

QC
Avro
CF105
P/WT/9

QCX
Avro
CF105
P-WT-9
⑤

FILE IN VAULT

C105 ~~SECRET~~ P/WIND TUNNEL/9
~~UNCLASSIFIED~~ ~~NON~~ ~~DECLASSIFIED~~
C.A.L. TESTS SEPT. 1953.
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES
~~ANALYZED~~ WITH WIND TUNNEL RESULTS
COPY #6

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIÉ

ANALYZED



National Research Council Canada
C.I.S.T.I.
Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering Library

Conseil national de recherches Canada
I.C.I.S.T.
Bibliothèque d'aéronautique et de génie mécanique

TO
A

DATE

Dec. 7, 1992

Report no.: QCX - AVRO - CF105- P-WT-9
has been downgraded to : _____
 de-classified

by (Name): Michel W. Drapeau

(Dept): A/DND Coordinator, Access to Information

Date: Dec. 7, 1992

R. Auger
Signature



45119

12416930



A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

AIRCRAFT: C-105

REPORT NO. P/Wind Tunnel/9

FILE NO:

NO. OF SHEETS: _____

TITLE:

C.A.L. TESTS SEPT. 1953

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES

WITH WIND TUNNEL RESULTS

~~UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED~~
SECRET

Classification cancelled / changed to: UNCLASSIFIED

By authority of: DRDA 7/DARFT 5-8/DAS Eng 6-4-5

Date: 5 Nov 1992

Signature: *Barbrey*

Unit / Rank / Appointment: DSIS 3, Secretary CRAD HQ DRP

PREPARED BY

DATE Sept. 1953.

CHECKED BY

DATE

SUPERVISED BY

DATE

APPROVED BY

DATE

ISSUE NO.	REVISION No.	REVISED BY	APPROVED BY	DATE	REMARKS

Cornell C105 Tests:

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

Base pressure correction:

$$\Delta C_{DB} = \frac{(P_B - P_S) S_B}{q_M S_W}$$

where P_B is static pressure in balance region cm Hg

P_S " " " free stream

$$S_B = .02215 \text{ sq. ft. (in.)}$$

$$S_W = \text{ref. area} = \text{wing area} = 1.102 \text{ sq. ft.}$$

q_M = free stream dynamic pressure, p.s.f.

Ex. run 116 Pt. 5 $M=1.20$ $C_L = -.0046$

$$C_D = .0242 \quad C_D = .0748$$

$$\left(\frac{S_B}{S_W} = \frac{.02215}{1.102} = .0201 \right)$$

cm. Hg \rightarrow p.s.f.

$$1 \text{ cm. Hg.} = \frac{1}{2.54} \text{ in. Hg.} = \frac{1}{2.54} \frac{2116.229}{29.92117} \text{ p.s.f.} = 27.8 \text{ p.s.f.}$$

\therefore In form given

$$\Delta C_{DB} = .0201 \times C_{DB}$$

$$\Delta C_{DB} = .0201 \times .0748 = .00150$$

$$\therefore \text{Corrected } C_D = +.0242$$

$$- .0015$$

$$\underline{\underline{.0227}}$$

$$.0148$$

Run 111-5 $C_D = .01730$ $.0039$
 $M=1.05$ $-.00068$
 $\underline{\underline{.01722}}$

Run 115-5 $M=1.1$

$$C_D = .0233$$

$$.00213$$

$$\underline{\underline{.02117}}$$

$M=1.0$

Run 112-4 $.0522$

$$.0171$$

$$.00105$$

$$\underline{\underline{.01605}}$$

Run 114-5 $M=1.23$ $C_D = .02401$

$$C_D = .0680$$

Corr

$$.00137$$

$$\underline{\underline{.02263}}$$

Run 117-4 $M=1.15$ $C_D = .0246$

$$C_D = .1006$$

$$.00202$$

$$\underline{\underline{.02258}}$$

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES WITH WIND TUNNEL RESULTSCONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>I DESCRIPTION</u>	
1 Summary	1.1
2 Introduction	1.1
3 Model	1.2
4 Results	1.3
5 Discussion	1.4
6 Conclusions	1.8
7 Model General Arrangement	1.9
<u>II LONGITUDINAL STABILITY</u>	
1 Aerocentre position vs Mach number	2.1
2 $C_{L\alpha}$ vs Mach number	2.2
3 C_{M_0} vs Mach number (cambered & uncambered wing)	2.3
<u>III LONGITUDINAL CONTROL</u>	
1 $C_{L\delta}$ vs Mach number	3.1
2 Centre of pressure of elevator load vs Mach number	3.2
3 $C_{M\delta}$ vs Mach number at constant α & constant C_L	3.3
4 $C_{h\alpha}$ vs Mach number	3.4
5 $C_{h\delta}$ vs Mach number	3.5
<u>IV DRAG DATA</u>	
1 $C_{D_{MIN}}$ vs Mach number	4.1
2 e vs Mach number	4.2
3 $\frac{\Delta C_{D_{MIN}}}{\delta^2}$ vs Mach number	4.3
4 $\Delta\left(\frac{\partial C_D}{\partial C_L^2}\right)/\delta$ vs Mach number	4.4
5 C_L at $C_{D_{MIN}}$ vs Mach number	4.5

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT No. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET No. 1.1

AIRCRAFT: C 105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J.A. Chamberlin

Sept. 11/53.

CHECKED BY

DATE

1 SUMMARY

Wind tunnel tests of the Avro C-105 were conducted in the 3' x 4' transonic throat of the Cornell variable Density Wind Tunnel to confirm the predicted performance estimates which were based on the use of a small amount of negative wing camber to reduce the elevator drag in flight at high altitudes. The basic drag, the longitudinal stability and the effect of camber were in excellent agreement with the estimates. The elevator effectiveness, hinge moments and drag were found to be more favorable than had been anticipated by a substantial margin. It is hence concluded that these tests have confirmed the validity of the assumptions used in estimating the performance and established the basic soundness of the configuration.

2 INTRODUCTION

R.C.A.F. Spec. AIR 7-3⁽¹⁾ calls for a design study of a supersonic fighter meeting the detail requirements laid down therein. One of these requirements is that the aerodynamic data on which the study is based be confirmed by wind tunnel tests. Accordingly, tests were conducted in the 3' x 4' transonic throat of the Cornell Variable Density Wind Tunnel from Aug. 27 to Sept. 2 on a model of the configuration which was selected by the R.C.A.F. (as the one which best met their requirements), on the basis of the data given in Avro Design Study Report No. P/C105/1⁽²⁾.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIE

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT NO. P/wind Tunnel/9

SHEET NO. 1.2

AIRCRAFT: C 105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J.A. Chamberlin

Sept. 11/53.

CHECKED BY

DATE

2 INTRODUCTION (Continued)

This report gives a summary of the results of these tests and compares them with the data used in the Design Study (2). It was pointed out in that study that one of the major features of the design was the use of negative wing camber in order to reduce elevator angles required at high altitudes and hence the elevator drag. Furthermore, it was made clear that adequate test data on which to base the effectiveness of camber did not exist and that information on elevator drag was not altogether satisfactory. The purpose of these tests was to resolve these matters, as well as to confirm the other data on which reasonably satisfactory information was already in existence.

3 MODEL

The model was made to .03 scale for sting mounting in the 3' x 4' transonic throat of the Cornell Variable Density Wind Tunnel. The aircraft dimensions are given on the general arrangements shown on sheet 1.9. The model was of metal construction and housed specially designed strain gauge balances within the fuselage. A free passage for air was allowed within the fuselage between the engine intake ducts and the jet nozzle. Two wings were made for the model; one without camber, and one cambered the required amount. Only the uncambered wing was fitted with elevators. The elevator on the port side was fitted with strain gauges for measuring hinge moments.

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT No. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET No. 2.3

AIRCRAFT: C 105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J.A. Chamberlin

Sept. 11/53.

CHECKED BY

DATE

3 MODEL (Continued)

The transonic throat of the tunnel is of a type specially developed by Cornell and employs suction through the porous walls of the working section to avoid choking and incidently to avoid all tunnel constraint corrections as well as interference from reflected shocks. The present throat was originally intended as a model to establish the design requirements for modifications to the entire working section of the tunnel. However, the model has proved so successful that it is being used extensively for routine testing pending the development of the full scale throat. This will require some time, since the suction requirements are so large that special equipment will have to be provided, having a capacity greatly exceeding that of the two J 35 jet engine compressors which are used to provide suction for the small working section.

4 RESULTS

The results have been reduced to coefficient form and are compared with estimated values on the graphs given in sections II to IV of this report. The basic data from which the coefficients were derived is contained in Ref. 3.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIE

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT NO. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET NO. 1.4

AIRCRAFT: C 105

PREPARED BY	DATE
J.A. Chamberlin	11 Sept./53.
CHECKED BY	DATE

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Longitudinal Stability

5.1.1 Aerocentre *n!*

Figure 2.1 shows excellent agreement between the test and estimated positions for the aerocentre. This confirms that c.g. limits assumed are reliable. The effect of camber on this is not appreciable, as was expected.

5.1.2 Lift

The slope of the lift curve with incidence as obtained from test agrees well with the estimates as shown on Sheet 2.2. Furthermore it has been shown on Sheet 5.1.1 of ref. 3 that the low speed $C_{L_{max}}$ is in good agreement with estimates and is not affected by camber. The C_L 's at higher speeds were not extended above about 0.7. There was no evidence of stalling or buffeting with this range, which was more than adequate to achieve the estimated manoeuvre envelope.

5.1.3 Camber Effectiveness

The effect of camber on C_{M_0} is shown on Sheet 2.3. It can be seen that the cambered wing gives a C_{M_0} that is in very good agreement with the estimate. In view of the scanty evidence on which the estimate was based, this is extremely gratifying. The fact that there is not as high a peak as estimated between $M = 1.0$ and 1.2 is very favorable. The agreement elsewhere should assure the validity of the previous estimates.

n! Estimate for camber effect

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT No. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET No. 1.5

AIRCRAFT: C-105	PREPARED BY	DATE
	J. A. Chamberlin	Sept. 11/53
	CHECKED BY	DATE

5 DISCUSSION - Cont'd.

5.2 Longitudinal Control

5.2.1 Elevator Effectiveness

The elevator control characteristics are compared with the estimates on sheets 3.1 and 3.2 in terms of lift effectiveness & point of application of the lift respectively. These two elements are combined to give the moment effectiveness on Sheet 3.2.2 which is the primary criterion of longitudinal control. This shows that the experimental effectiveness is considerably better than the estimate below $M = 1.13$. Above this it is inferior. However, the experimental curve can be smoothly extrapolated to agree with the estimates above about $M = 1.5$.

How can they be when all experimental evidence plus theory is violated

Since estimated values above this speed are believed to be very reliable, this seems a very reasonable extrapolation.

Nonsense

It is of very considerable interest to note that the effectiveness is linear with elevator deflections up to 30° through the transonic region.

On the basis of these results the trim troubles near $M = 1.0$ should be greatly alleviated by the very high effectiveness in this region, while the slight deficiency between $M = 1.13$ and $M = 1.5$ is not felt to be very serious, especially since its effect will be alleviated by the fact that the aerocentre does not move back as much as was anticipated between these Mach numbers, and the hinge moment coefficients are lower than estimated as noted below.

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT NO. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET NO. 1.6

AIRCRAFT: C 105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J. A. Chamberlin

11 Sept. 53

CHECKED BY

DATE

5 DISCUSSION - Cont'd.

5.2 Longitudinal Control

5.2.2 Elevator Hinge Moments

The elevator hinge moment coefficients are shown on Sheets 3.4 and 3.5. They are considerably lower than was forecast. This will permit increased manoeuvrability since the maximum hinge moment that can be developed is limited by mechanical considerations.

5.3 Drag

5.3.1 Basic Drag

||| The values of C_{D_0} given on Sheet 4.1 are in good agreement with the estimate. However the wind tunnel values cannot be considered as particularly reliable in this case, since a correction equal to about one third^{of} of the measured drag has to be applied to allow for internal ^{flow} in the ducts and for the base drag ^{due to} of the sting. These corrections must be estimated on the basis of a somewhat inadequate pressure measurement in the model, and hence may be subject to considerable error. The correction should not vary appreciably with α or δ , so that the above reservations about the accuracy of the drag data apply only to the values of C_{D_0} .

The induced drag efficiency factor "e" is shown on Sheet 4.2. This is slightly higher than expected at Mach numbers over 0.8. This will result in slightly lower drag at high altitudes.

5.3.2 Elevator Drag.

The elevator drag coefficients are given on Sheets 4.3 and 4.4. It can be seen from Fig. 4.3 that the variation of profile

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFÉ

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT NO. P/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET NO. 1.7

AIRCRAFT C 105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J. A. Chamberlin

11 Sept. 53

CHECKED BY

DATE

5. DISCUSSION - Cont'd.

5.3 Drag

5.3.2 Elevator drag - Cont'd.

drag with elevator deflection is considerably below the estimate based on wind tunnel tests and tends more to the values obtained from rocket propelled models. The effect on the induced drag can be seen from Fig. 4.4 to be very much less than that obtained from any source previously.

This should result in a substantial reduction in the elevator drag over those used in the previous estimates which were based on N.A.C.A. wind tunnel data.

5.4 Effect of Reynolds Number

To assess Reynolds number effects, two runs were made at $M = .9$ at $R.N. = 1.5 \times 10^6$ and 3.4×10^6 . Detailed results are presented in Ref. 3 Section VI. They show that the influence of Reynolds number is negligible. This is substantiated further by the fact that the present results are on the whole in excellent agreement with predictions based chiefly on free flight rocket propelled model data usually obtained at Reynolds numbers of the order of 20×10^6 .

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFÉ

A. V. ROE CANADA LIMITED
MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

REPORT No. F/Wind Tunnel/9

SHEET No. 1.3

AIRCRAFT: C105

PREPARED BY

DATE

J.A. Chamberlin

Sept. 11/53.

CHECKED BY

DATE

6 CONCLUSIONS

The comparison of data obtained from the transonic wind tunnel test of C-105 at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories Inc. with the original estimates of aerodynamic characteristics indicate that:

- (1) Longitudinal stability will be entirely satisfactory and is very close to the estimate. //
- (2) Manoeuvrability will be better than expected in the entire Speed Range notably at low speed and high subsonic speeds. //
- (3) Performance will be appreciably better than estimated. //
- (4) Cornell Transonic Wind Tunnel is an excellent experimental tool, and will be of great use in the further development of the project: the data obtained being in close agreement with free flight high R.N. rocket tests.


REFERENCES

- (1) R.C.A.F. Spec. AIR 7-3 Design Studies of Prototype All-Weather Interceptor Aircraft - Issue 1, May 1953.
- (2) Design Study of Supersonic All-Weather Interceptor Aircraft - Avro Report No. P/C-105/1
- (3) Avro Report No. P/WT/7 - C.A.L. Tests Sept. 1953 - Corrected Plots.

GENERAL ARRANGEMENT

TRANSONIC MODEL


UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED



$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{18 + 1.65}{2} \times 18 = \frac{165 \times 18}{2} \\
 & = \frac{18^2}{2} = 162 \text{ sq in} = 56 \\
 & = 1.125 \text{ sq ft} \\
 \text{Full scale: } & \frac{1.125}{0.025} = \frac{1.125}{0.009} \\
 & 1250 \text{ sq ft}
 \end{aligned}$$

1 = 33.33

SCALE 1/2 MODEL



UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C105
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES & W.T. RESULTS

$C_{L\alpha}$ vs. MACH No
 $-2^\circ < \alpha < 2^\circ$

07

$C_{L\alpha}$
PER DEG

06

05

04

03

02

EXPERIMENTAL POINTS:

UNCAMBERED WING

WITH NEGATIVE CAMBER

Experimental Points

ESTIMATE

20
MACH No

15

16

14

12

10

8

6


4

02

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C-105
CM₀ 15 MARCH NO
COMPARISON - WT & ESTIMATE

WT TESTS
ESTIMATE



359 12 KEUFFEL & ESSER CO
100 24th St. Philadelphia, Pa.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C105
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES & W.T. RESULTS

C_L vs MACH No

EXPERIMENTAL POINTS


$\alpha = 0^\circ$

$\alpha = 4^\circ$

ESTIMATE

MACH No

C_L PER DEG



389-12 MEUFFEL & ESSER CO.
10 X 10 to the 1/2 inch, 5th lines accented.
MADE IN U.S.A.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C105
CAL. WT. TESTS - SEPT 1953
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATE WITH WIND TUNNEL
CENTRE OF PRESSURE OF ELEVATOR LOAD VS. MACH NO.
UNCAMBERED WING

CP
%MAC
140

120

100

80

60

40

.4

.6

.8

1.0

1.2

1.4

1.6

1.8

2.0

MACH NO.

ESTIMATE

WIND TUNNEL

354.12 KEUFFEL & ESSER CO.
10 1/2" x 10 1/2" 1/4" thick. Tab lines provided.
3034, 10, 1, 5.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED DATE SEPT. 9/53

C105
C.A.L. W.T. TESTS SEPT. 1953
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATE WITH WIND TUNNEL
 C_{M8} (CONST. α) VS. MACH NUMBER
CG 282/MAC UNCAMBERED WING

WIND TUNNEL
O CONST. $\alpha = 0$
 Δ CONST. $\alpha = 4^\circ$


NACA RM ASZ DOIC

ESTIMATE

C_{M8} (CONSTANT α)
PER DEGREE

-0.010
-0.008
-0.006
-0.004
-0.002
0

0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2.0
MACH NO.



59-12 REUFTEL & ESSER CO.
10 3/16 to 1/4" dia. 5/16" thick. 5/16" holes needed.
M.A.S. 10-1-53

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C105
CAL. WT. TESTS SEPT. 1953
COMPARISON OF ESTIMATE WITH WIND TUNNEL
 C_{Ms} (CONSTANT Q) VS. MACH NO.
UNCAMBERED WING

C_{Ms} (CONSTANT Q)
PER DEGREE

-.010
-.008
-.006
-.004
-.002
0

WIND TUNNEL

ESTIMATE

MACH NO.

2.0
1.8
1.6
1.4
1.2
1.0
.8
.6
.4

339-12 REUFEL & ESSER CO.
10 x 10 to the 10 inch grid paper available
page 15 of 24

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFÉ

Check vs Mach Number
Cornell W-T Tests c/w
Estimated Values
 $\alpha < 6^\circ$
Configuration BCW, VR
(Uncambered.)

$\diamond \delta = -5^\circ$
 $\triangle \delta = 0^\circ$

Check %

-0.03

-0.02

-0.01

0

0.2

0.4

0.6

0.8

1.0


1.2

1.4

1.6

1.8

Mach Number



UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C_{pes} vs Mach Number


Estimation of w Cornell Tests

◇ $\alpha = 0^\circ$

△ $\alpha = 4^\circ$


-10° ≤ β ≤ 10°

Configuration BCWVR
(Uncambered)



359-12 KEUFFEL & ESSER CO.
10 x 10 to the 1/2 inch, 51B lines included.
MAY 18 9 5 A

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED



386-12 REUFFEL & ESSER CO.
10 X 16 to the 1/2 inch, 5th line accepted.
MAY 19 5 4

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED


C105
AERODYNAMIC EFFICIENCY
8.0°

CAL. WIND TUNNEL

CAMBERED WING

UNCAMBERED WING

ESTIMATE



389-12 KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. 10 X 10 for the 10 inch 2 1/2 inch diameter. MADE IN U.S.A.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED


EFFECT OF ELEVATOR DEFLECTION ON MINIMUM
DRAG COEFFICIENT

CL00

$$\left(\frac{\Delta C_{D_{min}}}{C_{D_{min}}} \right) \%$$

$$\frac{\Delta C_{D_{min}}}{C_{D_{min}}}$$

12×10^{-5}



CALC WIND TUNNEL

ESTIMATE WIND TUNNEL DATA


ESTIMATE MISSILE DATA

$-20^\circ < \delta < +10^\circ$
 $\delta = -30^\circ$

390-12 KEUFFEL & ESSER CO.
10 x 10 to the 1/2 inch, 25 lines per inch.

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIED

C105
CORNELL INT TESTS
C_L vs MACH No
UNCAMBERED WING



MACH No
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
+10
-10

UNCLASSIFIED / NON CLASSIFIÉ

DUP TANG
1258
MADE IN U.S.A.