Appendix E

Home Office

Public Protection Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

T: 020 7035 4848
www.gov.uk/homeoffice

Cllr Michael Hill OBE,
Kent County Council
Sessions House
County Hall
Maidstone
ME14 1XQ

27 October 2017

Dear Councillor Hill,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Kent (DHR18) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 20 September 2017. I apologise for the delay in providing the Panel's feedback.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded this was a well written report which constructively challenges agency practice as well as highlighting good practice. Despite the lack of involvement by family and friends, the author has done well to see events through the victim's eyes in a sensitive way. The Panel particularly commended evidence of wider research of other related reviews in the area i.e. an Adult Safeguarding Review.

There were, however, some other aspects of the report which the Panel felt may benefit from further analysis, or be revised, which you will wish to consider:

- The 278 page combined chronology submitted with the report should not be published. However, the Panel concluded it contained information that could help inform the background on the victim and perpetrator in the main report. For example, both had mothers who had mental health and alcohol misuse problems which could be relevant in terms of the impact this may have had on their upbringing;

INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- The discussion under equality and diversity could examine in more detail the sexuality of the victim and consider whether this impacted on the response of agencies and whether there were any barriers to the victim accessing services;

- The Panel felt it would be helpful if the executive summary included narrative on the perpetrator's criminal history about his previous violence to give context;

- Given the analysis around housing, consideration could be given to making the recommendation to address these findings more robust;

- Linked to the above, you may wish to consider including a recommendation to have a deputy housing manager who can attend MARAC in the absence of the regular attendee;

- A mental health and substance misuse specialist on the review panel may have been beneficial;

- The Panel suggested it might be helpful if the relationship between the victim and perpetrator could be discussed earlier in the report to help a reader understand the dynamics of the relationship;

- A glossary spelling out the acronyms in the executive summary would be helpful;

- Please proof read the full report as there are typing and grammatical errors. For example, GALOP runs a helpline and not a hotline. Please also check whether the annual MARAC caseload set out in paragraph 12.10 is correct.

The Panel does not need to review another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could include our letter as an appendix to the report. I would be grateful if you could email us at DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and provide us with the URL to the report when it is published.

The QA Panel felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners on DHRs in their local area. I am, accordingly, copying this letter to the PCC for information.

Yours sincerely

Christian Papaleontiou
Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel