

Derogation Assessment

Name of Applicant: **Roger MacNaughton**

Location/Name of Project: **Team Survey**

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 checked="" 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 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:

• Application incorrect: additional names of those requiring a derogation are not listed in the application form but in the report, suitable alternatives also not fully discussed 24/06/2025

• 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.

The applicant has outlined that the proposed Oilgate to Rosslare Harbour N11/N25 transport link is an important part of the national transport network. In the detail provided it is clear that the applicants are relying on the public health and public safety aspect of Reason C as the project will reduce the frequency and severity of collisions and casualties on the N11 and N25. The new road will be safer for active travel and car users. The applicants are also relying on the imperative reasons of overriding public interest aspect of Reason C in that The project will also generate economic benefits and support investment in the wider area by improving journey times reliability and increasing access to jobs and key facilities. The applicants have provided evidence as to the nature and scale of both the public health and public safety and the overriding public interest 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 - 09/07/2025

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):

Alternatives (do nothing, emergence surveys and re-entry surveys were considered as alternatives to endoscope surveys of PRFs. However, this proposed method follows best practice guidelines and provides more accurate data on bat roosts to inform the EIAR, facilitating the accurate assessment of impacts and appropriate design of mitigation. See Section 6 of the report and Q11.1 for further details on their assessment of alternatives and conclusion that this is the only satisfactory alternative to gain accurate data..)

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):

The application is to cover bat surveys to inform a development.

The applicants are suitably trained and experienced and providing best survey practise is observed there should be no significant impact on the conservation status of the bats in the area.

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. [Best practice guidance on endoscope use around bat roosts to be adhered to at all times in order to limit disturbance as much as possible.]
2. [Results to be returned to WLU following surveys.]
3. []
4. []

[add additional conditions where required]

Signed: 

Date: 24/07/2025

Position: Ecologist