



Home Office

Public Protection Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

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

Stuart Pattison
Crime Reduction Manager
Housing Solutions and Crime Reduction
People Directorate
Bristol City Council

27 October 2015

Dear Mr Pattison,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review report for Bristol to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the Quality Assurance Panel meeting on 23 September 2015.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel found this to be an acceptable report where a good variety of sources had been used to inform the review.

However, there were some aspects of the report which the Panel felt may benefit from further consideration, or be revised, which you may wish to consider before you publish the final report:

- The Panel noted that the report had taken a considerable length of time to complete from when the homicide took place and was concerned to observe that some of the actions have completion dates in the future. For example, youth offending has March 2016 for reviewing policies and training staff;
- The action plan has no stated outcomes. Additionally the Panel would have expected to see more agencies listed under cross agency actions, such as health and housing providers. The Panel was particularly concerned that some of the recommendations for children's services, including one on dealing with disclosures of abuse, had been left blank and not prioritised;
- The Panel suggested there should be job titles or role descriptions of panel members which may provide clarity on why there was sizeable representation from Bristol City Council. Furthermore, additional information was needed on the agencies listed as "AWP" and "Next Link" to confirm their role and whether they are statutory or voluntary agencies;

- The Panel felt further clarity was needed in the report on why there was no mental health review given the victim was receiving mental health services at the time of her death;
- In the Panel's view, the combined chronology spreadsheet, which appears as an appendix, gives a rich and detailed narrative of the victim's life and the learning this can bring to practitioners. Consequently it may have been helpful if more of this detail was summarised in the main body of the report;
- The Panel felt the report could benefit from more analysis around the victim's childhood experiences and the potential impact of her physical and sexual abuse;
- The Panel queried why the suicide of the victim's mother appears towards the end of the analysis. The Panel questioned whether this information required further analysis. For example, when did the suicide occur and what was the impact on the victim;
- The Panel noted there is repetition of information and felt the report may benefit from being more succinct;
- Please revisit the narrative at the top of page 26 as the Panel felt it did not display a sufficient understanding of the dynamics of coercive control;
- The Panel considered that the first recommendation for mental health on page 20 could be more definitive. In other words, you could consider whether to recommend that mental health should include a question about domestic abuse in their assessment;
- Some of the recommendations need to be more SMART. For example, under Children's Services, the recommendation "perhaps care leavers could be provided with mentoring services where this is assessed as needed".
- Please enhance the anonymity. For example, remove the area of Bristol in which the victim lived under "Scope of the Review" at section 4.3. On page 47 (pink line) it is not clear whether the names of the foster parents are real or pseudonyms. Pages 138 and 139 mention the "death of SU" – this needs removing if they are the real initials of the victim. Third entry from the end of the spreadsheet (page 139) contains an error in the date (30/02/2010) and also names a doctor, which should be removed or anonymised.

The Panel does not need to see another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could include our letter as an appendix to the report when it is published.

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 QA Panel