

Vickie Crompton
Domestic Abuse & Sexual Violence Partnership Manager
Fenland District Council
Fenland Hall
County Road
PE15

5 September 2023

Dear Vickie,

Thank you for resubmitting the report (Daniel) for Fenland Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was reassessed in August 2023.

The QA Panel felt the report benefitted from a good level of engagement with those affected by Daniel's murder, including his partner and family, and the inclusion of their voices through the use of quotations was welcomed. The panel was also positive about the identification of circumstances that warranted an extension of the time period under review (from 2016 to 2010). The panel also considered that the action plan was detailed enough for agencies to take forward learning in relation to the dynamics of familial abuse and conflict relating to child contact disputes. They also acknowledged that progress with the review had been timely in spite of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Whilst the report continues to have limitations, the QA Panel is of the view that on balance the report should be published subject to a number of specific amendments/deletions being made to address the most problematic aspects that remain:

- Para 16.1. Suggest the current paragraph is replaced with:
Daniel and Beth were involved in a lengthy, emotive and, at times, embittered dispute about child contact arrangements.
- A new paragraph 16.2 should be inserted following 16.1 and subsequent paragraphs renumbered:
Beth made a number of allegations of post-separation domestic abuse against Daniel. As a result, she had been considered as a high-risk victim at a MARAC and had secured a non-molestation order against the victim. The most serious allegation was that Daniel had set fire to her home.

- Para 16.4 (will now be 16.5 if new 16.2 above is added). Suggest the current paragraph is replaced with:

Although the arson investigation totally focussed on the culpability at Daniel, there remains no witness or forensic evidence to place him at the scene, the passive data located his phone some 10 miles away on the morning of the arson attack, he was found not guilty at court. The DHR panel formed the view that Daniel would not have wanted to jeopardise access to his children by committing such an act.

- Para 17.21. Repword second sentence to read:

Mary suggests that false allegations of abuse were being made by Beth against Daniel concerning the children.

- Repword first sentence of para. 17.24 to read:

Coupled with this were the ongoing family court processes, which were invariably protracted and complex.

- Repword paras 17.30 and 19.16

- In 17.30, replace the words 'fiscally based punitive control' with 'financial control' to read:

What both the statement of Andrew and letter from Beth are indicative of, coupled with the information disclosed concerning the family holidays and the share of the cost distribution, is that there appears to have been an element of financial control towards Daniel by Beth and Andrew.

- In 19.16, repword the third sentence to read:

It appears that Andrew financially excluded him in favour of his daughter and the grandchildren. Beth re-enforced that financial exclusion by her asserting that he was "*allowed*" to live with her rent-free, when that allowance was bestowed on her by her father and therefore vicariously to Daniel as her partner.

- In addition, the CSP should ensure that the Executive Summary is updated to remedy the concerns reflected here and in previous feedback.

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,

Lynne Abrams

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel