

Robin Cahalarn

To: John Rogers (E-mail); Steve Ellis (E-mail)
Subject: Feasibility studies Grenfell Tower

I have looked through the reports following our meeting of yesterday and would comment as below:

Hydraulic Lift:

Appendix A -page B Top photograph is upside down

2. I am disappointed at some of the photos & remarks attributed to the standard of maintenance and would question the relevance of this in this lift refurbishment feasibility report. Zurich Insurance & TMO monitor and inspect the lifts at regular intervals and ILS who have been employed by RBK&C for over 20 years maintain the lifts to an acceptable comprehensive level. I would suggest possibly that your visit fell between service visits and items mentioned would now of been dealt with, I do accept that you stated service contractor doing well to maintain lift service.

3. I attended site following our meeting & found some oil in lift pit not excessive & the floor level was level not a trip hazard as page E.

I also investigated the possibility of resiting the lift motor room & would suggest this could be done by repositioning on ground floor at back of lift shaft, cycle sheds would need to be moved.

Passenger Lifts

1. Obviously the decision on the acceptable option will be financially lead but my initial reaction would be for Option 3 +A

2. 2.0 Page 3 Concierge is 24 hours

3. 3.1 Page 5 I dont understand the last sentence in this statement.

4. 5.1.2 Page 10 What would be done by the successful tenderer engineer on the retest for 1 week -would it just be service & adjust or would new parts be fitted (if available)

5. 6. Traffic Study I dont really understand this study, maybe the figure statistics need clarification, we can discuss at next meeting.

6. 9. Pages F, G, H, J, K, P & M As item 2 above on hydraulic lift, I would expect some need for cleaning during normal service visit, which would of been following your site visit or visits.

7. Page W -we haven't found the lift controllers to be a major cause of breakdowns, although I accept the controllers are obsolete & difficult to source with new parts.

Lift breakdowns since 1.4.03. H90 -6 breakdowns 2 door obstructions, 1 equipment failure, 2 Working on arrival & 1 lift engineer reported ground fl pos indicator not working.

H091 - 1 breakdown Doors not closing.

The above comments are made to be constructive and I hope they are of help, in obtaining the best possible lift refurbishment

Robin Cahalarn

To: Robin Cahalarn; John Rogers (E-mail); Steve Ellis (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Feasibility studies Grenfell Tower

I also noted pass lifts picture X although still not enough there are actually 2 fans in lift room

-----Original Message-----

From: Robin Cahalarn
Sent: 10 July 2003 12:01
To: John Rogers (E-mail); Steve Ellis (E-mail)
Subject: Feasibility studies Grenfell Tower

I have looked through the reports following our meeting of yesterday and would comment as below:

Hydraulic Lift:

Appendix A -page B Top photograph is upside down

2 I am disappointed at some of the photos & remarks attributed to the standard of maintenance and would question the relevance of this in this lift refurbishment feasibility report. Zurich Insurance & TMO monitor and inspect the lifts at regular intervals and ILS who have been employed by RBK&C for over 20 years maintain the lifts to an acceptable comprehensive level. I would suggest possibly that your visit fell between service visits and items mentioned would now of been dealt with, I do accept that you stated service contractor doing well to maintain lift service.

3. I attended site following our meeting & found some oil in lift pit not excessive & the floor level was level not a trip hazard as page E.

I also investigated the possibility of resiting the lift motor room & would suggest this could be done by repositioning on ground floor at back of lift shaft, cycle sheds would need to be moved.

Passenger Lifts

1. Obviously the decision on the acceptable option will be financially lead but my initial reaction would be for Option 3 +A

2. 2.0 Page 3 Concierge is 24 hours

3. 3.1 Page 5 I dont understand the last sentence in this statement .

4. 5.1.2 Page 10 What would be done by the successful tenderer engineer on the retest for 1 week -would it just be service & adjust or would new parts be fitted (if available)

5. 6. Traffic Study I dont really understand this study , maybe the figure statistics need clarification , we can discuss at next meeting.

6. 9. Pages F, G, H, J, K, P & M As item 2 above on hydraulic lift , I would expect some need for cleaning during normal service visit , which would of been following your site visit or visits.

7. Page W -we haven't found the lift controllers to be a major cause of breakdowns , although I accept the controllers are obsolete & difficult to source with new parts.

Lift breakdowns since 1.4.03.H90 -6 breakdowns 2 door obstructions , 1 equipment failure , 2 Working on arrival & 1 lift engineer reported ground fl pos indicator not working.

H091 - 1 breakdown Doors not closing.

The above comments are made to be constructive and I hope they are of help, in obtaining the best possible lift refurbishment