



NPWS

An tSeirbhís Páirceanna
Náisiúnta agus Fiadhúla
National Parks and Wildlife Service

**Derogation Number
DER-BAT-2026-222**

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (BIRDS AND NATURAL HABITATS) REGULATIONS, 2011
(S.I. No 477 of 2011)**

DEROGATION

Granted under Regulation 54 of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011, hereinafter referred to as “the Habitats Regulations”.

The Minister for Housing, Local Government & Heritage, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by Regulation 54 of the Habitats Regulations hereby grants to **St. Joseph’s NS Carrabane of Athenry Road, Carrownagower, Athenry, County Galway** a derogation. It is stated that this derogation is issued:

- A. In the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment
- B. As there is no satisfactory alternative, and the action authorised by this derogation will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of **bats** referred to below at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

This derogation authorises the following:

1. Roost disturbance
2. Actions authorised within the derogation

The derogation is issued in respect of the following **bat species**:

- **Soprano Pipistrelle** **Pipistrellus Pygmaeus**



NPWS

An tSeirbhís Páirceanna
Náisiúnta agus Fiadhúlra
National Parks and Wildlife Service

Terms and Conditions

1. This derogation is granted solely to allow the activities specified in connection with the works located at **Kilconieron GAA Club, Carrowbaun, County Galway for St. Joseph's NS Carrabane**
2. All activities authorised by this derogation, and all equipment used in connection herewith, shall be carried out, constructed and maintained (as the case may be) so as to avoid unnecessary injury or distress to any species of **BAT**. Anything done other than in accordance with the terms of this derogation may constitute an offence
3. This derogation may be modified or revoked, for stated reasons, at any time. In addition, the Minister reserves the right to revoke the derogation where updated information indicates that the basis upon which the derogation was granted has materially changed.
4. The mitigation measures outlined in the application report (**Bat Derogation Licence Supporting Document St. Joseph's N.S., Carrabane, Athenry, Co. Galway**) together with any changes or clarification agreed in correspondence between NPWS and the agent or applicant, are to be carried out. Strict adherence must be paid to all the proposed measures in the application.
5. The actions which this derogation authorise shall be completed between **22nd May – 31st December 2026, inclusive**.
6. The works will be supervised by bat ecologist(s): **Sara Fissolo**
7. If this derogation addresses works that are subject of a planning application, no such works permitted under this derogation can occur until planning permission is granted.
8. If this derogation expires prior to works permitted under this derogation commencing, a new application must be sought in advance, including the provision of any updated data or reports.
9. This derogation shall be produced for inspection on a request being made on that behalf by a member of An Garda Síochána or an authorised NPWS officer appointed under Regulation 4 of the Habitats Regulations.
10. The local **NPWS Regional Manager – Rebecca Teesdale**, rebecca.teesdale@npws.gov.ie, must be contacted prior to the commencement of any activity, and if bats are detected on site during the course of the work, under the terms of this derogation.
11. On completion of the actions which this derogation authorises, all recordings of bat species affected will be made using the standardised Returns form and must be submitted to the NPWS **within four weeks of the expiry date of this derogation**. Included with the Returns form, a report will also be submitted to wildlife.reports@npws.gov.ie detailing results of works and success of mitigation. **Both documents must be submitted to constitute a derogation return.**



NPWS

An tSeirbhís Páircenna
Náisiúnta agus Fíadhúlra
National Parks and Wildlife Service

For the Minister for Housing, Local Government & Heritage

Fiona O' Mahony.

(an officer authorised by the Minister to sign on his behalf)

22 May 2026

Any query in relation to this derogation should be sent to reg54derogations@npws.gov.ie





Derogation Assessment

Name of Applicant: St. Joseph's NS Carrabane

Location/Name of Project: Carrabane, Athenry, Co Galway

Tick the following prohibition as chosen on the application:

(a) Deliberately capture or kill any specimen of the relevant species in the wild	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Deliberately disturb these species particularly during the period of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Deliberately take or destroy eggs of the relevant species in the wild	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Damage or destroy a breeding or resting place of such an animal, or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Keep, transport, sell, exchange, offer for sale or offer for exchange any specimen of the relevant species taken in the wild, other than those taken legally as referred to in Article 12(2) of the Habitats Directive.	<input type="checkbox"/>
(a) Deliberately pick, collect, cut, uproot or destroy any specimen of these species in the wild, or	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Keep, transport, sell, exchange, offer for sale or offer for exchange any specimen of these species taken in the wild, other than those taken legally as referred to in Article 13(1)(b) of the Habitats Directive.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Test 1: A reason(s) listed in Regulation 54 (a)-(e) applies to the proposed activity

i. Tick which reason the applicant claims should be applied to the derogation

(a) In the interests of protecting wild flora and fauna and conserving natural habitats,	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) To prevent serious damage, in particular to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries and water and other types of property	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) In the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) For the purpose of research and education, of re-populating and re-introducing these species and for the breeding operations necessary for these purposes, including artificial propagation of plants, or	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) To allow, under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent, the taking or keeping of certain specimens of the species to the extent specified therein, which are referred to in the First Schedule.	<input type="checkbox"/>



ii. Test 1: Conclusion

Please tick the following where it applies:

There is a valid reason(s) listed in Regulation 54 (a)-(e) which applies to the proposed activity:	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please outline your analysis below and state how the applicant has provided evidence to support your conclusion:

The application form and associated documentation provided by the applicant has been reviewed in full. The application relies on regulation 54(2)(c) *'in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'* as the reason chosen for a derogation that they believe applies to the proposed activity.

In the detail provided, it is clear that the applicants are relying on the imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature aspect of Reason C.

As outlined on page two of the accompanying report, the derogation is required to facilitate proposed works at St. Joseph's NS, Carrabane, Co. Galway. The proposed works involve the felling of woodland to allow for the construction of a new public school.

The school currently uses temporary buildings that due to recent population increases cannot meet the current and future needs of the school. As a result, the report notes the current school is not fit for purpose and is not conducive to a healthy and active learning environment.

The applicants have provided evidence as to the nature and scale of the overriding public interest reasoning and the proposed activity is necessary to achieve these overall objectives. Based on the above this application has passed Test 1 and can now proceed to Test 2 |



Test 2: Absence of a satisfactory alternative

Please tick the following where it applies and add a comment below to support the recommendation:

The applicant has provided satisfactory evidence that alternative solutions have been considered and have given reasons why the proposed approach is the only satisfactory alternative:	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please outline your analysis below and state how the applicant has provided evidence to support your conclusion (If you wish to add additional conditions please complete pg. 6):

The documentation submitted by the applicant has been reviewed, including the evidence for alternative solutions.

The purpose of the derogation is to allow the following activity to take place:

The licence is being sought to destroy a bat roost as part of the felling of woodland required for the construction of a new school. Planning consent and a felling licence have already been granted. Bat surveys have identified a tree roost in an Ash tree in the woodland that hosts a small roost of Soprano pipistrelles. The woodland is of local importance for all identified bat species in terms of foraging and commuting.

The alternative solutions suggested by the applicant are: firstly to do nothing, secondly to retain the tree in which the roost was identified and lastly, to choose an alternative site.

1. “Do-Nothing” scenario: If the development were to not go ahead, the woodland, including the tree roost would remain for now, bearing in mind it is a planted forestry plot; with the intention of future felling for commercial timber production, had the site not been selected as the best/only option locally for the new school. If the ‘Do-Nothing’ scenario was selected, there is no viable alternative site locally for the school development.. This would result in the lack of provision of accommodation for the school and children locally as outlined in Test 1 and is therefore considered an unsatisfactory alternative under Test 2. **This is not a viable option as it has already been outlined in Test 1 that the felling of the woodland to facilitate the construction of the new school meeting demands locally for a fit-for-purpose educational facility.**
2. Alternative 1: The tree roost in the woodland is located within the footprint of the proposed new school, in the central area of the site. The school design was finalised and consented to accommodate the 10-classroom requirements of the school. Felling of the tree cannot be avoided if the school is to be built to the size and density required to meet current and future educational needs in the area. **Based on the above, this is not a viable option as retaining the tree roost would limit the scale of the development (already consented) and the development would not be of the required size and density.**
3. Alternative 3: The site was chosen for its availability, proximity to the centre of the village and its location adjacent to an existing community sports centre. No other locations are available within the village. **Based on the above the woodland location is the only suitable location that is available within the**



NPWS

An tSeirbhís Páirceanna
Náisiúnta agus Fiadhúlra
National Parks and Wildlife Service

village for the development. Furthermore, planning consent and a felling licence are already in place for the school development at this location. This is not a viable option.

The applicant has provided satisfactory evidence that alternative solutions have clearly been considered. As outlined on page 16 of the accompanying report three alternative solutions, including the “do-nothing alternative” were examined by the applicant.

Based on the assessment of the application documentation, it is regarded that the applicant has considered all available alternative solutions and at this time no other alternative solutions are apparent.

Having weighed the possible solutions to solve the applicant’s problem against the effects of a derogation on the species concerned, it is concluded that the application has passed Test 2 and can proceed to Test 3

Upon completion of your assessment, please return this Recommendation to WLU to continue the application process.



Test 3: Impact of a derogation on conservation status of the species

Please tick the following where it applies and add a comment below to support the recommendation:

The derogation would NOT be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species in question at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please outline your analysis below and state how the applicant has provided evidence to support your conclusion. (If you wish to add additional conditions please complete pg. 6)

A small pipistrelle roost is present within one of the trees due for felling on site. Soprano pipistrelles are widespread and abundant in Ireland and are in favourable conservation status. This species is also adaptable and quick to occupy new roosting features.

Suitable and proportionate mitigation has been proposed, including the provision of alternative roosts in the form of bat boxes. Providing these mitigation measures are implemented, I am satisfied that the works will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species in question at a favourable conservation status in their natural range

If the answer above is Yes then the derogation may be granted, providing Tests 1 and 2 have also been met.

Upon completion of your assessment, please return this Recommendation to WLU to continue the application process.



Derogation decision

The application for a derogation under Regulation 54 of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations, 2011 (S.I. 477 of 2011), as amended, has been assessed by officials in the Department and the following decision has been made:

Tick box where appropriate:

There is no satisfactory alternative

and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species to which the Habitats Directive relates at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

Therefore, a derogation may be granted to the applicant, since it is—

(a) in the interests of protecting wild fauna and flora and conserving natural habitats

(b) to prevent serious damage, in particular to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries and water and other types of property,

(c) in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment,

(d) for the purpose of research and education, of repopulating and re-introducing these species and for the breeding operations necessary for these purposes, including the artificial propagation of plants, or

(e) to allow, under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent, the taking or keeping of certain specimens of the species to the extent specified therein, which are referred to in the First Schedule.

OR This application has been refused as one or more of the conditions set out above have not been met



The following conditions should be attached to the derogation:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

[add additional conditions where required]

Signed: .

Date: May 22, 2026

Position: Ecologist