

OAK COTTAGE  
47 CADBURY ROAD  
SUNBURY  
TW16 7LY

31 MARCH 1998.

AGENDA FOR TECHNICAL PANEL.

10 MAY 1998.

1. PRESENT.
2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.
3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING / MATTERS ARISING.
4. FRONT WHEEL DRIVE HATCH-BACK WINDOWS.  
S.W.
5. N.G TF. INCLUSION INTO CLASS 7 WITH SAME SPEC AS  
TA WITH FULL WINGS.  
S.B.
6. MORE CLASSES? WHITE, BLUE, YELLOW, RED, ETC.  
S.B.
7. CLASS CLEANS ON HILLS WHICH NO ONE HAS  
CLIMBED?
8. ELECTION OF OFFICERS.
9. A.O.B.
10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING.

# The M.C.C.

Albury  
68 Quarry Road  
WINCHESTER  
Hants  
SO23 0JS

☎ 01962 862505

8 April 1998

Dear Delegate

## ACTC COUNCIL MEETING - 10 MAY 1998

1 A little later than I would have wished, but I hope this letter will give you sufficient time to at least canvas views from your Club's Committee on 2 subjects.

2 Under Item 14, The MCC would like to raise the subject of:

### **The substitution of plastic for glass in the tailgates of hatchbacks.**

3 A little controversy arose about 3 years ago when a number of front wheel drive competitors decided that the rear window of a hatchback is part of the boot lid for the purposes of M6.3.6 "... boot lid ... the material may be changed", and installed polycarbonate in place of glass. The MCC Scrutineers at the time did not accept that interpretation and by the next event everyone had refitted glass windows. However the situation has now reoccurred and in the interests of the sport the issue should be formally resolved.

4 Firstly, there is no provision in part M of the Blue Book to change window glass, thus E13.1 applies - 'unless it says you can, you can't'. It has been suggested that E13.19.8 gives authority to change window glass - "... if plastic ... windows are fitted the thickness must not be less than 4mm." (my emphasis). The MCC maintains that this is an incorrect interpretation and the regulation *only* applies to the thickness of the plastic when specific Regulations for a particular discipline allow the replacement of glass eg, L11.4.5 for modified production cars in speed events.

5 Secondly, if the rear window is accepted as part of the 'boot lid' (manufacturers of hatchbacks refer to 'tailgates' or '3rd/5th doors' rather than 'boot lids'), then inequalities appear, eg the glass part of the boot lid could be replaced in a Gulf but a Mini, with a fixed rear window, would have to retain the glass. E13.2.9 of the Blue Book clearly draws a distinction between 'boots, doors and tailgates'.

6 A contrary view is that we should allow this type of modification under the broad heading of 'boot lid' as part of the efforts to reduce the performance difference between Class 1 and the rear wheel drive Classes.

7 The situation was not helped in 1995 when the Trials Executive of the RACMSA replied to a competitor that, in his opinion, glass in a tailgate *did* form part of the boot lid for the purposes of M6.3.6 and the material could be changed. Six months later he replied to me, making no reference to his earlier opinion to a competitor, that this was a

matter of interpretation, and it was free for an organising Club to clarify the situation in SRs.

8 An ACTC resolution would thus be in everyone's interest. The Technical Panel will be considering the matter on the morning of Council, but your Club's views are nonetheless needed for the main Meeting.

9 After detailed consideration, The MCC Executive Committee's formal Recommendation to Council is that:

*the interpretation of M6.3.6 should be that the rear window in the tailgate of a hatchback car is not "the boot lid" for the purposes of this Regulation and its material cannot be changed from standard.*

#### **Agenda Item 8 - Guidelines for the Construction of Class 8 Cars**

10 The MCC Executive Committee have formed a view which may be of interest to other Clubs in advance of the Council Meeting.

11 The initiative to review the absence of certain regulations governing Class 8 is timely and welcomed. However, Guidelines in themselves would be unlikely to influence the development of vehicles in the future, and to be effective would need to be translated into regulations to be included in the Blue Book.

12 The main restraints on construction are already in place - the requirement for free and uninterrupted differentials; the restriction of rear overhang; seat position not being behind the rear axle; prohibition of fiddle brakes; 185mm as a maximum tyre section size and not more than 20mm tyre section differential between front and rear. Organisers have the discretion to exclude any vehicle whose appearance or condition is not of a standard appropriate to the event (B12.1.7).

13 On balance the Committee concluded that most of the necessary controls are already in place whilst leaving scope for the type of innovation that has characterised our sport over 70 or so years. There seems to be no compelling reasons why construction materials should be restricted or experiments with motorcycle engines prohibited. Thus it is suggested that:

*The situation be kept under review but that the Class 8 Guidelines be not progressed at this stage, except that the Technical Panel be asked to consider whether a minimum wheelbase dimension in excess of 1830mm (72" - E13.19.7) should be included in Part M of the Blue Book (eg matching the National Trials Car Formula Dimensions) together with a means of controlling the articulation of front axles.*

Yours sincerely



Alan Foster





# Minutes of the Meeting of the Technical Panel

10th May 1998

Present: Alan Foster      John West  
David Alderson      Gerald Burridge  
Simon Woodall

Apologies: Richard Dawe

Minute	Matter	Action
Matters Arising	The debate of the Marlin specification is now closed. All owners should have a copy of the latest specification	
98/01	There has been no mention of the new Pouncey League in Triple magazine despite numerous requests to the editor. Action: MCC delegates to apply internal pressure.	AF / JW
98/02	Motorcycles: Concern has been expressed in various quarters as to whether the current recommended capacity class breaks are working. There would appear to be a large imbalance in entries between the two classes. A number of different figures have been suggested, all with a number of advantages and an equal number of potential problems. Action: Report to Main Council for clubs to review.	Clubs
98/03	Motorcycles: With the resignation of Richard Dawe from the post of championship secretary there was a gap in the make up of the technical panel for a "motorcycle expert". Action: Ask Richard Dawe to remain on panel as co-opted M/C expert.	SW
98/04	Martyn Harry's Ford Engined, VW Gearboxed Hillman Imp - The legality of this vehicle was queried, although it has been passed as acceptable for class 7 based on photographic evidence. The panel was reminded that to be eligible for C7 a vehicle must retain the original chassis/floorpan within the wheelbase. Action: Verify same by visual inspection at next opportunity.	SW
98/04	Tyres: Many Austin 7's are currently using a Chen Ching tyre. It is originally intended as a motorcycle tyre. Although this is not labelled as a grip type tyre it would not be legal on a trials motorcycle as it fails the block gap test. This was regarded as sufficient argument to make it illegal on a car. There was a belief that the tyre was on the Car Tyre white list. Action: Verify the tyre list.	SW
98/05	Windows: The question of the use of plexiglas in place of class in windows was raised with the particular emphasis to the interpretation in M6.3.6 that the hatch on a hatchback was equivalent to the bootlid on a conventional saloon and therefore its material could be changed. After some debate this was passed on a 3/2 vote. It was	

also noted that the *only* glass that could be changed is that in a hatch, not the side windows and that scrutineers should be vigilant over this matter.

98/06 A letter had been received from Shenstone DMC regarding the use of "Type 4" engines in VW Beetles in class 6. DA had replied to this prior to their trial stating that under the current regulations such engines were legal. The panel agreed that the status quo should remain.

98/07 Some debate was held regarding the letter received from Camel Vale identifying problems that had occurred on their Bodmin trial with competitors not complying with some of the Blue Book Section E regulations. As this matter was also going to be debated by Council, no formal conclusion was reached, but the need to publicise the content and legal status of Section E was emphasised.

Clubs /  
Restart

98/08 Class 8 Formula / Guidelines: The use of this document as a set of guidelines was felt to be inappropriate, either they should be regulations or not. The main points that had come out of the exercise, were (1) the wheelbase limit, which needed to stay at 6 ft as some cars exist at this length, and the rule is already in existence - E13.19.7 and (2) the strength of front axles - It was felt that a regulation that would prohibit the use of Sporting Trials style pivoting beam front axles should be drafted, but no detail work was done.