Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 14th October 2026

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
13	3	3	6	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
2026132	28 Jun 26 1330	B737 (CAT)	Drone	5556N 00406W 12NM ENE Glasgow 4600ft	Glasgow CTA (D)	**The B737 pilot** reports that whilst being vectored for the ILS to RW23, a large, dark coloured, drone was spotted just beneath the aircraft in the 12 o'clock position, tracking to the left of the aircraft which was in the descent. The drone passed within approximately 50m of the aircraft's left wing. The event was passed to ATC. Subsequently, with reference to the aircraft's track, it was felt that the drone was very roughly above the area of Moodiesburn. **Reported Separation:** 0ft V/50m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium **The Glasgow controller** reports that the inbound B737 pilot reported a drone 50m off their left-hand-side at 4300ft. The police were informed. **A NATS Investigation** reports that at 1330:15 the B737 pilot reported "…*just passed a drone on left hand side at erm fifty metres*". This was acknowledged by the controller who then asked if the drone was at the approximate same level as the aircraft. The pilot responded that it was. At the time the drone sighting was reported to Glasgow Radar, [the B737] was descending through 4600ft, 12.5NM bearing 080° from Glasgow Airport, in the Glasgow CTA (Class D). The pilot reported that the drone was at the same altitude as the aircraft. Analysis of the radar by Safety Investigations indicated that there were no associated primary or	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

[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
						secondary contacts visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.		
2026146	8 Jul 26 2334	B737 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5250N 00115W 4.5NM E East Midlands Airport 1600ft	East Midlands CTR (D)	**The B737 pilot** reports that, on passing the EME beacon, and whilst configuring for final approach to RW27, they noticed an illuminated object pass to the left of the Captain's window. They suspected it was a drone. They continued the approach to an uneventful landing. On vacating the runway, the incident was reported to ATC. This was followed up, after shutdown, with a telephone conversation. Post inspection of the aircraft showed no damage to the aircraft. **Reported Separation:** NR **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **The East Midlands ATC Safety and Compliance Manager** reports that they enquired with the watch that was on [duty at the time]. They had [received] a drone sighting report from, presumably, [the pilot of the B737], and they dealt with the drone sighting in accordance with local procedures, but no further issues were reported.	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
2026160	11 Jul 26 1717	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00031W 1.5NM W Heathrow 500ft	Heathrow CTR (D) Within FRZ	**The B787 pilot** reports on approach to Heathrow RW09L at approximately 500ft AGL, 1.5NM from the threshold, the pilot in command (in the right seat), sighted a drone. The drone was located to the right of the cockpit at [a range of] approximately 200m. **Reported Separation:** '200m' **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **The Heathrow controller** reports [the B787 pilot] reported seeing a drone [when] at about 500ft, to the right-hand side of the [RW]09L approach. Police were contacted with details. [The B787 pilot] parked [on] stand and Air Arrivals was informed, who notified subsequent arrivals. 20min later another report was received in a similar area. This was initially stood down by the AFDM but 10-15mins later a report was received by an [airline company pilot] saying the drone had flown quite close to the aircraft. This was followed by a report from the next inbound [airline company pilot] saying it had flown close to	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
						them. The following [airline company pilot] reported visual when informed about the drone but the controller wasn't totally sure whether they were referring to the drone or the runway. The AFDM called and decided to suspend operations; 2 aircraft were sent around, and the rest broken off and rerouted to RW09R with no gaps.		
2026162	11 Jul 26 1812	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00032W 1.9NM W Heathrow 700ft	Heathrow CTR (D) Within FRZ	**The A321 pilot** reports that during the final approach to RW09L a drone was reported by the previous two aircraft at approximately 1.7NM. The First Officer then observed it pass to the right side at approximately 40ft laterally and 20ft vertically below at 1.7 DME. They reported that to the tower. The aircraft behind them then also landed, but about the next 4 or 5 aircraft were sent around by the Tower [controller]. Operations were then switched to RW09R for landing and RW09L for departure. **Reported Separation:** 20ft V/40ft H **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **Heathrow Safety** [filed the following report] on receipt of a notification from the Airprox Board Reference:2026162. [The A321 pilot] on 1.9NM final to RW09L reported a drone that went under their wing. The RW09L Air North Arrivals controller had informed all inbound aircraft since [another company aircraft] landed on RW09L at time 1717 and reported a drone encounter with GMC. Between this timeframe, each aircraft had reported visual with the drone. TC, the Police and the Airport Authority were made aware. At 1816 the Airport Authority suspended operations to RW09L for 10min. [The A321 pilot] subsequently filed an Airprox as did [the pilot of the other company aircraft].	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, 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
2026168	19 Jul 26 1054	PA22 (Civ FW)	Drone	5334N 00115W 4NM N Mexborough 2600ft	London FIR (G)	**The PA22 pilot** reports that, during the cruise in good [VMC] at 2600ft (Leeds Bradford QNH) they, and their experienced passenger, both saw a red object ahead and slightly above their level. They turned the aircraft slightly right to achieve some lateral separation and, as they flew past the object, it appeared that it was a drone. It was approximately square in planform, and they had the fleeting impression that there were two lift-fans. A subjective	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
						assessment of its size is that it was approximately 2ft square. **Reported Separation:** 100ft V/0.25NM H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High		
2026171	18 Jul 26 1930	A321 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5109N 00031E Staplehurst 9000ft	London TMA (A)	**The A321 pilot** reports during the climb [heading] 090°, passing 9000ft, [the] Captain (PF) gained visual contact [with] a white glossy tic-tac shaped unidentified flying object at less than 50ft below, level, heading (it was thought) westerly at range 100m. [Their] aircraft was [at] 300kt and climbing at 2000fpm. The Captain called the [sighting] and [the] FO (PM) also became visual. [The] item passed under [the] starboard engine at 150-200ft maximum, but difficult to say. [The] FO reported some specks of red [colouration] but [this may have been reflected] from [the] sunset. [The] object was approximately 1-2m long, thin, straight [and] tic-tac shaped. No propellor [was] noticed. No wings [were] seen. Due to [the] high closing speed and no identifying marks nor propellor nor obvious [orientating features] like cockpit [or] wings, it was thought to be heading west [on an] opposite track, but [may have] been heading east if very slow. [The occurrence was] reported to ATC. [The] object [was] seen for less than 2sec due [to the] high closure rate. [It had a] white glossy surface [and was] 'not thought to be military'. **Reported Separation:** <50ft V/100m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **The Swanwick controller** reports [the A321] was airborne from Gatwick on an ODVIK departure. Passing FL100 they reported having had a close encounter with a white drone with red parts, their estimate was 50ft and in the pilot's words 'we nearly hit it'. They passed this information to the Group Supervisor to put on the ATIS and gave subsequent inbound traffic on the same route that information, keeping them a little higher than would have otherwise [been the case]. **The Swanwick Investigation** reports the pilot of [the A321] reported a close encounter with a drone	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
						when passing FL90 after departure from Gatwick. The pilot reported to the TC BIG controller they had come into close proximity with a drone at approximately 9000ft. The distance was estimated to be 50ft with the drone tracking 270°. The drone was described as, "*a small white drone with some red on it*" and the pilot stated, "*we just missed it*.". The pilot stated, "*We'd like to declare a PAN on that one, I'm not really sure*.". The TC BIG controller alerted the Group Supervisor, and the presence of the drone was added to the Gatwick Departure ATIS to alert pilots. Given the proximity of the report [position] to the Heathrow inbound track, the controller also kept subsequent inbound aircraft higher than usual to mitigate against any further drone activity. There were no further reports of the presence of the drone. 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.		
2026174	21 Jul 26 0652	ATR72 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5335N 00215W Bury 9000ft	Manchester TMA (A)	**The ATR72 pilot** reports during [the] descent to Leeds, [they] levelled at FL090 and soon after, around 25NM southwest of the field, [they saw an] object approaching the airplane, that looked like a black bird. When it passed by, [at the] same level [and] 'really, really close' [to the] left wing, they could clearly see a red light on the back of the object, [which looked] like a black triangular drone. Scottish ATC [was] informed. **Reported Separation:** 'really really close' **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **NATS (En-route) plc** reports the pilot of [the ATR72] submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of a drone whilst approximately passing FL90 in the descent for Leeds. It has been estimated that the UAS was at FL90. Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of [the ATR72] reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible. Description of UAS: [The] pilot reported a drone pass close to their left wing when passing FL90 in the	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
						descent inbound to Leeds. The pilot stated, '*It first appeared like a bird, but it had some red lights on the rear, so it was a drone, really really close to the aircraft*". Other pertinent information: controller subsequently informed the pilot of [another airliner], inbound to Manchester, that an aircraft beneath them had reported a drone on their current track 5-6 miles ahead at FL90, [and] therefore, to keep a good lookout. The location of the drone was in the vicinity of waypoint TENSO. 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.		
2026176	13 Jul 26 1250	ATR72 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5327N 00310W 5NM NW Birkenhead FL65	Holyhead CTA (C)	**The ATR72 pilot** reports that, while under a radar vector, climbing through FL065, the Captain - [pilot] flying, noticed a drone passing on the [left] side for approximately 5sec before it went out of view. It was white in colour and quite large. **Reported Separation:** 200ft V/<0.5NM **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium **The Scottish controller** reports that [the ATR72 pilot] sighted an eastbound drone 5NM west of WAL [VOR] at FL65, shortly after departing [departure point]. [The pilot of an unrelated aircraft] also reported the drone 14mins later, now 5NM north of TIPOD at 5000ft. The GS and Liverpool Approach were both informed.	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
2026177	23 Jul 26 1453	ATR72 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5134N 00311W 5NM S Brecon VOR FL100	Cardiff CTA (D)	**The ATR72 pilot** reports that the object was either a drone, or some form of unmanned aerial vehicle. While only in the Captain's line of sight for max 5sec, its shape was more rectangular, white or silver in colour. The Captain advised ATC immediately. It was not the typical shaped drone normally seen. **Reported Separation:** 1000ft V/ NR H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium **The Cardiff controller** reports that at approximately 1455 whilst passing FL100, 5NM SE of the BCN VOR, the ATR72 crew reported seeing a possible	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

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
						drone about 1000ft below the left wing of the aircraft travelling away in a southerly direction. Information about the sighting was passed to other pilots, as well as GD Radar, Western Radar, GS West and Cardiff TWR with a warning placed on the ATIS.		
2026178	24 Jul 26 1155	PA28 (Civ FW)	Drone	5138N 00019W 1.5NM S Elstree 1100ft	Elstree ATZ (G) Inside FRZ	**The PA28 pilot** reports that they joined the downwind leg for RW26LH. A large drone, roughly 1.5m in size, black, looking like a figure of 8 with two propellers in each circle, 'came at them' from the south, on a northerly heading. It entered the Elstree ATZ at exactly 1000ft. The pilot and student spotted it at the last moment and dived. The drone missed the aircraft by about 5m (it was close enough to make out the details shared above). The PIC reported it to the Elstree AFISO who asked the [solo student in the aircraft ahead of the PA28] to land. [The pilot of the PA28] landed subsequently. **Reported Separation:** 5m **Reported Risk of Collision:** NR **The Elstree AFISO** reports that, at 1155, [the pilot of the PA28] reported a drone over RT in the southern circuit, approximately at Bentley Priory at 1000ft. At 1157, the police were called and were given the approximate location of the drone. Officers were dispatched. At 1158, [the AFISO] requested the traffic in the circuit to land (a student). At 1159, the circuit direction was changed to RW26RH. At 1201, the Airfield Manager was notified. At 1209, [the pilot of the PA28] landed and they spoke with the pilot. [The pilot] reported that the drone came within 10ft of them and that they would file an MOR. At 1220, the police attended the 'tower' and said they would go and see what they could find.	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
2026187	02 Aug 26 1410	A321 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5305N 00137W 4NM north of TNT DME FL115	Daventry CTA (A)	**The A321 pilot** reports that they were overhead TNT cleared direct to DAYNE, descending through FL115 to FL80. A black triangular object shaped like a small stealth fighter (they assume a drone) passed	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.	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
						overhead by about 100ft and slightly to the right (maybe 20m) in the opposite direction. They reported it to Scottish and filed an ASR. **Reported Separation:** 100ft V/20m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High **The Scottish ACC controller** reports that SE Tactical had a drone reported to them at approximately 1403 by [A321 C/S]. The drone was described by the pilot to be "*like a mini stealth bomber*" and was approximately 200ft above them as the aircraft was at FL110 at DAYNE. MAN APC were told and SE Tac advised the next inbounds of the drone report for 30min. No further sightings were reported. [The incident was] reported to the police via 999. **The NATS Safety Investigation** reports that the pilot reported that a drone had passed approximately 200ft above them as they passed 11,000ft in the descent. They described that "*it was certainly pretty close*". When asked to describe the appearance, the pilot responded, "it looked like a stealth fighter if that makes sense, but obviously tiny, that's the sort of shape it was". The controller informed subsequent aircraft of the reported drone, however no further sightings were reported. 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. It has been estimated that the UAS was at approximately 11,200ft.	**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.	
2026189	04 Aug 26 0933	Matrice 300 (Civ UAS)	Drone	5142N 00020W 2NM S St. Albans 328ft AGL	London FIR (G)	**The Matrice pilot** reports that while flying their Matrice 300 multi-rotor drone at part of their surveying works, a second drone entered into their flight zone. [The Matrice pilot reports that] they had permission from the landowner to be flying at the time of the flight and had been informed that no other drones would be flying [over] their land. They had completed all checks using Drone Cloud and	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. The Board noted that the unknown drone operator was not required to gain landowner's permission for overflight. However, members questioned the ability of the unknown drone	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
						followed their PDRA01. The second drone was being flown by a separate company that as far as they were aware had not notified the landowner they would be crossing over their site. The pilot for this flight was located 1200m away from where the incident occurred. The pilot visually noted the second drone and lowered theirs down and sent it back to its home position. They then tried to see where the second drone had come from, and where it had taken off, but could not see the remote pilot's position. They then notified the owner of the land. [The Matrice pilot had access to a branded EC unit which had not registered any emissions from the other drone]. **Reported Separation:** 70ft V/100m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High	operator to visually clear the airspace around their drone, without additional mitigation, at the distance suggested by the Matrice 300 pilot. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 4, 5 **Risk:** The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, the actions of the Matrice 300 pilot ensured that there had been no risk of collision.	
2026193	08 Aug 26 1127	PA24 (Civ FW)	Drone	5417N 00111W 5NM ENE Felixkirk 4900ft	London FIR (G)	**The PA24 pilot** reports that the drone was sighted too late to take avoiding action. They estimate it was approximately between 1.2m and 1.8m wide but could not be sure. It was dark grey/black with no lighting, no NOTAM and not seen by Teesside Radar. [They opined that] this was not a hobby drone. They reported it to Teesside Radar. They spoke to the controller on landing via phone to advise that they would file an Airprox [report]. There were two qualified pilots on board who were specifically looking out for other aircraft, specifically gliders, at the time of the incident. They further reported that the drone was estimated to have been less than 0.25NM west of them, maybe far closer, off their left wing when parallel. **Reported Separation:** 0ft V/0.2NM H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High **The Teesside Radar controller** reports [the pilot of the PA24] was under a Basic Service at an altitude of 5000ft. At 1128, the pilot reported a black drone 0.5NM west of them with 4 rotors. Nothing was visible on radar. The approximate location was 541726N 0011111W. The information was passed to [the pilots of] other aircraft in the vicinity and to North Yorkshire Police via the Tower Assistant.	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
						Upon landing at [their destination], the pilot notified Teesside ATC via landline that they would be filing an Airprox. **Teesside ATC Investigation** [The investigation confirmed, after viewing their recordings, that there had been] no contact showing on the radar display in the vicinity of the reporting aircraft. [The timeline indicated, at 1127, the pilot of the PA24 transmitted] *"We've just passed what looks like a drone at 5000ft, 0.5 miles of us to the west."* [The Teesside Radar controller responded by reiterating that Sutton Bank was active, and the PA24 pilot replied] *"It wasn't a glider, we'll keep a lookout, it was definitely a drone".* [The Radar controller] asked for further information on the drone which was described as black/silver in colour with 4 rotors. **Investigation Findings** • No contact observed at the time of the report. • The ATCO handled it very well and followed all procedures (informing other aircraft in vicinity and Police). • The ATCOs were relieved as per ATCSL documentation.		

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)	