

E695.

11/13a

Mr. P. Bowles, ^{as,}
N.I.R.N.S.,
AERE,
Harwell

Evans Lift

My letter of the 9th November, written following our meeting last Thursday, has at last evoked a reply from the firm's Managing Director. Copies of both letters are attached.

It is interesting to note that the Ministry of Works are experiencing troubles with the Evans lift in the British Embassy in Prague!

While there is nothing in the Evans Lifts letter which would lead me to suggest any deviation in the course of action which we have already agreed, I would like to be able to reply indicating the period during which you use the services of their maintenance engineers. My impression is that you would naturally prefer to place a maintenance contract with the lift manufacturer, but have ceased to do this owing to their general incompetence.

I have also now recommended to our Contracts Branch that this firm should be deleted from the Authority's list; a saga of your troubles in some detail would also be useful in supporting this view.

I shall be very grateful if you could arrange for a report to be sent to me on these lines.

Following some further discussion with Mr. Tolcher, I can confirm that I have made arrangements for a meeting to take place between Mr. Bowers, Mr. Tolcher and representatives of Messrs. James Scott whom I would suggest would be a very suitable firm to design and install a completely new control panel. This has been fixed for Wednesday of next week.

G. M. Harbert

G. M. Harbert

SWO, Tadley
Ext. 5859

15 November, 1962

c.c. Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Bowers

London Office
75 VICTORIA STREET
S.W. 1
Phone VICTORIA 6715/4
Telegrams
EVANSLEYA SOWEST LONDON

EVANS LIFTS LTD

Directors: F. G. CHERRY (Chairman), L. WHEELER (Managing), W. CLIFFORD, ATKINS, BRIDGEMAN, H. C. SEPTON, H. BATE, W. G. MITCHELL

Manufacturers of Electric Lifts for all purposes

PROSPECT WORKS

ABBEY LANE, LEICESTER

Telephones LEICESTER 62464/8 Telegrams ELEVATOR, LEICESTER

Birmingham Office
51 STAFFORD STREET
Birmingham 4
Phone CENTRAL 018/9
and at
BRADFORD, LEEDS
BRISTOL, BELFAST
DUBLIN, LIVERPOOL
MANCHESTER

Your Ref. GMH/MCS
016470A

Our Ref. LW/BA C/11332

13th November, 1962.

The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority,
Engineering Group,
Southern Works Organisation,
New Church Road,
Tadley,
Basingstoke,
Hampshire.

For the attention of G.M. Harbert, Esq., Assistant Chief Engineer

Dear Sir,

Rutherford Laboratory, Harwell - Lift No. C/11332

We are in receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, and are sorry to note your reaction to our previous communication but the writer would repeat that when you 'phoned through at the beginning of last week it was explained that our Senior Engineer, Mr. Colquhoun was at that time in Prague at the British Embassy and for your information he had been sent over at the specific request of the Ministry of Works to straighten out some troubles which they were experiencing on a lift in the Embassy.

Mr. Colquhoun returned during the last weekend and supplementary to our previous letter of November 5th combined with the disappointment in your reply, we feel it necessary to make the position even more clearer to you.

Please do understand when our own Engineers attended on Saturday the 27th October they found the equipment in a very poor state of adjustment and it was not surprising that so many troubles had been experienced but we must express our disappointment in your suggestion that the equipment itself was at fault and that you would even consider having this removed and replaced by equipment of another make which might even prove troublesome even though it be properly adjusted.

(1)

(2)

We have every confidence in the components which we manufacture and we say without fear of contradiction that they are equal to the best which can be obtained and which has been specially designed for the very heavy duties it is called upon to perform.

The fault lies in the fact that unfortunately, the lift is not being serviced by our own skilled engineers but we wish to make it quite clear that we have no desire to cast reflection on your own staff as while the various control equipment in the motor room was out of adjustment it was kept very clean and the incorrect adjustments had been made through ignorance and in an endeavour to make the contactors work differently from that for which they were designed. We would much prefer that you be guided by us in allowing our engineers to attend at regular intervals to undertake the servicing over a period of say 12 months and we are quite prepared to defer the question of reimbursement until the end of the 12 months period and we would consider that such an arrangement would at least be fair to us in proving that the equipment is properly designed and manufactured for its duties.

We could not, of course, give a guarantee that the lift would not fail as there are so many factors which can affect the satisfactory running but then again no one in any field of the engineering world could give a guarantee either, but we are confident that if the lift is left entirely in our care the possibility of stoppage would be substantially reduced.

When our London Engineer attended on Wednesday, 31st October and at which time by the way the lift was running satisfactory, he did arrange with Mr. Robson that any further troubles, however slight, should develop, then Mr. Robson would 'phone through to our London Office immediately, and at the time of writing we are informed by our London Engineer that there have been no reports whatsoever.

Regarding the last paragraph of your letter, Mr. Colquhoun is rather mystified as in the knowledge that he has every confidence in our equipment he simply cannot understand how the impression could have been formed that we should be willing to meet the cost of removing the equipment and to credit you with the value, as obviously we are anxious to safe guard our

(2)

(3)

good name and it would be a most serious reflection on us if the equipment was removed either by ourselves or anyone else, despite the fact that such equipment does not prove faulty in itself but has only suffered through lack of experience.

We do hope, therefore, that when you write to us again you will first consider the matter very carefully in the light of the foregoing and we can only say that we are most anxious you should be fully satisfied but at the same time we are also most anxious that we should be given fair consideration.

Yours faithfully,
EVANS LIFTS LTD.

Managing Director