

**ACCIDENT**

<b>Aircraft Type and Registration:</b>	Stampe SV4C(G), G-BWEF	
<b>No &amp; Type of Engines:</b>	1 De Havilland Gipsy Major piston engine	
<b>Year of Manufacture:</b>	1946	
<b>Date &amp; Time (UTC):</b>	19 November 2005 at 1140 hrs	
<b>Location:</b>	Redhill Aerodrome, Surrey	
<b>Type of Flight:</b>	Private	
<b>Persons on Board:</b>	Crew - 1	Passengers - 1
<b>Injuries:</b>	Crew - None	Passengers - None
<b>Nature of Damage:</b>	Right wing damaged	
<b>Commander's Licence:</b>	Airline Transport Pilot's Licence	
<b>Commander's Age:</b>	46 years	
<b>Commander's Flying Experience:</b>	15,800 hours (of which 7 were on type) Last 90 days - 150 hours Last 28 days - 50 hours	
<b>Information Source:</b>	Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot and enquiries by the AAIB	

**Synopsis**

The aircraft struck a marker board whilst taxiing after landing. The marker board, which indicated the hold position for the displaced threshold of Runway 19, was correctly positioned and properly notified to aerodrome users. The pilot acknowledged that his lookout from the rear cockpit of the tailwheel aircraft had been inadequate. However, the investigation also revealed that communication between the aerodrome authority and the home-based flying organisations was not fully effective and a recommendation has been made for the establishment of regular formal meetings.

**History of the flight**

The pilot landed on Runway 08L at Redhill Aerodrome and vacated the runway to the left. He requested and was cleared by ATC to follow Taxiway 'A' back to his parking area. However, when G-BWEF was abeam Runway 19 threshold, the pilot turned left towards his parking area on the west side. Having crossed the western edge of the runway, the lower right wing of the aircraft struck the edge of marker board G3 which indicated the holding position for Runway 19. The weather was good with a light surface wind.

**Aerodrome information**

The runways at Redhill Aerodrome have grass surfaces, with associated marker boards indicating threshold

positions. Each marker board is attached to two vertical metal structures, which are set into a rectangular concrete base. The markers are approximately 1.2 m wide and 1 m high. Each board is set at right angles to the runway direction and has a 'Day-Glo' covered square at each edge for improved conspicuity.

Marker board G3 was installed in August 2005 and was located some 40 m to the west of Runway 19 centre-line. Information about the new board was circulated to all home-based flying organisations and published on the aerodrome web site from the date of installation.

### **Other information**

In his report, the pilot acknowledged that he was familiar with the aerodrome but his lookout from the rear cockpit had been inadequate. However, he also considered that the marker boards were poorly positioned, difficult to see edge-on and should be more frangible.

Since 2000, there has been one other report involving an aircraft colliding with a ground marker at Redhill. This occurred on 20 May 2001 and involved a Taylorcraft aeroplane colliding with metal poles which were marking an area of rough ground. The aerodrome authority confirmed that there had been no formal approach from any home-based flying organisations regarding the position or construction of the marker boards.

CAP 168 defines the dimensions of each runway strip, which should be kept clear of all obstructions except permitted aids to navigation. Runway 19 at Redhill is a Code 2 runway and as such, the area within 40 m of the centre-line was required to be free of obstructions. The aerodrome is subject to periodic inspections by the CAA Aerodrome Standards Department and the Authority was content with the positioning and construction of the marker boards.

### **Analysis**

The collision occurred in good visibility when the pilot turned off the taxiway onto the grass towards his parking area. The position of marker board G3 had been promulgated and the pilot was familiar with the aerodrome. Although the forward visibility from most tailwheel aircraft is limited, the pilot has the final responsibility to ensure that his proposed route is clear. In this case, he acknowledged that his lookout had been inadequate.

However, the pilot also considered that the positioning of the marker boards is poor and that they are difficult to see when viewed side-on. Additionally, he considered that they could have been made of more frangible material. These points are relevant for a grass airfield where manoeuvring aircraft can include tailwheel types with restricted forward visibility. Nevertheless, enquiries confirmed that the positioning of the G3 marker board was in accordance with CAP 168, that the runway was correctly marked and that there was a designated taxiway. Furthermore, it is accepted that the priority of any marker boards sited outside the obstruction free area of the runway strip should be conspicuity and weather resistance rather than frangibility.

The investigation also indicated that communication between the aerodrome authority and the user flying organisations was not fully effective. Some home-based flying organisations considered that there was tension between them and the aerodrome authority regarding the marker boards whereas the aerodrome authority had reportedly received no complaints. Unlike most airfields, recently there had been no regular formal meetings between the aerodrome authority and the home-based flying organisations.

It would therefore be sensible for the aerodrome authority to establish regular formal meetings with the home-based flying organisations to monitor operating procedures and to enable any issues to be resolved at an early stage.

**Safety Recommendation 2006-044**

It is recommended that Redhill Aerodrome Ltd establishes a programme of regular formal meetings with flying organisations based at the aerodrome to discuss and monitor operating procedures.

**Safety action taken**

The aerodrome operator reported that there had been a users' committee for many years but meetings were

suspended in 2004 because no agenda items had been put forward for some time. Since that time changes to aerodrome procedures or layout have been communicated to all Redhill based users and groups through e-mails.

In response to Safety Recommendation 2006-044 the aerodrome operator stated:

*'Redhill Aerodrome Limited will consult with the based flying training organisations as to the benefits of re-establishing the User's Committee in addition to the consultation/notification presently undertaken by e-mail and the Redhill Aerodrome web site'.*