

Date: 1st June 2026
Our ref: FOI/26/016791/F

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/26/016791/F

I write in connection with your request for information dated 29/04/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I am writing to make a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 in relation to the following Britannia Hotels property or properties within your force area:

- * *Britannia Hotel Manchester, Portland Street, Manchester, M1 3LA*
- * *Britannia Sachas Hotel, Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1SH*
- * *Britannia Ashley Hotel, Hale Road, Hale, Altrincham, WA14 2EW*
- * *Britannia Country House Hotel, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2WG*
- * *Britannia Stockport Hotel, Dialstone Lane, Stockport, SK2 6AN*
- * *Airport Inn Manchester Hotel & Spa, Altrincham Road, Wilmslow, SK9 4LR*
- * *Britannia Hotel Bolton, Beaumont Road, Bolton, BL3 4TA*
- *

For each of the above addresses, I respectfully request the following information:

1. Section 116 Notices (Child Sexual Exploitation at Hotels)

Whether your force has issued a Child Sexual Exploitation notice under Section 116 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to any of the above premises, and if so: (a) the date the notice was issued; (b) the duration of the notice; (c) whether the notice has been renewed or revoked; (d) the number of incidents that prompted the notice.

2. Police-recorded incidents at the premises

For the period 1 January 2015 to the date of this request, the total number of police-recorded incidents at each of the above addresses, broken down by the following categories where possible: (a) child sexual exploitation (CSE); (b) child criminal exploitation (CCE) / county lines; (c) modern slavery / human trafficking; (d) rape or sexual assault; (e) missing persons (under 18); (f) safeguarding referrals involving minors.

3. Arrests and charges

For the same period, the number of arrests made at or in direct connection with each of the above addresses for any of the above offence categories (CSE, CCE, modern slavery, rape/sexual assault involving a minor).

4. Multi-agency referrals and safeguarding activity

Whether the premises have been the subject of any multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH) referrals, strategy meetings or joint visits by police and children's services in relation to child exploitation, and if so, the number of such referrals or meetings.

5. Formal engagement with hotel management

Whether your force has formally engaged with the management or ownership of any of the above hotels in relation to child exploitation or safeguarding concerns, including but not limited to: (a) Operation Makesafe or equivalent hotel safeguarding training programmes; (b) formal written warnings or advisory letters; (c) licensing authority referrals.

I appreciate that some data may engage exemptions under Section 31 (law enforcement) or Section 40 (personal data). Where this is the case, I ask that you provide whatever information can be disclosed, applying the public interest test. I am happy to receive aggregated or anonymised data.

I would be grateful for a response within the statutory 20 working days.

Result of Searches

Greater Manchester Police neither confirms nor denies that it holds the information requested by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 31(3) – Law Enforcement

Section 38(2) – Health and Safety

Section 40(5) – Personal Information

Section 31 and 38 are prejudice based and qualified which means that there is a requirement to articulate the harm in confirming or not whether information is held as well as carrying out a public interest test.

Overall Harm

Taken as a whole, the request seeks to establish whether a named premises has been associated with child exploitation, safeguarding concerns, police investigations or enforcement activity. Confirming or denying this information would create a detailed intelligence picture about police awareness, assessment of risk and operational focus at a specific location. Disclosure would be likely to prejudice law enforcement activity, undermine safeguarding arrangements, and increase the risk of harm to children and vulnerable persons. The harm arises not from the detail of any one answer, but from the cumulative effect of confirming or denying the existence of policing or safeguarding activity at the premises.

Section 31(3) – Law Enforcement - The public interest in disclosure lies in promoting transparency and public confidence in how the police respond to child exploitation risks, and in reassuring the public that safeguarding powers are used appropriately. However, the public interest in maintaining the effectiveness of law enforcement is strong. Confirming or denying whether the premises has been subject to notices, incidents, arrests or safeguarding activity would reveal sensitive information about policing priorities, thresholds for intervention and known vulnerabilities. This could be exploited by offenders, undermine crime prevention efforts and compromise future operational activity. On balance, the public interest favours maintaining an NCND position to protect effective law enforcement.

Section 38(2) – Health and Safety - There is a public interest in openness where matters relate to child protection and safeguarding. However, disclosure in this context would carry a real risk of increasing harm.

Revealing whether a specific location has been linked to exploitation or safeguarding activity could expose children and vulnerable persons to further risk, stigmatise individuals or families, and deter

reporting or engagement with the police and partner agencies. The public interest in protecting the safety and welfare of vulnerable individuals outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

Section 40(5) – Personal Data - While transparency is a general public interest consideration, there is a strong public interest in protecting the privacy rights of individuals, particularly children and those involved in safeguarding processes. Even without naming individuals, confirming or denying safeguarding or exploitation activity at a specific premises could lead to indirect identification of victims, suspects or others involved. Disclosure would be unfair and contrary to data protection principles. The public interest therefore favours withholding information to protect personal data.

Balance Test

Having considered the competing factors, the public interest in maintaining effective policing, safeguarding children and vulnerable persons, and protecting sensitive law enforcement information clearly outweighs the public interest in location-specific transparency. The balance therefore favours refusal to confirm or deny the information requested.