

Cheshire

Constabulary – review of burglary dwelling investigations

Findings of an inspection commissioned by the
police and crime commissioner

© HMIC 2014

ISBN: 978-1-78246-385-6

www.hmic.gov.uk

Contents

Executive summary	3
Conclusions	6
Background and context	8
Burglary as a focus	8
Governance	11
Strategic leadership	11
Responding to burglary incidents	13
Initial deployment of police.....	13
Strengths	13
Areas for improvement.....	14
Investigations	15
Offender management	18
Strengths	19
Areas for improvement.....	19
Management of intelligence	20
Strengths	21
Areas for improvement.....	21
Managing performance	22
Recommendations	24
Annex A: Terms of reference	26
Annex B: Methodology	27
Glossary	30

Executive summary

Main findings

In December 2013, the police and crime commissioner (PCC) for Cheshire Constabulary commissioned¹ Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) to provide:

- an independent assessment of the effectiveness and resilience of the current arrangements in place within Cheshire Constabulary to respond to and investigate reports and complaints of burglary dwelling; and
- recommendations for improvement.

The full terms of reference are set out in Annex A of this report

An initial scoping exercise was conducted in late August 2013 at the request of the PCC with early feedback provided at that time to the Constabulary. A more detailed inspection in the force was conducted by HMIC in January 2014. The inspection methodology is set out at Annex B in this report.

During the inspection, HMIC found that there were examples of good practice that had been put in place by senior officers to oversee the force's approach to burglary in dwellings. There was also good local responsibility from teams who delivered a quality service in investigating this type of offence. However, we did speak to some frontline staff that were not aware of the increased focus by the constabulary in tackling burglary.

The inspection team found that police officers were deployed to burglary incidents appropriately. In the majority of cases, officers who were investigating these cases had been trained to carry out an effective investigation.

¹ Police and crime commissioners can commission HMIC to undertake inspections under section 54(2BA), Police Act 1996.

Our inspection staff found that the constabulary has initiated and then developed good arrangements for crime scene investigators and analysts to recover suspect footwear marks from scenes and match them to offenders.

However, HMIC found that there was room for improvement in the following areas:

- Senior managers told us it was expected that crime scene investigators (CSIs) attend the scene of all burglaries to secure evidence. During the inspection, HMIC found that this was not always the case.
- Some neighbourhood policing team officers who were first on the scene of these incidents would benefit from additional training.
- Staff in the control room told us that they do not receive a formal briefing on live local policing issues as they come on duty; they report at various intervals and were expected to use their own time to access the latest briefing update. The HMIC inspection team was told that often staff in the control room do not have time to access this intelligence and as a result were not aware of the most recent information on house burglaries.
- Intelligence gathering on burglary dwelling is incomplete. The constabulary has identified gaps in its intelligence gathering on suspects and stolen property.
- The constabulary needs to recruit more covert human intelligence sources (CHIS) who can give reports on the burglary dwelling and stolen property market.
- There was an opportunity for the constabulary to enhance its current arrangements to share intelligence with neighbouring forces on travelling criminals coming into Cheshire.
- There had been a notable drop in the number of offences taken into consideration (TIC). Officers spoke to officers to during the inspection who raised concerns over conducting such interviews, despite a new policy introduced by the force recently.
- Officers made good use of time limits once suspects for burglary were held on arrest in custody. However, in a limited assessment of some burglary dwelling

custody records, HMIC found that searches permitted under the authority of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 were not being conducted at every opportunity.

- The current database that records stop searches is not linked to the constabulary intelligence system. This requires officers to submit intelligence additionally on a separate form to make sure it is recorded. HMIC found that separate records are only done when officers recognised the relevance of the stop search for intelligence purposes. There is a risk that opportunities are missed if officers do not submit an additional intelligence form in support of the stop search.
- Strategic leadership on burglary dwelling was provided by senior officers based at headquarters. Each basic command unit (BCU) then produced their own bespoke plan designed to tackle their locally identified burglary dwelling issues. Officers working in those areas identified their own local managers, within their BCUs, as being the key individuals leading the local response to tackling burglary.
- The constabulary does not wish to set specific numerical targets regarding burglary dwelling performance. HMIC found there was a lack of clarity among some senior managers as to how the constabulary would measure success in its strategy to tackle burglary. Staff were unsure how to interpret the performance data available to them to identify success.

Conclusions

From the inspection, we found clear evidence that Cheshire Constabulary have staff at all ranks committed to tackling burglary dwelling.

In the cases HMIC examined, patrols were deployed to incidents promptly. The officers who responded were, generally, suitably skilled and equipped to conduct a thorough investigation with good follow-up and good arrangements for victim care in place.

HMIC inspection staff found that crime scene investigators (CSI) were not attending all burglary dwelling crime scenes. They are carried out telephone assessments to decide whether or not to attend, and conducted scene of crimes examinations after conversations with colleagues and complainants.

We found that lines of investigation for burglary offenders in police detention are generally properly managed. However HMIC did find that in the few burglary dwelling custody cases we reviewed, opportunities were overlooked to conduct address searches permitted under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 to obtain evidence.

We also found little use of the new constabulary TIC policy (offences taken into consideration). Failure to obtain TICs has a negative effect on the number of burglary dwelling cases solved.

HMIC found limited information that sharing arrangements were in place with neighbouring police forces. One good example was the sharing of an intelligence system platform with Merseyside Police but there was scope to do more.

Intelligence is not developed routinely or acquired by the constabulary in relation to burglary dwelling offences and the stolen property markets.

Overall, the inspection found that the standards of investigation of burglary dwelling offences across Cheshire Constabulary were good. The staff that HMIC interviewed were committed and enthusiastic and are focused on providing a quality service on burglaries of dwellings.

Burglary dwelling offences were attended promptly and staff, in general, were suitably trained for the role they were expected to perform. It was evident that since HMIC conducted a scoping exercise in August 2013, and the governance arrangements were put in place by an assistant chief constable in September 2013, the constabulary has solved more investigations

It is the view of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary that although this report makes recommendations for further improvement, none of those recommendations are considered so significant as they would warrant immediate remedial action by the constabulary.

Background and context

Burglary as a focus

In the Cheshire police and crime plan (2013-16), the police and crime commissioner set out a number of key areas of focus for the constabulary, following consultation with the communities across Cheshire. One of the main issues highlighted within the plan is 'reducing theft'. Burglary from dwellings is not mentioned.

The police and crime plan also sets out a number of objectives for the first year of the Commissioner's tenure, together with performance measures on some types of crime and anti-social behaviour. Whilst this does not specifically focus on burglary dwelling, it does place an overall priority on reducing crime.

In August 2013, the police and crime commissioner requested HMIC carry out a brief review of burglary dwelling investigation and detection processes within the force. This followed an increase of reported burglary dwelling offences in the spring of 2013 and a reduction of solved (positive outcome) investigations.

The burglary dwelling performance picture at that time was as follows²:

Comparisons were made between the periods 1 April 2013 to 31 July 2013 with the same period in 2012:

Change in offences recorded for Cheshire Constabulary: + 10.8% (+ 94 offences)

- Eastern BCU: + 15.2% (36 more than 2012)
- Western BCU + 15.1% (34 more than 2012)
- Northern BCU: + 5.9% (24 more than 2012)

² Source: Cheshire Constabulary Performance Unit 2013/14

Change in positive outcomes³ for Cheshire Constabulary: 13.6% (12.7% points lower than 2012)

- Eastern: BCU 8.3% (13.9 percentage points lower than 2012)
- Western: BCU 19.7% (30.5 percentage points lower than 2012)
- Northern: BCU 13.3% (2.2% percentage points lower than 2012)

A brief review of the force's approach to burglary dwelling was undertaken by HMIC in late August 2013. Early findings were reported to the police and crime commissioner soon afterwards, suggesting areas of development for the constabulary. This included:

- the constabulary's approach to performance and monitoring of burglary dwelling;
- developing new governance arrangements for overseeing investigations into burglary dwelling;
- coordination of constabulary and BCU operations, tactics and activity;
- developing the basic command units' focus on investigations through proactive policing teams;
- improving the extent and quality assurance of investigations, particularly post initial scene investigation;
- developing the constabulary's acquisition of forensic evidence; and
- improving briefings.

In early January 2014, HMIC conducted a follow-up inspection. This involved a more detailed review of burglary dwelling investigation to establish progress made by the constabulary following the HMIC's initial visit in August 2013.

³ Positive outcomes include any offences charged, cautioned, taken into consideration by an offender.

Performance figures were produced by the constabulary and comparisons were made between the periods 1 August 2013 to 31 January 2014 with the same period in 2012/13.⁴

Change in offences recorded for Constabulary: + 1.9% (+28 offences more than 2012/13)

- Eastern: + 2.4% (11 offences more than 2012/13)
- Western: + 9.5% (41 offences more than 2012/13)
- Northern: -4.0% (24 offences less than 2012/13)

Change in positive outcomes for Constabulary: 18.4% (6.4% points better than 2012/13)

- Eastern: 19.5% (7.1% points better than 2012/13)
- Western: 18.9% (4.7% points better than 2012/13)
- Northern: 17.1% (7.1% points better than 2012/13)

These figures indicate that the rate of increase in numbers of burglary dwelling offences being committed across the Constabulary has slowed, which may be indicative of the increased focus given to tackling this type of offence during this period.

The positive outcome rate has improved since the end of July 2013 from 13.6% to 18.4% at the end of January 2014, which is a notable increase.

⁴ Source Cheshire Constabulary Performance Unit 2013/14

Governance

Strategic leadership

HMIC found that tackling offences of burglary dwelling was not a priority for the constabulary during discussions with senior leaders. However, this is clearly a concern for the force, which has given an assistant chief constable (ACC) responsibility for improving the constabulary response to this type of offence.

Middle and senior managers stated that the ACC has provided a clear focus on burglary dwelling investigations across the county. However, HMIC found that this focus has not reached the frontline staff who have day to day responsibility for burglary investigation.

We found that the constabulary has good governance and control arrangements in place to tackle burglary. The deputy chief constable chairs a force-wide strategic delivery board. The ACC chairs the newly formed strategic investigation board and a chief superintendent chairs a burglary governance board. In the BCUs, managers retain an oversight of local performance on burglaries from dwellings and hold meetings, from which locally-based staff are assigned work to prevent and investigate burglary dwelling offences.

The constabulary records all burglary dwelling offences on the daily 24-hour briefing system. They are then considered each day at a force level meeting chaired by a detective superintendent, who can require additional action to be taken in specific cases to develop an investigation further or to address an area of particular concern.

The assistant chief constable had visited BCUs to meet staff involved in investigating burglary offences to emphasise the priority placed on tackling this crime type by chief officers. Despite this effort, several officers in BCUs that we spoke to were not aware that these offences were a particular concern to the constabulary.

Historically, the constabulary has branded its county-wide response to tackling burglary dwelling at Christmas time as 'Operation Empirical'. This same operational name was used by the force for its new burglary initiative that began in autumn 2013. This caused confusion among staff at all levels. When questioned regarding Operation Empirical officers routinely spoke about the annual Christmas campaign.

Local arrangements

HMIC found that each of the BCUs conduct a daily tasking meeting, which considered crime-related and public safety issues. This meeting then considered daily deployments and the development of the intelligence available.

Inspectors also saw that each of the BCUs has developed its own burglary action plan. These were regularly reviewed and updated to inform the strategic governance meeting. BCUs are also able to seek the deployment of wider constabulary resources, such as the operational support unit and the roads policing unit, to combat burglary from dwellings.

Strengths

HMIC found evidence of strong leadership at each level of the constabulary to address burglary from dwellings. There are governance structures in place to react to the day-to-day issues of burglaries across the county.

During the inspection, HMIC saw that each of the BCUs had developed an action plan to tackle these types of burglaries and were deploying officers in support of the local strategy to reduce it. There were local managers in each BCU accountable for reducing burglary from dwellings and monitoring investigations.

Areas for improvement

The constabulary should review its communication to staff about the investigation of burglaries from dwellings. HMIC found that senior leaders were reluctant to identify burglary dwelling as a key crime priority above other types of crime. Officers working on the frontline who spoke to HMIC considered burglary dwelling was a priority because of the local scrutiny by their managers.

Chief officers should provide clarity to staff about the force's operation to reduce the number of burglaries.

Responding to burglary incidents

Initial deployment of police

In Cheshire Constabulary, decisions to deploy a police response to calls from the public are based on urgency, necessity and vulnerability which are applied to both the individual and to the wider community.

Inspectors found that current shift arrangements did not build in time at the beginning of a tour of duty for control room staff to be properly briefed on intelligence and offenders. Some control room staff did use the force briefing platform (called I-brief) to update themselves on relevant local intelligence, but that was only at times when it was less busy within the control room and when time permitted.

As part of our inspection, we reviewed a small sample of incident logs relating to burglary dwelling and found the deployment of patrols to be appropriate to the circumstances of each call. HMIC inspectors found that crime scene investigators were contacted via their BlackBerry mobile phones and informed of the report of a burglary dwelling.

When inspecting the control room, we looked at the role and responsibilities of area incident supervisors who were based in the control rooms. HMIC found that these supervisors saw their role as ensuring officers were sent to incidents promptly.

A 'trigger plan' is used to direct officers to particular points or take certain actions in an effort to intercept burglary dwelling offenders. Control room staff were not aware of any trigger plans either currently or previously in existence in response to burglary dwelling problems. As a result, deployments were made in an ad-hoc manner at the instigation of local staff.

HMIC found that officers from a pro-active policing team (PPT) are usually the first officers sent to investigate burglary dwellings. If the PPT is not available, a neighbourhood policing team officer will be deployed to attend.

Strengths

In the cases we reviewed, the constabulary deployed a police patrol promptly to incidents of burglary dwelling. There was a good initial collection of information from

call handlers dealing with the public who were reporting burglary dwelling incidents. HMIC found good consideration given to each victim's circumstances and their vulnerability.

HMIC also found evidence that crime scene investigators are being notified at the earliest possible opportunity about reports of burglary dwelling offences.

Areas for improvement

The force should consider making sure an adequate briefing is provided to staff in the control room at the start of their tour of duty.

The constabulary should look at how control room staff are involved in deploying patrols to direct officers to intercept offenders using 'trigger plans'.

Investigations

Scene attendance and investigation

In the majority of cases, pro-active policing team (PPT) officers attend scenes and commence an initial investigation. These teams are adequately resourced and have received additional training up to PIP level 2 (a higher level of investigative technique training than is provided during initial police training). A PPT team member will manage each investigation to its conclusion.

In order to improve initial evidential recovery at burglary dwelling scenes, the constabulary has introduced a minimum standard checklist setting out the minimum standards expected of officers' reports and to improve how data is captured. Officers at each scene of crime are expected to report on:

- scene management;
- details of offenders/suspects;
- possible witnesses;
- availability of closed circuit television images;
- extent of house to house enquiries conducted;
- nature of property stolen and enquiries made to recover the property;
- nature and context of forensic evidence recovered;
- availability of intelligence;
- details of any similar offences committed; and
- any other pertinent information.

HMIC inspectors heard evidence of poor management of the crime scene when a neighbourhood policing team officer attended a burglary dwelling rather than a PIP level 2 PPT officer. Some officers told HMIC inspectors that they had not received any refresher training on crime scene management since the so-called force's Safer Homes Training' in 2005.

We did find some limited examples of officers being allowed time to work alongside Pro-active Policing Team officers to improve their own level of knowledge and experience. Often this was a precursor for an officer to apply to join the unit full time.

HMIC also found some good examples of police and community support officers (PCSOs) assisting in visits to reassure victims. They were also supporting investigations by undertaking local house-to-house enquiries despite having had no formal training.

During the inspection, HMIC staff found some good examples of recovered stolen property being returned to owners after diligent work by officers. This entailed examining crime records individually to identify potential owners for recovered goods. These potential owners were then invited to view the recovered property so that items could be identified and returned. Officers told inspectors that although it was fit for purpose, the force crime property system was not easy to use.

During the supervision of investigations, we found that the cases we looked at were being checked and updated by managers and guidance was being offered where necessary.

Crime scene investigation

HMIC inspectors found that crime scene investigators (CSIs) are attending most, but not all, burglary dwelling scenes of crime. The constabulary states that in December 2013, its CSIs were attending approximately 80 percent of reports of burglary dwelling.

Inspectors were informed that CSIs are required to input information about all crime exhibits recovered by the constabulary onto a force exhibits database, before this is submitted for forensic examination. This takes some time and has an impact on their ability to attend scenes. In addition, while CSIs had all received initial and refresher training, their high workloads did not permit them to attend scenes of crime together, or with a supervisor, to build on their knowledge and learn new skills.

HMIC found that submission of forensic samples recovered from crime scenes that could lead to suspects being identified for further investigation was encouraged. The financial cost for investigating offences of this type was not an issue for the constabulary.

During the inspection, HMIC found that once offenders have been identified through forensic evidence, cases are allocated promptly for further enquiries to be made to arrest offenders. Each BCU is provided regularly with a list of outstanding burglary dwelling offenders by the central performance unit in the force headquarters to allow it to monitor progress in bringing these offenders to justice.

HMIC found that the constabulary has initiated and then developed good arrangements for crime scene investigators and analysts to recover suspect footwear marks from scenes and match them to offenders.

Strengths

The introduction of a checklist of minimum standards is a good initiative to improve the investigations at scenes of crime.

All burglary dwelling investigations are currently managed by the proactive policing teams who have the skills and training to deal with these offences.

HMIC found that the initiative to detect offenders by analysing footwear marks is good and shows promise. Crime scene investigators and police officers secure footwear marks for evidence and imprints of suspect's footwear wherever possible to increase the amount of evidence gained in incidents of burglary dwelling.

Areas for improvement

The constabulary should ensure that its instructions to deploy CSIs to burglary dwelling scenes are carried out.

The constabulary should review the training for neighbourhood policing team officers in relation to crime scene management.

The constabulary should review the use of PCSOs in relation to supporting burglary dwelling investigations and ensure appropriate training is given.

Offender management

In custody

HMIC found that once suspects of burglary dwelling offences have been arrested and brought into custody, officers prioritised principal lines of enquiry and conducted interviews, to gain evidence to support charging decisions.

There was good understanding that offenders needed to be dealt with according to the time limits set out in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. Staff obtained an extension for further detention time, where necessary, to conduct further enquiries.

During the review, we also looked at identification procedures and found that generally they were being used well while the offender remained in custody to afford witnesses an early opportunity to identify potential offenders.

Premises that are owned or controlled by a person can be lawfully searched by police officers, in specific circumstances, for further evidence under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act. During our review, we found that a search had been authorised under this legislation for burglary dwelling offences in just five of 16 custody records examined. We were unable to explore this issue further as the constabulary does not gather data on such searches routinely.

We were told by the force that when searches were conducted, they are undertaken by operational support unit staff trained in search methods whenever possible but we could not verify this statement.

Some of the officers we spoke to told us that they were reluctant to secure admissions for offences that could be taken into consideration because they were unsure that obtaining admissions in this way was supported at senior levels. This followed a disciplinary case in 2012, where some officers were subject to a disciplinary process for obtaining admissions inappropriately.

HMIC was told that a new policy on this practice has been circulated to staff. Many staff told us during the inspection that they were unaware of the document.

Post charge

HMIC was pleased to see examples of police officers attending court to provide additional information in relation to defendants to the Crown Prosecution Service in support of remand in custody applications.

In the community

In the case of burglary dwelling offenders who are on bail, HMIC found that they were being visited regularly and their bail conditions checked by neighbourhood policing teams.

HMIC inspectors found that BCU action plans on burglary offences were being used at daily morning meetings to direct proactive policing activity towards those who are suspected of involvement in these crimes.

The constabulary is working with partner agencies on an integrated offender management scheme which provides opportunities for diversion from crime for offenders of burglary dwelling to discourage future offending.

Strengths

Officers are taking the opportunity to attend court to inform the Crown Prosecution Service in person of issues concerning burglary dwelling offenders.

The constabulary has ensured that when possible, searches of targeted addresses are carried out by properly trained officers.

The constabulary has an integrated offender management programme which has good working arrangements with other services who are working with offenders to reduce re-offending.

Areas for improvement

The constabulary should ensure that where they exist, opportunities are taken to conduct searches under section 18, Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

Chief officers should communicate clearly the force position that the obtaining of offences taken into consideration is an acceptable way to solve some burglary investigations.

Management of intelligence

During the inspection, HMIC found that the constabulary briefing system (called I-brief) allows officers to view prepared intelligence slides on demand. Within each BCU, there are a number of crime and intelligence officers who prepare briefings for officers.

Our inspection found that officers were taking the opportunity to view I-brief to obtain information concerning their patrol area. In the briefings we reviewed, we found there was relevant information around burglary dwelling locations, trends and patterns, together with details on suspects and their vehicles.

We found evidence that the constabulary needs to improve its intelligence gathering arrangements. There is a need to increase levels of intelligence in relation to burglary and the stolen property market.

During the inspection, HMIC found there to be gaps in the intelligence picture and, in particular, from covert human intelligence sources (CHIS).

While HMIC found evidence of some information sharing arrangements (such as on Northern BCU with Merseyside Police), we found that there is no formal exchange of intelligence in place and the constabulary rarely receives any information as a result.

Many vehicles used by the constabulary are equipped with automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) equipment. ANPR technology allows officers immediate access to police intelligence on vehicles being used on the road. This can allow officers to identify and stop vehicles used by criminals more easily which can prevent crime. The constabulary is buying more fixed site cameras so it can extend the coverage of the ANPR technology across the county.

HMIC inspectors found that the constabulary's stop search database is not connected to the intelligence system. As a result, officers have to submit separate forms in relation to each stop check and any intelligence obtained. This is an issue that was highlighted by HMIC in a previous inspection on stop search in 2012.

HMIC found that the constabulary has used volunteers in its county-wide neighbourhood watch scheme. Members of the Special Constabulary assist frontline staff by supporting regular officers conduct their duties within each BCU.

Strengths

HMIC inspectors found that the constabulary has a good briefing system which officers and staff found easy to use.

The constabulary is committed to extending the coverage of its automatic number plate recognition cameras which will improve the potential to identify criminals using the roads.

Areas for improvement

The constabulary should review opportunities to develop the intelligence picture for burglary dwelling and the stolen property market.

The constabulary should review its current arrangements regarding the sharing of intelligence with other forces.

The constabulary should progress the link being made to connect the stop search database and the intelligence system.

Managing performance

As part of the inspection process, a number of performance documents for burglary dwelling were assessed. HMIC inspectors found them to be comprehensive, informative and fit for purpose.

On the force intranet, there is performance data in relation to burglary and other crime types. These include information on dates, locations and numbers of crimes. The information is available to all staff within the constabulary and the office of the police and crime commissioner (OPCC).

An issue of concern was how key performance messages in tackling burglary dwelling are considered and communicated across the constabulary. Staff spoke to HMIC had received no feedback over changes in operating procedures or practices that could be viewed as a means of improving investigations. As no benchmark had been set, it was difficult to understand how the constabulary would be able to measure improvements in the quality of burglary dwelling investigations and the part played by each member of staff involved.

Officers spoken to commented on changes in the numbers of recorded offences over the course of the year, which are not directly attributable to the work of the police or other services working in the community.

In order to assist staff regarding the quality of their work, and to ensure the standards set by the constabulary are followed, benchmarks for minimum standards of burglary dwelling investigations could be set in the following areas:

- call-taking
- deployment
- actions on attendance
- developing investigations.

These could then be checked to ensure they are being completed to the required standard and any progress fed back to staff.

From the inspection, HMIC were told by some of the officers interviewed, that the constabulary's position on the definition of success would be useful as they worked to reduce the offences of burglary.

Strengths

The constabulary produces good useful performance products for tackling burglary dwelling.

The force intranet contains information on burglary dwelling that is easily accessible to all staff and the office of police and crime commissioner.

Area for improvement

The constabulary should develop indicators of success in relation to burglary dwelling investigation that can be communicated to staff

Recommendations

1. The constabulary should review how it communicates with staff about the investigation of burglaries of dwellings. HMIC found that senior leaders werereluctant to identify burglary dwelling as a key crime priority above other crime types. Officers working on the frontline considered burglary as a priority because of the increased focus placed on this crime type by their managers.
2. Chief officers should provide clarity to staff about the force operation to reduce the number of burglary dwellings.
3. An adequate briefing should be provided to staff in the control room when they come on duty.
4. The constabulary should consider how it involves control room staff in deploying patrols in response to recent burglaries to prevent the escape of offenders.
5. The constabulary should ensure that crime scene investigators are deployed to burglary dwelling scenes of crimes.
6. The constabulary should review the training given to neighbourhood policing team officers on crime scene management.
7. The constabulary should review the use of PCSOs in relation to supporting burglary dwelling investigations and ensure appropriate training is given following any decisions made.
8. The constabulary should review and increase opportunities on authorising of searches under section 18, Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.
9. Chief officers should communicate clearly that obtaining offences taken into consideration is an acceptable way to solve some burglary investigations.
10. The constabulary should review opportunities to develop the intelligence picture for burglary dwelling and the stolen property market.
11. The constabulary should review its current arrangements on sharing intelligence with other forces.

12. The constabulary should make progress on work to link the stop search database and the intelligence system.
13. The constabulary should develop indicators that measure success in the investigation of burglary dwelling and that can be communicated to staff.

Annex A: Terms of reference

Purpose

This review examined the following areas in relation to burglary dwelling investigations and detections:

- readily identifiable data sources;
- governance at force and BCU level including performance information and monitoring;
- resource usage;
- burglary investigations – initial reports, attendance and investigation activity;
- forensic strategy;
- detection opportunities including offences taken into consideration;
- offender management; and
- proactive opportunities including the use of intelligence, briefings and patrol.

Annex B: Methodology

The methodology and approach included:

- requisition, examination and assessment of key constabulary documents, including policy, guidance, assessments and other documentation
- data gathering and analysis based around burglary dwelling and sanction detections
- interviews with key personnel
- site visits to include interviews, focus groups with planned and unplanned site visits
- dip sampling of investigations, incident logs and custody records
- consideration as to progress against the results of the August 2013 initial scoping exercise conducted by HMIC.

The inspection team interviewed:

- the assistant chief constable lead for burglary
- the force head of crime scene investigation
- the basic command unit commander for Western Division
- the force performance manager
- the manager of the force contact centre
- police officers and staff working within the force contact centre
- police officers and staff working within teams dealing with burglary
- crime scene investigators
- the manager of the force intelligence unit
- police officers and staff working on response and neighbourhood policing duties

- the force crime registrar.

The inspection team inspected the following documents:

- the force police and crime plan (2013-2016)
- the force strategic assessment scoping document
- the force burglary problem profile
- northern/western burglary response improvement plan
- western tactical assessment
- minutes of force governance meetings around Operation Empirical
- the crime scene investigation attendance policy
- the graded response policy
- initial investigation – 10-point checklist
- the integrated offender management strategy
- management Information packs on burglary
- the TIC policy
- prison production guidance for police officers
- Operation Clean Slate PowerPoint presentation
- arterial route briefing slides – I-brief
- footwear impressions guidance
- policing model Cheshire – 2012
- Macclesfield Hub / Widnes Hub– briefing sheets
- actionable intelligence workflow guide.

The inspection team reviewed the following information from the Constabulary:

- case crime files relating to investigations into burglary (spread across the three basic command units);
- incident logs relating to calls to burglary incidents across the county in November 2013 and in January 2014; and
- custody records relating to burglary offenders detained in the constabulary custody facilities.

Glossary

ACC – Assistant Chief Constable

ANPR – Automatic Number Plate Recognition

BCU – Basic Command Unit

CHIS – Covert Human Intelligence Source

CSI – Crime Scene Investigator

DCC – Deputy Chief Constable

HMIC – Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

OPCC – Office of the police and crime commissioner

PACE – Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984)

PCC – Police and crime commissioner

PCSO – Police and Community Support Officer

PPT – Proactive Policing Team

TIC – Taken into consideration (offences)