

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 10th December 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
3	1	0	2	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
2025227	22 Oct 25 1219	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5131N 00000E IVO Plaistow 6000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that on initial approach into LHR, passing through 6000ft turning base, a drone passed down the aircraft's right-hand side. It was approximately 100m to 200m away from the aircraft. The event was reported to ATC and the police met the aircraft on arrival on stand at Heathrow for a statement. It was just north of the RW27R centreline.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100m-200m H Reported Risk of Collision: N/R</p> <p>The Swanwick TC Radar controller reports that [the B787] pilot reported a drone to the northwest of London City Airfield, while on a base leg from the north to RW27R for Heathrow. The pilot estimated the drone had been at 5500ft. The controller passed information to following aircraft about the drone for approximately 12min, they then received an update that a drone was around the final approach track RW27R, approximately 13NM to touchdown, estimated to be at 3500ft and orange in colour. The controller continued to pass information on the latest sighting for another 5min before being relieved by an oncoming controller.</p> <p>The Airport GS reported the 2 sightings to the police.</p> <p>The NATS Safety Investigations reports 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.</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, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	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
2025230	04 Nov 25 1504	Prefect (HQ Air (Trg)	Drone	5244N 00022W 2NM SSW Bourne 6000ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The Prefect pilot reports that, during a teach 'Straight & Level' exercise at 6000ft (Barnsley QNH) on radial 030°/7NM from Wittering, and located west of Bourne, the QFI spotted a large (3-5ft) black drone with steady green light. It was seen to be hovering approximately 100ft laterally and slightly below the aircraft. Once a safe MSD was achieved an orbit was initiated while reporting to Cranwell Bank TATCC on frequency. Surprisingly, the drone started to follow the smooth turn rate with impressive speed, and was judged to be First Person View type.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 300ft V/ 100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p> <p>The Cranwell controller reports that at 1504 a Prefect pilot reported a drone at 6000ft in their vicinity, approximately 8NM NNE of RAF Wittering. The Prefect tracked away and gave an updated drone position report. As Wittering had numerous aircraft in the area, the drone information was passed onto the Wittering Approach controller and reported to the shift ATCO IC. The drone did not show on radar at any point. The police were informed.</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

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
2025238	16 Nov 25 1348	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5132N 00014W S of Kensal Green 5000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A321 pilot reports that they had a near miss with a large black drone at about 5000ft, just after intercepting the LON 070° radial on an ULTIB1J SID. The drone was above the clouds and it was overcast. It passed over the right wing. The pilot reported the drone to ATC, and the flight continued normally.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 'passed over the wing' Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The London Terminal controller reports that [A321 C/S] departed Heathrow on an ULTIB departure. On passing 5000ft the crew reported that a drone had passed very close to them. They described it as being large and black in colour. They advised the GS who informed Heathrow Tower and they also informed their colleague on NE Departures.</p> <p>UKAB Secretariat An analysis of the NATS radar replay was undertaken and there were no primary tracks detected in the vicinity of the reported Airprox</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

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)	