

Derogation Number DER-BAT-2025-292

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 **Craig McCauley** c/o **Church Committee Secretary, Janet Fletcher, 5 Castlesize Drive, Sallins, County Kildare** 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 <u>bats</u> 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**:

Brown Long-Eared Bat Plecotus Auritus



Terms and Conditions

- This derogation is granted solely to allow the activities specified in connection with the works located at St John's Church, Main Street, Kill, County Kildare, W91 CD66 for Craig McCauley
- 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.
- 4. The mitigation measures outlined in the application report (St. John's Church of Ireland, Kill, Nass, Co. Kildare Derogation Licence Supporting Information), 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 9th September 31st December 2025, inclusive.
- 6. The works will be supervised by bat ecologist(s): Tina Aughney & Shaun Boyle
- 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 District Conservation Officer**, killian.brennan@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 data form provided below and must be submitted to the NPWS within four weeks of the expiry date of this derogation. Included with the below 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.



For the Minister for Housing, Local Government & Heritage

Claire Conten

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

08 September 2025

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



Derogation Assessment

Name of Applicant: Craig McCauley

Location/Name of Project: St. John's Church, Kill, County Kildare

Tick the following prohibition as chosen on the application:

(a)	Deliberately capture or kill any specimen of the relevant species in the wild	
(b)	Deliberately disturb these species particularly during the period of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration	\boxtimes
	<u> </u>	
(c)	Deliberately take or destroy eggs of the relevant species in the wild	
(d)	Damage or destroy a breeding or resting place of such an animal, or	
(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.	
(a)	Deliberately pick, collect, cut, uproot or destroy any specimen of these species in the wild, or	
(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.	

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 conserv natural habitats,	ring
(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 tho of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment,	se
(d) For the purpose of research and education, of re-populating a re-introducing these species and for the breeding operations necessary for these purposes, including artificial propagation of plants, or	
(e) To allow, under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective be 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.	

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	Yes	\boxtimes
the proposed activity:	No	

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 have 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 applicant is relying on the imperative reasons of Public health and public safety aspect of Reason C to facilitate the proposed works at Saint John's Church noted as a protected structure. As outlined in the Derogation Licence Supporting report, the proposed works, which involve the re-roofing of the church are needed to repair and ensure the long term structural integrity of the building. If the works do not take place, it will lead to further damage and deterioration of the structure and present a health and safety concern to the public as the church is an active place of worship.

The applicant is also relying on the imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences aspect of Reason C as Saint John's Church is an active place of worship. It is important for the church community to have access to the building as a focal meeting point.

The applicants have provided evidence as to the nature and scale of the public health and public safety reasoning and reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature; therefore, 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		\boxtimes
solutions have been considered and have given reasons why the		
proposed approach is the only satisfactory alternative:		

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 purpose of the derogation is to allow the following activity to take place: to enable the reroofing of St Johns RC church in Kill. The current roof is no longer viable and there are concerns over public health and safety as the church is actively used. It is also a protected structure and there is a need to ensure its long term structural integrity.

The specific situation that needs to be addressed is that the roof of the church is used as a roost by a colony of brown long-eared bats. In order to repair the roof there would have to be some disturbance as the church have a limited window for getting the repairs completed and due to financial constraints the works need to be completed before the end of September.

The alternative solutions suggested by the applicant are not considered viable. The two

alternative solutions are not considered partially effective given the state of disrepair of the existing roof and would not reduce or mitigate the problem.

1) Patch up-works – the applicants have clearly highlighted how patch-up work will not

- 1) Patch up-works the applicants have clearly highlighted how patch-up work will not suffice as the roof needs to be fully repaired given its age and condition. If the roof fails the roost will be lost.
- 2) Do nothing The applicants have provided reports from relevant professionals in relation to the state of the existing roof and the need to replace it. Again doing nothing will eventually lead to the loss of the roost.

The applicant has provided satisfactory evidence that alternative solutions have clearly been considered as noted above.

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 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		\boxtimes
populations of the species in question at a favourable conservation	No	
status in their natural range.		

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):

This church supports a maternity roost of brown long-eared bats. Mitigation is required to ensure that no bats are injured during the works and that the attic space will remain suitable for bat roosting after works have been completed. The works need to be undertaken outside the maternity season and under supervision by a bat specialist to ensure that no bats are harmed during the process. Bat slates will also be inserted into the structure to ensure that bat can re-enter the roof space at the Exit Point 2 while Exit Point 1 will remain post works.
Providing these mitigation measures are implemented and the works are carried out as per the submitted method statement and under the supervision of a bat specialist then I am satisfied that there should be no negative impact on the conservation status of the bats on site.

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

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

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	\boxtimes
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. Mitigation measures outlined in the bat report should be implemented in full 2. The works should be carried out under the supervision of a bat specialist 2. 3. 4.	
[add additional conditions where required]	

Signed: Date: September 8, 2025

Position: Ecologist