Local Government Outcomes Framework

Proposed Huntingdonshire District Council Feedback

- Responses to the general and specific consultation questions
- Examples and references from HDC's Corporate Plan 2023–2028
- Suggestions for additional metrics and contextual data
- Emphasis on local flexibility, innovation, and early intervention

1) How would you like to see the framework used as a tool to support local authorities and local partners to deliver against key national outcomes? For example, undertaking quiet conversations with councils based on outcome trajectory, convening departments to coordinate support where there are concerns across multiple outcomes.

a) As a tool to support Local Authorities:

Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) welcomes the LGOF:

- to support outcome-based accountability
- to underpin strategic alignment across local and central government

We support its **use in enabling focused and prioritised action planning given finite resources** based on observed trajectory.

HDC will use the framework as part of our broader set of existing contextual measures to benchmark progress, identify areas for improvement, and support integrated planning with partners such as the Integrated Care System.

It will also inform our performance reporting and strategic planning aligned with our Corporate Plan 2023/2028.

We will revise and consolidate the contextual measures to incorporate the Outcomes Framework. These are published on our website and shared with public sector and voluntary partners through our place board and more broadly with those seeking to invest in growth to ensure we maximise the right positive outcomes for our community – as embodied in the Council's place strategy, Huntingdonshire Futures.

Recommended:

A **community of practice** that supports **peer learning regarding action planning and prioritisation** given trajectories across England would be useful supporting coordinated action and support where outcomes are off-track, **sharing challenges and innovation.**

b) As a tool with Local Partners:

Shared priorities for action will be established following our approach of Do, Enable and Influence. What we can do ourselves in the direct services we provide, what we can enable though our partnership and community advocacy and influence through shared awareness of the challenges and goals for the communities we represent.

The Council has already started this journey through a co-created place Strategy – **Huntingdonshire Futures** that set out a common set of goal for our communities that they, our partners and ourselves are working to achieve through the way we work.

The Council has an established set of contextual measures which have informed the Futures Strategy but also the priorities or ourselves and partners through our Corporate Plan and its Outcomes and the Place Board.

We would seek to continue to look at system based solutions that address prevention using the framework to identify key systemic barriers and support prioritised and focussed local innovation with partners.

Recommended:

It would be helpful for other public services in the locality to have **a duty to take account of** the identified trajectory and outcomes to establish **a common framework of outcomes** which is more likely to lead to the successful delivery of shared community outcomes.

2) **How would your organisation use the Framework either in its own work or when working with partners?**

a) Strategic Planning and Prioritisation

- **Use case**: Aligning HDC's Corporate Plan priorities with national outcomes.
- **How**: The LGOF provides a consolidated view of key national outcomes and metrics. HDC can use this to benchmark its own priorities (e.g. improving quality of life, housing, climate action) and ensure local plans contribute to national missions.
- **Example**: HDC's focus on early intervention and prevention (e.g. financial vulnerability model) can be mapped to LGOF outcomes like homelessness, health and wellbeing, and multiple disadvantage.

b) Performance Monitoring and Reporting

- **Use case**: Enhancing transparency and accountability.
- **How**: The LGOF offers standardised metrics that HDC can integrate into its quarterly performance reports and dashboards.
- **Example**: HDC already tracks metrics like households in temporary accommodation and planning application timeliness—these align directly with LGOF indicators.

c) Partnership and System Integration

- **Use case**: Coordinating with ICS, CPCA, and other partners.
- **How**: The LGOF encourages joined-up working across public services. HDC can use it to facilitate shared planning and delivery with health, education, and voluntary sector partners.
- **Example**: HDC's role in the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICS can be strengthened by using LGOF health and social care metrics to guide joint priorities.

d) Innovation and Local Flexibility

- **Use case**: Supporting local initiatives and pilot programmes.
- **How**: The LGOF allows councils to supplement national metrics with local ones. HDC can showcase innovative models like Community Health & Wealth Building or Net Zero Villages.
- **Example**: HDC could propose additional metrics on local wealth retention, community engagement, or digital inclusion.

e) Self-Improvement and Peer Learning

- **Use case**: Identifying areas for improvement and learning from others.
- **How**: The LGOF's digital tool (from April 2026) will allow comparisons with similar councils. HDC can use this to identify best practices and areas needing support.
- **Example**: If HDC's performance on youth engagement or biodiversity is below average, it can explore successful approaches from peer authorities.

3) Do you have views on how the Framework can best support local innovation, partnership working and long-term planning?

a) Enabling Innovation

- **How**: By shifting from rigid, ringfenced funding and output-based reporting to outcome-focused accountability, the LGOF gives councils more freedom to design and test local solutions.
- **Supportive Features**:

- o No new data collection burdens—metrics are drawn from existing sources.
- o Flexibility to supplement national metrics with local indicators.
- **HDC Opportunity**: Use the LGOF to showcase innovative models like the Community Health & Wealth Building strategy or the Net Zero Villages pilot, which may not be captured by standard metrics but contribute meaningfully to outcomes, this follows the same approach as our Corporate Plan and actions to deliver the council's outcomes and priorities.

b) Strengthening Partnership Working

- **How**: The LGOF encourages alignment across public services (e.g. health, education, housing) by providing a shared set of outcomes and metrics.
- **Supportive Features**:
  - o Designed to support collaboration across tiers of government and with Integrated Care Systems (ICS).
  - o Promotes shared understanding of delivery progress and barriers.
- **HDC Opportunity**: Use LGOF metrics to coordinate with partners in the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICS, CPCA, and voluntary sector to align priorities and co-deliver services, this follows the same approach as Huntingdonshire Futures with shared outcomes and priorities as a way of working.

c) Supporting Long-Term Planning

- **How:** The LGOF is intended to work alongside multi-year financial settlements, giving councils the certainty needed for strategic planning.

- **Supportive Features:**

  - **o** Outcome metrics focus on long-term impact, not short-term outputs.
  - o Encourages preventative approaches and early intervention.

- **HDC Opportunity:** Embed LGOF outcomes into the Corporate Plan refresh cycle and use them to track progress on long-term goals like reducing crisis demand, improving housing quality, and lowering carbon emissions. This also links directly to the overarching place strategy outcomes with its priority outcomes identified.

General questions about the metrics

General Comments on Metrics:

(Please see Appendix 10 for Service Comments which will be included here)

1) To what extent do you agree that these are appropriate metrics to assess local progress against the priority outcome (given the standards set out in para 27)?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2) If you disagreed with any of the metrics in question 1) above, please explain why.

3) Do you think any other metrics should be added to indicate progress towards the priority outcome?

If you suggest alternative metrics please provide specific examples including links to data sources. They must meet our data standards as detailed above (para 27).

We support most metrics but recommend additional indicators for:

- Community engagement and co-production (e.g. % of residents involved in service design)
- Cultural and leisure participation (e.g. One Leisure usage rates)
- Digital inclusion (e.g. % of residents accessing services online)
- Early intervention (e.g. % of households supported before crisis)

Specific Comments:

- **Neighbourhoods:** *Add metrics on cultural participation and local influence (e.g. % of residents who feel they can influence decisions).*
- **Economic Prosperity:** *Add local wealth retention or social value procurement indicators.*
- **Health and Wellbeing:** *Include upstream indicators such as access to green space and community wellbeing.*
- **Child Poverty:** *Include local metrics on food insecurity or access to support services.*

4) **Relevant contextual information will be presented alongside the metrics e.g. detail of influencing factors outside of local authority control such as population demographics or geography. Is there specific contextual information you think** should be captured alongside any of the metrics? Please be as specific as possible.

There are several dimensions that impact the deliverability of change by the local council and its partners to the outcome framework which should be considered as a context:

a) Demographic and Socioeconomic Context

- Population size and density
- Age profile (e.g. proportion of older residents)
- Ethnic diversity
- Levels of deprivation (e.g. Indices of Multiple Deprivation)
- Rurality or urbanity

These factors influence demand for services and the complexity of need. For example, HDC has a growing and ageing population, which affects housing, health, and social care outcomes.

b) Local Governance and Service Delivery Models

- Changing authority structures including Parish Councils
- Shared services or outsourcing arrangements
- ICS and Combined Authority boundaries

These affect who is responsible for delivering outcomes and how services are coordinated. For instance, HDC currently works within a two-tier system which will experience a period of change in the next 5 years on the journey to establishing and embedding new unitary authorities and is a partner in the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICS.

c) Funding and Resource Constraints

- Core spending power per capita
- Access to capital funding or grants
- Historic underinvestment or legacy costs
- The Fairer funding review and potential benefits/disbenefits

This helps explain variation in capacity to deliver outcomes, especially in areas like housing, infrastructure, and climate adaptation.

d) Geographic and Environmental Factors

- Flood risk zones
- Air quality baseline
- Transport connectivity
- Access to green space
- Carbon emissions

These influence outcomes in areas like environment, health, and infrastructure. For example, rural areas may face challenges in public transport provision or EV infrastructure rollout. Huntingdonshire is one of the wettest and driest districts in England significantly impacting resilience and adaptation.

e) Policy and Regulatory Environment

- Planning policy constraints (e.g. Green Belt)
- National policy changes (e.g. welfare reform, housing standards)
- Statutory duties and inspection regimes

These can shape what is achievable locally and how quickly outcomes can be improved.

Questions about metrics by priority outcome

(Please see Appendix 10 for Service Comments which will be included here)

40. This section details additional questions that relate to metrics under specific priority outcomes. If there are no additional questions alongside any priority outcome please still consider the general questions about each metric as at para 37 (questions 1 to 4) when providing feedback.

Priority outcome	Additional questions
Homelessness and rough sleeping	No additional questions
Housing	• The metric 'Proportion of rental housing in local authority area deemed decent' uses modelled data given the lack of suitable alternatives. To what extent do you think the use of modelled data is suitable? • The metric 'Percentage of planning applications decided on time (dwellings)' combines both major and non-major planning decisions, which operate on different legal timeframes. To what extent do you think this combined metric is suitable?

Multiple disadvantage (MD)	• The approach to capture multiple disadvantage (MD) outcomes has been to look at data covering elements of MD and proxy the MD cohort by looking at the existing overlaps with other support needs captured in the data. To what extent do you agree with this approach? Please expand.
	• Are there any suitable data sources that could be used to capture outcomes around:
	   o the role of local authorities in improving population mental health
	   o local efforts to support people leaving prison and/or serving sentences in the community to secure settled accommodation?
	• How can we best capture the holistic efforts to coordinate services across delivery partners to improve the lives of those experiencing MD?
	• Would more flexibility be required in the definition of MD to accurately capture the MD population in your area? Are there suitable data sources that capture this?
	• There are data gaps that make measuring this cohort difficult. Putting those data gaps to one side, what would an ideal priority outcome area for MD measure?
	• Is there work ongoing in your area to improve data collection/linking around identifying individuals experiencing MD?

Priority outcome	Additional questions
Best start in life	• The duty on local authorities to secure sufficient childcare is currently proposed to be measured through take-up rates for early years entitlements. Are there any available metrics that can be used to measure local government's duty to secure childcare sufficiency more broadly (including early years, school-aged childcare and childcare for children with SEND)? • We intend to include an outcome measure in the LGOF for the Family Hubs and Start for Life programme. Family Hubs and
	their services support a wide range of parental and child health and development outcomes. What do you think is most important and practical for the LGOF to include?
Every child achieving and thriving	• Are there any available metrics that can measure participation by young people in youth services in an local authority area, or reflect the quality of youth services delivered by LAs? • Are there any available metrics to capture local authorities' contribution to delivering the aims of the youth justice service?
Keeping children safe and family security	No additional questions

Health and wellbeing	• The *Slope Index of Inequality (SII) in life expectancy* has been proposed as a metric to track changes in health inequality within LAs. To what extent do you think this is a suitable indicator to measure changes in health inequality at local authority level? • Is there an alternative metric available to measure health inequality at local authority level, which is better aligned to local authority delivery? • Are there any available metrics that could be used to capture outcomes around the role of local authorities in improving population mental health?
Adult social care	No additional questions
Neighbourhoods	• Are there any available metrics to capture local authority responsibility for reducing Anti-Social Behaviour?
Environment, circular economy and climate change	• Are there any available metrics to measure local government's contribution to flood resilience? • Are there any available metrics to measure local government's contribution to biodiversity?
Transport and local Infrastructure	• Do you have views on how the transport responsibilities at different tiers of government could be clearly reflected in the presentation of the metrics?
Economic prosperity and regeneration (contextual outcome)	• Are there any available metrics to capture local authorities' responsibilities for reducing poverty and delivering employment support? • Are there specific local authority activities you think should be highlighted in the contextual narrative when presenting this priority outcome?
Child poverty (contextual outcome)	• Reducing and mitigating the impacts of poverty and deprivation, particularly in children, is a key priority for many local authorities. We have captured relevant metrics in housing, homelessness and rough sleeping and the wider children's focused outcomes. Are there any other available metrics that could help provide additional context on the role of local authorities in tackling child poverty?