



## **Harlow High Wycombe**

We (at Harlow High Wycombe Ladies HC) believe that the current rule 7.6.2. (citing the last date for registration of players for the league as 1 February) disfavours small clubs, either trying to grow/develop their club or to survive as a club.

If a club is wanting to increase from one to two teams with a view to entering a second team in the league (May closing date), they will need to recruit and try out new players across the whole season if they are to meet the May deadline. It is clearly more difficult to increase numbers from one to two teams compared to, say, five to six teams

On the other hand, if a club is struggling for players, with only one team, and some of those players are hit with injuries, then the club may wish to encourage friends/partners/colleagues to play to help out - but are prohibited from doing so.

We have experienced both of these scenarios at different times. In the latter example, we resolved this by the injured players continuing to play through their injuries or we played short. We did not resort to playing new players under false names.

We propose that this rule is removed for South Central.

Maggie Westby

Chair Harlow High Wycombe Ladies HC

## **Amersham and Chalfont**

Have shared with the board for cascading.

Somewhat surprised to read that the proposed move to quarters and to smaller leagues were both supported. It will mean we need longer pitch bookings so can host fewer matches at home so will have to hire more pitches - meaning increased costs - and will mean fewer matches over a season so fewer match fees - meaning reduced revenues.

Could you share a breakdown of the survey data - for a change this drastic it would be helpful to understand how many clubs actually voted, what the voting was etc.

I would think there would have to be a quite compelling mandate for both changes. Along with the likely significant increase in EH fees this is combining to make a difficult job of growing participation in hockey even harder as we will have little option but to significantly increase fees to members.

Rob Levine

Chair, ACHC



## **Wycombe Hockey Club**

Last year clubs voted to not remove annual fees but to reinvest in primary school and umpiring with all the excess funds south central is generating.

How has this happened? I notice London have offered some funding for various activities. at wycombe we have paid over £5k to put a community coach into multiple primary schools to promote our sport. Can clubs apply for funding ?

Karen McKinnon

Wycombe Hockey Club

## **Isle of Wight Hockey Club**

IOW Travel subsidy

As per the 2024 AGM minutes there was meant to be a process communicated to clubs for the IOW travel subsidy but HHC didn't receive this.

I sent multiple emails to the finance director requesting the subsidy and the process and was eventually told there wasn't any subsidy or policy.

Clubs have to pay hundreds of pounds per team to play away vs IOW, what can be done about this?

Thanks

Charlie Bennett

HHC Director of Hockey

## **Henley Hockey Club**

### **1. Timely Submission of Complaints**

Last season, a situation arose where a team (Oxford OBU) submitted a complaint about player eligibility against another team in South Premier. The player in question had not been formally released by OBU and went on to play against them in the first match of the season. However, the complaint was only lodged in the penultimate week of the season. Over 6 months later. At a point when relegation was a possibility, and points could have influenced league standings.

I would propose introducing a clear timeframe within which such complaints must be submitted—ideally within 14 days after the incident. This would help ensure that concerns



are raised in good faith and in a timely manner, rather than being used retrospectively to gain a competitive advantage.

## **2. Sanctions and Points Allocation**

I also believe the current approach of awarding a 5–0 win to the “wronged” team may not reflect the spirit of fair play. In the case mentioned above, Oxford OBU were comprehensively beaten in the match but stood to gain a 5–0 win by default, had the complaint been upheld.

Instead, I’d suggest that if a team is found to have breached player eligibility rules, they should incur a points deduction (e.g. 3 points), regardless of the match result. This penalises the offending team appropriately without artificially inflating the result in favour of the other side. A useful parallel might be found in motorsport. If a driver runs another driver off the track, that driver is penalised with a time penalty. The other driver is not rewarded a time advantage.

In summary, my two requests are:

- Introduce a reasonable time limit (e.g. 14 days) for raising player eligibility concerns.
- Replace the awarding of a 5–0 win with a fixed points deduction for the team found to be in breach. No gain to the other team.

I believe these changes would promote fairness, clarity, and integrity across the league.

Grant Hunt  
+44 7788 361100