

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report  
199000588**

**Cessna 177**

**09 June 1990**

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 CEO 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 CEO 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](http://www.atsb.gov.au).**

**Occurrence Number:** 199000588  
**Location:** Leigh Creek SA  
**Date:** 09 June 1990  
**Highest Injury Level:** Serious  
**Injuries:**

**Occurrence Type:** Accident

**Time:** 1218

	Fatal	Serious	Minor	None
Crew	0	0	1	1
Ground	0	0	0	-
Passenger	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

**Aircraft Details:** Cessna 177  
**Registration:** VH-DZS  
**Serial Number:** 17700130  
**Operation Type:** Private  
**Damage Level:** Substantial  
**Departure Point:** Parafield SA  
**Departure Time:** N/K  
**Destination:** Leigh Creek SA

**Approved for Release:** 25th July 1990

#### **Circumstances:**

The pilot reported that on joining the circuit, he checked the windsock and elected to land on runway 29 into an estimated wind of 330 degrees at five knots. He recalled that he made a steeper than normal approach and then he levelled off too high. The aircraft then bounced twice and swung to the left, skipped several times and was on the gravel edge of the strip by the time the pilot applied full power for an attempted go-around. The aircraft lifted off the ground and flew along the alignment of a drainage ditch before it hit the edge of the ditch. The nosegear folded back and the aircraft stopped abruptly. It tipped up on its nose before falling back into the ditch on its tailplane. Subsequent discussions with the pilot revealed that the apparent width of the runway upon which he landed was greater than the runway with which he is most familiar - Camden. In these circumstances, a runway that is wider than expected will present the same visual cues as if the pilot was lower than he should be, that is, he will level off at a greater height to compensate. The usual result of levelling off too high without some corrective action is a bounced landing. This eventuated in this case and the pilot then failed to take the correct action for recovery from the bounced landing.

#### **Significant Factors:**

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

1. Misleading visual cues. . wider runway than the pilot was used to gave perception of being too low.
2. Pilot levelled off too high.
3. Pilot did not take correct action to recover from a bounced landing.