

Mandi George
Lead Officer for Domestic Abuse
Huntingdonshire District Council
Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street
Huntingdon
PE29 3TN

14th May 2026

Dear Mandi,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Maria) for Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 25th March 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	Maria
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Huntingdonshire
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	25 th March 2026
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials were appropriately translated into Polish, supporting meaningful engagement with the family. Arrangements were made for Maria’s daughter to speak directly with the Panel, with Maria’s photograph was shared at each meeting and regular updates provided, ensuring she remained central to the review. This was commended as good practice. • The report demonstrates strong use of read-across to previous relevant reviews. • The powerful use of Maria’s diaries alongside medical records adds significant depth to the analysis. • The Chair further strengthened the process by seeking appropriate expert input. • The background section is comprehensive and provides a clear contextual overview of the victim, perpetrator and the circumstances leading to the review.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	While the overview section is comprehensive, there is a considerable amount of repetition which could be reduced to improve clarity and readability.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	No amendments required.
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	Please clarify whether Maria's family was involved in the development of The Terms of Reference.
7	Equality and Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review states that intersectionality was considered; however, the report does not demonstrate how this analysis was applied in practice. The victim was a Polish national with limited English, which is a significant factor that may have influenced help-seeking behaviour, understanding of services, and professional risk assessment. Please review this section accordingly. The report would benefit from further analysis of how language barriers, discrimination (referred to) and potential social isolation may have interacted with domestic abuse dynamics and agency responses. For example, it would be helpful to clarify whether professional interpreters were consistently used, how agencies ensured the victim understood safeguarding processes, and whether culturally appropriate support services were considered.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	Whilst comprehensive, there is a lot of repetition from the combined chronology section which makes the report very long. Please consider reducing this.
11	Analysis	No amendments required.
12	Conclusions	No amendments required.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	No amendments required.
14	Timescales	No amendments required.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	No amendments required.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add the Domestic Abuse Commissioner be added to the dissemination list, along with Maria's family. • Please indicate whether Maria's family has been asked about dates to avoid for publication and whether they will need any support at that time.
21	Action Plan	The action plan would benefit from greater clarity regarding implementation and accountability. In its current form there are no clear timescales for completion and no named accountable leads for the actions identified. Including specific dates and identifying responsible officers or organisations would strengthen the action plan and support effective monitoring and oversight by the CSP, in line with DHR statutory guidance which encourages recommendations to be specific, measurable and accountable. Please review this and amend accordingly.
22	<p>Has there been a request to withhold publication?</p> <p><i>If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i></p>	No request to withhold publication.
23	Any other comments	This is a very well thought out and comprehensive review that demonstrates careful consideration of the evidence and the key issues arising from the case. As referenced above, in some sections the report becomes lengthy and repetitive. It may also be helpful to review whether the extensive list of appendices is necessary where material is already included within the main body of the report, as streamlining this could improve the clarity and accessibility of the final document.