

# 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

18<sup>th</sup> March 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 of Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> November 2016

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 28 attendees and 13 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 3 clubs. There are 27 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 8 members of the S&ORC plus a further 4 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
Simone Birch (CM)	ALRC
Mark Whaley (S L CM)	North Eastern RO
Graham Pink (L)	North Eastern RO
Paul Walton (G)	North Eastern RO
Andy Scarr (R)	North Eastern RO
T Walton (G)	North Eastern RO
Ian Whaley (G)	North Eastern RO
Dennis Wright (S L CM)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Richard Banks (L CS)	Midland ROC
Richard Smith (L)	Midland ROC
Ruth Smith (G)	Midland ROC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Antony Birch (G)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Mark Pycraft (R)	Essex LRC

NAME	CLUB
Andy Dennis (L)	Breckland LRC
Fraser Parish (S L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
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
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC
Stuart Newton (G)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Tim Linney (S CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Matthew Fulwood (R)	Chiltern Vale LRC
John Walters (R)	Staffs & Shrops LRC
Paul Barton (R CM)	Surrey Hills 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
Simon Saunt (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
David Jeffries (S L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Pete Garlick (L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Adam Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC

NAME	CLUB
Ray Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Mykul Jones (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Mark Neale (L)	Essex LRC
Simon Kerfoot	Red Rose LRC
Andrew Sinclair (L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Terry Buss (L)	Southern ROC

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 (9<sup>th</sup> July 2016)**

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

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

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

Simone Birch has written to the MSA on the 14<sup>th</sup> April 2016 and we are still waiting to hear back from the MSA. Andrew Flanders has said that this is being discussed by the MSA and he is planning to talk to Alan Page, a trainer with the MSA to see if some training could be arranged. We are not the only organisation asking for this as the AWDC are also experiencing problems in getting scrutineers for their events. Andrew Flanders is to try and progress this topic with the MSA Off Road Committee at their next meeting, which will now not be until next year.

**ONGOING.**

### **5. Rule Change Proposals**

a. After the last S&ORC meeting the ALRC Council agreed that the following proposal could go forward to the member clubs for voting on at the EGM held this morning.

## **ALRC SUPPLEMENTARY COMPETITION REGULATIONS**

### **Part 3 Competition Regulations**

#### **Section L. Vehicle Classes**

##### **L.1.1 Trials**

**Class Q. A vehicle manufactured from Land Rover parts in accordance with MSA Regulations. Vehicles must retain Land Rover axles, engines and drivetrain. Vehicles must retain the appearance of a Land Rover.**

##### **L.1.3 Competitive Safari**

**Class Q. A vehicle manufactured from Land Rover parts in accordance with MSA Regulations. Vehicles must retain Land Rover axles, engines and drivetrain. Vehicles must retain the appearance of a Land Rover.**

Votes were received from 18 out of the 27 competitive clubs with the outcome being 16 For, 2 Against and 0 Abstentions.

An ALRC Council meeting has been held today which has ratified this vote so this rule change will come into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017.

b. 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.**

On the 8th October 2016 the ALRC Council agreed that this proposal could be sent out to the member clubs for voting on at the ALRC AGM to be held on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

c. After the last S&ORC meeting the ALRC Council ratified the following clarification to an existing regulation which took immediate effect under the safety criteria. The addition has been highlight in bold text.

#### **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. A clevis and pin fitting or pair of Land Rover chassis-shackles (not spring shackles) are recommended.*

*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).*

**All recovery points must have a minimum of a 3mm thick, mild steel spreader plate behind its mounting point, regardless of its type or location.**

This has caused some comments to be made at events and also the following has being sent from Mark Pycraft, secretary for Essex LRC.

*Please find below a matter for the attention of the Scrutineering & Off Road Committee. I would appreciate it being included in the agenda under 'enquiries received since previous meeting', for the November 12th meeting.*

*Several of our members use Defender 90 TD5s for RTV events. These later Defenders have captive nuts within the cross member. The back of the cross member is inaccessible because of the fuel tank location and tank guard. Our members have asked us to confirm how the ALRC reg change, re 3mm spreader plate behind the all recovery points, is to be achieved. I believe that this issue was also raised at the recent Baskerville event.*

*Can the committee clarify what they sensibly expect to be done to these vehicles for them to conform to the new regulation, without incurring huge extra cost? Obviously Land Rover provide extra chassis mounting points for a drop hitch arrangement, but this would hinder the vehicles ground clearance and give older models an unfair advantage. Whilst I believe it is possible to gain access to the back of the cross member by removing the tank guard, I assume the captive threads will require drilling out to extend the bolts through the cross member, thus damaging the vehicles usability for any further towing arrangement, and how is this to be checked by the scrutineer with the tank guard in place?*

*We acknowledge that from TD5 on, the cross members were not as strongly made as the earlier versions so there is at risk from deformation if a snatch recovery is performed.*

Tim Linney stated that in his opinion this would not apply at all as it is not a recovery point but the rear hitch is a towing point rated by the manufacturer to what the vehicle can tow. It should only be applying to front fittings.

It was said at the meeting that if a towing point was used for recovery then the rule should apply regardless.

There is still the worry that a tow hitch if attached to a rear cross member without a spreader plate then it could be pulled through when used for recovery.

The ambiguity about the use of spreader plates has arisen because the use of them is highlighted in the scrutineering section of the ALRC Handbook but this has not been included in the actual regulations.

There has been much discussion at scrutineering over the years as to the necessity of fitting spreader plates.

On some vehicles it is not possible to see if a spreader plate is fitted but this also applies to the criteria of other regulations as well. Competitors do sign a declaration to say that they have read and will abide by the rules.

Tim Linney said that on a TD5 the tow hitch is sometimes the drop plate that can be removed and then the tow hitch is bolted onto the top two holes only. This advice has come from a Land Rover dealership when it was queried re the use of a NATO hook when towing a Sankey trailer.

Tony Sinclair stated that these are not type approved towing bolts with the correct rating when using only the top two holes, it is only type approved when the whole system is in place together with the back stays. The two bolts are a location point only.

Tim Linney was told that if he received it in writing from Land Rover that it was permissible to just use the top two holes for a recovery point then this would be permitted.

The military have never fitted a NATO hook onto a TD5 but when one is fitted to an old military 90 it is fitted with a spreader plate across the 4 bolts.

Charles Darby asked would it be possible to fit a plate on front side of the bumper / cross member thus making this the spreader plate? It was thought that this would then be classed as a spacer.

The question was then raised as to whether high tensile studding could be used to go through the original fittings.

Dennis Wright said it would not be possible to check that these were high tensile as they would not be a bolt but a set screw with probably no markings.

If a drop plate is removed and the original towing point removed then a pair of chassis shackles i.e. forged Jate rings could be fitted in its place. The use of JATE rings is already mentioned in the scrutineering article in the ALRC Handbook but does not appear in any regulation. It must be remembered that JATE rings must be fitted as a pair and not used singly.

It was proposed by Andy Dennis, seconded by Steve Kirby that the following wording be added to the ALRC Regulation B 19 Recovery Points with the existing wording on the spreader plates being moved to the end of B19.1 so that it is clear that this only applies to that part of the rule. The word "All" to be changed to "These".

19.2. A pair of Land Rover chassis shackles (forged JATE rings) are suitable.

This was voted by the S&ORC For 7, Against 1, Abstention 0.

The complete Regulation would now read as the following:

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.

This Rule Change will now be considered for ratification by the ALRC Council under a safety clarification criteria and if agreed will be notified to all clubs.

Richard Banks said that we need vehicles to be safe and also able to be easily visually checked by a scrutineer. Safety is paramount and there should be no apology made for insisting on the use of spreader plates if they could potentially save lives by stopping a tow ball being pulled through and coming off a vehicle.

Tony Sinclair reminded members that the vehicle being used for recovery should also be scrutineered.

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

The following wording has previously been proposed by Andy Dennis, seconded by Graham Pink and has appeared in previous minutes.

*C.3.1 Max capacity changed to 8500cc to allow 5000cc forced induction, using the multiplication factor of 1.7.*

This would need to also allow forced induction engines to be permitted.

The regulation *C.3.4.Forced induction petrol engines are not permitted* would then need to be removed if this rule change proposal was voted FOR.

Charles Darby raised concerns that if we proceeded to go to this size of engine and allowed forced induction in petrol engines then the MSA would look very seriously at all the necessary safety requirements and it would take Comp Safaris out of the Clubmans category. They would force us to have rescue units and competitors would also have to fit FIA belts, seats, FHR etc. all adding to the cost for both competitors and organisers.

Fraser Parish agreed that this could happen and the use of bigger engines was originally requested due to the lack of available engines currently allowed. There are engines readily available up to 4600 and to go above this would also make the need for better gear boxes, engine management etc.

Paul Walton said that some members are prepared to spend a lot of money to make their vehicles go faster.

Mark Whaley said that the biggest fear is the speed that larger engines can go. The average speed can be limited by course design but the maximum speed would greatly increase. The bogey speed for Clubman Comp Safaris is 30mph and you are penalised if this is exceeded. Anything above the bogey 30mph is classed as a Safari plus.

Charles Darby said that if the super charged engine was taken out of the discussion and just the date in the regulation A2 changed it may be a better outcome.

Mark Whaley replied that his view was that we should look at the regulations to allow the naturally aspirated petrol V8 engines that are produced now to be used in vehicles for all events. He has an aversion to force induction petrol engines of that capacity because of the likely increase in maximum speeds that could be achieved.

There was no rule change proposal submitted in the correct time scale for the 2017 ALRC AGM so this will not be voted on until March 2018. We need to consider carefully where we want to progress to and how a regulation needs to be worded

Matthew Fulwood asked should this rule be comp safari /speed specific opposed to a general rule that also covers trial vehicles? We need to be considering diesel engines as well

Most members who compete in multiple events using modified vehicles do so in the CCVT and Comp Safari. A turbo charged petrol engine is not necessary for a CCVT but may be desirable for a Comp Safari.

It must be remembered that the Q class does allow for different engines but this regulation is being run for a two year period and may stop after that. This regulation has been introduced to produce more membership and entries for club events. If this does not prove to be the case then it will be withdrawn.

We need to discuss which engines we are wanting to consider – i.e. 2 ltr T series turbo which when you put in the multiplier would fit in the current rules on the capacity or 5ltr super charged.

Mark agreed with Charles Darby that the rules on engines also need to be looked at with conjunction to Regulation A, with particular A2. A number of regulations would need to be looked at together.

At present anything made prior to 2001 can be fitted into any vehicle across the board.

The rule stating that engines must stay in the vehicle model they were manufactured in was not introduced until 2010.

This has not been progressed and has come to a full stop.

Andy Dennis said we need to also consider which engines will be readily available.

### **ACTION**

**All club members are asked to consider what they see the aims of the ALRC and to give thought to how the regulations should be changed. A formal proposal does need to be made. Several regulations would 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 next edition of the ALRC Handbook due out in the New Year the time scale would be to hope to have something in place before the next publication in 2019.**

**This will be further discussed at the next meeting   ONGOING**

**6. Enquiries received since previous meeting - None received**

**7. Any other business.**

**a. Re-cutting Tyres – Matthew Fulwood, Chiltern Vale LRC**

Matthew Fullwood asked where does it say that you can re-cut tyres for CCVT? He appreciated it is not allowed for RTVT as they are not road legal.

This is seen as very difficult to police and prove that they have been cut.

Stuart Newton stated that this was allowed for under the Scrutineering Tyres section of the ALRC Handbook.

Matthew said that this is another case of it not appearing in the regulations.

It was then pointed out by Simone that under B.8.2. *Tyres may be changed to any type...* which would allow recut tyres in CCVT but they are prohibited for RTVT by an event specific Regulation E.2.1. which states that the tyres must be road legal.

It was agreed at the meeting that this does not cause problems at events.   **CLOSED**

**b. Access to Rear Cross Members– Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC**

Andy asked how scrutineers were supposed to check if spreader plates were in place on the rear cross member if the protection guards are in situ at the top and bottom?

We need to take this on trust and remember that the competitor does sign a declaration stating that the vehicle does comply with the regulations.

Andy queried whether it was worth having an inspection hole? Not thought necessary but if asked then a competitor would need to prove to the scrutineers satisfaction that the vehicle was safe to take part. This may require a protection guard to be removed.

This may result in a competitor not entering but all should be aware of the rules.   **CLOSED**

**c. Q Class Vehicles – Paul Walton, NERO**

We do need to make sure that vehicles that should be in this class appear as such.

At NERO where the Q class has already been trialled the entrant in the Q class vehicle has won the events that have been entered but he realises that he is not eligible for championship points in the club league so he will not win any trophy. This may encourage him to change his vehicle to an ALRC compliant one.

So far we are still not seeing great numbers entering however the word is starting to get out.

Our August trial had one Q class entrant who won the event.

Our September trial had 2 Q class entrants, one of whom won the event. (Same as last month).

Our October trial had 1 Q Class entrant who won the event again.

The winning Land Rover is an 88" Coiler with a Lightweight Body. It's Silhouette is the only issue to take it into Q Class.

The Other entrant from September will be back in November and has said he has two other new members coming with him.

At the recent LRO Show at Peterborough, I was asked to come along to an RTV demonstration in the main arena. Russ Brown asked me to explain Q class and to assist in making sure that myths and confusion was quashed.

This appeared to work well and I understand has generated a lot on conversation on forums and amongst attendees of the show. Russ has been very supportive of the Q class.

It was clarified that any vehicle entered in an RTVT under Q class must be road legal as required under the MSA regulation as RTVT stands for road taxed vehicle trial.

Matthew Fulwood asked if the event specific regulations i.e. Section E would still apply to Q class vehicles as the class has been placed in Section L? Answer - No. Section L just classifies between Standard, Modified or Q class. Q class is a completely stand-alone class.

This has been bought in primarily for RTVT – 100” 90 with bikini top and no door tops is an example.

It is being taken out of context for the whole idea of what the rule is supposed to have been introduced for and that is to be inclusive and allow clubs to survive by increasing membership and entries at events. For small clubs the difference of 1 or two entries could make all the difference to whether they continue as a club or cease to exist.

We need to allow this regulation to be run at club level and record what vehicles are being used at events so that we can see what actually is being used.

The club SR's for a CCVT must show that a roll cage is required.

Post Meeting Note:

**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.  
ONGOING**

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

Next Meeting – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2017

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

Council - February 4<sup>th</sup>, June 10<sup>th</sup>, October 7<sup>th</sup>.

AGM / EGM / S&ORC March 18<sup>th</sup>, July 8<sup>th</sup>, November 18<sup>th</sup>.

**9. Close the meeting.**

Meeting closed at 14.45.