

# 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

22<sup>nd</sup> March 2014 starting at 13:00. (1 o'clock pm after the AGM)  
The Oaks Farmhouse  
NFU Insurance HQ, Tiddington (near Stratford-upon-Avon).

## AGENDA

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

For those who have not been there before:-

The NFU Insurance HQ is in Tiddington, just to the East of Stratford-upon-Avon.

If you cross the Avon Bridge in Stratford-upon-Avon heading South East, take the very first left turn off the end of the bridge, signposted Tiddington, B4086. This becomes Main Street in Tiddington. It's one mile to the prominent rectangular building set well back on your right on the Western outskirts of Tiddington near the junction with Knight's Lane. If you get to Knight's Lane, you've just gone past the building!

If you're coming in from Wellesbourne heading West, drive carefully through the narrow Tiddington village towards the Western outskirts where NFU HQ is on your left just past Knight's Lane.

We now use the separate building to the left of the main Head Office so turn left off the main driveway just before you get to the main building.

Please sign the register in the entrance area so the security staff know who is in the building in the event of an emergency.

# 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 of Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> November 2013

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 21 attendees and 11 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 6 clubs. There are 27 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 8 members of the S&ORC plus a further 8 log book scrutineers.

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

Those present - Taken from the NFU attendance list.

NAME	CLUB
Mark Whaley (S L CM)	North Eastern RO
Bill Groves (L)	North Eastern RO
Ian Whaley (G)	North Eastern RO
Gary Campbell (S R L)	North Eastern RO
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Dennis Wright (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simone Birch (CM)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Antony Birch (G)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC
Dave Canham (L R CS)	Southern ROC

NAME	CLUB
Terry Buss (L)	Southern ROC
Paul Barton (CM)	Dunsfold CSSS
Ray Godwin (L CS)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Steve Kirby (S L R CM)	Hants & Berks LRO
Fraser Parish (L)	Cornwall & DevonLRC
Pete Garlick (L)	Cornwall & DevonLRC
David Jeffrey (L)	Cornwall & DevonLRC
Mark Neale (L)	Essex LRC
Belinda Neale (G)	Essex LRC
Pete Lugg (S L)	Somerset & Wilts LRC

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

Apologies for absence received from:

NAME	CLUB
Andrew Flanders (S LCM)	Anglian LRC
Tim Linney (S, CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Richard Smith (L)	Midland ROC
Andrew Birch (CS)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Martin Sullivan	Breckland LRC
Hazel Mellish (G)	Lancs & CheshireLRC
Neal Mellish (R)	Lancs & CheshireLRC

NAME	CLUB
Harold Carman	Lancs & CheshireLRC
Simon Smith	Lancs & CheshireLRC
Adam Godwin	Wye & Welsh LRC
Mykul Jones (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Alex Cowsill (L)	Cumbrian ROC
Terry Shepherd (L)	Cornwall & DevonLRC
Guy Cashmore (R)	Cornwall & DevonLRC

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

**1. Open the Meeting.**

The meeting was opened at 13:10 p.m.

**2. Apologies for absence.**

Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

**3. Review the minutes of the previous meeting (16<sup>th</sup> November 2013)**

The minutes were proposed by Tony Lockwood seconded by Dennis Wright and agreed unanimously. Signed by Mark Whaley.

**4. Review of ongoing Topics.**

**a. Updated Production Vehicles Size / Dimensions Chart / Bumper widths.**

This was included in the 2011 ALRC Handbook but there are still gaps for some of the vehicles – mainly Range Rover 2009 / 2010, Sport, Discovery 3 & 4 and Range Rover P38 are missing as well. Gaps do need to be filled in if possible. Tony Sinclair is progressing this and will provide the dimensions to Simone Birch to pass on to Steve Kirby for the Handbook. The overall length for the 110 in the Handbook needs changing from 175” to 171.5”.

**CLOSED**

**b. Simon Sault’s build** - Andrew Flanders showed photo of rear damper top mount on a roll cage. See previous minutes from 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2013. This is not thought to be clear enough to show the loading from the roll cage to the chassis. Tony Lockwood has now seen the vehicle and new photos have been supplied and the design has been deemed acceptable. It is well engineered and if anything breaks it cannot enter the vehicle. If anyone wishes to see details of this build they are produced on the P&DLRC forum.



**CLOSED**

**d. Tim Linney asked about alternative engines being put into vehicles.**

He has been asked if it is permissible to put a TDV6 diesel engine in a 90. This is allowed but will put the vehicle in a modified class.

ALRC Regulation A2 states

Rover Company to 2001.

Land Rover by whoever owned.

Vehicle specification should be limited to European countries only and the engine must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in. (Implemented 16<sup>th</sup> October 2010).

The line “Rover Company to 2001” is quoted in rule A2 to set the end date for the use of Rover car engines in Land Rovers. This was to allow Rover car engines before 2001; but not any forbears such as Austin, Morris, British Leyland, etc.

There is no cut-off date for engines used by Land Rover given.

The intention behind this rule was to try and keep vehicles as standard as possible.

The understanding was that in modified class any engines are allowed up to the maximum engine fitted in a P38, petrol or diesel in earlier vehicles prior to 2001 but for newer engines they can only be used in the vehicles they

were manufactured.

There are engine sizes listed in the Production Vehicle Sizes chart.

The rules in the Engine Description B.2 are contradictory as B.2.1. states the engines that are allowed but then

B.2.10 states that the engine must stay in the vehicle it was manufactured.

In modified class it states that any engines up to 4600cc can be used complete with their ancillaries but that is also subject to A2 which may not allow it.

The contradictions do need to be sorted out – probably a rule change will be required.

We need to be prepared for changes that do come with the progression of time.

To be thought about and discussed at the next meeting.

This discussion also touched on the changing of gearboxes and it was pointed out by Steve Kirby that under the standard regulations there is a heading of “gearboxes” and in modified the heading used was “transmission”. This needs to be tidied up.

Further discussion:

Tim Linney asked if these minutes could be shown to the person making the enquiry?

Answer - All General meetings / S&ORC minutes should be made freely available to any club member who wishes to see them.

It does appear that rule A2 does contradict itself and the A rules should never be over-ruled by the rules in B or C but should apply to all classes and there does seem to be confusion

The fact that C.3.1 states that any Land Rover or Rover car engines (and other with Rover part numbers) up to a max of 4600cc may be used complete with their ancillaries subject to A2.

As A2 states that the engines must stay in the vehicle it was manufactured in – this means the vehicle model as opposed to year of manufacture.

4200cc and 4600cc engines were produced in a 90 prior to 2001 so they are allowed.

It was pointed out at the meeting that there should perhaps be a rule change proposal put forward to keep up with current vehicles and engines as they are produced by Land Rover. This also would then make sure that it is clear to all members.

This particular enquiry came about because the club member wanted to put the engine in a road going vehicle that is used occasionally to enter a RTVT. A TDV6 would tow a trailer better.

This should be covered under the Competitive Events Consultation where cut off dates may need revising to keep up with changing technology.

Decision: The current ruling says “no” but this may be further discussed under the consultation discussion..

**CLOSED**

#### **e. How vertical is vertical for the main hoop?**

An issue highlighted during the Harold Carman’s discussion was how vertical is vertical for the main hoop. ALRC Roll Cage reg 2.4. says that the hoop “should be vertical”; whereas the MSA reg K.1.1.4. says “near-vertical”.

Log book scrutineers have looked at the vehicles in their clubs and this is not seen to be a problem.

Andrew Flanders is to check with the MSA to see if it is acceptable for the tube to be out of vertical by the size of the diameter of the tube and hopefully circulate the answer when received.

The report from the MSA is that this is still being looked into but the MSA committee thinks that the FIA allow a tolerance of +/- 10 degrees from vertical. Members of the MSA committee have been asked for examples of the main hoop.

Awaiting MSA statement on setting a specific angle plus tolerances. No meeting is due to take place until next year.

**ONGOING**

#### **f. Bumpers with hinged ends.**

Following the 2012 Majors Memorial Trial, hosted by Midland ROC in September Richard Banks had asked if the issue of bumpers with hinged ends and also bumpers made of aluminium which were nowhere near as strong as the steel originals could be discussed.

It is down to the competitors to comply with the regulations and if they do not they may be failed at scrutineering.

The rules are quite clear; the problem here is one of enforcement.

Hinged ends and bumpers of inadequate strength are NOT permitted. If bumpers or parts of bumpers become bent or missing during the event, or are seen to be bent or missing at the end of an event, then the vehicle may be disqualified. The hinged bumpers are designed to break, which could give the entrant a competitive advantage during a section but can then be replaced with new bolts for the next section. When a bumper breaks the entrant should score there. SB agreed to promulgate information that rule A1 in combination with rule B.13 combine to make hinged or under-strength bumpers cause for disqualification and this will be upheld by the Scrutineering Committee. This is to be publicised before the National Rally in time for restorative action to be taken prior to the event. All log book scrutineers and club scrutineers should be enforcing these rules.

A letter covering this was sent to all clubs and was displayed at the 2013 National Rally where a few bumpers were changed.

This letter listed hinged ends – not bolt on ends.

Should the addition of the wording “one piece” be added to the wording on bumpers? To be discussed by the ALRC Council as a clarification – this is still to take place and guidance as from the S&ORC is wanted.

Richard Banks stated that there are members taking part in events with bolted on ends that are playing by the rules and they would be penalised because a few are not playing by the rules. The bolt on ends should be as strong as the original.

Mykul Jones stated that it would be easier for scrutineers at events if they were not allowed. It removes any ambiguity as to the strength of the bolted ends.

If a one piece bumper gets bent then sometimes it is difficult to straighten the end during an event. Should a bolted on end bend or snap off then the competitor should score on section where that happens.

Some members do want to go to non-ALRC events where different bumpers are allowed – it is not difficult to change a bumper held on with 4 bolts.

Vote from the S&ORC for one piece bumpers – 5 – For, 2 – Against. This will now be discussed by the ALRC Council.

A letter was sent prior to 2013 National Rally saying that regulations A1 and B13 should be enforced at club events.

At the last Council meeting this was discussed with the following outcome.

The further letter is to be sent by Simone stating that rule A1 in combination with rule B.13 combine to make hinged or remountable or under-strength bumpers cause for disqualification and that this must be upheld at all events under the above guidelines. Bumpers should be as strong as an original. Club scrutineers are asked to enforce this with immediate effect. The following words were thought to be suitable at the meeting – missing ends on hinged or re-mountable bumpers will result in penalties being scored and must be reinstated before the next section is started.

Further discussion at this meeting took place with the scrutineering committee still wanting the wording one piece put in place. Hinged bumpers are not allowed. Should ends come off, competitors should score where this happens and they must be reinstated before the next section.

Simone Birch said that at the Majors Memorial Trial this year there was a team from Cornwall & Devon LRC entered in the group where she was marshalling. One vehicle has a bumper which had welded on ends. On the first section on the second day one of these ends snapped off and there was no way of reattaching it. The vehicle also had the cutaway wings so without a bumper end there was a big advantage. I did advise him that this was currently being discussed by the S&ORC. The team were nowhere in the running for winning the event so were allowed to continue driving (should really have been retired). The matter was report to Richard Banks, chief scrutineer for the event who looked at the vehicles as they were leaving the site and he thought that approximately 30% of the vehicles entered had the cut away wings. If the team had been in the running to win the event the vehicle would have been re-scrutineered and excluded.

If a one piece bumper had been fitted it could have folded back and then snapped off with the same results. Some drivers do have bumper ends that can be reattached if they come off and this must be done before they carry on competing.

They do need to be fitted properly and not be capable of moving when pushed or stood on. It is much easier for the scrutineers if original style bumpers are used.

One piece bumpers – i.e. ones welded as a solid face, so long as it is as strong as an original should be allowed.

The general principle of our Handbook only allows modifications that are written into the regulations. See A1. The regulations do not say that you can weld ends onto the end of bumpers. This stems from what is allowed by clubs at their events and the wording as strong etc. should be applied to all events.

A reply to the S&ORC is that there is no actual rule for a one piece bumper (some standard bumpers are actually 5 pieces). It is not felt that a further rule is required if the rules are adhered to. Clubs should be enforcing the rules and when bumpers are damaged, accidentally or deliberately then they should be repaired or replaced. Failure to do this should result in a maximum score for a section or scoring at the point of the damage if this is noticed. Certainly at the start of every section the bumper should be in place so no advantage is gained. Missing ends on bumpers will result in penalties being awarded and must be reinstated before the start of another section is started. Some bumpers are actually not one piece but 3 or 5 pieces. Models that are manufactured with a one piece bumper must continue to have one fitted.

The following amended wording on B.13.2. was voted on by the S&ORC – 8 For. Unanimous. Changes in bold.

B.13. BUMPERS & CROSS-MEMBERS

B.13.2. On Land Rovers, bumpers, mounting and rear cross-members must be straight, have at least equal strength to the original fitment, **be of original specification** and shall be mounted in the original position with the front and rear faces presenting flat vertical faces. (Amended & Implemented 16<sup>th</sup> November 2013).

This will be discussed for ratification by the ALRC Council after this meeting.

**CLOSED**

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

The fast-tracking of Off-road Scrutineers was carried out by the MSA some years ago but this does not seem to be available now even though the grade appears on the Official Licences application list.

The MSA currently want all their Scrutineers to cover all event disciplines but this isn't practicable or indeed necessary for a scrutineer to check off-road vehicles. AF to find out the current status on this because we are running out of scrutineers at this grade. We need to have scrutineers that specialise in off road.

This is now being looked at by the MSA. The next meeting is planned for February 2014

Dennis Wright pointed out that there was still an Off Road Scrutineer listing on the MSA website. Malcolm Wilson said that the changes came about because the MSA were short of National Scrutineers for all speed events and this was supposed to be a temporary measure.

**ONGOING**

**i. Vehicle entered in National Rally CCVT / Team Recovery – General discussion**

Concern was expressed by those present at the meeting about the fact that a vehicle that had been rolled in the CCVT and had the tag removed due to having a damaged roll cage was then allowed to enter the Team Recovery. The damaged cage had three bent bars with the front and back hoops also being bent. It was prevented from carrying on in the CCVT but was then allowed to be entered in the Team Recovery as the C-o-C for that event said it was safe to do so. It was understood that the damaged roll cage was straightened and then a new tag applied. After the Team Recovery this tag was then removed so that a full repair could be made to the vehicle.

If someone at the time had concerns then the correct procedure would have been to make an eligibility appeal to the Stewards which would have prevented the vehicle being used as no competitor may compete “under appeal” and it would need to go to the MSA for a decision .

This process was not used.

Dennis Wright stated that a damaged roll cage can be re-tagged by a single log book scrutineer provided is if it has had a bend on the front hoop and the front hoop has been repaired. If the main hoop has been damaged then the vehicle has to go back through the process of log booking and requires two signatures. This does not now appear in the ALRC Handbook and does need to be added as it seems to have been omitted from earlier handbooks.

If the C-o-C overrules the scrutineer of an event, which he is entitled to do and he then goes to an ALRC log book scrutineer and asks them to re-tag a vehicle, a log book scrutineer can refuse to do that.

The C-o-C and log book scrutineer were not present at this meeting so a full account of their actions was not received. This does need addressing so a similar situation does not arise again in the future. Hopefully the C-o-C and log book scrutineer will be present at the next meeting to explain their actions or a report sent in.

No correspondence received to date.

**ONGOING**

**j. Roll Cage with a Roof – General discussion**

Following the shattered Perspex roof at the National Rally there was discussion about the material that should be used when a roof is fitted. Steel and polycarbonate with a British standard mark were both mentioned as materials that could be suitable and if necessary an addition is required to the ALRC Handbook to cover this in the future.

It was pointed out by Richard Smith, Midland ROC that following a roll over at a CCVT run at Eastnor it was the roof that caused the problem when the drivers head hit it.

It was said that if there had been no roof, a rock could have done damage as well.

In speed events it should be noted that sun roofs are not allowed and they must be covered by the same material that the roof is made from.

The use of suitable material is to be further discussed at the next meeting when more facts about what is used at present are available. Log book scrutineers are asked to check current vehicles and report back.

The results from clubs were that most roofs are made from metal or weld mesh to prevent branches coming in. There is no requirement for a roof. There are Perspex type materials that would not shatter but policing this would be very difficult for the scrutineers to test this. If we ban all plastics it could include something allowed by the MSA to replace windows. These would usually have standard makers mark.

Are some members putting Perspex as an inner under a tilt to stay in standard class in RTVT to then remove the canvas to be in modified class in CCVT? The current rules do not allow this as it is not specifically mentioned.

It was thought that the rule also needed to be placed in standard class as well to cover this.

The use of metal, canvas and weld mesh were considered suitable. Not plastic. Old tilts with windows in would comply with this.

On safety grounds the rule needs to be added under B12 – Bodywork & Chassis and C. 12- Silhouette.

Our rules state what can be done so the following wording under B.12.6. and C.12.5 was voted by the S&ORC – 8 For – Unanimous.

(POST MEETING NOTE - AT NO TIME DURING THE MEETING DID FIBREGLASS OR SIMILAR MATERIAIS GET MENTIONED SO THIS WAS OVERLOOKED).

B12. BODYWORK & CHASSIS

**B.12.6 When a roof is fitted it must be made of any metal, canvas or weld mesh only. No other materials allowed.**

C.12. SILHOUETTE

**C.12.5. When a roof is fitted it must be made of any metal, canvas or weld mesh only. No other materials allowed.**

This will be discussed for ratification by the ALRC Council after this meeting.

**ONGOING**

**5. ALRC Competitive Events Consultation Document. Simone Birch. (7<sup>th</sup> July 2012)**

There were no further comments received on what had been discussed at the last meeting but it would appear that there is no discussion taking place outside of these meetings.

Dave Canham said that because we were now asking for comments as opposed to asking direct questions the consultation had now got too big.

It does seem to be that the severity of RTVT's is the main concern and this could perhaps be controlled by what tyres can be used.

"Aggressive" tyres (as defined in MSA tyre list) could render an otherwise "Standard" vehicle to "Modified". They would not be banned but would move a vehicle into the modified class. To remain in standard, mud terrain tyres should be used. Tyres have the biggest single effect on performance. Chiltern Vale LRC are currently looking a rule change proposal along these lines.

Dennis Wright pointed out that if clubs amalgamate classes this could be demoralising for members that do want to remain in standard but are then put with modified in the results due to insufficient entries. From the discussion - Could the winners of RTVT come with the standard vehicles being placed before modified as at the National Rally? Some clubs already have annual trophies for standard and modified vehicles.

We have already allowed modifications so it is too late to stop this. Members using modified, coil sprung 80"s are now not going to want to go back to standard vehicles.

It must also be recognised that some of our members compete with other clubs outside of the ALRC and as they are not competitive they are leaving the ALRC to make further modifications outside of the rules to enable them to compete.

Is there the need to keep a true standard class but then allow more freedom in the modified class whilst keeping the silhouette?

It is not thought that members with more modified vehicles would really be interested in taking part in a RTVT that is laid out for standard vehicles.

It was not thought that extra classes were necessary or wanted by the clubs- No "Super-modified" or "Super-RTV plus" classes please! We should be trying to get the standard class right to try and stop extremism.

Members still seem to be using RTVT as the entry into off road sport – not the Tyro. Are members using the same vehicles to RTVT and CCVT – do some only do RTVT which could encourage them to modify their vehicle to enable them to do this? This does not happen in all clubs with members still having two different vehicles to compete in the events. In this economic climate this means costs for storage, towing to events, fuel etc.

Terry Buss said that dislocation cones, cranked radius arms, lift kits will not work if the tyres are regulated. On the flip side we may also lose members if tyres are specified.

Need to consider effects on membership because potential new members may be put off when they see aggressively equipped RTV vehicles.

The "must-have" tyres are Insa Turbo Special Track. These do not damage the ground as much as mud terrain ones driven aggressively. It is down to how clubs are laying out their events

The idea of having a vehicle straight out of a showroom and being able to compete in an RTVT does not mean having aggressive tyres.

No tyre rules would be immediate but there would be a few years to implement – tyres do not last forever so when replacing them less aggressive tyres could be fitted.

There is no talk of banning tyres – only putting more aggressive ones into modified class.

The question was asked "How many people sitting in this room regularly (every month) drive RTVT's?" – 1 person.

"How many people drive CCVT's?" – 1 person. "How many people drive Comp's?" – 1 person.

The perception from the membership is that people who do not participate in the events are trying to dictate how they are run.

The RTVT's drivers in clubs are not complaining about events where members with aggressive tyres win each time. Members do seem to be happy with the rules as they are.

C-o-C's are the issue with laying out too severe trials – "How many people present at the meeting lay out trials?" – the majority of those present. The C-o-C guidelines under "Trials and how to run them" in the ALRC Handbook could be reworded with good practice highlighted. Steve Kirby is progressing with this.

Mark Neale said that perhaps a video could be made on how to or how not to lay out trials as a visual aid.

Dennis Wright said there used to be a penalty in the form of fines for rolling at events!

## **ONGOING**

### **6. Rule Change Proposals**

Both the proposals have been signed by Steve Aston, Chairman and Kevin Wood, Membership Secretary, Hants & Berks LROC. No one was present from Hants & Berks LRC.

Proposal 1. Hants & Berks LROC propose that disc brakes are permitted (in any class) on the grounds these present no competitive advantage.

We propose to add a new rule:

#### **B.15.5. Disc-brake handbrakes are permitted.**

Comment from meeting – anyone who has one fitted at the moment is classed as a modified vehicle. Does it give an advantage? The X brake is a good brake for a parking brake but it does give an advantage for handbrake turns. As it alters a vehicle that is why it is modified class. Land Rover do not fit disc brakes so they are not type approved, if they do it could then be a standard.

At the next meeting in November it will be decided if this proposal should proceed to the member clubs for voting on at the ALRC AGM after feedback from the club members. Please discuss this among your club members.

No feedback has been received on this. Technically this could not pass an MOT as it is not type approved. To

follow due process voted on by S&ORC to present to the clubs for voting:- 5 For. 3 Abstentions. Carried  
This will be discussed for ratification by the ALRC Council after this meeting.

Proposal 2. Hants & Berks LROC propose that alpine / roof windows, sunroof windows and rear side windows (not those mounted on doors) can be replaced by sheet metal, aluminium or any other non-transparent material, on the grounds that this presents no competitive advantage, solves leaking problems (leading to rust issues) and avoids the risk of broken glass entering the vehicle should the windows be subject to contact with any external object. As there is no current ruling, only a statement in Paragraph 2 on page 58 of the 2013 ALRC members' handbook, we propose either a re-write of this paragraph or a new ruling:

**Alpine / roof windows, sunroof windows or rear side windows (not those mounted on doors) can be replaced by either sheet steel, aluminium or any other non-transparent material.**

Comment from meeting – Vehicles are made by Land Rover without these windows so does it matter if they are pop-riveted over?

At this year's National Rally there was a roll in the CCVT where the vehicle had a roof made from Perspex on top of the cage. This became very sharp when it was damaged.

The non-transparent material would perhaps need further definition.

There is already a rule E.1.1.2 Hardtop vehicles must have the whole of the manufacturer's hardtop to truck cab with all fastenings secured and all glass in position.

There has been no rule number assigned to this rule change proposal so we are not sure where the intention is to add it.

This is to be checked with Hants & Berks LRC as to be a valid rule change proposal it does need to have a number as it is just a statement at the moment. It should be submitted with a rule number if they want it to go forward as a rule change proposal.

This will be further discussed at the next meeting when we know where the rule change proposal is to be placed – standard class, RTVT class or general rule.

Dave Canham again raised the question that as proposal 2 had not been a properly formulated before the July meeting why was it being allowed to go forward?

Paul Barton had pointed out this morning that it is awkward when proposals are put forward but then no member of that club is present at the meeting to join in a discussion. They were given the opportunity to correct this omission. Steve Kirby is the club representative and he said that the thinking behind this is that members do keep breaking their alpine lights when taking part in RTVT's. The meeting thought that this was down to bad setting out of sections. This is not seen in other clubs events. The comment was made - Could guards be manufactured to go over the glass?

It must be remembered that when any voting takes place Steve Kirby votes as a member of the ALRC S&ORC and not as a club representative. Members of the ALRC S&ORC and log book scrutineers represent the ALRC and not their individual member clubs.

Final wording of proposal **"E.1.4. All windows (including sunroofs) apart from those mounted in doors, tailgates or rear doors can be replaced by either sheet steel or aluminium.**

Voted on to present to the clubs for voting: 8 against, UNANIMOUS

**CLOSED**

## **6. Any other business. New topics 16 Nov 2013.**

### **a. Enquiry asking if adjustable Panhard rods were allowed to be fitted. Received by Andrew Flanders from Tony Sinclair, Leics & Rutland LRC.**

I have been asked by one of our club members whether or not he can fit an adjustable panhard rod to his CCV motor. He wants to fit it to enable him to centralise his axle, to keep his wheels under the arches. I would be grateful for your input on this as he would like to fit one for the Majors.

Reply sent - The ALRC do not permit the use of these, as they are not a Land Rover standard part, if you wish to raise this at the next meeting and put forward a rule change proposal backed by your club it would be considered by the Scrutineering committee etc. Most would view it as a competitive advantage, and would not vote in favour, General view from the meeting was "No". This was the reply expected.

Mark Neale pointed out that there is no problem in packing out the casting on the chassis rail. You can weld spaces on and add longer bolts of the correct tensile strength, effectively shortening the panhard rod.

**CLOSED**



**b. Proposal to allow inverted U type damper mounts in Standard class vehicles. Kevin Peake, Breckland LRC**



Photo circulated to all at the meeting with the following query - Can I alter the shock mounts on a Defender 90 the tubular type (shown below) and stay in standard class for RTV / CCV / Comp? This is not a standard part and can be bought in different heights. If they were just like for like then it would not be seen as such a problem. The manufacturers state that the single front shock absorber bracket is manufactured from heavy-duty steel and replaces the existing turret mount which is susceptible to corrosion by allowing a build-up of dirt inside which is hard to clean thoroughly. The new design is harder wearing and easier to clean. The rules state in standard that "dampers are free" and in modified "that additional dampers may be fitted"

In standard class "additional damper mounting are permitted" was to allow standard comp safari motors to have two dampers in place. There was no description as to what they should look like but the original mountings should still be there.

Damper mounts may only be changed on Series I's to give more clearance.

It would appear that 90% of vehicles that are running with different dampers will have different mountings on as well so this will put vehicles in the modified class.

It is thought that these may be wanted to allow even more extreme dampers to be used.

This query highlighted the fact that mounts of this design are not permitted in any ALRC class. It seems to have slipped through the net for years. A new rule will be needed to permit these.

The following proposal was put forward by the S&ORC as a clarification to the vehicle regulations for immediate implementation.

**C.6.2. Damper mounts are free.**

Vote for this: 8 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions.

This will be discussed for ratification by the ALRC Council after this meeting.

**7. Date and location of next meeting.**

The next meeting has been booked for the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2014 at 13:00 after the EGM.

Dates for other 2014 meetings are July 5<sup>th</sup> and November 15<sup>th</sup>.

The location will be The Oaks Farmhouse, NFU Mutual HQ in Tiddington, near Stratford-upon-Avon.

**8. Close the meeting.**

Meeting closed at 15:15 pm.