Piper PA-23-250, G-ZSFT, 1 July 1996

AAIB Bulletin No: 8/96 Ref: EW/G96/07/01 Category: 1.2

Aircraft Type and Registration: Piper PA-23-250, G-ZSFT

No & Type of Engines: 2 Lycoming IO-540-C4B5 pistonengines

Year of Manufacture: 1979

Date & Time (UTC): 1 July 1996 at 1707 hrs

Location: Southampton Eastleigh Airport

Type of Flight: Private

Persons on Board: Crew - 1 Passengers - 1

Injuries: Crew - None Passengers - None

Nature of Damage: Left propeller scrapped. Left engineshock loaded

Commander's Licence: Airline Transport Pilot's Licence

Commander's Age: 34 years

Commander's Flying Experience: 2,686 hours (of which 345hours were on type)

Last 90 days - 102 hours

Last 28 days - 50 hours

Information Source: Aircraft Accident Report Form submittedby the pilot and enquiries by the AAIB

The pilot arrived at Bournemouth with a companion for some plannedflying. He intended to fly to Southampton where he would collectthree other friends, fly to Cherbourg and then back to Bournemouth;he submitted flight plans for the cross channel flights. Aftera normal pre-flight external check which revealed G-ZSFT to befully serviceable, the pilot carried out an uneventful flightto Southampton. The weather was good with a surface wind of 260°/12kt. There was no indication of any engine abnormality duringtake off, cruise or landing. After a short break at Southamptonto complete administration and meet his friends, the pilot startedhis normal pre-flight checks. During these, he noticed that theleft propeller had sustained some damage. His assessment of thedamage was that the tip of one blade was bent to a length of 2inches and offset 1/2 inch and the other blade had two nicks eachapproximately 1/3 inch deep and 1/3 inch wide. However, the pilotconsidered that this damage would not preclude flight. He notedno vibration after start or during his power checks, includinga full power check prior to take off. The flight to Cherbourgwas

uneventful and after landing, the engines were shut down andthe pilot completed some administration for his return journey. He carried out another inspection of the left propeller and notedno additional damage. Accompanied by his friends, he then flewback to Bournemouth.

That evening, a company engineer recognised the extent of thedamage and enquiries were initiated to identify the possible sourceof the damage. The pilot considered that it was probably causedwhile taxying at Southampton; the next day, on the taxi-way thatG-ZSFT had used, a light cover was found broken. Although thepilot considered that this may have been the source of the propellerdamage, ATC considered that the broken light cover could alsohave been caused by grass cutting which was in operation thatday. Regardless of where the damage occurred, the pilot subsequentlyacknowledged his unwise decision to fly the aircraft on two furtherflights without engineering advice.