



Terms and Conditions

1. This derogation is granted solely to allow the activities specified in connection with the works located at **34-41 Catherine Street, Limerick, County Limerick for Deirdre Keane**
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 **accompanying application report** 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 January – 31st December 2026, inclusive**.
6. The works will be supervised by bat ecologist(s): **Anne Mullen**
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 – Aine Lynch**, aine.lynch@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 Páircanna
Náisiúnta agus Fiadhúlra
National Parks and Wildlife
Service

For the Minister for Housing, Local Government & Heritage

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

22 January 2026

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





Derogation Assessment

Name of Applicant: Deirdre Keane

Location/Name of Project: 34-41 Catherine Street, Limerick, County Limerick

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 three page of the accompanying report, the derogation is required to assist with proposed works at 34-41 Catherine Street, Limerick, Co. Limerick.

The objective of the works involves the conversion of a number of derelict structures including one listed as protected into 76 apartments and associated works to the site, which is zoned, for high-density residential developments. To achieve these aims, these structures will be either demolished or redeveloped for residential use including one containing a bat roost. The report outlines on page nine that the proposed development will provide “urban regeneration” through its location and “sustainable housing” which will help to alleviate housing demand while supporting “the conservation of built heritage.”

It also notes that the proposed development aligns with the “objectives of the National Planning Frameworks and the Limerick City Development Plan, both of which prioritise compact urban growth and regeneration of brownfield sites” bringing both social and economic benefits to the city by its transformation into a vibrant populated area.

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: Conversion of the derelict site into 76 residential units.

The specific situation that needs to be addressed is: A small (<3) Common and Soprano pipistrelle roost is present within the building.

The alternative solutions suggested by the applicant are:

1. “Do-Nothing” scenario: unsatisfactory for several reasons. The site at 34-41 Catherine Street is currently derelict, posing significant public safety hazards due to structural instability and attracting anti-social behaviour. Leaving the site untouched would perpetuate these risks and fail to address the urgent housing shortage in Limerick City, where the demand for residential units is acute. Furthermore, this approach is in line with the objectives of the National Planning Frameworks and the Limerick City Development Plan, both of which prioritise compact urban growth and regeneration of brownfield sites. In addition, the roost itself is not guaranteed long-term protection under this scenario; ongoing structural degradation could lead to uncontrolled destruction of the roost without mitigation or monitoring. For these reasons, the do-nothing alternative is socially, economically, and ecologically
2. Complete Avoidance of Works: The option of relocating the proposed development to an alternative site was also examined. This alternative is impractical because the Catherine Street is strategically important for urban regeneration and is zoned for high-density residential development. No equivalent site within the city offers the same opportunity to deliver housing while conserving heritage structures. Relocation would result in significant delays and cost escalation, undermining the delivery of housing targets and the retention objectives set out in national and local planning policy. It would mean the loss of an opportunity to refurbish and retain protected architectural structures on Catherine Street, which is integral to heritage conservation goals. Consequently, complete avoidance of works is not a satisfactory solution.
3. Exclusion Without Compensation: Another alternative considered was the exclusion of bats without providing compensatory roosting habitat. This approach was rejected because it is not in line with NPWS best practice and the Bat Mitigation Guidelines for Ireland, which require that roost loss be offset by suitable replacement habitat. Exclusion without compensatory roosting measures carries a high risk of stress or mortality for bats and does not maintain ecological connectivity or ensure favourable

conservation status. Furthermore, this option would still require a derogation licence as a last-resort measure, making it legally and ecologically inadequate. For these reasons, exclusion without compensatory measures cannot be considered a satisfactory alternative.

The applicant has provided satisfactory evidence that alternative solutions have clearly been considered. As outlined on page 10 of the accompanying report. *A number of alternative solutions, including the “do-nothing alternative” were examined by the applicant, the applicant has sufficiently explored the alternatives and why the alternative solutions are not viable options.*

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 the building on site. Both common and soprano pipistrelles are widespread and abundant in Ireland and are in favourable conservation status. These species are also adaptable and quick to occupy new roosting features.

Suitable and proportionate mitigation has been proposed. 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: January 22, 2026

Position: Ecologist