



**Minutes of the Hornet Class Association AGM held at Netley Sailing Club on
Sunday 14th August 2011 at 18:15**

Harry Ashworth, Kevin Burt, John Shelton, Mike Owen, Jin Ingram, Peter Bennett, Geoff Furlong, Pippa Rogers, Strangler, Steve Cooke, Graham Dare, Mark Styles, Tom Guy, Richard Garry, Martin Arnison, Toby Barsley-Dale, Gary Haylett, Tracey, Haylett, Roger Kelleway, Tim Coombe, Dean Saxton.

1. Apologies

Peter Willans

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the AGM held on Sunday 1st August 2010 were agreed. Adoption of the minutes was proposed by Mike Owen, seconded by Dean Saxton.

3. Chairman's report

Dinghy Exhibition – Harry Ashworth gave an update on the 2011 Dinghy Exhibition, where Hornet number 2140 was on the stand. There was quite a lot of interest in the class and the conclusion at the end of the weekend was that it was worth having a presence there. As it is the 60th anniversary in 2012, the proposal is that there will be two boats on the stand: one old boat (perhaps 610) and one modern boat (boat tbc).

Open meetings – Harry reported that there had been open meetings at Stone, Herne Bay and Exe and that future events were planned at Shoreham, for the August Bank Holiday weekend, and Carsington, for 22nd and 23rd October, sharing with Tempests and Javelins.

Moulds – Harry noted that at the 2010 AGM it was agreed that a sub-committee would be formed to try to move the unsatisfactory position with the moulds forward. Harry summarised the current position, confirming that discussions with Ivor Woodland had stalled. However, the whereabouts of the moulds is known, but there is currently no builder and there are no potential buyers. Discussions had been held with Mike Owen regarding retrieving the moulds and storing them where the class could control them. Mike reported that he had identified that it would cost £1 per day for storage. The meeting acknowledged that discussions had stalled and agreed that the committee should progress discussions regarding retrieving the moulds.

Rule changes – Harry noted that there were three proposed rule changes for discussion later in the meeting.

2011 Nationals – Harry advised that there were 19 boats at the Nationals. It was noted that there was no one from Herne Bay and that some of the regulars were missing

Membership – Harry noted that there were 32 paid-up members.

2012 Nationals – Harry advised that discussions with Thorpe Bay were reasonably advanced and noted that there were 2 boats from Thorpe Bay at Netley. The 60th anniversary would be marked in some way and further details would be posted on the website.

Unmeasured sails – Harry noted that unmeasured sails were being used at this regatta and needed to be measured.

Harry confirmed that he was happy to stand for re-election as Chairman.

4. Election of Officers

Harry Ashworth's re-election as Chairman was proposed by Mike Owen, seconded by John Shelton. Kevin Burt was proposed once again as Treasurer, by Mike Owen, seconded by John Shelton. There being no candidate, the office of the Secretary remains vacant.

5. Nominations for Committee

All current members had agreed to stand once again save for John Shelton. Jim Ingram had agreed to stand to fill the vacancy left by John. Election of the committee en bloc was proposed by Peter Bennett, seconded by Graham Dare.

6. Treasurer's Report and adoption of the accounts

Kevin Burt reported that membership subscriptions had remained broadly the same as last year and that overall there had been a small loss of £73 for the year. The biggest costs had been the Sandwich Bay championship and the Dinghy Exhibition. Harry asked how the current championship at Netley would affect the accounts. Kevin responded that the impact was not yet known but there was unlikely to be a big impact and potentially a small profit. Adoption of the accounts was proposed by Dean, seconded by John.

7. Rule Change proposals

(a) To **amend** rule G.3.2(a) to read: '**the ply fibres shall be optional**'.

Proposer: Harry Ashworth; seconder: Mike Owen

Harry noted that the proposal is for the mainsail only.

Mike Owen commented that there would be minimal difference, if any, in performance of the sail, although laminate sails might possibly be lighter. There is a perceived advantage by those who want to use them. However, whilst Dacron will stretch, laminate sails are more consistent, but laminate sails might last for 5-7 years then suddenly blow to bits. Mike added that laminate sails would be slightly more expensive.

Toby Barsley-Dale responded that a laminate sail would be 10-15% more expensive and that the sail would 'go off' quicker. At championship level, a Dacron sail may last 2 years, whilst a laminate sail may last for **one**. Also more would need to be done to manage the rig. Toby then expressed a concern that a move to laminate sails may be the first step to 'cheque book sailing'.

It was noted that the proposal had been discussed with Mike MacNamara prior to the meeting and that he was opposed to it.

In summing up, Harry noted that the proposal would make the boat look more modern.

A vote was then taken. There were 12 in favour, 6 against. The motion was carried.

It was noted that the proposal requires approval from the RYA.

(b) To **amend** rule G.5.4 to read: 'Leech and Luff lengths maximum **4650mm**'.

Proposer: John Shelton; seconder: Tim Coombe

John noted that the proposal had been worded incorrectly and had overlooked the foot median measurement. The proposal should be to **amend** rule G.5.4 to read: 'Leech and Luff lengths maximum **4650mm**' and 'Foot Median maximum **5400mm**'.

John went on to explain that an increase to spinnaker pole length, with no change to the size of the spinnaker, had been agreed at a previous AGM, and that this tended to make the spinnaker fly higher. He commented that the aim of the current proposal was to tidy up the earlier change.

It was noted that a prototype sail had been made and trialled by a number of members, but the sail was felt to be too big. A second prototype had been made, which halved the size of the additional panel.

John commented that he had tried the second prototype in a Force 3-4. He noted that it lowers the centre of effort of the sail. John added that the advantage of the proposal is that existing sails can be amended and the Mike MacNamara has estimated that the cost would be around £70 (2 hours).

Toby Barsley-Dale disagreed and felt that the effort to modify a sail would be more like 4 hours.

John noted that a number of members have purchased new sails this year and said that he was proposing the motion because it has been discussed on a number of occasions and a decision needed to be made one way or the other.

One member asked whether the new sail was faster. John commented that it didn't appear so, on the basis of the trial, although the sail hadn't been made particularly well.

Dick commented that the sail seemed unstable and that his crew noticed a bigger pull.

John noted that the sail would only be 1m² bigger.

Toby noted that the sail could be made flatter for reaching, but that it is currently a good all-round spinnaker. He went on to say that in his opinion it would be difficult to alter existing spinnakers and that full radial sails could not be altered.

Harry asked about the principle of a bigger spinnaker. Toby responded that lighter teams would struggle.

Peter Bennett said that he had been in favour until he tried the second prototype and now he was agnostic.

Mike Owen asked whether the rules could be totally re-defined to get a better shape. Harry responded that would not be possible at this meeting.

A vote was then taken. There were 7 in favour, 12 against. The proposal was rejected.

(c) To **delete** rule G.5.1(b).

Proposer: Tim Coombe; seconder: John Shelton

Tim explained that the proposal was to remove the requirement to have numbers on the spinnaker. Numbers produce higher stress levels; asymmetric boats and Merlin Rockets do not require numbers.

Steve Cooke commented that he thought the current rule was that the spinnaker *may* have numbers. Harry noted that this was incorrect and that numbers are currently a requirement.

There were no other comments, so a vote was taken.

Everyone was in favour, so the motion was carried.

8. Any other business

There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 19:00.