

Katie Walker
Runnymede Community Safety Partnership
Runnymede Borough Council
Civic Centre, Station Road
Addlestone
KT15 2AH

23 August 2024

Dear Katie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Tracy) for Runnymede Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 17th July 2024. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel was grateful for sight of this well written and comprehensive review on what was clearly a complex and challenging case. They noted that it was good to see a joint DHR and SAR being undertaken and felt that the review presented Tracy's voice throughout, with a strong sense of her circumstances and the adversities she faced.

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:

- It would be helpful to clarify why the time period of five-and-a-half years was set for the review.
- It is helpful that Tracy's friend contributed to the review. However, if there was more information from the friend about Tracy's background and circumstances it would be helpful to include this as much of the picture of Tracy is built up from views of professionals who may have had limited contact with her.
- The Panel asked why a request was made not to involve the eldest child, who was over the age of 18. It would be helpful to set out further information around the family circumstances, specifically on the ages of the children and the decision by the father that the oldest child should not participate.
- It is currently unclear from Section 6 who was written to when the review chair contacted Tracy's family.

- The Panel felt that it would be helpful to include further information on economic abuse and the financial issues Tracy disclosed, particularly post-separation economic abuse and how this can be used in legal proceedings. They noted that it would be beneficial to draw upon research such as Surviving Economic Abuse's [global study on economic abuse](#), which includes a summary of evidence on how legal proceedings can be used as part of economic abuse (page 51), and how prolonging proceedings can be a form of this.
- There was no public health/mental health or suicide prevention representative on panel, to provide the lens of domestic abuse, self-harm, mental health, and links to suicidality. The CSP may wish to consider this in the future.
- In section 3, there are references to 'Samantha' and to 'Natasha'. It is not currently clear if these are pseudonyms for the same friend, or for different people.
- In the timeline, the exact dates of the appointments immediately leading up to the death are set out. In terms of anonymising the case, it may be best to leave out this level of detail.
- Paragraph 16.7 appears to reveal the sex of the eldest child, which should be amended to ensure anonymity.
- There is a reference to the family not wishing to contact the police due to 'mistrust'; it would be helpful to explore this further.
- The Panel felt that the equality and diversity section could go into greater detail. For example, it would be helpful to set out whether any of the protected characteristics raised barriers to accessing services.
- In section 12, the dissemination list should include the Domestic Abuse Commissioner.
- 9.1 states that 'The Chair of this Domestic Homicide/Safeguarding Adults Review is a legally qualified Independent Chair of Statutory Reviews'. It is unclear what this means around DHRs. Further information on where the Chair has held positions would aid transparency.
- A learning around agencies increasing their professional curiosity may be worth a consideration.
- There are no recommendations for the Metropolitan Police Service. It is accepted their policies have changed in recent years, but areas such as lack of professional curiosity may still be relevant, as above.
- Please cross-check the Action Plan for dates, as some of these have passed since the report was submitted.

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.

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 Panel feedback letter 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 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,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel