

Sarah Fines
Cambridgeshire County Council
Scott House, George Street
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE29 3AD

13th January 2026

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Fiona) for South Cambridgeshire Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was reviewed at the QA Board meeting on 3rd December 2025. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding.

Please find the QA Board's feedback in the form below. There were aspects of the report which the QA Board felt needed further revision. On completion of these changes the DHR should be resubmitted to the QA Board for review by **13th April 2026**.

On resubmission, please clearly indicate where changes have been made by using a different colour font or highlighting the added or amended text in the report. If paragraph numbers have changed, please give revised location of the answer to the feedback comment. Please make it clear in the subject line of your email that the documents contained are revised versions for reconsideration. The deadline for this resubmission is **13th April 2026**.

I look forward to receiving an updated report.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Fiona
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	South Cambridgeshire
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	3 rd December 2025
DECISION	Resubmit to the QA Board
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table outlining the timeline for the review is very helpful. • The chair engaged well with the family and respected their wishes as they declined to participate.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full and through proofread should be completed prior to submitting reports to the DHR QA Board. • It would have been helpful to have considered the research base on economic abuse or brought in relevant expertise on this area. Please consider this where relevant for any future reviews undertaken.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
1	Title Page	Please remove the word pseudonym from the title page as this is explained in the confidentiality section.
2	Contents Page	No amendments required.
3	Pen Portrait	There is currently no pen portrait for Fiona included in the report. While the family declined to participate in the review, the author should consider drafting a brief pen portrait based on available information from agency records and professional observations. This will help provide context and a more complete picture of Fiona within the review.
4	Condolences	No amendments required.
5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.
6	Terms of Reference	No amendments required.

7	Equality and Diversity	Given the focus on affluent women in the terms of reference, it would be useful for this section to include an analysis of socio-economic status. This would provide greater context and insight into how financial circumstances may have influenced vulnerabilities, decision-making, and access to support. Please consider adding this accordingly.
8	Background Information	Section 2.1.8 states that in June 2023, HMRC contacted Timothy informing him VAT had referred him for his company to arrange a visit in relation to him owing over £23,000. Please can this sentence be re-structured for clarity.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	No amendments required.
11	Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This analysis would benefit significantly from referencing research on economic abuse. For example, there is no exploration of the implications of Timothy's efforts to pay the arrears on the life insurance, particularly in the context of his other debts. His browsing history suggests that Fiona's murder was premeditated; however, the conclusion merely states that the prosecution argued the motive was financial, obtaining her money and life insurance to pay off debts. • The charity <i>Surviving Economic Abuse</i> has a policy paper on life insurance and economic abuse, which could have been considered and referenced to strengthen this analysis. • It is also unclear whether Timothy lied about pursuing a divorce, as he did about having cancer. Furthermore, Timothy appeared to be researching methods of ending his own life, raising the possibility that this case could have been a homicide-suicide. Reference to research on men who kill when losing control due to debts (e.g. Professor Monckton-Smith's work) would provide valuable context.
12	Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis is present in this section; however, it should explicitly acknowledge that abusers use different forms of control at different times. This point should be reflected at 4.1.11. • It is incorrect to question whether someone experienced economic abuse simply because they may not have experienced it previously. Economic abuse can occur intermittently or alongside other forms of coercive control, and this should be recognised in the analysis.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary 4.1 - the panel considered implementing a recommendation on economic abuse but did not identify anything suitable or relevant. The QA Board would advise the panel to seek expert input from <i>Surviving Economic Abuse</i> to identify an appropriate recommendation for this review. This could potentially become a national recommendation.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to grow the evidence base on affluent women experiencing abuse could have been highlighted here; its absence is noted in the review. The QA Board question the focus on narcissism as a theme for case study analysis by agencies. Given that domestic abuse is widely recognised as a pattern of power and control, this framing would be more appropriate and aligned with established understanding.
14	Timescales	It is stated at 1.3.3 that Jackie Dadd was commissioned to provide an independent Chair and Author for the DHR on 20 th November 2023. The table states this happened on 13 th March 2024. Please could this be clarified.
15	Involvement of family / friends / community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair may wish to consider reaching out to the daughters prior to publication of the report (following any resubmission agreed by the Board) to ensure they are prepared for potential media interest, given the high-profile nature of this case. It would be helpful to confirm if the Home Office leaflet was shared with family members and if friends of the couple were contacted.
16	DHR contributors	The decision not to request IMRs was based on the assessment that no agency held sufficient information to justify completing one. Please confirm this rationale is accurate.
17	DHR Panel	Please could the author clarify if the panel members were independent.
18	DHR Author	No amendments required.
19	Parallel Reviews	No amendments required.
20	Dissemination	Please indicate whether the family has been asked about key dates to avoid publication and also whether the family will need support as they did not believe Fiona had been subject to domestic abuse.
21	Action Plan	The action plan needs updating.
22	<p>Has there been a request to withhold publication?</p> <p><i>If Yes, include the reason for the request.</i></p>	No request from the CSP to withhold publication.

	<i>Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i>	
23	Any other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QA Board raised the following points on the executive summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - P.6: please use victims instead of victim's. - 6.9: having gone to bed earlier than Timothy, just before midnight, Timothy's exercise app shows his heart rate exceeding that of the exercise workout he had completed earlier and was exceptionally high for over three minutes. Within the next two hours, he then disarms the house alarm, plugs his mobile in on three occasions and unlocks it on seven occasions. Please clarify this paragraph. - 4.2: Timothy made attempts to prevent the insurance company that was owed money speaking to Fiona and she was not aware of his dealings in relation to her life insurance. The panel have reviewed this and there is GDPR as governance and you can also nominate a spouse to speak with them if required. The panel reflected that the barriers to leaving an abusive relationship can be increased for Fiona as she had a marriage and also run a company with Timothy making their lives intrinsically liked. Please rewrite this paragraph for clarity. - 4.4: No domestic abuse history should not be assumed to suggest that domestic abuse does not exist. These are areas that may have been identified if a Detective Inspector who is a trained investigator and experienced had attended. Please rewrite this paragraph for clarity. - 4.5: As it may take some time and a lot of courage for a victim to finally take the step to reach out for support, the panel felt that Cambridge Women's Aid's (CWA) automated email response may make the victim feel rejected and not have the courage to reach out to another service provider that is suggested. This was acknowledged by who will scope as to how this can be re-worded. Please clarify this paragraph. - 4.10: please cite the relevant research. - 4.11: Physical abuse was shown during Fiona's death due to her strangulation and suffocation by Timothy which is an extreme act of violence for someone to display if they haven't been violent previously. This statement appears to be an extrapolation and needs to be more evidence based if included. • The overview report, 6.8, references Silent Rights ZA – this is a South African support website – please clarify if there is there any information available as to why this website was accessed by Fiona. • The term SOCO (Scenes of Crime Officer) is used, the correct term is Crime Scene Investigator. • It is not necessary to include the conversation the Chair had with a professional woman at 3.2.3.