

Cessna 152, G-BPTU

AAIB Bulletin No: 5/2004	Ref: EW/G2004/01/08	Category: 1.3
Aircraft Type and Registration:	Cessna 152, G-BPTU	
No & Type of Engines:	1 Lycoming O-235-L2C piston engine	
Year of Manufacture:	1979	
Date & Time (UTC):	24 January 2004 at 1610 hrs	
Location:	Runway 22 at Cranfield Airport, Bedfordshire	
Type of Flight:	Private	
Persons on Board:	Crew - 1	Passengers - 1
Injuries:	Crew - None	Passengers - 1 (Minor)
Nature of Damage:	Nose landing gear collapsed and propeller damaged	
Commander's Licence:	Private Pilot's Licence	
Commander's Age:	33 years	
Commander's Flying Experience:	69 hours (of which 67 were on type)	
	Last 90 days - 4 hours	
	Last 28 days - 0 hours	
Information Source:	Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot	

History of the flight

Following an uneventful local flight, the aircraft returned to Cranfield and the pilot joined the left-hand circuit, downwind to land on Runway 22. The weather was good with a surface wind of 270°/15 kt. Following a stable approach at a speed of 75 KIAS and with the aircraft configured with landing flap, it crossed the threshold at an IAS between 70 and 75 kt.

The approach had been smooth and stable with the pilot intending to land 'long'. The aircraft touched down on the main landing gear then almost immediately lifted off again. The pilot held the control column back and the aircraft touched down harder than the first time. The aircraft bounced back into the air and came down heavier and flatter than before and may possibly have touched down nose landing gear first. The aircraft pitched forward as the nose landing gear collapsed from the impact and the propeller struck the runway surface. At some stage the passenger sustained an injury which might have been attributable to 'whiplash'.

The aircraft quickly came to a stop on the runway on a heading approximately 20° left of the runway centreline. The pilot carried out the shut down drills and both persons vacated the aircraft through the normal exit. The airfield RFFS attended immediately and monitored the situation.

Analysis

Whilst the pilot was unsure of the exact cause of the incident, in discussion with the flying school owner and operator it was considered that the approach was too fast. It should have been flown at 65 KIAS.