

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
198500660**

Piper PA38

21 June 1985

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.

Occurrence Number: 198500660
Location: Parafield SA
Date: 21 June 1985
Highest Injury Level: Nil
Injuries:

Occurrence Type: Accident

Time: 1530 (Aprx)

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

Aircraft Details: Piper PA38
Registration: VH-MHO
Serial Number:
Operation Type: Solo Practice
Damage Level: Substantial
Departure Point: Parafield SA
Departure Time: 1530 (Aprx)
Destination: Parafield SA

Approved for Release: 4th September, 1985

Circumstances:

The pilot was returning from a period in the local training area. Another aircraft was also returning and was advised that it would be number 2 in the landing sequence. However, the pilot of this aircraft overtook VH-MHO on the downwind leg. On final approach it was considered that insufficient separation would exist for landing, and the pilot of VH-MHO was offered the use of the parallel runway. Because the threshold of this runway was 250 metres closer than the planned runway, the pilot carried out a he pilot recovered the situation moothly, but the firewall and nosegeposed a steeper than normal approach. The aircraft landed heavily nosewheel first and bounced. The pilot recovered the situation and re-landed smoothly, but the firewall and nosegear assembly had been damaged. The pilot had probably been confused when the aircraft which was supposed to be following appeared ahead in the landing sequence, and he was offered a late change of runway. the steep approach had led to a misjudgment of the flare. The Instructor in the other aircraft, after acknowledging an instruction to position as number 2, and advising that he had the preceding aircraft in sight, did not maintain the required sequence.