

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 17th June 2026

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
10	2	4	3	1	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
2026064	29 Apr 26 1030	A319 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5102N 00011W 1.3NM southeast of Handcross VRP 8000ft	London TMA (A)	The A319 pilot reports that 3NM north of WILLO waypoint, on radar vectors (Gatwick control), 8500ft AMSL and descending, turning left, a disc or “flying saucer” type suspected drone was seen flying very close in the opposite direction, at the same level to them, past their right wing. Approximately 100-300ft from their aircraft wing. The object looked like a disc with darker markings on the rim, a suspected possible drone but not sure. It was very close to the aircraft, but no evasive action was required as they were in a turn already. They reported [the event] to ATC, and known drone activity was reported on the ATIS. Reported Separation: ‘very close’ Reported Risk of Collision: NR The Swanwick Centre Terminal controller reports that [the pilot of the A319] reported a drone 3NM north of WILLO at approximately 8500ft passing very close to the aircraft. The drone was described as a small flying saucer type shape. Subsequent aircraft were given warning, and nothing was seen by any other aircraft. NATS Operations Investigations Conclusion and Assessment [The pilot report was referred to.] Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of [C/S] reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible.	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 although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

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
2026065	28 Apr 26 1550	AW169 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5333N 00021W Humberside Airport 600ft	Humberside ATZ (G) (Inside the Humberside FRZ)	The AW169 pilot reports that they had been on a flight from Hornsea to Humberside with 5 pax, for a visual recovery to RW02. When on a right-base to RW02 at Humberside at approximately 600ft AGL, they passed a drone on their right side. The drone was between 20-50m away from the helicopter and 10-20ft below in altitude. They could not tell if it was moving as they passed it with 75kt IAS. The drone looked like a quadcopter with a size between 40-80cm in diameter, and a shiny material in the middle, perhaps a camera lens. Colours were grey/white/black. They reported the drone observation to ATC immediately before landing on RW02. After landing (1551), Humberside ATC called them to acquire some more details for their report. Reported Separation: 10-20ft V/20-50m H Reported Risk of Collision: 'minor' The Humberside controller reports that at 1448 on 28th April 2026 [the pilot of] an arriving AW169 helicopter reported a drone passing down the side of the aircraft at approximately 600ft when the aircraft was inside the ATZ close to right base for the runway in use RW02. No drone was spotted from the VCR either before or after the supposed incident.	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 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
2026068	3 May 26 1425	C152 (Civ FW)	Drone	5207N 00144W Lower Quinton 2500ft	London FIR (G)	The C152 pilot reports that this was reported to Wellesbourne Information primarily to make other airspace users aware of the drone operating at an altitude used commonly by light aircraft. Initially, it was thought to be a bird of prey but as it got closer the shimmer of rotors identified it as a drone. It passed down their port side 100-150ft below their level. It did not appear to change flight track from first sighting to going out of view. It was very difficult to assess its actual speed given its relative size. As it went down the port side of the aircraft the student was able to distinguish that, whilst predominantly black in colour, it had green markings. It also appeared to be somewhat elliptical in shape as if designed for a level of aerodynamic efficiency. Report raised for awareness of proximity to this unexpected aerial vehicle rather than concern about a potential collision. Reported Separation: 100-150ft V/ 0.1NM Reported Risk of Collision: Low The Wellesbourne FISO reports that the C152 departed RW36 at 1418 for a local flight. At 1425 the instructor informed Wellsborne Information that they had just passed very close to a drone, approximately 1NM east of the old aerodrome at Long Marston (4NM southwest of Wellesbourne). The Instructor confirmed it was definitely a drone (not a bird) and was black/green in colour. The C152 was operating at 2500ft and the drone passed down their left side, in the opposite direction at 2400ft.	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
2026071	09 May 26 1938	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00036W Windsor Castle 1300ft	London CTR (D) EGR156	The A320 pilot reports that, at 4.3NM on ILS 09L at 1300ft, a small blue drone was seen from the right hand seat, very close to the aircraft, certainly within one aircraft wing length. LHR Tower [controller] was informed. An exterior visual inspection was performed, nil damage. Details were given to HAL on arrival. Reported Separation: 'very close' Reported Risk of Collision: NR The Heathrow North Arrivals controller reports that at 4.3NM final approach to RW09L, [The A320 pilot] reported a drone on their right-hand side. Subsequent inbounds were warned. [The pilot] later filed an Airprox [Report]. Factual Background UK AIP ENR 5.1 EGR156 WINDSOR CASTLE SFC – 2500ft ALT Flight permitted by: any aircraft operating for or on behalf of National Police Air Service; any aircraft operating for or on behalf of The Helicopter Emergency Medical Service; any aircraft operating for or on behalf of The Maritime and Coastguard Agency for the purposes of search and rescue operations; any aircraft operating for or on behalf of The King's Helicopter Flight; any aircraft operated by a member of the Royal Family; any aircraft flying in accordance with an agreed exemption issued by, or with the permission of, the Metropolitan Police (Royalty and Special Protection); or landing in the grounds of Windsor Great Park at the invitation of the Director of Royal Travel provided that Protective Security Operations (PSO) has been informed in advance of such intended flight or landing; any aircraft approaching to, or departing from, London Heathrow Airport. NATS Heathrow Investigation [cites the above controller report]. The weather at 1920, METAR EGLL 091920Z AUTO 09010KT 9999 NCD 16/03 Q1017 NOSIG= The HAL detection unit was not activated as it was outside the 3km radius. No further investigation was required.	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
2026072	10 May 26 1010	A330 (CAT)	Drone	5119N 00025W 2NM NE OCK 4500ft	London TMA (A)	The A330 pilot reports on a SID passing 4500ft when the Captain saw a drone in the 12 o'clock that passed overhead by about 100-200ft. Reported Separation: 100-200ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: Not reported The London controller reports acting as an OJTI when the A330 pilot, just northeast of OCK, reported seeing a drone. They asked for more detail and the pilot stated it was black with 4 propellers and passed a few hundred feet [sic]. They advised the Supervisor who [passed the information on to the relevant controlling agencies]. They [also] told [the relevant] controller so they could pass information to any following [departures] and they advised any further departures before being taken out for a normal break. They passed [the information] to the incoming controller on handover.	In the Board's opinion the reported description of the object was sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone. Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 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
2026073	8 May 26 1751	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5136N 00009W 15NM NE Heathrow FL090	London TMA (A)	The A320 pilot reports that whilst climbing through FL090, a large (50cm in diameter by 30cm high) black and white object was seen passing down the right-hand side, within approximately 100ft of the aircraft. Reported Separation: NR V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High The NE Deps controller reports that [the A320 C/S] reported sighting a drone around half a metre in size and coloured black and white. The details taken and passed to GS Midlands. Reports were passed to following aircraft if necessary and no further incident was reported. A NATS Investigation reports that there were no secondary or primary responses associated with the drone visible on the radar at the 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 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
2026074	28 Apr 26 1440	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5134N 00047W Marlow 4500ft	London TMA (A)	The A321 pilot reports that, whilst in a left turn onto base leg for RW09L at LHR (over Marlow), a drone was witnessed to fly down the left-hand-side of the aircraft at close enough proximity to see details such as the colour, shape and individual props spinning. Reported Separation: 0ft V/NR H Reported Risk of Collision: NR The Swanwick TC controller (LL FIN) reports that [the pilot of the A321] had been vectored for RW09L from LAM and was turned onto a base leg for a 12NM final. As they were passing 4500ft, the pilot reported a silver, circular drone on their left-hand-side at a similar level. They advised that they would be filing an Airprox report. Subsequent aircraft were warned about the drone for 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, 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
2026075	15 May 26 1230	DJI Mini 5 Pro (Civ UAS)	Drone	5136N 00002W Banbury Reservoir <400ft AGL	London FIR (G)	The DJI Mini 5 Pro pilot reports that, whilst flying above the roof at their given coordinates, another UAS was spotted at approximately 50m AGL above and to the east of their survey area. This aircraft was being flown from a separate site to [theirs]. The DJI Mini 5 pilot continued to fly taking care to keep an eye on the [other] aircraft's movements, it appeared the pilot was capturing site progress imagery and was staying stationary during flights so didn't prove to be a large risk to their ops. The DJI Mini 5 pilot reports that they had a notification in place to other air users using Altitude Angel and this was showing on the live map, no other users had notified in any way. The Mini 5 Pro observer states that they were surveying the turbine and receiving hall roof when they looked down at an image the pilot had taken and then looked back up, noticing a second drone in the airspace nearby. The observer immediately warned the pilot, who reduced the drone's altitude and repositioned it to hover directly above their position. The observer then attempted to locate the pilot of the other drone, as they should have been within their line of sight based on the drone's position. However, they were unable to identify the pilot at that time. The other drone then moved away from the immediate location, allowing them to continue the survey safely. The observer maintained constant visual awareness to ensure the [other] drone remained clear of their working area. They note that they were able to complete the survey while the second drone operated on the far side of the new building works. The observer later managed to track the drone back to its pilot, who was located just inside the opposite building site. At one point, the observer believed that the [other] pilot may not have maintained VLOS (Visual Line of Sight), as the drone would have been positioned behind both the pilot and a high hoarding. Reported Separation: <250ft V/30m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low	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, 5 Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision due to the action taken by the DJI Mini 5 Pro remote pilot.	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
2026076	13 May 26 2148	EC135 (NPAS)	Drone	5551N 00416W Kingston Bridge VRP ~1700ft	Glasgow CTR (D)	The EC135 pilot reports that whilst on-task, a drone closed to within 50ft of the aircraft and proceeded to manoeuvre behind them. They continued their turn to maintain [visual contact] and climbed for separation by 400ft to about 2100ft. The drone matched the aircraft for about a minute before descending rapidly towards Strathclyde Loch. The drone was bird-winged in shape with red lights predominately on the upper surface and with an approximate wingspan of 0.75m. ATC was informed. Reported Separation: 'within 50ft' Reported Risk of Collision: Not reported The Glasgow controller reports that the EC135 pilot reported sighting a 'bird shaped' drone within 50ft of their aircraft, illuminated red in colour and with an estimated length of 75cm.	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 safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	B
2026084	8 May 26 1823	A321 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5141N 00007E 2NM NW LAM VOR FL145	London TMA (A)	The A321 pilot reports that, during the climb after departure from Heathrow (roughly 2NM NW of LAM VOR on an assigned radar heading of 040° at roughly FL145 with 320kt IAS and 400kt TAS) they passed a black object of unknown but significant size with no discernible features. It was at the same altitude with a separation of 30-100m (estimated based on the closing speed and angle). They did not observe a collision. [The Captain] was heads-down and did not see the object. No further action was taken. Reported Separation: 0ft V/30m H Reported Risk of Collision: NR NATS Safety Investigations report that analysis of the radar [replay] indicated that there were no associated primary or secondary contacts associated with the pilot's report [of the object], 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, 5 Risk: The Board considered that there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.	D

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)	