

Cllr Paul Webb,
Kent County Council
Sessions House
County Hall
Maidstone
ME14 1XQ

14th May 2026

Dear Paul,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Lana) for Kent Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 25th March 2026. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

Please find the QA Board's feedback in the form below. On completion of the changes suggested the DHR may be published.

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 and the feedback form 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.

The DHR report including the executive summary and action plan should be converted to a PDF document and be smaller than 20 MB in size; this final Home Office QA Board letter and feedback form should be attached to the end of the report as an annex; and the DHR Action Plan should be added to the report as an annex. This should include all implementation updates and note that the action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk

On behalf of the QA Board, 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,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Lana
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Kent
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	25 th March 2026
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	• A heartfelt and moving tribute to Lana from her sister is included, which adds strong personal context. • The Senior Investigating Officer was appropriately invited to the Panel's first meeting to share information from the criminal investigation and advise on disclosure matters. This was commended as good practice. • The Chair's interviews with Lana's sister and nephew are a strength of the review. Their reflections on Lana's experiences of services ensure her voice is clearly represented. • There is excellent engagement with Lana's family throughout the review, supported effectively by advocacy input from AAFDA. • The analysis is particularly well written, with strong use of relevant research, and there is a clear and effective link between analysis, learning points and the recommendations. • The use of specialist expertise throughout further strengthens the quality and depth of the review.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	This is an excellent review. On occasion there is reference to 'abusive relationship'. Please could this term be considered in the future so that the reader is clear who is doing what to who (as recognised in the review itself at 5.1.18) and the abuser is held accountable (for example 1.5.3 which could have stated: whilst subject to domestic abuse by her partner).

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	No amendments required.
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	No amendments required.

4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.
6	Terms of Reference	No amendments required.
7	Equality and Diversity	No amendments required.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	There appears to have been a missed opportunity to articulate the child's voice in the context of post-separation abuse. While the review describes the impact of parental actions on Lana's mental health, it does not sufficiently explore how these events were experienced by the children. For example, the review notes that following Jensen exercising parental responsibility for his two youngest children, Lana's mental health deteriorated significantly, culminating in a suicide attempt by prescription overdose in the presence of a child on their 16th birthday. The child's perspective in this event is not explored. Similarly, the review later refers to an argument resulting in police attendance, during which Lana reported that her children did not like her and verbally abused her; again, the children's voices and experiences are absent. Greater attention to the lived experience of the children in these key events would strengthen the analysis and enhance learning about the impact of post-separation abuse and parental mental ill-health on children.
11	Analysis	The analysis primarily focuses on the impact on Lana and could further convey the voices or perspectives of the children. Please consider adding further detail on this area.
12	Conclusions	No amendments required.

13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	The review states that in November, Jensen contacted Children's Services stating he had evidence of Lana's drug use and sought to stop her contact with the children. Later that month, he contacted the police reporting that Louis had threatened to burn down his home with the children inside. While the police investigated, the outcome was limited to "words of advice" being given to Louis, with safeguarding advice provided to Jensen. If accurate, this response is concerning and represents a significant missed safeguarding opportunity. This warrants explicit analysis within the review. Consideration should be given to a recommendation for the police to review decision-making and thresholds in this incident.
14	Timescales	No amendments required.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	No amendments required.
16	DHR contributors	No amendments required.
17	DHR Panel	No amendments required.
18	DHR Author	No amendments required.
19	Parallel Reviews	No amendments required.
20	Dissemination	• Please add the Domestic Abuse Commissioner to the dissemination list. • Assurance is also requested that Lana's family has been consulted about any key dates to avoid publication and whether they have been asked if they require support at this time.
21	Action Plan	No amendments required.
22	Has there been a request to withhold publication? <i>If Yes, include the reason for the request.</i>	No request from the CSP to withhold publication.

	<i>Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i>	
23	Any other comments	• Please consider replacing the term 'abusive relationship' with abusive person'. • Please add 'honour'-based abuse to the definition of DASH. • The review notes that Lana had pets, including a dog. On one occasion, a dog was stolen from the front garden, and on another, a neighbour accused Louis of killing their cat. It is unclear whether the panel considered harm to or threats against animals within the context of coercive control. This may represent a missed opportunity, as abuse of animals can be a recognised indicator of coercive and controlling behaviour and escalation of risk.