

# Derogation Number DER-BAT-2025-338

# 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 **Faye Bohan** of **Wildlands, Moycullen, County Galway, H91 WYV2** 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**:

Soprano Pipistrelle Pipistrellus Pygmaeus



#### **Terms and Conditions**

- 1. This derogation is granted solely to allow the activities specified in connection with the works located at **Location** for **Faye Bohan**
- 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 (**Bat Derogation Licence Application Wildlands Moycullen**), 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 **24**<sup>th</sup> **October 31**<sup>st</sup> **December 2025, inclusive.**
- 6. The works will be supervised by bat ecologist(s): Aoife Joyce, Ryan Connors, David Culleton & Clare Mifsud (with Saoirse Fitzsimons under supervision)
- 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.
- 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 Managager Rebecca Teesdale, <u>rebecca.teesdale@npws.gov.ie</u>, 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 <a href="wildlife.reports@npws.gov.ie">wildlife.reports@npws.gov.ie</a> 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

Cleire Conten

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

24 October 2025

Any query in relation to this derogation should be sent to <a href="mailto:reg54derogations@npws.gov.ie">reg54derogations@npws.gov.ie</a>





## **Derogation Assessment**

Name of Applicant: Faye Bohan

Location/Name of Project: Wildlands Moycullen, County Galway

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	$\boxtimes$
	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 the applicant claims should be applied to the derogation

<ul> <li>(a) In the interests of protecting wild flora and fauna and conserving natural habitats,</li> </ul>	
<ul><li>(b) To prevent serious damage, in particular to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries and water and other types of property</li></ul>	
(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,	$\boxtimes$
(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	Yes	$\boxtimes$
the proposed activity:		

## 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 works at Wildlands Adventure Park, Moycullen Village, Co. Galway.

These proposed works involve the demolition of a number of structures and vegetation clearance to facilitate the construction of additional holiday cabins within the park. The aim is to enhance local tourism and recreational offerings in the west of Ireland, which will provide social and economic benefits.

The applicants have provided evidence as to the nature and scale of the public interest including those of a social or economic nature for the proposed works 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	Yes	$\boxtimes$
solutions have been considered and have given reasons why the	No	
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 Bat Derogation Licence Application report look at a number of alternative options. It concludes that there is an absence of satisfactory alternatives.

The buildings are required to be demolished in order to allow for the construction of new holiday let units. Retaining the structures is not viable as they are situated in the core development area, and their removal is essential in terms of an efficient layout for the development and for cabin access. The bat survey showed low use of the buildings by bats and their suitability as a roost was evaluated as 'low'. They were designed as temporary structures and therefore would not constitute a long term option as a bat roost if they were retained.

The 'Do nothing' approach, ie not proceeding with the development of the site would not be inlink with current National, Regional and Local policy in relation to the promotion of tourism in the area. I am satisfied the applicant has shown that this is not a viable option.

The alternative of retaining the structures and proceeding with the development is unsatisfactory as this would mean the development of the site for tourism could not go ahead also, as the location the structures are situated in within the footprint of the proposed development would mean a loss of efficiency in terms of site layout, and a restriction on cabin access. In addition, and the temporary nature of the existing structures would not provide a longterm, nor quality roost site for bats in any case. I am satisfied that this is also not a viable option.

Mitigation measures are outlined for this project in the derogation application and supporting documentation in terms of timing of demolition, landscaping, and trees and linear features deemed of importance to protected bat species are to be retained where specified. Bat boxes are to be erected in the site to enhance roost availability. A pre-commencement survey will also be carried out prior to any demolition works. Lighting on site will be designed with consideration of current guidelines. The derogation application concludes that no significant impacts are envisaged on the local population of Soprano pipistrelles, nor on their favourable conservation status.

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



#### 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		
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)

A small number of soprano pipistrelles have been identified roosting on site. This species is widespread and abundant in Ireland. The loss of this roost will not have a significant impact on the favourable conservation status of this species in the area and proportionate mitigation is proposed

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		

Signed: Date: October 24, 2025

Position: Ecologist