

# Readers *Letters*

Dear Sir,

I wanted to clear up any possible misunderstandings regarding your recent article on Vertikal.Net covering the appointment of an administrator for Allan Access Hire.

The directors of Allan Access Hire Ltd have instructed Liquidity Ltd, our invoice financing partner, to appoint an administrator to the affairs of the business.

The decision has been forced on us by recent actions of Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) who had issued a winding up petition on the Company taking effect on 1st July 2009. Despite the best efforts of the directors HMRC would not entertain a company voluntary arrangement to address the petition for monies due to be paid over a period, together with all of the other creditors who will now suffer as a result of this action and non co-operation.

For several weeks Allan Access Hire Ltd was in advanced negotiations with a major UK bank to provide new working capital facilities via the new Government Initiative Loan Guarantee Scheme. This scheme was launched this year specifically to help companies where additional working capital was required to grow the business and where traditional bank funding had effectively ceased due to the enormous pressures on banks during the current economic recession. In principle a loan was provisionally agreed, provided that HMRC accepted in writing payment of all outstanding liabilities over a reasonable period. Initially HMRC agreed to this but delays by the bank in finally passing off the loan, partly due to their own cautiousness and partly due to the unfamiliarity of the new Government scheme, has led to the whole deal being frustrated and HMRC taking a different stance than originally discussed, and deciding to petition to have the company wound up.

Allan Access Hire Ltd only started trading last October when it had to purchase the business assets from SFP (Simon Franklin Plant) the administrators of Allan Access Ltd after Close Invoice Finance chose to appoint the administrator (SFP) rather than allow Allan Access Ltd to move to another factoring company. Close Invoice Finance has a history of these unscrupulous activities to bring about a mutually lucrative fee earning arrangement. (SFP's fees alone were approximately £200,000!) When the Directors of Allan Access Ltd were held to ransom, they had no choice but to negotiate to purchase their family business back at a price that had expected to also have some funds available for creditors.

When purchasing the business back very tough conditions were imposed by SFP on Allan Access Hire Ltd. These conditions together with the one of the most dramatic economic downturns in the industry for many years and restricted bank facilities have all contributed to the adverse financial position of Allan Access Hire and hardly giving the company chance to get back on its feet.

The directors of the business despite having taken every step possible to protect and save the company, and jobs by putting in their own personal monies will also be very severely hit by these actions caused by the bureaucratic and non commercial decision of HMRC in not agreeing to a viable CVA.

The directors of Allan Access Hire Ltd believe that with the appointment of an administrator to oversee the current situation a quick solution can be sought to address the business in the future saving jobs and an on going business operation.

Yours truly,

Phil Allan

The following letter was received in response to a photograph we carried on Vertikal.net and also on page 13 of this issue showing a JCB telehandler and platform placing people on Trafalgar Squares fourth plinth. If you have a view on this please do let us know. We did respond to Mr Garrick but will not publish that until our next issue in order not to confuse your responses.

Dear Sir,

Reference the article with the JCB telehandler, after conducting a dual category IPAF training course today and checking the Vertikal site for current news, I need some answers to this article.

Can someone please tell me that the lifting operation as been risk assessed and properly planned? I doubt it very much but please correct me if I'm wrong.

All credit to JCB for getting the coverage, but come on, the lifting regs tell us to use the most suitable piece of equipment to carry out a planned lift, while lifting personnel. Is this telehandler the right piece of equipment for the job?

The public seem to be wandering around everywhere, i don't see any barriers separating them, indicating no control measures.

The ground control personnel have not got sufficient PPE they are not wearing hard hats and I'm guessing they have no safety foot wear.

I can not make out if any body in the platform is wearing a safety harness, enlighten me please.

And finally I thought that forklift trucks and telehandlers should be static when lifting personnel and travelling with a platform basket is forbidden?

I take it the JCB is new and would therefore comply with the six months Loler certificate, as opposed to a 12 months inspection certificate now put me right!!!!!!

Yours

Graham Garrick, UK Power Booms

Dear Sir,

In the article concerning Trak Lift it was mentioned that Alfons Thihatmer was the founder of Teupen. This is not correct. The founder of Teupen was Bernd Teupen in 1977.

Yours,

Dr. Christian Teupen

*Thank you for pointing out this piece of information which we had previously missed/were unaware of.*

Dear Sir,

When you publish reports on certain accidents and list some of the possible causes of the said accident, perhaps you also ought to include in your text that insufficient or a lack of maintenance and/or inspection could also be a reason for the accident/failure? While proper attention to these things can of course help prevent such accidents happening.

Best Regards

**Name and accident concerned withheld  
for obvious reasons**

*The above letter came in response to an accident and does make a fair point. However in all but a small handful of cases it is absolutely not possible to make this statement and incredibly detrimental to the owner of the machine if we are wrong. At the same time while general appearance of a failed machine might be an indicator to the level of maintenance it is by no means a solid one, poor looking machines can actually be well maintained while newly repainted smart looking one can be poorly maintained - although one does usually go with the other.*

*We already stick our necks out more than most, and do our utmost when commenting to stick to straightforward less intangible possible causes or where information is sparse to not comment at all. Our aim is always to try and help explain the likely causes where it might assist others with similar equipment and thus aid safety. As a matter of fact, over the past few years on a quick and totally unscientific look at the times we have commented on such things we have either been 100% correct or have listed the cause as one of the most likely.*

Dear Sir,

We also wish to remain anon - but have had, and are still having problems with (company name edited out). We are still having problems because they sent us an invoice using a factoring company - for consequential loss when our crane broke down. Since we had offered an alternative, which could have been there within the hour, and have referred to the CPA conditions of hire the charge was unwarranted. We have still not received a credit note from the Factors. (Name edited out) blames the factoring company for this not being dealt with yet. The only way we got paid the rest of our money was to use a debt collector. However they have withheld the value of the invoice.

I have checked risk disk for the directors today and noticed that one director is also down as a separate individual with a slight modification of his name. Since cross referencing a Director's other business' is vital when making credit decisions, is there anyone this can be reported to so it can be corrected?

**Name and accident concerned withheld  
for obvious reasons**

*This in relation to earlier articles that we have published in this magazine regarding a UK based cranes and access company.*

*The following letter from a reader in Australia was received in response to a story we published online regarding the recovery of the Wolff tower crane in Liverpool earlier this month. We said that it was suspended from the Liebherr MK100 self erecting mobile crane, which was why that crane had joined the job. We also criticized the suspended platform used for the inspections, happily a far more suitable platform was used for the actual work of removing the crane.*

Hi Leigh,

Just a small thing I noticed regarding your comment on the man basket used for inspection of the tower crane in Liverpool, I definitely agree that with all the money spent on two of the biggest cranes available for the lift surely the budget couldn't have been too tight to hire something more appropriate, but I do want to correct you on the fact it was actually suspended from either the AC700 or more likely the LTM1500 as one of the pictures show it with boom extended. The giveaway here is the dual hook block it is suspended from. Good to see they at least connected the harnesses to a sling on the hook instead of the platform as many others do in the older baskets.

Keep up the great work. Can't wait to see more photo's from the recovery, which is easier to say knowing that no one was badly hurt.

Thanks again.

**Western Australia**

**Permission to publish correspondents name not  
requested at time of publication**