# **UKFast Cheshire Cricket League**

# Minutes of Management Committee Meeting

The Victoria Club, Holmes Chapel

Thursday 30th November 2017.

**Present** - Committee Members - : Selwyn Stephenson : Graham Beckett : Nick Corless : Tony Sayle : Brian Birtles : Bill Livesley : Mike Boffey : Bob Hutton : Richard White :Phil Smith : & Representatives of 60 Member Clubs

The meeting commenced at 8:00pm

# 1) Roll Call -

# Clubs Present :

Appleton : Ashley : Ashton-on-Mersey : Audlem : Barnton : Bredbury St Marks : Bromborough : Brooklands : CH Ladybridge : Cheadle Hulme : Chester BH : Chester CO : Cholmondeley : Congleton : Didsbury : Disley : Europa Exiles : Frodsham : Hale Barnes : Haslington : Heaton Mersey : Heaton Mersey Village : Holmes Chapel : Irby : Kerridge : Kingsley : Knutsford : Langley : Lymm Outrington Park : Macclesfield : Malpas : Maritime : Mellor : Middlewich : Mossley : Neston : Oakmere : Old Parkonians : Over Peover : Port Sunlight : Poynton : Prestbury ; Rostherne : Saughall : Stockport Georgians : Stockport Trinity : Styal : The Groves : Timperley : Trafford Metrovics : Tranmere Victoria : Upton : Warrington : Westminster Park : Wilmslow : Winnington Park : Winsford : Wirral : Wistaston : Woodford

#### Not in Attendence :

Aston : Barrow : Bowdon Vale : Bunbury : Burton : Chelford : Christleton : Glazebury : Hartford : Oxton : Runcorn : Stretton : Urmston : Weaverham : Wilmslow Wayfarers Woodford :

#### The above clubs will be fined £15 as per rule 18a - Non attendence at AGM or rule change dicussion meeting

#### Note: This fine does not count towards the proposed maximum 10 fines and then lose points

#### 2) Apologies :

David Lawson : Brian Davenport (Joint Presidents) : Graham Coull (Chairman) : Jim Rafferty : Bowdon Vale CC ; Wilmslow Wayfarers CC

In the absence of Graham Coull, Selwyn Stephenson (Vice Chairman) chaired the meeting

Selwyn invited Bob Hutton to give an update on the League Dinner and Presentation evening.

253 people attended the function and the concensus was that the evening was good.

However, there was still a substantial amount of moneies outstanding from Clubs for tickets. Some clubs had attended but not yet paid, some clubs had replied but not attended so owed for the mandatory 2 tickets, other Clubs had not even had the manners to reply at all , but still owed for the mandatory 2 tickets (£56). In all the outstanding money amounts to circa £1,300. Clubs who have not yet paid are urged to settle their account at the earliest opportunity. Clubs owing for tickets will be contacted, detailing their debt and requesting payment.

#### 3) Minutes of last meeting :

Minutes of the last Management Meeting held 22nd June 2017 were accepted as a true record. Proposed - Brian Birtles. Seconded - Prestbury CC

4) Matters arising None

#### 5) Chairmans remarks

Selwyn welcomed all club representatives to the meeting and was pleased to see such a good turnout. Commented that the league dinner had, in general, been well received by most Clubs. Few things to discuss that may not be on the agenda. We will take them as they come

#### 6) Club Welfare issues

The on-line DBS forms had now been officially rolled out across the cricketing fraternity which means no more paperwork to fill in and track. Would still be required to contact a verifyer to complete the form. New list will be issued within website.

It was suggested that the League approach the new County Welfare Officer, Julie Rafferty, as to the possibility of speaking at the AGM in January. This would give Julie the opportunity of updating the Clubs and also meeting the reps. also reps meeting Julie

ACTION 1 Phil to contact Julie to discuss

# 7) Websites

No report. Same as last time, if any Club had any information to share on the website then contact Jon Gledhill and give him details

# 8) Secretary and correspondence

#### Phil :

Application for membership from Irby 3rd X1 who had been released from the Liverpool and District Cricket competition. To be verified by member Clubs at AGM

#### Brian :

As per Phil, /correspondence/issues will be dealt with as we go along

## 9) Treasurer

No report

The Cheshire Cricket Alliance had formally closed their bank account and forwarded a cheque for the balance to the Treasurer

#### **10) Fixtures and Results**

**Graham Beckett** - Informed the meeting that he had the trophies that were not collected at the Presentation Evening were with him. They could be collected at the closure of the meeting if any winning Clubs were present

#### 11) Umpires

There are major revisions to the Laws of Cricket for the 2018 season. With this in mind all panel umpires will be required to attend a training evening during the close season to familiarise themselves with these changes It will also be encumbant upon Club captains and vice captains to attend the preseason "Umpires and Captains evening" so that they too may be made aware of whats changing

12) Grounds

No Report

**12) Discipline** No report

#### 13) Rule changes and amendments

Comments refer to the paper sent out by Brian Birtles "UKFast CCL Rule change proposals Jan 2018 AGM"

# These minutes are a quick resume of discussions to give clubs an insight to what was said and to use at your club discussions in making up your minds for the AGM vote

#### SECTION 1

1st Page : 85/2 to 88/20 (Top pg 2) agreed en-bloc with the exception of 88/18c, concessions, This to be taken down to section 3 and voted on seperately

88/18c - Discussion regards deduction of points for conceeding game - Change deduction from 'Clubs highest placed team' to 'team conceding'. -

- i) Some 1st X1s are now in County League so not possible to deduct points from them
- ii) Old Parkonians pointed out that the former Alliance ruling was that for the 1st two concessions the points deduction was suspended, but on a 3rd offence 15 points were deducted and a further 5 points for each concession afterwards. This meant that teams genuinely unable to field teams for various reasons were not penalised whilst repeat offenders suffered the consequences.

This format was proposed by Prestbury and seconded by Cholmondeley and carried unaminously to go

# forward to AGM vote

# SECTION 2

SECTION 2			
90/1	Divisions etc	Procedural only for handbook rewrite	
90/6	Overs limits - 2 pts pena	lty - Proposed - Old Parkonians. Seconded - Prestbury For 50 Against 3	
90/3a	Helmets	Proposed - Didsbury Seconded - Heaton Mersey Unaminous	
90/3b	Fast bowling	Proposed - Macclesfield Seconded - Timperley Unaminous	
90/3c	Over limitations	Proposed - Cholmondeley Seconded - Woodford Unaminous	
90/4	Use of new balls	Proposed - Westminster Pk Seconded - Old Parks For 52 Against 1	
90/6	Start time	Procedural only for handbook rewrite	
90/6	Start time	Procedural only for handbook rewrite	
92/13	10 overs or more	Procedural only for handbook rewrite	
93/14 line 5 to 107 &108 Accept		Accepted en-bloc Proposed - Prestbury Seconded - Europa Unaminous	
SECTION 3			
88/18	Accumulated fines	i) Should this refer to Clubs or individual Teams	
		ii) Clubs with more than 1 team will accumulate 10 fines quicker than 1 team club	
		iii) Would a monetry fine be better than points deduction?. It was thought that a points deduction would better focus the captains mind and make him complete the requirements	
		iv) Some teams leave the game without giving the relevant information of names etc to the home team for input to play-cricket. Away clubs can now go into play-cricket and enter the relevant information in the "Unsure" box.	
		v) A warning will be issued to Clubs after say 8 fines have been levied. Also an up todate data base will available on the website, Updated weekly with fines.	
		totale data base will available on the website, Opdated weekly with thes.	
	Proposed - Old Parkonia	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7	
90/6a	Proposed - Old Parkonia Start times - proposed 1p	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7	
90/6a	-	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7	
90/6a	-	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7 om start	
90/6a	-	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7 om start i) The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain	
90/6a	-	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7 om start i) The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain ii) Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well iii) Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make	
90/6a	-	ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7 om start i) The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain ii) Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well iii) Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts iv) These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a	
90/6a	-	<ul> <li>ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7</li> <li>om start <ol> <li>The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain</li> <li>Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well</li> <li>Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts</li> <li>These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a local away game.</li> <li>This proposal may enable games to finish earlier in the evening but on the otherhand parents of young children may prefer to spend Saturday mornings with</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
90/6a	-	<ul> <li>ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7</li> <li>om start <ol> <li>The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain</li> <li>Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well</li> <li>Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts</li> <li>These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a local away game.</li> <li>This proposal may enable games to finish earlier in the evening but on the otherhand parents of young children may prefer to spend Saturday mornings with the child has they will be in bed when they return from the game</li> <li>As it stands with a 1pm start many players will be leaving home at 11am, even 10.30am, when playing away so that they can meet at the pick-up point and then</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
90/6a	Start times - proposed 1p	<ul> <li>ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7</li> <li>om start <ol> <li>The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain</li> <li>Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well</li> <li>Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts</li> <li>These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a local away game.</li> <li>This proposal may enable games to finish earlier in the evening but on the otherhand parents of young children may prefer to spend Saturday mornings with the child has they will be in bed when they return from the game</li> <li>As it stands with a 1pm start many players will be leaving home at 11am, even 10.30am, when playing away so that they can meet at the pick-up point and then travel to the away ground to be there a minimum of 15 minutes before start time.</li> <li>Will By starting at 1pm any "early finish" could mean the players going home rather than staying and having a drink in the bar. This revenue is all that keeps some of the smaller clubs solvent and loss of it could have disasterous consequences for that</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
90/6a	Start times - proposed 1p	<ul> <li>ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7</li> <li>om start <ul> <li>i) The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain</li> <li>ii) Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well</li> <li>iii) Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts</li> <li>iv) These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a local away game.</li> <li>v) This proposal may enable games to finish earlier in the evening but on the otherhand parents of young children may prefer to spend Saturday mornings with the child has they will be in bed when they return from the game</li> <li>vi) As it stands with a 1pm start many players will be leaving home at 11am, even 10.30am, when playing away so that they can meet at the pick-up point and then travel to the away ground to be there a minimum of 15 minutes before start time.</li> <li>vii) By starting at 1pm any "early finish" could mean the players going home rather than staying and having a drink in the bar. This revenue is all that keeps some of the smaller clubs solvent and loss of it could have disasterous consequences for that club</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	Start times - proposed 1p Proposed - Warrington	<ul> <li>ns Seconded - Langley For 66 Against 7</li> <li>om start <ul> <li>i) The current concession of bringing the start time forward by 1 hour will remain</li> <li>ii) Can we also have option to move back 1/2 hr as well</li> <li>iii) Some clubs argued that they had a number of players committed to working Saturday mornings at their place of work. These players already struggled to make 1.30 starts and would probably be unavailable for 1pm starts</li> <li>iv) These Saturday workers are already only available for home fixtures, unless its a local away game.</li> <li>v) This proposal may enable games to finish earlier in the evening but on the otherhand parents of young children may prefer to spend Saturday mornings with the child has they will be in bed when they return from the game</li> <li>vi) As it stands with a 1pm start many players will be leaving home at 11am, even 10.30am, when playing away so that they can meet at the pick-up point and then travel to the away ground to be there a minimum of 15 minutes before start time.</li> <li>vii) By starting at 1pm any "early finish" could mean the players going home rather than staying and having a drink in the bar. This revenue is all that keeps some of the smaller clubs solvent and loss of it could have disasterous consequences for that club</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

101/21 Wide balls	Off-side wide markings - this was inavertantly overlooked at meeting so will leave in and vote at AGM
107 New 2nd x1 ground criteria	It was thought that these proposals setting out standards for 2nd X1 grounds were a bit draconian and may prevent a newly formed team from gaining access to the League and also impacted some existing 2nd X1 grounds. Could be big financial implecations to clubs.
	Executive considered that the lack of sightscreens could pose a Health & Safety issue with players being injured when failing to pick up the flight of the ball
	Also is it fair on Clubs who have invested in good facilities to be asked to play at these grounds
	Decided to make the criteria an "aspiration" rather than a dictat.

All these proposals have proposer and seconder and will therefore go forward for voting at the AGM

## 13) Divisions C

Discussions took place around the paper previously issued by Brian Birtles and distributed to Clubs

Warrington started the debate - Used to 90 over cricket. Not to happy with Win/Lose and would prefer to keep Draw option

Old Parkonians - Keep the status Quo. No longer a requirement to bowl out a team in the second innings to win. Just need to bowl negative and keep defensive field to ensure opposition don't get your score.

Average game 2017 was of 75 overs. Some 90 overs still finished in draws. 80 overs give more draws?

Win/Lose cricket could encourage side batting second to "throw the towel in" if team batting first as big score, Nothing to play for second innings. Draw will allow junior batters to play an extended innings that means something

No preparation for senior first team cricket where the format is completely different

Tranmere Victoria - Status Quo. With reduced overs the senior bowlers will want to bowl as many as allowed thus meaning less chance for juniors to participate

No scorers, no umpires, but a complicated set of rules for reduced overs

Rather bowl at teams playing for a draw, and bonus points, than have a team give up. Less overs to bowl so less bowlers get a chance

Juniors use draw cricket as a means of getting meaningful batting practice and better their game

Saughall - prefer win/lose

General

Have shorter game of 80 overs but keep Draw element

Vote was taken in two parts :

Shorten game to 80 overs For 29 Against 19 Abstentions 5

Win/Lose format Majority against (didn't count individuals but was obvious majority)

Therefore only the 80 overs will go forward to the AGM. Draw cricket remains

There was a suggestion from the floor that only clubs involved in division C matches should be allowed to vote on this proposal. Phil commented that 44 clubs are represented in Division C.

Again, after discussion, it was agreed that the proposition would be voted on as a league

#### 14 AOB

Overseas players - A question was asked if overseas players were still permissible. They are as long as theHome Office and ECB directives are followed.

Brian issues all communication received to all clubs in the league

Meeting closed 9-40pm

# 13) Any Other Business

Meeting closed - 9:15pm