



Home Office

Public Protection Unit  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

T: 020 7035 4848  
[www.gov.uk/homeoffice](http://www.gov.uk/homeoffice)

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

28 January 2019

Dear Councillor Hill,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Kent (Emily/2017) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 12 December 2018.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded that this is an honest, transparent review with a focus on mental health and which highlights good practice as well as where improvements could be made. There are a considerable number of recommendations in the action plan which have been well articulated and evidence based.

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

- There is no detailed description in the overview report of the fatal event, including the attempted murder of the mother. The Panel felt this would help give context and would also explain how a manslaughter verdict came to be accepted by the court;
- The tension between the victim's parents has not been sufficiently drawn out in the report to give insight into why the relationship broke down;
- The victim's mother's voice is missing from the review and the Panel felt it may have also been helpful to have interviewed the tutor who taught the victim at home;
- The Panel felt the summary chronology in the executive summary does not contain sufficient information to enable a reader to understand the basis for the recommendations and lessons learnt that have been identified;

- There is no equality and diversity consideration in the report which the Panel felt was particularly relevant given the mixed heritage of the victim and how the family perceived and managed the victim's mental ill health;
- Given the significant mental health issues, a mental health voluntary sector specialist on the review panel may have been beneficial to the review;
- You may wish to review paragraph 11.6.28 as the Panel felt it could be regarded as insensitive;
- Recommendations 5 and 6 in the action plan are missing detail;
- It would help enhance anonymity if precise dates were not used in the report. You may also wish to further conceal the specific area mentioned in the terms of reference.

The Panel would be grateful if you could provide a revised version of the report with the changes suggested by 1 April 2019. Please clearly indicate where changes have been made in the revised report, and make it clear in the subject line of your email when resubmitting that the documents contained are revised versions for reconsideration. Please let me know if this will prove difficult.

Yours sincerely

**Hannah Buckley**  
Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel