COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION

## AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION SUMMARY REPORT

Reference No.

AS/711/1036

- CITE ATTATION	· ····	<del></del>	<del></del>	·				
1. LOCATION OF OCCURREN	CE			<del></del>				<del></del>
urfors Paradise Gardens, Queensland			Height o.m		23,11,71	Time (1		Zone ESuT
2. THE AIRCRAFT								•
Make and Model  Beech 95-B55 Baron		Registration VH-PEC		rificate of	Valid from 28.8.68		Valid to 27.8.77	
Registered Owner Lazonby Pty. Ltd.,	John M. Elsing, 136 Booran Road,			Degree of damage to aircraft Substantial				
c/- Spry Walker & Co.,				Other property damaged				
339 Collins Street, Melbourne, Victoria		Caulfield, Victoria.			Nil			
Defects discovered								
3. THE FLIGHT								
3. THE FLIGHT	Time of departure	Next point of intens	•	Purpose of flig		Į.	of operation	
3. THE FLIGHT	Time of departure 1645	Next point of intend	•	Purpose of flig Trave		Į.	of operation Private	
3. THE FLIGHT Last or intended departure point	1		•			Į.	•	
3. THE FLIGHT  Last or intended deporture point  fers Paradise Gardens	1	Coolangat	•			Į.	•	ijury
3. THE FLIGHT  Last or intended departure point  fers Paradise Gardens  4. THE CREW	1645	Coolangate  Age Class	ta	Trave	el 	Į.	Private	ijury
fers Paradise Gardens  4. THE CREW  Name	1645 Stotus Pilot	Coolangate  Age Class  53 Pr	ta s of licence ivate	Trave	Total hours	Į.	Private  Degree of in	ijury

## 6. RELEVANT EVENTS

A take-off was commenced towards the south-east on a heavily grassed strip of adequate length with a crosswind from the north east at 10 to 20 knots. The pilot, who had not calculated the required take-off distance from the chart in the flight manual, was not confident that the aircraft would clear a power line and trees located on the take-off climb path so he abandoned the take-off and allowed the aircraft to roll to the south-east end of the strip. He considered a take-off from this end but decided against it and taxied back to the other end from where ake-off was commenced after lining up and applying full power before releasing the brakes. The pilot had already decided to raise the undercarriage as soon as the aircraft became airborne and this procedure was followed. Immediately following the "UP" selection the aircraft yawed to the left and port wing dipped towards the ground. The pilot applied positive aileron correction but because the aircraft was just above the ground, with the undercarriage retracting, the starboard propeller struck the ground. The aircraft lurched onto the left propeller and then settled in a level attitude and slid to a halt. The pilot vacated quickly and there was no fire.

During investigation on the following day it was noted that the fuel supply controls were selected to the main tanks, both of which were found to be empty although the two auxiliary tanks were almost full. The fuel in the starboard main tank had drained through damaged sump drain valves as a result of the accident, but no reason could be found for the lack of fuel in the port main tank which, on the basis of records of the last refuelling and the subsequent flight time of the aircraft, should have contained about 12 gallons.

It has not been possible to establish why the aircraft yawed after becoming airborne and the possibility that there was an interruption to the power from one engine cannot be completely eliminated. Nevertheless, propeller cut marks along the strip indicate that both engines were operating at similar revolutions per minute and that engine speed was consistent with take off power settings.

## OPINION AS TO CAUSE

The cause of the accident was that the pilot did not establish the aircraft in a positive climb before retracting the undercarriage.

	$\mathcal{A}$	$\sigma(i)$			
Report released	Jeanh	Frank	E. YEEND)	Assistant Director-General (Air Safety Investigation)	17.1.74.
MF 193	1/	<del>!</del>			<u> </u>