

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President: Mr Denis Bourne



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: tonybirch@btinternet.com
07786 443474

Scrutineering & Off Road Committee Meeting

17th March 2018 starting at 13:00.

**THE BRITISH MOTOR MUSEUM
BANBURY ROAD, GAYDON, WARKS, CV35 0BJ**

AGENDA

1. Open the meeting.
2. Apologies for absence.
3. Acceptance of minutes the previous meeting.
4. Ongoing Topics.
5. Rule change Proposals
6. Class Q Information
7. Enquiries received since the last meeting.
8. Any other business this meeting.
9. Date and location of next meeting.
10. Close the meeting.

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President: Mr Denis Bourne



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: tonybirch@btinternet.com
07786 443474

Minutes of the Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting of 18th November 2017

Distribution:-

Via club secretaries who forward them accordingly to their club members, Scrutineering & Off Road Committee members, Log Book Scrutineers, Club Representatives, Council members and other interested parties.

Note: Recipients of these minutes need to ensure that these matters are discussed at club committee meetings and also to publicise any concluded issues in their club newsletters. In the majority of cases, the minutes are sent by post and e-mail to the secretaries of all competitive clubs, S&ORC, Log Book Scrutineers, club delegates and members attending the meetings.

There were 17 attendees and 9 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 6 clubs. There are 29 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 8 members of the S&ORC plus a further 1 log book scrutineers.

The accuracy of these minutes will be confirmed by their acceptance at the next meeting.

Those present -

NAME	CLUB
Simone Birch (CM)	ALRC
Mark Whaley (S L CM)	North Eastern RO
Dennis Wright (S L CM)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simon Saunt (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Allen Rowell (G)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Fraser Parish (S L)	Cornwall & Devon LRC
Peter Alexander (R)	Cornwall & Devon LRC
Dave Canham (SLRCS)	Southern ROC

NAME	CLUB
Debbie Darby (CM)	Southern ROC
Charles Darby (G)	Southern ROC
Tim Linney (S CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Matthew Fulwood (R)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Stuart Newton (G)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Richard Banks (L)	Midland ROC
Paul Barton (R CM)	Surrey Hills LRC
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC

S = Scrutineering Committee member. R = Club Representative. L = Log-book Scrutineer.
CS = Chief Scrutineer (of the named club) G = Guest CM = Council member.

Apologies for absence received from:

NAME	CLUB
Andrew Flanders (LCM)	Anglian LRC
Steve Kirby (S L R CM)	Hants & Berks LRO
David Jeffrey	Cornwall & Devon LRC
Andy Wilson (R)	Dorset LRC
Richard Smith (L CM)	Midland ROC
Paul Walton	North Eastern RO
Mark Pycraft (R)	Essex LRC
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Andrew Sinclair (L)	Leics & Rutland LRC

NAME	CLUB
Frank Champion (S L CM)	Lincs LRC
Terry Buss (L)	Southern ROC
John Walters (R)	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Andy Dennis (L)	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Adrian Neaves	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Ray Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Adam Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Mykul Jones (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC

Note that the elected scrutineers committee members and log book scrutineers, marked (S or L) above, represent the ALRC as a whole; the club name is included for information only. Matters that are concluded will be marked CLOSED.

Any enquiries should be copied to Simone Birch, at the above address, so that they can be entered into the minutes of the meeting with the correct wording.

1. Open the Meeting.

The meeting was opened at 13:05 p.m.

2. Apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

3. Review the minutes of the previous meeting (8th July 2017)

There were no comments received on these minutes. The minutes were proposed by Tony Sinclair, seconded by Fraser Parish and agreed unanimously. Signed by Mark Whaley.

4. Review of ongoing Topics.

a. MSA Off-Road Scrutineers. (23 March 2013)

Following the meeting of the MSA Cross Country Meeting held in May 2017 this matter has now been referred to the MSA Council for consideration at their meeting in September. No further information has been received from the MSA as yet.

ONGOING.

b. ALRC National Rally Scrutineering, Peter Gladman, Wye & Welsh LRC

Following the National Rally a discussion took place in our committee about vehicles being passed at the National Rally which would not pass at one of our club trials. Examples given were no spreader plates behind tow balls, bare radiator pipes within the vehicle, bent roll cage. I understand this led to one scrutineer failing a vehicle and then another passing it.

We felt that if something does not comply with the green book and is passed then why bother having the rules.

Perhaps the procedures used at scrutineering need to be looked at to avoid these sorts of situations and inconsistent decisions.

It was explained at the meeting that some failed items were rectified by the entrants and then passed by the scrutineering team.

The following reply has been received from Malcolm Wilson, Chief Scrutineer at the National Rally.

Firstly, please accept my apologies for not being able to attend the July meeting as I was officiating at a sprint meeting in north Lincolnshire that weekend.

After having read through the S&ORC minutes for the July meeting I feel I need to comment on the above item.

Firstly as far as I am aware no vehicle took part in this year's National that was not deemed to be safe, any person that submitted a vehicle that was found not to comply with the rules was asked to go and rectify the problem and then bring the vehicle back for re-checked by a scrutineer, with regard to the vehicle with the "bent roll cage" I can only assume this was dealt with by another scrutineer while I was possibly dealing with a retest, because as far as I am aware it was not brought to my attention, and I hope I would notice and remember if someone presented a vehicle with a bent roll cage to me. As to vehicles passing with "no spreader plates behind tow balls" I am aware of only 2 vehicles where spreader plates were an issue, one where a spreader plate appeared to be missing, to which an alternative tow point was fabricated so that it could compete, the other was a vehicle where the spreader plate was covered and difficult to see, in this case the entrant was asked to modify the area so that the plate could be seen more easily in future. With regard to the vehicle with the bare radiator pipe in within the vehicle, which I think may have been the vehicle that was supposedly failed by one scrutineer and passed by another, if this is the vehicle I am thinking of, then all I can say about the incident is that it caused, I believe, a very upset representative from the entrants club to come and confront the chief scrutineers about the matter, which we then had to spend approximately an hour after scrutineering had finished that evening sorting out, and yes the vehicle was eventually passed by another scrutineer so that it could compete.

I think it should be remembered, I believe, that the main job of the scrutineer is to make sure a vehicle is safe to compete in an event that it is entered in, and it complies with the regulations for the type of event the vehicle is competing in. also if a vehicle does not comply then the scrutineer may well suggest a temporary fix so that the vehicle can compete, it is the responsibility of the entrant/competitor to make sure the vehicle complies with the regs before it is presented for scrutineering.

I feel that scrutineering is not all about finding as many faults as you can on a vehicle then telling the entrant he/she can't compete in an event, perhaps I have been doing it wrong all these years, as I am of the opinion that it is part our job as scrutineers to help and point the entrant/competitor in the right direction so that next time they bring their vehicle to scrutineering they get through without hassle, not to try cause them grief and try and put them off.

Dennis Wright agreed that this was a fair comment of how scrutineering was carried out at the National Rally. Mark Whaley said that there were only two vehicles that were deemed unsafe to enter event and that both competitors were happy to accept this decision. One vehicle could not be repaired as the chassis was cracked by the steering box and the competitor was grateful that this had been found as the potential for harm could have been high. The other vehicle was unsafe due to corrosion in the brake pedal box. Solutions were offered on how it could be corrected but the vehicle was not re-presented for scrutineering.

The scrutineers want as many members as possible to enjoy motorsport in a safe manner. The scrutineering is primarily a safety issue before the event and any eligibility issues can be checked after the event as necessary.

CLOSED

c. Steering Wheel Knobs, Malcolm Wilson, S&ORC

At the ALRC National Rally where several vehicles were presented and passed at scrutineering it was queried by a marshal on the legality of using a steering wheel knob.

On checking previous S&ORC meeting minutes it was found that these were approved for use in May 2007, after an initial enquiry in January 2007 and some debate at the meetings.

This information is now to be added to the regulations in the ALRC Handbook to avoid confusion at future events and make all aware.

At the ALRC Council meeting on the 7th October 2017 the following ALRC Regulation clarification was proposed by Paul Barton, seconded by Dennis Wright and agreed unanimously.

B.20.1. Steering Wheel Knobs to be added to "a".

CLOSED

d. Bush Cutter Wires, Malcolm Wilson, S&ORC

A vehicle was presented at scrutineering for the ALRC National Rally comp safari with brush cutter wires fitted. The driver was asked to remove these which he reluctantly did.

On checking previous S&ORC meeting minutes it was found that these were outlawed in competitions in July 2011. This had been listed in the MSA Yearbook but appears to have been removed.

This information is now to be added to the regulations in the ALRC Handbook to avoid confusion at future events and make all aware.

At the ALRC Council meeting on the 7th October 2017 the following ALRC Regulation clarification was proposed by Paul Barton, seconded by Dennis Wright and agreed unanimously.

B.20.2. Bush wires are not permitted.

CLOSED

e. Suspension set up on a CCVT vehicle, Fraser Parish, Cornwall & Devon LRC

A club member has asked the following question.

Can I run the axle and radius arms sent up like this? It is Discovery 2 trailing arms and mounts on a Discovery 1 rear axle? I have just bought the vehicle, it has competed at the Majors and other national and club events over the last few years.

Richard Banks said he had never seen this suspension set up at any of the Majors events where he had been the chief scrutineer. In his opinion this could not be guaranteed as safe as the components have been loaded in a way that they were not designed for.

Under C.5.5 all the bolts would need to be in place and fastened properly and tightened. There are bolts missing from the set-up which has been done to perhaps allow for more articulation.

C.5.1. states that any Land Rover suspension system and components may be used on many model and the suspension parts modified to accommodate the components.

This is not a complete system as it is a mixture between Discovery 2 and Discovery 1 parts.

Dennis Wright said as it does not represent a complete system he would not pass this set-up.

A vote to allow this set-up was taken by the S&ORC members present – For - 3, Against - 4.

Fraser confirmed that this set up was to be changed.

CLOSED

5. Rule Change Proposals

The Rationale

The availability of V8 engines is starting to dwindle. Many of them out there are getting tired and will require significant money spent on them so they can be re-engineered to a reliable condition. This rule change allows an approved engine from a vehicle over 10 years old to be used which will lead to a supply of newer donor vehicles coming available.

Proposal

Current wording:-

A.2 Source

Rover Company to 2001 – This was to allow car vehicles prior to that date.

Land Rover by whoever owned.

Vehicle specifications should be limited to European countries only and the engine must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in. (Implemented 18th October 2010)

New wording:-

A.2 Source

Rover Company to 2001 – This was to allow car vehicles prior to that date.
Land Rover by whoever owned.

Vehicle specifications are limited to European countries only.

Engines may be transplanted from vehicles over 10 years old that are on the ALRC Permitted Engine List. All other engines and any hybrid / electric propulsion systems must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in.

Proposed by Terry Buss (Southern Rover Owners Club)
Seconded by Dave Canham (Southern Rover Owners Club)

New wording:-

A.2 Source

Rover Company to 2001 – This was to allow car vehicles prior to that date.
Land Rover by whoever owned.

Vehicle specifications are limited to European countries only.

Engines may be transplanted from vehicles over 10 years old that are on the ALRC Permitted Engine List. All other engines and any hybrid / electric propulsion systems must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in.

Vehicle Classes may need to be adapted to suit adoption of new engines. The engine list will define which class.

At the last meeting it was asked for a list of engine families to be considered so that a table could be constructed to show engines and relevant classes.

This needs to be done to help the scrutineers.

Matthew Fulwood said he had supplied a list when the previous consultation took place but had not resubmitted it.

Simone said it was very frustrating when any information was asked for from the clubs so it can be discussed but nothing was returned. This was asked for in August so clubs could be discussing it at club level and then give their input.

Matthew read out his list of engines that were over 10 years and said he would forward to Simone for ease of adding to the minutes. These included the following vehicle makes and engines:

- Discovery LR 3 Jaguar AJ-V8, Ford Cologne SOHC V6, Ford PSA Lion V6.
- Range Rover Sport Jaguar AJ-V8, Jaguar AJ-V8 AJ133, Ford PSA Lion V6.
- Freelander 2/LR 2 Ford Ecoboost, Ford S16 (B6324S), Ford Duratorq TDCI PSA DW12.
- Range Rover L322 BMW M62TUB44 V8, Jaguar AJ-V8, Jaguar AJ-V8 AJ133, BMW M57 Straight 6, Ford PSA Lion V8.
- Freelander I Rover K Series, Rover KV6, Rover L Series, BMW M47R.
- Discovery II OHV Rover V8, TD5.
- Range Rover P38a OHV Rover V8, BMW M51 Straight 6.
- Discovery I OHV Rover V8, Rover T Series Mpi, 200 Tdi, 300 Tdi.
- Range Rover Classic OHV Rover V8, VM TD, 200 Tdi, 300 Tdi.
- Defenders Ford Duratorq ZSD Puma TDCI – 2.2 and 2.4. Isuzu 4BD1 – Australian market so not permitted. We do allow military options. BMW DOHC M52B28 Straight 6 – South Africa market so not permitted.

Earlier vehicles use engines already mentioned.

These engines are very similar to those previously discussed at the last meeting. A table would need to be constructed to show engines and permitted classes to go together with the proposal. Comp Safari classes are listed by engine size so the following could be applied.

ENGINE	COMP SAFARI CLASS
BMW V8	9
JLR V8	9
JLR V8 DIESEL	9
JLR V6 DIESEL	9
4 CYLINDER PUMA	8
6 CYLINDER BMW DIESEL	9
BMW Td4	9

Classes for trials are listed by vehicle size and not engine capacity. To differentiate for changed engines in the Modified classes 6 – 11 the suffix “A” could be used if the new generation of engines are used.

The question was asked whether the engine classes could be left the same but for turbos and diesels could the multiplier be used. The 4 cylinder Puma would be similar to the TD 5. It does seem to be down to how much money competitors want to spend. We do not currently apply the diesel multiplier as stated in the ALRC Handbook B.2.8. - see MSA Yearbook J.5.4.1.

We would need to say that all the new generation diesel engines over 2.5 litres would have the diesel multiplier applied.

B.2.8 currently reads “The forced induction coefficient does not apply to diesel engines”. (See MSA Yearbook 2017. J.5.4.1.)

It would need to be changed to the following if the rule change proposal was accepted.

B.2.8. The forced induction coefficient does not apply to diesel engines under 2500cc. (See current MSA Yearbook J.5.4.1.).

The question was also raised as to whether maximum capacity would need to be considered?

It was agreed that the maximum capacity should be as fitted to a Land Rover product.

It is not going to be possible for a scrutineer to police this but it is down to the competitor to be truthful in this matter.

The full proposal now reads as: New wording:-

A.2 Source

Rover Company to 2001 – This was to allow car vehicles prior to that date.

Land Rover by whoever owned.

Vehicle specifications are limited to European countries only.

Engines may be transplanted from vehicles over 10 years old that are on the ALRC Permitted Engine List. All other engines and any hybrid / electric propulsion systems must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in.

Vehicle Classes may need to be adapted to suit adoption of new engines. The engine list will define which class.

Maximum capacity allowable for each family of engine is that when fitted to a Land Rover product.

There have been two other comments received from clubs on the matter of engines.

Kevin Peake – Breckland LRC

Original Land Rover engine	Acceptable replacement
1.6 and 2 litre	Rover 60 2 litre car engine.
2.25 litre	Rover 80 2.25 litre car engine, or normally aspirated 2.5 litre diesel.
2.6 litre	Any Rover P4 range car engine.
Up to 2.5 litre 4 cylinder Turbo-diesel	Any other 4 cylinder 2.5 litre (nominal) turbo-diesel Land Rover engine.
2.5 litre 5 or 6 cylinder Turbo-diesel	Any other 5 or 6 cylinder 2.5 litre (nominal) turbo-diesel Land Rover engine.
V8 petrol (where factory fitted.)	Any V8 aluminium engine up to maximum size listed in the vehicle size chart from product listed in A.2 for that vehicle.

Looking at above engine chart from ALRC Handbook there is no mention of a 2.5 litre normally aspirated diesel engine as fitted to early 90/110's.

There has been a question raised on Facebook regarding what is allowed as a replacement for a n/a 2.5 diesel, but it seems to have been overlooked - for how many years I have no idea.

David Moore – Somerset & Wilts LRC

New rule proposal **B.2.1 Alternative engines or engine parts which may be interchanged**

Under the current ruling above, the only acceptable replacement or alternative for a standard Series 1 in Class 1 is the Rover 60 2 litre car engine. I have recently been looking for another engine for my 1951 Series 1 Land Rover due to a crack in the block that is not repairable. With prices of 1.6 and 2 litre Rover engines pushing 4 figure sums, it is not financially viable to find a replacement engine should you have any trouble like I have with mine. The Rover 60 engine that is shown as an acceptable replacement is arguably just as hard, if not harder to find than a Land Rover engine of the same capacity. I have recently been quoted an engine rebuild from Cox and Turner Engineering for over £4K and a 12 month lead time for a 2 litre, that is providing you have a decent block to start with.

An acceptable replacement for a Series 2 or 3 in class 2 is a normally aspirated 2.5 litre diesel. I believe this was due to the fact that 2.25 diesel engines were becoming harder to find. However, prices for a running 2.25 litre petrol or diesel engine are anything between £100-£500. They are also pretty easy to come by with a quick look on eBay. The value of Series 1's has increased dramatically due to collectors and they are now sought after by Land Rover dealers for their showrooms. Hence, to find a running 1.6 or 2 litre, you will need in excess of £1500. And even then, it will still be an engine that is over 55 years old which will undoubtedly need work. As mentioned above, I understand the 2.5 NA diesels were allowed under standard class 2 as it was deemed that the 2.25 diesel was becoming harder to find. If this is the case, then how has Class 1 not been allowed to develop? The lack of engine spares could see this class completely disappear.

I have been planning on putting a 2.25L petrol engine into my Series 1 now, but under the current ruling I would be competing in a modified class against V8s and 300TDI powered Land Rovers. The power of a 3.5 V8 is significantly more than a 2.25 (more than double the BHP!) Also, the gearbox and drive train is simply not designed to take the power of a V8 or the torque of a 300TDI. The gearbox, axles and steering components from later Series Land Rovers are already allowed in Class 1 and therefore compatible with a 2.25L petrol engine.

A rule change to allow 2.25 engines in Class 1 would allow those who have already converted their vehicles to 2.25 engines to compete against similar vehicles. Under the current ruling, Class 6 (modified leaf sprung 80"s) can range anything from a 2.25 litre engine up to a 4.6 litre. The power difference between a 2 litre engine (Rover 60) and a 2.25 litre petrol engine is around 14BHP and 3 IB/FT in torque. Compare this to a 2.25 and 3.5 V8, which under the current ruling would put both in the same modified class, the power of the V8 is over double the 2.25.

I genuinely believe that there will be no Class 1s in the near future without the below rule change. It would be a great shame to see these classes diminish due to the lack of engines available.

Rule Proposal B.2.1 Alternative engines or engine parts which may be interchanged are:

Original Land Rover Engine	Acceptable replacement
1.6, and 2 litre	Rover 60 2 litre car engine Land Rover 2.25 engines Rover 80 2.25 litre car engine or normally aspirated 2.5 litre diesel.

Dennis Wright replied that he thought the Class 1 80" should remain with the engine it was originally built with. If the engine was changed it would still be able to be entered in events but would be placed in a different class. This appears to be a problem for some competitors who do not want to enter under a modified heading.

Charles Darby said that the power that could be achieved by changing from a 2 litre to 2.5 litre engine is three fold at least.

It is appreciated that there are not many old engines around but to allow a change of engine just so a Class can be continued was not thought to be an option.

One option would be to categorise the vehicles under the engine size and not the vehicle size. This would mean that a 80" with a 2.25 petrol engine would be classed as a Class 2 vehicle. This is not seen as an ideal solution. The turning circle between an 80" and an 86", 88" or Lightweight is quite a difference so this would disadvantage the larger vehicles.

Fraser Parish pointed out that the cost of rebuilding an engine to remain as a standard vehicle can be quite prohibitive and run into £1000's.

Matthew Fulwood said that if there was a second tier of modified vehicles this might provide the solution. This was not thought to be an option. A vehicle is either classed as Standard or Modified with no grey area between.

The argument from David Moore appears to be that in the future there would be no Class 1's competing but unfortunately this was seen as something that is inevitable as the vehicles get older.

Charles pointed out that there were also not many Class 3's competing now.

It was unfortunate that David Moore could not attend the meeting to answer the comments raised. As he wants to put forward a new rule change proposal this will need further discussion and a completed rule change proposal would need to be submitted by June 1st 2018 so there is time to discuss this at the next S&ORC meeting where hopefully David can attend.

The instrument to include different engines has not been voted on yet so the above two comments would require a rule change to be submitted at this time.

ONGOING

6. Class Q Information - See attached chart

The chart circulated is made up from information received by Simone prior to this meeting. We are aware that there a Q class entries at some events that are not being reported but hopefully this can be corrected going forward.

It also appears that some of the points being picked up may put a vehicle into a Modified Class instead of the Q Class.

From the information received it does appear that the bulk of entries are in RTVT's with only one club giving any details for entries in a CCVT.

Wheel spaces are mentioned but there are no measurements being taken. These should be limited to 30mm as per the MSA Yearbook so anything larger than that should not be allowed to compete. This should be noted by all clubs as allowing larger wheel spacers could jeopardise the event permit.

Larger 50mm spacers are allowed on the road but are not allowed in competitions. MSA Yearbook P.56.6. It was agreed when the Q Class trial was started that if there was anything obvious that could be incorporated into the ALRC Regulations that it would be considered at this meeting for a vote to be taken at the AGM in March. There is obviously no guarantee that the clubs would vote For a proposal.

If nothing is put forward now but something arises before the end of the consultation period then that would follow the usual format for rule changes and would require a rule change proposal to be submitted by 1st June 2019 for voting on in 2020.

Matthew Fulwood apologised for not sending in more information prior to the meeting. At Chiltern Vale LRC they are finding increased entries from tubular bumpers on mainly Discoveries, wider off set rims exceeding the 4" dish allowed.

The intention of Q Class was to run only for two years to then study the information being returned. It was not intended for Q class to continue past November 2018.

Presently the main information does not support Q class carrying on beyond that time if the bumper issue is resolved as this is the main topic that appears to be causing vehicles to be placed in Q Class.

Mark Whaley said that bumpers have been an ongoing topic for a number of years.

In the Modified RTVT classes there is nothing stopping a competitor having a fabricated steel bumper so long as they are no smaller, weaker or more flexible than the original - ALRC Regulation E.6.1.

This is a RTVT Specific Technical Regulation would allow tubular bumpers in the Modified Class in a RTVT only.

RTVT's should be non-damaging and the vehicles entered should be taken into account by C-o-C's when they are setting out the event.

To make an exception for Range Rover / Discovery entrants to be allowed to have any bumpers would discriminate against those with standard bumpers because it is likely at events that classes would be amalgamated.

The member clubs have already said that they do not want a major re-write of the rules as they voted not to proceed with the previous competitive events consultation.

If Q class was to stop then no modifications such as tray backs would be allowed in the future. Rule changes would be required to allow vehicles with the various modifications being listed under Q class to be allowed to continue to event.

Richard Banks pointed out that as clubs were struggling in the present economic climate that the continuation of Q class may help clubs to survive. Q Class is not producing vehicles that are unsafe to compete and does not appear to be doing any harm.

Dave Canham replied that some members were not happy with the Q class and there was some animosity to it in some areas. Richard Banks said he had not experienced any of this at events.

Dave said that at Southern ROC events when someone turned up with a different vehicle they are usually able to be accommodated in the Modified classes and if necessary change items to comply.

Simone said this was also the case at Leics & Rutland LRC events.

It was also said that some photographs on social media show that some clubs are allowing Q class vehicles in events but these are not being reported – it could be that these events are being run as privilege events.

There was one team entered in this year's Majors Memorial Trial hosted by Midland ROC which included Q class vehicles. One of the vehicles if it had had a bumper fitted would have probably fitted an ALRC Class. The only one that was outside the rules was the 88" because the rear body was considerably changed and came down in line with the rear wheels. One was on a chassis that there was some debate about the dimensions of the rails. The main criticism was the sharpness of the bent body panels. The vehicles were all considered safe to compete.

There were several other ALRC vehicles presented without inner wings fitted.

It was proposed by Mark Whaley that the Q class should be allowed to continue past the two year period this was seconded by Matthew Fulwood. More information seems to be required before regulations may need to be amended.

Simone said that originally the Q Class was a proposal for RTVT only but the S&ORC meeting where it was announced asked for all events to be included. There have only been returns from 1 Tyro vehicle, 3 CCVT vehicles and 2 comp safari vehicles with 35 RTVT vehicles being listed.

Dennis Wright said that originally he thought that the Q Class should apply to all events but had now changed his mind and it should be restricted to RTVT.

It was thought by the meeting that the Q Class should be limited to RTVT only and the time extended. This could be done at the end of the trial period for a further 2 years from January 2019. Information would still be required to be submitted.

To gauge support for Q Class it was proposed by Dave Canham and seconded by Mark Whaley that member clubs are to be asked the following question with a YES or NO answer at the ALRC AGM in March:

Should the ALRC Q Class Trial be allowed to continue for a further two years from January 2019 for RTVT only.

As this is not a rule proposal this decision would be made by the ALRC Council at their February meeting.

As wheel spacers are one of the main differences that are putting vehicles into Q Class there was discussion about these. Wheel spacers are mainly fitted to vehicles with taller and/or wider tyres than fitted as standard to maintain adequate steering lock, in particular when OEM wheels are retained. Discussion followed surrounding the need to permit the use of wheel spacers versus or greater wheel off-set

Debby Darby gave an example of six 90's entered in a trial – 2 without wheel spacers i.e. Class 4 and 4 with i.e. Class 10. Clubs would probably amalgamate the classes and this would then disadvantage the standard class vehicles. We have seen this in the leaf sprung classes especially with the 86" vehicles. This would potentially be a worry.

The following rule change proposal was discussed to put forward for voting on at the AGM.

It was proposed by Matthew Fulwood, seconded by Charles Darby and agreed unanimously by the S&ORC members present (8) that the following rule proposal be sent to the clubs for voting on at the AGM.

Current wording:

B.7.2. The use of wheel spacers is prohibited. (Regardless of rules P.56.6 and J.5.8.2 in the 2017 MSA Yearbook).

This would remain in place.

New wording which would apply to RTVT's only.

E.2.5. In modified classes wheel spacers are permitted up to current MSA Yearbook Regulation P.56.6

7. Enquiries received since previous meeting.

a. Yellow Tag Removal – Ray Godwin, Wye & Welsh LRC.

Question – after removing the yellow tag due to damage to a cage and making note of the numbers what do we do with the yellow tag? Do we dispose of it or send it somewhere?

Dennis Wright replied that the number part should be sent to him as the log book secretary so that it can be recorded as cancelled.

Information sent should record the Blue / Red tag number to identify the vehicle. Where there is an old number typed on a logbook with a new one hand written on, then both numbers should be given for identification to take place.

Some competitors have several vehicles and it is sometimes difficult to match tag numbers to the correct vehicle.

Dave Canham asked as an aside had anyone noticed the yellow tags becoming brittle? – None had been reported.

CLOSED

8. Any other business. None received

9. Date and location of next meeting.

Next Meeting – 17th March 20178

The location will be at the British Motor Museum, Banbury Road, Gaydon, CV35 0BJ.

Dates for 2018 booked at the British Motor Museum.

AGM / EGM / S&ORC – 17th March, 7th July, 17th November.

Council – 3rd February, 9th June, 6th October. Venue to be Ibis Hotel, Rugby.

10. Close the meeting.

Meeting closed at 15.25.