table represents UDC's Q2 performance for 16 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.
28. UDC's performance was better than, or the same as, the benchmarked average for **7** indicators (highlighted in the table below) and below the average for **9** indicators (although it is very close to the average, within 1%, for five of those).

**29. 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 Q2 performance for 16 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
<b>General Indicators:</b>				
4	CCI 05	% Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days (max)	89%	82%
4	CCI 06	% of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council (max)	89%	90%
12	CCI 09	% of Council Tax collected (max) *	56.91%	56.13%
12	CCI 10	% of Non-domestic Rates Collected (max) *	56.91%	56.11%
7	CCI 22	% of invoices paid within 30 days (max)	97%	96%
12	CCI 24	Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications (within 13 - 16 weeks with EIA or including any Extension of Time) (max)	92%	100%
12	CCI 25	Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications (within 8 weeks or including any Extension of Time) (max)	89%	83%
8	CCI 26	% of Appeals upheld for Major Applications (min)	6.41%	3.60%
9	CCI 28	% Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (max)	49.85%	53.67%
<b>Housing Indicators:</b>				
4	CCI 13	Housing Property Services: Gas Safety - % of domestic dwellings on programme with valid LGSR gas safety certificate (max)	100%	99.64%

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator		Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
3	CCI 14	Housing Property Services: % properties compliant with Carbon Monoxide and smoke detector regulations (max)	99%	98%
4	CCI 15 (a)	Housing Property Services: Asbestos Management - % Risk Assessments in date (max)	99%	100%
4	CCI 18	Housing Property Services: Lift Safety - % lifts with an-in date safety inspection (LOLER) (max)	96%	100%
3	CCI 34	Housing Property Services: % Responsive emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max)	90%	75%
3	CCI 35	Housing Property Services: % Responsive non-emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max)	88%	78%
3	CCI 36	Housing Property Services: % of customers satisfied with responsive repairs (transactional) (max)	88%	92%

30. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q2 2025/26 is available in Appendix B.

## Risk Analysis

31.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
If performance indicators do not meet quarterly/annual targets then areas	2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target.	3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has	Performance is monitored by CMT, and Cabinet on a quarterly basis. Short and long term analysis is carried

such as customer satisfaction and statutory adherence to government led requirements could be affected leading to a loss in reputation for the Council.	Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.	the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.	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.