

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
199402318**

**Cessna Aircraft Company
Skyhawk**

20 August 1994

Readers are advised that the Australian Transport Safety Bureau investigates for the sole purpose of enhancing transport safety. Consequently, Bureau reports are confined to matters of safety significance and may be misleading if used for any other purposes.

Investigations commenced on or before 30 June 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with Part 2A of the Air Navigation Act 1920.

Investigations commenced after 1 July 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with the Transport Safety Investigation Act 2003 (TSI Act). Reports released under the TSI Act are not admissible as evidence in any civil or criminal proceedings.

NOTE: All air safety occurrences reported to the ATSB are categorised and recorded. For a detailed explanation on Category definitions please refer to the ATSB website at www.atsb.gov.au.

The Bureau did not conduct an on scene investigation of this occurrence. The information presented below was obtained from information supplied to the Bureau.

Occurrence Number: 199402318	Occurrence Type: Accident
Location: Rowland Flat, 50km NNE Adelaide	
State: NT	Inv Category: 4
Date: Saturday 20 August 1994	
Time: 1215 hours	Time Zone: CST
Highest Injury Level: None	

Aircraft Manufacturer: Cessna Aircraft Company	
Aircraft Model: 172N	
Aircraft Registration: VH-WLQ	Serial Number: 17271888
Type of Operation: Charter Passenger	
Damage to Aircraft: Substantial	
Departure Point: Rowland Flat SA	
Departure Time: 1200 CST	
Destination: Rowland Flat SA	

Crew Details:

<u>Role</u>	<u>Class of Licence</u>	<u>Hours on Type</u>	<u>Hours Total</u>
Pilot-In-Command	Commercial	35.0	400

Approved for Release: Wednesday, November 30, 1994

While conducting joy flights a misunderstanding made the pilot believe that a commercial requirement necessitated landing in the 25 direction, which had a 2 degree downhill slope. The first approach for landing was high, and a go-around was initiated from about 100 feet above ground level. The pilot reported that during the overshoot the aircraft performance was poor, failing to climb satisfactorily and passed close to the tops of a group of trees.

The next approach was still high and at a speed slightly faster than the published approach speed for the prevailing conditions. The aircraft floated for a distance after flaring, and touched down late. Being reluctant to attempt another go-around, the pilot tried to stop the aircraft before the end of the airstrip, but it overran and continued down a steep slope, coming to rest in a ditch.

Witness reports indicate that although the wind at the time of the occurrence was described as a variable gusty crosswind, a certain amount of downwind component had previously been noticed.