

Sarah Fines  
Domestic abuse review co-ordinator  
Cambridgeshire Domestic Abuse & Sexual Violence Partnership  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Huntingdon  
PE29 9QR

21<sup>st</sup> April 2026

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Gloria) for South Cambridgeshire Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> February 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](mailto: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](mailto: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

<b>TITLE OF DHR</b>	Gloria
<b>COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP</b>	South Cambridgeshire
<b>DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>DECISION</b>	Publish with amendments
<b>GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The careful, multi-disciplinary assessment of Gloria's mental health and suicide risk in this review was commended as good practice.</li> <li>• The Panel made appropriate and sensitive efforts to engage family members and offer advocacy support.</li> <li>• The contributions from Gloria's siblings add valuable context.</li> </ul>
<b>FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs</b>	For future reviews, it may be helpful to consider including a short overview section to draw together the key findings and learning in an accessible way.

	<b>DHR SECTION</b>	<b>DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)</b>
1	Title Page	Please add 'DHR' to both the Executive Summary and the Overview Report and include the date of death (month and year only) to the Overview Report.
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	No amendments required.
4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.
6	Terms of Reference	No amendments required.
7	Equality and Diversity	The section demonstrates strong awareness of protected characteristics, particularly sex, age and disability, and references relevant national data appropriately. However, the analysis currently risks becoming descriptive rather than evaluative. The

		review would be strengthened by clearer articulation of how Gloria's age, disability and dependency may have increased vulnerability, and whether services adjusted their responses accordingly. Greater focus on intersectionality would enhance depth.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	The section would benefit from clearer highlighting of potential risk indicators emerging over time, including repeated suicidal ideation, reduced engagement with rehabilitation, increasing dependency, and pressures on Marcus as a carer.
10	Overview	The report does not include a clearly defined Overview or Executive Summary section drawing together the key findings and learning. While the information is present throughout the document, a concise overview would strengthen accessibility and ensure that readers can readily identify the core safeguarding themes and required changes.
11	Analysis	This section would benefit from more focused critical reflection. In particular, it could explore more clearly the repeated suicidal ideation, the timing of discharge over a holiday period, the limited consideration of Marcus's emotional capacity as a carer, and the unclear GP letter.
12	Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion that Gloria "did not experience domestic abuse" may benefit from more cautious phrasing.</li> <li>• Additionally, the conclusions could more explicitly reference systemic learning, particularly around carer stress, suicidal ideation in care contexts, and discharge planning.</li> </ul>
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	<p>Some recommendations would benefit from greater specificity and measurable outcomes. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does "embed" mean in practice and how will this be evidenced?</li> <li>• How will partners "provide reassurance" and to whom?</li> <li>• What oversight mechanism will confirm that signposting to carers' assessments is happening?</li> <li>• How will improvements in GP third-party information handling be audited?</li> </ul>
14	Timescales	It would strengthen the report to clarify what governance oversight was in place during the delay period and whether any interim learning was disseminated to agencies.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	No amendments required.

16	DHR contributors	The inclusion of a specialist domestic abuse service (Women's Aid) is particularly positive. It would be helpful to clarify whether adult safeguarding expertise specific to older people was considered given the victim's age and disability.
17	DHR Panel	No amendments required.
18	DHR Author	No amendments required.
19	Parallel Reviews	Given the acceptance of a plea to manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility, it would be helpful for the report to clarify how the findings of the criminal court were considered within the DHR analysis.
20	Dissemination	The report could clarify how learning will be shared operationally beyond senior recipients.
21	Action Plan	No amendments required.
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	The report requires a proof-read, as there are several spelling mistakes and typos.