

Date: 17/09/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017483/A

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017483/A

I write in connection with your request for information dated 19/08/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

- 1. The total officer overtime cost attributable to policing No 10 North since 23 July 2026.***
- 2. The number of officer shifts deployed to Heron House over the same period.***
- 3. Whether any additional funding has been sought from the Home Office or Cabinet Office for policing No 10 North, and the amount.***

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

Whilst the request seeks information relating to costs, funding arrangements, agreements and policing activity, confirmation or denial that information is or is not held would itself disclose sensitive information regarding policing operations, protective security measures, resource allocation, operational planning and the existence or otherwise of specific security arrangements connected to government premises, sites associated with national security, protected persons and other high-profile individuals.

You have framed your request around specific locations and premises rather than seeking information about protective policing arrangements in general terms. GMP recognises that it may, in certain circumstances, be publicly acknowledged that protection is afforded to individuals holding particular public offices. However, the issue in this case is not whether protection may generally be provided, but

whether information is held concerning policing, security, funding or operational arrangements at specific identifiable locations.

Confirming or denying whether information is held in relation to those locations could reveal information about the presence, extent, nature or focus of policing and protective security activity at a particular site. Unlike a general acknowledgement that protective policing exists, a confirmation or denial linked to a specific building, premises or residence could enable conclusions to be drawn regarding operational deployment, threat assessments, security priorities and the likelihood of attendance or use of that location by protected individuals.

In respect of locations associated with the Prime Minister or other protected persons, GMP cannot assume when, how frequently, or under what circumstances such individuals may be present. Confirmation or denial that information is held regarding a particular location may therefore reveal sensitive information about protective security arrangements which is not otherwise publicly available. Such information could be of value to individuals seeking to identify vulnerabilities, undermine policing activity, circumvent security measures, target protected persons or otherwise cause harm.

Furthermore, any confirmation or denial would need to be considered alongside information already available in the public domain. When combined with other information, seemingly innocuous disclosures may contribute to a wider mosaic picture of policing, security and funding arrangements, enabling sensitive conclusions to be drawn regarding operational capabilities, deployment models, security measures and resource allocation.

As disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is effectively disclosure to the world at large, confirming or denying whether information is held would create a real risk of prejudice to national security, law enforcement capabilities, public safety and the commercial interests associated with sensitive policing, security and funding arrangements.

Public Interest in Confirming or Denying Whether Information is Held – S24

There is a public interest in promoting transparency and accountability regarding the use of public funds and the deployment of policing resources.

Confirmation or denial may assist public understanding of the extent to which GMP commit resources to the policing and security of government premises, public office holders and other locations of public interest. Greater openness promotes informed public debate and enables the public to better understand how policing services are delivered and funded.

Public Interest in Neither Confirming Nor Denying Whether Information is Held – S24

There is a very strong public interest in protecting national security. Confirming or denying whether information is held would itself provide insight into policing and security arrangements associated with government-related sites, protected individuals and locations connected to national security functions.

Such disclosure may enable hostile actors to draw conclusions regarding security priorities, threat assessments, deployment models and the allocation of policing resources. When combined with other information already available, even limited disclosures may contribute towards a broader understanding of protective security arrangements through the mosaic effect.

Any compromise to national security would be contrary to the interests of the public and could have significant consequences for public safety and the effective discharge of policing responsibilities.

Public Interest in Confirming or Denying Whether Information is Held – S31

There is a public interest in promoting openness and accountability regarding policing activity and expenditure. Confirmation or denial may assist public understanding of how operational policing

resources are prioritised and deployed and may contribute to public confidence that policing decisions are subject to appropriate scrutiny. Disclosure may also inform public debate concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of policing services by GMP.

Public Interest in Neither Confirming Nor Denying Whether Information is Held – S31

There is a substantial public interest in ensuring that law enforcement functions are not prejudiced.

Confirming or denying whether information is held could reveal the existence, scope or level of policing activity, specialist deployments, operational support arrangements or protective measures.

Such information may be of value to those seeking to disrupt policing activity, evade law enforcement, identify vulnerabilities or interfere with security arrangements. Releasing information capable of undermining policing tactics, operational capability or resource deployment would prejudice the prevention and detection of crime and would not be in the wider public interest.

Public Interest in Confirming or Denying Whether Information is Held – S38

There is a recognised public interest in openness concerning the expenditure of public money and the measures taken by GMP to protect individuals and locations. Confirmation or denial may contribute to public understanding of the steps taken by GMP to fulfil its responsibilities and may enhance public confidence in policing arrangements.

Public Interest in Neither Confirming Nor Denying Whether Information is Held – S38

There is a very strong public interest in protecting the health and safety of individuals. Confirming or denying whether information is held may disclose information from which the presence, absence, nature or extent of policing and security arrangements can be inferred.

Such disclosures could increase risks to protected individuals, police officers, police staff and members of the public by assisting those seeking to identify vulnerabilities or exploit perceived weaknesses in security arrangements. The public interest is strongly served by ensuring that information likely to increase risks to safety is not placed into the public domain.

Balance Test

Greater Manchester Police recognises the importance of transparency, accountability and public scrutiny regarding the expenditure of public funds, the deployment of policing resources and the arrangements entered by public authorities. Confirmation or denial of whether information is held could contribute to public understanding of policing activity, security provision, funding arrangements and collaborative working between police forces and government departments.

However, there is a substantially stronger public interest in ensuring that information is not disclosed, either directly or indirectly, where doing so could undermine national security, prejudice law enforcement activities, compromise protective security arrangements, increase risks to the safety of individuals, or prejudice sensitive funding, operational and collaborative arrangements between policing bodies and government departments.

The requested information relates to matters involving government premises, security-related activity, protected individuals, policing operations, resource allocation and potential funding or support arrangements involving organisations such as the Home Office, Cabinet Office, Metropolitan Police Service and other public authorities. Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal information capable of contributing to an understanding of security measures, operational priorities, funding mechanisms and protective policing arrangements.

When considered alongside information already available in the public domain, any confirmation or denial could contribute to a mosaic of information from which sensitive conclusions may be drawn. This could undermine the effectiveness of protective policing and security arrangements, prejudice law enforcement functions, impact upon ongoing or future operational and funding discussions, and increase risks to protected individuals, police officers, staff and members of the public.

Having carefully considered the competing public interest arguments, Greater Manchester Police finds that the public interest in maintaining neither confirm nor deny position outweighs the public interest in confirming or denying whether information is held.