

Katie Dawtry
Development Manager
Strategic Partnerships Team
Adult Care Services
Hertfordshire County Council
Farnham House, Six Hills Way
Stevenage, SG1 2ST

10 May 2021

Dear Katie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (■■■) for Dacorum Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office. Due to the COVID-19 situation the Quality Assurance (QA) Panel was unable to meet as scheduled 24th March therefore the report was assessed by a virtual process. For the virtual Panel, members provided their comments by email, the Home Office secretariat summarised the feedback and the Panel agreed the feedback.

The QA Panel found the review clear and easy to follow with the victim's voice coming through clearly. The information from the victim's friends works to provide a voice for the victim and an insight into the family dynamics. The Panel felt that the friends' recollections have helped to get a sense of the tensions between the brothers following their mother's death, their subsequent estrangement and the potential source of continued tension through the terms of their father's will.

The DHR also demonstrates good practice in having interviewed Simon's previous employer. The review recognises the coercive control of Peter and Simon's father towards them and is sensitive around this. The reference to the J9 project was helpful and the information on the Domestic Abuse Pathways Project was interesting to read.

The QA Panel felt that there are some aspects of the report which may benefit from further revision, but the Home Office is content that on completion of these changes, the DHR may be published.

Areas for final development:

- Initial scoping – it is not clear if all local agencies were contacted, for example substance misuse services or local authority housing. It would be helpful to include a list of agencies contacted and whether they responded. Housing in particular may be relevant as the perpetrator was in a bedsit.

- The dates are referred to inconsistently, for example, the first assault is referred to as 'March 2018' and '25 March', then it states the arrest was 'March'. This does not allow the reader to understand a clear timeline.
- This case would have benefitted from exploration around the signposting Peter had to local services for advice and support. He had experienced an assault which was related to financial issues, therefore there were a number of options for support.
- The report refers to predictability which should be removed as this is not in keeping with the current guidance.
- The DHR is written as though it is still draft form or a working document as opposed to the final version awaiting Home Office sign-off. The DHR needs to be rewritten to refer to what actions have been taken as opposed to what actions it intends to take. This could be misleading to the reader if published. E.g. Para 10.1, Section 4.1.
- Use of language – when referring to Peter as refusing things, it may be more appropriate to refer to him as declining to avoid any appear of victim blaming. If it is a quote then this should be made clear.
- There are several issues with the action plan:
 - It lacks outcomes for the most part focus on training programmes and awareness raising.
 - Some dates have passed over a year ago, with no updates.
 - The West Herts Hospitals Trust does reference outcomes, but gives no evidence to demonstrate the assertion that outcomes have been achieved. What difference have they made and how can these be monitored?
 - The recommendations are not all SMART.
 - Recommendation could be developed further to look at specific training on adult family violence, ensuring agencies are aware of support available for those experiencing adult family violence (AFV). Recommendations around signposting to other services in "family dispute" type cases would also be beneficial.
- Independence – it states that the DHR Author is independent from any of the agencies involved, however she retired from Hertfordshire Constabulary and Hertfordshire Constabulary are the only agency required to submit an IMR due to their contact. The Panel suggest addressing this in the report.
- The Equality & Diversity section is incredibly brief and does not say whether any of the characteristics were relevant and how. Sex would be relevant to this case given it involved a male victim and perpetrator.
- The glossary in the appendix includes many terms that are not actually used in the review (e.g. A&E, OM, FLO, OASys, VCS).
- It was mentioned that the perpetrator had been a carer for his mother but no information was given on whether any carers assessments were carried out.

- The report says that there were no agencies involved with the family, perhaps it would be reassuring to know to what extent the DHR had tried to engage with agencies and particularly if the GP had any information that would have been useful to consider.
- A full proof-read is required to correct any grammar and typos.

Once completed the Home Office would be grateful if you could provide us with a digital copy of the revised final version of the report with all finalised attachments and appendices and the weblink to the site where the report will be published. Please ensure this letter is published alongside the report.

Please send the digital copy and weblink to DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk. This is for our own records for future analysis to go towards highlighting best practice and to inform public policy.

On behalf of the QA Panel, I would like to thank you, the report Chair and Author, and other colleagues for the considerable work that you have put into this review.

Yours sincerely,

Lynne Abrams

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel

