Date: 14/10/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017815/A

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017815/A

I write in connection with your request for information dated 08/10/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Revised from 01/FOI/26/017646/B

I wish to refine and narrow the scope of my existing request.

Please answer the following questions which were included in my original request:
1. What is the total annual cost, current and projected as applicable, to GMP for policing related to Number 10 North?

2. How much of the above cost is additional spending for GMP versus within current budgets? How much funding has been allocated by the UK Government to assist with such costs?

Please answer as much of those two questions as you can.

I do not expect that any of the exemptions you have cited should be applied to a simple question about costs, which is in the public interest and in the interests of transparency, within the spirit of the Act.

Given the ample time to search that has lapsed already, please respond with this information within three working days.

Result of Searches
Greater Manchester Police neither confirms nor denies that it holds information relevant to this request by virtue of the following exemptions:

S24(2) National Security
S31(3) Law Enforcement

S38(2) Health and Safety

Harm

Confirmation or denial of whether GMP holds information relating to the costs of policing Number 10 North would reveal information about protective security arrangements connected to a location that may be subject to policing because of its association with high-profile individuals. Even seemingly innocuous information concerning costs, budgets or funding allocations can contribute to a wider intelligence picture when combined with information available from other sources. This is known as the mosaic effect, whereby disparate pieces of information can be collated to identify the nature, scale, capability, deployment patterns and resourcing of policing operations.

Disclosure, or confirmation that such information is held, could enable hostile individuals to draw conclusions regarding the level of police presence, operational capability and security measures in place at a protected location. Such information may be of value to those seeking to disrupt policing activities, undermine security arrangements or target individuals and locations afforded protective measures. This would have the potential to prejudice national security, impede law enforcement functions and place the safety of officers, staff, protected persons and members of the public at risk.

Furthermore, providing information on additional spending, existing budgets or central government funding would allow comparisons to be made regarding the scale and extent of protective operations. Even if the information appeared limited in isolation, its disclosure could assist those intent on identifying policing priorities and operational deployments. GMP therefore considers that confirming or denying whether relevant information is held would itself be likely to cause harm to national security interests, law enforcement capabilities and public safety.

Section 24 - National Security

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
There is a public interest in transparency and accountability regarding the expenditure of public funds.

Confirming or denying whether information is held relating to the policing costs associated with Number 10 North would assist public understanding of how policing resources are allocated and funded. It would also contribute to public debate regarding the financial impact of protecting high-profile individuals and locations.

Factors Favouring Neither Confirming Nor Denying

There is a very strong public interest in protecting national security. Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal whether GMP has responsibility for, or involvement in, protective policing arrangements relating to a specific location. Such information could be combined with material already available in the public domain to build a picture of security measures, operational capability and resource deployment. Any disclosure that undermines protective security arrangements, however indirectly, would not be in the public interest and could have implications for national security.

Section 31 - Law Enforcement

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
Confirming or denying whether information is held would provide greater transparency around policing activity and the allocation of resources. Disclosure would help demonstrate how public funds are utilised and could provide reassurance that appropriate measures are being taken to fulfil policing responsibilities.

Factors Favouring Neither Confirming Nor Denying
There is a significant public interest in ensuring that law enforcement agencies are able to carry out their functions effectively. Confirming or denying whether information is held could reveal information

about the scale, extent and nature of police deployments and operational policing activity associated with a specific location. Criminals or hostile actors may use such information, together with other data, to identify vulnerabilities, assess policing capabilities or infer operational tactics. This would be likely to prejudice GMP's ability to prevent and detect crime and maintain public safety.

Section 38 - Health and Safety

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
There is a public interest in demonstrating that appropriate and proportionate measures are in place to protect individuals and locations requiring policing support. Confirming or denying whether information is held may increase public confidence that security arrangements are properly funded and managed.

Factors Favouring Neither Confirming Nor Denying
There is a substantial public interest in protecting the health and safety of police officers, staff, protected individuals and members of the public. Confirming or denying whether information is held could assist in identifying the level of policing and security arrangements associated with a particular location. This may increase the risk of individuals seeking to target, disrupt or circumvent those arrangements. Any increase in risk to the safety of those involved would not be in the public interest.

Balance Test

GMP recognises the public interest in transparency, openness and accountability regarding the expenditure of public funds and the use of policing resources. There is a legitimate public interest in understanding the financial impact of policing activities and any associated funding arrangements, particularly where public money is involved.

However, greater weight is afforded to the public interest in protecting national security, preserving the effectiveness of law enforcement and safeguarding the health and safety of officers, protected persons and the wider public. Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal information about the existence, extent or nature of policing and protective security arrangements connected to a specific location. Even limited information, when combined with other information available in the public domain, could contribute to a broader understanding of operational capabilities, resource deployment and security measures.

GMP considers that any prejudice to national security, law enforcement functions or public safety would carry significant consequences. The public interest is best served by ensuring that protective security arrangements and operational policing capabilities are not undermined.

Having weighed the competing public interest factors, GMP has concluded that the arguments in favour of neither confirming nor denying whether the requested information is held significantly outweigh those in favour of confirmation or denial. Therefore, the public interest favours maintaining the NCND position under Sections 24(2), 31(3) and 38(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.