

[REDACTED]
Safer Communities
Dudley Council
Brierley Hill Police Station
Bank Street, Dudley
DY5 3DH

24th February 2026

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Lisa) for Dudley Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 14th January 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	Lisa
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Dudley
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	14 th January 2026
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	• Expert advice was appropriately sought from the Traveller Movement to provide insight into Romani (Gypsy) culture, and the potential barriers Lisa may have faced. • The review gave careful and respectful attention to Lisa's heritage, cultural norms and lived experiences. • There is strong analysis referencing the stages of suicide and domestic abuse. • It was helpful to see the summary of meetings and an overview of what the Panel did at each of these. • There were good efforts by the Chair to engage Lisa's family.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	• Please ensure pen portraits are included in any future reviews undertaken (where possible). • Please follow the statutory guidance in structuring the report and its contents.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	The inclusion of the review period timeframe is not necessary on the title page.
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	The review would benefit from a pen portrait that highlights Lisa's life experiences for both the overview and the executive summary.
4	Condolences	There were no condolences offered to the family and friends of Lisa. Please add these.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	• Please could a section on this be added and clarification given around how the pseudonyms used in the report were arrived at. • There are breaches of confidential information. Lisa's exact date of death is disclosed in both executive summary (para 7) and overview report (1.17 and 6.102). Please amend these accordingly.

6	Terms of Reference	• Please indicate if Lisa's family was involved in the development of the terms of reference. • The terms of reference are in appendix one of the overview report. It would be helpful if they were in the body of the report.
7	Equality and Diversity	• This content is currently included within the methodology section; however, the statutory guidance sets out that it should form a standalone section. Please could this be separated accordingly. • The QA Board disagree with the conclusion that age was not a relevant factor. There was a 20-year age gap between Lisa and Adam, with Lisa being older. The review further notes that Lisa was assessed by a support worker as having a mental age of 13, which influenced the police decision not to complete a DARA. This makes age, both chronological and assessed developmental age, clearly relevant to risk and decision-making. Please reflect this accordingly. • Under sex, please reference research on female victims of domestic abuse and suicide, as this evidence base is directly applicable and would strengthen the analysis.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	No amendments required.
11	Analysis	• At 7.109 the analysis around Lisa's homelessness is thorough. However please could the fact that other residents were financially exploiting Lisa be linked to her inability to pay her rent and therefore the risks this created around her ability to move out of the facility where she may have been safer. • That Lisa presented as someone who had the mental age of 13 begs the question as to why she was in housing designed to support independence. This is given as the reason why staff did not 'get involved' with customer's private lives, yet Lisa was clearly very vulnerable. Please could this be addressed. • 7.206 – please avoid the term 'committed' suicide where possible and use an alternative term. This is particularly important given the views of suicide in the traveller community.
12	Conclusions	• 8.8 – please remove reference to the housing service adhering to its policies – the safeguarding policy was not followed, and the report has identified the repercussions of this (including at 8.13). • 8.22 – Adam will also have posed a risk to other vulnerable females using the housing service. Please could this be noted.

13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	Please consider a broader recommendation around whether mixed accommodation for vulnerable people is appropriate and how the housing facility can respond to situations when an individual might need to be moved to safeguard other residents.
14	Timescales	No amendments required.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	• It was good to see the efforts made by chair to engage with family. Please clarify if friends considered. • There is no mention of whether the chair sought to engage with Lisa's son who was a teenager to seek his input to the DHR process. Please clarify this.
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	There is no section on dissemination. Please could this be added as per the statutory guidance.
21	Action Plan	Please review the Action Plan to ensure that all recommendations are SMART and time-bound.
22	Has there been a request to withhold publication? <i>If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i>	No request to withhold publication.
23	Any other comments	This case highlights cultural barriers and could be considered as a case study. Dudley has a diverse Roma and Traveller community and more recent migrants. This case could be an opportunity to highlight the experiences faced by Lisa as an opportunity to improve awareness and of local support services.