Cessna 152, G-BGIB

AAIB Bulletin No: 10/2003	Ref: EW/G2003/08/32	Category: 1.3
Aircraft Type and Registration:	Cessna 152, G-BGIB	
No & Type of Engines:	1 Lycoming O-235-L2C piston engine	
Year of Manufacture:	1979	
Date & Time (UTC):	5 August 2003 at 1620 hrs	
Location:	Shoreham Airport, Sussex	
Type of Flight:	Training	
Persons on Board:	Crew - 2	Passengers - None
Injuries:	Crew - None	Passengers - N/A
Nature of Damage:	Nosewheel collapsed and propeller damaged	
Commander's Licence:	Commercial Pilot's Licence	
Commander's Age:	48 years	
Commander's Flying Experience:	681 hours (of which 396 were on type)	
	Last 90 days - 48 hours	
	Last 28 days - 15 hours	
Information Source:	Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot	

History of flight

The aircraft was on a training flight with the student pilot flying circuits under supervision and was approaching for a touch-and-go; the student had previously completed this procedure successfully three times during the flight. Late clearance was received by the pilot from ATC for the manoeuvre due to a previous aircraft on the runway. The student and instructor considered and prepared for a go-around but the previous aircraft cleared the runway and G-BGIB continued the final approach which was slightly high and flown at 70 kt. The aircraft touched down half way along the runway; initially the flare was satisfactory but then the student pulled sharply back on the control column, he was advised to "lower the nose a bit" by the instructor. This was performed abruptly by the student and the nosewheel struck the ground causing the aircraft to bounce after which the instructor took control. On the second touch-down the nose landing gear collapsed and the propeller struck the runway.

Damage was sustained to the propeller and the engine bulkhead; the engine was shock loaded and the engine mount was torn; the nose landing gear was bent forwards. The maintenance company conducted a further examination of the airframe to assess fuselage damage.

Analysis

The student commented that the large nose down pitch rate when he lowered the nose was due to an incorrect trim setting giving a greater nose down movement than he had intended; the trim setting was

checked after the incident and found to be normally set for landing. It was commented during followup enquiries that due to the student being considered proficient, the instructor did not take control as soon as she might have done.