



Safety recommendation no. 487

Date of the publication	23.02.2015
Number of the final report	2217
Safety deficit	<p>On returning from a private flight to Geneva, the pilot of a single-engined aircraft informed the air traffic controller of his intention to fly over the concrete runway in order to join grass runway 05 downwind. The air traffic controller's instruction to this aircraft was to fly over the threshold of concrete runway 05 and to call back at the downwind end of grass runway 05. This course, which was not published in the visual approach charts, was justified as a result of the traffic taking off from the airport. The pilot correctly acknowledged the instruction, but continued his flight without changing course, which took him above approach B.</p> <p>Shortly before flying over the concrete runway, the air traffic controller asked the pilot for his altitude. The latter replied that his altitude was 2,500 ft whereupon the air traffic controller pointed out to him that flying over the runway should take place at a minimum altitude of 3,000 ft. This restriction, enforced by the ATMM, did not appear on the pilot's documentation. A few seconds later, the air traffic controller gave a type AVRO RJ-100 aircraft permission to take off. Just before rotation, the pilot noticed the Cessna overflying the runway in front of him at an altitude of 2,400 ft, just 1,850 m away.</p>
Safety recommendation	The Federal Office of Civil Aviation should assess whether to add speed limits to VFR approaches.
Addressees	BAZL Bundesamt für Zivilluftfahrt
Stage of the implementation	Not implemented. FOCA considers that too much information on the charts affects their legibility. Speed restrictions may be ordered by air traffic control at any time.
Investigation report concerning the safety recommendation	<u>Rapport final</u>