

# DHC-1 Chipmunk 22, G-BDDD

## AAIB Bulletin No: 3/97 Ref: EW/G96/11/18 Category: 1.3

<b>Aircraft Type and Registration:</b>	DHC-1 Chipmunk 22, G-BDDD
<b>No &amp; Type of Engines:</b>	1 De Havilland Gipsy Major 10 MK 2
<b>Year of Manufacture:</b>	1951
<b>Date &amp; Time (UTC):</b>	26 November 1996 at 1315 hrs
<b>Location:</b>	Farnborough Airport, Hampshire
<b>Type of Flight:</b>	Private
<b>Persons on Board:</b>	Crew - 2 - Passengers - None
<b>Injuries:</b>	Crew - None - Passengers - N/A
<b>Nature of Damage:</b>	Punctured fabric of left lower wing surface and damage to tripod-mounted measuring equipment
<b>Commander's Licence:</b>	Airline Transport Pilot's Licence with FI and Night Ratings
<b>Commander's Age:</b>	55 years
<b>Commander's Flying Experience:</b>	10,400 hours (of which 350 were on type) Last 90 days - 120 hours Last 28 days - 30 hours
<b>Information Source:</b>	Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot plus reports from Farnborough ATC

There was a trial underway at Farnborough on the day of the accident. The trials team had sought verbal permission by RTF from the aerodrome controller to position tripod-mounted measuring equipment on a disused runway. The controller assumed that the equipment would be sited at the edge of the disused runway and that it would be removed once the particular trial flight was completed at about 1230 hrs. In fact the equipment was positioned on the centreline of the disused runway where it remained between flights. The trials activity was mentioned during the 1300 hrs handover briefing between aerodrome controllers but the presence of the tripod-mounted equipment was not mentioned because the outgoing controller assumed that the equipment had already been removed.

In between trial flights the Chipmunk had occasion to taxi along the disused runway in order to avoid a parked aircraft. The aerodrome controller at the time was unaware of the presence of the tripod-mounted equipment and could not have seen it because it was obscured by a radio antenna

array. Neither pilot saw the equipment and there was a minor collision which punctured the aircraft's wing fabric and damaged the equipment. The aircraft was later repaired with a fabric patch.

Had the trials team followed correctly the relevant trials instructions, there would have been a face-to-face meeting for the trials team to explain their exact requirements to ATC. The controllers would then have been aware of the presence and precise location of the equipment and the accident is unlikely to have happened.