

# 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](mailto:tonybirch@btinternet.com)  
0116 286 7913

## Scrutineering & Off Road Committee Meeting

8<sup>th</sup> July 2017 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](mailto:tonybirch@btinternet.com)  
0116 286 7913

## Minutes of the Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> March 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 30 attendees and 14 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 1 club. There are 28 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 10 members of the S&ORC plus a further 5 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
Derek Spooner (CM)	ALRC
Mark Whaley (S L CM)	North Eastern RO
Paul Walton (G)	North Eastern RO
Dennis Wright (S L CM)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simon Saunt (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Andrew Sinclair (L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Antony Birch (G)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Mark Pycraft (R)	Essex LRC
Ray Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Mykul Jones (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Anthony Knight (G)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Murray Wiltshire (CM)	Wye & Welsh LRC

NAME	CLUB
Peter Alexander (R)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Steve Kirby (S L R CM)	Hants & Berks LRO
Dave Canham (SLRCS)	Southern ROC
Debbie Darby (CM)	Southern ROC
Charles Darby (G)	Southern ROC
Mark Baitup (G)	Southern ROC
Terry Buss (L)	Southern ROC
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC
Peter Lugg (S L)	Somerset & Wilts ROC
Tim Linney (S CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Matthew Fulwood (R)	Chiltern Vale LRC
John Walters (R)	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Andy Dennis (L)	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Paul Barton (R CM)	Surrey Hills LRC
David Mitchell (R)	North Wales 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
Fraser Parish (S L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC

NAME	CLUB
Richard Smith (L)	Midland ROC
Frank Champion (S L CM)	Lincs 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 13:00 p.m.

### **2. Apologies for absence.**

Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

### **3. Review the minutes of the previous meeting (12<sup>th</sup> November 2016)**

There were no comments received on these minutes. The minutes were proposed by Matthew Fullwood, seconded by Andy Dennis and agreed unanimously. Signed by Mark Whaley.

### **4. Review of ongoing Topics.**

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

A decision on this is to hopefully be announced at the next meeting of the MSA Cross Country Committee which is taking place on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2017. Please read the AGM minutes (18<sup>th</sup> March.2017) for further background on this matter.

#### **ONGOING.**

#### **b. Modified Class Vehicle Regulations – Engine sizes , Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC.**

Last meeting we asked members to go back to their clubs to discuss what types of engines they would like to be considered for including in the regulations to move them forward.

A formal proposal would need to be made and several regulations may need to be looked at simultaneously.

Change in engines, reasonable costs and to remain in the spirit of the ALRC all need to be taken into account.

With the latest edition of the ALRC Handbook just published the time scale would be to hope to have something in place before the next publication in 2019.

Should there be a rolling date in the rule A2? A ten year cut-off date was suggested with a bi-ennial check to allow the ALRC Handbook to be updated. The last time this rule was amended was on the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

It should be remembered that the rules apply to all disciplines i.e. trials and comp safaris.

The Q class introduction is not meant to allow bigger engines in without changing the rules. It must be remembered that this Q class is being trialled for a two year period only and will then be assessed as to its need.

There is concern that larger capacity forced induction petrol engines, whilst reasonably inexpensive to purchase, would be further modified resulting in excessive top speed. Current MSA regulations limit the average lap times and not absolute maximum, but it is thought that our timed competitions would come under closer inspection by the MSA if they were allowed resulting in more stringent medical cover at events. Whilst ultimate speed may not affect trials vehicles there remain members that still want to compete in trials and comp safaris in the same vehicle so any changes must be able to be applied to all events.

Thought and discussion surrounding the merits of naturally aspirated and forced induction petrol engines from Range Rovers from L322 onwards was then discussed, should we retain our current capacity limit of 4600cc?

Would we allow small capacity 2000cc forced induction Petrol in the future? This second point would be discussed if such an engine were developed for a standard volume production vehicle in the future.

Some members do spend a lot of money on their vehicles and whilst our sport is not dependent on having to do this it has always been the case that some will.

Charles Darby again stated that the MSA may look at safety aspects at events if larger engine sizes and petrol forced induction were allowed. Diesel forced induction is not seen as such a problem.

More stringent medical crews may be required. There is currently a proposal from the MSA which will take immediate effect if adopted that says that at Hill Rallies a MSA registered paramedic may be appointed as the Chief Medical officer instead of a doctor.

Simon Cooper, Staffs & Shrops LRC has sent the following comments from reading the previous minutes

*Charles Derby says that increasing engine sizes and allowing forced induction could lead to the MSA looking at safety aspects and maybe taking Comp Safari's out of the Clubmans category. He goes on to say that this would mean "They would force us to have rescue units and competitors would also have to fit FIA belts, seats, FHR etc."*

*This statement is actually not correct. Rescue units are only required when running National A events, which allows speeds up to 50mph average. Clubman and National B events are only allowed to run at 30mph average, and do not require rescue units under MSA rules. Plus all Comp Safari's, including National A events, do not come under FIA regulations, so therefore there is no need for in date seats or belts. Also, the use of Front Head Restraint's is only required by drivers of UTV vehicles under the current MSA regulations, which are of course only allowed in Open Comp Safari's.*

We cannot say what will happen in the future but this may happen should larger engines be allowed without any regulation.

Dennis Wright said that if Terry Buss wished to propose the rolling date of ten years, he would second it i.e.2007 onwards. It would require a rule change proposal to be submitted to Simone by 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017.

The original rule and the amendment or completely new rule should be included.

Tony Sinclair asked why limit to 10 years old – why not use current engines?

#### **ONGOING**

### **c. Q Class Vehicles**

Post meeting comment from previous meeting - An ALRC log book is required for CCVT and comp safari events which are currently issued for ALRC classes 1 -11. Further discussion regarding issuing log books for a Q class vehicles is required.

This took place at the ALRC Council meeting held on the 4<sup>th</sup> February 2017 and the following information was sent to all clubs on the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

There will be no log book issued for a Q class vehicle.

Vehicles with roll cages will be issued with a yellow tag and the initial scrutineering paperwork showing clearly that the vehicle is a Q Class. Two photographs should be provided and the yellow tag number should be written on these. The competitor should then keep this paperwork and photographs to show at future events.

The sheet should be returned to Dennis Wright as usual.

The yellow tags are free of charge.

Matthew Fulwood asked if a vehicle has an ALRC log book but has then been fitted with something that makes the vehicle a Q class should the log book be taken away and the red / blue tag cut off. Yes. These should then be returned to Dennis.

The intention is not for members to build or change their vehicles to become a Q class but to attract genuine new people who are not members at present. This aim is to allow our member clubs to be inclusive to all enthusiasts and may allow other non-ALRC club members to perhaps join events. It will also allow existing members to compete in none compliant vehicles during 'Privilege' events which they currently cannot do; some member clubs have created parallel clubs to allow this to happen but this is not viable for ALRC clubs to run a second non-ALRC sister club.

Please remember that this is being run for a two year period when the results of membership and entries will be reassessed. To date only one club (Wye & Welsh LRC) has submitted any details. Information should be sent to Simone prior to Council and EGM meetings so that it can be assessed and all can be informed. The ALRC did try for some time to adapt the rules to include more flexibility but the member clubs whilst they liked the format they did not like the changes proposed. The trial period will end on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018.

Tim Linney said that at Chiltern Vale LRC whilst they have attracted some Q class entries, other club members have stopped coming as they do not agree with it.

When a person with a Q class vehicle arrives at a CCV or timed event or enquires about membership to compete in such events they should be told about the necessity of having two photographs and the fitting of a yellow tag. It must be remembered that not all clubs have a log book scrutineer present actually at their events and this may be something that needs sorting prior to entry, this is no different to the current situation.

Only one signature is required for the fitting of a yellow tag as no dimensions are taken.

### **ONGOING**

## **5. Rule Change Proposals**

a. At the last meeting following Rule Change Proposal was proposed by Andy Dennis and seconded by Matthew Fulwood.

### **Section C - Modified Class Vehicle Regulations**

#### **C.5. Suspension & Axles**

##### **C.5.7. Axle casings can be modified.**

As of last night there were insufficient votes for this proposal and it is only by Simone chasing clubs this morning that enough votes were cast. Only 5 had been returned prior to the meeting and several club members this morning were unaware of the vote. 14 votes were required.

If clubs do not vote then they cannot complain when there are no changes made.

For – 14, Against -2, Abstention – 1.

The rule will now go forward to the ALRC Council for ratification after this meeting and will take immediate effect if approved. This rule was brought in to cover what members have previously already been doing for several years. It does not make the action right but we do not want non-compliant vehicles running at events. This should not be taken as a precedent for other unauthorised modifications.

### **CLOSED**

b. Section B – Standard Class Vehicle Regulations

#### **B.19 RECOVERY POINTS**

*B.19.1. Adequate front and rear recovery attachments must be provided for recovery purposes in all events. Bumpers, tie-down rings, lifting rings or Range Rover / Discovery "tow fittings" are not adequate. Factory specification (or better) trailer hitches are acceptable. If a tow-ball is fitted, welding alone is insufficient - high tensile nuts and bolts must be used for attachment. If the recovery point is attached to a bumper, the bumper must be attached to the chassis with high tensile nuts and bolts. These recovery points must have a minimum of a 3mm thick, mild steel spreader plate behind it's mounting point, regardless of its type or location.*

*Factory specification recovery points, when installed and used as vehicle handbook, to the following generations of vehicle are deemed suitable for recovery up to and including RTV Trials:*

- *Range Rover P38A and subsequent generations*
- *Discovery 3 and subsequent generations*
- *Freelander, all generations*

*Towing balls, jaws and pintles used for recovery must be rated as a minimum to the capacity of the vehicle being recovered. E.g. a 3.5Te towing ball fitted to a Freelander is compliant: a 2.25Te combined ball and jaw hitch fitted to a Defender is not compliant. (Clarification 4<sup>th</sup> July 2015).*

*B19.2 A pair of Land Rover chassis-shackles (forged JATE rings) are suitable.*

At the last meeting the following rule change was put forward to the ALRC Council for ratification with immediate effect from 12<sup>th</sup> November 2017. This was notified to the clubs on the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2016

**CLOSED**

#### **6. Enquiries received since previous meeting.**

a. Replacing of Logbook Tags – Andy Dennis, Staffs & Shrops LRC. (23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016)

Is there a cost incurred when a blue or red tag needs to be replaced due to the number fading etc? This seems to only affect the old red tags. No these are free of charge but any changes should be notified to Dennis Wright and written on the log book. The old number should be crossed out and the new number written above it. Dennis requires both the old and new number.

**CLOSED**

b. New Rule Change Proposal regarding Diffs in the Standard Class - Alex Moore, Somerset & Wilts ROC (13<sup>th</sup> March 2017)

B.6.5 or B.17.3 Crown wheel slipper pads or pegs can be used.

Reasoning behind the proposal:

*Same wording as C.5.6 to allow a wider range of components to be fitted.*

*C.5.6 was pushed through in 2011 and introduced in to the books in 2012 from what I can see; ALRC newsletter 79 talks about the proposal being ratified at the meeting held 11th June 2011 but I can't find the minutes to see the reasoning behind it only being in modified class, maybe that's all that was asked for by the proposer?*

*I've removed a pegged 4 pin differential from my other vehicle during an upgrade and now want to fit that differential in my class 4 RTV 90 for peace of mind especially when it may one day get CCV'd or comp'd under standard class, but under the current rulings it looks like fitting that differential would put it modified?*

*I did wonder whether it could be fitted and stay in standard under rule A.5.2 as a direct like-for-like replacement? It serves exactly the same three purposes as a standard differential of reducing ratio, changing drive direction by 90 degrees, and giving an open differential effect for turning. It just does the second and third of those in a slightly more reliable fashion.*

*Different crown wheels can already be fitted under B.17.2, which I presume allows for heavy duty ones (there'd certainly be no way of externally checking)? Pegging a differential case is a cheaper option of getting the strength of a heavy duty crown wheel & pinion without changing gearing or requiring specialist expensive spares.*

*Any clarification / assistance much appreciated before I go and spend a load of money on parts to achieve the same outcome that the 'free' differential sat in the workshop will already achieve!*

Unfortunately Alex could not be at the meeting as he already had other commitments but was available on his mobile if necessary

This currently is allowed in Modified classes and was felt by the meeting to give a competitive advantage and should not be allowed in Standard classes.

Matthew Fulwood asked why competitors did not want to be in a modified class? It does not stop them entering events.

There was no-one at the meeting prepared to second the proposal for it to proceed as a rule change proposal and it was unlikely to get support from the S&ORC for it to proceed any further.

Pete Lugg is to inform Alex of this decision.

**CLOSED**

c. Q Class rule Clarification – Andy Dennis, Staffs & Shrops LRC. (16<sup>th</sup> March 2017)

Engine position / Suspension Design / Chassis Design is free. So for example is a Bowler Bulldog compliant?

The rules states that vehicles must retain Land Rover axles, engines and drive train and also be made up from Land Rover parts. It was not the intention to design new vehicles to run in Q class.

Is the chassis a Land Rover part? No not allowed.

**CLOSED**

d. The Chassis. Future supply/Gene pool - Andy Dennis, Staffs & Shrops LRC. (16<sup>th</sup> March 2017)

Generally speaking there are 2 chassis suppliers. Both are busy. One forms their chassis as per a Genuine chassis and has a relatively small range. The other fabricates their chassis, i.e. not to original spec.

Many of these fabricated chassis are in use, predominately in RTV cars.

So as the ALRC are allowing fabricated chassis could the future see a tube version being allowed?

To set up for the variety of styles required for CCVT and Comp in the numbers required would not be viable, in box section.

But there are, companies who could supply built or part built, say like a roll cage kit, a tube frame. I feel this is something that should be considered to ensure the future of our sport.

It was said by Paul Barton that the fabricated chassis' are paten-part chassis' to the same design as a Land Rover chassis. This is covered by A.5.2 "Equivalent cross references" - Rover parts may be replaced with parts made by other manufacturers on condition they are of the same basic design and are offered for sale as direct like-for-like replacements for those Rover parts.

The allowing of a tube version would require a rule change proposal to be submitted.

**CLOSED**

e. Tyres at events – Gordon Renshaw, Peak & Dukeries LRC (1<sup>st</sup> March 2017)

Letter to Simone.

I believe you have an ALRC meeting coming up, could I ask you to submit this letter to that meeting on my behalf.

I've read through the SR's for the upcoming National Rally and with reference to regulation CS19 Article CS19

Tyre eligibility will be from MSA Permitted Tyres (L) List 5 (a), (b) and (c)

The list doesn't include Bronco diamond pattern tyres. This may be because Bronco have been out of business for some years now.

The fact is that some members still have these tyres and would like to use them till they have worn out.

While this may just be one of these issues that's been overlooked the fact still remains that at least 2 competitors from P&D alone won't be eligible to enter this year's National and that's just the ones I know of. There may be quite a few more or worse someone may have entered and turn up only to be told you can't use that diamond pattern tyre because it has the wrong name on it.

On the tyre list there are three other types of diamond pattern tyre and so it doesn't make sense to exclude a tyre that within a few more years will disappear anyway.

Is it possible to add an amendment to the SR's to include this tyre as I feel it would be in the best interest of the ALRC.

Simone pointed out that the Bronco tyres are still listed in the ALRC Handbook. This is an error.

Mark Baitup said that any tyre not listed in the tyre list should be classed as an aggressive tyre. This is a verbal agreement and it was thought better to include it in writing for the National Rally SR's so that it can be applied to all.

The following has been received from Frank Champion.

I've spoken to the MSA on this subject before, John Symes said the tyre list only contained tyres that were listed as still commercially available, and there where many that for one reason or another didn't appear, it could be the manufacturer was no longer trading or no longer held the moulds, it could be that they had only just started production or made them in insufficient numbers to be listed in trade directories, he stated that we were to use our common sense.

I would like to propose that "vehicles fitted with tyres that in the scrutineer's opinion are of the same visual appearance as tyres listed in MSA Permitted Tyres list 5 are deemed compliant with the tyre requirements".

Malcolm Wilson as Chief Scrutineer for the National Rally was in agreement with this wording.

It was not thought necessary to add any dates.

Simone will send this to the MSA as an amendment to the National Rally and they will hopefully confirm their consent by email and an amended copy of the SR's will then be posted on the website etc.

**Post Meeting Note: The proposal was put to the MSA Permitting department following the meeting but was unfortunately rejected. The MSA have insisted that all tyres comply with the current list published in the 2017 Yearbook (The Blue Book).**

**The 2017 National SRs have now been submitted with the original wording for Article CS19.**

**CLOSED**

f. Cross Member Recovery Points – Mark Pycraft, Essex LRC (14<sup>th</sup> January 2017)

Regarding the issues for Defender TD5 on, cross member recovery point. Several of our members who use Defender 90 TD5s for RTV events have been struggling to comply with the rules as reviewed at the last meeting.

They have endeavoured to fit Jate rings but have found the fuel tank and cover restrict this to such an extent, that the cover and tank would need to be removed to fit the rings. Therefore fitting JATE rings creates as much work as fitting a spreader plate, and has the possibility of interference of the bolt heads with the tank.

The Land Rover OE tow fittings create considerable disadvantage for rear ground clearance. See picture 2

I have been asked to present an option in picture 1 (in this case manufactured by Extreme 4x4) which has a four bolt attachment using four captive nuts in the cross member, as opposed to the 2 bolt attachment for a standard tow hitch. It is offered that the two bolt tow hitch bolted directly to the cross member will exert a considerable leverage load on the bolts and surrounding cross member which is why they pull out or come loose. The four bolt after market recovery point is distributing the load through four evenly spaced bolts thus reducing any leverage stress.

Would the committee be inclined to review the ruling to include this style of recovery point, without spreader plates behind the cross member?



Picture 1.  
Extreme 4x4, four bolt recovery point.



Picture 2.  
Land Rover OE tow hitch rated 3.5t

Mykul Jones has had previous experience of a two bolt tow hitch becoming pulled through. After the last meeting Tim Linney approached his local dealer regarding this issue but could not get an answer so went direct to Technical Support at Land Rover. They do not recommend either the two bolt hole being used or the four bolt configuration any longer. Since the TD5 they have adopted tow hitch designs which incorporate bracing returning to the main chassis longitudinal members, the technical department would not put anything in writing. Mykul Jones said it may be possible to modify the plate and arms so that the plate drops down 50mm below the cross member and the arms modified to be closer to horizontal, but it was said at the meeting that this would make it not type approved for towing. It was further pointed out with the exception of the Range Rover L322 American hitches were not type approved in the UK. Tony Sinclair pointed out that Marsland replacement chassis' adopt TD5 onwards cross-members no matter what period they are intended to replace.

It was agreed at the meeting that any tow hitch must be type approved and that the attachment in picture 1 is not acceptable without spreader plates.

Tim Linney asked - Should we add the wording type approved towing hitches should be used for TD5 onwards.

B.19.1 already states the following:  
*Adequate front and rear recovery attachments must be provided for recovery purposes in all events. Bumpers, tie-down rings, lifting rings or Range Rover / Discovery "tow fittings" are not adequate. Factory specification (or better) trailer hitches are acceptable.*

This is down to clubs not enforcing the rules at club events and this can be sorted before the National Rally so all comply. Dennis Wright did say that sometimes members do not attend club events but just enter the National Rally so wrong fittings may not be picked up before that.

It is down to clubs to publicise all information to their members via magazines, websites and other means – it must be remembered that the ALRC is a product of all its members and only by their input can rules etc. be made.

**Post Meeting Note: Following the meeting Richard Hannam, Wye & Welsh LRC, took time to review Defender handbook for a Td5 era vehicle and located the following caution message on page 77:  
"Tow bar mounting points- If a NATO Hook or a Jaw and Pintle type towing accessory is to be fitted, do not attach them directly to the chassis rear cross-member, It is essential that an adapter plate kit is also fitted. Consult your Land Rover Dealer/Authorised Repairer"**

**CLOSED**

g. Clarification of drawing in ALRC Handbook – Andy Dennis, Staffs & Shrops LRC (18<sup>th</sup> March 2017)

On page 121 Configuration

Clarification is required in text / picture required for diagram “A” as to where the rear bars need to join the main hoop. There have been several queries on this in the last few weeks to Andy and Dennis Wright.

The following rule in the MSA 2017 Yearbook states.

Competitor Safety (K).

**1.3.3. Backstays.** *These are compulsory and must be attached near the roofline and near the top outer bends of the main rollbar on both sides of the car. They must make an angle of at least 30° with the vertical, must run rearwards and be straight and as close as possible to the interior side panels of the bodyshell. Their materials specification, diameter and thickness must be as defined in 1.4.1. Forward facing stays are permitted if an angle of 30° cannot be achieved with Backstays, providing they do not unduly impede Driver and Co-Driver access to the vehicle.*

The picture on page 125 of the ALRC Handbook shows the positioning.

Rear backstays should be positioned on or as close as possible to the bend to provide the most strength.

## **7. Any other business.**

a. ALRC Competition Regulations Section E – E.1 Bodywork – Mykul Jones, Wye & Welsh LRC

*E.1.1.2. Hardtop vehicles must have the whole of the manufacturers hardtop or truck cab with all fastenings secured and glass in place*

If the truck cab has been extended does this still remain in standard class?

No this becomes a Q class. The rules say that modifications are not allowed unless specified.

**CLOSED**

b. Positioning of Batteries - Charles Darby, Southern ROC.

In the MSA 2017 Yearbook under Competitors Vehicles (J) the following is written

*5.14.1. Have any wet batteries in driver/passenger compartment enclosed in a securely located leak-proof container.*

*If located in the Driver/Passenger compartment, where a Passenger/Co-Driver is present the battery must be situated behind the base of the Driver's or Passenger/Co-Driver's seat.*

This came up at the scrutineering seminar as some car competitors are moving their batteries forward in the passenger compartment to distribute their weight and are not always covering the batteries.

Charles has also discussed this directly with the MSA

For our vehicles where the batteries are under the passenger seats this is acceptable and not an issue.

This is mentioned for information only.

**CLOSED**

## **8. Date and location of next meeting.**

Next Meeting – 8<sup>th</sup> July 2017

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

Council - June 10<sup>th</sup>, October 7<sup>th</sup>.

AGM / EGM / S&ORC November 18<sup>th</sup>.

Dates for 2018 booked at the British Motor Museum.

Council – 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 9<sup>th</sup> June, 6<sup>th</sup> October. (Only can do February at British Motor Museum).

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

## **9. Close the meeting.**

Meeting closed at 15.00.