

Public
Key Decision – No

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title:	Local Government Outcomes Framework – Consultation Response
Meeting/Date:	Performance & Growth – 3 rd September 2025
Executive Portfolio:	Councillor Stephen Ferguson, Executive Councillor for Resident Services and Corporate Performance
Report by:	Head of Policy, Performance and Emergency Planning
Ward(s) affected:	All

Executive Summary:

This report presents the Panel with an outline of the new Local Government Outcomes framework (LGOF), which is a proposed set of priority outcomes and draft metrics aimed at supporting local government in service delivery and accountability. The framework proposed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) is designed to guide sector engagement and inform future performance measurement and policy alignment.

Councils are expected to reference and align their strategies with these metrics, indicating how direction of travel is considered to achieve specified outcomes.

This is not new thinking for HDC, an outcomes framework was used to create Huntingdonshire Futures and the Corporate Plan Outcomes:

- The five strategic “journeys” in the Huntingdonshire Futures Community Atlas
- The contextual indicators in Contextual Outcome Measures
- Strong alignment exists between LGOF and HDC’s strategic frameworks, especially in areas like housing, health, and economic inclusion.
- Contextual measures already track many of the LGOF’s proposed metrics, including deprivation, employment, housing quality, and educational outcomes
- The Corporate Plan’s “Do – Enable – Influence” model complements the LGOF’s emphasis on shared accountability and system-wide impact.

The timeline for engagement is set out with an analysis by the Performance and Insight team of the link to the Outcomes framework and indicators proposed and the council's performance management framework, Corporate Plan outcomes and Contextual measures.

The proposed measures have been collated for the Council using the Local Government Associations' Insight Tool for information as we work to a single set of outcome metrics, part of the refresh of the Council's performance management framework. This will combine and simplify the Council's existing contextual measures, the contextual measures associated with Huntingdonshire Futures and LGOF. This will be available to support Service Planning in Quarters 3 and 4 of 2025/26 and the Corporate Plan refresh.

The proposed feedback to inform the government's proposals is also presented which has been informed by engagement across Council services.

Recommendation(s):

Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance & Growth) is

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) To comment on the contents of the report
- (b) Make any comments regarding the proposed feedback submission (Appendix 9 and 10) in the government's initial engagement period which will be submitted by 22nd September 2025.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This engages the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance & Growth) in the government's consultation regarding the establishment of Local Government Outcomes Framework seeking comments on the Council's proposed initial feedback.
- 1.2 To set out the Council's position in respect of the new proposals.
- 1.3 To set out the way in which the Council will embed the LG OF within its performance management framework.

2. WHY IS THIS REPORT NECESSARY?

- 2.1 The government intends to:

- Publish a national dashboard of outcomes data to support transparency and benchmarking.
- Enable local authorities to contextualise performance using local intelligence and narrative reporting.
- Avoid punitive comparisons by focusing on learning and improvement rather than league tables

Councils will be expected to have reference to and align strategy with the metrics, demonstrating how direction of travel is considered and used to achieve better outcomes.

- 2.2 The Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Growth) Panel are central to the Council's Performance Management Framework.

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OUTCOMES FRAMEWORK

- 3.1 Government Priority Outcome Proposals

The framework (Appendix 1) identifies 15 core outcome areas, each with a clear strategic aim:

1. **Homelessness and Rough Sleeping** – Prevent and reduce homelessness and rough sleeping.
2. **Housing** – Ensure access to decent, safe, secure, and affordable homes.
3. **Multiple Disadvantage** – Improve outcomes for adults facing overlapping challenges (e.g., homelessness, substance use, offending).
4. **Best Start in Life** – Enhance early childhood health, education, and family support.
5. **Every Child Achieving and Thriving** – Support children and young people to succeed in school, home, and community.
6. **Keeping Children Safe and Family Security** – Strengthen family resilience and ensure safe, loving homes.
7. **Health and Wellbeing** – Promote longer, healthier lives and reduce health inequalities.

8. **Adult Social Care – Quality** – Deliver high-quality care through a skilled workforce.
9. **Adult Social Care – Independence** – Support independence, choice, and control in care.
10. **Adult Social Care – Neighbourhood Health/Integration** – Provide joined-up health and care services at the local level.
11. **Neighbourhoods** – Foster safe, inclusive, and satisfied communities.
12. **Environment, Circular Economy, and Climate Change** – Build resilience to climate risks and enhance natural and built environments.
13. **Transport and Local Infrastructure** – Improve connectivity and sustainable transport.
14. **Economic Prosperity and Regeneration** – Drive local economic growth and opportunity.
15. **Child Poverty** – Reduce child poverty and improve life chances.

3.2 Draft Metrics for Sector Engagement

Each outcome is supported by a set of draft metrics (Appendix 2), divided into:

- **Outcome Measures.** Indicators of long-term impact (e.g., life expectancy, educational attainment, housing quality).
- **Output Measures.** Indicators of service delivery and operational performance (e.g., planning decisions, care placements, enforcement actions).

These metrics draw on data from national sources to ensure consistency, comparability, and reduce the burden of new data collection:

- Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)
- Department for Education (DfE)
- Office for National Statistics (ONS)
- Department for Transport (DfT)
- NHS Digital and ASCOF
- Public Health England (Fingertips)
- Ministry of Justice (MoJ)

The metrics will be collated and published by government without any requirement for submission, except where the relevant public sector bodies already undertake statutory returns for these measures.

3.3 MHCLG Engagement Timeline

- **Initial Engagement Period July – September 2025:** MHCLG is requesting feedback from local authorities and stakeholders on the LGOF through submissions, webinars, and Q&A sessions.

- Proposal Development Through 28 November 2025: Local authorities are required to prepare comprehensive proposals for local government reorganisation, integrating input gathered during the initial engagement phase.
- Government Consultation Early 2026: MHCLG will formally consult the public and stakeholders on final proposals and implementation plans.

Key Milestones:

5 February 2025:	Statutory invitation, councils to begin planning.
21 March 2025:	Deadline for submission of interim plans.
3 July 2025:	LGOF formally announced LGA conference.
July–September 2025:	Feedback window for LGOF engagement.
28 November 2025:	Deadline for full proposal submissions.
Early 2026:	Formal government consultation begins.

4.0 Implications for HDC

4.1 Approach

This is not new thinking for HDC, an outcomes framework was used to create Huntingdonshire Futures and the Corporate Plan Outcomes (see Appendix 3 for high level mapping):

- The five strategic “journeys” in the [Huntingdonshire Futures Community Atlas](#)
- The contextual indicators in [Contextual Outcome Measures](#)
- **Strong alignment** exists between LGOF and HDC’s strategic frameworks, especially in areas like housing, health, and economic inclusion.
- Contextual measures **already track many of the LGOF’s proposed metrics**, including deprivation, employment, housing quality, and educational outcomes
- The Corporate Plan’s **“Do – Enable – Influence” model complements the LGOF’s emphasis on shared accountability and system-wide impact.**

4.2 Mapping LGOF against the Council’s Performance Framework

4.2.1 Mapping LGOF against Contextual Measures

Appendix 3 shows the overview and correlation of LGOF priority outcomes against the outcomes used to inform and evaluate progress against Huntingdonshire Futures, the Corporate plan and Contextual measures that support service planning and strategy development.

Appendix 4 combines the metrics from the original HDC contextual dashboard, the Huntingdonshire Futures research, and the LGOF proposal document results in a total of 158 contextual measures. Out of 158 measures, 32 are new from the LGOF proposal (excluding metrics from county functions), 52 are new from the Huntingdonshire Futures dataset, and 28 are unique to the original HDC dashboard. These will be

reviewed with services as part of the review of the performance management framework to consolidate into a single contextual measures' framework. This will be presented for approval in Quarter 4.

Strong alignment exists between LGOF and HDC's strategic frameworks, especially in areas like housing, health, and economic inclusion. **Contextual measures** already track many of the LGOF's proposed metrics, including deprivation, employment, housing quality, and educational outcomes. The **Corporate Plan's "Do – Enable – Influence"** model complements the LGOF's emphasis on shared accountability and system-wide impact.

4.2.2 Gap Analysis LGOF and HDC Priorities

Appendix 5 shows a review of LGOF against the Council's Priority outcomes within the Performance Management Framework. The conclusions from the comparison to feedback to MHCLG:

Community Health & Wealth Building. No metrics on local wealth retention, social value procurement, or community-led investment
Implication: May miss HDC's innovative approach to economic resilience

Prevention and Early Intervention. Focuses on outcomes, lacks early-stage intervention metrics
Implication: Could overlook upstream success like HDC's financial vulnerability project

Local Influence and Empowerment. Limited depth on co-production and local engagement
Implication: May not reflect HDC's "Do, Enable, Influence" model

Cultural and Leisure Services. Minimal reference to leisure, culture, or physical activity
Implication: Risks undervaluing HDC's One Leisure and wellbeing offer

Digital and Innovation. No indicators on digital inclusion or service innovation
Implication: Misses HDC's transformation and efficiency agenda

Lowering Carbon Emissions. No indicators on carbon emissions, these are already readily available and reported by the Department for Energy Security and Net-Zero
Implication: Broad prioritisation will not reflect HDC Climate Strategy driving our activities and encouraging others to do the same.

4.4 The Council's Current Position

- 4.4.1 Using the Local Government Association's Insight Tool an initial report against proposed LGOF indicators (Appendix 6) against the group of Council's identified by CIPFA Nearest Neighbours model, developed by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, is a statistical tool used to compare local authorities with others that share similar social and economic characteristics. This model is based on **fair benchmarking** and **performance comparison** between councils that

face similar challenges and contexts identified the following strengths of our communities and areas for focus.

Key Positives in Huntingdonshire

Homelessness Prevention

- Low use of B&Bs: 0 families in B&Bs over 6 weeks (vs. neighbour average of 1).
- High prevention success: 59% of homelessness prevention duties ended in successful accommodation (vs. 55% average).

Housing Quality

- High proportion of decent rental homes: 90.3% (vs. 86.3% average).
- 100% of LA-owned social housing deemed decent (vs. 99.5% average).

Housing Supply

- Strong housing delivery: 1,239 net additional dwellings (vs. 773 average).
- High new homes delivery rate: 1.7% of total stock (vs. 0.8% average).

Environmental Performance

- High recycling rate: 53.9% of household waste recycled (vs. 46.75% average).
- High composting rate: 31.72% (vs. 24.62% average).

Employment

- High employment rate (16–64): 81.6% (vs. 78.6% average).
- Above average number of high-growth enterprises: 30 (vs. 29 average).

Neighbourhood Satisfaction

- Trust in community: 52% agree people can be trusted (vs. 48% average).
- Satisfaction with area: 84% satisfied with local area (vs. 79% average).

Key Challenges in Huntingdonshire

Education Outcomes

- Early years development: 65.9% of children with good development (vs. 70.1% average).
- KS2 attainment: 56% meeting expected standards (vs. 62% average).
- KS4 Attainment 8 score: 45.0 (vs. 46.9 average).

Youth Offending

- Reoffending rate: 33.3% of youth offenders reoffended (vs. 31.8% average).

Planning Performance

- Major applications decided on time: 75% (vs. 82% average).

EV Infrastructure

- Public EV chargers: 65.2 per 100k population (vs. 75.9 average).

Economic Productivity

- GVA per hour worked: £37.44 (vs. £40.14 average).
- Median weekly pay: £734.10 (vs. £770.33 average).

- Business density: 0.76 jobs per working-age resident (vs. 0.81 average).

Child Poverty

- Above average numbers of children in both relative and absolute low-income families.

- 4.4.2 The same report has been prepared comparing Huntingdonshire to our geographical neighbours in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (Appendix 7).

Overall Huntingdonshire performs strongly on housing quality, homelessness prevention, community satisfaction, recycling, and employment rates. However, it faces challenges in historically reported planning determinations, business growth, public EV infrastructure, and some aspects of economic and environmental performance. All of which are key priorities and actions within the Council's Corporate plan.

4.3 Proposed Actions

Establish Corporate Ownership & Co-Ordination

- The Performance & Insight Team is coordinating HDC's response to the LGOF consultation to maintain a unified approach.
- The Performance Team is organising officer input through the response template and arranging participation in online seminar sessions. Appendix 8 shows the service alignment and ownership in relation to each outcome. This has been approved by Corporate leadership team and all services have informed the proposed feedback.

Governance

- Embed contextual measure annual update alongside annual Corporate Plan refresh and Transformation Plan refresh

Align Contextual Measures with LGOF Metrics (Quarter 3)

- LGOF outcomes are aligned with HDC's Corporate Plan and the five Huntingdonshire Futures journeys, ensuring local priorities like climate resilience, inclusive growth, and wellbeing are included in contextual measures.
- The Performance & Insight team will align service-level metrics and contextual measures into a unified framework.

Update Contextual Dashboards (Quarter 4)

- HDC will adapt the contextual dashboard to track LGOF metrics, supporting policy, strategy, service planning, and outcome delivery.

Embed Outcome Thinking in Transformation (Quarter 4)

- The LGOF used as a foundation in the Council's updated contextual measures.
- Establish contextual measures as a tool for services, enabling integration within service, strategy and policy planning.
- Include contextual measures in Corporate Plan Annual Update.
- Update public-facing dashboard to demonstrate transparency, accountability and encourage use of factual data to drive better outcomes consistently.

5.0 Proposed Feedback

5.1 Appendix 9 sets out the proposed outline response to the MHCLG questions regarding LGOF based on the review presented in this report.

5.2 Appendix 10 sets out the more detailed service feedback that has been collated to complete the sections highlighted:

- General questions about the metrics
- Questions about metrics by priority outcome

6.0 RISKS

6.1 Strategic Risks

- **Loss of Autonomy vs. Increased Accountability.** The LGOF brings added flexibility but also clearer national expectations, meaning councils may face scrutiny if local progress is not shown.
- **Alignment Challenges Across Tiers.** The framework encourages partnership, but Councils may face difficulties aligning with partners when goals or resources differ.
- **Funding Dependencies and Uncertainty.** The LGOF, linked to the Fair Funding Review 2.0, aims to simplify grants but presents funding risks if outcomes aren't achieved.

6.2 Operational Risks

- **Data and Measurement Complexity.** Councils should monitor progress with existing outcome metrics and are well placed to adapt their performance framework for LGOF.
- **Performance Management Pressures.** While the framework avoids rigid targets, poor performance may prompt central government intervention under the Best Value Duty.
- **Cultural and Capacity Shifts.** LGOF requires a focus on outcomes rather than outputs, which aligns well with the Council's existing strategy.

6.3 Reputational and Compliance Risks

- **Public Expectations vs. Delivery Reality.** Greater transparency may expose councils to reputational risk if performance is seen as lacking.
- **Legal and Statutory Duties.** While the LGOF seeks to reduce reporting burdens, statutory duties remain.

7.0. LINK TO HUNTINGDONSHIRE FUTURES, THE CORPORATE PLAN, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

7.1 Huntingdonshire Futures uses an outcomes framework with contextual measures to track community change. Its co-created outcomes align well with LGOF and can be integrated easily. [Huntingdonshire Futures Community Atlas](#).

- 7.2 The Corporate Plan uses an outcomes-based approach, connecting strategy from Huntingdonshire Futures to service and team objectives.
- 7.3 The Corporate plan priority outcomes are all relevant to the purpose and scope of LGOF.



8.0. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no additional resource requirements arising from the Corporate Peer challenge or the Action Plan derived from the recommendations.
- 8.2 The Council's update of the Performance Management Framework which includes streamlining the contextual measures used to inform the Corporate Plan and Service plans will incorporate LG OF.

9.0. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 9.1 This report presents the proposed response to the initial engagement form MHCLG regarding LOOF for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance & Growth).

10. LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

- Appendix 1 [MHCLG LGOF Briefing Document](#)
Appendix 2 [MHCLG LGOF Priority Outcomes and Draft Metrics](#)
Appendix 3 Mapping LGOF against Contextual Measures

Appendix 4 Contextual Measures for Consolidation
Appendix 5 LGOF and HDC Performance Management Framework
Appendix 6 LGOF Comparator Authorities CIPFA
Appendix 7 LGOF Local Neighbours
Appendix 8 LGOF and Service Owners
Appendix 9 Draft Outline Response LGOF
Appendix 10 HDC LGOF Metric Comments by Service Tracker

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- [Huntingdonshire Futures](#)
- [Huntingdonshire Futures Community Atlas](#)
- [Performance Management Framework \(2023\)](#)
- [Contextual Outcome Measures](#)

CONTACT OFFICER

Name/Job Title: Neil Sloper
Head of Policy, Performance and Emergency Planning

Email: neil.sloper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk