

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 15th July 2026

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
12	4	3	4	0	1

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
2026077	21 May 26 1130	Atlas (HQ Air (Ops))	Drone	5205N 00239W 2.5NM E of Hereford 400ft AGL	London FIR (G)	The Atlas pilot reports that they were the handling pilot and Captain in the left hand seat (CM1) with a trainee co-pilot in the right hand seat (CM2) and trainee Captain in the middle seat (CM3) conducting a low level simulated air drop procedure at approximately 400ft AGL with 2 passes planned. The aircraft was in air drop configuration with the ramp and door open and three loadmasters positioned on the ramp. Just prior to the beginning of the run in for the airdrop, CM3 called that they had spotted a 'drone' co-altitude to the left of the aircraft, CM1 and CM2 were not visual, CM3 then called that the current heading would keep the aircraft clear. CM3 followed the contact as it passed down the left hand side of the aircraft, one of the loadmasters then called that they had visual and that it was co-altitude and approximately 100ft away, after several seconds the loadmaster then called that the aircraft was clear of the conflict, the simulated airdrop was cancelled, as was the planned second pass. The position was marked and the aircraft continued with the planned sortie with nothing further to report. The drone was described as a small to midsize grey/black quadcopter. Of note several UAS NOTAM's had been briefed pre-flight close to the planned route, but none were present on the planning system at the position of the incident. They were on the Low Level Common frequency, and not in receipt of a FIS. Reported Separation: 0ft V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 7 Risk: The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	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
2026083	21 May 26 1602	FA20 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5436N 00103W Dormanstown 1500ft	London FIR (G)	The FA20 pilot reports that when on a VFR recovery, they spotted what they considered initially to be a large black bird. It passed approximately 100ft above and 100ft to the left of the aircraft, at which time they noticed it was a man-made object. It was black with rotors. They assessed, based on its appearance, it was a quadcopter UAS. Reported Separation: 100ft V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High The Teesside controller reports that the FA20 had been cleared to enter Teesside CAS VFR. At 1602 the aircraft was just east of the Redcar Racecourse VRP when they reported a sighting of a drone. The drone was at approximately 1600ft altitude. The FA20 landed without incident at 1608. In a subsequent telephone call after landing, the sighting pilot stated the drone passed approximately 100ft above and less 100ft left abeam of the FA20 and was "of a black, large size and possibly a quadcopter design". Subsequent VFR traffic in the area was warned of the presence of the sighted drone and was vectored away from the immediate area and Traffic Information passed. The Teesside Investigation reports that at 1602:21 the FA20 pilot, who was receiving a Basic Service from Teesside Radar, was just east of the Redcar Racecourse VRP when the pilot called "<i>drone flight in this location 1600 feet</i>" the FA20 was indicating 1500ft at that time. No primary contact could be seen on the surveillance display and the drone report acknowledged by ATC.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 4, 7 Risk: The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	B

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
2026086	22 May 26 1525	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5110N 00006W Smallfield 1000ft	Gatwick CTR (D)	The A320 pilot reports on final approach to Gatwick RW26L, at approximately 3 miles and 1000ft AGL, when the Captain saw a drone fly past at a similar altitude and crossing their flightpath. The FO was manually flying the approach at that stage. The Captain saw an object flying just below the aircraft out to the right-hand side and noticed it moving at high speed across the aircraft's flightpath from right to left. They first thought it may be a bird, but noted it was travelling too quickly to be a bird. They noticed the object approaching and as it passed across in front of the aircraft and passed the left side flight-deck window confirmed that the object was a drone. The distance from the aircraft was unknown, but the Captain perceived it to pass approximately 10-20m in front of the aircraft. The drone was a large professional sized drone, grey/brown in colour with 4 black propellers. Location of [the Airprox] was approximately 3 miles from the RW26L threshold. Weather conditions at the time were daylight VMC, 10k+ visibility and no cloud. The drone continued past the aircraft without making any contact with the aircraft. The flight crew immediately reported it to the Gatwick Tower controller. Airfield operations attended the aircraft after parking on stand, asked for a brief report on what had been seen, and they were advised that drones had not been detected on a drone detection device. The Captain confirmed that it was definitely a drone. Flight crew was in receipt of Gatwick DATIS which had no reports of possible drone activity, nor was a verbal warning given by ATC that drones were operating in the area. Reported Separation: NK Reported Risk of Collision: NR	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A

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
						Gatwick ATSU reports [the A320 pilot] reported a 'brown' drone pass in front of them at 1000ft/3 miles, whilst on approach to RW26L. The controller informed the Supervisor, and movements were temporarily stopped until a threat assessment could be conducted and the controller could obtain further information from the crew. After [the A320] landed, the controller obtained further information and liaised with the Supervisor and coordinated with Radar. A controller handover commenced and movements resumed approximately 10min later.		
2026087	26 May 26 1415	Prefect (HQ Air (Trg))	Drone	5310N 00011W ~3NM NW Horncastle 9000ft	London FIR (G)	The Prefect pilot reports that, having levelled off at 9000ft in Sector 2 on a heading of 030° 3NM SW of Horncastle, a drone was sighted about 200m to the right and slightly ahead of the wing, approximately 300ft below. It was cruciform in shape and silver/grey in colour. It was obscured by the wing for a few seconds and then reappeared behind the wing. Shortly after this [the pilot] lost sight of the object. They would estimate the size to be 1m tip-to-tip. The sighting was reported to Cranwell Departures, and the sortie was continued without further incident. Reported Separation: 300ft V/200m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium The TATCC (Terminal Air Traffic Control Centre) reported the sighting to civil police. Nothing [had been] painting on radar.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 4, 5 Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

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
2026088	27 May 26 1326	E190 (CAT)	Drone	5126N 00000E 4.5NM SSW London City 2000ft	London City CTR (D)	The E190 pilot reports that, during the approach to RW09 at London City airport, maintaining approximately 2000ft, the First Officer observed a drone on the right-hand-side of the aircraft. The drone was sighted approximately 200-300ft below the aircraft and was observed for an estimated 1-2sec. The object appeared to be a relatively large drone displaying a red colour casing. Due to the brief sighting duration, no further identifying characteristics could be determined. At the time of the sighting, the aircraft was on the approach in daylight, with normal cockpit workload. No evasive manoeuvre was considered necessary due to the relative position and short observation time. No TCAS indications or other aircraft system alerts were generated. Thames Radar was informed immediately following the sighting. No additional drone sightings were made during the remainder of the approach and landing. Reported Separation: 200ft V/200m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium NATS Operations Safety Performance and Investigations report that [the E190] was downwind, approximately 5NM southwest of London City airport at 2000ft, when the pilot reported a red drone on the right side approximately 200-300ft below. The controller alerted the GS who passed details on to London City Tower. Safety Investigations was subsequently informed that the pilot had filed the event as an Airprox. Analysis of the radar by Safety Investigations indicated that there were no primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

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
2026093	30 May 26 1455	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5133N 00214W BRI/060R/24NM FL080	Cotswold CTA (A)	The A320 pilot reports that [on initial Approach to Bristol airport] they saw a possible Drone/Object in close proximity to the aircraft. No avoiding action was taken as it was viewed as beneath them and seen quite late. Reported Separation: 200ft V/1NM H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium The Bristol Radar controller reports that they had been operating as the radar controller (combined function) with RW27 in use. [A320 C/S], an inbound A320 (ICTAM 1B STAR), was vectored (initial HDG 240°) and descended to FL80 towards Bristol Airport. On exiting the CTA 3/14 boundaries they were provided with descent (in CTA 8) and further vectors into Bristol Airport. There were numerous targets operating outside CAS (SSR returns). Whilst on final approach the crew described a TCAS TA event received earlier whilst at FL80, and the sighting "something that looked like a drone" [pilots words] approximately 1000ft below them at the time. they asked the crew If they intended to file an Airprox which they indicated they may [this was not completed on the frequency at the time]. The pilots subsequently filed an Airprox once on the ground and relayed the following information via the landline to OSS at 1520 [recording held]. The controller recalled one 7000 NMC target in the immediate vicinity just before descent from FL80 was given, [Crew report - Airprox POMAX FL80, [TCAS] diamond - no readout / [Drone] - less than 1000ft, black/blue, quite large, right hand side, big black chunky - jetpack - wheelie case size].	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 5 Risk: The Board considered that normal procedures and/or safety standards had applied.	E

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
2026097	1 Jun 26 1032	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5135N 00004W Stamford Hill 6500ft	London TMA (A)	The A320 pilot reports descending through roughly 6500ft downwind to RW27R, [when] a black object passed to the left of the flight deck [by] no more than a few metres. The FO was heads down at the time so just saw a black streak out the corner of their eye. The Captain was PF and it caused them to duck [due to its proximity]. [They were not] able to see any detail within the object. Reported Separation: 'a few metres' Reported Risk of Collision: High The NATS Investigation reported that 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.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 6 Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A

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
2026098	5 Jun 26 1032	Hawk (HQ Air (Trg))	Drones	5417N 00130W 0.5NM SSE of RW34 threshold, Leeming 700ft	Leeming ATZ (G)	The Hawk pilot reports that they were the non-handling pilot of the lead aircraft. They were on the final turn of their last circuit to land, they saw what they believed to be 2 small quadcopters, white in colour, hovering inside their turn radius at around 200ft AGL, with no relative motion to them. They continued their approach to land with nothing further to report. Reported Separation: 500ft V/300m H Reported Risk of Collision: High The Leeming Ground controller reports that a recovering formation of station-based fast jets had joined the circuit and then landed on RW34RH. The aircraft were given instruction to taxi back to ASP1 crossing RW21/03. Whilst taxiing along Alpha the formation informed them that they had seen drone activity underneath the circuit south of the roundabout that leads directly to the main entrance to the camp; two white quadcopter drones perceived to be not above 200ft in height. As the Ground controller they passed the information to the ATC Supervisor who advised that the Station should be informed. They passed the information to [the relevant authorities who conducted] two patrols of the area but did not witness any drone activity. They called a company, who were based in the area that the drones were reported but they did not know about any activity. The Aerodrome controller (ADC) passed the information about the drones to all aircraft joining until the ATC Supervisor called and informed them that no further drone activity had been sighted in the area, at which point the ADC stopped passing the information.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 3, 4, 5 Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

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
2026104	27 May 26 0929	C172 (Civ FW)	Balloon	5126N 00057W Reading 1700ft	London FIR (G)	The C172 pilot reports that they saw a small, circular, reflective object with a hollow centre. No distinct rotors or motors were observed. It was about 1-2ft diameter and at circa 1700ft AMSL. It passed low and to their left. It appeared to be travelling in the opposite direction as the closing speed seemed higher than their airspeed alone. No action was necessary as it was not converging. They alerted the Farnborough controller who was providing them with a Basic Service. Reported Separation: 50ft V/50ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Low The Farnborough LARS West and Zone controller reports that [the pilot of the C172] was on a flight from [...] to [...] on the Farnborough listening squawk, overflying Reading. The pilot called on frequency to report a drone flying in close proximity to their aircraft. The aircraft was at an altitude of 1700ft, and they reported that a circular shaped drone had just flown under the aircraft's wing at 1700ft. No other pilot reports were passed. NATS Operations Safety Performance and Investigations report that, analysis of the radar by Safety Investigations indicated that there were no primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it was probably a balloon. Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 6 Risk: The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	B

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
2026105	6 Jun 26 0835	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00026W Heathrow RW09 300-400ft	London CTR (D)	The B787 pilot reports that, just after airborne when taking off on RW09R at approximately 300-to-400ft prior to selecting the auto pilot. As pilot flying from the P2 seat, a drone was spotted. Initial thoughts were bird however it was quite clearly in the hover, approximate size of a football mostly white in colour. Estimate of about a 50ft clearance vertically above the aircraft wing as they passed. It was on the port side. Unsure of lateral displacement, but close enough to visually identify clearly whilst travelling at 170kt on climbout. There is no doubt in the P2's mind that it was a drone. Reported Separation: 50ft V / 'close' H Reported Risk of Collision: N/R The Heathrow VCR Supervisor reports that this report was filed on behalf of the Air South Departures controller. The pilot of [B787 C/S] reported a 'possible' drone sighting to the Air Departures controller. The crew stated that it was just after lift-off, around 100 feet on the left hand side of the aircraft. Nothing was sighted from the Tower, and no alerts were triggered on the HAL drone detection system. The warning was passed to following aircraft and no further reports were received. The police were informed.	Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 3, 4, 7 Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A

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
2026107	8 Jun 26 2008	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5120N 00037W Chobham 5500ft	London TMA (A)	The B787 pilot reports they had departed Heathrow RW27L on a MAX1T1G departure. Initial left turn completed and [on] handover to London Control [they were given] a radar heading of approximately 210°. After rollout on this heading, First Officer noted a drone pass down the right of the aircraft, about 5m away and slightly higher than the flightdeck windows but lower than the top of the tail. Sighting was too late and too fast to take any avoiding action. Drone was approximately 1m in diameter, of light colour with some dark contrast. [ATC] was contacted and other traffic were advised of a drone in the area. [A following CAT] flight noted the drone at approximately 5000ft. Reported Separation: 5ft V/5m H Reported Risk of Collision: High The Swanwick controller reports [the B787 pilot] reported the FO had seen a drone on the right side at approximately 5500ft over Woking. [Another CAT flight] departed behind, same route and drone Traffic Information was passed. [They] said [they] could also see it, same altitude and location. Drone reported to be about 1m in length and a cream/white colour. Third departure said [they] could not see it. Heathrow Tower was informed to pass [drone Traffic Information] to departures. Information was passed to ATCO taking over and police informed.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A

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
2026108	12 Jun 26 0753	A330 (CAT)	Drone	5122N 00012W IVO Sutton 6200ft	London TMA (A)	The A330 pilot reports that at 6200ft, 220kt descending, right downwind RW27L, the FO pointed out a drone to the left of the aircraft, they could see the lights and black colour clearly. The Captain only saw it when it passed about same altitude and a maximum of 200 to 300m away, by their left wing, through the rear left flight deck window. They informed LHR via radio and police met the aircraft to take all the information. Reported Separation: 0ft V/200-300m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium A NATS Investigation reports that the pilot reported that a drone had passed down their left-hand side when passing approximately 6200ft. When asked to describe the drone, they advised "<i>It was a small one, I couldn't really tell you, it was flashing and black and green in colour</i>". The LL FIN controller informed the GS AIR and transmitted drone information on the frequency for the following 30min.	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. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

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)	