

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 16th July 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
9	4	0	4	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
2025038	26 Mar 25 2147 (night)	Bell 429 (HEMS)	Drone	5111N 00154W Shrewton ~900ft Alt Terrain in that area is roughly 122m (400ft). Aircraft and Drone height was therefore approximately 500ft AGL	D125 (Danger Area)	THE BELL 429 PILOT reports that the crew were tasked at night with a HEMS mission in Salisbury on the opposite side of Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA) to their base in [...]. As there was an active exercise taking place with a Joint Tactical Air Controller (JTAC) controlling aircraft, the pilot rang the JTAC directly and discussed their need to cross the plain via the Lavington to Shrewton low level route. The JTAC indicated that they would get all aircraft and drones in the danger area a minimum of 1km away from the route and would confirm by radio this had occurred before their helicopter entered the danger area. The Bell 429 pilot reports that they departed [...] using [the Night Vision Imaging System] (NVIS) with conditions being clear skies but no moon. They received the all clear from the JTAC on Salisbury Ops 122.755MHz and proceeded along the standard route. As they approached Shrewton at 550ft AGL to exit the SPTA, the Technical Crew Member (TCM) in the LHS saw an unusual light in the vicinity of Shrewton. They tried to determine the source of the light as they had approached Shrewton, lifting their head to see what the natural colour of the lights were off-NVIS. The TCM began to see some parallax with the lights not moving while the background did and immediately brought the attention of the rest of the crew to the light and identified it as a [small multi-copter] drone. They quickly assessed there had been an increasing rate of change in aspect on the drone lights so did not call for a break manoeuvre (a good call given the low altitude they had been at). The drone lights continued to change in aspect and the drone passed level with the cockpit around 200m to the left of the	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

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
						<p>aircraft's path a few seconds later. The approximate location of the drone was SU06724384. They immediately reported the drone via VHF to the JTAC. The Bell 429 pilot notes that they subsequently aborted the mission over Salisbury due to a reduction in visibility on the ground and elected not to transit back along the low-level route and instead went via Warminster. They reported the drone on landing to the JTAC for further reporting via SPTA as civilian drones are not permitted within the SPTA danger area. They had received the call that all the drones in the SPTA were clear so it was natural to second guess what they initially saw and this may have delayed their reaction to the threat.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/200m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>THE SALISBURY PLAIN TRAINING AREA JOINT TERMINAL ATTACK CONTROLLER (JTAC) reports that [the Bell 429 pilot] called prior to take-off to say they wanted to fly down the A360 and to which [the JTAC] said "YES". [The JTAC then noted that] it did not take long to [ensure military] drones were [landed] and that [one drone] had been kept 2km to the west of the flying route but when the Bell 429 pilot left the SPTA to the south they reported one small UAV at the same height as themselves (500ft AGL) about 200-300m away (over Shrewton). Luckily the Bell 429 was tracking to the side of the town. This had happened in the vicinity of SU 0700 4364 (Shrewton).</p> <p>THE SPTA TSO (AT HQ SPTA) reports that SPTA Air Ops had no involvement in the incident as they had been closed. The Drone involved in the incident was reported to the CRTC JTAC-I on the ground on 122.755MHz (Salisbury Information Secondary Freq) by the Bell 429 pilot. The location of the Drone sighting was outside the Salisbury Plain Training Area.</p> <p>The SPTA TSO adds that SPTA airspace also includes civilian areas outside SPTA in which 'Salisbury Information' has very little control. SPTA Air Ops does try to enforce with the local population that drone users are to request drone flights</p>		

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
						<p>following normal SPTA Air Ops booking procedures. If the drone user in this event had requested to operate through SPTA Air Ops, and followed correct booking procedures, the details of the drone would have been on SPTA Air Ops out-of-hours brief and the Bell 429 pilot would have been made aware of the location of the drone.</p> <p>All Military RPAS flying takes place inside the Ground Training Area boundary which was what the JTAC had been referring to when they had passed that 'the route was clear of all other aircraft' to the Bell 429 crew.</p>		
2025084	28 Apr 25 1936	B787 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5137N 00034W 3NM NW Denham FL70	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that a drone was spotted passing down the left side of the aircraft at 7000ft, downwind for RW09L.</p> <p>Reported Separation: NR Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Heathrow INT North controller reports that they have no recollection of the event.</p> <p>NATS Safety Investigations report that the pilot of [the B787] reported to the LL INT North controller, <i>"there's a drone, just passed in our ten o'clock position. We think it was a drone down our left side just about seven thousand"</i>.</p> <p>Analysis of the radar replay indicated that there were no primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.</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, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D
2025088	15 May 25 1720	Dauphin (JAC)	Model aircraft	5134N 00018W Northwick Park 1700ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The Dauphin pilot reports that during the top of climb cruise (1700ft AMSL) routing out of the London TMA (approx 2NM northwest of Wembley Stadium VRP) a potential conflict was identified and raised to the crew, initially as a bird. Once the object got closer, it was evident this was a winged UAV, approximately 1.5m in length. The UAV passed approximately 100ft below and 300m from the aircraft (1600ft AMSL ivo Northwick Park Station). The location and altitude of the UAV were passed to Heathrow Radar. The sortie was continued without further incident.</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 model aircraft.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1 ,2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	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
						<p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/ 300m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p> <p>The Special VFR Controller reports that [the Dauphin pilot] reported a possible drone in the vicinity of Greenhill, near to Northwick station at around 1720 UTC. [The controller] asked [another pilot] if they could see anything when they flew past the area, and they didn't see anything.</p> <p>A NATS Investigation reports the Dauphin pilot submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of drone whilst approximately 2NM North-West of Wembley VRP, in the vicinity of Northwick Park station. The pilot reported that the drone was white and approximately 1.5m in length.</p> <p>It has been estimated that the UAS was at 1600ft. 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>A JAC Investigation reports that no NOTAMs or any other source of information were available during planning to inform [the crew] of the presence of any UAV activity in this area. Also no aids alerted them of it approaching at the time. It was purely their visual lookout which drew their attention to its presence. ATC was not aware of it either when they raised it on the radio.</p> <p>The crew felt no need to take any evasive action as they were comfortable that they had seen it and could ascertain that it would pass safely down their side, however, they also felt that there were no other barriers that would have guaranteed this had they not seen it.</p>		
2025106	04 Jun 25 1401	ATR72 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5330N 00210W 12NM NNE Manchester Airport 5000ft	Manchester CTR (D)	<p>The ATR72 pilot reports that they had been downwind right for VOR DME RW23R at 5000ft QNH1003 Hdg 150°. Both pilots spotted an object in-front of the aircraft at exactly the same level. It passed very close down the left hand side within a few metres (5-10) of the port wingtip. It appeared to be a rectangular box shape with legs/skids beneath and a small balloon on-top. The whole structure was</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>	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
						<p>approximately 1m tall. On checking the internet it looked like a "helium assist" type drone. They think the balloon was black with gold stripes and the rest of the structure was black. ATC informed and phone call report made on ground. It would have caused significant damage if it had hit the aircraft. Looking at the wingtip from the FD, it straddled the top and bottom surface of the wing exactly as it passed.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/5-10m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Manchester Controller reports that the ATR72 was established for an ILS approach for RW23R. Passing 7.5NM from touchdown, the pilot reported passing in close proximity to an unknown object that may have been a drone. Upon receipt of this information, all following arrivals were warned by A/R or Manchester approach. No further sightings were reported.</p>	Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	
2025107	19 May 25 1809	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	N5132 00004W E Central London FL90	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that the flight departed from LHR RW09R, on the BPK6J SID initially and then an eastbound heading over London. Whilst over central London at FL90 in clear skies at a speed of 250kt IAS, both the Captain and First Officer saw a bright white object pass overhead from the opposite direction. The object appeared to be approximately 2-3m in size at the very least, it may have been larger as it filled a good proportion of the windshield. There was no appreciable separation vertical or horizontal. The First Officer observed that it was triangular in shape. The Captain only saw the object for a second or two in peripheral vision so could not reliably comment on the shape. No markings were identified. The object did not appear on TCAS. The encounter was immediately reported to London control</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10m V (above) Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Swanwick TC Radar controller (NE departures) reports that at 1810 [the A320 pilot] reported a drone sighting at FL90, 10NM west of</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>	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
						<p>[London City Airport], it was grey. This information was passed on to Heathrow Approach also.</p> <p>The NATS Safety Investigation reports that the pilot of [the A320] reported that an object passed within about 10m of the aircraft as they were passing 9000ft, approximately 5NM west-northwest of London City Airport. Safety Investigations was subsequently informed by the UK Airprox Board that the event had been submitted as a drone Airprox. The pilot stated that the object “<i>went over us, probably within about 10 metres</i>”. The NE DEPS controller informed the Heathrow Intermediate Director, the Heathrow Tower Supervisor was also informed.</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> <p>They concluded that the pilot of [the A320] submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of a drone whilst approximately 5NM west-northwest of London City airport.</p> <p>It has been estimated that the UAS was at 9000ft. 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.</p> <p>UKAB Secretariat reports that an analysis of the NATS radar replay was undertaken and a single primary return was seen at 0.2NM ahead of the A320 to the east of Central London at 1808:50 when the A320 had been at 9200ft. There were no further similar returns detected on radar.</p>		
2025110	10 Jun 25 0956	EMB190 (CAT)	Drone	5130N 00017E Thurrock 3000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The ERJ190 pilot reports that during the approach, at 3000ft and approx 7.5 DME, a yellow and black quadcopter drone was spotted below and in front of the aircraft. They estimated that it passed 20ft below the nose, travelling from ahead to slightly right, passing between the aircraft and engine 2. An ATC report was made and police report filed.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 20ft V/0m H</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	Location ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						Reported Risk of Collision: NR		
2025111	08 Jun 25 0803	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00009W 11NM final RW27R Heathrow 3400ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that a drone was sighted as it passed within approximately 100ft laterally from the left-hand side of the aircraft and at a similar altitude to the aircraft on the final approach to RW27R at Heathrow</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/<100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Swanwick TC Radar controller reports that [the B787] was making an approach for RW27R into [Heathrow]. They had just instructed the pilot to transfer to the Tower frequency when they reported seeing a drone off the left-hand-side close to the aircraft. At the time no returns were visible on radar. They asked for a description of the drone and informed subsequent aircraft. Details were passed on to the GS Airports for further dissemination.</p> <p>The B787's position was noted at 10NM final for 27R at Heathrow at an altitude of 3900ft</p> <p>The NATS Safety Investigation reports the sector was Heathrow Final Director (LL FIN) with the flight conducted in the London TMA Class A airspace. At the time of the pilot's report [the B787] was passing 3400ft. The pilot stated that the drone passed very close to the aircraft, <i>"less than one hundred feet away"</i>. The controller passed details of the report to following arrival [aircraft] and made an 'all stations' broadcast with information on the position of the reported drone. The controller also informed the GS Airports for further dissemination. 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. Their conclusion and assessment were that the pilot of [the B787] submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of a drone whilst at approximately 11NM on final approach for RW27R at Heathrow. It has been estimated that the UAS was at 3400ft.</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	Location ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of [the B787] reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible.		
2025113	15 Jun 25 0901	DR400 (Civ FW)	Drone	5150N 00038E 2NM N Witham 2100ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The DR400 pilot reports that upon reaching cruise altitude of circa 2100ft QNH 1021hPa , a red drone passed them (at same altitude) to their port side at a an approximate distance of 100ft. They reported the incident to Southend Radar.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>A Southend Investigation reports that at the time of the reported Airprox (0901), [the DR400 pilot] was not in communication with Southend Radar and was squawking 7000 (VFR conspicuity). There was no other radar contact that could have been a drone IVO of the DR400 displayed on the radar.</p> <p>[The DR400 pilot] did however call Southend at 0902:05 and requested a Basic Service. They reported [their routeing and that they were] 5NM east of Rivenhall, level at altitude 2100ft. There was a short delay to agree the service due to controller workload.</p> <p>At time 0903:37 a Basic Service was agreed, and the aircraft changed their squawk to 4575 (Southend conspicuity), they then reported that they had sighted a drone when they had passed Rivenhall, this was acknowledged by the controller, however, the pilot did not report the sighting as an Airprox on the Southend frequency. Having analysed the surveillance recordings, there was no other radar contact displayed that could have been a drone, in that area, at that time and at the DR400's level and range from Southend. It is highly unlikely that the radar would detect a drone.</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, 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2025119	18 Jun 25 1940	A320 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5127N 00009W 11.8NM final LHR 27L 3800ft	London TMA (A)	The A320 pilot reports that a drone was observed passing close under the nose of the aircraft at approximately 11.8NM final approach for LHR ILS27L, altitude around 3800ft. The estimated separation was 100-200ft below their altitude,	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.	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
						<p>exactly on the runway centreline. The drone was round, shiny and black. The pilot reports that they had only seen it for a few seconds and were unable to recall more detail.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100-200ft V / 0ft H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Swanwick TC Radar Controller reports that they had been in position as LL FIN. The landing runway was 27L. The A320 was established on the localiser and descending on the glidepath when the pilot reported a drone sighting - at around 11NM and 3A for RW27L, colour black. This information was passed on to the supervisor and subsequent arrivals.</p>	<p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</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)	