DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

REPORT INTO THE DEATH OF IZZY

(December 2016)

Report produced by: Kate Mitchell

Date: 28th February 2019

Amended in the light of Home Office feedback: 8th October 2019

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction to the Review 3
2. Introducing Izzy 3
3. Timescales 4
4. Confidentiality 5
5. Dissemination 5
6. Terms of Reference 5
7. Methodology 8
8. Family Involvement 9
9. Involvement of Colleagues and Employer 10
10. Information received by the Review 10
11. Members of the DHR Panel 12
12. The Independent Author 13

SECTION TWO: REPORT OF THE DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW

13. The facts 14
14. Chronology 15
15. Information from Family Members 32
16. Information from Colleagues and Employer 34
17. Analysis 36
18. Questions from Family 47

SECTION THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

19. Effective Practice and Lessons Learned 49
20. Lessons Learned by Employers 61
21. Panel Conclusions 62
22. A Review of Relevant Literature 65
23. Observations from Family 67
24. Recommendations 69
25. Action Plan 74

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction to the Review:

The death of Izzy[1] in December 2016 was established to be a homicide and her partner, known as Colin in this Report, was arrested. Accordingly, this was determined to be a domestic homicide and eligible for a Review as set out in statute. This is the Overview Report following that Domestic Homicide Review. It examines the agency responses and support given to the victim known in this Report as Izzy, a resident of Bradford, West Yorkshire, prior to the point of her death.

The Chair and Panel members would like to express their sympathies to the children and the parents, and all other family members, on their tragic loss.

The Review has considered the contact and involvement of agencies with Izzy and other members of the household including her children, and with the perpetrator, between 12th April 2014 (the first known contact with an agency during the relationship between Izzy and Colin) and the date of her death. Where agencies had contact with either Izzy or Colin before this timescale, the Review has considered background information in context.

The key purpose for undertaking a Domestic Homicide Report (DHR) is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides where a person is killed as a result of domestic violence. In order for these lessons to be learned as widely and thoroughly as possible, professionals need to be able to understand fully what happened in each homicide, and most importantly, what needs to change in order to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future.

2. Introducing Izzy:

Izzy was a 39-year-old mother of two who was described by family and colleagues as petite, pretty, intelligent, hardworking, devoted to her children.

Izzy grew up in the Bradford area. Her parents separated when she was three, and she lived permanently with her mother and younger brother. Her father remarried and had further children, maintaining contact with Izzy and her brother but not, in his own view, as much as he would have liked due to the conflicted nature of the separation. A number of father figures were involved in Izzy's upbringing and she observed domestic abuse in the household until,

[1] The names Izzy, Greg and Jane are pseudonyms chosen by the family to protect their confidentiality. Colin is a pseudonym chosen by the reviewers, to protect the confidentiality of the victim and her family.

when Izzy was an adult, her mother met and married her current partner. Izzy had a close relationship with her brother throughout her life until a couple of years before her death, when they cut off contact following an argument between him and Colin.

Izzy enjoyed school and was good at maths and English. She met Colin during her final year, and they dated but only briefly, as Izzy disapproved of his offending and drug-taking. She left school at 16 after GCSEs, went on to college and was planning to go to university but became pregnant with Greg. His father was serving a prison sentence when Greg was a baby and Izzy broke off the relationship; by all accounts, though kept at a distance due to his lifestyle, he has remained loyal to Izzy, and to Greg. Izzy was a single parent, working part time in a supermarket, when she started to help out at Greg's school, and enjoyed it. She applied to the local National Health Service (NHS) and was employed in administration. Her family recalls how proud she was, to have this job, and determined to make a career of it; the NHS provided training and she developed skills and confidence. Being efficient and accurate in her work was important to Izzy; she expressed that she was interested in promotion.

She met and married Jane's father, and Jane was born. Izzy worked with her husband on various businesses. Her family and her colleagues knew this was an unhappy marriage: in their view, Izzy took up with men who exploited her; she worked and provided money, which they spent. Her husband was witnessed to shout, swear and verbally abuse Izzy, who is said to have stayed with the marriage because of her children, but decided to leave after she met Colin. Her mother, mother's partner, father and stepmother, were in close contact and supportive of Izzy and the children during her separation from her husband.

It is believed that Izzy re-met Colin either through social media or while out socializing over the Christmas period of 2013, and started a relationship with him. She left her husband in early 2014, taking the children with her to rented accommodation, and at a point between then and March 2014, Colin moved in with her.

3. TIMESCALES

This Review began with the first meeting of the Overview Panel on 11th June 2018 and was concluded with the presentation of the Overview Report to the Community Safety Partnership. There had been a delay in commencement due to an internal review of procurement policy in the City of Bradford Metropolitan Borough Council (CBMBC); and while the criminal proceedings were ongoing. Reviews, including the overview report, should be completed, where possible, within six months of the commencement of the review. There

was a delay of four weeks to this timescale as a number of Independent Management Reviews (IMRs) required re-drafting, new information was received, and further inquiries were identified; and the completion of the Review was postponed for six weeks in consultation with the family, as the dates then coincided with anniversary dates, to allow the family to receive the draft report and attend the final Overview Panel. The Review therefore commenced eighteen months after the death of Izzy and completed eight months later.

4. CONFIDENTIALITY

The findings of the Review are 'Restricted' as per the Government Protective Marking Scheme until the agreed date of publication. Prior to this, information will be made available only to participating professionals and their line managers who have a pre-declared interest in the Review. The Chair directed that these confidential findings were shared with family members who have been involved in this Review, and their comments and questions were invited prior to completion of the Report, and a final copy was then prepared which included their comments. This copy will be provided to the family in advance of publication.

This Overview Report has been anonymised for dissemination and publication. All information that might lead to the identification of members of the household, such as names, dates of birth, schools and addresses, has been generalised, anonymised or removed, to retain the meaning of the information but protect the confidentiality of individuals. The victim and her children have been given pseudonyms chosen by the family. The perpetrator has been provided with a pseudonym by the reviewers, in order to protect the confidentiality of the victim and her family. Parents and the victim's husband and others will be referenced by their relationship to the victim or perpetrator.

5. DISSEMINATION

Copies of this report prior to publication have been disseminated to members of the Overview Panel, to the Community Safety Partnership and to Izzy's parents.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Overview Panel in June 2018 agreed the following Terms of Reference for the Review:

6.1 Members of the family invited to participate in the Review are:

- Izzy's eldest child and Izzy's parents, who are to be invited to meet with the reviewers, to attend Overview Panel meetings with support, to be provided with information and advice about advocacy, to read the full Overview Report and

comment before submission to the Home Office, and to be invited to contribute views during the process which will be considered to have equal weight with the submissions of individual agencies.

- Izzy's husband is to be offered information and advice about the process and invited to contribute views relative to the safeguarding of the children.

6.2 The colleagues of Izzy are invited to meet with the reviewers.

6.3 The employer of Izzy, as a public sector agency statutorily engaged in the DHR Process, will be asked to meet with the reviewers to discuss the relevant questions in these Terms of Reference, identify lessons learned, and make recommendations for action.

6.4 Specific questions to be addressed by the Independent Management Reviews are:

Awareness of domestic abuse services:

- Were barriers experienced by Izzy or her family / friends / colleagues in reporting any abuse in Bradford or elsewhere, including whether they knew how to report domestic abuse should they have wanted to?
- Whether, if it is known, Izzy had experienced abuse in previous relationships in Bradford or elsewhere, this experience impacted on her likelihood of seeking support in the months before she died.
- Could more be done to raise public awareness of services available to victims of domestic violence?

Information sharing procedures:

- Did the agency comply with domestic violence and abuse protocols agreed with other agencies, including any protocols for information-sharing and referring cases?
- How does the agency process domestic abuse referrals? Is this process effective?
- Was information about Colin's risk (history of sex offending, violent offending, domestic abuse) shared effectively with organisations working with Izzy?

Assessment and decision making:

- What were the key points or opportunities for assessment and decision making in relation to both the victim, and the perpetrator, in this case? Do assessments and decisions appear to have been reached in an informed and professional way?
- Did agencies in contact with Izzy have an opportunity to refer her to a domestic violence organization and if so did they? If not, why not?

- Were there warning signs of domestic abuse in this relationship, and were any opportunities missed?
- Were agencies in contact with Colin aware of domestic violence in the relationship with Izzy or previous relationships, and if so, what action was taken to provide a disclosure to Izzy? ('Clare's Law.')
- The perpetrator was a Registered Sex Offender. Was there ongoing risk assessment and decision making as circumstances changed? Was disclosure to Izzy considered/ undertaken? ('Sarah's Law.')

Interventions:

- Did risk management plans and actions fit with the assessment and decisions made? Were appropriate services offered or provided, or relevant enquiries made in the light of the assessments, given what was known or should have been known at the time?
- Had the victim disclosed to anyone and if so, was the response appropriate? Was this information recorded and shared, where appropriate?
- Did employer(s) have an opportunity to provide support and advice, including referring to a domestic violence organisation, and if so, did they? If not, why not?
- Overall, were there opportunities for agency intervention in relation to domestic abuse regarding Izzy, Colin, or the children, that were missed?

Policies and procedures:

- Did the agency have policies and procedures for the risk assessment and management of domestic abuse (including DASH)? Were those policies and procedures correctly used in the case of this victim and this perpetrator?
- Was the victim subject to a MARAC or other multi-disciplinary risk management process? If so, was that process effective?
- Did the agency have policies and procedures in place for dealing with concerns about domestic violence and abuse? Is agency guidance, including tools and resources, for practitioners, and colleagues, effective?
- Does the agency/ service as an employer have policies and procedures for identifying, enabling disclosure, supporting, employees who may be experiencing domestic abuse in their personal life?

Practitioner skills and training:

- Were practitioners sensitive to the needs of the victim and the perpetrator, knowledgeable about potential indicators of domestic violence and abuse and aware of

what to do (policies and procedures, referral pathways, assessment etc) if they had concerns about a victim or perpetrator?

- Were practitioners trained to the level of training and knowledge required to fulfil these expectations?
- Are there any training or awareness raising requirements to ensure a greater knowledge and understanding of domestic abuse processes and / or services in the City?

Safeguarding Children:

This Domestic Homicide Review notes that the perpetrator was, at the time of the homicide, on bail for an allegation of sexual assault against a child, and that the perpetrator was a Registered Sex Offender whose risk to the specific child had been assessed and was managed through a supervised contact order. The DHR Overview Panel recognizes that the Local Safeguarding Children Board therefore has a responsibility to review this incident. IMR authors are asked to consider the following questions in relation to the two children:

- Whether agencies in contact with the children were aware of domestic violence in Izzy's relationship with Colin, and if so, what support or referral was provided to any member of the family?
- Where practitioners were in contact with the children, were they confident of observing behaviour that could signal domestic abuse?
- Where practitioners were concerned about risk to the children, or the impact on the children of domestic abuse, did they act in line with LSCB policies and procedures?

7. Methodology

7.1 The reviewers in this Domestic Homicide Review are the Independent Author, Domestic Abuse Team Manager and Development Officer. All meetings with Panel and with Authors of the Independent Management Reviews (IMRs) have been chaired by the Independent Author; all meetings with family representatives have been undertaken jointly.

7.2 The methodology for the Review consisted of scoping all partner agencies, and projects and services in the field of domestic abuse in Bradford; this process identified the agencies which knew Izzy and the children, or the perpetrator. There was a meeting of those agencies, the senior representatives of which formed the Overview Panel. The Terms of Reference were developed and agreed. Single-agency chronologies were requested and merged into one multi-agency timeline. Independent Management Reviews (IMRs) were prepared by the agencies identified through scoping. Agencies which had an involvement before the timeframe, or within the timeframe but without

relevance, were asked for a summary of involvement rather than a full chronology. IMRs were quality assured by the Independent Author and amendments and further information requested. Each IMR conforms to a template and a methodology that includes access to all records, interviews with individual staff, analysis and conclusions.

7.3 There were three meetings of the Independent Author with the IMR authors and their line managers. Two sessions explored the themes identified in the IMRs, cross referencing with information provided by family and employers, and raising queries for further information. The Independent Author developed an initial analysis and facilitated a meeting in which IMR Authors and their line managers together discussed this to draw out lessons learned.

7.4 This initial analysis was discussed with family representatives and further developed to reflect their contributions, and this forms the analysis in this Report.

8. Family involvement

Izzy's mother, and her father and stepmother, have been fully involved in the review process; they have provided valuable information and insights, shared memories and feelings, and spoken openly, posing questions that enabled the reviewers to seek out and explore new information, and expressed clearly their views about events leading to their daughter's death. We very much appreciate their contribution to this Review.

There were several meetings with Izzy's father and stepmother, and two meetings with Izzy's mother, during the process, and further conversations to discuss the draft Report. Mother and father together with other family representatives met with the Overview Panel at the end of the process and the discussions that took place have been included as Section 23 of this Report.

Izzy's estranged husband was invited by voicemail, text and email, and via family representatives, to meet with the reviewers, and did not respond.

Izzy's son Greg, now an adult, agreed to meet the reviewers and on reflection decided against this; he has been reassured through family representatives that he could reconsider at any time. Prior to the final meeting of the family with the Overview Panel, he was able to make some observations over the telephone.

9. Involvement of colleagues and employer

The reviewers were unable to identify friends who knew Izzy socially. It appeared that over recent years, Izzy lost contact with friends outside her work environment. A number of colleagues who had known Izzy during the past thirteen years or so, considered themselves her friends, even though they had not recently shared a social life with her. The reviewers met with several colleagues who shared their memories of Izzy, and openly and helpfully offered their view of Izzy's lived experience. Her colleagues continue to be significantly affected by the loss of Izzy and what they now know of her experience and were committed to helping the Review to identify lessons learned; in particular, to find a way in which their organisation could improve support to colleagues experiencing domestic abuse. Their views and ideas have contributed to the Review's analysis and conclusions.

In meetings with several senior representatives of Izzy's employer, the reviewers were able to discuss emerging findings and to share their views of lessons to be learned.

10. Information received by the Review:

10.1 Independent Management Reports were received from the following agencies:

West Yorkshire Police (WYP)

All contact with the victim and perpetrator during the time period under review was by officers of the Bradford and Kirklees Districts of West Yorkshire Police. This included the Safeguarding Unit in relation to children present at the time of domestic incidents and the necessary liaison with Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and Children's Social Care. Also, the Public Protection Unit, which was responsible for the assessment and monitoring of the perpetrator who is a Registered Sex Offender.

The WYP has a Serious Case Review section which oversees all such reviews. This Independent Management Review Author is a specialist management reviewer in this section.

Bradford Children's Social Care (CSC)

Children's Social Care is part of Bradford Children's Specialist Services and was responsible for assessing and identifying risk and need in relation to the children of the family of the deceased, during the period under Review.

The IMR Author is a Team Manager independent of the events and people involved in this case.

Bradford Districts, City, Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

The General Practice having contact with the victim during the time period under review is based in the Bradford Area and co-commissioned by NHS England and this Clinical Commissioning Group. This CCG, representing the General Practice, was therefore represented on the Overview Panel.

The Independent Management Review was prepared by a General Practitioner specialising in safeguarding in the Bradford area.

Bradford District Care Foundation Trust (BDCFT)

BDCFT is an integrated Mental Health and Community Services Trust providing care for people of all ages who have community health and mental health needs. One of BDCFT services is School Nursing, working within schools and community settings to support children and young people of school age and those who care for them. It is this Service which was in contact with the family, in relation to their youngest child, during the timescale under review.

The Independent Management Review has been prepared by a Specialist Practitioner within BDCFT Safeguarding Team.

The Bridge Project

The Bridge Project is a commissioned service, providing treatment for drug users and had contact with the perpetrator from May 2015. This concerned different services provided to the perpetrator at different periods according to his need, including the abstinence programme and the core programme. The Bridge Project operates a 'Concerned Other' Service which aims to offer independent support for those living with substance misusers. The Project had contact with the victim on a number of occasions in relation both to the perpetrator's treatment programme, and discussions concerning the victim's need for testing information to support a court application, and in consideration of her own need for support.

Due to the lean management system in a small project, the IMR Author is also the Overview Panel representative.

10.2 Additional information was received from:

- The National Probation Service in relation to Colin
- The Crown Prosecution Service and West Yorkshire Police in relation to Colin
- MARAC in Kirklees in relation to Colin's previous history
- X College in relation to Greg
- Y Academy in relation to Jane

10.3 Additional documents used by the Review included:

- A letter written by Izzy to Colin at an unknown time, thought to be shortly before her death. This letter was read by the reviewers but not retained, and is referenced in the report but not quoted, for confidentiality reasons.
- Police shared the reports of the investigation with the reviewers.
- There was correspondence between the reviewers and the CPS to clarify events surrounding the perpetrator's release on bail shortly before the murder.
- The reviewers were provided with a copy of the application for bail to Judge in Chambers in November.

11. The DHR Overview Panel consisted of:

Kate Mitchell	Chair and Author	Independent
Noreen Akhtar	Domestic and Sexual Abuse Team Manager	CBMDC
Helen Khan	Domestic and Sexual Abuse Development Officer	CBMDC
Mark Long	DCI Serious and Organised Crime	Bradford District, WYP
Helen Hart	Deputy Designated Nurse (Safeguarding Adults)	CCG
Helen Hyde	Named Nurse (Safeguarding)	BDCFT
Tracey Hogan	Director of Operations	Bridge Project
David Stephens	Service Manager	Children's Social Care, CBMDC
Maggie Smallridge	Head of Service	National Probation

		Service

12. The Independent Author:

Kate Mitchell was commissioned as Independent Chair and Author of this Review. Having had no working relationship with any agency in West Yorkshire, Kate Mitchell is independent of City of Bradford Metropolitan Borough Council and all agencies involved in this Review. She has experience of working at a practitioner, manager and senior level in the Probation Service, including chairing MAPPA and representing the Service on LSCB and Safer Community Partnerships. Since 2008, she has worked independently, and has undertaken a number of projects related to safeguarding and domestic abuse, has chaired and authored one previous DHR in Bradford, and several DHRs and Serious Case Reviews in other areas.

SECTION TWO: DOMESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEW REPORT

13. **THE FACTS**

13.1 Izzy lived in a privately rented house in Bradford, which she shared with her partner, Colin. They had cohabited since early 2014. Her children did not live at this house: Greg was at this time over 18 and living independently, while Jane, aged nine, lived with her father. (All pseudonyms.)

13.2 On the date of Izzy's death, in December 2016, she and Colin visited his parents in the afternoon. They brought home a bottle of vodka which he later stated he drank most of, while Izzy drank a little. By his account, Colin also took cocaine and heroin during this timeframe. Izzy had told Colin she was pregnant. Colin stated that he believed her to be six weeks pregnant and he calculated that he had been in prison at that time. He became suspicious of Izzy, and challenged her, and did not believe her denials. At some time after 8.30pm, he accused her of having a relationship with another man. When she denied this, he attacked her. Afterwards he stated that he wanted her to admit seeing other men. He stated that the attack lasted around one hour.

13.3 By the perpetrator's account, supported by CCTV evidence in the neighbourhood, he remained in the house overnight and on the following morning at 8.00am, went to the supermarket to collect his methadone prescription, returned to the house, took two further journeys to a phone box to order illegal drugs, and then took a third journey to the phone box when he called the ambulance, stating that someone had been stabbed at the address. Police and ambulance services responded to the call and discovered Izzy deceased.

13.4 The crime scene investigation and Post Mortem examination evidence that Izzy experienced a brutal, sustained and frenzied attack which had been contained within the sofa, where she was found. The weapons were two knives and a pickaxe handle. Izzy suffered 24 stab wounds, one of which penetrated her heart. She had extensive bruising, defensive stab wounds and blunt force trauma injuries. Izzy was found to be in the early stages of pregnancy at the time of her death. Toxicology results revealed evidence of opiates and cocaine in the hours prior to her death, as well as prescribed antidepressants. Nothing in the investigation indicated drug use prior to this occasion.

13.5 The perpetrator was discovered in the early morning of the following day, in Izzy's car, parked in a street in Bradford. He appeared before the Crown Court at Bradford in June

2017. He pleaded guilty to murder and was sentenced to life imprisonment with a tariff of 23 years.

13.6 There will be no Coroner's Inquiry as the criminal investigation resulted in a conviction.

14. CHRONOLOGY

A chronology was received from each agency identified during the scoping. This recorded contact with Izzy, Colin and their families by agencies, professionals and others who have contributed to the review process, the time and date of each occasion and the views and wishes that were sought or expressed. This was merged into one multi-agency chronology. The following is an overview of that merged timeline, which has been developed in discussion with Panel and the IMR Authors. It represents a summary of relevant information about the perpetrator prior to the timeline, and significant events concerning victim and perpetrator within the timeline.

14.1 Contextual Information

The timeline agreed following scoping was from April 2014. Prior to this, Izzy was not known to the agencies until January 2014. Between then and March 2014, three non-crime domestic abuse reports were recorded between Izzy and her husband, the father of her daughter. These incidents marked the period of their separation during which they stopped living together.

Colin is known to West Yorkshire Police, and to the Probation Service[2], having an offending history dating from 1989 (aged 15), including ABH, theft, burglary, sexual assault, and possession of heroin. He has been a Registered Sex Offender since convicted of a sexual assault on an adult female in 1998, for which he was sentenced in 1999 to 2 years and 6 months imprisonment. The circumstances were that the complainant was known to Colin, and he forced his way into her home where he blocked her exit and assaulted her. He was managed by West Yorkshire Police through MAPPA[3] at Level 1, the lowest level of risk. This was based on an assessment of his risk of further sex offending against an adult, as

[2] The Probation Service has been the West Yorkshire Probation Board or Trust and the National Probation Service during the period considered by this Review. For ease of reference, it is referred to in this Report as the Probation Service.

[3] Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) set out how agencies should manage the risks posed by sexual and violent offenders. Government issues guidance to Police, Probation and Prisons, the lead agencies in implementing these arrangements.

measured by the RM2000.[4] However, due to his aggravating risk factors of drug use, he was, until April 2014, assessed and managed as High Risk. In April 2014, Colin was assessed as Medium Risk, as it was believed he was in a stable relationship with his partner in Kirklees and that together with that partner, was clean of drugs. He was to be reviewed six-monthly in accordance with national guidance by the PPU[5].

There was a domestic violence incident recorded in 2003 in relation to a previous partner.

Colin was last known to the Probation Service as the subject of a Community Rehabilitation Order for 12 months, 2004/2005, for two offences of Dwelling House Burglary. Prior to this he had served a two-year sentence for burglary. An offender assessment record from 2005 states that the offences were committed to fund heroin use. He was in a relationship at that time; the name of his partner was not recorded and the assessment states there was no previous domestic violence. At the termination of the Order, the assessment review stated he was drug free. In 2007, he was given a Conditional Discharge for a shop theft offence. The record shows this offence was committed to fund heroin and crack cocaine use. He was not known to the Probation Service after 2007, until the period covered by the timeline.

14.2 Significant events within the timeline

2014

April

The record of agency contact with Izzy and Colin starts on 12th April 2014, when an adult female contacted West Yorkshire Police and alleged having been subjected to a sexual assault by Colin and Izzy at their home. Both were arrested**.** They made counter-allegations, saying there had been a party at their home and they had caught the female stealing and there had been an argument. After investigation, police decided to take no further action due to insufficient evidence and at the end of May the matter was closed.

It is believed that Izzy and Colin started to live together from some point between 20th January and 18th March 2014. This is relevant as Colin was a Registered Sex Offender

[4] Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2000) is the standard sex offender risk assessment tool applied to Registered Sex Offenders.

[5] The Public Protection Unit (PPU) is responsible for the assessment and monitoring of Registered Sex Offenders. The PPU falls within the remit of West Yorkshire Police (WYP).

(RSO), required to inform his offender manager at the PPU[6] of his current address. Based on family and third-party accounts, it is believed they had been in a relationship since the end of 2013, and that, after Izzy left her husband and rented a house, Colin had stayed with her regularly but maintained his home with his ex-partner in Kirklees for some time. As a result of the investigation of the sexual assault allegation, PPU became aware of his relationship with Izzy and interviewed Colin; he said they were not in a sexual relationship. He repeated the denials when he was seen by his offender manager at the end of April, registering Izzy's home as an occasional address. It was established that Izzy did not know he was an RSO and he was told to disclose this.

At this time, his ex-partner reported threats and domestic violence from Colin. She was referred to the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)[7]. MARAC became aware that he had perpetrated ten years of domestic abuse against his partner, and that although the relationship had ended, he continued to threaten physical violence. Police were so concerned that they checked her home on a regular basis throughout May.

When the PPU became aware of the uncertainties about his relationships, his offender manager re-assessed him as medium risk on the Risk Matrix (RM2000) but graded his actual risk as Very High and increased contact to monthly. In early May, he was arrested in breach of registration requirements, as he had failed to inform the PPU of a change of address, but not charged.

12th April 2014 was also the date when Izzy's conflict with her husband, regarding custody of their daughter, first involved the Police. The children, known for the purposes of this Report as Greg, then 16, and Jane, then 6, were living with Izzy. Her husband contacted West Yorkshire Police several times, reporting that he was concerned for Jane's safety with Colin in the home. There were five incidents of domestic violence involving the Police, in which Izzy was recorded as the suspect, her husband as the victim, then her husband was the suspect and finally both were subjects.
On 17th April Izzy obtained a non-molestation order[8] (NMO) against her husband.

---

[6] The Public Protection Officer (PPO) is the offender manager tasked with the day to day assessment and management of Registered Sex Offenders (RSO), referred to as offender manager, or PPO.

[7] Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) is a multi-agency meeting responsible for planning the support of people who are at high risk of domestic abuse, by allocating actions to statutory agencies and to other agencies working with domestic abuse.

[8] A non-molestation order (NMO) is a type of injunction under the Family Law Act, 1996, that can be obtained to prevent a partner or ex-partner from using or threatening violence, or intimidating, harassing or pestering.

On 24th April, Izzy's son Greg left her home, stating that Izzy's behaviour was changing, he thought she was taking drugs, that Colin bragged about his offending, and he could not stay there.

Izzy's husband reported that Jane had a bruise on her neck. West Yorkshire Police sent a referral to Children's Social Care (CSC) but this was not received by CSC due to a typo in the email address, and was resubmitted on 7th May. Meantime, it had been established that the mark on Jane was only a black marker pen, and CSC therefore decided no further action.

During this time there were various allegations about one party damaging the car of another party. There is anecdotal information to suggest Colin damaged a car to make it appear to Izzy that it was her husband. There were arguments in public when Police were called.

During this period, Colin remained with his drug treatment provider, Lifeline,[9] based in Kirklees, where he was provided with a methadone prescription. He was reportedly free of illicit drugs.

May

On 12th May 2014, CSC recorded that the Duty Suite[10] which is located within the Multi-Agency Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)[11] considered referrals on three occasions and assessed each time that there was no risk to children from Colin as his RSO status related to a sexual assault on an adult female. On this date, there was a further referral from police as a result of the ongoing conflict, and CSC decided there was no further information and there would be no action.

On 14th May, the PPU offender manager challenged Colin to disclose his offending to Izzy, (Sarah's Law) and confirmed with Izzy that he had done so. It is likely that he minimised this account, as the Review was told Izzy believed the registration was about to expire.

---

[9] Lifeline was a drug and alcohol treatment agency commissioned to provide services in prisons and community until May 2017 when it unexpectedly went into liquidation.

[10] The Duty Suite is the system whereby incoming referrals are reviewed by a team on duty, and decisions made, within the MASH.

[11] Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASHs) were set up after 2014 as part of new governmental guidance, to mitigate the risk of anyone slipping through the safeguarding net. Staff from all statutory agencies are co-located in order to share information and act effectively.

On 22nd May, Izzy's husband obtained a Prohibited Steps Order (PSO)[12] because of his concerns about Colin, to stop him having contact with Jane. Whilst the record confirms that Izzy's husband was aware of Colin's history of violence and drug-taking, it does not mention his RSO status, so we presume he was not aware.
On 28th May at Halifax County Court, the Judge ordered a Report to be completed by CSC under section 37 of the Children Act 1989[13].

June

Acrimony between Izzy and her husband about care of Jane escalated over the following two weeks. On 8th June 2014, Izzy's husband alleged that Izzy had breached the Prohibited Steps Order by allowing Colin to have contact with Jane. Within 10 days of the section 37 Report being ordered, the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS)[14] filed for an urgent hearing and on 18th June at Halifax County Court the Judge ordered that Jane would reside with her father.

On 16th June, WYP officers visited Colin to discuss his breach of the Prohibited Steps Order. The officers observed that Izzy had bruises to her wrists and arms which on inquiry Izzy said were caused by falling. She complained that the officers were rude to Colin during this visit.

Further calls were received by Police from Izzy and her husband, and Izzy alleged that her husband was in breach of the NMO, which caused him to be arrested on 3rd July. It was resolved that he was not in breach – he had correctly attempted to get Jane's clothing by contacting Izzy's mother, rather than Izzy herself. The standard risk assessment in Domestic Abuse Stalking and Harassment (DASH)[15] was not completed, and on exploration this appears to be because the report concerned Izzy's mother, not Izzy, and the incident was therefore not recorded as domestic abuse.

---

[12] A Prohibited Steps Order (PSO) is an order granted by the court in family cases which prevents either parent from certain activities with their children without the express permission of the other parent.

[13] A section 37 Report requires a social worker to investigate a child's circumstances and make recommendations to the Court to inform its decisions about residence, contact and other arrangements; a Guardian is usually appointed to represent the child.

[14] The Children & Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS) looks after the interests of children involved in family proceedings. They work with the child and parents and advise the Courts what action they believe is in the best interests of the child.

[15] The Domestic Abuse Stalking and Harassment template is a risk assessment in use since 2009 by professionals working in the field of domestic abuse. It is an evidence-based, proactive tool for assessing and managing risk in domestic incidents. Policy requires that police attending a domestic incident complete a DASH unless the reason this cannot be done, is recorded and agreed managerially.

July

During June and July 2014, the Social Worker undertook interviews for the Section 37 Report. Greg expressed concern for his mother, saying she was 'being blind and caught up with [Colin]' who was a drug user and that his mother now spent most of her time in bed, not with Jane. In the interview with Izzy, the Social Worker challenged Izzy about her denial that she had allowed Colin to have contact with Jane. She agreed she had taken a photograph of Jane on his knee. However, she stated she would prioritise Jane over Colin.

On 2nd July, the PPU reviewed Colin's registration and risk assessment and although he was seen to be stable, the decision was that he would remain high risk.

On 19th July, Izzy reported to WYP that she had been attacked by three girls but was unable to provide identification details. Izzy's family confirmed she had clearly been assaulted, and some days later, this family member was told by contacts, that Izzy had been attacked as part of a revenge attack on Colin, possibly as a result of his drug-taking activities. The details were hard for police officers to ascertain. When they tried to interview Izzy, Colin prevented officers from speaking to her and when they asked him to leave the room, Izzy complained they were rude to him. Without further information, WYP took no further action.

August

On 3rd August 2014, Izzy contacted WYP asking for a welfare visit to Jane at home with her father. Allegations had been escalated by Facebook exchanges between members of the wider family. Police visited Jane and had no concerns.

On 5th August, the Social Worker interviewed Colin, challenging him with information from his ex-partner. He described her as a pathological liar and stated he was stable in drug treatment.

On 6th August, Izzy's husband contacted the Social Worker and reported that Jane had said she was pushed and dragged on the floor by Izzy; when asked, Jane repeated this to the Social Worker, over the telephone.

On 7th August, the Social Worker interviewed Izzy's mother who supported her daughter, believing Izzy's husband was aggressive, while Izzy was now in a loving and caring relationship with Colin. The Social Worker recorded that Izzy's mother did not have full knowledge of Colin's offending.

On 7th August, there was an incident between Izzy, Colin and Izzy's husband which involved the Police. This was a disagreement about the care of Jane. Jane was screaming in the car

while Police attended. It was recorded as clear evidence that Izzy and Colin were with Jane when they should not be.

On 8th August, the Social Worker interviewed Izzy's father. He reported that he knew people who lived near Izzy, and they told him they often heard shouting and screaming from Izzy's house. He was worried for Izzy's safety.

September – October

On 17th September 2014, Colin appeared in Court charged with driving over the prescribed limit, was fined and disqualified from driving.

During a routine monitoring visit to Colin on 8th October the officer from the PPU noted that Izzy had lost weight and spoke to her about it. Izzy said she was stressed by court proceedings. Colin told the officer that the court had asked for weekly drug tests in relation to the custody case for Jane. He said he had been clear of drugs for ten months. This information is not available from Kirklees Lifeline as that organisation has gone out of business with no system for retention of records. His offender manager reviewed the risk assessment and he remained Medium risk, but the decision was that he would be on three monthly reviews, which is more frequent than required by policy, pending the outcome of custody hearings in December in respect of Jane.

November

On 3rd November 2014, Izzy went to her GP and reported being stressed due to her divorce and abusive ex-husband. She was given medication and a referral was made to the mental health team.

On 10th November she asked for a further sick note as she had trouble sleeping and was given repeat medication. On 21st, she did not attend her review GP appointment. On 25th she attended and was given a further sick note and encouraged to opt in to the mental health team. She did not take up this offer of support.

On 29th November 2014, police were called by a neighbour to an incident in the street. Colin had dragged Izzy out of the car by her hair and she was screaming. The neighbour reported that these arguments were a regular occurrence. Colin was arrested on suspicion of assault. He refused to give a breath sample and had been observed to be driving Izzy's car (illegally). Izzy was hostile to the police officers, attempting to prevent his arrest, so was herself arrested, for obstructing police. He was cautioned for the assault. Izzy was charged with obstructing the police and bailed to Bradford Magistrates' Court on 6th January 2015. On

that date, the matter was withdrawn. In response, Colin asked the Police to withdraw his caution. This was refused. He was charged with failure to provide a specimen, driving without a licence and no insurance.

December

On 8th December 2014, Izzy's husband shared his concerns about Izzy with Jane's teachers, telling them that Izzy was taking drugs.

Greg had returned to the home at some point, for on 11th December, he called WYP asking for help in getting his belongings from the house. He was distressed about Colin's drug taking in the house and had argued with his mother. A neighbour reported hearing Colin shouting, throwing things, then driving off (although disqualified). Police attended to get Greg's property, and he went to live with his stepfather, Izzy's husband, who later called officers to complain that they had believed Izzy's account of the incident and had not been supportive of Greg.

On 18th December at Halifax County Court, there were concerns that Colin had tested positive for cocaine, and that Izzy may be using drugs due to 'significant decline in her presentation'. She was to provide a hair strand test. The case was adjourned to 9th Jan. In the meantime, Jane was to reside with her father; Colin was not allowed contact with Jane; and Izzy's contact with Jane was to be supervised by Izzy's mother. (The hair strand order was discharged on 9th Jan so not provided.)

It was clear to the Court that Izzy's mother was not fully aware of the situation, and so the following day, the Social Worker visited her to discuss Colin's offending and to ensure she understood the risks in order to supervise Izzy's contact with Jane. Izzy was present during this interview and is recorded as having been 'very abrupt and rude'. Her mother agreed to comply with the non-contact order, though she remained supportive of her daughter's view of Colin's offending.

On 19th December, Colin was charged with driving disqualified.

On 30th December, Jane was taken to the GP by her father, who was concerned about the impact of events on her wellbeing, and she was referred to CAMHS[16]. The referral was

[16] CAMHS is the NHS Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.

triaged by CAMHS staff on 9th January, and it was concluded that Jane's needs would be best met via the School Nursing service.

2015

January

On New Year's Day there was an incident at Izzy's husband's home. His windows were smashed during the night. CCTV footage was indeterminate, and police could not identify the suspect so ultimately there was no further action. However, Izzy's husband believed it had been Colin, in revenge for the court outcome.

On 6th January 2015, Colin appeared in Court and was fined £200 and further disqualified from driving.

Following the referral to the School Nurse from CAMHS, the School nurse visited Jane and her father at home and became aware of the contact arrangements. The nurse undertook to notify the school of the conditions, to ensure Izzy could not contact Jane unsupervised at the school. During this visit, the School Nurse noted that Jane was aware of the supervised contact arrangement and appeared to be happy.

February – April

Acrimony between Izzy and her husband concerning her contact with Jane continued, with both of them involving the police. On 28th March 2015 her husband complained that Izzy took Jane shopping unsupervised. The Police advised him that this was a matter for his solicitor. On 30th April, Izzy asked police to welfare check Jane as she was concerned that her husband's new girlfriend's son was living there. Police had to wake Jane to check she was well and had no concerns; the son of the new girlfriend was sharing a room with Jane but was well within the acceptable age range for this arrangement. In retaliation, her husband stopped Izzy having contact with Jane and Izzy complained to police about this, saying that Jane had been self-harming. Police liaised with CSC who advised that this was a legal matter.

Until this point, although living in Bradford, Colin had been attending drug treatment at Lifeline in Kirklees and there is no information available to the Review. In February and March 2015, his offender manager at the PPU liaised with Lifeline and recorded that Colin was on a reduction plan. He told his offender manager he was testing negative and not drinking much; however, he had tested positive for cocaine whilst on methadone. When they

became aware he was now in Bradford, Lifeline undertook to transfer him to Bridge, the equivalent service in Bradford. However, they did not do so for two months.

Following this information and after a monitoring visit, his offender manager updated his risk assessment and he remained at Medium risk with three-monthly reviews.

May

In May 2015, Lifeline, the drug treatment project in Kirklees, transferred Colin to the Bridge Project, in Bradford. He commenced the abstinence programme and was given a methadone prescription. He reported that he last used heroin 14 months before, and crack in February. He claimed he lived with his partner and her two children.

Izzy called Bridge and asked for Colin to be given weekly drug tests that could be used in a private law matter regarding custody of her daughter. Bridge Project was accustomed to providing drug tests and agreed with Izzy and Colin that they would use the same process of notifying positive and negative results. Izzy told the Bridge Project staff that the main barrier to her contact with Jane was Colin's drug use. If he tested negative for six months, Izzy planned to return to Family Court and regain contact with her daughter. There is no record that this ever took place; whilst Colin tested drug-free on a number of occasions, he was not drug-free for six months. He was still being tested for this private law matter in December.

June

There is no record of Izzy communicating with Lifeline in Kirklees but once Colin transferred to Bridge Project in Bradford, she regularly communicated with staff about his drug treatment. In early June 2015 she emailed asking if she could collect his prescription and was allowed to do so but told this would not happen again. The following week, she attended with him. On the 8th June, Colin told his PPU offender manager that he was drug free, on methadone. On the 12th June, Izzy contacted his drug worker to say he had been to the dentist and given codeine and she was worried that he might test positive; she was reassured that the test would identify the medication. On two further occasions Izzy asked to collect his prescription as he was ill, and this was allowed, although she had been told on the 2nd June that it could not happen again. On 25th June, Colin tested positive for illicit drugs.

Following the visit on 8th June, the offender manager received information from Bridge Project of the positive test and updated the risk assessment. He remained at Medium risk and still with three-monthly visits.

July – September

This period is characterised by records of Colin's drug treatment and Izzy's support of his treatment programme and the ongoing tests. Izzy regularly attended appointments with Colin from July to September 2015, staying in reception.

During July, a worker at Bridge was able to view information received by Lifeline and became aware of the MARAC discussion of his domestic abuse against his previous partner. The worker discussed this with him and Colin explained it had been an argument witnessed by a neighbour and had not resulted in any action.

On the 6th August he tested positive for cocaine in addition to prescribed methadone.

On the 10th August Izzy contacted to say he had a broken ankle and could not attend; this was said to be an accident while he was working. Colin gave this account to the Project when he attended; however, cross referencing indicates that it happened during a tussle with a male member of Izzy's family whom Colin threatened, thinking he was paying Izzy too much attention.

On 23rd September 2015, the PPU contacted Bridge Project, and shared information about Colin's history of offending and the reason Jane did not live with Izzy. The following day, Colin attended for a planned appointment and was challenged about withholding this information. He was informed there would be continuing information sharing with the PPU. A new risk assessment was created. The Bridge Project worker discussed with Colin his over-reliance on Izzy, encouraging him to develop a wider social network. The worker also gave Izzy information about their 'Concerned Other' Service which would support her in her own right, though she did not take up this offer. Staff re-iterated that it would be their policy not to allow Izzy to collect his prescription in future to try to reduce his dependence on her. He was on a low dose of methadone and considered to be reducing his drug use.

From this point there was regular information exchange between the Bridge Project and PPU, relative to Colin's drug treatment, informing of positive tests and significant information.

On 30th September, Colin's PPU offender manager conducted an Active Risk Management (ARMS) assessment[17] and noted Colin's disregard for his driving disqualification and his potential for further risk-taking behaviours; but identified that there were no other adverse

[17] Active Risk Management System (ARMS), is a framework for working with male sexual offenders who are subject to statutory supervision. It is not in itself a risk assessment tool but in the PPU is used alongside the RM2000 to assess dynamic risk and protective factors.

reports and no dynamic risk indicators to suggest he was likely to re-offend. He was seen to be in a stable relationship and no domestic incidents had been reported since November 2014. He was assessed as Medium risk.

The only specific reference to Izzy during this period is that she attended her GP on 28th August, following panic attacks which she stated were due to conflict with her ex-husband.

October – December

On 1st October 2015, Izzy phoned the Bridge Project, saying Colin was attending hospital due to a swelling of his leg, and asked to pick up his prescription; Izzy was reassured that if he was in hospital, he would be provided with his prescription there. It was confirmed with the hospital that he had not attended there, and at his next appointment on the 5th October, Colin was challenged and after a number of attempts to present alternative accounts, admitted he had been using cocaine, and also tested positive for illegal methadone. He said that Izzy never used drugs.

On the 8th October, Colin was arrested, driving whilst disqualified. It was noted that this was Izzy's car, for which she had a salary sacrifice scheme with her employer.
On the 9th October, he tested positive for crack, and admitted drinking vodka.
Izzy attended appointments with Colin during October and November, coming out of work to drive him to the Bridge Project. Twice he was challenged about suspect urine samples, and tested negative for illicit drugs until the 13th October, when he started to test positive for cocaine and cannabis through October and November. His methadone treatment continued and on 14th December, he tested negative for illicit drugs, and reported feeling positive after years of heroin dependence.

On the 3rd November Izzy attended her GP with an injury to her elbow. It is not clear if she was seen alone or with Colin as he had an appointment with the same GP on the same day.

On the 21st December, Izzy contacted Bridge to ask if Colin's prescription could be dropped off as he was ill, and this was refused. Colin came to the Project, complaining and saying he wanted a transfer. He was tested, and this proved positive for cocaine.

On the 29th December 2015, Izzy reported to the police that her car had been damaged. This was not investigated.

2016

January – March

On the 12th January 2016, Colin appeared in Bradford Magistrates Court and received a Community Order with curfew order for six months for the offence of driving disqualified.

At his next two drug treatment appointments he tested positive for cocaine metabolite and prescribed methadone. He withdrew his complaint and request for transfer.

On the 20th February, Izzy attended A&E following a panic attack.

Colin attended routine appointments until the 25th February when he disclosed smoking heroin and using double his methadone dose; he tested positive for cocaine and morphine in addition to methadone. He gave as the reason that he was upset about the conflict with Izzy's husband. This information was shared with his PPU officer whom he had told he was heroin free.

In March 2016, he continued to test positive for morphine and cocaine. He told his PPU offender manager that he had bought heroin in expectation of going to prison on 12th January; it is noted that the date of his court appearance and the dates of his positive tests do not coincide. His Matrix 2000 risk assessment showed his risk of sex offending to be Medium and his risk of violent offending now increased to Very High, and no risk to children was identified.

On the 14th March Colin reported to the police that Izzy's car had been found abandoned, extensively damaged.

On the 18th March Izzy attended an appointment with the nurse at her GP Surgery and as she was pregnant, was referred to the midwife. On the 5th April Izzy failed to attend a routine appointment with her GP.

Bridge Project records show that on the 17th March 2016 Colin and Izzy attended his appointment and said Izzy was pregnant; both were said to be very pleased. The worker spoke separately to Izzy and stated that there was no resistance from Colin when he was excluded from this conversation. Izzy was again offered support on her own account through the 'Concerned Other' Service. In response Izzy stated she didn't feel she needed support as things were going well. She had a supportive family and she worked for the NHS and her employer had been very good with her over the issues with her ex-partner.

Throughout March and April Colin disclosed smoking heroin and tested positive for drug use. He was referred back to the Core Service, as he was no longer stable. Izzy continued to attend regularly with him, usually waiting in the car.

May – August

During a routine scan for Izzy's pregnancy, a miscarriage was recorded. Izzy went to her GP on the 10th May 2016 and was given a sick note. On the 23rd May she went to her GP distressed and said she wanted to speak with a support group. Over the next three days there were three unsuccessful attempts by her GP to contact her with details of the support group.

From the 17th May, Colin started missing appointments with the Bridge Project, and continued using heroin regularly. He told the drug worker he had low mood and had relapsed following the miscarriage. Through May and June, he continued to give this reason for testing positive for morphine and cocaine. It is noted that he relapsed during the pregnancy, not after the miscarriage, as he suggested.

In July and August 2016, Izzy attended his appointments with him and he continued to test positive for cocaine, morphine, and codeine, and admitted using heroin and crack, whilst claiming that he was being supportive to Izzy. It is noted that he continued to be utterly dependent on Izzy for his social contact although by his account she was now working full time.

On the 31st August, Izzy's husband reported to the police that Izzy and Colin had breached the contact order by taking Jane to the seaside without supervision. He believed that Izzy's mother was not a suitable person to supervise contact and he was advised to contact CSC. He stopped all contact between Jane and Izzy and stated he would go back to court.

September

On the 19th September 2016 Izzy failed to attend an appointment with her GP, attending a week later reporting that she was experiencing stress following her husband taking her child four weeks earlier (coinciding with the events of the 31st August).

Through September Colin continued to use Izzy's miscarriage to rationalise his relapse, rather than, as evidence from the tests indicated, the pregnancy being the trigger. On the 27th September he attended a session with Izzy, stated he had not used, but tested positive for opiates. There was a further discussion about his over-reliance on Izzy, including his reluctance to attend treatment support groups because he believed he could get the support he needed from home and his relationship with Izzy. The worker asked Izzy about her

appointment for counselling with her GP and Izzy said this was going well as she had her appointment for counselling. It is noted that this is the day after Izzy attended her GP and reported stress, and there is no record of Izzy accepting counselling.

This was the last contact between Bridge Project and Izzy.

On the 28th September 2016, Izzy removed Jane from school, which triggered a call from her husband to WYP, alleging that Izzy had abducted Jane from school. Izzy then called the Police alleging that Jane had been assaulted by her father by slapping. She went to her husband's house with her mother and Jane, and there was a domestic incident involving shouting. Police attended and spoke to Jane who was found to be safe and well and did not disclose any incidents to the police. Later, Izzy said her allegation had been historical, and that she only alleged this in order to counter the call to police by her husband. Police recorded a domestic incident graded as Medium Risk, and a child protection incident, and submitted a referral to CSC. This was deemed to be a private law matter as it concerned a disagreement over contact between Izzy and the child, and Izzy's husband was viewed as acting protectively towards Jane by stopping contact. He was advised to seek legal advice as he was effectively breaching the order, albeit protectively. However, it is noted that the Order stated police or CSC could agree to suspend contact temporarily until the matter was brought before the Court.

Police visited Jane's school to explain the situation; and recorded that Social Services was supporting. There is no record that the case returned to Court to formalise these actions.

October

On the 7th October 2016 Izzy visited the nurse at the GP surgery, asking for medication for depression, stating this was due to issues with her ex-husband, and that her current relationship was supportive.

At the Bridge Project on the 11th October Colin reported feeling guilty because Izzy could not see her daughter and stated this was his reason for taking drugs. He said Izzy had lost a lot of weight and was not eating because of the stress. He said he was thinking of leaving her. The worker suggested Izzy should be referred to the carers' service and it is not recorded whether this referral took place. Colin continued to test positive for heroin.

On the 28th October, Izzy's husband contacted WYP and alleged that Jane had been sexually touched by Colin on the occasion Izzy and Colin took her unsupervised to the

seaside on the 31st August. Colin was arrested and charged with sexual touching. He denied the allegation and stated it may possibly have been an accidental brushing against Jane while helping her to get changed. Izzy was arrested and charged with child neglect, as she had enabled Colin's contact with Jane despite the Prohibited Steps Order. In interview, Izzy admitted breaching the Contact Order on a handful of occasions. She minimised Colin's sex offence conviction and told Police that CSC would be happy to allow contact with Jane if Colin was drug free for six months. She did not believe her daughter's allegation and told police that it had been a stressful time and that she had had a nervous breakdown. She was bailed – originally to 9th November, then this was amended to 15th November – on condition not to contact her husband, her daughter, or to have contact with any child.

A Section 47[18] investigation started on 28th October 2016 and a Child and Family Assessment was undertaken by CSC. During this assessment, Izzy was not interviewed by CSC.
On the 29th October at Bradford Magistrates' Court, Colin was remanded in custody to 11th November; then further remanded in custody for trial in April 2017.

November
On the 15th November 2016 Izzy appeared at Bradford Magistrates' Court and was committed to Bradford Crown Court on the 13th December.

On the 16th November, the PPU offender manager completed a new Matrix risk assessment which showed a Very High risk for violent recidivism with a Medium risk of sexual recidivism, based on his recent arrest for alleged sexual assault on a child. This indicated an imminent risk of re-offending. The action plan was to monitor the investigation into the alleged offence and ongoing intelligence, maintain contact with the Bridge Project if he were released from custody, and speak with Izzy about the status of her relationship with Colin.

On the 18th November, Colin's solicitor made an application to Judge in Chambers for bail and this was granted. Conditions were: residence at his parents' address; reporting to police each Monday and Friday between 12pm and 2pm; not to contact directly or indirectly any

[18] A section 47 inquiry (s47) is a child protection investigation. CSC must carry out an investigation when they have 'reasonable cause to suspect that a child who lives, or is found, in their area is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm'. The enquiry will involve an assessment of the child's needs and the ability of those caring for the child to meet them. The aim is to decide whether any action should be taken to safeguard the child. The timescale for a s47 inquiry is 45 days.

prosecution witnesses; and not to have unsupervised contact with children under 18. These conditions did not prevent contact with Izzy.

On the 22nd November, after his release from custody, the PPU officer home-visited to re-register Colin on the Sex Offender Register. Colin said he was still in the relationship with Izzy and that she believed him in relation to the allegation. He was to be managed through three-monthly visits. The management plan, which was endorsed by a supervisor, stated that no immediate actions had been identified and no concerns had been raised, which contradicts the view expressed on the 16th.

After prison, Colin had no negative drug tests. On the 28th November he was using heroin and drinking. Police received intelligence of dealing at Izzy's address.

December

On the 5th December 2016 Colin told his drug worker he was getting on better and was determined to show Izzy and his parents that he was trying; however, he tested positive for heroin and crack. On the 12th December he told his drug worker he was drug free but tested positive for cocaine and heroin, and on the 19th December, his last contact with Bridge Project, tested positive for heroin and cocaine. He told his worker he was using because he was worried about the Pre-Trial Planning hearing the following day. The Bridge Project reports that he received a back payment of benefits for £1100 on his release from prison.
On the 13th December Izzy appeared at Bradford Crown Court. A trial date was set for the 18th April 2017. A Pre-Trial Planning hearing took place on the 20th of December and Izzy and Colin were re-admitted to bail pending the trial.

On the Friday before Izzy's death, Colin failed to report to the police as per his bail conditions and was circulated as wanted on the Police National Computer system later that evening.

During December, Izzy had told two of her closest colleagues that she was pregnant and was very excited by this. She told her mother that she was pregnant and that a social worker had told her she would not be allowed to keep a baby if she was still with Colin. She had not sought antenatal care, or consulted her GP surgery, however the post mortem confirmed she was in the early stages of pregnancy.

Izzy was last seen by her colleagues on the Friday when she appeared happier than for some time; by her mother two days later, on the evening before her death, when Izzy visited

to leave gifts for the children for her mother to pass on; and by Colin's parents on the day of her death, after which she returned home with Colin.

14.3 Other relevant facts or information from agencies

14.3.1 The Probation Service had brief contact with Colin in early 2016 when he was assessed at Court for an oral report for the offence of Drive Whilst Disqualified and received a Curfew Order. This is a standalone order and included no contact with the Service. The assessment shows the last violent conviction on record was dated 1995. There was no evidence of domestic violence. Correct checks were made with Children's Social Care, revealing that Colin was not allowed contact with Izzy's daughter, who lived with her father; and CSC was informed of the current offence. Colin stated he was not using drugs and was a social drinker.

14.3.2 The school and college for Greg and Jane were contacted to inquire what contact there had been in relation to safeguarding. This identified that there had been no contact with Greg during the timeline, though he had experienced problems at home and at school during his mother's marriage. Information provided by Jane's school shows that Jane did have difficulties during 2014/2015 and was referred to CAMHS but referred back to the school nurse who was able to support appropriately. The school was actively involved and supportive of Jane's father at the time that Izzy was seeking contact with her against the conditions of the contact order, and liaised with CAFCASS to share information. The record shows the school was primarily concerned with safeguarding Jane and sought to ensure that Izzy and Jane did not have unsupervised contact.

15. INFORMATION FROM FAMILY MEMBERS

Izzy's mother, father and stepmother contributed the following information to the Review. They recalled Izzy's separation from her husband at the end of 2013 and beginning of 2014, the beginning of her relationship with Colin, and events of 2014 as Izzy went through the conflict and court case concerning contact with Jane. This was a very challenging time for the whole family. Her father thought she previously had friends who fell away after she started seeing Colin. She brought Colin to meet her father, and he immediately identified him as 'a bad one' and asked her why she was with him. The Family Court case in 2014 caused a split in the family. Her father supported Izzy's husband against her; he saw Colin as a high risk and didn't want his granddaughter to be near him. Izzy's husband was 'not perfect but

was best for the child, he would keep her safe'. Izzy fell out with her father over this and did not speak to him for two years.

It appears that whilst Izzy and her father fell out over her relationship, Colin got on well with her mother, who initially saw him as charming; though over time she saw another side to him: she observed him throwing a glass at Izzy's son, and having a fight with Izzy's brother because he was jealous of him talking to Izzy. She knew it was his fault that Izzy had lost contact with her daughter. He didn't work, using various excuses, and Izzy financed him. However, she believed the accounts Izzy gave her about his drug taking and offending and the sex offence; Izzy said his registration as a sex offender had ended after ten years.

Both parents, and her stepmother, saw Izzy with bruises on several occasions. She made excuses such as falling down the stairs and refused to discuss it. Supervised access took place at her father's home, until they fell out; although they believed Izzy loved her children and would do anything for them, they did observe that during supervised access visits, Colin would park at the end of the road and constantly text Izzy during the visit, so she was responding to his messages, rather than speaking to Jane.
Izzy was back in touch with her father during 2016; when she visited, it was to borrow money. Then she came to borrow more. She also borrowed from her mother, who said she bought food and essential household items when Izzy had no money. She later found some items she bought had been taken to Cash Converters, including the tablet PC she bought for one of the children. Izzy's mother felt unable to challenge Colin and had to support Izzy for fear of losing contact with her. She felt her daughter changed during this relationship and admires that Izzy was able to keep working with everything that was happening at home.

Izzy's mother made it clear that she had not liked Colin, but felt she had to be nice to him for Izzy's sake. She had experienced domestic abuse in her own relationships and whilst Izzy denied she was being abused, her mother believed she was, and understood the pressures on Izzy. She wanted to ensure that she could stay close to Izzy. She felt this might have been misinterpreted by professionals. She commented that Colin had a handmade cross in the house, with babies' names on it; and thought he had lost babies in the past and that Izzy's pregnancies were therefore of particular significance. Indeed, the MARAC recorded that his previous partner miscarried their babies twice.

No members of the family think Izzy would have taken drugs and said she did not drink alcohol often. They are aware that toxicology showed heroin and cocaine in the hours prior to Izzy's death and believe it likely that Colin forced these on her during the assault.

Family members agreed that Izzy did not see herself as experiencing domestic abuse, or as a victim, in her relationship with Colin.

Izzy spoke to family members about her pregnancy. She said a social worker had told her the baby would be taken off her, if she stayed with Colin. They believe this would have affected her thinking about her future with him. Her mother believed Izzy's clothes were packed into black bags before her death, and that she had saved money; her stepmother agreed that she had money in a separate account, but WYP was unable to verify this information. However, family members suggested Izzy may have been planning to leave.

The family told us about a letter that Izzy had written to Colin and the reviewers were able to have sight of this letter. It is believed that Izzy wrote it in the last weeks of her life. It is a declaration of her commitment to him, of how much she loved him and wanted them to stay together; but she says she had given up too much for him and his drugs and pleads with him to change. The letter was found on Colin when he was arrested.

Izzy's son was able to tell the reviewers, at the conclusion of the Review, that he felt there was no one he could speak to about what was happening in his family, both before she left his stepfather, and afterwards, when he was concerned about his mother in the relationship with Colin.

Izzy's family met with the Overview Panel at the conclusion of the Review as set out in sections 18 and 23 below.

16. INFORMATION FROM EMPLOYERS AND COLLEAGUES

The reviewers were unable to identify friends outside Izzy's work setting. However, several colleagues had known her since she had been employed by the NHS as an administrative worker in 2005; some had worked with her at an earlier time, but a number worked alongside her for the past few years and considered themselves friends: they had known her through her marriage and this relationship, and they knew her children. It was believed she enjoyed her job; her career was important to her, she worked hard, had her head down and focussed on the task. Described as friendly and always polite, Izzy was chatty but without revealing much about herself or her private life. She was smart but not fashionable, and

colleagues thought it was special when she had new clothes, for example, she was excited when Colin bought her a new winter coat.

After leaving her husband, colleagues noticed she became thin and looked unhealthy; she said Colin made her a packed lunch, but it was rare that she actually brought food to work. She smoked a lot and seemed always to be hungry and would accept snacks from colleagues; when people brought cakes in for birthdays, Izzy would be first in the staff room and would noticeably eat a lot.

Close colleagues knew she had been in an unhappy, and many believed abusive, marriage and believed that Colin had rescued her from this, that she loved him and was happy. She 'lit up' when she spoke about him, and although she didn't mention him often, when she did, it was always positive; when a colleague was moaning about her own partner, Izzy would say '[Colin] would never do that…'. She told them he did everything for her, and only mentioned him positively. '[Colin] was the good guy; [her husband] was the bad guy.'

From some time in 2015, Izzy started to ask colleagues for loans. She said this was to pay the electricity bill, or an emergency, and once, to get her daughter to hospital. She repaid these loans, only after people asked for their money back. Once, while on sick leave, she texted a colleague and arranged to meet her in reception to take money. On several occasions, she was seen at her desk, researching payday loan websites. Few colleagues knew she had a car of her own as she was seen to rarely drive to work.

None of Izzy's colleagues or line managers knew she had lost contact with the children. She mentioned the custody case, but not that her husband had custody. Her colleagues and managers all believed she was caring for her daughter throughout. She told them her husband was difficult about this and when she came in with a black eye, said there had been an argument with her husband about contact. When she was late for work, she said her husband had caused this; when she asked for emergency leave or a change to her hours, she said this was to take her daughter to school or pick her up, and when she borrowed money, she said it was for expenses related to her daughter.

Colin phoned the office at 9am every day, which was usually shortly after Izzy arrived at work. If she wasn't there, he spoke to the colleague at the next desk, got to know her name, was 'charming'. They thought this was evidence of him caring for Izzy, in light of what Izzy said about him. He would meet her from work, and often came to reception to see her during the day; once, when she was working off site, he turned up at that location.

Having previously had a reputation for good work, Izzy's competence started to vary widely: she was either very good, or very poor; she became slower, in order to do a good job. She often asked for changes to hours or days off at short notice, was late or absent. She had a lot of time off sick. Her line manager thought she was taking advantage of the generous terms and conditions, and when she was challenged, their working relationship broke down. After her miscarriage in May 2016, she took three weeks off sick, and was very low in mood.

Colleagues worried about her loss of weight, the bruising, poor attendance, and erratic work conduct; and one who had been a friend for some years, asked her what was wrong, but Izzy said it was nothing. The friend asked her about drug use and Izzy was very clear that she was against it. A number of colleagues discussed their worries together but felt they shouldn't interfere.

In the last three months of 2016, there appear to have been a number of significant events. Izzy developed a good relationship with her new line manager and in November, expressed that she was looking for career opportunities at work. She seemed happier. She confided in her friend that she was pregnant, talked about the disappointment of her miscarriage earlier that year, and was said to be very emotional, 'high', excited about the pregnancy. On the last working day before her death, she was noticeably happy and sent out a friendly email to her colleagues, which they noted was unusually outgoing.

17. ANALYSIS

The information from agencies, from family and colleagues, was synthesised and an initial analysis discussed with IMR authors and Panel members. Emerging themes were shared with family members who were able to add views, correct information and ask questions. These discussions identified a series of stages, or episodes within the timescale of Izzy's relationship with Colin.

17.1 The period 9th March 2014 - 28th May 2014: the start of the relationship between Izzy and Colin, conflict with Izzy's husband about care of their daughter, up to the Family Court ordering a s37 report.

In retrospect, the pattern of an abusive relationship appears to have developed through this period. Izzy left an unhappy marriage thinking Colin was her rescuer. To make this new relationship work, she started to alter her norms and behaviours to fit with his. As early as April, she was drawn into allegations of behaviour that had never featured in her previous life.

His drug treatment was still in Kirklees and we have no information about this. The information collected by the Review suggests there was an overlapping period in which he was living with his partner of ten years while establishing the relationship with Izzy. His previous partner was in fear of him, and in May/June alleged domestic abuse over a number of those years. It is likely he was using his previous address for his drug treatment and his sex offender registration, while establishing his cohabitation with Izzy, so Izzy did not know much of this side of his life. The PPU record indicates that when the offender manager discovered he was living with Izzy, she challenged him to tell Izzy about his sex offender registration, as she did not know. He did so, but the information Izzy then disclosed to her family about his registration, indicates that he minimised his offending and gave her an untrue perspective of his registration. The PPU record of this period suggests that Colin attempted to manipulate the information available to Izzy and to others, denying the relationship, then denying staying there more than occasionally. This may have been in order that he didn't risk his benefits status, or in order to control the flow of information to Izzy.

Without information from Kirklees Lifeline – now out of business – we cannot know whether Izzy supported his treatment before he moved. The accounts of Bridge Project and her employers suggest that it was around the time of his transfer to Bridge, in May, that Izzy started to take time off work to attend with him. This period culminated in his previous partner seeking help from the police, alleging that he threw her down the stairs. She was referred to MARAC in June. There was a MARAC plan and she was supported by police.

There is no evidence that Izzy experienced violence from Colin during this period. This was an extremely stressful period for Izzy, being the breakup of her marriage and a time of conflict with her husband about the care of their daughter. There were allegations and counter-allegations of abuse, all of which related to verbal abuse from her husband, and which involved the police. All Izzy's conversations with colleagues about her domestic situation described her husband's behaviour and conveyed that life with Colin was good. The non-molestation order in April, against her husband, supported this narrative.

The period highlights good practice by the offender manager to challenge Colin and to ensure he disclosed his registration to Izzy, once their relationship was recorded as a result of the offending allegation on the 12th April. His change of address and the new relationship could have been noted earlier, had there been more proactive practice. It did not impact on the outcome but has been noted by WYP as a development point.

Whilst Izzy's husband was aware of Colin being a recovering drug addict, it does not appear that he was aware of Colin's sex offender registration; however, it was not an offence against a child, and therefore no disclosure would have been indicated. The husband took his own steps during May, obtaining a Prohibited Steps Order against Colin, to protect Jane.

School noted that there was domestic abuse in the family, and this was in regard to the incidents between Izzy and her husband, and their actions evidenced safeguarding concern about Jane.

There has been considerable discussion in this Review about the rationale for decisions by CSC to take no further action, as police submitted a number of referrals. In a number of CSC decisions, it was noted that Colin's sex offending was not against children, and this underpinned the decisions to take no further action. Further, as the conflicts about contact were a court matter, CSC would not be involved. However, members of the Review Panel were concerned for children living in households such as this, where there is clear evidence of conflict, and where there is likely to be an emotional and psychological effect on children, and suggests that in these situations, there ought to be an assessment.

The information available during this period indicated that Colin was controlling: he coerced his ex-partner through threats, during the overlapping period when he needed to use her address for his registration, his drug treatment, and possibly also for his benefits claims; he controlled the information about his personal situation available to Izzy, first by not telling her about his Sex Offender Registration requirements, then minimising his account of that offending; and possibly by not being open about his drug treatment requirements.

He had a history of domestic violence which became evident in May/June, but there was no indication of violence in his relationship with Izzy. She was escaping an unhappy marriage and was very optimistic about her relationship with Colin. However, there was an indication in the allegation in April, that he had begun to control her behaviour by causing or influencing her to behave according to norms that did not previously form part of her personality.

17.2 The period from 8th June – 30th December 2014: there was a marked deterioration in Izzy's health and presentation.

During these six months, concerns about Izzy were expressed by her son and her colleagues that Izzy might be taking drugs. Her husband expressed the same concerns,

from the point of view of contesting custody; he believed Izzy was no longer able to care for their daughter. Colin's offender manager observed that she had lost weight and may be taking drugs. There was a significant decline in her presentation, not only losing weight but smoking more and seeming hungry, at work. When challenged supportively by a close colleague who had known her some years, she was adamant that she was not taking drugs. Members of her family have told us how anti-drugs she was. Her life seemed to become more chaotic. She became less reliable at work, taking time off work to attend Colin's drug project with him.

She was very supportive of Colin's drug treatment needs and was actively supporting him to attend for treatment. After a prolonged period when records suggest he was stable on methadone, Colin was now back on cocaine. He was arrested driving Izzy's car over the prescribed limit, and then driving her car while disqualified. She was assaulted and this may have been by strangers, as she said; may have been a message to Colin by his enemies as family members suggested; or may have been the start of physical abuse by Colin.

There was a shift during this period, in Izzy's allegiances. The information, taken together, suggests that she started to prioritise Colin's needs over those of her children. At the same time, she was clearly under considerable stress on account of the ongoing conflict about contact with her daughter. Her husband had obtained the Prohibited Steps Order and she supported Colin's perspective, and still believed they could be happy together, with her children. She enabled contact between her six-year-old daughter and Colin in breach of the Order. She engaged in verbal abuse in the street with her husband despite their daughter being present and visibly upset. Greg left home, unable to deal with the situation, preferring to live with his stepfather, despite that they had not got along previously.

The Section 37 Report was completed during this timescale. The Social Worker was so concerned about the situation that he returned the case to Court within ten days, asking for residence of Jane to be granted to the husband. Izzy lost residence. Izzy's voice was clear in the records of interviews with the Social Worker: she was very assertive and supportive of Colin. She continued the narrative that her husband was the problem, to the Social Worker, and to her GP, and started medication. Her GP referred her to the mental health team for support, but she did not opt in to the service and was discharged. At the end of this six-month period, residence was to continue with her husband.

Four times, there were concerns about domestic abuse: in June, the offender manager noted bruising on her wrists and arms, and she said she had fallen. This was the same

month that allegations of domestic abuse by Colin's ex-partner were being referred to MARAC. This Review finds there is no system for transferring the information from a MARAC in one area to a MARAC in another area, and that even if such a system had existed, MARAC is focussed on the victim and not on the perpetrator, so that information could not have been passed to another area of West Yorkshire. This is a gap in the process that is discussed later in the Report.

Secondly, there was Colin's assault on Izzy in the street in November 2014. Despite concerns of family and the offender manager, this was the only incident of domestic violence involving Colin and Izzy which involved the police. When he was being arrested, Izzy was so physically resistant to his arrest, that she was arrested for obstruction (a charge that was later discontinued).

The third occasion was when Izzy's father reported to the Social Worker undertaking the Section 37 report that he was worried about Izzy's safety. He observed that she was not engaging with her daughter while on supervised contact visits at his home, because Colin was sitting in the car along the street and texting her constantly. He saw bruises on Izzy when she came to his home for supervised contact.

In addition, there was a discussion between school and CSC with school reporting that between September – December 2014 Izzy had attended school with 'an egg sized lump on her forehead with cut down the middle'. Izzy was with her mother at the time and her mother said Izzy was reluctant to discuss the injury but had told her that she had banged her head on a set of drawers. The focus by the Social Worker in the Report appeared to be the domestic abuse allegations and counter-allegations between Izzy and her husband. As such, there was a missed opportunity to ask Izzy during this time if she felt under pressure by Colin. Considering other information available to the Review, there is no suggestion that the outcome would have been different, as Izzy was defensive of Colin in her conversations with her father, with the offender manager, with her mother, and with the police. The Review does not find it likely that she would have disclosed to the Social Worker; however, it would have been good practice to have had this conversation, and to have provided information to Izzy about support services, should she feel the need in the future.

Family divided during these events. Izzy broke off contact with her father and stepmother because they supported her husband; her mother turned away from Izzy's husband towards Colin, who she believes in retrospect had 'charmed' her, and she wanted to support her

daughter. Izzy's father was worried for her and thought he had reported his concerns to the Social Worker. He did not then see Izzy for almost two years.

In summary, this period saw continuing acrimony with her husband, the loss of residence with both her children, the isolation from her father and stepmother, and the first signs of domestic violence from Colin. Over half the WYP chronology is concerned with events in 2014. The stress in Izzy's life must have been considerable.

The Review suggests that Colin established a coercive pattern of behaviour in their relationship, exerting emotional, financial and social control to the extent that Izzy financially supported him, to her own detriment, as she was not eating properly and started borrowing money from colleagues. There is no evidence that he was working. He was clearly driving Izzy's car, which she was financing. He was using cocaine in addition to prescribed methadone, and in retrospect, using information and accounts now available, we believe Izzy was financing his drug use at the same time as doing all she could to support him to attend and comply with treatment. Her life was becoming chaotic, her excellent work record was changing, but she continued the narrative, to family and colleagues, that her relationship was good, and it was her husband's behaviour that was the problem. She became isolated from friends and family, except her mother, who describes Colin's behaviour towards her in a way that could be defined as him grooming her; with her own experience of domestic abuse in her background, she wanted to support her daughter and to keep in contact with her, and therefore found herself in a position where she might be seen as colluding with him. In her relief at leaving an unhappy relationship, and given the stress of subsequent events, instead of understanding that she was being coerced, Izzy believed this was a close and loving relationship, and that he cared for her. These events appear to have driven Izzy closer to Colin, causing her to prioritise his needs over those of her children, and isolating her from potential sources of support.

The Review noted fast action by the Social Worker to safeguard the child, and the missed opportunity to provide information and support to Izzy when there were allegations of domestic abuse. At the end of the year, the GP was concerned about the impact of the situation on Jane, as reported by her father, and referred her to CAMHS, and she was subsequently supported by the school which was proactive. The Review Panel considered that Greg, the eldest child, could have been more effectively safeguarded. In the aftermath of the homicide, the impact of these events on Greg's wellbeing, raises a concern.

17.3 A 15-month period of stasis: 1/1/15 – 17/3/16.

During this timescale, events continue without further development. It is a period in which there is evidence of Colin's lifestyle and behaviours, but Izzy's voice is largely absent, except through the records of those working with Colin. The accounts of colleagues are important.

After a number of years without coming to the notice of police for offending, Colin was now regularly offending by driving disqualified, in Izzy's vehicle. However, it is his drug use that dominated their lives in 2015. He reduced his drug use and stabilised, relapsed, reduced, achieved stability again, then relapsed to heroin use which to the best of his treatment provider's knowledge he had not taken for a number of years. Records indicate that he used excuses for his drug use, citing issues that were historical, e.g. Izzy losing her daughter. Because of information-sharing failures by Kirklees Lifeline, it was September 2015 before the PPU and Bridge Project started to share information about Colin, but then communication became effective and both agencies were able to challenge him about his accounts. He had not disclosed his sex offending, or given an accurate account of his domestic situation, to his drug worker. The Bridge Project worker noted his over-reliance on Izzy, encouraging him to develop a wider social network. The worker also offered support to Izzy in her own right, though she did not take up this offer.

Acrimonious contact between Izzy and her husband continued at a lower level. Contact was supervised largely by Izzy's mother and her mother's partner. Izzy talked to the Bridge Project about her plans to take the residence of her daughter back to Court. She evidently believed that if Colin tested negative for illicit drugs for six months, she would get her daughter back. This belief was mirrored in her conversations with her mother: she said the only concern for Jane, was Colin's drug use. This account reflected Colin's minimisation of his risk behaviours. His negative samples were sporadic; he was clearly using heroin and cocaine in addition to his prescribed methadone. Izzy actively supported his treatment programme, taking time off work to attend with him, and on a number of occasions tried to collect his prescription for him, because he was ill. There was evidence that he caused Izzy to collude with him, for example when she asked to collect his prescription because he was attending hospital, which was untrue. It could be that Izzy was so determined to reach the six months' stability target that she colluded with his drug use in the belief this would help him to reduce. The drug worker noted that his dependence on Izzy needed to be reduced. Izzy was offered support in her own right. The worker spoke to Izzy one-to-one and Izzy gave a positive account of the relationship.

Izzy's colleagues said that her borrowing money from them, and from the team fund, was during this period. She was thin, smoked a lot, and was always hungry. When she did talk about Colin it was very positive, and she maintained the narrative of her husband being the problem. When she came to work with a black eye, she said it was a row with her husband. Her line manager referred her to Occupational Health. She did not attend. Everyone believed she lived with the children. When she was late/ left early/ took sudden days off, she told her manager and colleagues that she had an emergency relating to her daughter, and when she borrowed money, said it was for her daughter; a close colleague noticed her researching payday loans. Izzy started borrowing from her mother and sold her daughter's tablet and other things her mother had bought.

This is therefore a period in which the Review suggests that Colin's social, financial and emotional control of Izzy was established. He was dependent on Izzy for all his social contact, and not prepared to act on advice to reduce his dependence. It is likely, given that Izzy should have been financially independent with her salary, yet was borrowing money, selling her belongings, and getting into debt, that she was continuing to finance his lifestyle, including his illicit drug use. The situation regarding contact with her daughter was at an unhappy resolution: Izzy was determined to try to change it. This depended on Colin changing his behaviour. The chronology highlights that being put under any pressure regarding his conduct or actions, triggered his adverse behaviour. There are a number of examples in the chronology where he was challenged by his drug worker or his PPU offender manager, because he had not disclosed information, had not been honest and truthful, or even that he became aware that agencies were working together to share information, and this was followed by further drug use, or by offending. It is not known whether domestic violence was also triggered. It would follow that being asked by Izzy, to help her regain residence of her daughter by reducing his drug use, would have triggered more drug use, in a subtle sabotage that further established him as the sole focus of her attention.

It is known that Izzy's colleagues continued to be concerned for her, and challenged her; however, Izzy recounted an 'ideal' relationship with Colin. He had started to follow her during this time, phoning her at the office at the time she was due to arrive, turning up in reception during the day, even going to another location when she was working off-site. The Review defines this as stalking behaviour though at the time, her colleagues were reassured by Izzy that it was evidence of him caring.

The Panel was concerned about the sharing of information by Kirklees Lifeline, both with PPU and with Bridge Project, which was neither timely nor effective. His transfer to the Bradford service was delayed. Lifeline had information about the MARAC matter which would have alerted Bridge Project to his history of domestic abuse, and could have triggered an action by Bridge, to be more proactive in offering information and advice to Izzy. Lifeline no longer exists, but the Bridge Project has picked up the learning from this gap, as discussed later.

The School Nurse proactively supported Jane for a period, but this had ended prior to the next set of events.

During this period, the PPU reviewed and updated his risk assessment after each monitoring visit, in April, June and September. Although he remained at Medium risk, he was managed at a higher level, with monitoring visits and reviews more frequent than required by policy.

17.4 18th March to 31st August 2016: a short but significant period in which the perpetrator's erratic behaviour escalated.

In this period, Izzy was pregnant, and miscarried, was off sick for some time, and experienced low mood. At work, her relationship with her manager broke down because of her unreliability and poor performance and another manager started to give her supervision. Her colleagues were worried, but still believed she had the children living with her and was in a loving relationship.

Colin's drug use escalated, and he was transferred to the core service. He claimed he was relapsing because of Izzy's miscarriage. Whilst anecdotal information suggests that Colin has a history of miscarriages and this is likely to have had an emotional impact, records indicate the escalation of his drug use started before this time, indeed appears to have been triggered by Izzy's pregnancy. His drug worker again noted his dependence on Izzy for all social contact, but he was resistant to advice on how to reduce this.

Due to his drug taking, whilst his Matrix 2000 risk assessment continued to show his risk of sex offending to be Medium, his risk of violent offending now increased to Very High. No risk to children was evidenced.

Izzy was breaching the supervised contact order during this time, in order to spend time with her daughter; her mother was supporting her daughter and believed her. Izzy was therefore

spending unsupervised time with Jane, and on these occasions, Colin was usually, if not always, with her.

This must have been a very challenging and stressful time for Izzy; she was recovering from a miscarriage, was low in mood, was trying to balance the needs of Colin, his attention seeking and drug use and his utter dependency on her, (which the Review indicates was controlling and coercive) with her own need to spend time with her daughter. She communicated to her mother that she was deeply disappointed that his drug use prevented her from seeing more of Jane. During this summer, while not well, she had no money, no food in the house, could not pay for electricity. She was doing badly at work which was important to her. Nonetheless she maintained the dual narrative, in which she supported Colin at home in what must have been difficult circumstances, while giving the impression she was in a close, loving relationship, living with her children, experiencing ongoing problems with her husband about his contact with their daughter.

In the words of a close colleague: 'She'd built a prison for herself'.

This period culminated in the events of 31st August, when Colin allegedly sexually assaulted Jane during an unsupervised contact visit. It was not disclosed until later in October.

17.5 31st August – December 2016: events escalated

In retrospect, the Review identifies an escalation following the alleged assault on Jane: Colin's illicit drug use became more chaotic in the two months between the date of the alleged assault and the date Jane disclosed her experience and he was arrested; he may have been under pressure, anticipating being discovered (he admitted during his police interview that he may have accidentally brushed her private parts when changing her, and therefore it could be assumed that he knew he had behaved inappropriately and had put his liberty and his relationship at risk).

Colin was remanded into custody until trial; however, three weeks later he was bailed by Judge in Chambers. The Review considered the information available to this hearing and found that the CPS's objection to bail, on the basis of Colin's risk of failing to comply, was clear. Not so clear was the solicitor's statement for Colin, as discussed below. He was released to reside with his parents, but this did not prevent him having contact with Izzy. The Review heard from Bridge Project that his drug use further escalated following his release from prison, and he received a substantial benefits back-payment which would have enabled this.

Izzy was charged with neglect, in that she had placed Jane at risk by enabling Colin to have unsupervised contact with her. She was bailed to have no contact with children.

Izzy's husband immediately stopped contact between Jane and Izzy. A Section 47 investigation commenced, which remained outstanding at the time of Izzy's death.

The Review heard from colleagues about Izzy's positive attitude in the last few months of her life, specifically from the point that Colin was remanded into custody. In retrospect it is known that Izzy had written a letter to Colin explaining that his drug use needed to change, identifying everything she had given up for him and saying she was committed to staying with him. She was in the early stages of pregnancy and had told her mother that she knew from a social worker that she would lose the baby if she was still with Colin. In the letter to Colin she did not explicitly mention the pregnancy, but it is clear she needed his drug taking to change. There was nothing in the letter to suggest she was considering ending the relationship.

One hypothesis explored by the reviewers and discussed with family members who were in broad agreement, was that, while Colin was remanded in custody, Izzy had the opportunity to consider her circumstances. She loved Colin, but all attempts to reduce his illicit drug use had failed, and this would stop her bringing her family back together; not only in renewing contact with Jane, but in keeping the baby. Anecdotal information from family and colleagues tells us that her children were very important to her; their priority had become lost in Colin's controlling and attention seeking behaviour, but with him in custody, she may have had time to reflect and reconsider, and determine to be more assertive in asking him to change. It is not a challenging letter; it is written from the heart, is loving, supportive, and pleads with him to stop taking drugs, which Izzy identifies, in this letter, as the one obstacle in their lives.

There is evidence in this Review that Colin exercised coercive control, and the tone of pleading in her letter suggests Izzy may not previously have asked him to change. It was further evidenced during the Review that Colin responded badly to being challenged, however mildly, displaying erratic behaviour including illicit drug use. For example, when he was challenged by his drug worker about failing to disclose his sex offending, and again, when he was discovered to be telling lies possibly to avoid attending for tests, he very quickly relapsed into serious illicit drug use. It is noted that he had, after a period of some stability, relapsed on a number of occasions during the time Izzy was depending on him to

provide negative tests so she could return to the Family Court and hope to regain her daughter. To suggest this was in order to control her access to her children, may be conjecture, however, it would fit the pattern of manipulation identified by this Review.

As such, it is possible that Colin saw Izzy's request to him to change as a challenge. Further, that her assertiveness, though very mild, was new, and in the context of his coercive control could only be explained by her having another man in her life, who was in turn controlling her. Izzy told her mother that Colin didn't believe the baby was his, and Colin said this to police during interview. The belief that she had another man and that this was not his baby, could have acted as a trigger that final day. By his account after his arrest, she did admit having a male friend, and he was able to see that she may have said this to please him, and then retracted the statement when she found it did not help.

There is evidence that Izzy had taken opiates and cocaine prior to her death. Although a number of people reported concern that she might be taking drugs, there was no evidence in this Review that this had ever been the case. On the basis of discussions with family and colleagues, this Review suggests she may have taken drugs in those final moments in order to appease her attacker; that he may have challenged her to do so to prove something to him. There was information to suggest that one of his controlling behaviours had been to require Izzy to behave in ways she would not have considered acceptable, to change her norms and bring her to his level.

The Review explored in more detail whether there had been the opportunity for a professional to speak to Izzy after October 2016, when Colin was first remanded in custody, then in November, when he was bailed to another address. The CSC did not interview Izzy during the Section 47 investigation which was taking place during this time. This was therefore a missed opportunity to consider whether Izzy had been coerced by Colin into enabling him to have contact with her daughter; and to challenge her narrative and enable her to identify risks to herself and her daughter. In November 2016, the PPU offender manager created a new Risk Management Plan which included visiting Izzy 'to ascertain whether the relationship will continue'. This did not occur. Visiting her on her own may have been an opportunity to explore their relationship and discuss issues of domestic abuse and particularly coercion and control. There is no suggestion from previous contacts with Izzy that she would have taken up an opportunity offered by either of these professionals; however, nor can we say that she would not have.

18. Questions from Family about this Analysis:

The reviewers discussed these findings with Izzy's parents as they emerged. Izzy's father queried whether there had been opportunities when police could have taken the responsibility away from Izzy and charged Colin with domestic abuse related offences. This was discussed with WYP and one incident was identified when this could have happened, in November 2014. As Izzy supported Colin during this event, to the point that she was arrested for obstruction, it would have been difficult for them to proceed. He was cautioned and as such the offence was recognised and dealt with. Had the information about the MARAC in June 2014 been available, it is difficult to see how Police could have acted other than by using a simple caution, in the light of Izzy's confident assertions. On this point, Izzy's father has been reassured.

In March/ April 2014, Izzy's father asked police for a disclosure of Colin's sexual offending under Sarah's Law[19] and was concerned not to have received a reply. The WYP investigated and could find no record of the request but was able to clarify that Sarah's Law relates to sexual offences committed against children, and as Colin's offence was against an adult, it would not have applied. However, the Review recognizes that for Izzy's father, Izzy was his child, and his concern for his daughter's safety led him to make this inquiry. At this point in time, there was no record of Colin's history of domestic violence (until the MARAC in May 2014) and therefore there would not have been a Clare's Law disclosure, even had that been requested and forwarded to the appropriate department. The Review has clarified that had a disclosure been possible, police could not have shared information with Izzy's father as she was an adult.

The family is concerned about the Judge in Chambers decision to bail Colin, in November 2016. This was an important turning point since, had he not been bailed, he would not have been at liberty at the critical time leading up to the final, tragic event. The Review has seen the application for bail which includes the statement that [Colin] 'has provided an explanation that might account for the accusation that has been made'. This may refer to Colin's interview with Police, when he stated he may have touched Jane accidentally, brushing against her when he was helping her to change. If this statement was true, it nonetheless places him in breach of a Prohibited Steps Order which itself is evidence that he will not comply with conditions. However, the WYP has established that information about this

[19] The Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme, known as 'Sarah's Law', allows a member of the public concerned for the welfare of a child, to visit a police station to ask the police whether someone who has access to a child, has child-related sex offences.

Prohibited Steps Order, and Colin's risk factors, including his failure to comply in the past, and his risk assessment, was available to the Judge in Chambers through the Crown Prosecution Service's submission and objection to bail. As such, the Review has established that all the information was available to the Court in making this bail decision.

These issues were further discussed between the family and the Overview Panel, and the conclusions recorded in Section 23.

SECTION THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIIONS

This section addresses the specific questions posed in the Terms of Reference.

19. EFFECTIVE PRACTICE/ LESSONS LEARNED

19.1 Awareness of domestic abuse services:

There was no information in the Review to suggest Izzy wished to report abuse. When her family and colleagues noted her bruises, she gave reasons such as falling, or blamed a confrontation with her husband. At no time did she suggest that Colin was abusing her.

Izzy's father became aware, through neighbours reporting to him, of shouting and arguments from her house. He spoke to the Social Worker undertaking the Section 37 report about this in mid-2014. This conversation is recorded by the Social Worker who did not act on this information by asking Izzy if she felt under pressure by Colin. This was clearly a missed opportunity. Subsequently, Izzy broke off contact with her father, partly because of his concerns for her safety. In his discussions with the reviewers, Izzy's father believed he had correctly passed on his concerns and is dismayed that this was not acted upon.

Izzy had experienced abuse in her marriage, as reported by herself to her colleagues, and by family members to this Review, and evidenced by WYP records of a number of domestic incidents. In these incidents, Izzy was recorded as perpetrator as often as she was recorded as the subject. There is evidence that WYP followed procedures and after she left her marriage, all the issues concerned contact with her daughter, therefore the advice was accordingly to seek legal assistance. These episodes evidenced that Izzy was prepared to seek support from the police and would have been no less likely to do so on the basis of the response she received after these incidents.

The officers who interviewed Izzy in October 2016 sought to explore the nature of her relationship with Colin and the solicitor stopped this discussion and refocussed the interview onto strictly evidential issues. This would potentially have been a barrier, had Izzy wished to disclose, however, the record of the interview indicates that Izzy defended Colin against the allegation (of assault against her daughter) and was very positive about their relationship.

19.2 Information sharing procedures:

The lack of information sharing by Lifeline with the Bridge Project is a concern. When transferring Colin to Bridge, Lifeline provided no information on his history of violent or

sexual offending. This meant Bridge's risk assessment – completed on all new referrals – was not accurate. Bridge staff could have followed this up, but the medication transfer indicated he was stable on medication and there were no concerns to trigger a follow-up, though it would have been good practice to do so.

The PPU attempted to share information with Lifeline and was told this was not possible due to client confidentiality. Had information been shared effectively by Lifeline, it would have led first, to his offender manager at the PPU having a more accurate risk assessment; secondly, knowing when he was transferred to Bridge and then sharing information more quickly with Bridge, which in turn would have led to Bridge having a better risk assessment; and thirdly, the PPU could have shared information about the MARAC in June 2014, with the Bridge Project. This would have given Bridge staff important information about his previous history of domestic abuse and led to an updated risk assessment; there would then have been the potential for a more assertive intervention when the drug worker became aware of his dependence upon Izzy. The PPU contacted the Bridge Project in September 2015 and shared information concerning Colin's conviction for a sexual offence dating back to 1998 and that this offence had been linked to his use of cocaine; and that he was not permitted contact with Izzy's daughter due to his sexual offending history and that the legal status was that the child was to reside with her father. This was all important information that enabled Bridge to understand the true picture of his lifestyle, which was contrary to that described by Colin, and then to work more effectively with him. Subsequently, the PPU and Bridge liaised regularly to share risk information. The last alert from Bridge to the PPU was in early December 2016, when they disclosed his continuing use of heroin and crack cocaine and that he had not given any clean urine samples since being released on bail in November. This demonstrates good proactive information sharing between both agencies.

Whilst Lifeline has since gone into liquidation, and the Bridge Project has developed a new transfer protocol, this is a lesson learned for commissioners and providers of substance misuse services, to ensure everyone is aware of their duties and responsibilities in information sharing.

Other than exchanging information with the Bridge Project, the WYP records of dealing with the domestic incidents show good and regular liaison with other agencies, particularly CSC when there were safeguarding concerns. This is illustrated by the contact with CSC regarding the children of Colin's niece following his arrest and charge in October 2016.

There was evidence of effective inter-agency communication by a health practitioner who contacted CSC when a risk to Izzy's daughter was perceived, and by police and schools with CSC concerning the impact of events on Jane.

Izzy disclosed domestic abuse to her GP, stating this was the reason for her low mood and that her husband was the source of her stress. She was offered timely access to mental health service to support her; it is an opt-in system and Izzy did not do so. There is a system of including domestic violence risk on the mental health referral form which highlights the need to ask when someone has an indicator of domestic violence, including emotional disturbance. Izzy was asked on three occasions about her circumstances and she did not disclose domestic violence in her current relationship.

Whilst MARAC is a victim-focused process, which meant that information about the perpetrator's abuse of a previous partner did not follow him to Bradford, this left a significant gap in information sharing in this case, and consideration should be given to this.

19.3 Assessment and decision making:

In April 2014 there was information which indicated that Colin was no longer living at his registered address, with his previous partner. No tasking was undertaken to have either address checked at appropriate times, e.g. in the early hours, to establish where he was actually living. This should have been a priority given the presence of children at Izzy's address. When Colin was spoken with at Izzy's home in June, and stated he was living there, no enquiries with Izzy or her son, then aged 16, were included in the management plan.

When a statement was obtained from his previous partner in May 2014 to the effect that he was no longer at her address, he was arrested and released without charge on the basis that she was not a reliable witness. Available enquiries to corroborate her account were not completed, e.g. speaking to Izzy's son who had earlier reported that he had left home because of Colin's presence there, or enquiries with current or former neighbours.

At this time, however, the offender manager assessed him as medium risk on Matrix 2000 but graded his actual risk as Very High due to uncertainties about his relationships, and increased contact to monthly. This was good risk assessment practice.

The WYP IMR Author notes that the failure to exercise professional curiosity or be proactive to effectively manage Registered Sex Offenders has been a theme of several internal

reviews conducted over the past year and recommends the Force should now collate and effectively communicate the lessons learned from these reviews to improve the management of Registered Sex Offenders.

Once Colin had registered his address as Izzy's, consideration was given to making a disclosure to Izzy of his sexual offending and the offender manager confirmed that Izzy was aware. However, his previous partner subsequently disclosed a ten-year history of coercive control and physical assault and reported continuing threats after he had left her. This case was taken to a Kirklees MARAC. There was no consideration by the offender manager of initiating a Clare's Law[20] disclosure to Izzy. This would have been an appropriate action to promote her safeguarding. The action recommended above should include issuing guidance to offender managers to implement disclosure procedures, i.e. the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme which has been introduced since these events.

However, the offender manager did review Colin's registration and although he was seen to be stable, the decision was that he would remain high risk, due to the uncertainties.

In respect of the breach of bail two days before Izzy's death, no tasking appears to have taken place although a briefing item was automatically generated. Because this is a concern for the family, the IMR author explored breach of bail procedures further and found it unlikely that any urgent action would have been taken between the breach of bail on the Friday afternoon, and the death of Izzy two days later. Colin was on bail for an alleged assault on a child, who was being safeguarded by her father, and there was no concern about domestic violence. However, the IMR author further finds there was no process at that time for allocating breach of bail matters. Such a process was put in place in October 2017, but dip sampling indicates it is not yet embedded. Included in this DHR is a recommendation that instructions for tasking bail breaches should be reviewed by Bradford District and re-circulated to Inspectors.

The opportunities to refer Izzy to a domestic violence support service were first, in November 2014, following the incident in the street; however, the evidence from that police interview is to the effect that Izzy denied domestic violence from Colin. There had been previous opportunities, in domestic incidents involving her husband; however, WYP Force policy states that victims of domestic abuse can be referred to Victim Support and other

[20] The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, known as 'Clare's Law' after the landmark case that led to it, gives any member of the public the right to ask the police if their partner may pose a risk to them. Under Clare's Law, a member of the public can also make enquiries into the partner of a close friend or family member.

support agencies only with their explicit and informed consent. This was never consented to, by Izzy. The Force could have referred Izzy to MARAC had she been identified as High Risk under the DASH; in those incidents, the risk was assessed as Standard or Medium.

There was one incident, in February 2014, involving Izzy and her husband. In the course of completing this inquiry, the WYP IMR Author identified an 'electronic black hole' as Izzy had given consent to being referred to a support agency and this had not been completed due to a tasking error. As a result of this finding, WYP has implemented a new 'master task' facility from September 2018. The Review notes that this was in relation to Izzy's experience of abuse in her relationship with her husband, and not in relation to her new relationship.

Izzy did discuss domestic abuse with her GP and was referred for support but did not opt in. The Bridge Project staff followed good practice by offering Izzy a support service on a number of occasions, which she did not wish to take up. At work, and in contacts with agencies, Izzy explained her panic attacks and stress as arising from the acrimony with her husband.

There were warning signs of domestic abuse, from November 2014, including not only the incident of assault at that time, but the deterioration in Izzy's health and presentation; however, Izzy consistently explained this as being due to her conflicted relationship with her husband, not with Colin. The key missed opportunities in this regard were during the period October to December 2016, when the PPU offender manager and the Social Worker were in a position to interview Izzy and discuss her relationship with Colin. Given the anecdotal information that has led the Panel to believe Izzy was reflective and determined to improve her circumstances at that time, when she was in the early stages of pregnancy, these conversations may have led to her disclosing, and accepting support.

The perpetrator was a Registered Sex Offender. The Review finds there was ongoing risk assessment and decision making by the PPU, as circumstances changed, and that disclosure to Izzy was completed in accordance with the police's common law powers and their duty of care to the public and in accordance with case law.

The Review has been able to determine, via the investigations of the WYP IMR Author, that DASH risk assessments were completed on all occasions bar two events: Izzy complained to police in June 2014 that her husband was texting her mother as a way of contacting her, in breach of the NMO; and following the assault by Colin on Izzy in November 2014. In the first incident, it was established that her husband had been attempting to gain property

belonging to their child and had contacted her mother on the advice of a Social Worker in order not to breach the terms of the NMO, and this was therefore discontinued. In relation to the November incident, both parties were arrested and in interview Izzy denied that a domestic abuse incident had taken place.

19.4 Interventions:

Only one home visit to Colin by the offender manager was significantly overdue, by one month in September/ October 2016. Over ninety percent of the PPU's visits were unannounced which represents good compliance with national standards. Supervisory oversight is routinely evidenced as timely.

A Risk Management Plan was created in November 2016 following Colin's charge of sexual assault against a child, which included visiting Izzy 'to ascertain whether the relationship will continue'. This did not occur. Visiting her while he was remanded may have been an opportunity to explore their relationship and discuss issues of domestic abuse and particularly coercion and control given what was known of his relationship with his previous partner. Although there is evidence that in her police interview in October, Izzy had been supportive of Colin, the Review has identified that Izzy might have been reflecting on her future in November/ December and therefore not completing this planned action was potentially a missed opportunity.

The drug treatment interventions provided by Bridge Project have been evidenced as compliant with policy and procedures; invariably, the drug workers were very experienced, and this is reflected in their understanding of manipulative and minimizing behaviours such as was clear in Colin's relationship with his treatment. There was appropriate challenge, with use of evidence from tests to support this, and he was transferred to a core service when it was clear that he was no longer stable. There were a number of occasions when drug workers noted that Izzy was acting in collusion with his drug taking, and steps were taken both to stop this happening, and to offer support to Izzy as a 'concerned other'.

Overall, the key opportunities for agency intervention in relation to domestic abuse that were missed, were, as related above, in October – December 2016.

19.5 Policies and procedures:

There was a missed opportunity for CSC to ask Izzy, during the information gathering for the Section 37 Report, if she felt under pressure from Colin, following Izzy's father raising concerns with the Social Worker. There was a further missed opportunity following a

discussion (as part of the Section 37 Report) between her daughter's school and CSC when the school reported that between September – December 2014 Izzy had attended school with what was described as "an egg sized lump on her forehead with cut down the middle". The focus by CSC with the Section 37 Report appeared to be fixed on recording domestic abuse accounts given by Izzy about her husband and vice versa. It cannot be unusual for neglect of children to be linked to domestic abuse. More detailed discussions could have been held with Izzy about support for her as the victim of domestic abuse, and encouragement given for her to access support from relevant agencies and being asked about a MARAC referral. The Panel believes other information indicates that Izzy would not have admitted to being abused by Colin at this stage and would not have taken up offers of advice. However, these are clear missed opportunities to follow policy and it is important that guidance is provided to staff in relation to developing a greater awareness of the links between domestic abuse and safeguarding children.

Much later, in 2016 following the arrest of Izzy and Colin in respect of the allegation by Izzy's daughter, there was a Section 47 investigation. This investigating Social Worker did not interview Izzy. Whilst it is noted that Izzy was charged with neglect in that incident, it would have been proper procedure to have interviewed her. The Review has identified that there may have been a window of opportunity during the time she was on bail, when Colin was remanded in custody, and afterwards, when she found she was pregnant and wrote the letter to Colin. Whilst it is with the benefit of hindsight, as discussed elsewhere, that the Review suggests Izzy may have had a change of viewpoint around this time, it could have been an important opportunity for her to consider and disclose and be offered support. However, Izzy was not interviewed and whilst the Section 47 investigation had completed, it had not been closed.

The police officers who interviewed Izzy in October 2016 sought to explore the nature of her relationship with Colin and an opportunity was provided to her to make disclosure. 'Routine enquiry' is not part of current police procedure. However, the IMR Author notes that significant numbers of women sentenced to imprisonment have been victims of domestic abuse (the charity Women in Prison estimates 79%). Being in police custody may offer women an opportunity to make disclosure and seek assistance and the Force should consider how this might be achieved. It is noted that on this occasion, it was the solicitor who stopped the line of questioning and refocused the interview onto evidential matter.

As described above, the Bridge Project was unaware of Colin's sex offending and history of domestic violence until an error by the referring agency in July 2015 made an entry

viewable, which referenced a domestic violence incident the previous year. This references his assault on Izzy in November 2014. At his next appointment, Colin was asked about this entry and provided an account of the incident which was minimized, stating they were both arrested and released without charge. Had the practitioner asked the referring agency for more information, rather than believing Colin's account, there may have been an opportunity to become aware of his domestic abuse. It is an indication of Colin's plausibility, and that he and Izzy gave an impression of domestic stability; his drug use was, at that time, under control. The Bridge Project has committed to learning from this and being more proactive in seeking full disclosure when information is received about domestic abuse and updating the risk assessment.

The Bridge Project has a separate service to provide confidential support for Concerned Others, affected by substance misuse of a family member or friend, in their own right. In accordance with policy and procedure, Izzy was encouraged to attend on five separate occasions, which demonstrated good practice. Had she done so, this may have led to Izzy finding support in her own right and this may in turn have led to her identifying the risks within this relationship. However, Izzy did not wish to attend.

As employers, the agencies engaged in this Review discussed and evidenced that there were policies and procedures in place which could identify and enable disclosure where employees experience domestic abuse in their personal lives. However, given that Izzy was employed by the NHS, the Review has been able to work with the employer to identify lessons to learn, and it is recommended that these are considered by all agencies in the Partnership. These are discussed separately, below.

19.6 Practitioner skills and training:

Drug practitioners evidenced good practice in speaking to Izzy independently of Colin to offer the support of the 'Concerned Other Service'. These interactions were not documented as they were opportunistic and occurred outside of any sessions held with Colin; however, the discussions were recalled and recorded in interviews with the IMR Author. Izzy consistently stated she was stressed out regarding the situation with her daughter and that her former partner was making things difficult for her and she was finding it difficult to eat and the stress was getting to her. Practitioners were clear about the benefits and importance of having someone she could talk to about her feelings and having support in her own right. They were also aware that she was employed and reminded her that the service had late sessions. The response from Izzy was that she worked for the NHS and had lots of support through work and family and she was aware of the other supports available to her.

Practitioners stated that Izzy always presented as confident and they believed her assertions. This was good practice. The IMR Author explored the lack of record of these discussions and found there was some ambiguity regarding third party contacts with friends and family, where these were not explicitly linked to safeguarding. The Record Keeping Policy has now been updated and guidance given to staff, to clarify that these conversations should be recorded in the service user record, as it forms part of the service to the client; there is a separate confidential record held where someone does attend the Concerned Others Service.

There were a number of occasions when practitioners evidenced good practice, such as in challenging Colin in his over-reliance on Izzy, challenging his accounts, and offering support to Izzy.

Within the CCG, a Domestic Violence Manager is employed, to promote good practice, raise awareness and advise practitioners in relation to domestic violence situations across the health economy, including primary care. The IMR Author noted that the GP practices are expected to access training for all staff on safeguarding and found, in relation to this Review, that all staff had attended the required standard of training in safeguarding adults and children, which includes reference to domestic violence. Each practice has a named Child and Adult Safeguarding Lead.

In WYP, neither the PPU offender manager, nor the Safeguarding Unit child protection officer interviewed by the WYP IMR Author had participated in recent domestic abuse training and in particular had not participated in the coercion and control training implemented during 2016 and 2017. There is a recommendation to rectify this.

19.7 Safeguarding Children:

There were several referrals by WYP to CSC in relation to domestic incidents, the records for which demonstrate that officers were alert to the impact of acrimony between the parents, on Jane, who was six years old at the time. Until the point that a Section 37 Report was requested by the Court, the CSC made decisions for no further action. The IMR Author for CSC explored these decisions. Good practice was evidenced within the reviews undertaken in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH): these reviews were undertaken by qualified, experienced Social Workers with oversight of the Duty Suite Team Manager. Each review considered if Jane or Greg were present during the domestic abuse reports to police. On each occasion apart from one where Greg was present it was reported by police that the adults were alone.

In response to the domestic abuse between Izzy and her husband, and Izzy and Colin, the CSC IMR Author found that CSC had shared information with schools to alert them to a child suffering/ witnessing domestic abuse within the home. As part of Operation Encompass practice, operated by CSC since January 2017, police record and name a child on domestic abuse call outs, whether the child was present or not. On receipt of police reports, alerts are generated by CSC and sent to schools each morning before 9am. This ensures that schools are alert and responsive to a child's needs and can offer support. All domestic abuse reports are graded in priority as green, amber and red. However, in this case, as Izzy did not have care of her child, she was not provided with information about domestic abuse services.

WYP made a referral to CSC following a domestic incident between Izzy and her husband in June 2014, in which Colin was present. This was noted by the Safeguarding Unit, but he was not identified as a registered sex offender. This was key information that should have been shared with CSC. The referral was submitted as a routine report following a domestic incident and not as a specific child protection referral based on Colin's association with Izzy. It is noted elsewhere in this Review that CSC was informed on a different occasion of Colin's registered sex offender status and noted that as this conviction did not involve children he was not seen as a risk to children. Nonetheless, it would have been good practice for the Safeguarding Unit to pass on this significant information to CSC, and the Force should ensure this is implemented.

The report taken by WYP on the 31st August 2016 that Colin had contact with Jane during an unsupervised trip to the seaside resulted in the submission of a child protection occurrence. Colin was not linked to the occurrence on the log and consequently no notification was sent to the PPU offender manager. Similarly, Colin was recorded as being present, but not linked to the child protection or domestic abuse occurrences submitted on the 28th September 2016 and consequently no notification was passed to the PPU offender manager. This was a failing as receipt of this information may have resulted in a re-assessment of Colin's risk of harm. The WYP has a recommendation from this Review which stresses the importance of linking the record of registered sex offenders to the record of occurrences.

Izzy and Colin asked the Bridge Project to undertake drug testing in order to provide evidence of Colin's stability for a private court dispute in 2015. Supervision was sought by the practitioner and advice implemented. The Project agreed to provide drug tests to the same standard as a Child Protection case. This action demonstrated that the practitioner and the manager were alert to risks to children and would implement the same standard of

practice despite the private nature of the dispute in question. This was evidenced in the way the staff went on to conduct tests, objectively and without collusion, given that Colin did not achieve stability throughout that year.

All BDCFT's involvement in this case relates to the School Nursing Service and is therefore concerned with safeguarding. Following Jane's assessment at CAMHS, the School Nurse was asked to support her in school. The IMR Author found the service responded to this referral promptly and addressed the needs of the parent, who in this case was Izzy's husband, and the child, in a timely fashion following best practice in accordance with the core school nursing standards to address the needs of individuals and families. The child was seen individually and at her home, which was a safe environment, and the 'voice of the child' was reflected in the record. Information was shared in a prompt and timely fashion.

The information regarding the allegations of sexual abuse made by the child was not shared with the school nursing service until December 2016, which represented a delay in communication and possibly a lack of consideration of the potential for Jane to have any emerging health needs from this experience. As such, Jane was not able to be assessed by the School Nurse, who would then have been able to make connections between that and the previous safeguarding issues of which the School Nurse was aware. This was therefore a missed opportunity for Jane and her father to be seen and with consent, Jane to be assessed and potentially provided with relevant support in a safe environment.

The BDCFT IMR Author found the concept of 'professional curiosity' was well established within the training and supervision provided by the BDCFT Safeguarding team at the time of the input for Jane. The School Nurse had documented that the child contact order was in place 'due to risk'. There was a missed opportunity to gain clarity of the risks posed to Jane by Colin during the School Nurse's discussions with Jane's father & the CSC Social Worker, which might have provided an opportunity to understand the child's lived experience & organise any additional support for Jane via the school.

A recent area inspection of the multi-agency response to abuse and neglect across Bradford included a 'deep dive' focus on the response to children living with domestic abuse. Although practice across BDCFT was highlighted to be effective in many areas, one area highlighted for improvement included the School Nurse service not asking direct questions about domestic abuse. Consequently, there has been change in response to this and School Nurses now include a routine enquiry into domestic abuse as part of the Emotional Wellbeing Tier 1 assessment. It was not known by the School Nurse that Jane had

witnessed any domestic abuse between her parents. But, the possibility of domestic abuse being an issue in her life and therefore indicators of domestic abuse recognized in her presentation might have been noted and acted upon should the question had been asked and elicited a positive answer.

BDCFT Safeguarding Team has developed training on 'Coercive Control and the impact on victims and children' which has been available for staff from January 2017 which meets their safeguarding children compliance requirements. The addition of this training and the embedding of learning from this, if attended, should make a positive difference to staff's recognition and response to indicators of domestic abuse in children.

The Review received supplementary information from Jane's school, which indicates that in 2014, her father discussed his concerns about his daughter's safety and wellbeing in relation to her mother's relationship with Colin, and his fears that Izzy was putting Colin before the child. When school staff became aware of the restrictions on contact by Jane's mother and partner, they passed relevant information to CSC. The school appears to have provided a safe place for Jane.

The Review noted that Greg was 16/17 years old during the time he was experiencing the conflict in his mother's home. He then lived with relatives and for a time in supported accommodation. He was interviewed by police during domestic disputes on the one occasion when he was present in the home. The Review received a limited amount of information that indicates Greg was distressed during this period and although he received targeted support for a short time from the housing service, there is no evidence that his needs – in relation to experiencing or witnessing domestic abuse – were considered. At the Lessons Learned meeting, it was noted that young men who have grown up in conflicted households are over-represented in substance misuse services, and observations made that more support might have been offered had Greg been younger, or female.

20. LESSONS LEARNED BY EMPLOYERS

Representatives of Izzy's NHS employers engaged with this Review process, meeting with the reviewers to share actions that had been taken or were planned, and to consider other actions that could help them to better support employees experiencing domestic abuse. Izzy's colleagues expressed that they wished to see particular initiatives arising from Izzy's experience. A number of practical steps had been identified and implemented following Izzy's death. Some of these lessons learned, in as much as it concerns good supervision and employment practice, can be shared across the public sector and commissioned services. For example:

- Training managers to develop awareness of domestic abuse, and to enable them to respond to a range of verbal and nonverbal clues as well as information, that a member of staff may be in difficulty, and having that conversation.
- Offering opportunities for staff's personal learning, so they are aware of how domestic abuse can affect colleagues, and what they can do to support, including how to pass on concerns safely.
- Being aware that there will be victims of domestic abuse in their workforce, and there will also be perpetrators.
- Developing processes such as Return to Work interviews that specifically ask all staff about domestic abuse.
- Developing a culture of support within the workplace where staff know they will be supported if they are experiencing abuse, including having accessible and relevant policies and procedures

In discussions in the Overview Panel, these lessons learned have been shared and a recommendation reflects Panel members' commitment to addressing domestic abuse where it arises in the workplace. A recommendation from this Review reflects this discussion.

21. PANEL CONCLUSIONS

Izzy thought Colin was her 'rescuer' from an unhappy marriage, whereas the information available to the Review suggests he was her jailer. After a brief period of happiness, when she left her marriage, Izzy became subject to increasingly controlling behaviour by Colin, and did not recognize this, defending him against others who had a more objective view of his risks. Over a very short period in 2014, he established control of her behaviour, changing her norms, causing her to behave in ways she would not previously have tolerated. He went on to control her belongings, and her finances. He stalked her through her working day and demanded complete attention to his needs when she was not at work, isolating her first from friends, then from any family member who was not in agreement with him. He nurtured, or groomed, relatives who he believed would be supportive of him. They have said they did not like him but tried to be nice to him for the sake of Izzy.

Izzy loved her children, enjoyed her career, and was financially independent. She was manipulated into circumstances in which she lost her children, got into debt, could not afford to eat, pawned household items and her children's belongings. This assertive, ethical, intelligent woman fell in love with a high-risk individual and was coerced by him to use her strengths and her qualities to support him to the exclusion of her children, her family, her career and her own independence. She created a fictional life to explain the anomalies that were visible to employers and colleagues: that she had her children living with her and was in a custody battle with her husband. As a smoke-screen, this parallel narrative explained the increasing chaos in her life: being late for work, needing to change her hours at short notice, having emergencies, being short of money; and those who knew how unhappy her previous relationship had been found her account that her husband was responsible for her bruises believable.

The Panel found no indication that Izzy would have disclosed abuse, had the resource been available to reassure her that this would be safe to do. The reviewers discussed with agencies, colleagues, and family members, whether Izzy was keeping herself safe by denying the extent of her partner's abuse. We find nothing to indicate this, though we recognise it can be a subtle process. We think it reasonable to suggest that Colin used his vulnerabilities to control Izzy: he was not so well educated or trained as Izzy, had few skills and no employment history to speak of; was a long-term drug abuser, often unwell; had a history of offending including being a registered sex offender. As such, Izzy was the strong person in this relationship. She supported him in every aspect of his vulnerabilities, deprioritising her own needs, and even her own children, in order to try make the relationship work.

Around October 2016, coinciding with his remand, even though she had lost contact with her daughter and was facing a charge of neglect, there was anecdotal evidence that Izzy's emotional state improved; she had been low for a long time, particularly since her miscarriage in May 2016. Now, she was supported by anti-depressants, and a new, positive approach became evident to her colleagues and line manager. This must have been a period of intense pressure for Izzy, while she awaited trial for a charge of neglect arising from the perpetrator's actions, unable to share this situation with her family; and one hypothesis is that she had some respite from him, while he was on remand; time to reflect on what she had lost and decided to make changes. She was in the early stages of pregnancy, confided in her mother that she would lose the baby to the care system if nothing changed. The letter suggests she became more assertive and reflective when he was released. This letter may have been one of a number of positive steps she took to try to change things in her relationship; but we believe her aim was to secure her future, with her children, not to leave the relationship.

When Izzy set out the plea in her letter, if Colin took the 'just enough' approach, in which a controller makes small changes to reassure the other person that things will be different, but quickly slips back into familiar patterns of behaviour, this could have reassured Izzy and would have been a reason for her being happier and more positive during that period. However, her more determined mood, and the letter, could then have been the trigger to the tragic event when Colin reinstated his complete control. In police interviews, he alleged she had been seeing someone else; this has no basis whatever in the police investigation, or in the findings of this Review. She only wanted him to change his drug-taking behaviour, to give them a chance of a family life. There is no information available to the Review to indicate that Izzy at any time considered herself a victim of abuse and wished to seek support.

If the most important indicator of domestic abuse is a history of domestic abuse, then the most significant gap in this case could be the lack of knowledge of the perpetrator's previous ten-year history of abuse of a partner. However, there was information from family members that Izzy knew about the allegations from Colin's previous partner, and her account of this to her mother indicated that he minimised and blamed the victim, and that Izzy had believed his account. These allegations were reviewed by MARAC in Kirklees in June 2014, and indicated that he was controlling, and would use threats and physical violence when a partner stood up to him. However, as the MARAC is a victim-focussed process, there was no facility for this information to be passed to Bradford.

There were potential missed opportunities. During the Section 47 investigation, the social worker failed to interview Izzy. The PPU offender manager planned, but did not, speak to Izzy about her intentions in the relationship, when Colin was released on bail. There is no evidence to suggest that Izzy would have disclosed abuse had either of these conversations taken place; but given the indications that her mood changed at that time, we cannot say this would not have been an opportunity.

The Panel discussed resources in relation to whether these had impacted on services' engagement with Izzy. Whilst it is clear that thresholds for engagement have adapted to reducing resources, and the rate of domestic abuse incidents in the Bradford area has increased by fifty percent in the past five years, Panel members do not find evidence that any decisions in this case were influenced by resource constraints.

22. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The themes that have emerged from this Review have been cross-referenced with the literature. Whilst a significant body of literature and research exists, this section seeks only to highlight in brief, relevant findings which can offer an understanding of the pattern of abuse in this particular case.

22.1 The Power and Control Wheel developed by the Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project [21] offers an understanding of the pattern of power and control in this relationship:

- *Using children*: the perpetrator exerted control over contact between Izzy and her children; he disrupted visitation by texting and remaining close by; was instrumental in the separation from her son and her daughter, and potentially controlled Izzy's aspirations for regaining contact with her daughter, through his illicit drug use.
- *Minimizing, denying and blaming*: a long history of abusing his ex-partner was minimized and blamed on her; following the homicide, he alleged that Izzy contributed to his state of mind by having an affair where there is no evidence whatever to support this.
- *Economic*: Izzy's salary financed his lifestyle whilst he was habitually unemployed and buying illicit drugs. Izzy sold her household possessions and personal items, even her daughter's tablet, to pay for day to day living expenses. Despite earning a good salary, she was in debt and had no money.
- *Male privilege*: Izzy worked, while he enjoyed a lifestyle financed and supported by her.
- *Coercion*: he made her do illegal acts; he placed her in a position where she must choose between her children and him; he caused her to neglect her child to prove she believed him.
- *Intimidation*: stalking, keeping Izzy under surveillance throughout the day at work including when she was working off-site, while she had contact visits with her daughter, and at home by isolating her from her friends and family.
- *Emotional abuse*: Izzy's access to, and care of, her children, was manipulated by the perpetrator's behaviour so that she could not achieve her aim of a family life, which was a source of emotional stress for her. His vulnerabilities dominated her emotional life.
- *Isolation*: Izzy was isolated from family members who disapproved of her partner, and there is no evidence that she continued any friendships during their relationships, other than her contact with colleagues. The homicide appears to have been triggered when he believed she was in contact with, and influenced by, others.

[21] www.theduluthmodel.org

22.2 The focus of this Review has been on Izzy and her experience, and the reviewers have not explored the perpetrator's background in detail, although his voice has been more in evidence – through the records of his offending, offender management and substance abuse – than Izzy's voice. This has led to a recognition that the perpetrator evidenced skills and behavioural deficits that are common in perpetrators of coercive control: chronic drug and alcohol use; poor conflict resolution skills evident in his response to challenge[22]; and, in relation to his final, lethal act, stalking, escalation of his drug taking and offending behaviours, and extreme jealousy.[23] Committing anonymous acts, such as damaging Izzy's car and her husband's home, and stalking, are further indicators of coercive controlling behaviour.[24]

22.3 Stark[25] defines coercive control as 'a strategic course of self-interested behaviour designed to… [establish] a regime of domination in personal life'. To achieve this oppression is ongoing rather than episodic and results in subordination/ subjugation of a victim that can be termed *entrapment*. Stark's description of the tactics of coercive control: isolation, domination of emotional life, degradation, exploitation, regulation, surveillance, are all features of hostage taking, and resonate with this DHR.

22.4 The trigger for fatal domestic abuse is often the threat of separation[26] which may have been the perpetrator's interpretation of Izzy's letter. Being on bail to reside at his parents' address, although spending much of his time at Izzy's house, could have represented a partial separation and a further threat to his domination of the household, in addition to his extreme jealousy. Research indicates that pregnancy increases the risk of homicide significantly and is the leading cause of maternal mortality.[27]

22.5 On the basis of *Interviews with Victims,* Monckton Smith *et al*[28] describe control in an abusive relationship as a process; it is practised over time to gain the victim's trust, instilled through 'seemingly innocuous behaviours, or through stated vulnerability'. Slowly isolating the victim from friends and family, making it difficult for her to maintain contact, isolating her from their influence and a source of help. Reflecting the frustration of parents who can do nothing to influence a daughter living with a controlling man who has isolated her, the author

[22] Tolman and Bennett, A Review of the Quantitative Research on Men who Batter, 1990
[23] Dobash *et al*, Homicide in Britain, 2002
[24] Evan Stark, Coercive Control in Violence against Women, in Violence Against Women, 2013
[25] *ibid*
[26] Stark, Coercive Control: The Entrapment of Women in Everyday Life, 2007
[27] Campbel *et al,* 2007, quoted in Domestic Abuse, Homicide and Gender, Monckton Smith *et al,* 2014
[28] *ibid*

points out that where isolation from family has occurred, there is very often control: 'If family are worried they should be taken seriously'.

23. OBSERVATIONS FROM FAMILY

The draft Report was shared with family members who then met with the Overview Panel. A number of their concerns detailed in this Report were discussed and clarified, in addition to which family members made the following observations:

- When Izzy's father attended the police station to seek disclosure he was not adequately advised. This visit was not recorded or passed to the right department.

The WYP has accepted that Izzy's father should have been given information about the correct procedure and advised that as Izzy was an adult this information could not be disclosed. His request should have been recorded. Whilst practice has changed in the past five years, and WYP believes desk staff are now trained and up to date, staff will be reminded of the proper process.

- The family finds it difficult to understand how Colin would have been bailed in November 2016, given the clear information about his risks.

Colin was not, at the time of the bail decision, seen as a risk to Izzy. He was managed as high risk by the PPU, even though his sex offence was historical, and this was good risk assessment practice. There was no history of a risk to children, until he allegedly assaulted Izzy's daughter. The information before the Court indicated that the child was being safeguarded by her father, and that his risk to her and other children could be managed by residence at his parents, and by reporting conditions. Risks to Izzy were not known and were not before the Court.

The discussion concluded that there may be insufficient attention paid by practitioners to multi-dimensional risk assessment. The risks presented by this perpetrator are of violence, sex offending, and domestic abuse, and these were managed as specific risks towards specific target groups. Taken together, in retrospect, the information available to the Review indicates that he presents a very high risk of violent and sex offending generically, not only to a specific group he has targeted in the past.

- Family felt that CSC had been hostile towards Izzy, and not supportive of her in her attempts to have contact with her daughter.

It was accepted by CSC that, during the Section 47 process in 2016, the social worker did not interview Izzy, and this was a missed opportunity. Parents who do not have care of the children can be missed in the safeguarding process, and important learning for CSC from Izzy's case, is to ensure that absent parents are included.

Practitioners should also consider how parents who appear not to understand or accept the risks that a partner presents to their children, and who appear to be neglectful and unable to safeguard the children, may be acting under the coercive control of that partner.

- What can parents do?

The family challenged the Panel members to consider how they would respond if an adult child was being abused. For the family, the statement in the Report which stood out as most meaningful to them, is in Section 22 above:

> *Reflecting the frustration of parents who can do nothing to influence a daughter living with a controlling man who has isolated her, the author points out that where isolation from family has occurred, there is very often control: '**If family are worried they should be taken seriously'.***
>
> (Monckton-Smith in *Interviews with Victims*)

This discussion highlighted that there is much to be improved about the information available on the internet to assist parents to support their children, including helping them to understand why their child might be isolated by a controlling partner, and to enable them to respond.

As a result of these discussions, actions were agreed with family and are included in the Recommendations below.

24. RECOMMENDATIONS

24.1 Local Agency Recommendations

The following recommendations arise from the investigations of the IMR authors and have been agreed by the Overview Panel as reflecting lessons learned for each agency.

WYP 1.	Communicate to staff the importance of linking RSO nominals involved in an occurrence to the occurrence to ensure notification of the report to ViSor staff and via them to PPUs/ PPOs.
WYP 2.	Review the need for whether additional training in domestic abuse, particularly the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, including Clare's Law, and Coercion and Control, by officers working in offender management and child protection roles and if required, plan to deliver training.
WYP 3.	Re-circulate local policy on the tasking of breach of bail suspects and monitor its implementation in Bradford District.
BDCFT 4.	When there is an indication of risk for a child, BDCFT staff must engage with multi-agency services to gain clarity around this risk where possible. This will be implemented through safeguarding supervision, training and duty.
BDCFT 5.	The recognition of the key learning from this DHR for BDCFT staff includes: 1) Risks to adolescents & boys to be given the same consideration & responses as those risks to younger children & girls 2) That staff professional curiosity is extended to adolescents including boys ensuring that they're given the same safeguarding responses to younger children & girls.
BRIDGE 6.	Improve referral processes to ensure a consistent standard of risk information is provided by agencies transferring care packages in to the Project, as well as agencies referring to the Project.
BRIDGE 7.	Record all contact with family members and friends of service users in the service user record (as suppressed third party contact) irrespective of the type of contact and presence of the service user. The rationale for this contact should be recorded along with the interventions provided and whether the service user was present or aware of the contact.
CSC	The learning from this DHR will be used as an anonymized example in

8.	training and supervision to highlight the importance of addressing domestic violence with parents who don't have full time care of their child/children.
CSC 9.	Child and Family assessments will consider past and present domestic abuse of all adults in past and present relationships as well as the current conflict and how this may impact on the child. This will include consideration of the environment that the child lives in and visits regardless of whether the perpetrator is there to identify the impact on the quality of the child's contact with a parent.
CSC 10.	Victims of domestic abuse, or where domestic abuse is considered to be a possibility, will be given the opportunity to speak to professionals alone and in a safe space.
CCG/GP 11.	All GP practices will have a current Domestic Violence Policy which includes reference to how staff will be supported if they are experiencing domestic abuse.

24.2 Panel Recommendations

The following recommendations reflect the overall themes and lessons learned that have emerged from this DHR:

Recommendation 12: Disseminating the learning from this Review

The learning from this DHR is to be disseminated across all relevant staff groups in order that individual practitioners and managers can develop awareness and knowledge of coercive control and apply the lessons learned from this process.

ACTION: ALL AGENCIES AND THE BRIDGE PROJECT

Recommendation 13: Employers learning from this Review

Partnership agencies as employers can learn from this DHR to develop processes to support staff experiencing domestic abuse, and it is recommended that the agencies in the Community Safety Partnership consider examples such as: developing return to work interviews to include asking a routine enquiry about domestic abuse; and when any information indicates that a member of staff is experiencing domestic abuse, to be able to

signpost staff to resources for their assistance, counselling or action to keep them safe; and to offer support for work-related issues to enable an employee to return to work and/or prevent further absence occurring.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Recommendation 14: Improved DHR processes

This DHR was delayed in part in order to achieve meaningful engagement with the family but also because there were examples of IMRs that were of insufficient quality. Conversely this allowed the IMR author group to work together to identify lessons learned in a way that was helpful to this process.

The Panel therefore recommends that Bradford CSP develops its DHR process to enable the Independent Chair and Domestic Abuse Team to deliver a briefing to IMR authors before preparing IMRs, and a Lessons Learned workshop after completion of IMRs, with the aim of improving the cross-agency analysis.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (DSV TEAM)

Recommendation 15: Sharing MARAC information

Whilst recognising that MARAC is a victim-centred process, this Review identified that sharing information about the perpetrator could have resulted in a Clare's Law disclosure at an earlier point in time. Therefore, the Local Authority Domestic Abuse Team will work across West Yorkshire, and share this lesson learned nationally, with Safe Lives, to look for ways in which information can be shared.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (DSV TEAM)

Recommendation 16: Engaging with the judiciary

As part of its dissemination of the learning of this and other DHRs, the Overview Panel will engage with the judiciary, to seek ways in which information about offender risk can be shared and challenged, to inform bail or other hearings. This will be an opportunity to discuss with the judiciary and legal representatives, the development of domestic abuse legislation, policy and practice.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (DSV TEAM)

Recommendation 17: Young people growing up in abusive households:

This DHR was concerned about the 'invisibility' to services, of young people in transition from childhood to adulthood, particularly boys, living in abusive households, and the potential impact of this lack of recognition of the need for support, on future adults. This was emphasised through the voice of Izzy's son.

The CSP will therefore seek assurance that the voice of older young people in households where there is domestic abuse, is not ignored. Further, that service providers consider developing specific pathways for additional age-appropriate support.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (DSV Team, LSCB and SAB)

Recommendation 18: Multi-dimensional risk assessment

This recommendation emerged from discussions with family:

When assessing risk, it is important to take a multi-dimensional view of risks posed by individuals. The questions in the DASH template are multi-dimensional and can be used to encourage practitioners to think laterally about risk.

This learning is to be promulgated across agencies through debriefing from this Review.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Recommendation 19: Information for parents concerned about their children:

This recommendation emerged from discussions with family:

The Domestic Abuse Team will review the CBMBC website and improve information, to include guidance on the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, and advice for family members who feel isolated and unable to offer a source of support to a child.

ACTION: COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (DSV TEAM)

23.3 Recommendations of national relevance

Izzy's family wants to see greater public awareness of how abusers use isolation as part of a pattern of control. They want families to understand that if a daughter or other family

member is withdrawing from them, or behaving out of character, they may be acting under coercion, and families in this situation need information and advice to help them find ways of maintaining contact and offering a source of support. Above all, they want families who are worried, to be taken seriously by professionals.

The Review noted that 'grooming' some family members whilst isolating Izzy from those who disapproved of him, was a feature of this case. In safeguarding, grooming is recognised as a precursor to exploitation, and members of the public have, through safeguarding, gained an understanding of the term. The Panel believes it would help the public to develop awareness of coercive control, if this terminology was reflected in national discussions of domestic abuse.

Overall, this Review highlights the need to continue to raise public awareness of coercive control, with the aim of individuals recognising when they are in a relationship that is abusive, or where family or friends may be in that situation. Recent DHRs in this area reinforce that this remains an issue of national relevance.