

Summary of Non-Demand Pressures 2025/26 - 2028/29 (Draft Budget Position)

	Directorate	Reference	Pressure	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	Total
				£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Chief Executive	Customer and Community	P25-38N	Online Accessibility Software	4				4
		P25-39N	Casino Income	55				55
		P25-40N	Customer Experience & Digital Channel Income	26				26
			Total Customer and Community	85	0	0	0	85
	Finance and Resources	P25-41L	Azure		499			499
			Total Finance & Resources	0	499	0	0	499
Deputy Chief Executive	Planning and Placemaking	P25-42L	Planning Academy Continuation	(88)	(90)			(178)
		P25-43N	Heritage & Design Income	140				140
			Total Planning and Placemaking	52	(90)	0	0	(38)
Grand Total			137	409	0	0	546	

Summary of Demand Pressures 2025/26 - 2028/29 (Draft Budget Position)

There are no business cases for these pressures as they are demand-led pressures

	Directorate	Reference	Pressure	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	Total
				£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Chief Executive	Adult Services	P25-1L	Learning Disability (LD) Services		725	1,145	2,406	4,276
		P25-2L	Older People (OP)	1,478	724	737	734	3,673
		P25-3L	Physical Disabilities (PD)	1,663	501	501	501	3,166
		P25-4L	Mental Health	1,215	1,149	1,530	1,983	5,877
		P25-5L	Autism	1,213	1,104	1,062	1,062	4,441
		P25-6N	Homelessness Prevention - Accommodation	200				200
		P25-7L	Mental Health Supported Accommodation	101				101
		P25-8N	Block Care Home Contract	685				685
		P25-9N	Block Care Home Contract (offsetting pressure)	(685)				(685)
		P25-10N	Minor Adaptations	50				50
		P25-11N	Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES)	121				121
			Total Adult Services	6,041	4,203	4,975	6,686	21,905
	Children's Services	P25-12L	School Travel Support (STS)	51	528	562	598	1,739
		P25-13L	Children with Disabilities (CWD)	1,067	377	453	546	2,443
		P25-14L	Children's Social Care - External Residential Placements	8,135	403	403	403	9,344
		P25-44N	Children's Social Care	(1,500)	0	0	0	(1,500)
		P25-15L	Children's Social Care - External Fostering Placements	2,365	136	82	82	2,665
		P25-16L	Children's Social Care - In House Placements	1,052	246	291	281	1,870
		P25-17N	Corporate Parenting Staffing Teams	316				316
		P25-18N	Fostering Finance Policy	106				106
		P25-19N	Regional Adoption Agency	156				156
		P25-20N	Fostering Panel Fees	25				25
		P25-21N	Legal	500				500
		P25-22N	Resources Panel	201				201
		P25-23N	Educational Psychology	259				259
		P25-24N	ASYE Statutory Assessor	20				20
		P25-25N	Young People's Substance Misuse Service	50				50
		P25-26N	Children's Advocacy Contract	47				47
		P25-27N	Family Time Staffing	122				122
	P25-28N	Children With Disabilities (CWD) Staffing Team	113				113	
			Total Children's Services	13,084	1,690	1,791	1,910	18,475
	Finance and Resources	P25-29N	LWP/Reduction in subsidy recovery	140				140
			Total Finance and Resources	140	0	0	0	140
Deputy Chief Executive	Law & Governance	P25-30N	Legal establishment	179				179
		P25-31N	Legal establishment	(179)				(179)
		P25-32N	Legal establishment for CSC	119				119
			Total Law & Governance	119	0	0	0	119
	Planning and Placemaking	P25-33L	Planning income		(150)	(450)		(600)
		P25-34L	Land charge income	(30)	(60)	0		(90)
			Total Planning and Placemaking	(30)	(210)	(450)	0	(690)
	Environment and Property	P25-35L	Demographic Growth (Waste)	302	370	537	450	1,659
		P25-36L	Demographic Growth (Landscape)	56	69	100	84	309
		P25-37L	Demographic Growth (Highways)	42	138	145	153	478
			Total Environment and Property	400	577	782	687	2,446
Grand Total			19,754	6,260	7,098	9,283	42,395	
Total All Pressures			19,891	6,669	7,098	9,283	42,941	

Outline Business Case:	Reference:	
Other Pressure	P25	38N

Portfolio Holder <i>(select)</i>	Pete Marland	<i>Leader of the Council</i>
Director <i>(select)</i>	Sarah Gonsalves	<i>Director, Customer and Community</i>
Head of Service	Kellie Evans	<i>Head of Communications</i>
Budget Manager / Lead Officer and Job Title	Kellie Evans	<i>Head of Communications</i>
Budget Code and Description	50000590	<i>Communications</i>
Brief Description	Silktide - A website accessibility auditing tool to enable us to meet the requirement of demonstrating our online accessibility.	

Status <i>(select)</i>	New this year	
Reason	Policy Choice	
Risk Level <i>RAG (select)</i>	Low	<i>Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year.</i>

Financial Summary	Profile				
Detail of proposal elements. Enter cumulative figures, e.g., £50k in yr 1 + £50k in yr 2 = £100k by yr 2.	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	Total £'000
Silktide	4				4
					0
					0
					0
					0
Total In Year	4	0	0	0	4
Cumulative Total	4	4	4	4	16

If not new, how has this pressure been funded or absorbed in previous years?
Previously absorbed by non-recurring underspends.
What would be the impact of not funding this pressure? (financial impact if unavoidable, service impact if avoidable)
All UK public sector bodies are required to meet WCAG AA accessibility standards. Without accessibility testing software we would be unable to readily determine whether our website and microsites are accessible for customers/job applicants, or if they are meeting these standards (we are asked to provide evidence to Gov that the standards are met).
What management action has been taken to mitigate this pressure? (including any offsetting savings/income generation)
Last year, the comms team negotiated the service for free for one year from the supplier, but this was a one off opportunity. This supplier is the lowest cost provider.
How is the value of the pressure calculated? (and link to any working paper)
Reflects quote received by supplier.
How could risk be mitigated
We could decide not to monitor the accessibility of our websites and microsites, or do so sporadically eg every other year. This would make training web authors more problematic and would likely mean people fall out of good practice in thinking about accessibility when they update the site.

Other relevant information

--

Risk level	Description
High	Very Likely to change and the impact could be significant >£200k in any one year
Medium	Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum
Low	Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year

Outline Business Case:	Reference:	
Other Pressure	P25	40N

Portfolio Holder <i>(select)</i>	Pete Marland	<i>Leader of the Council</i>
Director <i>(select)</i>	Sarah Gonsalves	<i>Director, Customer and Community</i>
Head of Service	Lisa Beckett	<i>Head of Customer Data and Insight</i>
Budget Manager / Lead Officer and Job Title	Lisa Beckett	<i>Head of Customer Data and Insight</i>
Budget Code and Description	50004354	<i>Customer Experience and Digital Channel</i>
Brief Description	The income target for customer experience has created a pressure as it has never been achieved, nor is there the opportunity for this to improve.	

Status <i>(select)</i>	New this year	
Reason	Policy Choice	
Risk Level <i>RAG (select)</i>	Low	<i>Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year.</i>

Financial Summary	Profile				
Detail of proposal elements. Enter cumulative figures, e.g., £50k in yr 1 + £50k in yr 2 = £100k by yr 2.	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	Total £'000
CAN web advertising income pressure	26				26
					0
					0
					0
					0
Total In Year	26	0	0	0	26
Cumulative Total	26	26	26	26	104

If not new, how has this pressure been funded or absorbed in previous years?
Previously absorbed by underspends in other areas that will no longer be available.

What would be the impact of not funding this pressure? (financial impact if unavoidable, service impact if avoidable)
The income target will not be met. As this income target has never been met and there is no spending committed against this target, there is no operational impact.

What management action has been taken to mitigate this pressure? (including any offsetting savings/income generation)
For the last three years this has been met by underspends in other areas but this is not going to be possible in future years

How is the value of the pressure calculated? (and link to any working paper)
See supporting information

How could risk be mitigated
N/A

Other relevant information

--

Risk level	Description
High	Very Likely to change and the impact could be significant >£200k in any one year
Medium	Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum
Low	Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year

Outline Business Case:	Reference:	
Other Pressure	P25	41L

Portfolio Holder <i>(select)</i>	Lauren Townsend	<i>Cabinet Member for Resources and Customer Experience</i>
Director <i>(select)</i>	Steve Richardson	<i>Director, Finance and Resources</i>
Head of Service	Hazel Lewis	<i>Head of IT Services</i>
Budget Manager / Lead Officer and Job Title	Peter Firth	<i>Desktop Services Manager</i>
Budget Code and Description	50000270	<i>File Servers</i>
Brief Description	The Council procured a 3 year contract with Microsoft to host the main IT server estate in the Cloud. The term of the current contract is 3 years. This pressure provides base budget funding from 2025 to continue with a hosting arrangement once the initial funding has been fully utilised.	

Status <i>(select)</i>	Previously Approved - Unchanged	
Reason	Policy Choice	
Risk Level <i>RAG (select)</i>	Medium	<i>Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum</i>

Financial Summary	Profile				
Detail of proposal elements. Enter cumulative figures, e.g., £50k in yr 1 + £50k in yr 2 = £100k by yr 2.	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	Total £'000
Azure Licensing Costs	0	499	0	0	499
					0
					0
					0
					0
Total In Year	0	499	0	0	499
Cumulative Total	0	499	499	499	1,497

If not new, how has this pressure been funded or absorbed in previous years?
A Delegated Decision was approved on 25 January 2022 to fund the move from the Northampton Data Centre (legacy LGSS arrangement) to the Microsoft Azure for a period of 3 years. This has been funded from NHB grant originally held in the Capital Programme for a proposed Physical refresh. This pressure provides the base budget funding from 2025 to continue with an equivalent support arrangement. A full options review will be conducted prior to re-procurement, in line with the original DD.

What would be the impact of not funding this pressure? (financial impact if unavoidable, service impact if avoidable)
Loss of access to the Council's data centre including all data held. This would have significant impact across all departments within the Council and partners (such as the NHS, TVP, MKDP & BLMK CCG).

What management action has been taken to mitigate this pressure? (including any offsetting savings/income generation)
Decision taken to review of DataCentre provision to commence in 2023/24. Review took place, and a further review will need to happen in 2027/28.

How is the value of the pressure calculated? (and link to any working paper)
The value is estimated based on the current contract price. This will be reviewed nearer the time based on market conditions and our requirements at that point.

How could risk be mitigated

Other relevant information

--

Risk level	Description
High	Very Likely to change and the impact could be significant >£200k in any one year
Medium	Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum
Low	Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year

Outline Business Case:	Reference:	
Other Pressure	P25	42L

Portfolio Holder <i>(select)</i>	Pete Marland	<i>Leader of the Council</i>
Director <i>(select)</i>	Paul Thomas	<i>Director, Planning and Place-Making</i>
Head of Service	Jon Palmer	<i>Head of Planning</i>
Budget Manager / Lead Officer and Job Title	Sarah Evans / Olivia Drury	<i>Planning Projects and Services Manger / Planning Projects Manager</i>
Budget Code and Description	50004403	<i>Planning Projects and Services</i>
Brief Description	Planning Academy Continuation - This is to continue the Academy into future years whilst reversing previously applied pressure funding, assuming that the cohorts from 22/23 and 23/24 continue their training. This is necessary to take forward the discussions and Memorandum of Understanding we have with the Royal Town Planning Institute.	

Status <i>(select)</i>	Previously Approved - Unchanged	
Reason	Policy Choice	
Risk Level <i>RAG (select)</i>	Medium	<i>Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum</i>

Financial Summary	Profile				
Detail of proposal elements. Enter cumulative figures, e.g., £50k in yr 1 + £50k in yr 2 = £100k by yr 2.	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	Total £'000
Graduate Chartered Town Planners	-88	-90			-178
					0
					0
					0
					0
Total In Year	-88	-90	0	0	-178
Cumulative Total	-88	-178	-178	-178	-622

If not new, how has this pressure been funded or absorbed in previous years?
 2022/23 Annex U (200k) one off funding, and previously approved pressure for 23-24. This has been used to set up the Academy and cover the initial recruitment of three graduate planners in 2022 and a further two graduate planners in 2023. Further recruitment to the Planning Academy in 2024 was paused. This pressure continues the academy in future years whilst reversing previously applied pressure funding.

What would be the impact of not funding this pressure? (financial impact if unavoidable, service impact if avoidable)
 This is the reversal of a previous pressure. Continuing the Academy mitigates a number of issues: Continuously recruiting for planners that have limited availability in the market; Continued pressure on current staff to service current workload and needing to recruit. This is a method of growing our own planning professionals while current Senior Officers are developed by mentoring the graduates move into Principal Planning Officer positions.

Significant work has been undertaken, in conjunction with an MoU with the Royal Town Planning Institute, in setting up the Planning Academy. This has attracted a number of high quality candidates and positive press. There would be an additional reputational impact from not providing ongoing support for the Academy. Continuing the Academy would be seen positively both externally and by existing members of the team as the investment would show that the significant and ongoing challenges in recruitment is being addressed.

What management action has been taken to mitigate this pressure? (including any offsetting savings/income generation)
 MKDP included in programme as a placement for the graduates and in turn are a sponsor (£25k approved first and second years). Additional sponsorship for the Academy will be sought to support the ongoing operation of the Academy. This is likely to cover the administration and management costs of the Academy, which have not be included within the financial summary above.

How is the value of the pressure calculated? (and link to any working paper)

see supporting information.

How could risk be mitigated

Other relevant information

Risk level	Description
High	Very Likely to change and the impact could be significant >£200k in any one year
Medium	Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum
Low	Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year

Outline Business Case:	Reference:
Other Pressure	P25 43N

Portfolio Holder <i>(select)</i>	Pete Marland	<i>Leader of the Council</i>
Director <i>(select)</i>	Paul Thomas	<i>Director, Planning and Place-Making</i>
Head of Service	Jon Palmer	<i>Head of Planning</i>
Budget Manager / Lead Officer and Job Title	Jon Palmer	<i>Head of Planning</i>
Budget Code and Description	50000122	<i>Heritage & Design</i>
Brief Description	Heritage & Design Income - The income targets for Heritage & Design (previously Urban Design which merged with Heritage & Conservation) have not been achieved since 2021-22. This position is not expected to improve as, following two restructures and reduced capacity within Urban Design, it is no longer possible to meet the target. The pressure can no longer be covered by other areas within planning or one-off grant income.	

Status <i>(select)</i>	New this year	
Reason	Policy Choice	
Risk Level <i>RAG (select)</i>	Low	<i>Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year.</i>

Financial Summary	Profile				
Detail of proposal elements. Enter cumulative figures, e.g., £50k in yr 1 + £50k in yr 2 = £100k by yr 2.	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	Total £'000
Heritage & Design Income Pressure	140				140
					0
					0
					0
					0
					0
Total In Year	140	0	0	0	140
Cumulative Total	140	140	140	140	560

If not new, how has this pressure been funded or absorbed in previous years?
 Available grants to offset this pressure have been utilised but now fully used up, and external neighbourhood grants (previously received annually) have not been released for this year. It was also absorbed by underspends in other areas within planning, but the pressure is now too large to do this. The target is not achievable; if all staff charge out 100% of their time the income would still fall short of the target.

What would be the impact of not funding this pressure? (financial impact if unavoidable, service impact if avoidable)
 The pressure would need to be covered through the budgets associated with other areas within the Planning Service. This would result in a reduced capacity to deliver the statutory work of the service.

What management action has been taken to mitigate this pressure? (including any offsetting savings/income generation)
 Work of the team is being focused on supporting the preparation of the MK City Plan (covered by Annex W) and inputting to Planning Performance Agreements (funded by developers).

How is the value of the pressure calculated? (and link to any working paper)
 See Supporting Information tab

How could risk be mitigated

Other relevant information

--

Risk level	Description
High	Very Likely to change and the impact could be significant >£200k in any one year
Medium	Likely to change and impact could be up to but not more than £200k per annum
Low	Fixed or unlikely to change and impact less than £50k in any one year