

<b>Committee:</b>	Cabinet	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2025/26 Q4 and Year End Performance Update	Tuesday, 9 <sup>th</sup> June 2026
<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> N

---

## Summary

1. This report presents members with 2025/26 Q4 (January- March) and Year End performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).
2. Overall performance levels are slightly lower when analysing Q4 2025/26 status' against Q3 2025/26, with the majority of short-term trends decreasing however, long-term trends show the majority of indicators as improving. Year End data for 2025/26 shows a slight improvement in performance levels when compared to 2024/25 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, Q4 benchmarking comparisons against other Local Authorities has not been possible due to limited availability of information. Therefore, Q3 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 now 38 indicators being monitored.

### Performance Summary

11. Of the 38 indicators identified, a total of 35 indicators have Q4 outturn data reported. 33 of the 38 have Year End outturn data.




12. 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. Officers are encouraged to include information as to how performance can be maintained/improved as relevant.

13. 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

14. Indicator status definitions are as follows:










Table 1: Indicator status definitions

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

15. Overall, the statuses for the 35 indicators where Q4 2025/26 data is available, shows that performance levels are slightly lower with less at a green status, more at amber and two less at red, from Q3 2025/26 outturns as shown in the summary and Table 3 below:

- for Q4 there are **17** (49%) at green status, **8** (22%) amber and **10** (29%) at red
- in Q3 there were 19 (59%) at green status, 2 (6%) amber and 11 (35%) at red.

Table 2: Q4 Corporate Core Indicator (CCI) status and trend results




Status	Q3 2025/26	Q4 2025/26	Short Trend			Long Trend		
	19	<b>17</b>		<b>13</b>	37%		<b>17</b>	49%
	2	<b>8</b>		<b>14</b>	40%		<b>12</b>	34%
	11	<b>10</b>		<b>8</b>	23%		<b>6</b>	17%

16. Q4 short trend analysis for the 35 indicators that can be analysed indicates that there are **13** indicators trending as improving in performance against target, **14** indicators declining and **8** with no change.

17. For the long trend there are more indicators trending as improving **17**, than those declining, **12**, with **6** having no change.

18. For the 26 indicators that can be compared for 2025/26 against 2024/25 Year End outturns, there is an overall slight improvement in performance levels with **17** indicators at green status (achieving or exceeding target), **4** amber (within 10% of target) and **5** red (over 10% off target).

Table 3: YE Corporate Core Indicator 2024/25 status vs 2025/26

Status	YE 2024/25	%	YE 2025/26	%
	<b>15</b>	58%	<b>17</b>	65%
	<b>6</b>	23%	<b>4</b>	16%
	<b>5</b>	19%	<b>5</b>	19%
	26	100%	<b>26</b>	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.

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 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
Authority	Area km <sup>2</sup> (2021)	Population (2022)
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

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, 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 three organisations did not publish any performance information at all.
26. 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.

### Q3 2025-26 Retrospective Benchmarking Table

27. The following table represents UDC's Q3 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 three 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 Q3 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
<i>General Indicators:</i>				
4	CCI 05	% Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days (max)	87%	69%
4	CCI 06	% of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council (max)	91%	90%
11	CCI 09	% of Council Tax collected (max) *	85.22%	83.19%

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator		Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
10	CCI 10	% of Non-domestic Rates Collected (max) *	81.64%	82.90%
6	CCI 22	% of invoices paid within 30 days (max)	97%	99%
10	CCI 24	Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications (within 13 - 16 weeks with EIA or including any Extension of Time) (max)	94%	100%
10	CCI 25	Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications (within 8 weeks or including any Extension of Time) (max)	88.63%	89.00%
7	CCI 26	% of Appeals upheld for Major Applications (min)	10.00%	2.50%
10	CCI 28	% Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (max)	48.11%	52.54%
<b>Housing Indicators:</b>				
4	CCI 13	Housing Property Services: Gas Safety - % of domestic dwellings on programme with valid LGSR gas safety certificate (max)	99.84%	99.74%
3	CCI 14	Housing Property Services: % properties compliant with Carbon Monoxide and smoke detector regulations (max)	99.21%	98.08%
4	CCI 15 (a)	Housing Property Services: Asbestos Management - % Risk Assessments in date (max)	100%	100%
4	CCI 18	Housing Property Services: Lift Safety - % lifts with an-in date safety inspection (LOLER) (max)	92.94%	71.74%
3	CCI 19	Housing Property Services: Damp & Mould - % of reported damp & mould cases responded to (within 14 days/7 days) (max)	87.82%	65.45%
3	CCI 34	Housing Property Services: % Responsive emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max)	94.73%	85.48%

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator		Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
3	CCI 35	Housing Property Services: % Responsive non-emergency repairs completed within published timescales (max)	90.89%	80.89%

30. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q3 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 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.