

# Salary Sacrifice Pension Cap in 2029

## Why It May Never Happen



### A clear look at the factors that could delay, dilute, or derail the proposed £2,000 cap

The government has announced its intention to introduce a cap on the National Insurance (NI) exemption for salary-sacrifice pension contributions from April 2029, limiting the NI-free portion to £2,000 per year.

While the proposal is officially on the books, there are several compelling reasons why the policy may not be implemented as planned - or may be significantly altered before it takes effect.

In this article, we break down the major risks to the policy's survival.

#### What we know now

- ✓ The government has publicly committed to capping exemption: from April 2029, only the first £2,000 of employee pension contributions via salary sacrifice will be exempt from National Insurance (NI). Contributions above that will lose the NI advantage.
- ✓ The move is justified by the government as helping make the system "fairer and more sustainable," since salary-sacrifice pension contributions have reportedly grown significantly - from ~£2.8bn in 2017 to a projected £8bn by 2030 without reform.
- ✓ The government estimates the cap will raise about £4.7 billion in 2029-30.

However - there are quite a few reasons to suspect that the cap might not survive unaltered, or could even be reversed, before 2029.

## Reasons the £2,000 cap might not happen or could be weakened

### 1 Implementation and administrative complexity

Payroll teams, pension providers, and employers face major system changes to implement a contribution cap.

This includes:

- Updating payroll software
- Renegotiating employment contracts
- Re-engineering long-standing salary-sacrifice schemes



For many small or mid-sized employers, the complexity and cost may outweigh the benefits, leading them to withdraw salary-sacrifice schemes altogether. This undermines pension engagement and reduces the revenue uplift the government expects—raising questions about whether the plan is worth pursuing.

### 2 Pushback from industry and pension-savings stakeholders

Industry groups have broadly criticised the cap as counterproductive.



Concerns include:

- Reduced incentives to save for retirement
- Reversal of progress made through automatic enrolments
- Negative impact on middle earners, public sector workers, and older employees contributing heavily to pensions

If pressure from pension providers, employers, and unions intensifies, the government may be forced to soften or delay the measure.

### 3 Risk that revenue yield assumptions are wrong



The government estimates the cap will raise £4.7 billion in 2029–30. This assumes employees continue contributing at similar levels outside salary sacrifice.

But if individuals respond by:

- Reducing pension contributions
- Opting out of schemes
- Avoiding salary sacrifice entirely

...then the NI "gain" could be significantly lower. If the policy doesn't deliver the revenue anticipated, it becomes far less attractive to maintain.

### 4 Political Timing: The 2029 General Election

**This may be the single biggest threat to the policy actually happening.**

The timing of the planned April 2029 implementation overlaps with the most politically sensitive period—the run-up to the 2029 General Election. Campaigning will be in full swing throughout 2028 and early 2029, creating several risks:

#### Voter Backlash

Reducing take-home pay for millions of workers immediately before an election is politically dangerous. No government wants to be seen imposing a "stealth tax" on pension saving at such a critical time.

#### Opposition Party Attacks

Opposition parties will almost certainly frame the cap as:

- Anti-saver
- Anti-middle-earner
- Damaging to pension adequacy

This increases pressure on the government to delay or revise the policy to avoid handing opponents an easy campaign issue.

#### New Government Reversal

If the election results in a change of government - or even a narrow win - an incoming administration may reverse or review the cap before it ever goes live.

#### Legislative Constraints During Election Period

Civil service purdah and reduced parliamentary time limit the ability to finalise the policy. Large structural tax changes typically avoid being introduced in an election year for this very reason.



## Reasons the £2,000 cap might not happen or could be weakened

### 5 Employer and Providers Resist Change During Periods of Uncertainty

If the government is heading into an election, businesses may argue that:

- They shouldn't be forced to overhaul payroll systems for a policy that could be reversed
- The uncertainty makes planning difficult
- A review after the election is more appropriate

This argument gains strength during politically unstable or transitional periods.



### What's uncertain

- The government's own documentation admits that the estimate of £4.7 bn additional revenue is "subject to uncertainties related to potential responses to the change by employers and employees."
- It's not guaranteed that all employers will maintain their pension schemes - some may restructure benefits, reduce matching contributions, or even withdraw salary-sacrifice altogether depending on cost/benefit analysis post-cap.
- Long-term effects on retirement savings behaviour are unpredictable. If many people stop contributing, it could erode pension coverage - a politically sensitive problem that might lead to policy revision.

### Final Outlook

While the £2,000 salary-sacrifice cap is scheduled for April 2029, it faces significant headwinds:

- ✓ Administrative complexity
- ✓ Industry-wide opposition
- ✓ Uncertain revenue impact
- ✓ Political risk due to the 2029 General Election
- ✓ Likelihood of post-election review

Given these factors, it is increasingly plausible that the cap will be delayed, watered down, or scrapped entirely before 2029.

### 6 Continued legal, regulatory or stakeholder challenge



- There may be legal or regulatory scrutiny of how broadly the cap is applied (for example, whether it inadvertently affects non-pension salary-sacrifice schemes or other benefits). Implementing such changes in a way that avoids loopholes or unintended consequences could prove harder than anticipated.
- If unions, pension-industry bodies or employer groups organise effective resistance, pressure could mount to soften or abandon the cap - especially if it impacts pension uptake and long-term public retirement outcomes.

#### Stay connected!

Follow us on [LinkedIn](#) | Visit our [website](#) | [Contact Us](#) for a consultation

#### HEAD OFFICE

CORPAD Employee Benefits Limited, Unit 4, Antler Complex, Bruntcliffe Way, Leeds, LS27 0JG  
0113 387 0112 [ceb@corpad.co.uk](mailto:ceb@corpad.co.uk) [in](https://www.linkedin.com/company/corpad-employee-benefits-ltd/) Corpad Employee Benefits Ltd

[corpademployeefbenefits.com](http://corpademployeefbenefits.com)

