

ASSOCIATION OF CLASSIC TRIALS CLUBS

The Annual General Meeting of the Association of Classic Trials Clubs will commence at 2.15pm on Sunday 3rd September 1989, at the Bung Inn, Redhill, Writington, Nr Bristol, Avon (map reference 172/513640).

Due to refurbishment, food is not currently available at lunchtimes at the Bung Inn. Tea will be provided at the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence.
  2. Minutes of the meeting held on 7th May 1989.
  3. Matters arising from the minutes other than those detailed later on the Agenda.
  4. To receive the Accounts for the year ending 30th June 1989.
  5. Election of Officers:-
    - a) Chairman
    - b) Vice Chairman
    - c) Secretary
    - d) Treasurer
    - e) Championship Secretary
    - f) Championship Scorer
    - g) Championship Quality Controller
    - h) RACMSA Trials & Cross Country Committee Nominees
- Rule 8 states that all elections for officers are conducted by Secret Ballot. Martin Halliday is the Council Appointed Rights of Way Officer (1.9.85)
6. VSCC's membership of ACTC (Minute 89/3) - R Moore to report.
  7. Calendar of Events for 1990 (Minute 89/5) - to report any changes.
  8. Clash of dates 1989: Exmoor Clouds/Tamar (Minute 89/7) - Championship Secretary to report.
  9. Week numbering (Minute 89/6) - to report any progress.
  10. Supply of copies of ACTC Rules - to report progress.
  11. Proposed changes to Class 7 - to consider the recommendations of the MCC and the ACTC Technical Panel: see attached.
  12. To consider at the request of the Rights of Way Officer the achievement of a £250 contribution to a fighting fund (target £10,000) concerning the Traffic Regulation Order on the South Downs Way - Martin Halliday to introduce.
  13. RACMSA - proposed 'Green Paper' on Classic Reliability Trials (as part of a more general review of motor sport) - to receive a report from the Trials & Cross Country Committee nominees.

14. Any other non championship business.
15. To receive the Championship Accounts for the last financial year.
16. Report of Championship Secretary.
17. Report of the Championship Scorer, including the requirement from September 1989 for all championship drivers and navigators to complete a separate sheet at signing-on (Minute 89/8).
18. Report of the Championship Quality Controller including revised observers reports and system of feedback to clubs (Minute 89/9).
19. Proposed Open Forum: an opportunity for competitors to discuss the future of the Championship - officers to report (Minute 89/11).
20. Any other Championship business.
21. Date, time and place of the next meeting.

### Class 7 and all that

An article written for publication in both 'Triple' and 'Wheelspin'.

Where does a modified production car end and a one-off special begin? A question which many have talked over and around for as long as rules have mattered. Add to this the question of what is a standard kit car (or an alternative car as some prefer), then readers can understand why the MCC Executive Committee decided to ask current class 7 competitors for their views.

A fairly simple questionnaire and covering letter was distributed to the 32 known current class 7 entrants, and the Executive is grateful to 24 who made the time to think about the issues and return the form - a 75% response is commendable by any standard. All respondents said they regularly competed in MCC Trials, 63% (15) in ACTC Championship events and 58% (14) in other Reliability Trials.

It will be of no surprise that 42% (10) drove Marlins, whereas everyone else was unique in their choice of mount, save for 3 Bucklers. In other words, apart from Marlins, the great variety that we all enjoy seeing in our sport. There must surely always be a place for odd-balls, particularly those who drive their unusual cars for the sheer fun of doing so.

There was major support - 79% (19) - for the Executive's preliminary view that any reduction in wheelbase of a production or kit car automatically places that vehicle in class 8. There was also strong backing - 58% (14) - for more stringent requirements such as the chassis/floorpan between the wheel centres remaining as in the original car. The Executive thought 1992 was a reasonable date to introduce any new rules, thereby letting existing vehicles have a final fling. Only 29% (7) agreed, 46% (11) wanting an earlier date. The RACMSA Stability Rule means 1991 at the earliest in any case.

The next questions divided the respondents into 2 roughly equal camps. The present approach to kit cars whereby agreed specifications are prepared, received 46% (11) support, whereas the alternative, allowing the freedoms currently enjoyed for modified production cars - engines, transmissions, silhouette and so on, summed up by "if it looks like a Marlin, it is a Marlin" - was backed by 30% (9). Then there were others who wanted to change the world.

There are one or two production rear-engined vehicles fitted with 1.s.ds which occasionally compete and are currently eligible for class 7. With one abstention, respondents were almost divided equally on whether they should continue to be eligible.

As the questionnaire specifically invited comments, it is important to examine the points raised by those who thought the sport would benefit from fundamental change - or a return to the old days. Three respondents suggested that standard kit cars (whatever these are) should compete with production sports cars, a view that may not be shared by MG and Morgan drivers! Other suggestions involved annual reviews, or classification by success, and the need to take account of later modifications by the manufacturers themselves.

contd ....



More than one respondent reminded us that we are all in this sport for fun, and to have a good day out when we compete. There is no Formula One drive at the end of it, and in MCC events, we should not be competing against each other, but the Club.

It will now be for the MCC Executive to decide in the light of all the facts and opinions what to recommend to the ACTC Council and RACMSA. Whatever the outcome, in my view a number of factors emerge, all centred on the need for both the MCC and ACTC to make information more widely available, and equally important, competitors and organisers to know the rules, whatever they may be. Communication is two-way, and if changes are needed there is also an onus on competitors to make their views known to organisers and their corporate body.

At the end of the day, it is all about friendly competition and having fun. Awards are worthless if the respect of your peers is lost on the way.

Alan Foster