

Leicestershire & Rutland
Safer Communities Strategy
Board



Making Leicestershire & Rutland Safer

LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND SAFER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY BOARD

26 MARCH 2026

CSP DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW CONTRIBUTIONS

Purpose of report

1. The purpose of this report is to propose an increase in funding contributions to the DHR management process provided by Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Safeguarding Partnership Board Office (SPBO) and other officers across the authority.

Background

2. A report on the issue was previously presented to the Board on 21st November 2025. <https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/documents/s193131/DHRs.pdf>
At that meeting Board members requested further information before they could make a decision and deferred the item to the March 2026 meeting.
3. Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) were established on a statutory basis under Section 9 of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act (2004). Responsibilities to facilitate reviews fell to local authorities and partners through Community Safety Partnerships.
4. The infrequency of DHRs, however, posed potential issues regarding capacity and capability to undertake such reviews efficiently and effectively. As a solution in 2013 the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board (now the Leicestershire & Rutland Safer Communities Strategy Board) agreed delegated local arrangements to assist in the management and production of DHR Reports.

Management of DHRs

5. The process and procedures governing DHRs is attached at Appendix A; the management of DHRs includes the management of actions and recommendations.
6. Current delegated arrangements for the management of DHRs involve the commissioning of expert support, the cost of which is rising, and assistance from the Safeguarding Partnership Business Office (SPBO) and there are

numerous meetings and Boards attended by LCC staff at varying grading bands. This culminates at the point of publication of the Domestic Homicide Review by the relevant CSP.

7. Recommendations and actions are identified within the DHR report, and they can be a combination of forms:
 - Directly for the relevant CSP;
 - For a single agency identified within the review process;
 - Broader cross-agency or multi-agency recommendations and actions.
8. Recommendations and actions require implementation, monitoring and sign-off and in some cases suitable remedial action and support to ensure completion. Given the purpose of a DHR it is crucial that the post DHR process is both timely and robust; this is not currently the case.
9. There is currently an LCC identified post who picks up and drives forward all of the actions arising from DHRs, the funding for which was originally taken from the partnership DHR budget as a pilot. Leicestershire County Council has now mainstreamed this post to support the partnership on a permanent basis.
10. The number and more notably the complexity of DHRs is increasing; even before a decision is made that a case meets the threshold for a DHR much work is undertaken by the SPBO. A number of specialist Leicestershire County Council officers support the process, from Director level through to administrative support, including legal services, children and family services, adults and community and safer communities, as well as representatives from health, police and voluntary sector. Specialists in the field are also consulted with on an ad hoc basis.
11. Furthermore, the Home Office challenged a Leicestershire CSP through a judicial review, the pooled partnership DHR funding was used to support this Borough in defending themselves.
12. Summary:

Total number of DHRs (since 2011)*	Completed (including those not published)	Ongoing
17**	11	6

* this figure covers only those which progressed to a full review.

** this figure includes 2 Alternative DHRs and does not include the cases from 2025 as some decisions have not yet been finalised.

Funding of DHRs

13. The Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board (now the Leicestershire and Rutland Safer Communities Strategy Board) agreed current arrangements in 2013. The annual funding contributions agreed are set out below:

Leics. County Council	£30K +DHR post +officer time
OPCC	£16K
Districts & Rutland CC @ £2.5K Each	£20K

14. Contributions run in line with the financial year e.g., this year's contributions will be from April 25 – March 26 and is invoiced in Feb/Mar.

Outgoings:

- Recharge by the SPBO for their services. These are based on 0.5fte of a Grade 6 admin post and 0.6fte of a grade 12 post, this was £53,504.67 last financial year.
 - Costs of DHRs, this includes engagement of independent Chair/Author and ancillary expenses. On average an annual estimate based on four DHRs per annum costs circa £15 -20K. However, DHR numbers are unpredictable.
 - LCC do not currently charge for officer or management time.
15. During the Covid-19 pandemic both the number and progress of DHRs reduced and financial reserves increased. The table below shows the DHR costs by financial year, the lower costs have allowed reserves to build. As at the 1st April the available reserve was £70,788. It was the reserve that allowed for the funding of an additional pilot post for one year without a requirement to ask for additional funding from stakeholders.

Financial Year	DHR Costs (£)
2019/20	13,625.14
2020/21	4,288
2021/22	256
2022/23	8,677
2023/24	11,388

16. Factors which did impact the reserve:
- I. The additional post within SPBO, 0.5 FTE at Grade 9.
 - II. Increase in number and complexity of DHRs. Projected costings for contribution purposes were based on an average of four DHRs per annum. We currently have six at panel or pre-panel stage.
 - III. The costs for DHRs includes provision for appointment of an Independent Chair and an Independent Author. We have to date managed to run DHRs utilising a single person to undertake both roles

which has allowed for savings and consequent positive impact on the reserves. We do however need to maintain the option to utilise separate roles if required particularly for more complex cases.

- IV. The Home Office has consulted on the statutory guidance for DHR's. The draft indicates DHRs will become broader in scope. Larger numbers will be accompanied by increased costs.
 - V. A Home Office Judicial Review
17. After detailed discussions with finance colleagues, it has been advised that in order to cover the costs of DHRs going forward each District partner and Rutland should be invoiced £5,000.
 18. Due to the nature of Domestic Abuse, it is not possible to use demographic data, indices of deprivation, population figures or intelligence to identify areas of prevalence. DA can and does affect all members of society.
 19. A further consideration is that each LA or CSP area undertake their own DHR process.

Recommendations for the Board

20. It is recommended that:
 - (a) The Board notes the content of the report;
 - (b) The Board approves the proposal of an increased contribution to £5,000 as stated in paragraph 17 above.

Notable developments and challenges:

21. Developments and challenges have been as follows:
 - The number of cases has increased considerably since 2013;
 - The complexity of cases has increased significantly;
 - The funding arrangements have not been reviewed since 2013, despite numerous pay awards.

Officer to contact

Gurjit Samra-Rai
 Community Safety Team Manager, Leicestershire County Council
 Tel: 0116 305 6056
 Email: Gurjit.samra-rai@leics.gov.uk