

# YORKSHIRE CENTRE TIMES

Issue No 53



MARCH/APRIL 1994

## CHAIRMAN'S LETTER

I am writing this on the Tuesday morning following the Easter meetings. Both days were a success both in terms of competition and spectators and we were pleased to join with the Yorkshire Post's Sports Monday for another season of sponsorship. Inevitable Easter, when early, is cold but both days started predominantly dry until after the runs and it was pleasing to welcome new and old faces back.

The week before Easter we were guests of Paul Haigh at the International Motor Sports Show at Sheffield Arena. We were donated a stand and with help from Ivor & Shirley Pashley, Chris Seaman, Johnathen Varley, Graham Hickman, Graham & Carol Wride, Alan McKinney and Peter & Sue Varley we put on an excellent display which generated a lot of interest from competitors and spectators alike. Denis Carter helped by lending all the Club's exhibition materials and we hope to be invited back next year to improve our performance.

I am particularly pleased to welcome Nigel Drayton to the committee. Nigel was elected at the AGM and with a strong rally background will be an asset to us in new areas of development we are examining.

Training Day took place as usual and was extremely well attended by both trainers, marshals and competitors and a welcome return was made by Derek Ongaro of the RAC MSA who was so instrumental in helping the new course get off the ground. The day went well for all despite severely cold weather and was very productive for all involved. My thanks to all involved.

As you may know we have, for some time, toyed with the idea of moving the paddock to the fields below the start area and using the farm buildings for signing on, control, timekeeping and catering with the barn being used as a club house. Obviously there is more space and it is considerably warmer, however there are many considerations to take into account. Any member with any thoughts to contribute would be welcomed and should write or telephone myself.

I look forward to seeing you soon and wish you a competitive and enjoyable season.

Yours sincerely  
Simon Clark

## EDITORIAL

May I first say a very big 'Thank You' to David Bailey and Paul Nutter for their excellent reports on the Easter Harewoods. I put pressure on them to get the reports to me quickly and they both responded magnificently. Thank you both.

I am very concerned that one of our long standing members, Allan Staniforth, should suggest that competitors think twice about entering our championship because of a rise in registration fee from £5 to £6. Such an amount taken over the course of the season is so minuscule as not to be worthy of consideration and his further suggestion that if you don't do well in a championship you should consider not entering, I find destructive not constructive. While I welcome letters on any subject and will defend the members' right to freedom of the press, there are already democratic channels which could be used to achieve his aims without suggesting non-entry of the championship.

This is a bumper edition of the 'Times' as it contains reports on the two Easter Harewoods and also lengthy letters on the Harewood championship bogey system. Please keep your letters coming and don't forget that we are interested in births, deaths and marriages as well as the normal motor sport tittle tattle.

Pat Kenyon

## HAREWOOD DATES FOR 1994

14th May	Open/Novice/Newcomers
15th May	Open Championship
12th June	Jim Thomson Trophy
16/17th July	RAC Championship
7th August	Montague Burton Trophy
25th Sept	Championship Finals

*The inclusion of any article in this publication does not imply that the Club, its Officers, its Editorial staff or any other member shares any opinion expressed therein*

**Articles for the next edition of the Times please  
to the Editor by MAY 20th 1994**

**Mrs Pat Kenyon  
4 Leslie Road  
Hillsborough  
Sheffield S6 4RB**

**Tel & Fax 0742 340478**

## LETTER FROM ALLAN STANIFORTH

Harrogate  
15 Feb 1994

Dear Editor

Shock, horror, fury etc. Well anyway deep dismay following a quiet browse through the new '94 Harewood Regs Booklet, calculator in hand.

Would anyone believe that our very own esteemed and formidable hard-fought Hill Championship is actually contested on a sloping field with 15 sets of fake goalposts, all moveable, and this two year old state of affairs will be repeated again in the coming season.

To elucidate; the bogey times from which point scores are calculated relate not to real records set by a live driver in his racing car, but in the majority of classes are still based on a set of 'man-made' imaginary records worked out using slightly simplistic maths formula during the winter of 1981. (Ed: I assume you mean 1991 Allan).

Based on Old Hill records, it provided a set of figures on which to apply the 'plus 18' to give bogey times for the New Hill and as a stop gap these were not unreasonable to live with for 1992. However, in due time the season produced not only a complete set of 'real life' records set by best drivers in best cars on their day, it also revealed the major flaw of the 'calculation method' - that a majority of the 'records' it produced were in reality far out of reach, some by several seconds, a light-year in hillclimb terms.

Were either of these aspects recognised or acted on by BARC Yorks? They were not. All the imaginary targets stayed unaltered for 1993. They proved so far out of reach that not one was touched in a further season of racing. The failure gaps ranged anywhere from 1 to over 3 seconds, meaning that a new 'real life' record might only earn a points score of 17 or perhaps 15 instead of 18.

Quite unbelievably this situation now stays unaltered for yet another year in 15 of the 19 classes despite opposition at the Classes Forum last November. The Club rewards record setters, quite rightly, with the honour of a Record Plaque, but their achievements are totally ignored in the basic framework of our Championship. New cars, new drivers, better tyres, novel concepts cannot get anywhere near theory, are penalised for it - and unequally penalised at that.

Without boring anybody with a torrent of maths, one example will do. Consider Roy Lane, who as current record holder is not a slow man at Harewood. To achieve a maximum score he would have to take

2.5 seconds off his own class record, or 1.1 seconds off his own outright hill record

The fact is that drivers capable of winning anywhere in Britain, whatever the status of the event, cannot touch Harewood 'imaginary' ones, and they include Corbyn, Kerr, Kilty, Mineeff, Owen and Hickman in no particular order.

How much longer can Yorkshire go on playing God, ignoring what is happening in real life on our superb (and still improving) course? Presumably into the 21st century unless some glimmer of common sense and reality intrudes.

Discussing this with the hugely experienced and extremely fast Chris Seaman the Elder, he quite cheerfully and unblushingly accepts major responsibility for all this, primarily, if I understand him correctly, on the grounds that competitors in the suspect classes 'are going slower than they ought to be going'.

On the verge of being rendered speechless and apoplectic at this, I can only suggest that anyone thinking of entering the Championship in 1994 (£6, 20% up on last year) might consider what chance he/she has even if they can break the real-life records at every single meeting this year. Sadly the answer has to be 'very slim indeed' and that cannot be fair or reasonable.

Yours fervently

Allan Staniforth.

## BRIAN KENYON'S REPLY TO ALLAN STANIFORTH'S LETTER AS AN EX-MEMBER OF THE CLASSES COMMITTEE

On reading Allan's letter, I didn't know whether to laugh or cry. I take great exception to the implications and the tone of the letter. Allan's statements of '*sloping fields, fake goalposts, all moveable*' to me implies that the Classes Committee set out to 'screw' certain classes. This is far from the truth, the problem that Allan seems to have is not that the goalposts are moveable, it is that the committee refuse to move them to suit him and a small vociferous minority. I will attempt during the course of this letter to explain the thinking behind the classes committee decisions and also to explain the facts, which Allan's letter with its ill informed generalisations, lack of research and understanding, so lamentably lacks.

Allan uses all the journalistic ploys with his heading - shock, horror, fury etc - to cover up his lack of the grasp of the facts. I can only assume

that these words are used to create an impression upon the reader as he starts his letter.

The first FACT is that when setting the original bogey times for the long course in the winter of '91, at no time did the classes committee promise that they would change the bogeys to suit the lack of individual new records in '92, in fact if you refer to your June 1992 'Times' it was stated that if the records were so out of reach they would ALL be revised mathematically but not individually. At no time was it inferred or promised that the new records would be used to set the '93 bogeys, in fact everyone was informed that it would take a period of time before things settled down to an acceptable level. The classes committee were pleased when after a late start to the season on the new hill and extreme inclement weather, two new records were set by the end of the year. At the '92 Classes Forum it was announced that we would continue with the previous bogey system into the '93 season. In 1993 some classes saw the previous '92 times undercut by 2 seconds or more as well as two new class records. This proved to the committee that the records had yet to settle at a realistic figure, added to this bogeys were narrowly missed being broken in 5 classes with figures of 0.07 in Class 6, 0.37 in Class 7, 0.42 in Class H, 0.48 in Class J and 0.65 in Class 5. This, I think you will agree, is different from the impression Allan tries to give with his *'ranging from 1 second to 3 seconds'*, this means that NINE out of the 19 classes the records/bogeys have been broken or are within reasonable striking distance and hardly, as Allan states, *'flawed or light-years away in hillclimb terms'*. Of the others which range at best from 1.47 to 3.06, it can be easily explained why they haven't been approached. We will take Allan's example of Roy Lane's times. Roy set his class winning time, which was 2.31 away from the bogey but with two extra run-off runs he undercut this immediately to 1.09. As Roy is unfortunately not a regular competitor these days at Harewood, it is not unreasonable to think that he would undercut this even further with greater familiarity with the course.

I would challenge Allan's assumption that we attract the 'the best drivers in the best cars' unfortunately these days Harewood doesn't attract the quality of entry it used to achieve in the 60's, 70's and early 80's in many classes and that although the drivers competing at Harewood are the best on the day they and their machines are not necessarily quick, it's just that if they win, they are quicker than the rest.

Are we asking too much of drivers in certain classes, I think not. If we use Allan's *'real times'* is it not fair and reasonable to think that a 1600cc twin-cam Lotus should be at least as quick if not quicker than a push rod 1300cc MG Midget because if the Midget's time of 64.49 was achieved by the Lotus it would just miss breaking the Class 5 bogey by 0.16. In class 2 the genuine record is held by a 1600cc Escort at 66.24, 0.03 faster than the Class 1 1300cc time. If someone arrived on the scene with a full blown 2 litre, I would expect the class record to fall without a problem. Why hasn't this been done? Because we don't attract the quality of entry as I have said before. Class B Modified Production Cars up to 2000cc are actually 1.88 seconds faster than their unlimited capacity Class C brothers. I think that anyone can see that the Class C record at the moment is anything but competitive so obviously people who compete in this class and in some other classes are not scoring the high points to which Allan thinks they are entitled. If they go at least as quick as the smaller engined cars then they will be within 0.42 of their bogey. I have always thought that a good big 'un should beat a good little 'un.

If you take the example of Class E, a Formula Libre car set a time of 59.86. Is it unreasonable to expect that a 1300cc Formula Libre car, which is virtually a single seater with a streamlined body, to be as quick if not quicker than a 500cc Racing Car (59.69). This time is quicker, as you can see, than the 1300cc Libre time. As the bogey is set between the Class H (500cc Racing Car) record and the Class I record (57.72) which is 1100cc Racing Car, if the Formula Libre cars split the difference of these two classes the bogey would be easily broken. Note: All the records quoted are Allan's 'real time' records.

The largest difference between the actual record and the bogey is in Class F which very often, because of lack of entries, is amalgamated with Class G. The Class F record (1600cc) achieved (real life 60.27) is slower than the Class E record, (real life 59.86) surely a 1600cc should go quicker than a 1300cc in a similar category. Class K is the second glaring example whereby a class having cars of far greater potential are not achieving the times that they should (56.07). Yet again it is ridiculous that the times set by the 1600cc Racing Cars are quicker (55.68) than those achieved by the 2000cc engined counterparts. This suggests to me that they are just not going quick enough through lack of equipment, commitment or familiarity with the hill.

If you sit down and analyse each class individually it can be easily explained why the 'man-made imaginary records' are not achieved. I will leave you, the reader, to work out whether or not we have been fair and reasonable. We have always tried, since the start of the new hill, to keep the system fair to all. If we have failed or if there is a major ground-swell of opinion against our reasoning and efforts, I suggest that you attend the next Classes Forum (many drivers don't bother to come but still moan at the decisions taken) and get things changed to your way of thinking. Unfortunately, a lot of people do not consider the overall view of the championship but just how they can best make the system suit their own ends.

I find Allan's last paragraph extremely mischievous and Allan is undermining the Centre and the sport when he suggests that you, the members, should consider the worth of entering the championship because of the, as he puts it '20% rise in championship fee' from £5 to £6. I cannot believe that Allan or anyone else for that matter will break their bank by having to find an extra £1 over the season when in Allan's case, if he was quick enough, he could win £500 for the overall championship and £300 for the FTD series making a total of £800 - not a bad return I would think for his layout of £6. As an aside, although I have not gone into it in great depth, other championships, namely Mid-Cheshire charge a £10 registration fee the Midlands championship a £16 registration. I would not suggest that they are overcharging their contestants, it's just that the Yorkshire Centre's championship is so cheap. To take on Allan's last point, I would suggest that there is every chance that drivers exhibiting enough talent and with the right equipment, can shatter both the real-life records and beat the bogey system and in so doing feel that they have really achieved something rather than to have beaten a ridiculously slow record time. I think that that is fair and reasonable.

Brian Kenyon

PS. I understand that what I have written will not make me universally popular with many people but unfortunately Allan's letter has forced me into giving explanations for, what he sees as, anomalies. I stand by all I have said and if it gains me a certain unpopularity, so be it. The truth often hurts. **NOTE:** My replies to the two letters have been vetted by Classes Committee Chairman, Chris Seaman.

Chris has promised a letter on the Harewood Championship for the next 'Times'.

## LETTER FROM PAUL NUTTER

Once again I put pen to paper to bring up the issue of Harewood bogey times. After two years in use and 14 events later on, isn't now the time to do away with the calculated bogey times and set them from the existing class records?

So far only 4 bogey times have been beaten despite the fact that in the remaining 15 classes some of the quickest driver/car combinations in the country have visited the hill and competed. Maybe this fact has got something to do with the nature of the new part of the course in that it is very twisty compared to the old course and so a pure mathematical solution might not suffice.

The committee insist that the existing bogey times cannot be changed because of the fear that one or two classes will dominate the championship (as opposed to the norm of Minis, Midgets, Formula Fords and the odd Turbo cars I presume as has been the case for the last 6 years to my knowledge). If the bogeys were changed no one class would dominate as all 19 class winners (provided they set a time near the record and providing they were registered of course) would score near maximum points.

The committee seemed to be frightened to death that if the bogey times were altered all of a sudden drivers with absolute monster cars will crawl out of the woodwork (from where they have been hiding for the last 16 years in some cases) and no matter where they came from (it could be the south coast of England or the north of Scotland) they will join the BARC Yorkshire Centre, enter the Championship, obliterate the new bogey times and thus run away with the Harewood title. This is provided of course that only one or two would enter. If four or five entered then combined with the usual front runners we would at last have a wide open championship. It is the use of those two words ie wide open that seem to petrify the class committee.

I was under the obviously wrong impression that the championship was run supposedly for Yorkshire members of the BARC and that to win it you would have to compete in at least 5 rounds (meaning that you are a regular) but it appears that, because there are quicker cars belonging to drivers who are not Yorkshire Centre members and who do not compete at Harewood, the Harewood regulars who do attend every meeting at Harewood and support the club championship must be penalised due to this fact by having to

score points against artificial bogey times. Why should these 'potential' cars have an effect on the actual competitors in the championship?

Of course if cars do come to Harewood on occasions and set new class records all good and well because at least those records and therefore bogey times would have been set by cars competing today and not based on calculations from times set by cars which have never competed on the new course as is the majority of the case.

Another fact which leads me to question the class committee's ways is that when the original short course bogeys were set for the new classes in 1991, the times for Class 2, E and K were 'calculated' or set as such because the times that were available to them were not representative.

In Class 2 the times set by eligible cars over 13 years were not considered representative because they had failed to better the 45.49 set by K Tate in 1978 in an Escort which I have been told by two sources was fitted with a Formula Atlantic BDA engine. The committee then 'calculated' (HOW?) the bogey to be set at 44.50 which coincidentally was the 1988 over 1500cc Touring Car record set by M Kerr in a 2.3 litre HSR Chevette. If the above Escort was fitted with a BDA engine, both cars are not eligible for the current regulations and so are definitely not representative of this class yet the bogey time is calculated from the HSR's record. If this is not the case how did the committee reach this figure?

In Class E a bogey time of 58.00 was set because no car had beaten D Whitehead's 1985 1300cc Special Saloon record of 42.13. This bogey was calculated (HOW?) at a level somewhere between the two small racing car class records. With the committee unsure of what cars would enter this new class again opted on the safe side and set a lower rather than higher bogey time just in case dozens of 1300cc Sports Libre cars would suddenly enter the championship and run away with the title.

Finally Class K, Now the committee set the bogey time at 53.33 which is lower than the Class J bogey of 55.20. This was despite the fact that the Class J record (37.99) was lower than the Class K record (39.44). This was explained by Chris Seaman who said it was done to stop 1600cc cars entering Class K (by saying they had an engine larger than 1600cc) and therefore probably winning the championship. Fear again. In fact the bogey time based on the actual class record (39.44) was beaten only twice by a 1600cc car registered

in the championship and only 5 times in total. It was also beaten once by a 2000cc car who thus set a new record of 56.07 on the long course from which the 1993 bogey would have been based on. This new bogey time was only beaten by one 1600cc car which wasn't registered for the championship. No other cars were close. (PS If Chris Seaman had entered his car into Class K and the bogeys used were set from the actual class records he would have finished 2nd instead of 9th in 1992 with 84.65 points whilst in 1993 he would have finished 5th instead of 7th with 82.41 points.

This brings me to my final question. Why, when calculating the new bogeys, did the committee only consider times in classes 2, E and K not representative? For example comments have frequently been made that a properly sorted 1.4 Nova or a 1000cc Turbo Japanese super Mini would wipe the floor with the Class 1 Mini Coopers yet no allowance for this was made when setting the Class 1 bogey.

In Class 3 nothing was taken into account to allow for the fact that a 4x4 Sapphire Cosworth is vastly superior to a 2WD 3 door Sierra Cosworth never mind an Escort RS Cosworth.

In the Formula Ford class a new car is admitted every year and for this year semi-slick tyres will be allowed yet once again no allowance is made for this fact in calculating the bogey.

In Class B no change was made despite the short hill record being held by a 1600cc X/flow engined car. Strange when you consider that the same car could be powered by a 2000cc BDG or a 2000cc 16v Vauxhall engine.

Class C is the same when Westfields can be powered by 2100cc BDG engines or 4400cc Rover V8's or that turbocharged 4x4 Rallycross cars are admitted, but no allowance was made when calculating the new bogey times.

The committee cannot state that these times were not altered or guesstimated due to the fact that they were the current short course record holders and therefore very representative of their respective classes as this is precisely the same situation which exists on the long course today yet the times set by those cars are not used by the committee to calculate the long hill bogeys.

Could the committee please answer as to why they only used their crystal ball in 3 classes when as good a case can be made for nearly every other class. What is so special about classes 2 and E in particular?

One further question concerning Chris

Seaman's statement in the reply to my letter in the April/May 1992 'Times'. Namely that the classes committee 'fully expected 1978 times to be bettered considering the modern rubber available, also the developments in power and handling and last but not least, the fact that the hill has been resurfaced'.

He then states that the classes committee were very surprised when these old records were not beaten. Which major technical developments took place over the winter of 1990/91 that suddenly made it a surprise that 1978 times which hadn't been beaten in 12 years up to 1990 should suddenly be easily surpassed by cars that entered in 1991. Are the class committee privy to superb technical details on tyres, engines and suspension that would allow cars that competed at Harewood over 12 years to suddenly improve in performance by a major amount?

## REPLY TO PAUL NUTTER

BRIAN KENYON

Once again I take up the pen in defence of the classes committee decisions. With Paul's letter it is harder to dismiss some of his points. His letter is far more factual, well researched and thought out than Allan's. I will first of all attempt to point out some historical facts which Paul, by virtue of not being involved in the championship for long will not be aware of, whereas two members of your classes committee, namely myself and Chris Seaman have collectively 60 years of accumulated motor sport knowledge and facts to call upon. Since the championship's inception in 1968, first as a National Championship and then as the Harewood Championship, both used the same rules/markings system, although the points allowed for beating the bogey time has varied during the course of the passing years.

In the past many championships have been won through the simple expedience of looking for the easiest class then building a car to suit. Once the desired goal was reached and the championship won, the next easy class was picked on and so this state of affairs went on. Quite legitimate but nonetheless galling for all those who contested the same classes throughout the years. Another way the system fell down was when someone decided to build a modern 500 and quite obviously blew away the records set by the 'ancient' machinery which made up the class until this point. The championship was won half way through the season, not really a satisfactory situation from anyone's point of

view. Paul states that the committee are frightened to death of altering bogey times. A few years ago the committee were prevailed upon to lower a bogey time set for a then new class, the 1600cc Clubmans Cars. With the record lowered to their satisfaction, the following year they proceeded to blow the new bogey away to the tune of a second and a quarter thereby showing the legitimacy of the previous bogey time.

Although Paul would have it that we should be insular it is not beyond the realms of possibility that some competitors are hanging fire and could contest the championship if they thought they were given an easy ride. This does not necessarily mean that they would be current Harewood competitors for without the injection of new blood the championship, Harewood and the sport would have died long ago.

The reason that the championship has been dominated, to use Paul's words by Minis, Midgets and Formula Fords and the odd Turbo Car in the past 6 years, for 4 of those years the championship was contested on the old hill mainly against records that had been set during the years since the hill's inception (Paul, Midgets dominated the then Castrol BARC Championship for many years in the early 70's - what's new?). Perhaps the drivers in those particular classes in the last few years deserved to dominate because they were far quicker than any of the other drivers in the other classes. By and large the same categories have dominated the championship on the new hill, which blows away Paul's theory that the new part of the course suits specific types of car, surely it has a bit of everything, a quick section to the first corner followed by an even quicker section down the hill surely must benefit the more powerful cars, this of course will be evened out by the twisty Esses etc. I personally don't think that one particular type of car has an advantage. I agree with Paul that the championship is run for Yorkshire members as it has been for many years but there has never ever been any problem with quicker drivers competing from other parts of the country, perhaps the level of skill or preparation of our Harewood regulars has dropped in the last few years. Yes, some of the quicker national drivers have competed at Harewood, but most of them have only been a couple of times on the new hill so their window of opportunity to set new records has been small. If they were to come on a regular basis then I am sure that their times and the records would drop dramatically.



Like Allan, Paul has a problem with classes 2, E and K. The classes committee were faced with a very difficult task in each of these cases. Class 2 had previously been up to 2600cc and although we searched all the results available, we did not have a complete set. As the new class had a maximum capacity of 2 litre we were unable to determine that we had the quickest time available to us by a car of this capacity. It would have been wrong to have set a time which was unrepresentative so we erred on the side of caution. The bogey when set was comparable to bogeys in similar classes. The problem in this class is that a 1600 Escort presently holds the record and no matter how quickly a 1600 is driven, there is no way that it could be as quick as for example a full house 2 litre. The power and torque of the 2 litre should make it at least 2 seconds quicker than its smaller engined counterpart, if driven by a driver of the same ability. The main problem Paul is you have the right car but not the right engine, I'll give you an example; what would you think if your pal Carl Austin had a 1 litre engine fitted in his Mini. Would you still expect him to beat the extremely well prepared and driven 1300cc of Michael Holroyd, of course you wouldn't. The same applies to you, with an extra 350 cc under your right foot, you would undoubtedly go quicker. If you are not willing to do this please don't blame the Classes Committee for you being unable to break the bogey.

Class E used to be Special Saloons but when the class was changed to Sports Libre, this admitted cars of far greater potential so consequently it was necessary to set the time between the 500cc Racing Car Class and the 1100cc racing Car Class. As I have stated in my letter to Allan the 500cc Racing Cars are quicker than the 1300cc Sports Libre category. The difference in a modern 1300cc Libre car and a single seater is slim indeed, a little extra weight and a streamlined body being the most obvious changes so surely a time set by a 500cc Racing Car should easily be achieved by the Libre cars. We are only asking the Libre car to go just over a second quicker (1.12) and it would beat the bogey.

I never really understood the need for a 2 litre category in the single seaters but I can understand that there are many more 2 litre engines available than their 1600cc counterparts so perhaps it is a natural progression. For anyone to suggest that a 2 litre should have an easier record/bogey than a 1600cc is ludicrous. If this is the case then in the

unlimited single seater class why doesn't everyone run a 1600 rather than the large ex-Formula 1 engines that most cars are now fitted with? According to Paul's and Allan's theory, these people are wasting their money on large engines and perhaps if they fitted 1600's they could go quicker!!!

The majority of classes have been contested by competitive cars at sometime over a number of years and to suggest that many records are not representative and should be adjusted is not correct. The time set, for instance in Class 1, is extremely quick and though it may be possible for a more modern vehicle to go quicker, it would not be an easy task bearing in mind Paul that you in your larger capacity car in the up to 2 litre class are only 0.03 quicker. Amongst others Paul picks out Class C and as I have pointed out in my other letter, Class B is already quicker and yes, the previous Class B short hill record was held by a 1600 X-flow but the time was extremely competitive. It has always been accepted that all the other classes other than Formula Ford can have new tyres each year so therefore, one can say, that for many years a Formula Ford class is at a disadvantage and is only put back on level terms when, as this year, they are allowed a new type of tyre. We have never adjusted class records/bogeys just because there have been new cars entering the classes otherwise, if you follow my reasoning, every record would be changed every year.

Yes Paul we do expect, with modern rubber and developments in power and handling, the cars to go quicker. I can only point out in our defence a case in which I was personally involved. I set a record in 1972 which I held for 12 years. I stood and watched for many years cars with soft slicks, inclined off-set valve 1330cc engines and many other mods which were not available to me in 1972 (mine was a 1293cc), trundle up the hill and win the class, sometimes 3 seconds slower than I had gone in '72. These people were quite happy with their level of performance as they were obviously the quickest out at the time. My record was broken in 84, my enthusiasm was re-ignited, I entered Harewood in '85 and my first timed run up the hill broke the new class record after a 12 year gap in one of my old rivals cars that I used to beat in '72. My car was described as 'an old shed!' by quick Cooper 'S' driver Nigel Clegg. I will leave it to the readers to decide why it hadn't been done before but I think this answers your last question Paul.

## CARS & CAR CONVERSIONS NATIONAL SPEED CHAMPIONSHIP

Harewood Saturday 2nd April 1994

DAVID BAILEY

Rain, sleet, snow, high winds, freezing temperatures; ah yes - Harewood in the Spring, there's nothing quite like it! As I stood trying to shelter from the battering winds I thought 'so this is what I've been missing for the past 6 months'. If Michael Fish was to be believed, we might as well have stayed at home in bed. Fortunately for us, he was slightly wide of the mark. The morning's greasy track being washed clean by a few brief light showers and then dried again by the usual Harewood 'light breeze'.

A few non-starters plus some early morning casualties had thinned the already down on par entry. The Touring Cars got us under way with Classes 1 and 2 being merged. Michael Holroyd starting his 1994 season as he ended 1993 with a crushing class victory, his time of 67.28sec being some 3.5 secs clear of 2nd place Mark Brown, also Mini mounted. Next saw the biggest class of the day with Harewood's own Formula Ford Festival. Ken Bailey broke the Van Diemen stranglehold to score a debut win in the family owned Reynard with a climb in 64.36sec. Colin Wright was runner-up in his Van Diemen RF86 on 65.06sec and class returnee Stuart Abbott making a welcome return to the class in his brightly hued Van Diemen snatching 3rd place from Trevor Cooper on 65.65sec.

Class 8 was next with a specific 'MG Only' flavour about it. Dave Farrar was in control here, his smaller capacity Midget getting the better of Alastair Crawford's rumbling V8 engined MGB. Dave's best time of 66.81sec comparing to that of 67.22 for Alastair.

Nigel Dodsworth clinched the win in Class 15 for Alpine Renault cars, his 2nd run of 72.92sec being the deciding time after a first run excursion, and just over 0.5sec clear of runner up Richard Tomlinson's larger capacity and newer version.

Class 19 for Pre-War Austin Sevens, whilst not being the fastest cars up the hill, certainly created a lot of interest. They looked and sounded fabulous. Stephen Wilkinson's example getting the verdict by just over 1 sec with a time of 82.13sec from Robert Sterling.

The class for Standard Production cars up to 1600cc came next with Andrew Barrett taking a convincing class win by a massive 6.25secs, his Lotus Elan recording best time of 72.77sec with John Yates (Honda Civic) just pipping Steve Lock

(MR2) by 0.41sec with a time of 79.58sec.

Classes 22 and 23 were merged putting together the up to 2 litre and unlimited capacity Standard Production cars. Steve Muir's Sierra Cosworth taking the win with a climb of 72.51secs. Alan Worsley was 2nd (Peugeot 205) on 77.36sec with Richard Swarbrick's smaller, but equally rapid Peugeot 205GTi 3rd on 77.39sec.

Class 24 was merged with 26, this class for Road Going Production cars only receiving 2 entries. Giles Tinkler's smaller capacity and older Triumph Spitfire recording a time of 72.65sec compared with Adrian Thompson's Opel Manta whose best time was 84.15sec.

Class 28 for Road Going Kit Cars & Replicas up to 1700cc were next. Tom Whiter taking the class in his Caterham 7 with a time of 71.61secs. Runner up was Keith Beningfield in his Sylva Striker with a time of 74.05sec.

Class 29 for larger capacity Kit Cars had its programme entry reduced by 50% following withdrawn entries. Christian Silk's Westfield taking the win with a time of 66.32sec. The shared Dax Rush of Hugh Law and Glyn Morris were 2nd and 3rd with times of 67.46sec and 70.26sec respectively.

Class 4 was merged with Class A (Marque Sports Cars and Mod Prod Cars up to 1400cc). Paul Greaves was firmly in control of this class, his winning time being 67.21sec, ahead of Norman Pemberton on 68.81sec. Class B & C were also merged, this bringing together the Mod Prod classes up to and over 2000cc. Although conceding a few years, Haydn Spedding's E Type Jaguar showed a clean pair of heels to Geoffrey Kershaw's more modern Cosworth Sapphire. Haydn's time of 67.73sec bettering the Cosworth's 69.16sec.

Next followed a real mixed bag with 4 classes being merged; Class 30, D, E and G. David Park's Rover engined Harrier was tipped as favourite and he didn't disappoint taking the class with a climb in 68.13sec, just over 1 sec ahead of Chris Henderson's Mallock on 69.15sec.

The two smaller capacity single seater classes were next, H & I being merged. Craven Moses in the class sponsored Maclan took a comfortable win with a climb in 63.99sec. Co-driver Alan Greenwood making it a 1-2 with a climb in 67.19sec.

The final class of the day was the larger capacity single seaters of Class K. This was where FTD was to be fought out. Pete Griffiths' Chevron B47 having to be content with his first timed run to count but his time of 60.35 was good enough for FTD. Having sat out the 2nd class runs, Pete saw



Colin Wheeler get the closest with a best time of 61.84sec in his Delta.

So here ended the first event of '94 at Harewood with the weather doing its best to spoil things we were lucky to get 2 dry timed runs. Thanks to all the marshals and organisers who braved the elements and let's hope the weather and entries buck up for the next event.

#### RESULTS

CLASS	NAME	CAR	TIME
1&2	Michael Holroyd	Cooper S	67.28
15	Nigel Dodsworth	Alpine Renault	72.92
19	Stephen Wilkinson	D&S Special	82.13
21	Andrew Barrett	Lotus Elan S4	72.77
22&23	Steve Muir	Sierra Cosworth	72.51
24&26	Giles Tinkler	Triumph Spitfire	72.65
28	Tom Whiter	Caterham 7	71.61
29	Christian Silk	Westfield SEi	66.32
30.D.E&G	David Park	Harrier C2	68.13
4&A	Paul Greaves	MG Midget	67.21
7	Ken Bailey	Reynard FF89	64.36
8	Dave Farrar	MG Midget	66.81
B&C	Haydn Spedding	E Type	67.73
H&I	Craven Moses	Maclan	63.99
K	Colin Wheeler	Delta T832	61.84
FTD	Pete Griffiths	Chevron B47	60.35

## ICE COLD FOR ALEX

### Harewood Sunday 3rd April 1994

#### PAUL NUTTER

On a typically fresh! day at Stockton Farm Alex Graham made the long journey from Lanark worthwhile to record FTD at the Spring meeting in his well conducted Mallock. His time of 59.78 made him the only driver to set a sub one minute time and was therefore a thoroughly deserving winner of the Andrews Brothers Trophy and the £100 cash prize. Second FTD belonged to another Alex, this time the Royale ART921 driver Alex Tyson, whose time of 60.29 gave him a good start in his quest to better last year's runner-up position in the championship. Third quickest overall was another Class I driver Alan Aucote, the Terrapin pilot stopped the clock at 60.48 therefore just missing out on 2nd spot.

Practice was completed with a few hitches, namely a couple of drivers getting confused over running slicks or leaving them. The marshals soon sorted things out with the helpings of Blue Circle's best and things were back on schedule.

With the weather holding off the class runs began with reigning champion Michael Holroyd starting this year where he left off last year by recording a stunning time of 66.74 considering the conditions. This has put him well on course to retain his title. Runner up was Coco the Clown,

sorry I meant Carl Austin, who has now progressed from falling off the course to bits falling off his car. First it was the flywheel during Practice Day and today the complete exhaust system.

Class 2 Touring Cars were next up and with the Clio Williams not turning up it was left to the 1600 Escort of Tony Mekwinski to clean up in a time of 69.92. Dennis Crompton was next in the BMW setting a time of 72.21.

Class 4 and 5 Marque Sports Cars were merged and a close battle ensued between Paul Greaves and Keith Wilford. The Midget man came out on top over the Europa driver although Paul nearly spoilt his day by attempting a short cut into the paddock after crossing the finish line. The car ended up poised perfectly on a pile of gravel with the front pointing somewhere towards Mars.

The large Marque Sports Cars were as usual merged with the Class C cars and it was Haydn Spedding who took another class win with a time of 67.43 in his E Type. Don Williams came a game 2nd in his ever present Gilbern with a run of 69.57. In third place was Martin Baker in the Chevettte HSR which wins hands down the best looking car of the day award. (Do I get a go in it for saying that Martin? Grovel, Grovel!)

Onto the Formula Fords and the surprise winner although not to him I presume, was Stuart Abbott who perspexed. I mean perplexed the opposition to set a time of 64.44 in his Van Diemen RF86. In second place but only by the pipsqueak amount of two hundredths was Colin Wright in his similar car. Third was Ken Bailey in his new Reynard whose time of 65.19 put him clear of Trevor Cooper who was driving an 85 Van Diemen.

Class 13 was the TR Register class and unfortunately class favourite Mark Richards retired due to engine trouble. This left Derek Judson to take the class with a time of 73.47 in his TR7. Tony Blakes TR6 was therefore second with Chris Blakes TR7 third.

Onto the RAC classes and Michael Haigh took the honours in Class A with a time of 71.13 in his MG Metro. Martin Boast took the second spot in his Mini GT climbing the hill in 74.41 whilst another MG Metro, this time driven by Philip Sturdy, came third in a time of 77.34. Fourth was yet another BL Austin Rover car in the shape of Nick Beaumont's 1275GT.

Class B laudits were taken by Christian Silk whose Westfield completed the course in 66.64 to put him well clear of second place driver Chris Mann in his Nova GTE. Colin Stewart drove his

Lotus Cortina entertainingly into third place with a run of 74.48. The Fiat Uno of Garry Hewitt finished fourth in a time of 75.02.

The classes D, F & G were all merged and FTD man Alex Graham took the class one and a half seconds clear of the Splinter of Peter Needham. The Mallock of Bob Prest was third a further two seconds adrift.

And now we enter the sparsely populated racing car classes beginning with the up to 500cc racers. This class was the domain of Alan Dovey who crossed the line in his ASD in a time of 66.43 to push Mark Griffiths into second place. The Jedi driver stopping the clock in 67.67 seconds.

Class I contained both the 2nd FTD and the 3rd FTD drivers, namely Alex Tyson and Alan Aucote. The other contender in this class was Glyn Sketchley in his superb looking Megapin.

Colin Wheeler was victorious in Class K in his Delta with a best effort of 62.94. That was enough to beat the OMS driven by Pat Donnelly whose best climb was just over a second slower.

Finally to finish off Rob Turnbull in his F1 engined Pilbeam had Class L to himself.

There ends the first Sunday meeting of 1994, a poorly supported meeting compared to 12 months ago. Could this be a sign of things to come, who

#### RESULTS for SUNDAY 3rd APRIL

CLASS	NAME	CAR	TIME
1	Michael Holroyd	Cooper S	66.74
2	Tony Mekwinski	Escort 1600	69.92
4&5	Paul Greaves	MG Midget	67.48
6&C	Haydn Spedding	E Type	67.43
7	Stuart Abbott	Van Diemen RF86	64.44
13	Derek Judson	Triumph TR7	73.47
A	Michael Haigh	MG Metro	71.13
B	Christian Silk	Westfield	66.64
D&F&G	Alex Graham	Mallock	59.78
H	Alan Dovey	ASD	66.43
I	Alex Tyson	ART921	60.29
K	Colin Wheeler	Delta T832	62.94
L	Rob Turnbull	Pilbeam MP50	65.58
FTD	Alex Graham	Mallock Mk20	59.78

#### ENTRY FORMS & REGULATION BOOKLET 1994

Due to a printers error paragraph 2.5.2. on page 94-11 has been printed incorrectly. The second sentence should read as follows:-

Suspension modifications are allowed as long as the layout and method of operation and the suspension pick-up points on the chassis remain unchanged from standard **and used in their original position.**

#### MORE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Morley

Leeds

17.2.94

Dear Pat

BMW's recent interest in Rover prompted me to think about an anecdote some 'Times' readers might find interesting, especially if they have owned some of Rover's previous incarnations cars. I thought it quite ironic that BMW should ant a stake in Rover - surely their main reason for doing so is Rover's efficiency and high standards of quality control. Since its partnership in the mid 1980's with Honda, Rover has clearly gone from strength to strength. (Having said that, anyone who remembers the first badge engineered joint effort the 'Triumph' Acclaim must surely think matters could only have improved. Nowadays I wouldn't mind seeing the MG badge on some Japanese cars - the MX5 is a joy to drive and if you look you see an uncanny resemblance to a Frogeye Sprite there!) Clearly Rover is a revived company - it could not be illustrated better than by the recent sale of the Discovery in Japan - badged as a Honda.

What Rover has learned from Honda is the secret of 'Lean Production' - the technique of organising the whole production process around a 'just in time' philosophy. Parts of the car all come together in the factory with, in some instances, only half an hour between delivery and fitting. Not only are there almost no stocks at the factory, suppliers are not permitted to keep any stock either. The result of this is that any production problems can be immediately corrected and incorporated with modified components on site in a few hours not weeks or months later. To add to this the whole management hierarchy are on first name terms with the staff. Even the MD does one day a week working on the shop floor. The company's suggestion scheme works so well, in the last year it saved millions of pounds.

What all this prompted in my memory was a story Boz (Arthur) Heaton related to me some time ago over a leisurely pint at the Rugby Club. Boz, the father of Arthur 'Screaming Tim' Heaton of Harewood Cavalier SRi fame (Sump, Repair, Incured, I think that stands for, if Arthur's last trip round Farmhouse is anything to go by) was heavily involved in club motorsport in the 1950's and 1960's both at Harewood and various club circuits. Boz became famous as the pilot of the notorious 'Black Death' Riley (So called mainly due to its colour and propensity to expire. I think - sorry Boz!)

Through the RAF and through work Boz got to know many at the then BMC engineering and motorsport staff.

One day Boz was being shown around the engine shop for the then new B series powerplant by the chief production engineer. At the crankshaft balancing machine Boz's attention was drawn to the particular operation the machinist was performing. On one trolley were freshly machined cranks. The machinist stood at his machine in the middle, on the other side was the trolley being filled with 'balanced' cranks.

The operation the machinist had to perform required picking up an unbalanced crank and fitting it into the machine which would spin the crank to detect out of balance forces. Once this was done and the area for holes to be drilled highlighted, the machinist would drill the holes and then spin the crank once more in order for the balance to be checked. Once this was OK the crank would be taken off and put on the 'finished' trolley. Unfortunately whether or not the workforce was paid piece-work or bonus was not related to me, but in view of what I am about to divulge this seems likely. In the thirty seconds or so of free time it took for the crank to spin to speed etc. the operators hands were not idle. He used this time to put one unbalanced crank straight onto the 'balanced' trolley. Boz commented this didn't seem quite right, only to be told in hushed tones "Quiet, you'll have them all out!" (on strike).

This is clearly the attitude that made Britain Great and a lot of B-series engines very rough. So, if any of you Riley or Morris enthusiasts out there strip an engine and find a balance hole free crank - now you know why!

Regards

Nick Aveyard  
..... Morley  
Leeds  
17.2.94

Dear Pat

I would like to add my two-penneth to the raging class structure debate. It seems to me that any regulations that allow modifications of any serious nature then there will always be someone willing to spend a fortune on having the best of everything. That is the nature of both competitive sport and our unequal economic system (ie some people have more money than others - namely

more than me!) If that person can drive moderately well as a bonus, he will be very hard to beat. Having said that I am totally against any kind of retrenchment, having found my Midget with 120hp on slicks a hell of a lot more fun than when I started with 70hp and road tyres. (Brian, as we know, can set class records with 60hp and four wagon wheels [the biscuit] but that's a different story).

It has taken me three years to get my Midget even remotely competitive and I would be greatly annoyed if that great expense were rendered obsolete by someone moving the goalposts. That said, I am sure that if in 1990 there had been a road going class, then I would probably have gladly started there, and been much more competitive much more quickly. However, as Paul correctly points out, standard cars are singularly boring to watch - even the F40 was not as interesting as the Pellard Steam Car (the driver of the latter complained the Esses were a bit tight at 15 mph!).

Regards

Nick Aveyard  
..... Halesworth  
Suffolk

Dear Pat

Here is the letter that you have been hassling me about!! (And also my excuse for not appearing at the last September Harewood meeting and the next few dates to follow)

This year, as part of my HND course in Marine Engineering, is being spent on several P&O cruise ships (and they don't even let me steer - has Dad been talking to them about my cornering at Harewood I wonder?!)

Would you believe that when I am looking at the blue sea, blue sky and enjoying temperatures of 30 degrees+ on Harewood days I could almost wish to see the murky sky, get soaking wet and very, very cold! (But only sometimes!)

Hope everybody has a very good and enjoyable season and I look forward to seeing everyone at the August and/or September meetings.

Regards

Dan Wright

[Ed. Thank you Dan for your letter, sorry I hassled you!. We wish you well on your course and your cruise and look forward to seeing you at Harewood later in the year]

## FOR SALE

### NEW PARTS - HALF PRICE!

NGK spark plugs - B9EV & B8EV.  
Microdynamics IGN 07 Amplifier. Lumenition  
Optronic Ignition system + Ford X flow fitting kit.  
Facet Red Top fuel pump. BDA & X flow  
distributor tops and rotor arms. Lobro joints -  
VW type. Driveshaft - 15 1/4" long - with VW  
type CV's and aero boots

### ALSO

Good, used Mk9 and FT/FG ratios  
Jaybrand two layer pinstripe suit (Nomex 3) - 40"  
chest, 5'10" to 6'0" height

**Contact Roger Kilty on**

**0274 869747**

## FOR SALE

### OMS SINGLE SEATER

500cc V4 Yamaha with slicks, wets, spares and  
excellent covered trailer.  
Championship (circuit) winner in '92. Very quick,  
ready for '94

**£4500 ono**

**Tel: 0257 481613 (Lancs)**

## FOR SALE

### HAWKE DL19 ROLLING CHASSIS

Fully restored, all bodywork, rads, fire system  
etc. Fully winged, 6" and 8" new wheels and  
slicks. Ideal basis for 1100/1600 class.  
The car is in excellent condition

**£1495 ono**

also Don Parker Trailer, suit above  
Superb condition, tyre rack, stored undercover

**£395**

also March 803 Monocoque bare tub

**£800 ono**

Tel: Dave Baumforth 0751 474383

## BARC YORKSHIRE CENTRE OFFICERS & COMMITTEE 1994

CHAIRMAN	Simon N Clark
HON SEC.	John M English 32 Fairfield Road Knarborough HG5 8HB
VICE CHAIRMAN	J Richard Hardcastle
HON TREASURER	Peter Varley
HON COMP SEC	Chris G Seaman 0742 585695 (Business)
COMMITTEE	
Tim C Bendelow	Nigel Drayton
David Naylor	David Dalrymple
Antony J Hodgetts	John Staveley
Ivor Pashley	Graham Wride

## SNIPPETS

### 'BING' CROSBY

We learned recently of the illness of one of  
our 'Elder Statesmen', 'Bing' Crosby. 'Bing' has  
undergone bowel surgery and was in hospital 10  
days. He is now at home recuperating.

Hopefully we will see 'Bing' at Harewood  
sometime during the season.

His wife Joan has recently had a slight stroke  
but is home and on the mend.

We wish both 'Bing' and Joan a speedy  
recovery.

### BOBBY FIRTH

We recently learned of the death of Bobby  
Firth. Bobby was the wife of the late Harold Firth  
who for many years was a Yorkshire Centre com-  
mittee member. Harold Firth presented the Firth  
Bowl to the Centre many years ago. We send our  
sincere condolences to her family and friends.

### ALLAN STANIFORTH

Allan is recovering well from his recent hip  
operation. The rose joints are working well and as  
he puts it 'he is limping a little less each day!'.  
Hopefully he will be fit to compete this season.

## NOTE TO ALLAN STANIFORTH

### CHRIS SEAMAN

A quick note to set the record straight  
regarding Allan Staniforth's remarks regarding the  
registration fee for the Harewood Championship. I  
get the impression that Allan is suggesting that it is  
not value for money and competitors may be better  
off not entering. After reading the table below I  
hope that Allan may change his mind!

The following Championships all visit Harewood.

CHAMPIONSHIP	REG.FEE	TOTAL CASH AWARDS
Hammonds Bedroom Sprint & Hillclimb Championship	£10	£400 (plus a bonus for under 25's & Ladies)
Gulf Oils in association with Autosport RAC Hillclimb Championship	£26	NIL (To the best of my knowledge)
CCC/BARC Speed Ch/ship	£10	£250
Longton Championship	£5	£275
The Bridgestone RAC MSA Leaders Hillclimb Ch/ship	£22	NIL (To the best of my knowledge)
<b>The Harewood Hillclimb Championship</b>	<b>£6</b>	<b>£1785</b>

Only the Harewood and Longton Championships  
are without sponsors. Harewood looks pretty good  
value to me!!!!