Derogation Number
DER-BAT-2025-326

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 **Haskey Ltd.** of **Moondance, Church Road, Newcastle, County Wicklow** 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**:

- **Common Pipistrelle** **Pipistrellus Pipistrellus**
- **Soprano Pipistrelle** **Pipistrellus Pygmaeus**
- **Leisler's Bat** **Nycatalus Leisler**

Terms and Conditions

1. This derogation is granted solely to allow the activities specified in connection with the works located at **Newcastle Castle, Newcastle, County Wicklow** for **Haskey Ltd.**
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 (**Newcastle Castle, Newcastle, County Wicklow Ecological Survey**), 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 **8th October – 31st December 2025, inclusive.**
6. The works will be supervised by bat ecologist: **Faith Wilson.**
7. Bat boxes should be installed in the surrounding area
8. Works should only take place between September and March – **a new derogation will need to be applied for should any potential work in 2026.**
9. Works should be preceded by a bat survey to ensure no bats are present in the building.
10. Any suitable crevices identified by the bat ecologist should be discussed with the project architect and where feasible retained for future use by bats
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. The local **NPWS District Conservation Officer-John Griffin,** john.griffin@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.
15. 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

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

08 October 2025

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

Derogation Assessment

Name of Applicant: Haskey Ltd.

Location/Name of Project: Newcastle Castle, Newcastle, County Wicklow

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	☒
(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 <u>the applicant claims</u> should be applied to the derogation

(a) In the interests of protecting wild flora and fauna 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 re-populating and 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 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.	☐

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	☒
	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 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, the applicants are relying on the public health and public safety aspect of Reason C in that the proposed works at Newcastle Castle are necessary to ensure the castle does not deteriorate further do to its poor condition which will occur without intervention. These works and repairs involving a conservation management plan will alleviate the potential for collapse of the castle and reduce the health and safety risks currently posed.

The applicants have provided evidence as to the nature and scale of the public health and public safety reasoning and the proposed activity is necessary to achieve the overall objective. 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	☒
	No	☐

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 alternative solutions suggested by the applicant are;

1. **"Do-Nothing" scenario** A Do Nothing approach is not favourable as if no works are proposed the castle will continue to deteriorate. The purpose of the works is to secure the surviving historic masonry for the long-term. It is currently in poor condition and will continue to deteriorate without intervention. The increased frequency of heavy rainfall events resulting from global warming will accelerate this deterioration. This will in the long term cause loss of roosting areas for bats within this building

2. **Alternative 1** The proposed conservation works and mitigation measures set out in the applicants report ensure the protection of the bats during the works and the long-term conservation of their roosting locations within the structure as well as the structure itself. All three species of bats utilising the stricture are widespread species in Ireland and are listed as 'Least Concern' on the Ireland Red List No. 12: Terrestrial Mammals (Marnell et al., 2019), meaning they are not in any threatened category.

The proposed conservation works at Newcastle Castle will not be detrimental to the maintenance of populations of these species at a favourable conservation status in their natural range as required under Section 54 (2) of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations. A range of roosting locations will be retained as part of the restoration within the structure to provide continued access to roosting sites for bats.

The "do nothing" scenario has been discounted on health and safety grounds but in addition, it will in time mean the permanent loss of roosting/breeding locations for the Bat Species concerned.

Therefore, I recommend Alternative 1 as proposed is the correct solution in this case.

Having assessed the possible solutions proposed by the applicant, against the effects of a derogation on the species concerned, it is concluded that the application has passed Test 2 and can now 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	☒
	No	☐

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):

Small numbers of three species were found to be roosting in this ruined castle – common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and Leisler's bat. All three species are widespread and common in Ireland and they are all in favourable conservation status.
The planned conservation works will have no negative impact on the conservation status of these species if the proposed mitigation measures outlined in the bat report are implemented.

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. Installation of Bat boxes in the surrounds

2. Works should only take place between September and March

3. Works should be preceded by a bat survey to ensure that no bats are present in the building.

4. Suitable crevices identified by the bat ecologist should be discussed with the project architect and where feasible retained for future use by bats

[add additional conditions where required]

Signed: Date: October 8, 2025

Position: Ecologist