

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 5th November 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
3	1	2	0	0	0

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2025204	3 Sep 25 1436	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5120N 00000E BIG Hold FL110	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that they were in the hold for approach to LHR, when a large drone passed very closely down the left-hand side of the aircraft, in very close proximity.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Swanwick controller reports that the B787 pilot was on the outbound leg of the BIG Hold when they reported seeing a drone off the left-hand-side. The controller asked for a description of the drone and the distance, to which the pilot reported silver and “<i>pretty close</i>”.</p> <p>A general broadcast was made and another pilot in confirmed that they were also visual with the drone. Subsequent aircraft were vectored towards the OCK Hold and Heathrow police were informed.</p> <p>A NATS Investigation reports that the B787 pilot reported that the drone passed down their left-hand side at the same level which was “<i>pretty close</i>”. The INT S controller issued an all-stations broadcast with position and level of the reported drone, the pilot of [another aircraft] then reported that they were “<i>visual with it right now</i>” at 1437:20 and stated that it was at a similar level to the B787. Due to the presence of the drone, one aircraft in the BIG Hold and following aircraft inbound to the BIG Hold were vectored to hold at OCK. Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	B

¹ Latitude and Longitude are usually only estimates that are based on the reported time of occurrence mapped against any available radar data for the aircraft's position at that time. Because such reported times may be inaccurate, the associated latitudes and longitudes should therefore not be relied upon as precise locations of the event.

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2025211	24 Sep 25 0857	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5133N 00256W 3NM SE Newport FL050	Bristol CTA (D)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that a black object passed under their aircraft [when at] around 5000ft under radar vectors. The object was approximately 50-100ft below. The object was half a metre long and possibly travelling south-to-north.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 50ft V/NR H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Bristol controller reports that [the pilot of the A320] reported something passing below their aircraft but provided no further information and could not identify it.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 6</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	B
2025217	01 Oct 25 1154	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5130N 00003E IVO Greenwich 6200ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that on base leg to LHR, 6000ft approximately 18NM from threshold they spotted a large drone in their 1 o'clock position, heading toward them at extremely close range, they thought they were certain to hit it. It was a large drone, black and white, and unlit. This drone was the biggest drone they had seen, it would have caused significant damage if they were to hit it. They reported it immediately to ATC. Any drone sighting they have had before have been small drones but this was unlike anything they had seen before and it had scared them!</p> <p>Reported Separation: NR Reported Risk of Collision: <i>"just missed it"</i>.</p> <p>The Heathrow Final Director (LL FIN) reports that the pilot of [the A320] submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of a drone whilst approximately 1.6NM west of London City Airport. It has been estimated that the UAS was at 6000ft. Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of [the A320] reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible. The [A320] was 1.6NM bearing 258° from London City Airport (approximate coordinates 513021N 0000317E) when the sighting was reported, within the confines of the London TMA (Class A). The reporting aircraft was an Airbus A320 inbound to RW27L at Heathrow</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that 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	Location¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						<p>The time of the encounter was 1154:17 UTC. At the time of the report [the A320 was indicating 6200ft on the London QNH of 1028hPa. The pilot reported to the controller that the drone had passed beneath them.</p> <p>Analysis of the radar by Safety Investigations indicated that there were no associated primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report, visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.</p>		

Relevant Contributory Factor (CF) Table

CF	Factor	Description	ECCAIRS Amplification	UKAB Amplification
	Flight Elements			
	• Regulations, Processes, Procedures and Compliance			
1	Human Factors	• Flight Crew ATM Procedure Deviation	An event involving the drone operator deviating from applicable Air Traffic Management procedures	If the reported object was a drone, then the drone operator did not comply with regulations by flying above 400ft and/or in controlled airspace/FRZ without clearance
	• Tactical Planning and Execution			
2	Human Factors	• Action Performed Incorrectly	Events involving the drone operator performing the selected action incorrectly	If the reported object was a drone, then the drone operator was flying above 400ft without clearance.
3	Human Factors	• Airspace Infringement	An event involving an infringement / unauthorized penetration of a controlled or restricted airspace	If the reported object was a drone, then the drone pilot was flying in controlled airspace/FRZ without clearance.
	• Situational Awareness of the Conflicting Aircraft and Action			
4	Contextual	• Situational Awareness and Sensory Events	Events involving a flight crew's awareness and perception of situations	Pilot had no, generic, or late Situational Awareness
	• See and Avoid			
5	Human Factors	• Perception of Visual Information	Events involving flight crew incorrectly perceiving a situation visually and then taking the wrong course of action or path of movement	Pilot was concerned by the proximity of the other aircraft
	• Outcome Events			
6	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with Other Airborne Object	An event involving a near collision by an aircraft with an unpiloted airborne object (unknown object or balloon)	
7	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with RPAS	An event involving a near collision with a remotely piloted air vehicle (drone or model aircraft)	