

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
199201218**

**Beech Aircraft Corp
Bonanza**

02 May 1992

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.

Occurrence Number: 199201218 **Occurrence Type:** Accident
Location: Skye
State: VIC **Inv Category:** 3
Date: Saturday 02 May 1992
Time: 1555 hours **Time Zone** EST
Highest Injury Level: Fatal
Injuries:

	Fatal	Serious	Minor	None	Total
Crew	0	1	0	0	1
Ground	0	0	0	0	0
Passenger	1	0	0	0	1
Total	1	1	0	0	2

Aircraft Manufacturer: Beech Aircraft Corp
Aircraft Model: A36
Aircraft Registration: VH-MVM **Serial Number:** E398
Type of Operation: Non-commercial Pleasure/Travel
Damage to Aircraft: Destroyed
Departure Point: French Island VIC
Departure Time:
Destination: Skye VIC

Approved for Release: Tuesday, July 30, 1996

The aircraft was operating on to a 617 m grass strip with a fence at each end. The orientation of the strip was north/south and threshold markers were positioned on either side of the strip 79 m in from the fence at the northern end. Some 40 m beyond the southern end of the strip was a group of trees 14 m high.

The weather at the time of the accident was fine with good visibility. The Bureau of Meteorology estimated the surface wind to have been from the north-west at 12 kt. There was no windsock at the landing strip.

Observers saw the aircraft, apparently operating normally, fly towards the landing area and make an approach to land to the south. One witness said the aircraft touched down at the threshold markers. A second witness reported that the aircraft touched down about 200 m in from the fence, bounced to a height of 3-4 ft, then touched down again about 25 m further on. The witnesses then saw the aircraft continue along the strip at speed, with a significant level of engine power applied. Approaching the southern end of the strip, the aircraft swerved right, probably to avoid the group of trees beyond the end of the strip. The witnesses heard an increase in engine noise and saw the aircraft become airborne. The landing gear contacted the boundary fence and the aircraft continued across a road, through a line of bushes, and struck the side of a house. An intense fire broke out, destroying the aircraft and much of the building. The pilot escaped from the wreckage but the passenger did not.

The first marks identified on the airstrip surface were main wheel tyre tracks which commenced about 300 m from the threshold. These marks indicated that skidding had occurred from 350 m from the threshold and continued for about 50 m. From there the aircraft ran straight ahead for about 170 m before veering to the right by approximately 12-15 degrees. The tyre tracks continued to within about 20 m of the boundary fence.

Inspection of the wreckage did not reveal evidence of any defects that might have contributed to the accident. The landing gear was down and the wing flaps were extended 17 degrees.

The Aircraft Flight Manual landing chart does not provide for landing distance calculation where the tailwind component exceeds five knots. The Beechcraft A36 Pilot's Operating Handbook indicated that, with a 10 kt tailwind and when approaching over a 50 ft obstacle, a landing distance of about 700 metres would be required. However, when approaching over a 20 ft obstacle, this distance is reduced to about 500 m.

The available evidence indicates that the pilot conducted an approach to land in a manner which was not appropriate in the prevailing conditions. The pilot misjudged the approach and touched down well into the strip. The decision to go-around was delayed until too late to safely complete the manoeuvre.

The pilot declined to make himself available for interview during the investigation.

Significant Factors

The following factors were considered relevant to the development of the accident:

1. The pilot attempted a landing with a significant tail wind component.
2. The landing approach was misjudged.
3. An attempt to go around was made with insufficient airstrip remaining.