

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1080/00063657.2016.1262816

Landscape effects on nest site selection and nest success of Northern Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus* in lowland wet grasslands — [Source link](#)

[Nikolas P. Bertholdt](#), [Jennifer A. Gill](#), [Rebecca A. Laidlaw](#), [Jennifer Smart](#)

Institutions: [University of East Anglia](#), [Royal Society for the Protection of Birds](#)

Published on: 02 Jan 2017 - [Bird Study](#) (Taylor & Francis)

Topics: [Northern lapwing](#), [Vanellus](#), [Lapwing](#), [Woodland](#) and [Nest](#)

Related papers:

- [Predation of Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus* nests on lowland wet grassland in England and Wales: effects of nest density, habitat and predator abundance](#)
- [Great variability in nest lining size: support for thermoregulation but not for anti-predatory adaptation hypothesis](#)
- [Factors affecting nest survival of Northern Lapwings *Vanellus vanellus* in arable farmland: an agri-environment scheme prescription can enhance nest survival](#)
- [Predation on artificial, solitary and aggregated wader nests on farmland.](#)
- [Species-specific nest predation depends on the total passerine nest density in open-nesting passerines](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/landscape-effects-on-nest-site-selection-and-nest-success-of-10zoqsh90h>

1 **Landscape effects on nest site selection and nest success of Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus* in lowland**
2 **wet grasslands**

3 Nikolas P. Bertholdt¹, Jennifer A. Gill¹, Rebecca A. Laidlaw¹ & Jennifer Smart²

4 ¹School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ,

5 UK

6 ²RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Lodge, Sandy,

7 SG19 2DL, UK

8

9

10 **Capsule:** Northern Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus* avoid nesting close to small woodland patches but nest
11 predation rates do not vary with distance to woodland patches, either because risky areas are
12 avoided or perceived nest predation risk doesn't reflect actual risk.

13 **Aims:** To explore the effects of woodland patches in wet grassland landscapes on nest distribution
14 and success of Lapwings.

15 **Methods:** We quantified the effect of woodland patches on the distribution and outcome of Lapwing
16 nests across four wet grassland sites by mapping nest distribution and monitoring nest outcomes.

17 **Results:** Lapwing nested significantly further from woods than expected by chance. Neither nest
18 predation rates nor the probability of predation occurring at night (thus primarily mammalian
19 predators) or day (primarily avian predators) varied in relation to distance from woodland patches.

20 **Conclusions:** High levels of nest and chick predation in wet grassland landscapes limit the capacity
21 for breeding wader populations to be self-sustaining. Consequently, identifying manageable
22 landscape features that influence predation rates is an important focus of conservation research.
23 Lapwing avoid breeding close to woodland but, as nest predation rates don't vary with distance from
24 woodland patches, their removal may increase the area of suitable nesting habitat but is unlikely to
25 substantially influence productivity.

26 **Introduction**

27 Global declines in wader populations are a major current conservation concern (Stroud. *et al.* 2008).
28 In Europe, long-term population declines are evident in 11 of the 12 wader species monitored within
29 the Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (European Bird Census Council 2014) and, in
30 the UK, populations of Lapwing, Common Snipe *Gallinago gallinago*, Common Redshank *Tringa*
31 *totanus*, and Eurasian Curlew *Numenius arquata* have all declined to such an extent that they are
32 now either red- or amber-listed (Hayhow *et al.* 2015). These declines have largely been driven by

33 land drainage and intensification of agricultural management removing the resources required for
34 nesting and chick-rearing (Wilson *et al.* 2005, Eglington *et al.* 2008, Amar *et al.* 2011).

35 Habitat fragmentation is resulting in once-widespread species being increasingly confined to
36 remaining pockets of suitable habitat, and such fragmentation generally leads to reduced nest
37 survival due to predation (Stephens *et al.* 2004). This, combined with increases in generalist predator
38 **numbers**, can result in unsustainably high levels of wader clutch loss (Macdonald & Bolton 2008),
39 making predation a significant limiting factor for these species. In these circumstances, increasing
40 the availability of suitable habitat is typically insufficient to arrest population declines without also
41 identifying means of reducing levels of nest predation (Smart *et al.* 2013).

42 The effectiveness of direct predator control at reducing levels of wader nest predation varies
43 depending on the local predator community and context (Bolton *et al.* 2007), is time consuming and
44 therefore costly and any benefits are lost when control ceases. If predation rates vary in relation to
45 manageable landscape characteristics, these could potentially offer longer-term, more sustainable
46 means of improving productivity and aiding recovery of wader populations.

47 Landscape structure could influence wader nest success by altering predator distribution, abundance
48 or activity, and thus the risk of nests being located by predators (e.g. (Whittingham & Evans 2004),
49 Eggers *et al.* 2006, Laidlaw *et al.* 2015). However, such effects may be masked if areas in which
50 predation risk is high are avoided as breeding locations (Martin 2011, Lima 2009, Zanette *et al.* 2011,
51 Lima 2009). Avoidance behaviour could thus reduce the impact of habitat-specific nest predation
52 risk. For example, nesting close to habitat edges may increase exposure of nests to predators from
53 the surrounding landscape. Elevated levels of predation of artificial nests have been recorded near
54 to habitat edges in forest fragments (Hartley & Hunter 1998), in open prairie habitats (Burger *et al.*
55 1994) and, for artificial and real nests, in marshlands (Batáry & Báldi 2004). However, other studies
56 have reported little or no evidence for variation in nest predation rates with distance from habitat
57 edges ((Stroud *et al.* 1990), (Nour *et al.* 1993), (Lahti 2001)), which could reflect either no effects of

58 habitat edges on predator activity or effective avoidance of risky areas by species vulnerable to nest
59 predators. Increases in nesting density with distance from woodland edges have been shown in
60 grassland passerines (Renfrew 2005) and, in the UK uplands, breeding wader abundance increases
61 with distance from plantation edges, Wilson *et al.* 2014), suggesting either avoidance of woodlands
62 by these species or lower survival of individuals breeding close to woodlands. The landscapes in
63 which waders breed can differ greatly in the amount, type and distribution of woodland. Small
64 patches of woodland are common in lowland wet grassland landscapes, but the influence of these
65 woodland patches on the nesting distribution and nest success of the important wader populations
66 that breed in these areas is not well understood.

67 If waders in lowland wet grassland avoid nesting close to woodlands, as seen in the uplands, this
68 could render large areas of potentially suitable lowland habitat unusable, thus limiting the capacity
69 for species recovery. Similarly, if woodland patches are used by nest predators, nest predation may
70 vary with proximity to woodland. Previous studies of breeding waders on grasslands have shown
71 that mammalian predators, particularly red foxes, *Vulpes vulpes*, are responsible for the great
72 majority of wader nest losses (Macdonald & Bolton 2008), and that lapwing nests that are closer to
73 patches of tall (primarily grass) vegetation have lower predation rates (Laidlaw *et al.* 2015). As these
74 patches of tall vegetation support small mammal populations that are otherwise rare in wet
75 grasslands (Laidlaw *et al.* 2013), the greater success of wader nests close to tall vegetation may
76 result from foxes concentrating on small mammal prey in these areas. If woodland patches provide
77 similar small mammal prey resources, nest predation by mammalian predators may be lower close
78 to woodland. Alternatively, if woodland patches provide perching locations from which avian
79 predators can hunt, nest predation by avian predators may be greater for nests close to woodland
80 patches. While the identity of nest predators is rarely known, most mammalian nest predation
81 occurs at night while avian predators operate primarily during daylight, thus nocturnal and diurnal
82 nest predation are generally good proxies for mammalian and avian predators, respectively
83 (Eglington *et al.* 2009). To assess the influence of woodland patches in lowland wet grassland

84 landscapes on breeding wader distribution and success, we therefore quantify variation in nest
85 location, nest predation and timing of predation (night or day) of Lapwing nests in relation to
86 proximity to woodland patches, on four sites in eastern England.

87 **Materials and Methods**

88 Four wet grasslands sites on the Alde-Ore estuary in Suffolk, UK were studied between 31st March
89 and 30th June 2014 (mean \pm SD ha: 117.4 ± 67.5). These sites were at least 3 km apart and contained
90 grasslands with a mix of sward heights and wet features in the form of shallow floods and
91 footdrains. At all four sites, fields are managed by cutting or grazing with sheep or cattle, and the
92 sites are surrounded by a mix of arable farmland and dry grassland, with a vegetated sea wall
93 separating them from intertidal habitats along one boundary. Small patches of woodland are
94 present on all sites (mean number per site = 5 ± 2 SD; mean woodland patch size = $1.3 \text{ ha} \pm 1.1$ SD)
95 (Figure 1).

96 Lapwing nests were located during twice weekly visits to each site by observing incubating adults.
97 Eggs were weighed and measured, to calculate predicted hatching dates (Smart 2005), a
98 temperature logger was inserted beneath the nest lining, and the position of the nest was recorded
99 using a Garmin Etrex 30 handheld GPS.

100 Temperature loggers recorded temperature every eight minutes, and were retrieved once the nest
101 was empty. The resulting temperature traces were used to determine the date and time of hatching
102 or failure. Hatched nests were identified as being empty within two days of predicted hatch date and
103 in which tiny eggshell fragments were found within the undisturbed nest lining. Predated nests
104 typically had remains of predated eggs or a disturbed nest lining, and were empty prior to predicted
105 hatch dates. Trampled nests (containing broken eggshell and contents) and abandoned nests
106 (containing cold, intact eggs) were also recorded.

107 The positions of all woodland patches, ditches, field margin vegetation (hedges or tall vegetation
108 fringe) and within-field tall (>50 cm) vegetation and wet features were mapped using a combination
109 of GPS and ground-truthed aerial imagery, and imported into ArcGIS along with the positions of all
110 nests. Wet features are known to attract nesting Lapwing (Eglington et al. 2010) and thus their
111 influence on nest location had to be taken into account when assessing effects of woodland patches
112 on nest distribution and success. The effects of ditches, field margin and within-field tall vegetation
113 were included in initial analyses but, as they had no significant effects on nest site selection or
114 predation, these were excluded from further consideration in this study.

115 The effects of woodland patches on (1) nest site selection, (2) daily nest predation rate and (3) time
116 of nest predation were assessed using generalised linear models with a logit link function and
117 binomial error distribution. Daily predation rate was calculated using the extension to Mayfield
118 estimate methods described by (Aebischer 1999) (Table 1). Nest locations were compared to
119 randomly located points generated using the Create Random Points function in ArcGIS. The number
120 of random points generated for each site reflected the number of nests at that site (rounded up to
121 the nearest five), and random points were excluded from areas of unsuitable nesting habitat
122 (standing water and vegetation height greater than 15 cm) (Winspear & Davies 2005). The timing of
123 nest predation was classified as day or night, as defined by the hours of civil twilight.

124 **Results**

125 Across all sites, a total of 77 nests were monitored (12, 28, 13 and 24 per site) of which 32% hatched,
126 53% were predated, 9% failed due to trampling and 5% failed due to flooding or abandonment.

127 Nests were found, on average, 8.7 days (± 8.2 SD) from the start of incubation, and were located
128 between 71 and 1815 m from woodland patches (mean 717 m ± 327 SD), with 88% being located
129 over 500 m from the nearest woodland. The maximum distance of potential nesting habitat to
130 woodland patches was 2065 m. Nests were distributed closer to wet features and further from

131 woods than randomly located points (full model: $\chi^2_5=34.7$, $p<0.001$, Table 2.1, Figure 2.1). This
132 model successfully classified 63.5% of nests and 74% of random points.

133 For the 65 nests for which outcome (hatched or not) was known (Figure 2.2) and exposure days
134 could be calculated (12 of the 77 nests were excluded from this analysis due to being found at or
135 after hatching or data loggers failed, and hence outcome dates were lost), the Mayfield estimate of
136 mean daily predation rate was 0.05 (± 0.008 SE). There was no significant variation in daily
137 predation rate of these nests between sites or in relation to either distance to the nearest woodland
138 patch or wet feature (Table 2.2).

139 Predation events occurred throughout the breeding season and, of the 39 predated nests for which
140 time of predation was available, 68% were predated at night (Figure 2.3 and Figure 3). However,
141 there was no significant difference in the relative frequency of nocturnal and diurnal predation
142 events among sites or in relation to either distance to the nearest woodland patch or the nearest
143 wet feature (Table 2.3).

144 **Discussion**

145 In wet grassland landscapes in which small woodland patches are common, Lapwing nests were
146 located significantly further from woods than expected by chance, however the rate and timing of
147 predation did not vary in relation to these landscape features. In this study the presence of
148 woodland patches did not therefore appear to strongly influence the probability of Lapwing nests
149 being predated in these landscapes.

150 Avoidance of woodland patches was quite strong (only 12% of nests were within 500 m of woods
151 despite ~30% of the suitable nesting habitat being within 500 m of woods at these sites (mean site
152 area = 42.2 ha \pm 32.4 SD). The spatial scale of this avoidance of woodlands is similar to that
153 previously found in a range of wader species breeding at higher elevations (Stroud *et al.* 1990,
154 Wilson *et al.* 2014). Lapwing nests were significantly more likely to be located closer to in-field wet

155 features (as has also been shown elsewhere; Eglington *et al.* 2010), and so it is not clear whether the
156 removal of woodland patches alone would necessarily increase the area for nesting Lapwing at these
157 sites, unless in-field wet features were already present or were subsequently developed within the
158 areas previously close to woodland.

159 Increased levels of predation of Lapwing nests close (< 50 m) to trees and other avian perches have
160 been reported (Berg *et al.* 1992) but in our study all nests were located more than 70 m from
161 woodland patches, and thus particularly risky locations may well have been avoided by these birds
162 prior to our study. Waders have also previously been shown to avoid nesting close to tall structures
163 which can potentially be used as perches by avian predators (Wallander *et al.* 2006). Other than
164 woodlands there were very few structures, apart from gateposts which were less than 2 m high,
165 across the sites so tall structures were unlikely to have been important in this study.

166 A wide range of potential predator species were observed across the sites, including Red foxes
167 *Vulpes vulpes*, Eurasian badgers *Meles meles*, Eurasian otters *Lutra lutra*, Carrion crows *Corvus*
168 *corone*, Herring gulls, *Larus argentatus*, Greater black-backed gulls *L. fuscus*, Lesser black-backed
169 gulls *L. marinus*, Grey herons *Ardea cinerea* and Marsh harriers *Circus aeruginosus*. The majority
170 (68%) of nest predation events occurred during the hours of darkness, suggesting that mammalian
171 predators were responsible for most of the nest losses, and Red foxes have been shown to be the
172 main nest predator of waders on grasslands across Western Europe (Macdonald & Bolton 2008).
173 However, diurnal predation events were also recorded in this study, and thus avian predators may
174 also be involved. This range of both diurnal and nocturnal potential predator species, and the likely
175 differences in how they interact with woodland patches, may contribute to the absence of an overall
176 effect of woodlands on the timing of nest predation.

177 The absence of any change in nest predation rates with distance from woodland patches suggests
178 that the lack of nests close to woods is more likely to result from lapwing actively avoiding these
179 areas than from nests close to woods being predated prior to being detected. Avoidance of areas

180 close to woods could reflect a greater perceived predation risk in these areas, perhaps because trees
181 prevent clear lines of sight from nest locations and thus increase the perceived vulnerability to
182 predators of incubating adults.

183 A previous study of breeding lapwing on lowland wet grasslands has shown lower nest predation
184 rates close (within ~100-200 m) to areas of tall vegetation such as field verges (Laidlaw *et al.* 2015),
185 potentially reflecting predators concentrating on small mammal prey in these areas (Laidlaw *et al.*
186 2013). The lack of association between proximity to woodland patches and nest predation rates or
187 timing of predation suggests that woodland patches may either (a) not provide the same conditions
188 for small mammals as grassy field verges, (b) attract avian predators and thus offset any benefit of
189 reduced mammalian predator impact or, alternatively, (c) the avoidance of woodland patches by
190 nesting lapwing may constrain the capacity to identify their influence on nest predation rates. Our
191 analyses of distance to woodland used the straight-line distance which presumes that predator
192 movement around the sites is not constrained by any landscape features. While ditches could
193 potentially constrain the movement of mammalian predators between fields, previous studies have
194 found no evidence of foxes concentrating their activity along these features (Eglington *et al.* 2009),
195 and, in these study areas, the distance of many of the woodland patches from the study fields
196 (Figure 1) meant that direct and indirect (avoiding ditches) distances were very similar.

197 We have shown that the presence of woodland patches in lowland wet grassland landscapes may
198 influence the distribution of breeding Lapwing and could result in large areas of potentially suitable
199 habitat being unused for nesting. Consequently, in these landscapes, restoration of wet grassland
200 habitats might be best located away (i.e. > 500 m) from woodland and woodland creation away (i.e.
201 > 500 m) from fields suitable for breeding waders, and incorporating these criteria into agri-
202 environment options designed to support breeding waders may help to avoid habitat creation in
203 areas where parts of the landscape may be effectively unavailable to nesting lapwing. However, our
204 findings also suggest that such habitat modifications may be unlikely to reduce nest predation rates,

205 and thus the presence of woodland patches is not sufficient to inform or target predator control
206 strategies, and other management practices that increase productivity, such as predator control or
207 landscape manipulation to provide ample alternative food resources for predators, will still be
208 needed to reverse wader population declines.

209 **Acknowledgements**

210 We would like to thank the Paul and Louise Cooke Endowment for funding this work, Rodney West
211 for all his support during the development and implementation of the study, Jamie Curtis Hayward,
212 Mike Marsh and Gillian Hammond for help in the field, the landowners and managers of the sites,
213 particularly Paul and Louise Cooke, for allowing access, site staff and volunteers for supporting and
214 assisting data collection and the editor and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on the
215 manuscript. This study was undertaken as part of an MSc in Applied Ecology and Conservation at
216 UEA.

217 **References**

- 218 **Aebischer, N.J.** 1999. Multi-way comparisons and generalized linear models of nest success:
219 extensions of the Mayfield method. *Bird Study* **46**: 22–31.
- 220 **Amar, A., Grant, M., Buchanan, G., Sim, I., Wilson, J., Pearce-Higgins, J.W. & Redpath, S.** 2011.
221 Exploring the relationships between wader declines and current land-use in the British
222 uplands. *Bird Study* **58**: 13–26.
- 223 **Batáry, P. & Báldi, A.** 2004. Evidence of an edge effect on avian nest success. *Conservation Biology*
224 **18**: 389–400.
- 225 **Berg, Å., Lindberg, T. & Källebrink, K.G.** 1992. Hatching success of Lapwings on farmland:
226 Differences between habitats and colonies of different sizes. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **61**:
227 469–476.

- 228 **Bergin, T.M., Best, L.B., Freemark, K.E. & Koehler, K.J.** 2000. Effects of landscape structure on nest
229 predation in roadsides of a midwestern agroecosystem: a multiscale analysis. *Landscape*
230 *Ecology* **15**: 131–143.
- 231 **Bolton, M., Tyler, G., Smith, K. & Bamford, R.** 2007. The impact of predator control on lapwing
232 *Vanellus vanellus* breeding success on wet grassland nature reserves. *Journal of Applied*
233 *Ecology* **44**: 534–544.
- 234 **Burger, L.D., Burger, L.W. & Faaborg, J.** 1994. Effects of prairie fragmentation on predation on
235 artificial nests. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* **58**: 249.
- 236 **Eggers, S., Griesser, M., Nystrand, M. & Ekman J.** 2006. Predation risk induces changes in nest-site
237 selection and clutch size in the Siberian jay. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
238 *Sciences* **273**: 701–706.
- 239 **Eglington, S.M., Bolton, M., Smart, M.A., Sutherland, W.J., Watkinson, A.R. & Gill, J.A.** 2010.
240 Managing water levels on wet grasslands to improve foraging conditions for breeding
241 Northern lapwing *Vanellus vanellus*. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **47**: 451–458.
- 242 **Eglington, S.M., Gill, J.A., Bolton, M., Smart, M.A., Sutherland, W.J. & Watkinson, A.R.** 2008.
243 Restoration of wet features for breeding waders on lowland grassland. *Journal of Applied*
244 *Ecology* **45**: 305–314.
- 245 **Eglington, S.M., Gill, J.A., Smart, M.A., Sutherland, W.J., Watkinson, A.R. & Bolton, M.** 2009.
246 Habitat management and patterns of predation of Northern Lapwings on wet grasslands:
247 The influence of linear habitat structures at different spatial scales. *Biological Conservation*
248 **142**: 314–324.
- 249 **European Bird Census Council.** 2014. Trends of common birds in Europe, 2014 update. Available
250 from <http://www.ebcc.info/index.php?ID=557> (accessed October 8, 2014).

- 251 **Hartley, M.J. & Hunter, M.L.** 1998. A meta-analysis of forest cover, edge effects, and artificial nest
252 predation rates. *Conservation Biology* **12**: 465–469.
- 253 **Lahti, D.C.** 2001. The “edge effect on nest predation” hypothesis after twenty years. *Biological*
254 *Conservation* **99**: 365–374.
- 255 **Laidlaw, R.A., Smart, J., Smart, M.A. & Gill, J.A.** 2015. The influence of landscape features on nest
256 predation rates of grassland-breeding waders. *Ibis* **157**: 700–712.
- 257 **Lima, S.L.** 2009. Predators and the breeding bird: behavioral and reproductive flexibility under the
258 risk of predation. *Biological Reviews* **84**: 485–513.
- 259 **Macdonald, M.A. & Bolton, M.** 2008. Predation on wader nests in Europe. *Ibis* **150**: 54–73.
- 260 **Martin, T.E.** 2011. The cost of fear. *Science* **334**: 1353–1354.
- 261 **Nour, N., Matthysen, E. & Dhondt, A.A.** 1993. Artificial nest predation and habitat fragmentation:
262 different trends in bird and mammal predators. *Ecography* **16**: 111–116.
- 263 **Renfrew, R.B., Ribic, C.A. & Nack, J.L.** 2005. Edge avoidance by nesting grassland birds: A futile
264 strategy in a fragmented landscape. *The Auk* **122**: 618–636.
- 265 **Smart, J.** 2005. Strategies of sea-level rise mitigation for breeding Redshank. PhD Thesis. University
266 of East Anglia Norwich. Available from [http://www.bou.org.uk/student-post-docs-early-](http://www.bou.org.uk/student-post-docs-early-career-researchers/branta/smart/)
267 [career-researchers/branta/smart/](http://www.bou.org.uk/student-post-docs-early-career-researchers/branta/smart/) (accessed February 1, 2015).
- 268 **Smart, J., Bolton, M., Hunter, F., Quayle, H., Thomas, G. & Gregory, R.D.** 2013. Managing uplands
269 for biodiversity: Do agri-environment schemes deliver benefits for breeding lapwing *Vanellus*
270 *vanellus*? *Journal of Applied Ecology* **50**: 794–804.

- 271 **Stephens, S.E., Koons, D.N., Rotella, J.J. & Willey, D.W.** 2004. Effects of habitat fragmentation on
272 avian nesting success: a review of the evidence at multiple spatial scales. *Biological*
273 *Conservation* **115**: 101–110.
- 274 **Stroud, D.A., Baker, A., Blanco, D.E., Davidson, N.C., Delany, S., Ganter, B., Gill, R., González, P.,**
275 **Haanstra, L., Morrison, R.I.G., Piersma, T., Scott, D.A., Thorup, O., West, R., Wilson, J. &**
276 **ZöcklerStroud, C.** 2008. The conservation and population status of the world's waders at
277 the turn of the millennium. *Waterbirds around the world*. Eds. Boere, G.C., Galbraith, C.A. &
278 Stroud, D.A.. The Stationery Office, Edinburgh, UK. 643–648.
- 279 **Stroud, D.A., Harding, N.J. & Reed, T.M.** 1990. Do moorland breeding waders avoid plantation
280 edges? *Bird Study* **37**: 177–186.
- 281 **Wallander, J., Isaksson, D. & Lenberg, T.** 2006. Wader nest distribution and predation in relation to
282 man-made structures on coastal pastures. *Biological Conservation* **132**: 343–350.
- 283 **Whittingham, M.J. & Evans, K.L.** 2004. The effects of habitat structure on predation risk of birds in
284 agricultural landscapes. *Ibis* **146**: 210–220.
- 285 **Wilson, A.M., Vickery, J.A., Brown, A., Langston, R.H.W., Smallshire, D., Wotton, S. &**
286 **Vanhinsbergh, D.** 2005. Changes in the numbers of breeding waders on lowland wet
287 grasslands in England and Wales between 1982 and 2002. *Bird Study* **52**: 55–69.
- 288 **Wilson, J.D., Anderson, R., Bailey, S., Chetcuti, J., Cowie, N.R., Hancock, M.H., Quine, C.P., Russell,**
289 **N., Stephen, L. & Thompson, D.B.A.** 2014. Modelling edge effects of mature forest
290 plantations on peatland waders informs landscape-scale conservation. *Journal of Applied*
291 *Ecology* **51**: 204–213.
- 292 **Winspear, R. & Davies, G.** 2005. *A management guide to birds of lowland farmland*. Royal Society
293 for the Protection of Birds, Sandy, England.

294 **Zanette, L.Y., White, A.F., Allen, M.C. & Clinchy, M.** 2011. Perceived predation risk reduces the
295 number of offspring songbirds produce per year. *Science* **334**: 1398–1401.

296


297 Table 1. Descriptions of response and explanatory variables used in models of landscape effects on Lapwing nest site selection and nest outcome. Full
 298 model structures are shown for each analysis.

Analysis	Response	Explanatory variables (fixed factors)	
1: Is nest site selection affected by proximity to woods and wet features?			
	Nest or random location	Distance to woods, distance to wet features, (site)	
2: Is nest predation rate affected by proximity to woods and wet features?			
	Daily predation rate	Distance to woods, distance to wet features, (site)	
3: Is the timing of nest predation affected by proximity to woods and wet features?			
	Day or night	Distance to woods, distance to wet features, (site)	
Response variable descriptions			
Analysis	Variable	Distribution	Description
1	Nest or random	Binomial	All nests (n=77) and random points (n=85)
2	Daily predation rate	Binomial	Predated (n=39) and other outcome (n=26) accounting for exposure days
3	Day or night	Binomial	Period of failure of predated nests (night n=26, day n=13; period defined by hours of civil twilight)
Explanatory variable descriptions			
Analysis	Variable	Factor levels	Description
1,2,3	Site	Four sites	Four wet grassland sites in Eastern England
1,2,3	Distance to wet features	Continuous	Shortest linear distance to nearest within-field flood or footdrain(m)
1,2,3	Distance to woods	Continuous	Shortest linear distance to nearest wood(m)

299

300 Table 2. Results of generalised linear maximal models exploring the influence of woods and in-field
 301 wet features on nest site location, daily nest predation rate and timing of nest predation (day or
 302 night). Significant effects are highlighted in bold.

Analysis	Variable				
1: Does nest site selection vary with distance to woods and wet features?					
		Wald	expB	df	p
	Constant	0.087	0.849	1	0.77
	Site	2.097	-	3	0.55
	Distance to wet features	15.679	0.994	1	<0.001
	Distance to woods	5.375	1.002	1	0.02
2: Does nest predation rate vary with distance to woods and wet features?					
		χ^2		df	p
	Constant	22.46		1	<0.001
	Site	0.81		3	0.85
	Distance to wet features	0.57		1	0.45
	Distance to woods	0.49		1	0.48
3: Does the timing of nest predation vary with distance to woods and wet features?					
		Wald	expB	df	p
	Constant	0.398	0.319	1	0.53
	Site	1.016	-	3	0.8
	Distance to wet features	2.262	1.014	1	0.13
	Distance to woods	0.087	0.999	1	0.77




303

304

Figure 1. Locations of hatched and predated Lapwing nests and key landscape components at the


305

four study sites on the Suffolk coast, eastern England.



306

307 **Figure 2.** (1)The influence of distance to woodland patches, after controlling for site and distance to
 308 wet features, on the location of Lapwing nests (upper bars) compared to random points (lower bars),
 309 (2) the number of non-predated (shaded bars) and predated (solid bars) nests, (3) the number of
 310 nocturnal (shaded bars) and diurnally (solid bars) predated nests.



311

312 **Figure 3.** Seasonal and diurnal timing of Lapwing nest predation events. Lines show the timing of
 313 dawn and dusk (the beginning and end of civil twilight) throughout the breeding season.

314