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INTRODUCTION

1. This report of a domestic homicide review examines agency responses and support given to Georgia (not her real name), a resident of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) prior to the discovery of her death in Devon in January 2017.

2. In addition to agency involvement the review will also examine the past to identify any relevant background or trail of abuse before the homicide, whether support was accessed within the community and whether there were any barriers to accessing support. By taking a holistic approach the review seeks to identify appropriate solutions to make the future safer.

3. One morning early in January 2017, police broke in to a farm in Devon where they discovered the body of Georgia, aged 52 in bed with severe head injuries. A search of the outbuildings found Larry (not his real name), aged 62 hanging by the neck. Devon and Cornwall police had been alerted by Larry’s sister and brother in law who had, that morning, received a letter from Larry that clearly stated that he and Georgia will be found dead.

4. At the subsequent dual Inquest hearing in August 2017, the Coroner pronounced that Georgia had been murdered by Larry, who then committed suicide. She also ruled out the possibility of third party involvement.

5. The review will consider agencies contact/involvement with Georgia and Larry from January 2012 to the day of the homicide in January 2017. Any relevant fact from their earlier life will be included in background information.

6. The key purpose for undertaking Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR) is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides where a person is killed because of domestic violence and abuse. 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 to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future.

7. One of the operating principles for the review has been to be guided by humanity, compassion and empathy, with Georgia’s ‘voice’ at the heart of the process.

TIMESCALES

8. The review began with a Panel meeting on 26 July 2017 when Terms of Reference were agreed, and Chronology reports commissioned from all identifiable public and voluntary bodies that may have had contact with Georgia or Larry. At the second meeting on 5 September, an Integrated Chronology was reviewed, and it was agreed that the absence of relevant contact with either Georgia or Larry from any source meant there would be no further information to be gained from Individual Management Reviews (IMR).
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9. Following the Inquest on 25 August, it was apparent that the only source of insight on what had happened, and why, lay with family and friends and that line has been pursued by the Chair. An initial draft overview of the facts was considered by the Panel on 19 October when eight questions identified by the Chair were debated and it was agreed that further efforts should be made to secure evidence of an Asperger Syndrome Assessment of Larry which was done and considered and debated with a second draft overview on 4 December and a third on 29 January 2018. After a meeting in February and additional consultation with interested parties, the final version was discussed in April and presented to the Safer Kensington and Chelsea Partnership Board at the first available opportunity on 19 July 2018.

CONFIDENTIALITY

10. The chronologies are confidential. Information is available only to participating officers/professionals and their line managers.

11. For ease of reference, all terms suitable for acronym will appear once in full and there is also a glossary at the end of the report. The deceased will be referred to herein as ‘Georgia’, a pseudonym chosen by her sister. The perpetrator will be referred to as Larry, also a pseudonym, nominated by his close friend. Family and friends that feature in the review have been allocated initial letters that are included in the glossary for reference.

12. The Government Protective Marking Scheme (GPMS) was adopted throughout with a rating of ‘Official-Sensitive’ for shared material. Either secure networks were in place (gsi, pnn) and adopted (cjsm) or papers shared with password protection. An integrated chronology was provided to all Panel members for review and discussion.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

13. Following discussion of a draft in the first Panel meeting, Terms of Reference (ToR) were issued on the same day (appendix 1) with a chronology template for completion by agencies reporting contact with Georgia and Larry. The ToR were shared with both families and suggestions to add or amend invited without any offered.

METHODOLOGY

14. Under s9 Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004, a Domestic Violence Homicide Review (DVHR) was commissioned by the Safer Kensington and Chelsea Partnership and, on 19 June 2017, Bill Griffiths CBE BEM QPM was appointed Independent Chair of the DVHR Panel. Tony Hester supported him throughout in the role of Secretary to the Panel.

15. A review report would normally consist of an anthology of information and facts from the organisations represented on the Panel, most of which were potential support agencies for both Georgia and Larry but, in this case, the only sources of information derive from the police investigation and Inquest into the deaths, or from family and friends. The table below summarises all contact with public bodies from January 2012 to 2017. Anything of
relevance prior to that period was asked for but nothing was reported. No trace of either Georgia or Larry was discovered by local voluntary services in London and Devon.

16. Table 1 – Agencies and records of relevant contact in the order that it occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact period</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Summary of contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/12 to 02/16</td>
<td>A General Medical Practice in RBKC and another Practice in Devon</td>
<td>Provided GP services to Larry. Nothing of relevance noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td>Larry reported the theft of house keys from his car parked outside his home overnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/17</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Police</td>
<td>Georgia and Larry were found deceased following the letter he sent to relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14 to 06/16</td>
<td>A GP Practice in LB Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Provided GP services to Georgia. Nothing of relevance noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15</td>
<td>A West London Healthcare NHS Trust</td>
<td>Treated Georgia at an Eye Hospital Emergency Department for removal of a contact lens that had been stuck overnight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. This review was commissioned under Home Office Guidance issued in December 2016. Close attention was paid to the cross-government definition of domestic violence and abuse and is included in the Terms of Reference (appendix 1). The following policies and initiatives have also been scrutinised and considered:

- HM Government strategy for Ending Violence against Women and Girls 2016-2020
- Domestic Homicide Reviews: Key Findings from analysis of domestic homicide reviews published by Home Office December 2016
- MPS Domestic Violence Investigation and Supervisors Toolkit issued in July 2013
- London multi-agency safeguarding adults policies and procedures 2015
- HMIC (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary) Reports: ‘Everyone's business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse’ 2014 and ‘The Metropolitan Police Service’s approach to tackling domestic abuse’ 2014
- Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Council website: ‘Domestic Abuse and Violence Against Women and Girls’
Safer Kensington and Chelsea Partnership
Domestic Homicide Review Panel
Georgia, murdered by Larry, and both found dead in January 2017

https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/lscb/information-professionals-and-volunteers/violence-against-women-vawg

- Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy 2015, Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, Westminster
- ‘What were they thinking? Men who murder an Intimate Partner’, Dobash and Dobash 2011
- ‘The Homicide Triad’, Monckton Smith 2017
- Economic Abuse as an Invisible Form of Domestic Violence: A Multicountry Review, Sharp-Jeffs and others 2018

18. In addition, the Chair was provided with access to two prior DHR reports in the RBKC, one published and the other in progress, and there are no similarities or parallel lessons to be reviewed.

IN Volvement of Family, Friends, Work Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community

19. With the assistance of the police family liaison officer, initial contact from the Chair was made with Georgia’s father whist on holiday in France and he provided further information at the Inquest. Georgia’s sister and confidante, GH, who works in Geneva and lives in France, has provided further insight to her life, including a timeline for the recent years. She was given the opportunity to comment on the second draft overview report in November 2017 and her feedback has been integrated. She also was given a copy of the sixth version for comment on behalf of their family. GH has provided the pseudonym ‘Georgia’ for the redacted report.

20. For Larry, his brother-in-law, ST, has provided the family perspective in a meeting with the Chair, however, as a family they did not desire further engagement with the process. In April 2018, an update on the process was sought and the opportunity taken to check the accuracy of the facts section with ST. Larry’s oldest friend and Best Man at the wedding, JK, has shared his knowledge of Larry, Georgia and their marriage. JK received a verbal briefing on the second draft of this overview report and was able to correct some minor factual discrepancies. He also participated in a telephone check of the content of the sixth version in April and confirmed that he is content for the reference in paragraph 133 to his message to the Chair. He has nominated the pseudonym ‘Larry’ for his friend.

21. This was an unimaginned and appalling tragedy for Georgia’s family, and the Panel offer their heartfelt condolences upon their loss. For the family of the perpetrator, news of Larry’s actions must have been profoundly shocking, as well as inexplicable, and they also have endured loss, for which deepest sympathy is also offered.
CONTRIBUTORS TO THE REVIEW

22. As summarised in Table 1 above, chronology reports were provided by the Metropolitan Police, the Medical Centre where Georgia was registered for General Practice, the Healthcare NHS Trust where she received emergency treatment and the Surgery (also the Devon GP Practice) where Larry was registered. The Investigating Officer has provided relevant additional material.

23. Records have been searched by all possible statutory and voluntary services in Kensington and Chelsea, and Devon, without trace of either Georgia or Larry, other than listed above. Georgia’s sister was able to retrieve emails with Georgia in 2012 that gave access to a private consultancy that had conducted an Adult Asperger Assessment for Larry, and this was provided to the Chair and shared with the Panel as well as a Consultant Clinical Psychologist for an opinion. Latterly, expert advice on stalking (with connections to the housing sales sector) and economic abuse was also sought.

THE REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS

24. Table 2 – Review Panel Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shabana Kausar</td>
<td>RBKC Strategic Lead for Violence Against Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wynne</td>
<td>Safeguarding Adults Coordinator RBKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Knights</td>
<td>Central &amp; North West London NHS Foundation Trust (providing mental health services), Associate Director of Quality, Safety and Safeguarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Larkin</td>
<td>Central &amp; West London, Hammersmith &amp; Fulham (H&amp;F), Hounslow, Ealing CCG, Assistant Director Safeguarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Gibson</td>
<td>Head of Public Health Commissioning NHS England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Ashton</td>
<td>Public Health Westminster City Council (WCC), RBKC and H&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene McFarlane</td>
<td>Women and Domestic Abuse Lead, CGL The Alcohol Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LaToya Ridge  | Victim Support London, Senior Operations Manager
---|---
Gemma Snowball  | Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse RBKC MARAC Coordinator
Raffaele D’Orsi  | MPS RBKC Borough Police Commander
Ben Voss  | MPS Specialist Crime Review Group
Bill Griffiths  | Independent Chair and Author of Overview Report
Tony Hester  | Independent Administrator and Panel Secretary
Dr Scott Galloway  | Consultant Clinical Psychologist CNWLT (did not attend but provided specialist advice)
Suky Bhaker  | Head of Policy Development, Suzy Lamplugh Trust (did not attend but provided specialist advice)
Nicole Sharp-Jeffs  | Founder and Director Surviving Economic Abuse (did not attend but provided specialist advice)

**AUTHOR OF THE OVERVIEW REPORT**

25. Set out in appendix 2 are the respective background and ‘independence statements’ for Bill Griffiths as Chair and author and Tony Hester who managed the review process and liaison with the CSP and Panel.

**PARALLEL REVIEWS**

26. The Chair set up liaison with the Case Officer and the Coroner. An Inquest into both deaths was concluded in August 2017, the Chair attended as an ‘Interested Party’ and was provided with a copy of the disclosed Inquest documents. There will be no criminal or misconduct proceedings arising from the deaths of Georgia and Larry.
27. Consideration has been given to the nine protected characteristics under the Equality Act in evaluating the various services provided. Georgia was female, the review has identified a pattern of abuse connected with her socio-economic status in the relationship, and she was an older woman. The panel has considered these intersecting issues in its approach.

28. In respect of Larry, the review has established that he was assessed in October 2012 with Asperger Syndrome (AS) which is a disability specified by the Equality Act. So far as can be ascertained, Larry’s AS diagnosis was not known to anyone outside the family circle.

29. As will be apparent from Table 2 and the paucity of contact with Georgia and Larry, there is no evidence from this review of differential service from any statutory or voluntary body for either deceased.

DISSEMINATION

30. The intended recipients of copies of this report, once approved by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel, are listed at the end of the review after the glossary.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This summary outlines the process taken by the Community Safety Partnership Domestic Violence Homicide Review Panel established on 19 June 2017 under s9 Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004 by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC), independently chaired by Bill Griffiths CBE BEM QPM, to review the murder in Devon of ‘Georgia’ (not her real name) aged 52, caused by multiple head wounds in early January 2017, that had been inflicted by her husband of 24 years, ‘Larry’ (not his real name) aged 62, who then committed suicide by hanging.

The process began with a meeting on 26 July 2017 of all agencies that potentially had contact with those involved prior to the deaths of Georgia and Larry. Agencies participating in the review were:

- RBKC Violence Against Women and Girls and Adult Safeguarding Leads
- Central & North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWLT) – mental health services
- Central & West London, Hammersmith & Fulham (H&F), Hounslow, Ealing CCG
- Public Health Westminster City Council (WCC), RBKC and H&F and Public Health Commissioning NHS England
- Women and Domestic Abuse Lead, CGL The Alcohol Service
- Victim Support London
- Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse RBKC
- Metropolitan Police RBKC Borough and Specialist Crime Review Group

Contributions and specialist advice to the Panel were also received from:

- Devon and Cornwall Police (homicide/suicide investigation in Devon)
- Consultant Clinical Psychologist CNWLT
- Suzy Lamplugh Trust
- Surviving Economic Abuse

Agencies and local voluntary organisations in London and Devon were asked to give chronological accounts of their contact with the victim and perpetrator prior to their deaths. There were no reports or records that had any relevance or connection to what happened.

The only sources of information were from the police investigation and Inquest and from family and friends, notably GH the younger sister and confidante of Georgia and JK, a long-standing friend and confidante of Larry. Each has contributed their knowledge and experiences of the relationship between Georgia and Larry to iterations of the main overview report. They respectively nominated the pseudonyms used. The Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) Panel has offered condolences and sympathy to the families of both deceased.

The process ended when the Safer Kensington and Chelsea Partnership approved a final version of the review report at a meeting on 19 July 2018.
Background information (The Facts)

Georgia was born in Zimbabwe and was privately educated in the UK. She worked in the hotel industry in a Gulf State and then for a national charity in the UK. Larry was born in Uruguay and was also privately educated and attended university in the UK. He inherited substantial wealth and was a successful stockbroker. They met when Georgia responded to an advertisement from Larry to let rooms in his West London home. This led to a relationship and they married in 1991 when she was aged 27 and he 37.

Within a year, Larry was able to retire and, after a few years living in France, they set up home in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea that was owned as joint tenants. In 1998 they acquired a farmhouse with 80 acres in Devon, also as joint tenants, that became their second home and the scene of the terrible events over New Year 2017. Along with a property portfolio, Larry benefitted from an overseas Discretionary Trust from which he received capital payments for various projects. From 2002 to 2009 he was under investigation by Inland Revenue for alleged tax evasion concluding with payment of tax and a fine.

The relevance is that, possibly because of this lengthy investigation, Larry became over-concerned with money matters and this dominated his life. He confided in his friend, JK, and to a lawyer he was briefing in 2016 to represent him in a proposed divorce process, that the impact of the tax inquiry on him, took a toll on his relationship with Georgia. She did not work, and Larry had allocated her a “small” monthly allowance to a joint account for her to run the households, whilst he also paid for her holidays, hobbies and training courses. The Panel considered that, while the amounts may have been sufficient, Georgia did not appear to have any input or control in that decision making with a potential latent feeling that she should be grateful for his generosity. Larry had created a model of financial control.

There were no children from the relationship but there was an issue between them over a termination of pregnancy. The relevance to the review of this, and a second pregnancy (lost by a miscarriage) later in the marriage, has been carefully assessed by the Panel and included here because of its significance in the relationship and to understand subsequent events in the weeks prior to the homicide, including that Larry made use of this, by then quite historical, information to discredit Georgia with others. There is substantive evidence of long term subordination of Georgia in the marriage.

As a couple, they slept in the same bed but generally did not eat together, nor were any of their interests and pursuits shared. To observers, they seemed content in each other’s company while living separate, yet unfulfilled, lives. JK has described them as both “buttoned up” with an inability to communicate effectively with each other.

In the last three to five years before her death, GH noticed that Georgia had decided to take control of her life, and she was working towards a divorce. Believing that she would have to fend for herself, she started courses that would give her qualifications for employment. She had

---

1 Meaning if one partner dies, the other automatically becomes the sole owner of the home
2 As described by Larry in the ‘You and Me’ note dated 12/16
refreshed her cooking skills to cordon bleu standard and embarked on a Pitman’s course for secretarial work.

Evidence recovered from her computer shows in late 2013 that Georgia had conducted some analysis of her situation more than 20 years into the marriage, including that she had been “incredibly isolated” and had lost sense of her identity. To a woman she met on a walking tour in early 2016, she disclosed that she and Larry lived separate lives, that she could not turn to family as there were all abroad and she had no friends because he had “seen them all off”. The impression gained was of an abusive and bullying relationship.

In March 2016, Larry put the Devon farmhouse on the market and accepted an offer in July. There were complications and delays to the point when the sale could not be completed as hoped by Christmas but would proceed in January 2017. The sale process provided has provided the Panel with a window on the nature of their relationship. Georgia was interested in the Devon home as a potential catering business but was also suspicious of Larry’s approach to the sale to the extent that she believed he might forge her signature on documents. She arranged for direct communication with the estate agent. Larry expressed to anyone he encountered his frustration with what he perceived to be Georgia’s indecision.

Georgia’s computer records for October 2016 show clearly that she had actually seized the initiative by informing Larry that she wanted a divorce. This had provoked a strong adverse reaction from him, including threats that he would sell his share of the farmhouse, would close her bank account and cut her off financially. Over the next few days, he applied pressure to sign documents connected to the house sale and repeated the threats to leave her with a financial burden. Georgia’s note from early November lists an agenda for discussion of issues with Larry together with her strategy for calming his anticipated emotional responses.

Emotional reactions from Larry were observed by those that had contact with him over the next few weeks as he set out on a ‘campaign’ to avoid the prospect of divorce. For example, in the course of several emotional conversations with the estate agents for the sale, this included Larry’s palpable anger that Georgia’s family could benefit from the divorce and he accused her father of being a “financial waster”. He also inappropriately disclosed details of the lost pregnancies and his regret that he had put the property in joint names.

In December, Larry changed his ‘Last Will and Testament’ to exclude Georgia who had been the sole beneficiary and instead leave his Estate to his sister and three national charities. In his instructions to solicitors for the divorce, five financial concerns were noted, including the fact that he had attempted and failed to close their joint bank account, the source of Georgia’s allowance.

Over Christmas, Georgia spent a week as planned with her parents in Ireland, while Larry stayed with his sister and brother-in-law. They then spent two days together at their London home before driving to the Devon farmhouse for the New Year. Larry generated a note on his computer, ‘You and Me’, the significance of which is that he left a copy to be found with a folder of instructions after the murder and suicide. It amounts to a plea to Georgia to reconsider her decision to divorce him and provides some options for an amicable way forward. It also contains an admonishment for not properly investing a lump sum that he had given her some years earlier.
Georgia had converted this note to a Word document on her computer and inserted her responses and comments. While it cannot be ascertained if this document was in fact discussed, it is apparent from what is written that Georgia had resolved to bring the divorce to reality.

The police hypothesis for the fatal incident is that Georgia and Larry watched some television and consumed a half bottle of champagne over the New Year (Georgia sent a text message to GH at 23:50) and Georgia retired to bed. At some point in the early hours Larry attacked her from behind as she slept, with multiple blows from a metal object that caused her death. He then changed his clothing and deposited the soiled items and the weapon in the dustbin at the lane leading to the farmhouse.

At the same time and location, he posted a ‘suicide note’ to his sister. The note reveals a plan to kill Georgia and contains considerable vitriol directed at Georgia’s father. Larry subsequently took his own life by hanging within the barn situated on the property. Police were alerted to the crime scene when the note was received. The Devon Coroner has determined that Larry murdered Georgia before committing suicide. There is no evidence of third-party involvement.

Conclusions from the review

This review has identified all public bodies such as health that had anything to do with either Georgia or Larry at both their London and Devon homes. Nothing of note has been discovered. Nonetheless, the circumstances revealed in this review reinforce the need for professional practice such as routine inquiry to be considered even when the domestic situation seems stable and outwardly healthy. The only sources of information about what was going on latterly in their lives derive from the police investigation on behalf of the Coroner and friends and family, notably GH with respect to Georgia and JK on behalf of Larry.

Acting as Georgia’s prime source of support and encouragement, GH’s perspective is that, in the last 3-5 years of her life, she was trying to turn her life around. Georgia’s draft notes to her family in late 2013 are indicative of someone conducting analysis of her life and recording the issues she wished to assert in challenging their treatment of her. Georgia had also endured a substantial trail of controlling and coercive economic abuse imposed by Larry that had become more pronounced in the context of the sale of their Devon home.

George had been contemplating divorce for some time and, as verified by notes from her computer, she eventually asked Larry for a divorce in October 2016. From this point, whilst finance was clearly a major factor for Larry and control and threats followed on this theme, he also openly expressed fear of being alone, displayed signs of denial and attempted to exert proxy control of Georgia through the available network of friends and family, as never before. With his disclosures to others, he seemed keen to convey and confirm that he was in command of the situation and would find a resolution. In reality, the fundamental control over Georgia’s life that Larry had created over decades of marriage was slipping from his grasp.

JK advanced the view that the homicide/suicide was perhaps the outcome of years of growing resentment and frustration at their inability to communicate openly and that there had been a ‘trigger’ event that had tipped Larry over the edge. This review has exposed a different reality.
What JK and others outside the relationship would not have easily ascertained or understood, is that Georgia, far from being the one to initiate or promote argument, was exhibiting mature and rational responses to Larry’s increasing emotion and irrationality. The evidence for this from her written records in October, and her draft responses in the ‘You and Me’ note, is overwhelming.

There is substantive research available that relationship-based homicides are rarely spontaneous and the “He just snapped” explanation which suggests an immediate proximal provocation is not supported. A more recent study into the coincidence of three groups of characteristics, namely, the offender’s emotional or psychological state, the presence of acknowledged high risk markers and the triggers which create escalation, prompts speculation that Larry was:

1. Psychologically obsessed with financial security and control of his assets
2. Increasingly exhibiting the high-risk marker of coercive control of Georgia’s life
3. Escalating his resolve to complete his ‘emotional journey to homicide’, triggered by perceived rejection through Georgia seeking the divorce

Further analysis of what might have contributed to Larry’s coercive and controlling acts or behaviours, each of which were his choice to impose upon Georgia and their relationship, has identified a combination of factors:

1. His lifelong focus on financial security which was clearly central to his life
2. A long-running history of antipathy and suspicion towards Georgia’s family
3. Him not wanting a divorce, with her firming up on the contrary, which left him nowhere to go
4. The threat of losing his ‘hard-earned assets’ to Georgia’s family, as embodied in the sale of the Devon home
5. Apparent regret that they did not have children and readiness to imply that Georgia was blameworthy for the two lost pregnancies, possibly due to the lack of an alternative heir (than Georgia and her family) to his fortune
6. His frustration (at one point witnessed as an ‘explosion’ of fury) with his perceived procrastination by Georgia over key decisions in relation to the house sale
7. All of which heads to a point of no return around Christmas and the New Year (often difficult and hopeful in equal measure) and a desire to punish Georgia and her family, perhaps the latter more than her

---

4 ‘The Homicide Triad’ Monckton Smith 2017
5 Webster dictionary: a persistent disturbing preoccupation with an, often unreasonable, idea or feeling; an idea or thought that continually preoccupies or intrudes on a person’s mind
6 Compiled with the assistance of the Consultant Clinical Psychologist
7 It is known that Georgia made her own decision in respect of one of them
Recommendations from the review

**Learning Point 1:** There is a need to improve the support for GPs to routinely ask about domestic abuse to elicit a disclosure to those experiencing domestic abuse.

**Recommendations**
- a. GPs to be trained on understanding the dynamics of domestic abuse and coercive control and the need for routine enquiry
- b. The Children and Health Operational Group to identify GP surgeries and to share domestic abuse best practice and learning
- c. VAWG Partnership to consider future commissioning of the IRIS model to embed learning with GPs

**Learning Point 2:** Professionals within the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors to be made aware of the potential harm of coercive and controlling behaviour and their role in supporting those affected as part of the Coordinated Community Response.

**Recommendations**
- a. Housing sales and legal conveyancing professionals to be trained on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of coercive control
- b. The Housing Operational Group to share domestic abuse best practice and learning with housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors
- c. Resources for estate agents on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of financial control i.e. through controlling house sales

**Learning Point 3:** Increase and embed an understanding of the wider definition of controlling and coercive behaviour and economic abuse amongst frontline professionals, including myths surrounding perpetrator behaviour.

**Recommendations**
- a. A learning event to be held for professionals that focuses on addresses the dynamics of domestic abuse, coercive control, economic abuse and how power works
- b. All agencies and frontline professionals should consider the use of a DASH risk assessment where domestic abuse is featured even if it appears at a low threshold level

**Learning Point 4:** As part of the wider Coordinated Community Response model, friends and family to be equipped to safely and appropriately support those affected by domestic abuse.

**Recommendations**
- a. Community Ambassadors to be recruited and trained as part of the ‘Ask Me’ project, building a local network that breaks the silence about domestic abuse
- b. The findings from this review to inform a local campaign to raise awareness of domestic abuse and to challenge the myth of who is a victim (i.e. women from affluent backgrounds) and who is a perpetrator
BACKGROUND INFORMATION (THE FACTS)

Georgia

31. Georgia is the eldest daughter of CD and EF, and she has two sisters and a brother who is the youngest sibling. Her family moved around through Mr CD’s work and Georgia was born in Zimbabwe in January 1964.

32. The family returned to the UK and lived in Surrey and Wiltshire. From there, Georgia was privately educated at a Convent School in Dorset. She left aged 16 and attended a nearby Technical College where she studied catering. She gained employment as a private chef and also undertook office work. When her father was in the Gulf States, she worked for about 18 months as a trainee at a hotel. In about 1989, shortly after her return to London, she gained employment with a National Charity. She also met Larry.

Larry

33. Larry is the youngest of three children with two older sisters. His family also travelled the world and he was born in February 1954 in Uruguay. He was schooled privately in the UK before University (major unknown). He entered the City of London financial investment industry working with leading firms handling private client portfolios.

Their relationship together

34. Georgia was living with her sister in London when working with a national charity and the lease on the flat expired, so she had to find somewhere to live. She followed an advertisement in a well-known publication and, along with another woman, became a tenant of Larry at his house in West London. This led to a dating relationship of about 18 months and Georgia and Larry married in 1991. She was 27, he 37. Within a year of marrying Georgia, Larry had sufficient investment income to retire from stockbroking and he purchased a fish farm and camping business in France. For the next 4-5 years they spent their time between France and England, but this was found to be a dull and lonely life, so they sold up and set up home in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea that was owned as joint tenants.\(^8\)

35. In 1998 they acquired a farm with 80 acres in Devon, also as joint tenants, that became their second home and the scene of the terrible events over New Year 2017. Larry also developed a portfolio of four rental properties that provided regular income.

36. Around this time, Larry inherited a large sum from his family. An overseas Discretionary Trust was set up from which he received capital payments for various projects. From about 2002 he was under investigation by Inland Revenue for alleged tax evasion. The inquiry took seven years until concluded in 2009 and Larry had to pay some tax and a fine at the

\(^8\) Meaning if one partner dies, the other automatically becomes the sole owner of the home
end. The relevance is that, possibly because of this lengthy investigation, Larry became over-concerned with money matters and this dominated his life.

37. To his friend JK, he described the tax inquiry as “paralysing his life” and he could not move on until it was sorted. It had caused tension between him and his sisters which he was “very sad about”. In his instructions to the lawyer he was briefing in 2016 to represent him in a proposed divorce process, Larry suggested that the impact of the tax inquiry on him, took a toll on his relationship with Georgia.

38. Despite having a net worth of many millions, including a sizable proportion in accessible cash, Larry was reluctant to spend money. The two houses were each in need of refurbishment and their living conditions have been described as “not extravagant”. Their clothes were well used and the tyres on Georgia’s car were worn to the point of illegality.

39. Georgia did not work, and Larry had allocated her a “small” monthly allowance to a joint account for her to run the households, whilst he also paid for her holidays, hobbies and training courses. The Panel considered that, while the amounts may have been sufficient, Georgia did not appear to have any input or control in that decision making with a potential latent feeling that she should be grateful for his generosity. Larry had created a model of financial control.

40. To provide some balance to that perspective on his personality, in 2013, Larry provided financial support to Georgia’s sister to help her through a difficult divorce from her husband. This loan was repaid by GH after the divorce was settled. In 2015, GH was evicted from the apartment she owned due to structural damage, which had been caused by one of her neighbours. Larry then came to her assistance by paying her rent on a property for a year whilst the damage to her home was made good.

41. According to Larry’s divorce instructions in December 2016, he paid Georgia a lump sum from the trust fund that was subject of the tax inquiry when it was finalised in 2013.

42. However, in the last known correspondence between them (the ‘You and Me’ note in appendix 3), both examples of Larry’s apparent generosity may in fact have been mechanisms of control, firstly, when he offered further financial support to GH as an incentive for Georgia to reconsider separation, secondly, when Georgia's management of the lump sum provided grounds for criticism, which was a way of undermining her self-esteem.

43. There were no children from the relationship but there was an issue between them over a termination of pregnancy. The relevance to the review of this, and a second pregnancy (lost by a miscarriage) later in the marriage, has been carefully assessed by the Panel and included here because of its significance in the relationship and to understand subsequent events in the weeks prior to the homicide, including that Larry made use of this, by then quite historical, information to discredit Georgia with others.

---

9 As described by Larry in the ‘You and Me’ note dated 12/16 (appendix 3)
44. JK, who was at school with Larry and the Best Man at the wedding to Georgia, describes a time early in the marriage when they came to dinner and seemed very happy together. In 2016, more than 20 years after the event, Larry disclosed to his friend that he wished he had used that occasion to announce that Georgia was pregnant because, if he had done so, Georgia may not have had the termination which JK understands had taken place without consulting Larry. He went on to conclude that his deepest regret in life was not having children and that he had always wanted them.

45. In another conversation in 2016, Larry told JK that Georgia had suggested they try for a child some years later, but he had said “No” because he was at the time so worried about the implications of the tax enquiry. Within his instructions when consulting a divorce solicitor was a reference to two pregnancy terminations. He also mentioned to the estate agents involved in the sale of the Farm, when reacting angrily to the delay in exchange of contracts, there had been two pregnancy terminations in the marriage. This was completely out of context with the subject of the telephone call and put in a different way than Georgia might have done. Being childless had surfaced as a source of his anger long after the opportunity for children had passed.

46. Georgia’s version of the termination of her first pregnancy, as disclosed to her sister, was that she decided to end the pregnancy because she was not ready for children; Larry was not “with her” in the true sense of being a united couple. When they discussed trying for a child (subsequently and in the period of the tax investigation), Larry said he did not want children while the investigation was ongoing. As a result, Georgia felt unfulfilled. She has written of experiencing negative reactions because she was childless, when a newly-born child was “thrust under her nose” at a family gathering. Georgia’s sister is aware from Georgia that there was a second pregnancy that ended with a miscarriage in 2009 when she was 40.

47. Georgia is described as quiet, reserved, and a very private person who would procrastinate in decision making. She was interested in alternative therapies, took courses in acupuncture, and travelled quite extensively in Eastern Europe and the Far East. She confided in her sister that she felt socially inept and unattractive.

48. In her funeral eulogy for Georgia, GH acknowledged that Georgia could, at times, come across as a “clumsy, prickly bunny”, but that was only a reflection of her internal fragility and lack of confidence. She was prone to being bullied. She had many wonderful qualities which people rarely got to see. She was a prolific perfectionist whether it was making a skirt, cooking a cake or just making her own space. She was a selfless carer and a good and patient listener who was never judgmental or opinionated.

49. Another perspective is provided by LM, her sister in law, who described in a witness statement for the police Coroner’s investigation, that Georgia was prone to erratic and unpredictable mood swings with one example provided of LM being attacked for no

---

10 When the second was, in fact, a miscarriage
11 As before
apparent reason and ordered out of the house by Georgia. LM may well have developed a
different understanding of her brother’s relationship with Georgia.

50. GH recalls that Georgia told her about this incident. It arose when LM arrived
unannounced at the London home and expected to be waited upon. This was “the last
straw” and Georgia had reacted to constantly being ignored and belittled (for example,
being referred to as “wifey”) by Larry’s family who had never taken her in as a member of
their family.

51. Another example relayed by Georgia to GH is that Larry’s mother apparently chose the
Devon house for him to purchase without reference to Georgia. If accurate and not due to
misunderstanding, these examples are indicative of the application of long term
subordination of Georgia in the marriage.

52. In the last three to five years before her death, GH noticed that Georgia had decided to take
control of her life, and she was working towards a divorce. Believing that she would have
to fend for herself, she started courses that would give her qualifications for employment.
She had refreshed her cooking skills to cordon bleu standard and embarked on a Pitman’s
course for secretarial work.

53. To GH, Larry seemed quite gregarious and able to speak confidently and knowledgeably on
subjects such as finance, politics and the Brexit issues. He was a qualified pilot that
regularly flew and a committed golfer. He indulged his interests in game shooting, painting,
photography, antique furniture restoration and art dealing.

54. GH is also aware from Georgia that, in October 2012, Larry underwent an Asperger
Syndrome Assessment. This was a private non-clinical assessment following Professor
Simon Baron-Cohen’s Adult Asperger Assessment (AAA) tool. Georgia was present and
interviewed by the assessor, but it is not known if this was for the all of the Assessment
process. Evidently, Larry had been reluctant to undertake the assessment but was then
pleasantly surprised by its positive aspects. The assessor’s report has been provided to
the Panel.

55. Two strong caveats on drawing inference from the assessment report are that, firstly, this
was not a full clinical diagnosis. Secondly, people assessed or diagnosed with AS are no
more associated with domestic abuse than any other section of society. The domestic
abuse of a fellow human being is a choice, not a condition.

56. With that overriding consideration, it nonetheless may be helpful to our understanding that,
according to Professor Baron Cohen, some of the shared features of autism are: A difficulty
in developing social relationships; a difficulty in communication; the presence of unusually
strong, narrow interests; and a strong adherence to routines.

57. Extracts from the assessment provide a small window on their relationship in 2012:

12 A form of autism
13 Professor Simon Baron-Cohen article, 17 April 2003 in The Guardian
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“In terms of emotional understanding, [Larry] feels that he is ‘pretty bad’ and is aware that he does not anticipate or understand [Georgia’s] needs. He has a tendency to need to be busy and used to eat his meal and leave the table, not being aware of the social element of sharing a meal. He can also walk quite quickly in front of [Georgia] when she would like to walk alongside him and hold his hand.

“[Larry] has a number of passing intense interests which are often around the idea of finding an interest that may be a business venture, such as upholstery and furniture restoration. He will research these topics in-depth until it becomes apparent that they are not viable and then he will move on. He has a long-standing interest and extensive knowledge of the stock market which he spends considerable time involved in on most days.

“[Larry] has a preference for his meals to be at certain times and has a schedule for his week ahead. [Georgia] says that he can get very agitated when something changes. Larry’s view is that ‘if you get used to something, why change it’. Once he has decided on a way to do something, he cannot be convinced that there may be another way. He tends to be very early for appointments.

“In social situations … [Georgia] has noticed that [Larry] has set scripts that he can use in social situations, which are often things that she has said and he is repeating almost word for word. She says that he can say inappropriate things, such as sharing some very personal information about himself and [Georgia] to an aunt at a wedding”.

58. The assessment report was reviewed by an independent Consultant Clinical Psychologist who has provided a professional expert opinion for this review:

“While it is a reasonable assessment with a standard screening tool, it lacks in-depth early history and evidence of personality assessment, either through more detailed interview or psychometric assessment. The risk with such an approach is that, by looking for AS, everything is seen through that lens and the assessment process supports that. This report paints a typical picture of a typical presentation. It concludes that, because of the process that was applied, [Larry] met the full diagnostic criteria for AS and should be referred for a clinical diagnosis should he require one”

59. There is universal shock and disbelief from his family and friends that Larry could be capable of the extreme violence that was, in the end, inflicted by him upon Georgia. If anything, he was known for conflict avoidance and taking the easier path to keep the peace. GH had never seen Larry lose his temper, however, Georgia did share with her in a telephone call one instance when Larry had threatened her with a knife, around the time when he wanted her to sign papers in connection with the house sale in October 2016. GH is confident that Georgia would have disclosed to her any other examples of physical violence. The knife threat may be an example of the mask slipping on the affable persona that Larry promulgated, and is part of a pattern of other coercive/controlling behaviours, for which there is evidence, around the same period in their relationship.
60. As a couple, they slept in the same bed\(^\text{14}\) but generally did not eat together, nor were any of their interests and pursuits shared. To observers, they seemed content in each other’s company while living separate, yet unfulfilled, lives. JK has described them as both “buttoned up” with an inability to communicate effectively with each other.

**The years leading up to the homicide**

61. Confirmation that Georgia was becoming more assertive in the last 3 – 5 years of her life has emerged from the police investigation. Three Word documents saved to Georgia’s computer between September and December 2013 indicate that she had assessed her current situation and was planning to challenge her own family.

62. These documents also provide insights into the relationship with her husband that might help understand what had happened and what may be learned. It is not known whether these documents were shared with the intended recipients or were part of a ‘downloading’ process that may have been identified through counselling that Georgia was receiving.

63. The first in time, saved as ‘Email to mum’, is addressed to family members and she complains that: “Over the last few years I have been ignored which is a type of bullying so here are my terms”. This is followed by a bullet point list of 19 behaviours (for example, “Told what to do either directly or indirectly”) that she will no longer accept or tolerate from anyone and a six-point list of her expectations (for example, “Respect”) in future.

64. Georgia’s second draft note, ‘I do not deserve to be criticised’, in which she appeals for support from her family, contains the following extracts that are highly relevant to our understanding of the challenges she was facing in living with Larry that also provides insightful learning to practitioners on what may be characterised as a stereotypical controlling relationship:

    Since [Larry’s] diagnosis a year ago\(^\text{15}\) it is only in the last few months that I have started to regain my sense [sic] confidence and start to take small steps at trying to rebuild some kind of life for myself
    I married [Larry] without knowing what I was getting into and without any support or guidance from friends. I had very little or no understanding of what [Larry] or his family expected of me
    Now, twenty years later and despite my best intentions it seems impossible to make any kind of relationship with [Larry] who seems unaware of his own needs never mind anyone else’s
    I am really struggling to come to terms with the idea that I will ultimately have to leave and what all this would mean for me in the medium and long term. I am also struggling with the fact that not only have I been incredibly isolated in the ‘relationship’, but that I have almost completely lost all sense of who I am and what I want for my life

---

\(^\text{14}\) There is also evidence that Larry had his own room
\(^\text{15}\) Thought to be a reference to the AS assessment in October 2012
65. ‘All family’ appears to be a synthesis of the earlier two documents and this extract conveys a strong sense of frustration, subordination, isolation and vulnerability in her situation:

So it goes on round and round in endless circles!! The result is nothing gets resolved and there is only more confusion and more hurt. Which then leads me to back off or stay away because this is the only way to feel safe

66. By the end of 2015, issues in the relationship were coming to a head, for example, Georgia sought advice from GH, who works in Geneva as a legal assistant, regarding whether she should sign documents relating to the transfer of their assets, including their two homes, to a Trust that Larry was pressurising her to complete in order to gain further financial control. Georgia sent GH copies to examine and the advice she followed was not to sign, because the transfer would have been to her financial disadvantage. This example provides potential learning from Georgia’s situation within the legal sector.

67. An email in mid-December to an old friend from her Gulf living days provides a useful insight to where Georgia feels she is in terms of changing her life:

It seems that the last twenty-four years have had a more profound effect on me emotionally than I had realised. Although my relationship has been over both emotionally and physically for a long time and we effectively live separate lives. I still have some way to go in rebuilding a new life for myself before making that final step. Having been in touch with lawyers earlier this year the plan is to put things in motion in the spring by which time I also hope to have a new job in place. It has been a huge challenge for me to turn my life around in the past 3 years

The build-up in 2016

February

68. One of Georgia’s interests was to attend guided walks and, on a Saturday in February, she embarked on a walking tour of Winchester. She engaged in conversation with a fellow walker she had not met before and, unsolicited, “opened up her heart” on her personal life. These are the salient points of the conversation:

- Georgia only referred to her husband as “he”
- They lived totally separate lives and did not even eat together at home
- She was attending an office skills course because she wanted to leave and would need money for rent
- She could not turn to family as they are all abroad
- Her husband had money but she had no idea about finances. She had an allowance and access to a joint bank account
- In 2015, he paid for her to go on holiday to China and she did not feel able to ask him for more money
- At one point, she said: “He is doing my head in”
- The impression gained was that Georgia was in an abusive or bullying relationship (her companion had relevant personal experience) and contact detail for a divorce lawyer in London was provided
69. Subsequently, the walking companions corresponded by email. A meeting in London for coffee in the summer was cancelled by Georgia and the relationship lapsed. This is important evidence from a random and independent source that opens up a window on Georgia’s sense of isolation, engineered by Larry that, in turn, created dependency and gave control to the partner in the relationship that required it.

March
70. The home in Devon had been marketed for sale without success in 2015. Larry told sister GH that he had turned down a large offer as it was not enough. In late February, it was placed with a different agent at a lower asking price and there were 40 viewings over the next 6 months, with an offer made but not accepted in March. Larry had met the new agent and had come across as “affable and educated”. His reason for selling the property was that all the ongoing maintenance was his responsibility and had become onerous. The home was jointly tenanted and he explained that his wife was focused on her work and had lost interest in the property. She would not be involved in the sale but would expect more money as the new valuation and asking price was lower than in 2015.

71. The only time the agent met Georgia was over Easter which was late in March. She appeared “diffident and slightly vulnerable”. At her request, it was agreed she would be copied in to emails regarding the sale. This and other contact the agents had with Georgia and Larry suggest there is learning for the house sales sector on the signs of domestic abuse, coercion and control, at the point of sale and, as shall be revealed later, at the point of separation.

April
72. Georgia wrote to her Gulf State friend, disclosing that she was at the Devon home planning to meet a consultant the next day regarding the viability of a holiday letting business. She speculates about the conversion possibilities and nearby attractions with some enthusiasm. It is not known if Larry was aware of this visit or of her interest in a change of use for the home. Georgia told GH that she could see the potential for a business to combine with her cooking skills, however, the remoteness was a concern and she was also interested in the possibilities for a business venture at the London home.

July
73. In early July, Larry accepted an offer for the purchase of the farm that was £20k above the asking price (but below the offer he had turned down in 2015), however, the buyers had yet to sell their own property.

74. Over two days in mid-July there was an exchange of emails between Georgia and Larry about the two daughters of her sisters coming to stay for a few days in the school holidays. The following extracts illustrate the style and tone of the communication between them.

Addressed to [short version of Larry] and signed [Georgia’s full name]:

Whilst they are staying they will take up 100% of my time and attention - this is normal. It will therefore not be possible to have any discussion with you about the house until they have returned to their respective homes and I would ask that you please respect this request
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I have sent a number of text messages since my stay here and have received no reply to any of them. I wonder - would it be helpful do you think to respond to text messages and telephone calls so that communication can be facilitated in the normal way?

75. Addressed to [short version of Georgia’s name] and signed ‘Larry’, he signifies that he is fine with the guests staying and agrees not to talk about the house. On the matter of text messages, he writes:

I have answered all your text messages, one of which was simply a text saying you tried to call me. I note that you have also tried to call me on the landline but left no messages

76. The next day, Georgia writes, reiterating that she had not received his responses to her text messages and that it would be helpful if he did respond. He returned with a statement that he had replied to all her messages and had them on his iPhone to prove it. She responded that this sounded defensive and asked him to consider that the texts are not getting through for technical reasons.

77. GH says that Larry was known for not making use of his mobile telephone and he usually ignored contact by this method. This is further indication of his need to feel in control of even minor events in the relationship. It also may be illustrative of ‘Gaslighting’\textsuperscript{16}, a form of manipulation that seeks to sow the seeds of doubt in a targeted individual, in this case Georgia, hoping to make them question their own memory, perception and sanity. Using persistent denial, misdirection, contradiction and lying, it attempts to destabalise the target and undermine belief.

August

78. It seems that Georgia did follow through at least once with avoiding contact with others. JK recalls an occasion over the August Bank Holiday 2016 when he and his family were invited to the Devon home for the weekend. Georgia was not present, and the reason given that she was working, so they only had lunch and a walk with Larry before heading back to London. JK considered he and his wife had a cordial relationship with Georgia but avoidance of contact had been a feature for a few years.

September

79. In early September, the buyers signified that they can proceed with the purchase. A few days later, the estate agent received an email from Georgia asking for all documents relating to the sale to be sent to her in the post and that she needed more information about the process. The agent called her to explain the sale process and Georgia disclosed her fear that Larry would forge her signature on the document. It is not known from where such a fear and belief originated, but the comment is indicative of a relationship in which trust had been lost and experience of abuse is the probable cause. The agent reassured her that this forgery of her signature would not be feasible as a witness to the signing would be required.

\textsuperscript{16} Origin the 1938 play and 1940’s film ‘Gas Light’
80. JK recalls meeting Larry around this time and him complaining that Georgia “keeps changing her mind about the sale of the house” which frustrated him. What is known from other sources is that Georgia had proactively considered the farm as a holiday letting and catering business and that Larry had also wavered over commitment to the sale for many months.

October
81. The buyer’s surveyors wanted to value the farm and Georgia appeared not to understand why this was necessary. Larry was “extremely frustrated” with her and the date in early October was fixed. Georgia appeared to the agent to be under pressure and overwhelmed by the thought of the sale. Their relationship seemed at breaking point.

82. A diary note recovered from Georgia’s computer dated in mid-October reveals that it was, indeed, at breaking point as she had announced that she wanted a divorce and it provides contemporaneous evidence of Larry’s use of financial control and fear of consequences:

- Not feeling well at all today – in bed
- Very distressed – [L] shoving papers under my nose and begging me to sign
- Told him wanted a divorce – did best to say it as gently as possible (6 recordings on mobile of the conversation)
- He is in shock and very upset
- Lots of threats: close bank accounts, cut me off, sell his share of [the farm] leaving me with the bills etc., not going to get anything, won’t get 50%, etc., etc.,

83. On this day, the agents received an emotional phone call from Larry when he declared he was “at his wits end with Georgia”. He went on that her father was “a financial waster”, he wished he had never put the property in her name and Georgia had “aborted two pregnancies”. This reference to pregnancies was not only indiscreet (as well as inaccurate), it was completely out of context to the conversation.

84. As time went on, the agents formed the opinion that Larry had undermined Georgia to the point where she had become increasingly conflicted with her situation and was struggling to regain control of her life.

85. Georgia’s note dated the next day records that things had “calmed down a bit” and that Larry had contacted his sister who had recommended a barrister whom he arranged to meet the following week. Georgia included in this note:

Repeated same things, but is finding it very difficult to deal with and keeps trying to persuade/bully me into signing off on the house

86. In her ‘Note to me’ dated the following day, Georgia wrote that she had not slept and would make up the bed in Larry’s room for that night. He had gone off to Taunton races for the day and she hoped he will be able to calm down. She had consulted her solicitor to obtain clarity on selling the property and how to ensure that 50% of the proceeds would go to her

---

17 The police investigation did not find these recordings
account. It was clear to her that she needed to obtain legal papers from Larry to make sure this happened. As to continuing threats, she wrote:

This morning [L] again threatened me if I didn’t sign the documents to sell [the farm]. He kept asking for my assurance that I would sign whilst he is away in Taunton.

Threat is: he will sell his share via what ever means necessary leaving me with the bills etc. for the property etc.

I repeated again: that it was important that we do not let this situation escalate and that we calmly consider how we are going to proceed.

87. Over the next few days, the agent had several calls with Georgia and emphasised that it was her decision if and when she wanted to sell. After discussing matters with her family, Georgia agreed to continue with the sale in the last week of October.

88. JK recalls a meeting with Larry when he told him that Georgia wanted a divorce and it was the first time that he had spoken of their relationship in any kind of detail. He said that Georgia probably did not have a clue how to go about a divorce and did not understand the procedure or implications of a divorce. He said he could not think what the grounds for divorce would be, he did not think Georgia was seeing anyone else and he (Larry) was not involved with anyone else. He said he had paid for Georgia to see a therapist for a considerable amount of time\(^{18}\) but was unsure of the benefits. They had been trying to restore their marriage and were both attending “marriage guidance”\(^{19}\).

89. In this month, Georgia’s mother invited her and Larry to spend Christmas with them in Ireland and Larry accepted. In the event, Georgia visited alone.

November

90. In early November Georgia recorded another note headed: ‘List of what needs to be covered in conversations with [short version of Larry]’ that refers to emotional abuse from him and her coping strategy:

1. xmas
2. storage
3. where he wants to live
4. [the farm] – a business for me?\(^{20}\)
5. where we live
6. finances

How to manage emotional responses –

1. use clear time boundaried discussions
2. when things start to escalate stop conversation and go off for a short walk and explain that we will continue when he has calmed down

91. A few days after that, Larry completed an application for a shotgun licence and, with a covering letter and cheque for payment, handed it in at a Devon police station. He wrote that he had held a licence some 20 years before and had hardly used it so had sold it and

---

\(^{18}\) Enquiries have not identified if this is correct
\(^{19}\) Enquiries have not identified if this is correct
\(^{20}\) GH believes that Georgia’s continued interest in this contributed to Larry’s opinion that she was indecisive
allowed the certificate to lapse. He stated he was not sure he wanted to purchase another
but sought the licence “just for the option of buying one”.

92. The address for the application was the farmhouse where, after the homicide, police
discovered an unlocked shotgun cabinet containing an air rifle and eight boxes of shotgun
cartridges that were held illegally but may have been there from his original authorised use.
It cannot be established if the acquisition of a shotgun was part a developing plan to kill
Georgia and take his own life. In any event, the application was slow to progress and
telephone contact from the police firearms licencing officer was not attempted until 1
January but, for an obvious reason, was not picked up.

93. From early November, the agents noted that Larry’s mood changed from being deeply
upset to pragmatic and he declared that he would sort out the situation. Georgia was
reported by Larry to be undecided, especially with regards to the completion date for the
sale. In reality, she may well have been wondering what scheme he had developed to
advance the sale. In mid-November, Georgia changed her email account for the receipt of
documents to do with the sale, another indicator that she had lost trust and confidence in
Larry’s integrity.

94. At the end of November, GH and her daughter travelled from France and stayed with the
couple at their London home to see the Christmas lights. Larry asked GH for a private
meeting over coffee at a local Museum. Larry said that he did not want the divorce to
happen and could she speak to Georgia to dissuade her from action. GH explained that it
was Georgia’s decision as it is her life and Larry responded that this is “really serious” and
he will be consulting a lawyer.

December
95. At the beginning of December, the buyers of the property asked if they could move some
boxes into an outdoor barn just prior to completion, expected to be before Christmas. This
was agreed and, when they asked about some kitchen furniture in the house, Larry agreed
that it could be left for them, but Georgia did not.

96. Around the same time in December, Larry met his friend JK. He seemed very bothered
how Georgia would cope after a divorce and with being on her own. He said he was
frustrated with her indecision about everything including big decisions that she had to make
in her life. He seemed concerned about the financial implications of a divorce and he
speculated that Georgia’s father may have encouraged her to divorce to help sort out
finances in their wider family.

97. Larry also met his sister QR for lunch as he wanted some advice. Larry was concerned
about what would happen if he and Georgia were to separate as he thought she wanted to
leave and he did not know who to talk to. He said that Georgia was going to Ireland for
Christmas but he felt unsure if he was included21. He accepted an invitation to spend
Christmas with QR and her immediate family in the Isle of Wight.

21 He did not disclose he had been invited by Georgia’s parents and had accepted
A few days later in December, Larry met with his eldest sister, LM, because he had asked for advice on divorce. He explained that sometimes Georgia wanted a divorce and other times not. She felt this was typical of the mood swings she had observed in Georgia over the years. Larry said he was not sure either about divorce or not. It had been obvious to her that they had difficulty in communicating and she advised her brother that he and Georgia needed to talk. He said he would deal with this after the Christmas break as they were visiting separate family festivities.

The next day, Larry met with his solicitor and changed his 2004 ‘Last Will and Testament’ to remove Georgia from the position of single beneficiary. Instead, he named his sister QR and brother-in-law as executors and left them a substantial sum, after deduction of tax, with the rest of his estate shared between three National charities.

In mid-December, the estate agent spoke independently to all parties to impress on them, through their solicitors, the need to sign all legal documents so that each were ready to exchange before Christmas. On the same day, Georgia notified the agent that she would be in Ireland for a week over Christmas. The impression gained was that Georgia’s mindset seemed to have changed and she was taking control of her situation.

Larry called the agent within a few days to say that he would have to withdraw from the sale. His animosity to Georgia’s father resurfaced and he was worried that Georgia’s proceeds from the sale would be misappropriated by her family. He stated his intention to obtain specialist legal advice and was persuaded to continue with the sale as his solicitor could hold receipt of funds.

At around the same time, Georgia contacted a local storage company to obtain a quotation for the removal of her belongings into storage. An appointment was made for early January and a follow up call at the end of December confirmed that she planned to keep the appointment.

About a week before Christmas, all parties in the chain concluded that the exchange would not happen before then. Larry called the agent that day and again expressed his regret that he had put the property in joint names. The intensity of his “fury” at this situation was substantial and caused a visceral reaction with the agent. He said he would “win her [Georgia] round” as he had “been down this road before and everything would be alright in the end”.

On the same day, Larry attended solicitors in Wiltshire to give instructions for the divorce. The Solicitor found Larry to be a very measured man who had with him a notebook with the history of his marriage and reported being in an ‘OK’ marriage. He stated his wife Georgia wanted a divorce, which he believed was being driven by his father in law whom he believed was encouraging Georgia to divorce in the belief that Georgia would acquire half Georgia’s wealth that she would then share with her family.

Larry said that there were no children as Georgia “never wanted them”. She became pregnant and she terminated the pregnancy. In 2000, after visiting her sister who had just...
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had a child, she decided she would like a child after all. When pregnant, he stated she changed her mind again and a second termination (that we know was, in fact, a miscarriage) followed. Larry said that Georgia had never really worked, and he has paid for everything, including “endless counsellors”. He described Georgia as being a bit of a loner, was fundamentally unfulfilled and was, in some respects, not quite in touch with real life. She was often very depressed.

106. There are five concerns listed for Larry in the attendance note of the meeting, each of which is indicative of his desire to challenge and undermine Georgia’s financial status in the forthcoming divorce:

1. If he exchanges on the Devon property, how can he protect the money? He was advised that if the property is owned as joint tenants then all net proceeds belong to them both
2. Larry has been to the bank for their joint account (Georgia’s allowance) and been told that they cannot close the account without Georgia’s permission
3. Larry enquired about borrowing money against the security of the properties and was advised
4. Larry said that Georgia would not have the funds for a divorce and was advised on what her legal costs might be (estimated at multiple thousands)
5. Larry asked how much of his property portfolio Georgia “might be able to attack”

107. Larry was advised about collaborative law and the requirement to attend a Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting (MIAM) as part of the divorce process that he may have viewed as an additional impediment.

108. It appeared to the Solicitor that Larry did not want a separation and the meeting ended with his request for a conference with his barrister\(^\text{22}\) “to discuss the financial implications in detail”. Larry remarked at the end that perhaps an agreeable compromise for them both would be for Georgia to live in the London house, he in the Devon home, and that they went along as amicably as possible. There was no mention of any infidelity on either part and, other than the father in law’s influence, he did not profess to know of any reason for her desire for a separation.

109. A few days before Christmas, Georgia left London to travel to her parents’ home in Ireland for the Christmas period, returning on the 28th. That morning, Larry wrote an email to his solicitor, confirming that the Devon property is owned as joint tenants. They were proceeding with the sale and would be exchanging contracts in early January. He then added:

\(\text{After completion, if necessary, the funds will continue to be held by my solicitor. We are trying very hard to patch up our differences and hopefully keep the marriage going but, as a precaution, a meeting with [the barrister] is a sensible move}\)

110. Two days before Christmas, Larry attended a gathering of friends with JK and his wife and explained that Georgia was not present as she had gone off to Ireland to her parents. He said he had changed his mind about travelling with her and would instead be visiting his

\(\text{22 Later arranged for early January 2017}\)
sister and brother in law in the Isle of Wight. Larry was in good spirits and he disclosed to Mrs JK that he was trying to mend the marriage. He went on to describe his fear of being alone.

111. That day, Larry travelled from London to the Isle of Wight to spend Christmas with QR and her family, returning on 28 December. Larry spent a lot of time discussing property with one of his nephews who had some experience of such matters. He said to his sister they would be packing up the house in Devon as he expected the exchange to be within a month and he gave the impression that they would find another country property nearer to London. He spoke of his love for Georgia and the hope that they could move on and forward together in their relationship.

112. To ST, his brother in law, Larry complained that Georgia lacked confidence in making decisions and she often changed her mind, causing disruption and inconvenience to others. He gave the example of her changing her mind over the house sale. Tensions were running high and “behaviour characteristics” seemed to cause considerable stress. Joint decision-making and financial matters had become topics of conflict.

113. Over long conversations about resolution, Larry expressed his love for Georgia but had accepted that divorce was the only solution as the relationship had broken down. ST pointed out some of the consequences of divorce proceedings and, if he “wanted out”, he should make the break quickly and cleanly for the benefit of both parties. Larry responded: “I don’t have your killer instinct to make a cut like that”. He left for London on 28 December, apparently in good spirits. He took the trouble to email his thanks as well as write a letter.

114. It is now known that this was the last time that Larry would see his sister and family. He had already changed his Will, with her and her husband as the executors and beneficiaries, but he did not use the visit to disclose that information.

115. Georgia and Larry spent the following two days in London. On the morning of the 30th, Larry composed an email addressed ‘Darling [short version of Georgia]’ with the heading: ‘You and Me’. The significance of this document is that a copy, printed at 14:06 on 30 December, was left to be found with other important papers in a folder at the murder scene. It must have been sent to Georgia, and received, because she has converted it to a Word document on her computer and then inserted what appear to be her counter points to those raised by Larry.

116. This converted document is copied in full in appendix 3. It is useful because it confirms the method of communication between them and, on his part, seems to hold out hope for a future together, albeit that he takes the opportunity to admonish her for poor money management. Georgia’s written counter points are perhaps indicative of a resolve to bring the divorce to reality. However, it cannot be ascertained if they discussed the points raised in his email or the counter points in her converted document in their last hours together.
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117. Research by the police has established that they left London together in Larry’s car on the morning of 31 December, arriving at the Devon home at 15:30. They shopped together for household goods in their local town on the way. At 14:00, Georgia had texted her father with the picture of a public house in Wiltshire that they knew as a family when they lived nearby.

118. The Coroner has judged that Larry murdered Georgia before committing suicide. There is no possibility of third party involvement. The cause of her death was blunt force head trauma; his death was caused by ligature suspension. These stark conclusions aside, it is important for this review to have a clear understanding of the build-up that resulted in Georgia’s extreme course of action.

119. Georgia was found in bed wearing night attire, under a duvet with a pillow covering her head. She was on her right side occupying the left sleeping space with a bolster pillow at her back that effectively divided the bed in two. A magazine and her reading spectacles were on the floor beside her. The injuries and blood pattern indicate she was attacked from behind from the direction of the right side of the bed and there is no sign that she had a chance to defend herself. Multiple blows to her skull had been inflicted with a heavy object that striation marks on her skull indicate was a two-pronged tool.

120. The television in the sitting room below her bedroom had been switched on between 20:02 and 00:54 over the New Year. There was a half-consumed bottle of Champagne in the fridge and the toxicology reports confirm the presence of alcohol in both deceased, consistent with this consumption. Georgia had sent a New Year text message to sister GH at 23:50, so the most probable time of her death is in the early hours of 1 January 2017, a hypothesis that is consistent with the decomposition of her body when discovered on 4 January.

121. Microscopic examination of Larry’s brain in the post mortem examination for the Coroner did not detect any disease or change to the organ. There was no blood detected on his clothing and the police investigation has concluded that he must have disposed of what he was wearing when he committed the murder, along with the weapon. They hypothesise that Larry disposed of these items in the refuse bin at the end of the lane leading to the farm and this was routinely emptied on 3 January.

122. The murder and suicide scenes were discovered by police on 4 January. They had been alerted by ST who had, that morning, received a handwritten letter from Larry, which opens: *By the time you have read this note I will have killed [Georgia] and killed myself. It seems appropriate that such a grubby situation should end in such a grubby fashion*

123. Obviously, it is beyond doubt that the letter had been written and posted before Larry committed suicide. The envelope is post-marked 3 January in Devon and the probability is that he deposited the letter in the post box in the lane when disposing of his clothing and
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the weapon. Writing in the future tense about killing Georgia, strongly suggests her murder was a planned, rather than spontaneous, event.

124. The letter continues with considerable vitriol directed at Georgia’s father. Larry states:

There is some comfort to be drawn from the fact that I will have caused maximum damage to [Georgia’s] family

125. He goes on to set out the steps he had taken to change his Will to exclude Georgia and names the new beneficiaries. He then returns to the antipathy he has exhibited to Georgia’s family:

Above all I want you to ensure my will is carried out to the letter. I want you to be utterly ruthless, merciless and heartless to [Georgia’s family] as they have been with me

126. He continues that he seems to have spent his entire life fighting over money and that he cannot cope any more. He concludes:

For me it’s a case of Thank God it’s Over

127. It is likely that, after disposing of evidence and posting the letter, Larry then took his own life by hanging in the barn on the property where he was found by police. Pre-booked callers (for example, an electrician and the storage facility surveyor) at the house on 3 January could not raise a response to repeated knocking.
128. This review has identified all public bodies such as health that had anything to do with either Georgia or Larry at both their London and Devon homes. Nothing of note has been discovered. There is third party anecdotal evidence that Georgia may have been provided with counselling and that they sought couple counselling. It has not been possible to verify these reports and, in an abusive relationship, there are risks inherent in counselling as a solution, including that Georgia may not have been aware she was in an abusive relationship. With GH’s assistance, it has been established that Larry had been assessed for Asperger Syndrome in 2012.

129. The only sources of information about what was going on latterly in their lives derive from the police investigation on behalf of the Coroner and friends and family, notably GH with respect to Georgia and JK on behalf of Larry.

130. GH’s perspective is that, in the last 3-5 years of her life, Georgia was trying to turn her life around. She was acting as Georgia’s prime, and only, source of support and encouragement. The draft notes to her family in late 2013 [starting with: Email to mum] are indicative of someone conducting analysis of her life and recording the issues she wished to assert in challenging their treatment of her.

131. Collateral evidence of her intent to also leave the relationship with Larry is provided by Georgia embarking on training courses to become qualified to secure employment and fend for herself if necessary. The email to an old friend in December 2015 and the disclosure to a stranger she met on a walking trip three months later reveal Georgia’s frustration with more than twenty years of what became a loveless, unfulfilled and abusive marriage. She had been contemplating divorce and, as verified by notes from her computer, Georgia eventually asked Larry for a divorce in October 2016.

132. During that year, Larry started to confide in his oldest friend, his own disappointment with the marriage, and disclosed intimate detail, such as Georgia’s pregnancy termination, from decades before. He regretted that they had not had children, including that his worries about the lengthy tax investigation influenced his decision not to support her latter suggestion that they try for a child. He also expressed frustration with what he viewed as Georgia’s indecision over the sale of their second home in Devon that had added to the discord.

133. In a note from JK to the Chair, he described a process where the more he and his family have reflected on what happened to Larry and Georgia, the sadder and harder to understand it becomes. He speculated: “From my perspective, I can only think it [the homicide/suicide] is the outcome of years of growing resentment and frustration at their inability to communicate openly, perhaps triggered by some revelation or comment from [Georgia] that tipped [Larry] over the edge”.

134. This “trigger” comment is pure supposition, of course, and mirrors the default position that is all too commonly observed: that the victim must be to blame when there is not an
obvious alternative explanation. The Panel debated this point and felt that it should be included because the assumption that the victim must have provoked such a reaction is a stereotypical view, and this review has exposed a very different reality.

135. What JK and others outside the relationship would not have easily ascertained or understood, is that Georgia, far from being the one to initiate or promote argument, was exhibiting rational and mature responses to Larry’s increasing emotion and irrationality. The evidence for this from her written records in October and her responses in the ‘You and Me’ note (appendix 3) is overwhelming. Furthermore, the available forensic evidence strongly indicates that Georgia was attacked from behind whilst asleep, with multiple blows from a heavy instrument.

136. Moreover, there is substantive research\textsuperscript{23} available that relationship-based homicides are rarely spontaneous and the “He just snapped” explanation which suggests an immediate proximal provocation is not supported. Schlesinger describes ‘catathymic homicides’ as occurring when:

\textit{There is a change in thinking whereby the offender comes to believe that he can resolve his inner conflict by committing an act of extreme violence against someone to whom he feels emotionally bonded}

137. A more recent study, ‘The Homicide Triad’\textsuperscript{24}, into the coincidence of three groups of characteristics, namely, the offender’s emotional or psychological state, the presence of acknowledged high risk markers and the triggers which create escalation, prompts further speculation that Larry was:

4. Psychologically \textit{obsessed}\textsuperscript{25} with financial security and control of his assets
5. Increasingly exhibiting the high-risk marker of coercive control of Georgia’s life
6. Escalating his resolve to complete his ‘emotional journey to homicide’, triggered by perceived rejection through Georgia seeking the divorce

138. These models for evaluating whether there was indeed an ‘emotional journey to homicide’ on Larry’s part are compelling in the circumstances of this review. Certainly, the substantial trail of domestic abuse inflicted by Larry and endured by Georgia had become more pronounced in the context of the sale of their Devon home. It then seems likely that the plan for homicide was activated at the point of Georgia requesting a divorce in October 2016.

139. From this point, whilst finance was clearly a major factor for Larry and control and threats followed on this theme, he also openly expressed fear of being alone, displayed signs of denial and attempted to exert proxy control of Georgia through the available network of friends and family, as never before. With his disclosures to others, he seemed keen to convey and confirm that he was in command of the situation and would find a resolution. In

\textsuperscript{23} Schlesinger 2002, Adams 2007, Monckton Smith 2012
\textsuperscript{24} Monckton Smith 2017
\textsuperscript{25} Webster dictionary: a persistent disturbing preoccupation with an, often unreasonable, idea or feeling; an idea or thought that continually preoccupies or intrudes on a person’s mind
realities, the fundamental control over Georgia’s life that Larry had created over decades of marriage was slipping from his grasp.

140. The cross-government definition of controlling and coercive behaviours in the domestic abuse context was published in December 2013. Controlling behaviours include acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, depriving them of the means needed for independence and regulating their everyday behaviour. Coercion may include a pattern of assaults, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse, such as ‘emotional blackmail’ and ‘Gaslighting’, that is used to harm, punish or frighten their victim. In December 2015, such behaviour became a specific criminal offence.26

141. Examples of controlling and coercive acts in this review, with the efforts Georgia made to regain some measure of equality in decision making, are drawn from the facts above:

a. At the end of 2015, Georgia sought advice from GH because Larry had applied pressure on her to sign their joint assets, including both properties, over to a Trust. She took the advice not to sign.

b. In March 2016, Larry told the agents that Georgia would not be involved in the sale, albeit that the property was jointly tenanted.

c. Georgia had to secure a discreet agreement from the agents that she would be copied in to emails regarding the sale.

d. Georgia wrote to the agents asking for all documents relating to the sale to be sent to her by post and disclosed her fear that Larry would forge her signature.

e. In October, at the time that Georgia recorded that she asked him for a divorce, Larry told the agents he was “at his wits end”, whilst she was writing notes about him thrusting documents under her nose that he begged her to sign. His behaviour was bullying about closure of bank accounts and “cutting her off” from financial benefit from the sale. He also threatened that he would sell his share of the house leaving her with the running costs.

f. By November, Georgia had developed an agenda for discussion about the consequences of the sale, with a strategy for managing his anticipated emotional [angry] responses. She set up a separate email account for receipt of information from the agents.

g. In December, Larry took decisive and dramatic action by changing his Will and removing Georgia as the sole beneficiary. He may have understood, or been advised, that this would not prevent her receiving a fair share of the net proceeds from the farmhouse whilst alive.

h. When speaking to the agents about withdrawing from the sale, Larry repeated his belief that Georgia’s father was influencing her, apparently for financial gain, and his intention to obtain specialist legal advice as his solicitor could hold receipt of funds from the sale. This point was later reiterated to the solicitor he was instructing in the matter of their divorce.

i. In a subsequent conversation with the agents, Larry said he regretted that he had put the property in joint names. Larry’s emotion level of anger/frustration at this point is described as “fury” and was unmistakable, even over the telephone.

26 s76 Serious Crime Act 2015
j. Larry’s ‘You and Me’ note\(^\text{27}\) sets out the conflict in his feelings, from depression with suicidal ideation on one hand, to hope for a future together on the other. The prospect of being alone again at his age filled him with “absolute dread”. He went on: “Divorce can be absolutely horrendous”, “There is no such thing as an amicable divorce”, and: “There is often a huge amount of disruption, fights over money, heartache, feelings of abandonment and diminishment”

k. In the same note, he apologised for Georgia’s disclosure to him that she had “felt very isolated in our marriage”. Her inserted comment revealed her disappointment that: “it has not been possible for you to recognise this, nor to establish any meaningful dialogue”

142. The opinion of the Consultant Clinical Psychologist is that there is nothing in the AS assessment in 2012 that suggests rage. Evidence of rage heard by the estate agent in December, and observed from the crime scene in January, indicates that Larry was in an extreme state of anger when he inflicted the extensive fatal injuries to Georgia. In his suicide note, he writes in the future tense about killing Georgia, so there is corroboration of a plan in place if he could not seize back control during their New Year break. A continuum of planning for the end is observable from the point in October when Georgia asserted her right to leave him.

143. The opinion of the specialist adviser on economic abuse is that Larry felt a strong entitlement to money. Rather than him being obsessed by it following the tax investigation, it is suggested that this is indicative of it. Georgia appeared very aware of this, knowing that if she divorced him he would do all in his power to stop her from receiving a fair financial settlement, hence her concern about the house sale prior to divorce and looking for ways in which she could support herself financially.

144. Speculating on what might have contributed to Larry’s coercive and controlling acts or behaviours, each of which were his choice to impose upon Georgia and their relationship, there appears to be a combination of factors\(^\text{28}\):

a. His lifelong focus on financial security which was clearly central to his life
b. A long-running history of antipathy and suspicion towards Georgia’s family
c. Him not wanting a divorce, with her firming up on the contrary, which left him nowhere to go
d. The threat of losing his ‘hard-earned assets’ to Georgia’s family, as embodied in the sale of the Devon home
e. Apparent regret that they did not have children and readiness to imply that Georgia was blameworthy for the two lost pregnancies\(^\text{29}\), possibly due to the lack of an alternative heir (than Georgia and her family) to his fortune
f. His frustration (at one point witnessed as an ‘explosion’ of fury) with his perceived procrastination by Georgia over key decisions in relation to the house sale

\(^{27}\) Appendix 3
\(^{28}\) Compiled with the assistance of the Consultant Clinical Psychologist
\(^{29}\) It is known that Georgia made her own decision in respect of one of them
g. All of which heads to a point of no return around Christmas and the New Year (often difficult and hopeful in equal measure) and a desire to punish Georgia and her family, perhaps the latter more than her
CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

145. Georgia was murdered by her husband of 24 years at a time when she had taken steps to separate from him. In all probability, Larry then took his own life in the belief that he had done everything in his power to prevent her family from financial benefit or access to his considerable wealth at Georgia’s passing.

146. Not only was this a strained, loveless and unfulfilled marriage, it was characterised by Georgia’s subordination to Larry and isolation from sources of support, with substantive measures of financial and emotional control exercised by him. The trail of abuse was probably chronic and years in the making, but then noticeably ramped up by Larry to a ‘campaign’ level of abuse from the moment Georgia asked for a divorce in October 2016.

147. From this point, he appeared frantic and desperate at times with emotional, discreet, outpourings and palpable manifestation of rage, to people that barely knew them as a couple. At the same time, he was acting ruthlessly to develop a plan that would deprive, or at least reduce, Georgia’s financial security on separation, culminating in the fatal attack that he believed would deprive her family of inheritance.

148. On one hand, the ‘You and Me’ note of 30 December, that Larry left prominently to be found after his death, may be viewed as a ‘last ditch’ attempt to negotiate with Georgia for a different outcome than divorce. He professed his love for her and his hopes and ideas for a future together. He played to Georgia’s known love and support for her sister. Apart from the admonishment contained in the letter of Georgia’s finance management skills, Larry may have imagined this would be admired as a letter of empathy and reason.

149. On the other hand, the letter that announced his intention to kill Georgia and himself, with a specific list of post mortem requirements, is packed with hate and vitriol. There is no expression of love for Georgia, no word of sorrow at this course of action, merely egoistic regret that he has had to fight over money for his entire life.

Lessons learned

150. Georgia had no friends she could call upon; she disclosed to a casual walking companion Larry had “seen them all off”. All her family was abroad and, with the exception of her sister in France, she did not feel supported by them in any way. In fact, she had written about her experience of rejection and emotional abuse at their hands. GH was her only confidante and sole source of emotional support which was readily supplied. GH had her own challenges: forced to leave an abusive relationship and dependence on Larry for financial assistance.

151. Georgia was not known to anyone involved in safeguarding. No appropriately trained professional that had ordinary contact with her, such as at her GP Practice, or in the course of the one emergency visit to hospital she had for a contact lens problem, had a reason to
pose ‘routine inquiry’ questions. Best practice when faced with a more affluent patient such as Georgia could have been to challenge the stereotype of a domestic abuse victim and make routine inquiry of all attendees for consultation and treatment.

152. It cannot be ascertained if Georgia even knew she had been subject to long-term domestic abuse, including that economic abuse is a form of controlling behavior. In her case, this was contrary to the myths that domestic abuse only happens to women of low socio-economic status. She had her sister’s experience of an abusive relationship to go on and the advice from the walking companion who referred her to a divorce lawyer. From her writings in 2013, she believed she had been ignored and bullied by her own family (with the exception of GH), so her treatment by Larry may well have felt consistent with her general experience of life. There is no evidence that she was aware of the wider definition and criminal offence of domestic coercion and control.

153. This review has examined if there were any barriers to Georgia accessing support within the community and, with the right internet searches, it can be discovered that the RBKC Community Safety Partnership Team has published excellent advice and signposting on Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG). The three adjacent London Boroughs of Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster have worked in collaboration and set up the ‘Angelou Partnership’ website in 2015.

154. The difficulty for someone in Georgia’s position might be that a generic search identified disparate platforms and did not point a straightforward pathway to the VAWG advice. This review has ensured that basic searches of the RBKC website on ‘domestic abuse’ and ‘domestic violence’ have been modified to ensure rapid signposting to the Angelou Partnership site.

155. Awareness of the wider definition of controlling and coercive behaviour and the relatively new criminal offence does not seem as widespread as it could and should be. And it is felt that this gap in awareness may be more pronounced within the affluent sections of society found in RBKC and partner Boroughs. Consideration could be given to the use of this review as a case study to promote knowledge and awareness of the wider definition, not only locally, but pan London with the support of MOPAC (Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime) and its DV Coordinators Forum.

156. The estate agents that handled the sale of the Devon home were witness to the extremes of emotion generated by the combination of divorce and house sale, a situation that must be relatively commonplace in the sector. What is different about this sale, was the visibility of controlling behaviours and extreme emotions from Larry and the coping strategies by Georgia. Awareness of the wider domestic abuse definition could and should be promoted across that sector nationally. On the same rationale, consideration also should be given to awareness in the legal conveyancing sector.

---

30 Involves asking direct questions in relation to abuse of a specified population group when they present to a service. This can be at a particular point in their use of a service, or on all occasions at which they present. It does not matter whether there are any signs or indications of abuse.
RECOMMENDATIONS

157. Panel deliberations identified four main learning points and our recommendations are set out below. An Action Plan to achieve the recommendations is attached at appendix 4.

158. **Learning Point 1:** There is a need to improve the support for GPs to routinely ask about domestic abuse to elicit a disclosure to those experiencing domestic abuse.
   - **Recommendations**
     - d. GPs to be trained on understanding the dynamics of domestic abuse and coercive control and the need for routine enquiry
     - e. The Children and Health Operational Group to identify GP surgeries and to share domestic abuse best practice and learning
     - f. VAWG Partnership to consider future commissioning of the IRIS model to embed learning with GPs

159. **Learning Point 2:** Professionals within the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors to be made aware of the potential harm of coercive and controlling behaviour and their role in supporting those affected as part of the Coordinated Community Response.
   - **Recommendations**
     - d. Housing sales and legal conveyancing professionals to be trained on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of coercive control
     - e. The Housing Operational Group to share domestic abuse best practice and learning with housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors
     - f. Resources for estate agents on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of financial control i.e. through controlling house sales

160. **Learning Point 3:** Increase and embed an understanding of the wider definition of controlling and coercive behaviour and economic abuse amongst frontline professionals, including myths surrounding perpetrator behaviour.
   - **Recommendations**
     - c. A learning event to be held for professionals that focuses on addresses the dynamics of domestic abuse, coercive control, economic abuse and how power works
     - d. All agencies and frontline professionals should consider the use of a DASH risk assessment where domestic abuse is featured even if it appears at a low threshold level

161. **Learning Point 4:** As part of the wider Coordinated Community Response model, friends and family to be equipped to safely and appropriately support those affected by domestic abuse.
   - **Recommendations**
     - c. Community Ambassadors to be recruited and trained as part of the ‘Ask Me’ project, building a local network that breaks the silence about domestic abuse
     - d. The findings from this review to inform a local campaign to raise awareness of domestic abuse and to challenge the myth of who is a victim (i.e. women from affluent backgrounds) and who is a perpetrator
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CCG Clinical Commissioning Group
cjsm Criminal Justice Secure eMail
DA Domestic Abuse
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DV Domestic Violence
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DVHR Domestic Violence Homicide Review
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Name references used
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CD Father of Georgia
EF Mother of Georgia
GH Younger sister and confidante of Georgia
JK Friend and confidante of Larry
LM Eldest sister of Larry
QR Second sister of Larry and married to ST
ST Brother in law of Larry
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Panel</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cressida Dick</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Linden</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office for Crime and Policing</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
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<td>Baljit Ubhey</td>
<td>Crown Prosecution Service</td>
<td>London Chief Crown Prosecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Sawyer</td>
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<td>Devon and Cornwall Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Hernandez</td>
<td>Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Police</td>
</tr>
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Independence statements

Chair of Panel

Bill Griffiths CBE BEM QPM was appointed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea CSP as Independent Chair of the DVHR Panel and is the author of the report. He is a former Metropolitan police officer with 38 years operational service and an additional five years as police staff in the role of Director of Leadership Development, retiring in March 2010. He served mainly as a detective in both specialist and generalist investigation roles at New Scotland Yard and in the Boroughs of Westminster, Greenwich, Southwark, Lambeth and Newham.

As a Deputy Assistant Commissioner he implemented the Crime and Disorder Act for the MPS, leading to the Borough based policing model, and developed the critical incident response and homicide investigation changes arising from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. For the last five years of police service, as Director of Serious Crime Operations, he was responsible for the work of some 3000 operational detectives on all serious and specialist crime investigations and operations in London (except for terrorism) including homicide, armed robbery, kidnap, fraud and child abuse.

Bill has since set up his own company to provide consultancy, coaching and speaking services specialising in critical incident management, leadership development and strategic advice/review within the public sector.

During and since his MPS service he has had no personal or operational involvement within the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, nor direct management of any MPS employee.

Secretary to Panel

Tony Hester has over 30 year’s Metropolitan police experience in both Uniform and CID roles that involved Borough policing and Specialist Crime investigation in addition to major crime and critical incidents as a Senior Investigating Officer (SIO). This period included the management of murder and serious crime investigation.

Upon retirement in 2007, Tony entered the commercial sector as Director of Training for a large recruitment company. He now owns and manages an Investigations and Training company.

His involvement in this DVHR has been one of administration and support to the Independent Chair, his remit being to record the minutes of meetings and circulate documents securely as well as to act as the review liaison point for the Chair.

Other than through this and two other reviews, Tony has no personal or business relationship or direct management of anyone else involved.
Terms of Reference for Review

1. To identify the best method for obtaining and analysing relevant information, and over what period [Note: Agreed on 26/07/17 that from 1 January 2012 to date of discovery of the deceased (04/01/17)] with any relevant prior information to be summarised] to understand the most important issues to address in this review and ensure the learning from this specific homicide is understood and systemic changes implemented

2. To identify the agencies and professionals that should constitute this Panel and those that should submit chronologies and Individual Management Reviews (IMR) and agree a timescale for completion

3. To understand and comply with the requirements of the criminal investigation, any misconduct investigation and the Inquest processes and identify any disclosure issues and how they shall be addressed, including arising from the publication of a report from this Panel [Note: There are no criminal proceedings and no known misconduct allegations. The Inquest was concluded HM Coroner for Devon in August 2017]

4. To identify any relevant equality and diversity considerations arising from this case and whether either victim or defendant was an ‘an adult at risk’ and, if so, what specialist advice or assistance may be required [Note: Other than gender, none identified at Panel meeting on 26/07/17, however, it is possible that Larry was an adult at risk]

5. To identify whether the victim or defendant was subject to a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) or the victim or defendant subject to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) or Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programme (DVPP) and, if so, identify the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding with respect to disclosure of the minutes of meetings [Note: It was established on 26/07/17 that there are no such records in Kensington and Chelsea or Devon]

6. To determine whether this case meets the criteria for a Serious Case Review, as defined in Working Together to Safeguard the Child 2013, if so, how it could be best managed within this review [Note: It is understood that there are no children involved, although there have been incomplete pregnancies in the relationship]

7. To determine whether this case meets the criteria for an Adult Case Review, within the provisions of s44 Care Act 2014, if so, how it could be best managed within this review

8. To identify how should family, friends and colleagues and other support networks of both victim and alleged perpetrator contribute to the review and how matters concerning them in the media are managed during and after the review
9. To identify how the review should take account of previous lessons learned in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and from relevant agencies and professionals working in other Local Authority areas

10. To identify how people in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea gain access to advice on domestic abuse whether themselves subject of abuse or known to be happening to a friend, relative or work colleague

11. To keep these terms of reference under review and subject of reconsideration in the light of any new information emerging

Operating Principles

a. The aim of this review is to identify and learn lessons as well as identify good practice so that future safeguarding services improve their systems and practice for increased safety of potential and actual victims of domestic abuse (as defined by the Government in 2013 – see below)

b. The aim is not to apportion blame to individuals or organisations, rather, it is to use the study of this case to provide a window on the system

c. A forensic and non-judgmental appraisal of the system will aid understanding of what happened, the context and contributory factors and what lessons may be learned

d. The review findings will be independent, objective, insightful and based on evidence while avoiding ‘hindsight bias’ and ‘outcome bias’ as influences

e. The review will be guided by humanity, compassion and empathy with both the victim’s and alleged perpetrator’s voices at the heart of the process

f. It will take account of the protected characteristics listed in the Equality Act 2010

g. All material will be handled within Government Security Classifications at ‘Official - Sensitive’ level

Definition of Domestic Abuse

Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. This can encompass, but is not limited to, the following types of abuse:

- psychological
- physical
- sexual
- financial
- emotional
Controlling behaviour is: a range of acts designed to make a person subordinate and/or dependent by isolating them from sources of support, exploiting their resources and capacities for personal gain, depriving them of the means needed for independence, resistance and escape and regulating their everyday behaviour.

Coercive behaviour is: an act or a pattern of acts of assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim.
Darling [short version of Georgia]
What a rollercoaster the last few months have been in terms of emotions and feelings for both of us. I do not know about you but I have lurched from feeling suicidal, depression and then to feelings that there is still hope and a future together.

I understand that for you there are lots of mixed feelings and confusion.

In any long marriage one is left with two key ingredients, respect and affection for each other. If one or the other goes it is very hard to keep a marriage going.

Yes these are key ingredients in any marriage.

I think in our case the issue of respect for each other has slowly been eroding away. For instance, we both indulge in criticising each others families.

There has been lack of understanding about establishing clear boundaries with parties outside the ‘relationship’ which has made it difficult to move forward together as a couple

This has to stop, it is totally counterproductive, and means we are so often looking backwards, going over old ground, instead of looking forward and building a positive future together. I suspect over a number of years you have been thinking and trying to work out whether you might have a happier future on your own. You have probably wondered whether I would be able to cope on my own.

It is difficult to see what sort of life you might like either on your own or with me as there has never been any clarity about this

Before I met you, I know that I am not very good and do not enjoy being on my own but in those days my parents were still alive and were supportive and I also had a structure with work etc

There has been considerable effort on my part to encourage some kind of structured occupation which have been somewhat reluctantly persued

At my age being on my own again fills me with absolute dread, with so much less of a support network this time around. You have recently told me that you have felt very isolated in our marriage and for that I can only say how sad and sorry I am that you have felt that way

It is very disappointing that it has not been possible for you to recognize this nor to establish any meaningful dialogue
I think we have both felt very isolated and separate but have been unable to communicate that to each other. We need to address this issue and neither of us should feel fearful or diminished if we are open and honest and able to say clearly to one and other that they feel lonely. Divorce can be absolutely horrendous, more often than not leaving long term psychological scars on both parties. There is no such thing as an amicable, straightforward divorce, more often there is a huge amount of disruption, fights over money, heartache, feelings of abandonment and diminishment.

No – don’t agree

Fortunately, or unfortunately, depending on how you look at it I am quite materialistic. I inherited from my father a sense that one needs to keep building a strong capital base from which you can generate a steadily rising income. I have been successful at this and hence the idea of divorce and all the financial implications, are absolutely devastating to me.

However, if we are to have a future together I realise that we cannot go on in the same way, i.e. joint account and small monthly allowance. We must sit down together and discuss our joint finances and how to manage them, but this does require on your part a willingness to learn and understand how stock and bond markets work.

There is no need for me to learn and understand how stock and bond markets work

There are no returns to be had from leaving money in cash, that way lies disaster. I have no idea what you did with the money that you received from the trust in 2013, whether some of it has gone to [sister GH], but if you had invested in a FTSE 100 tracker it would now be worth nearly 25% more, and produced a reasonable income. With a bit more active management you could have done even better.

I know you are very close to your sister [GH], and that her financial and house situation are dire. Again, we can sit down together to discuss possible solutions. I have a number of ideas on that front.

???

There are many other issues that I would like to discuss but I think I will leave it at that for now.

Such as ??

In conclusion I just cannot see that going our separate ways id going to benefit either of us. The mechanics of getting divorced, the bitterness, the cost of it all and the disruption it entails will leave lasting scars. After divorce, the idea of coming home to an empty home and talking to the walls fills me with horror. Most of all I still love you very much and hope and pray that we will stay together. I hope that in 2017 we can work on a joint house project somewhere in the country and at the same time find fulfillment in the work, be it voluntary or paid, that we do.
28 January 2019

Dear Ms Kausar,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Kensington and Chelsea (DHR3) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 21 November. I apologise for the delay in providing the Panel’s feedback.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded that, despite the limited agency contact, this is a clear, detailed and sensitive review in which lessons have been fully drawn out and are evidence based. The Panel commended the review panel’s use of research and expert witnesses to inform the review.

The Panel was grateful to the chair, Bill Griffiths, for attending the meeting and providing additional insight into some of the challenges that emerged in conducting this review. The Panel made the following observations in relation to the reports:

- Consider whether the objectives in learning point 2 may be more achievable by, for example, exploring how to work with professionals in the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors in raising awareness of coercive and controlling behaviour;

- Review whether the narrative that challenges the quote from JK in paragraph 133 should be more robust;

- The Panel felt it may be helpful if the executive summary contained a little more information to determine the origin of the first learning point.
Safer Kensington and Chelsea Partnership  
Domestic Homicide Review Panel  
Georgia, murdered by Larry, and both found dead in January 2017

The Panel does not need to review another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could email us at DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk and provide us with the URL to the report when it is published.

The QA Panel felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners on DHRs in their local area. I am, accordingly, copying this letter to the Mayor’s Office for Policing for information. I have also sent a copy of this letter to the chair, Bill Griffiths.

Yours sincerely

Charlotte Hickman  
Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel

Home Office letter extracts with responses from Bill Griffiths, DHR Chair and report author, agreed by Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Community Safety Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Letter extract</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consider whether the objectives in learning point 2 may be more achievable by, for example, exploring how to work with professionals in the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors in raising awareness of coercive and controlling behaviour</td>
<td>Additional action included in the action plan for Learning Point 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review whether the narrative that challenges the quote from JK in paragraph 133 should be more robust</td>
<td>Paragraph 134 has been re-written to reflect this feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Panel felt it may be helpful if the executive summary contained a little more information to determine the origin of the first learning point</td>
<td>This has been added to the first paragraph in the conclusions section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Learning Point 1:** There is a need to improve the support for GPs to routinely ask about domestic abuse to elicit a disclosure to those experiencing domestic abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Scope of recommendation i.e. local or regional</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GPs to be trained on understanding the dynamics of domestic abuse and coercive control and the need for routine enquiry. | Local                                         | • CHOG to identify and train GPs surgeries  
• Briefings prepared and presented to Private Health Network | CHOG Coordinator  
VAWG Lead |                                                   | Sept 2019                     |-Oct 2019                        |
| The Children and Health Operational Group (CHOG) to identify GP surgeries and to share domestic abuse best practice and learning. | Local                                         | • Awareness raising posters to be displayed in GP surgeries.  
• CHOG to support embedding learning and recommendations from the IRIS model in GP surgeries. | CHOG Coordinator  
VAWG Lead |                                                   | Sept 2019                     |Oct 2019                        |
| VAWG Partnership to consider future commissioning of the                          | Local                                         | • Strategic meeting to be held to discuss CCG funding IRIS.                  | VAWG Strategic Board  
VAWG Strategic Board   |                                                   | Dec 2019                      |                               |
IRIS model to embed learning with GPs.  

| Learning from national Pathfinder to be shared. | VAWG Lead CCGs STADV | Mar 2019 – Mar 2020 |

**Learning Point 2**: Professionals within the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors to be made aware of the potential harm of coercive and controlling behavior and their role in supporting those affected as part of the Coordinated Community Response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Scope of recommendation i.e. local or regional</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Housing sales and legal conveyancing professionals to be trained on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of coercive control. | Local | • Explore how to work with professionals in the housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors in raising awareness of coercive and controlling behaviour  
• Specialist services and HOG to develop training for this sector. | HOG Coordinator  
Specialist services |  |  |
| The Housing Operational Group (HOG) to share domestic abuse best practice and learning with housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors. | Local | • Awareness raising literature to be displayed in this sector.  
• Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance standards to be | HOG Coordinator  
VAWG Lead  
DAHA Coordinator |  |  |

The Housing Operational Group (HOG) to share domestic abuse best practice and learning with housing sales and legal conveyancing sectors.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Scope of recommendation i.e. local or regional</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources for estate agents to be developed on understanding how property can be used to exert economic abuse as a form of coercive control i.e. through controlling house sales.</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>• Specialist services and HOG to develop resources targeted at estate agents.</td>
<td>Specialist services HOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Point 3**: Increase and embed an understanding of the wider definition of controlling and coercive behavior and economic abuse amongst frontline professionals, including myths surrounding perpetrator behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A learning event to be held for professionals that focuses on addresses the dynamics of domestic abuse, coercive control, economic abuse and how power works. | • A learning seminar to be held in RBKC aimed at multi-agency professionals.  
• Attendance at current training sessions to be reviewed to ensure representation of relevant agencies. | VAWG Lead | | Sept 2019 | |

| All agencies and frontline professionals should consider the | Local | • Attendance at current training sessions to be reviewed to ensure | VAWG Lead | | Nov 2019 | |
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- use of a DASH risk assessment where domestic abuse is featured even if it appears at a low threshold level.
- representation of relevant agencies.
  - Professionals meeting to be held with agencies such as Adult Social Care, Housing, Health to focus on training needs.

**Learning Point 4:** As part of the wider Coordinated Community Response model, friends and family to be equipped to safely and appropriately support those affected by domestic abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Scope of recommendation i.e. local or regional</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassadors to be recruited and trained as part of the ‘Ask Me’ project, building a local network that breaks the silence about domestic abuse.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>• Community members to be trained to be ‘Ask Me’ ambassadors.</td>
<td>Three Borough Champions Network VAWG Lead Women’s Aid National Ask Me Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The findings from this review to inform a local campaign to raise awareness of domestic abuse and to challenge</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>• 16 Days of Action to include awareness raising campaign.</td>
<td>Multi-agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the myth of who is a victim (i.e. women from affluent backgrounds) and who is a perpetrator.