

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 15th May 2019

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
12	7	2	2	1	0

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2019048	28 Mar 19 1638	B737 (CAT)	Drone	5342N 00142W Carr Gate 4000ft	Leeds Bradford CTA (D)	<p>The B737 pilot reports that they were descending under Radar Control when the crew saw a white, blue and yellow drone flash past the flight deck window, very close above and to the left. The crew assessed that it passed between the flight deck window and the left wingtip at about the same height as the vertical stabiliser. The incident was reported to ATC, who were aware of some recent activity in that area. The aircraft was also inspected for damage, with none found.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 6ft V/3m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and in controlled airspace such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the B737.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2019050	30 Mar 19 1409	B787 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5134N 00009W Highgate 6000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that a red coloured object passed down the right hand side of the aircraft. It was impossible to identify the object although it was large enough to cause concern. LHR approach were informed and an uneventful approach and landing followed.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/<100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The Board were unable to determine the nature of the object reported and so agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a conflict in Class A.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2019052	30 Mar 19 1056	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00011W Heathrow 3000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that he was established on the localiser for RW27 when he saw a drone pass underneath and slightly right of his aircraft. The drone had a yellow body and black propellers. It was reported to ATC and the police met the aircraft on arrival.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/NK H</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and in controlled airspace such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2019054	1 Apr 19 1544	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5141N 00012W 5nm SE BPK 6000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that they had departed Heathrow and, just south of BPK, he saw a black round drone with bright blue LED lights pass very close to the aircraft. There was no time to react.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 20m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p> <p>The Swanwick Controller reports that the A320 pilot reported seeing a drone at 6000ft when approximately 5nm southeast BPK. He described it as 2-3ft in diameter, black with blue neon lights.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and in controlled airspace such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2019057	7 Apr 19 1837	ATR72 (CAT)	Drone	5131N 00244W Avonmouth FL078	Bristol CTA (D)	<p>The ATR72 pilot reports in a normal climb when he noticed a possible object in the distance. He asked the FO to verify what it was. It was identified as a small black quadcopter about 2sec prior to passing overhead. ATC were notified and the flight continued normally.</p> <p>The Cardiff Controller reports the ATR72 was passing above Avonmouth own navigation when the pilot reported passing in close proximity to a drone. No other radar return was seen. The controller notified the Bristol Radar controller and an aircraft inbound to Bristol of the report, with a radar heading to pass 6nm to the west of the reported position before transfer to Bristol. He then advised the Watch Manager. Bristol reported the incident to their local policing unit.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 30ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and in controlled airspace such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the ATR72.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2019063	12 Apr 19 1820	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5105N 00035W 15nm WSW Gatwick FL098	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports in the climb when the FO saw an object above and in front of the aircraft. The object appeared to be a large black quadcopter, which passed above and slightly to the right.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 50-100ft V/10-20m Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and in controlled airspace such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2019067	15 Apr 19 1714	A330 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5139N 00010E LAM FL080	London TMA (A)	<p>The A330 pilot reports they were level in the LAM hold when a 'dark static object', most likely a drone, passed below.</p> <p>Reported Separation: ~500ft V/ 0m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The Board were unable to determine the nature of the object reported and so agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a conflict in Class A.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2019068	18 Apr 19 1445	Tutor (HQ Air Trg)	Drone	5216N 00127W 3nm SE Warwick 1100ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The Tutor pilot reports that they were conducting a low-level navigational exercise. About halfway through the sortie they turned to head east, when the student spotted a drone and took immediate avoiding action by making a climbing turn to the right. As he did this the instructor saw the drone pass down the left-hand side of the aircraft. The drone had grey and orange markings and was estimated to have been 75cm in diameter. Had the student not taken avoiding action they would have collided with the drone.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 20m H Reported Risk of Collision: Very High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the Tutor.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident and the fact that avoiding action was taken portrayed a situation where safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</p>	B
2019069	20 Apr 19 1055	PA28 (Civ FW)	Drone	5347N 00113W Sherburn-in-Elmet 1000ft	Sherburn ATZ (G)	<p>The PA28 pilot reports returning to base from a pleasure flight with two (non-pilot) passengers. He had descended deadside on to crosswind and was looking to turn right on to downwind when he glanced left out of the cockpit and saw an object which he first thought was a bird but quickly deduced was a small rectangular drone. The pilot noted that this was at a critical stage of flight as he was aware of another aircraft which had performed a touch and go and which would potentially be at a similar downwind position. He should have been looking right rather than being distracted to the left by the drone and consequently felt rushed during the remainder of the approach until established on a stabilised final.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/50m H Reported Risk of Collision: None</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the maximum permitted height of 400ft and within the lateral and vertical limits of an FRZ such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the PA28.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2019073	23 Apr 19 1812	A321 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5328N 00135W 20nm W Doncaster FL100	Airway L975 (A)	<p>The A321 pilot reports that they were at FL100 passing abeam waypoint ELNOD when both the flight crew observed what appeared to be a drone pass directly overhead the aircraft. They estimated that it passed 20-30 ft above it. They concluded that it must have been a drone because it was a solid, dark mass and square in shape.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 20-30ft V/ 0m H</p> <p>The Manchester Controller reported that the A321 pilot reported that they may have passed a black drone on climbing through FL100. A primary return was visible on the radar so he turned the following aircraft away to keep it clear.</p>	<p>Cause: The Board were unable to determine the nature of the object reported and so agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a conflict in Class A.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2019076	21 Apr 19 1310	B737 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5244N 00119W 5nm S EME NDB 6000ft	East Midlands CTA (D)	<p>The B737 pilot reports that he was on a westerly heading, descending downwind to East Midlands Airport when he spotted what initially appeared to be a bird. First sighting was through the front right-hand window. Almost immediately he realised it was a drone because it was too large for a bird and was reflecting sunlight. The drone passed very close, down the right-hand side and was gone in a matter of seconds. ATC were notified.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 50m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The Board were unable to determine the nature of the object reported and so agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a conflict in Class D.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</p>	B

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2019080	21 Apr 19 1209	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5554N 00422W Glasgow Airport 1000ft	Glasgow CTR (D)	<p>The A321 pilot reports that he was on the ILS for RW23 Glasgow passing about 1000ft when a drone flew beneath him. The drone was estimated to be at approximately 200-400ft, and was about 400-600ft below them. It was flying left to right at a relatively high speed and being flown over an open grass area between Drumchapel and Bearsden built up residential and commercial areas below the final approach to Glasgow. There was insufficient time to take any avoiding action, but a collision risk did not exist. The drone was white and assessed to be a DJI Phantom type quadcopter.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 600ft V/ 0m H Reported Risk of Collision: None.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown either just within, or near the lateral limit of the Glasgow FRZ. Because the Board were not able positively to determine whether the drone was within the FRZ, they agreed that the incident was best described as a sighting report.</p> <p>Risk: The Board did not believe there was a risk of collision, but, because they could not determine whether the drone was inside or outside the FRZ, they were unable positively to determine whether normal procedures had pertained (Category E) or whether, if it were inside the FRZ, safety had been reduced (Category C) therefore they assessed that there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D