



Roselyn Baker
Principal Policy Officer
Policy and Partnerships
Service Reform Directorate
Salford Community Safety Partnership

13 May 2021

Dear Roselyn,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Peter) for Salford 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 felt the report was clear, concise, sympathetic, and detailed. The victim's vulnerability is heard in the report, aided by the engagement of the family, who were provided with the Home Office leaflet and information about AAFDA support in the review. The combination of a Safeguarding Adult Review and DHR for this case, due to it being a same household murder, is commended as good practice and the reasons for this decision are explained well.

The report features good analysis which does well to pick up on key themes around lack of safeguarding referrals, financial abuse, unhelpful views of the victim's alcohol use and exploitation being part of a "lifestyle choice", utilising useful and appropriate referencing throughout. This importantly highlights research and recommendations from Alcohol Concern and Alcohol Change UK, including around difficulties with the Mental Capacity Act 2005, the problems in its use for those with alcohol problems and recommendations for guidance in this area in reference to Safeguarding Adult Reviews.

The Action Plan identifies areas of key importance such as the lack of understanding and dismissal of the victim as someone who chose a risky lifestyle. It features reasonable recommendations which came out of the learning and findings from the report.

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:

- The date of death is included at 1.1.1 and the victim's real initials on page 12, 42 and 46. These should be removed to improve anonymity.

- Clarification is needed as to the family's input in the anonymisation of the names of those involved.
- It would be useful for the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and Chair to have considered the panel composition and enhance with the inclusion of a Domestic Abuse (DA) specialists. It would also have been useful to have an alcohol misuse charity on the panel.
- It would be useful to detail why the panel took the decision not to approach the perpetrator as the report lacks information about the perpetrator's background, resulting in missed learning opportunities. For example, recommendations around services on release from prison in relation to the perpetrator's release and the fact the victim and perpetrator knew one another prior to the release.
- The Chair has marked 'not known' on the data collection form in relation to the question around the family having support of an advocate which is concerning and should be addressed.
- Despite COVID-19 restrictions the family should still have received a draft of the final review so they could consider the review in their own time as opposed to the Chair going through the report verbally on the phone. Given the panel met virtually, the family could have been offered the opportunity to virtually meet the panel.
- It would be useful for the report to have referenced cuckooing in section 2.1 where it mentions Peter was being exploited and taken advantage of.
- The Equality and Diversity section should discuss equalities around sex as well as age and disability.
- Analysis could be strengthened by considering the barriers Peter experienced. For example, the report mentions he often did not have a phone as he would sell it for money, this leaves him less able to ring police or help in an emergency and options such as a panic alarm could have been considered. Additionally, it seems he was unable to provide ID and proof of address in order to secure the move, exploring these barriers and how they could have been more proactively overcome with agency support would be of great benefit.
- The exploration of financial abuse could be expanded to consider economic abuse. For example, the perpetrator had the only key to Peter's flat which he kept on a string around his neck and he was sleeping in the only bedroom in Peter's flat, so the abuse was not purely about money, but extended to other economic resources.
- It would be useful to explain why single agency recommendations specifically in relation to the Community Rehabilitation Companies, were excluded from the Action Plan.
- The Action Plan should be updated further to focus on outcomes expected.

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