



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

This is an author version of the contribution published on:

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

Global Change Biology, 17: 32-44, 2011 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02247.x

The definitive version is available at:

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02247.x/abstract>

1 **Abstract**

2 **Urban development is increasing across the globe. This poses a major threat to biodiversity,**
3 **which is often limited in towns and cities. Despite much interest in identifying species' traits**
4 **that can predict their responses to environmental degradation this approach has seldom been**
5 **employed to assess which species are particularly vulnerable to urban development. Here, we**
6 **explore this issue, exploiting one of the best available datasets on species' responses to towns**
7 **and cities in a highly urbanised region, comprising avian densities across approximately 3,000**
8 **British urban and rural 1km x 1km grid cells. We find that the manner in which species'**
9 **responses to urbanisation is measured has a marked influence on the nature of associations**
10 **between these responses and species' ecological and life history traits. We advocate that**
11 **future studies should use continuous indices of responses that take relative urban and rural**
12 **densities into account. Contrary to previous studies we find that urban development does not**
13 **select against avian long-distance migrants and insectivores, or species with limited annual**
14 **fecundity and dispersal capacity. There was no evidence that behavioural flexibility, as**
15 **measured by relative brain size, influenced species' responses to urban environments. In**
16 **Britain, generalist species, as measured by niche position rather than breadth, are favoured**
17 **by urban development as are, albeit to a lesser extent, those that feed on plant material and**
18 **nest above the ground. Our results suggest that avian biodiversity in towns and cities in**
19 **urbanising regions will be promoted by providing additional resources that are currently**
20 **scarce in urban areas, encouraging supplementary feeding, and developing suitable**
21 **environments for ground-nesting species.**

22

23 **Key words: birds, brain size, cities, development, predation, specialist, species traits, urbanisation**
24 **index**

25

26 **Introduction**

1 Globally, urbanisation is amongst the fastest growing land uses (UN, 2008). This is partly due to
2 human population growth, but also arises from socio-economic factors that result in people moving
3 from rural to urban areas, a greater proportion of single person households, and elevated demand for
4 low density housing (Liu *et al.*, 2003; UN, 2008). Increased urban development has a negative
5 impact on biodiversity for three main reasons. First, urbanisation is most likely to occur in regions
6 that contain large numbers of people; this results in conservation conflicts because, at broad spatial
7 scales, human population density is positively correlated with species richness (Evans *et al.*, 2006,
8 2007; Luck, 2007). Second, the land selected for housing development is often more ecologically
9 valuable than undeveloped areas (Bartlett *et al.*, 2000; Gonzalez-Abraham *et al.*, 2007; Radeloff *et*
10 *al.* in press). Third, highly developed urban areas support fewer native species than the rural
11 habitats which they replace; indeed, many species do not occur in urban areas despite being present
12 in nearby rural habitats (Tratalos *et al.*, 2007; Grimm *et al.*, 2008). These reductions in biodiversity
13 are increased because there is limited spatial turnover in the composition of urban assemblages, i.e.
14 urbanisation promotes biotic homogenization (McKinney, 2006; Devictor *et al.*, 2007).

15
16 Urban development is thus a major threat to conservation (Czech *et al.*, 2000; McDonald *et al.*,
17 2008), and it is important to assess which ecological and life history traits predict species' responses
18 to urbanisation. A small number of initial investigations have been conducted that classify species
19 into two groups that differ in their response to urbanisation, such as those that occur or reproduce in
20 cities and those that do not, and then assess how species' traits differ between the two groups
21 (Bonier *et al.*, 2007; Kark *et al.*, 2007; Croci *et al.*, 2008; Møller, 2009). Such studies are severely
22 limited because they assume that all species within a group have an equivalent response to
23 urbanisation. This is highly unlikely to be valid as species vary in their urban densities, and the
24 types of urban areas in which they occur (Tratalos *et al.*, 2007; Grimm *et al.*, 2008; Evans *et al.*,
25 2009). Here, we provide a rare assessment of associations between species' traits and responses to
26 urban development. In notable improvements to previous studies we measure species' responses

1 using a continuous quantitative index, and assess how the nature of associations between species'
2 traits and responses to urbanisation depend on the precise form of these urbanisation indices. We
3 start, however, by assessing which ecological and life history traits are likely to influence a species'
4 ability to thrive in urban areas; this will be determined by successful progression through each of
5 the three phases of biotic urbanisation, i.e. arrival, adjustment and spread (Evans *et al.*, in press).

6
7 Species vary widely in their environmental tolerances, and generalists appear less vulnerable to
8 habitat deterioration and loss (Owens & Bennett, 2000; Shultz *et al.*, 2005), including urban
9 development (Bonier *et al.*, 2007; Kark *et al.*, 2007). Behavioural flexibility may also help species
10 tolerate environmental change. Measurements of flexibility, such as the acquisition of new foraging
11 techniques, are correlated with relative brain size (Lefebvre *et al.*, 1997, 1998; but see Healy &
12 Rowe, 2007), which can predict the magnitude and direction of population trends in response to
13 environmental degradation (Shultz *et al.*, 2005), and which species invade novel environments (Sol
14 *et al.*, 2005, 2008). Therefore, urbanisation may also promote behaviourally flexible species with
15 relatively larger brains.

16
17 Long distance migrants are declining more rapidly than residents, and may be more vulnerable or
18 more exposed to environmental change (Sanderson *et al.*, 2006; Wilcove & Wikelski, 2008); they
19 also appear to be scarcer in urban areas than residents (Friesen *et al.*, 1995; Rodewald &
20 Bakermans, 2006). This may be because migrants are disadvantaged when competing for limited
21 resources as they tend to arrive on breeding grounds after residents have established territories.
22 Migrants also appear more susceptible to mismatches between the timing of breeding and peak food
23 availability induced by climate change (Visser *et al.*, 2004; Post & Forchhammer, 2008); the urban
24 heat island effect (Collier, 2006) may thus make developed areas less suitable for migrants.

25

1 Within urban areas green space is highly fragmented, thus dispersal may result in arrival in
2 unsuitable environments more frequently than if individuals remained in their current habitat patch;
3 reduced dispersal capacity can thus be advantageous in cities (Cheptou *et al.*, 2008). This advantage
4 may also arise because frequent dispersal can generate sufficient gene flow between populations
5 occupying contrasting environments to swamp locally evolving adaptive genotypes, thus preventing
6 genetic adaptation to novel conditions, including those occurring in urban areas (Rasanen &
7 Hendry, 2008; Rios *et al.*, 2008). In contrast, strong dispersal capacity increases the probability of a
8 species colonising novel environments (Lloret *et al.*, 2005; Philips *et al.*, 2008), and recolonising
9 previously occupied habitat patches following local extinction (Hanski, 2001). It is thus generally
10 considered that, and despite the contrary hypotheses, species which have successfully colonised
11 urban areas are likely to have strong dispersal abilities (Møller, 2009).

12

13 Adjustment to novel urban environments may require genetic change (Partecke *et al.*, 2006; Rios *et*
14 *al.*, 2008). In sexually reproducing species the potential rate of such change is positively influenced
15 by short generation times and the production of a large number of offspring, as these determine the
16 number of meiosis events and thus the potential for DNA copying errors (i.e. mutations). These
17 demographic traits also generate high intrinsic population growth rates which may enable rapid
18 recovery from disturbance, and produce more potential colonists. These mechanisms may explain
19 why fecund species appear less vulnerable to environmental degradation (Owens & Bennett, 2000;
20 Purvis *et al.*, 2000).

21

22 Urban areas are often characterised by the provision of supplementary avian food, which
23 predominantly consists of seeds or other plant material (Davies *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, species
24 which can exploit such food sources may be more abundant in urban areas than those with
25 alternative diets (Fuller *et al.*, 2008); indeed insectivorous species appear to be relatively scarce in
26 urban areas (Chace & Walsh, 2006; Kark *et al.*, 2007).

1
2 Finally, predation risk may be greater in urban areas due to changes in habitat types (Riley *et al.*,
3 2005, Hamer & McDonnell, 2008), or higher densities of some predators such as domestic cats
4 *Felis catus* and nest predating corvids (Sims *et al.*, 2008; Evans *et al.*, 2009). It is often suggested
5 that bird species which nest on or close to the ground will be adversely impacted by urbanisation
6 due to increased nest predation (Jokimäki & Huhta, 2000, Chace & Walsh, 2006, Croci *et al.*,
7 2008). In contrast, a recent review concludes that across those species which occur in towns and
8 cities urbanisation does not consistently markedly alter avian nest predation rates (Chamberlain *et*
9 *al.*, 2009). However, when considering a wider range of species it remains plausible that those
10 which are vulnerable to predation because they nest on the ground will be adversely influenced by
11 urbanisation.

12
13 Here we assess the hypotheses that avian species which have (i) broad ecological requirements; (ii)
14 relatively large brains; (iii) resident populations, (iv) strong dispersal capacities, (v) high fecundity,
15 (vi) a plant-based diet, and (vii) do not nest close to the ground are more likely to be urbanised than
16 species which lack these traits. In so doing, we provide the first assessment of whether the nature of
17 associations between species' traits and responses to urban areas varies with the form of
18 urbanisation indices. Specifically, we compare indices constructed using different definitions of
19 urban land, and which do and do not take species' rural abundances into account. We use the British
20 avifauna as a case study for three reasons. First, the national Breeding Bird Survey (BBS) enables
21 population densities to be calculated for specific habitat types. We can thus develop urbanisation
22 indices along a continuous scale, a notable advance on previous studies that typically classify
23 species on a binary, and somewhat subjective, scale as urbanised or not. Second, detailed data on
24 the ecological and life history traits of British birds are available that enable more rigorous tests of
25 associations between species' traits and urbanisation than previously possible. Finally, Britain has a
26 long history of urban development and is now amongst the most highly urbanised regions (with

1 between 8% and 10% of the land area being urban, Haines-Young *et al.*, 2000; Fuller *et al.*, 2002).
2 Our analyses thus facilitate prediction of which species are likely to thrive, and which to be
3 threatened, in regions that are currently less urbanised but are experiencing rapid urbanisation.

4 5 **Methods**

6 *Urbanisation indices*

7 For each of 88 commoner and accurately surveyed? native breeding bird species recorded in the
8 2006 BBS (Raven *et al.*, 2007) the urbanisation index was first calculated as the density in urban
9 areas. Species may, however, occur at low densities in urban environments because their ecological
10 characteristics are such that they have a large home range and thus always occur at low densities,
11 irrespective of habitat type, rather than because urban environments are particularly unsuitable. We
12 therefore also calculated another urbanisation index as the ratio of urban and rural densities. We
13 used two definitions of urban areas that varied in the proportion of built up land in the focal area
14 (see below), thus giving four different urbanisation indices.

15
16 A full description of the BBS survey methodology is provided in Appendix A. In brief, distance
17 sampling was conducted along ten 200m transect sections in a randomly selected 1km x 1km
18 square. The main habitat, such as human sites or woodland, in each section was recorded together
19 with finer level habitat features (Crick, 1992). We defined urban BBS squares in two ways. First,
20 those in which the primary habitat type in each of the ten transect sections was classified as urban or
21 suburban; 153 of 3002 squares met this criterion. Second, those with at least six urban or suburban
22 transect sections; 272 squares met this criterion. Urban squares are located throughout the focal
23 region, and remaining squares were considered to be rural. The density of adult breeding birds was
24 determined using the methodology of Newson *et al.* (2008).

25 26 *Species traits*

1 Data on species traits were obtained for British populations from Cramp *et al.* (1977-1994) unless
2 otherwise stated (Appendix B). These data are typically derived from studies conducted in relatively
3 natural environments. Annual fecundity was calculated as the mean number of clutches per year
4 multiplied by the mean clutch size. Species were classified as nesting close to the ground if they
5 typically nested on or just above the ground. We recorded whether invertebrates or plant material
6 comprised major components of adult diets during the breeding season using two binary factors,
7 thus omnivorous species were coded as using both food sources. Using Wernham *et al.* (2002),
8 species were classified as long distance migrants if the majority of the population wintered south of
9 the Sahara, and as residents if the majority wintered in Britain. Arithmetic mean natal dispersal
10 distance of British birds was obtained for 61 species from Paradis *et al.* (1998). We used natal
11 rather than breeding dispersal distance as the former was available for more species. Paradis *et al.*
12 (1998) calculated both arithmetic and geometric mean dispersal distances, but the two are strongly
13 correlated (Spearman rank correlation $r_s = 0.93$, $n = 63$, $P < 0.0001$), and we arbitrarily decided to
14 use the former. We logarithmically transformed natal dispersal distance to base ten to reduce the
15 skew in its distribution.

16
17 Brain size can be measured as either endocranial volume or brain mass, and the two are very
18 strongly correlated (Iwaniuk & Nelson, 2002). We obtained data on endocranial volume (mm^3) for
19 51 species that were obtained by filling the brain cavity, of unfractured skulls from apparently
20 healthy adults, with a 50:50 mixture of sizes 10 and 11 lead shot, which yields highly repeatable
21 measurements (Iwaniuk & Nelson, 2003; A. Iwaniuk, unpublished data). We also obtained brain
22 mass data for 81 species from Mlíkovský (1989a-c, 1990). These data were converted to volumes
23 using the widely accepted value of the density of fresh avian brain tissue (1.036 g/ml; Ebinger,
24 1995; Iwaniuk & Nelson, 2001). The resultant two data sets were strongly correlated ($r^2 = 0.987$, P
25 < 0.0001 , $n = 49$; linear regression of data logarithmically transformed to base ten) and a paired t-
26 test showed there were no significant differences between them ($T = -0.01$, $P = 0.989$, $n = 49$).

1 When brain size data were available from both sources we used the average value, but otherwise
2 used information from a single source, thus providing data for 83 species. Brain size scales with
3 body size and this allometric relationship must be taken into account when assessing the influence
4 of brain size on species' ecological responses. The inclusion of both variables in the allometric
5 relationship, i.e. brain size and body size, as predictors in a single multiple regression analysis
6 provides the ideal method for assessing the influence of the focal variable, i.e. relative brain size
7 (Freckleton, 2002). We adopted this approach using mean body mass data from the compilation in
8 Gaston & Blackburn (2000) and logarithmically transformed both brain volume and body mass
9 data, to base ten, to reduce the skew in their distributions. Previous studies have taken the allometry
10 between brain and body size into account using residuals from a log-log regression of brain size
11 against body size as a measure of relative brain size, but the use of such residuals as predictors in
12 further analyses can generate biased parameter estimates and should be avoided (García-Berthou,
13 2001; Freckleton, 2002).

14
15 Due to the multi-dimensional nature of niche space we used two approaches to classify species
16 along the continuum from specialists to generalists. First, geographic range size has previously been
17 used as a measure of environmental tolerance under the assumption that possessing a large range
18 requires adaptation to a wide variety of environmental conditions. This may not be valid in all
19 situations, as a species may occur widely but use only a few habitat types within its range, but
20 validity will be maximised when range size is measured as area of occupancy, rather than extent of
21 occurrence, and will increase as spatial grain size becomes smaller (Gaston, 2003). Therefore, we
22 calculated the number of European 50km x 50km grid cells occupied by each species during the
23 breeding season from Hagemeyer & Blair (1997). Following Gregory *et al.* (1998) we excluded the
24 far east of the surveyed region as survey coverage in these areas was typically limited. Hagemeyer
25 & Blair (1997) do not distinguish between *Carduelis flammea* and *C. cabaret*. Only *C. cabaret*

1 breeds in Britain, and we estimated its range size from Hagemeyer & Blair (1997) using the
2 description of its distribution in Clement *et al.* (1993).

3
4 Second, and in reflection of the multi-dimensional nature of niche space, we obtained data on niche
5 breadth and niche position, which are two complementary measures of specialisation (Shugart &
6 Patten 1972). Niche breadth measures a focal species' tolerance to contrasting environmental
7 conditions. Niche position measures how typical the resource use of a particular species is relative
8 to all other species and the resources available; species with a large niche position thus use less
9 typical resources (Shugart & Patten 1972). Following the methodology of Gregory & Gaston
10 (2000), who previously calculated niche breadth and position of British birds, we calculated niche
11 breadth and position using a canonical correspondence analysis (CCA). The major change that we
12 implemented compared to Gregory & Gaston (2000) was that we excluded environmental variables
13 that described the magnitude of urbanisation from the calculations of niche metrics, thus leaving a
14 total of 29 environmental variables (Table 1). We also implemented three further minor changes: (i)
15 avian abundance data were from 2006, (ii) climatic data were updated to include more recent years,
16 which required the use of cloud cover rather than sunshine hours, and (iii) land-cover classifications
17 of 1km squares were updated. The standard deviation of each species' distribution of tolerance
18 across each axis identified by the CCA provides estimates of niche breadth, and the root mean
19 squared standard deviations across all four axes provides an overall estimate of niche breadth.
20 Niche position is calculated as the distance of the centroid of a species from that of the whole
21 assemblage, which is calculated as the mean of the coordinates of the species' centroids. Niche
22 position was logarithmically transformed to base ten to reduce the skew in its distribution. The
23 niche breadth and position data calculated by Gregory & Gaston (2000) were strongly correlated
24 with our newly calculated data (niche breadth: $r = 0.900$, $P < 0.0001$; \log_{10} niche position: $r = 0.842$,
25 $P < 0.0001$; $n = 77$ in both cases).

26

1 *Data analysis*

2 Analyses were conducted in SAS vs 9.1. Whilst our four measures of urbanisation were strongly
3 correlated (Table 2), initial analyses suggested that they may differ in the nature of their relationship
4 with species traits. We thus assessed the relationship between species' urbanisation indices and
5 traits using each of the four indices. Prior to analysis each index was logarithmically transformed to
6 base ten, after adding 0.1 to all values (to ensure that indices of species that did not occur in urban
7 areas could be transformed). For each continuous predictor we assessed if including the square term
8 improved the fit, measured using AIC values, of a linear bivariate model. This was the case only for
9 logarithmically transformed niche position, and its square term was thus included as an additional
10 predictor.

11

12 We conducted multiple regression analyses and, following standard protocols, adopted the
13 information theoretic approach to model simplification (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). All possible
14 models given the set of predictor variables were constructed, models with lower AIC values are
15 considered more parsimonious. We calculated model weights, the probability that a model provides
16 the most parsimonious fit to the data, and then constructed the 95% confidence set of models as that
17 with the smallest number of models whose cumulative weights summed to 0.95. We assessed the
18 explanatory power of each predictor using model averaging over the 95% confidence set. For each
19 response variable we first constructed multiple regression models for all 88 species but excluded the
20 predictors for which data were missing for some species, i.e. relative brain size, natal dispersal,
21 niche breadth and niche position (linear and quadratic terms), leaving six predictors and 63 possible
22 models. We then constructed an additional set of models that used data for the 55 species for which
23 data were available for all our predictors (11 predictors and 2047 models). For both sets of models
24 the tolerance values of all predictors (analysis of all species, range 0.61 - 0.82; analysis of all
25 predictors, range 0.29 - 0.74) were consistently above the threshold (0.1) at which collinearity
26 becomes a major concern (Quinn & Keough, 2002).

1
2 Analyses were first conducted assuming that each species provided independent data. We then used
3 phylogenetic generalised least squares (PGLS; Grafen, 1989; Martins, 1999; Garland & Ives, 2000)
4 to test for non-independence arising from shared evolutionary history. PGLS explicitly incorporates
5 the expected covariance among species into a statistical model fit. The correlations between error
6 terms are thus altered to reflect the magnitude of phylogenetic relatedness amongst species. The
7 PGLS approach was implemented in R, using the Analysis of Phylogenetics and Evolution (APE)
8 package (Paradis *et al.*, 2004) and the phylogeny of Thomas (2008). This phylogeny excludes one
9 of our focal species, coot *Fulica atra*, which was thus excluded from the PGLS analysis. PGLS
10 generates a metric (λ) which varies from zero (no phylogenetic autocorrelation) to one (strong
11 phylogenetic autocorrelation).

12

13 **Results**

14 *Phylogenetic constraints*

15 PGLS analyses demonstrated that λ was not significantly different from zero when modelling any of
16 our response variables ($P > 0.6$ in all cases), and changes to parameter estimates were negligible.
17 Phylogenetic correlation in these data is thus very low and analyses that treat species as independent
18 data points are justified.

19

20 *Urban densities*

21 Analyses of species densities in urban environments, conducted across all focal species, generate
22 remarkably consistent results whether those densities are calculated across highly urbanised squares
23 (i.e. those in which each of the ten 200m transect sections are located in urban or suburban
24 environments), or when moderately urbanised squares (i.e. those with six or more transect sections
25 in urban or suburban environments) are included (Table 3a). Species' ecological and life history
26 traits can explain almost 50% of the variation in species' urban densities (Table 3a). The predictor

1 with the largest explanatory capacity is European geographic range size, which correlates positively
2 with urban density (model averaged partial $r^2 = 0.23$ for both density metrics; Table 3a, Fig. 1a).
3 The explanatory capacity of two other predictor variables is greater or equal to 5%. Species have
4 higher urban densities if they include plant material in their diet (model averaged partial $r^2 = 0.08$
5 and 0.07 when urban squares are respectively defined as moderately and highly urbanised ones),
6 and if they are not long distance migrants (model averaged partial $r^2 = 0.05$ for both density metrics,
7 Table 3a).

8
9 In analyses that focus on the 55 species for which data were available for all predictors, species
10 traits can again explain approximately 50% of the variation in urban densities (Table 3b). In these
11 models higher urban densities are associated with species that use resources which are common in
12 the environment, i.e. have a low niche position (partial $r^2 = 0.25$ and 0.18 when urban squares are
13 respectively defined as moderately or highly urbanised ones; Table 3b, Fig 2c). To a lesser extent
14 high urban densities are also associated with species that feed on plant material (partial $r^2 = 0.09$
15 and 0.07 when urban squares are respectively defined as moderately or highly urbanised ones;
16 Table 3b). The explanatory capacity of all other predictor variables was less than 5%.

17

18 *Urban/rural density ratios*

19 In analyses conducted across all species, ecological and life history traits can explain approximately
20 30% of the variation in the ratio of urban and rural densities; results are again consistent with regard
21 to the definition of urban squares (Table 3a). The reduced explanatory power of the ratio indices
22 does not appear to arise from reduced variation in the response variables as both response variables
23 have similar coefficients of variation (moderately urbanised squares: density index, 2.55; ratio
24 index, 2.38; highly urbanised squares: density index, 2.74; ratio index, 3.09). The traits associated
25 with the ratio urbanisation index differ notably from those that explain variation in species' urban
26 densities. The most marked difference is that the size of a species' European geographic range is no

1 longer strongly associated with urbanisation (partial r^2 is consistently < 0.01 ; Table 3a, Fig. 1b); the
2 same also applies to migratory status (partial $r^2 \leq 0.01$; Table 3a). Species tend to have higher
3 densities in urban areas than rural ones if they do not nest on or close to the ground (partial $r^2 = 0.08$
4 and 0.10 when urban squares are respectively defined as moderately or highly urbanised ones;
5 Table 3a), and when their diet includes plant material (partial $r^2 = 0.10$ for both ratio indices; Table
6 3a).

7
8 In analyses conducted on the restricted set of species, their traits can explain approximately 40% of
9 the variation in the ratio index of urbanisation (Table 3b). Species with higher urban to rural
10 densities have lower niche positions (partial $r^2 = 0.20$ and 0.14 when urban squares are respectively
11 defined as those with six and ten urban/suburban transect sections; Table 3b, Fig 1d), and tend to
12 include plant material in their diet (partial $r^2 = 0.10$ and 0.09 respectively for moderately and highly
13 urbanised squares; Table 3b). Partial r^2 values were less than 0.02 for all other predictors.

15 **Discussion**

16 The lack of phylogenetic signal in the urbanisation indices is not surprising given that a number of
17 closely related avian species differ markedly in the extent to which they are urbanised in Britain.
18 For example, turtle dove *Streptopelia turtur*, tree sparrow *Passer montanus* and rook *Corvus*
19 *frugilegus* occur predominantly in rural areas, whilst congeneric species (collared dove *Streptopelia*
20 *decaocto*, house sparrow *Passer domesticus*, and carrion crow *Corvus corone*) are highly urbanised
21 (Evans *et al.*, 2009).

22
23 The species traits associated with urbanisation indices were consistent regardless of whether urban
24 areas were defined as those that contained only highly developed areas, or when moderately
25 developed areas were also included. In contrast, whether urbanisation indices were constructed
26 using species' urban densities or the ratio of urban to rural densities had a marked influence on their

1 associations with species' traits, especially when analyses were conducted across all species.
2 Urbanisation indices must thus be carefully designed to suit the aims of a particular study. We
3 suggest that the ratio of urban and rural densities is generally the most appropriate metric for
4 assessing responses to urban development. This is because associations between urban densities and
5 species' traits may arise either because the traits influence a species' ability to cope with
6 urbanisation, or because they are linked with traits that generally influence population density.
7 Binary classifications of whether species are urbanised or not are commonly used, but they do not
8 take relative rural and urban densities into account, and are further limited by their assumption that
9 all species which occur in towns and cities have equivalent responses to urban development.

10
11 European range size provides a good example of how the nature of the urbanisation index alters
12 relationships with species' traits. Whilst range size is positively associated with species' urban
13 densities and the occurrence of species in urban areas (Table 4, as previously reported by Bonier *et*
14 *al.*, 2007 and Møller, 2009), there is a negligible link between range size and the ratio of urban and
15 rural densities. This contrast probably arises because species with large ranges are common in both
16 urban and rural environments, as implied by the frequently documented positive interspecific
17 abundance-range size relationship (Gaston *et al.*, 1998). Moreover, the finding that the ratio of
18 urban to rural densities cannot be predicted by range size suggests that the latter provides relatively
19 little information regarding how a species' density is likely to change in a rural area that
20 subsequently becomes urbanised. This lends support to our suggestion that urban to rural density
21 ratios provide a preferable metric of species' responses to urbanisation than either their urban
22 densities in isolation or presence/absence in towns and cities.

23
24 Similarly, we find only limited evidence that long distance migrants have lower urban densities, and
25 migratory status has a very negligible influence on the ratio of urban and rural densities. Whilst this
26 appears to contradict previous suggestions that long-distance migration hinders a species' ability to

1 thrive in urban areas (Friesen *et al.*, 1995; Kark *et al.*, 2007; Croci *et al.*, 2008) it is partly a
2 consequence of previous studies' use of binary indices of species responses to urban development.
3 If we use an equivalent approach, species present in moderately urbanised squares are less likely to
4 be long-distance migrants than expected by chance ($\chi^2 = 9.31$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$), although
5 migratory status does not influence occurrence in highly urbanised squares ($\chi^2 = 3.21$, $df = 1$, $P >$
6 0.05).

7
8 Møller (2009) found that avian species occurring in European urban areas had greater dispersal
9 ability than those absent from towns and cities; while we found no association between urbanisation
10 indices and dispersal. However, it is difficult to compare the two studies directly due to differences
11 in the conceptual approach (we used continuous indices of urbanisation rather than binary
12 classifications), variation in the focal species, and in some cases differences in classification of
13 species; for example, Møller (2009) classifies carrion crow *Corvus corone* and wren *Troglodytes*
14 *troglodytes* as absent from European urban areas, but in Britain their mean urban densities are
15 respectively 22.7 km^{-2} and 25.3 km^{-2} (Evans *et al.* 2009). Measures of dispersal also differed
16 between the studies; we used data from intensive ringing studies, whilst Møller (2009) used
17 surrogate measures, i.e. the number of described subspecies and maximum distance between a
18 species' island and mainland populations. We removed the first of these differences by conducting
19 bivariate analyses of differences in dispersal distances in species that did and did not occur in at
20 least one of our focal urban BBS squares. The lack of association between dispersal ability and
21 occurrence in highly urbanised areas remained, whilst species occurring in moderately urbanised
22 areas tended to have shorter dispersal distances than non-urbanised species (Table 4), which is the
23 opposite pattern to that found by Møller (2009). It thus appears that in highly urbanised parts of
24 Europe, such as Britain, dispersal capacity has a limited influence on species' responses to urban
25 development. Dispersal ability may play a more prominent role in promoting urban colonisation in

1 regions where development has occurred less frequently and more recently, thus reducing the
2 number of potential sites and the time available for urban colonisation.

3
4 Annual fecundity was not associated with our urbanisation indices, even when classifying species as
5 present/absent in urban areas (Table 4). This contrasts with previous studies reporting higher
6 fecundity in urbanised species (Croci *et al.*, 2008; Møller, 2009), and the extent to which high
7 fecundity generally promotes the establishment of urban populations is thus unclear.

8
9 We found strong evidence that specialists, as assessed by niche position, had lower urban densities
10 and ratios of urban to rural densities than more generalist species. There was no association between
11 urbanisation and niche breadth. Therefore, whilst other work suggests that urbanisation promotes
12 generalist species, contributing to biotic homogenisation (McKinney, 2006; Bonier *et al.*, 2007;
13 Kark *et al.*, 2007; Møller, 2009), our results indicate that such patterns depend on the precise
14 definition of specialisation. Indeed, whilst niche breadth is a commonly used index of specialisation
15 many studies find that niche position is a strong predictor of ecological patterns, and can be a better
16 predictor than niche breadth (Gregory & Gaston, 2000; Shultz *et al.*, 2005; Hurlbert & White, 2007;
17 Ranap *et al.*, 2009).

18
19 We found no evidence that relative brain size is associated with a species' ability to adapt to urban
20 environments, thus concurring with Kark *et al.* (2007). An alternative measure of behavioural
21 flexibility is the number of novel feeding behaviours documented for a species. This metric is
22 sometimes positively associated with avian occurrence in urban areas (Møller, 2009; but see Kark *et*
23 *al.*, 2007), but the causal nature of this relationship is uncertain as in urban areas birds may
24 encounter more novel food sources, and thus have greater potential to exhibit novel feeding
25 behaviours.

26

1 Urbanisation appears to select against insectivorous species (Chace & Walsh, 2006; Kark *et al.*,
2 2007), but we found no evidence that species which included invertebrates in their adult diet had
3 lower urban densities, or lower ratios of urban and rural densities. It is possible that this contrast
4 arises because we include species that feed on terrestrial invertebrates, such as earthworms
5 (Lumbricidae), as insectivores. To test this we constructed full models (using the predictors retained
6 in the 95% confidence set of models) in which insectivorous species were defined as those that
7 gleaned invertebrates from vegetation, but such models still yielded little evidence that this trait was
8 associated with urban densities or urban and rural density ratios (maximum partial r^2 value < 0.02).
9 There was a tendency for species that included plant material in adult diets to have higher urban
10 densities and urban to rural density ratios, than species which did not. This supports earlier work
11 suggesting that urbanisation favours granivorous species (Chace & Walsh, 2006; Kark *et al.*, 2007),
12 presumably because they benefit from supplementary feeding in urban areas (Jokimäki *et al.*, 2002;
13 Fuller *et al.*, 2008).

14
15 In analyses conducted across all species, those that did not nest on or close to the ground tended to
16 have higher urban to rural densities than ground-nesting species. Ground-nesting species tend to be
17 open cup nesters, which typically experience higher predation rates than cavity nesting species
18 (Martin & Li, 1992). In additional bivariate analyses we found no evidence that any of our
19 urbanisation indices were associated with cavity nesting (partial r^2 < 0.01 for all urbanisation
20 indices). Thus the association between ground-nesting and urbanisation in our data is not
21 confounded with cavity nesting. Our results are comparable to the finding that ground nesting
22 species are disadvantaged in French cities (Crocchi *et al.*, 2008). Whilst the reduced ability of ground-
23 nesting bird species to thrive in urban areas may arise from increased predation risk, there is little
24 evidence for a universal increase in predation risk in urban areas (Chamberlain *et al.*, 2009). Also,
25 in analyses that take specialisation into account using niche metrics ground-nesting has no influence
26 on species' urban to rural density ratios. We thus suggest that urbanisation may select against

1 ground-nesting species because it reduces the availability of their preferred habitat types in addition
2 to altering predation rates.

3

4 **Conclusions and implications**

5 The total explanatory capacity of multiple regression models for the level of urbanisation of birds in
6 Britain is higher (range of 28% to 56%) than that typically found in many ecological studies (Møller
7 & Jennions, 2002), but is comparable to previous assessments of associations between species'
8 traits and responses to other types of global change (Shultz *et al.*, 2005; Jiguet *et al.*, 2007; Seoane
9 & Carrascal, 2008). The nature of associations between urbanisation indices and species' traits
10 varies markedly with how responses to urbanisation are measured; future studies should pay close
11 attention to this issue. We advocate that indices assessing relative urban and rural densities are
12 preferable to the alternatives of using binary classifications of whether species are urbanised or not,
13 which have been the focus of most other previous studies, or urban densities in isolation.

14

15 Britain has experienced profound habitat modification, but this has not resulted in marked
16 alterations to the species composition of the regional avifauna during the last few centuries
17 (Holloway, 1996; Stewart, 2004). Our results are thus unlikely to be biased by prior extinctions of
18 species with certain ecological or life history traits. Britain is, however, amongst the most urbanised
19 regions and the challenge remains of assessing how species' traits influence responses to urban
20 development in non-avian taxa and in regions with divergent urban development patterns. Previous
21 studies of avian species' responses to urban development have primarily been conducted in Europe
22 and thus concern regions with similar levels of urbanisation to Britain. Despite this similarity our
23 results differ markedly from these other studies as we find little evidence that urban development
24 selected against insectivores, avian migrants, and species with low annual fecundity and limited
25 dispersal ability. In some cases these differences probably arise, at least in part, due to differences
26 in how urbanisation indices are calculated. We find support for the hypothesis that generalist

1 species are better adapted to urban areas than specialists, although this is dependent upon the
2 precise definition of specialisation. Whilst explanatory power is more limited, our results also
3 suggest that urbanisation favours species that feed on plant resources and that nest above the
4 ground. In regions that are becoming highly urbanised, avian biodiversity in towns and cities may
5 be increased by maximising the availability of scarce resources, encouragement of supplementary
6 feeding, and increasing the suitability of urban areas for ground nesting species. The latter could
7 necessitate both habitat creation, and management of predation risk.

8

9 **Acknowledgements**

10 We thank the thousands of volunteers who took part in the Breeding Bird Survey, which is jointly
11 funded by the British Trust for Ornithology, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (on behalf of
12 the Countryside Council for Wales, English Nature, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Department
13 of the Environment for Northern Ireland) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Land
14 cover data derived from the LCM2000 data base and Land Characteristics data were provided by
15 the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology. Climate data were derived from United Kingdom Climate
16 Projections 2009 (UKCP09). A. Iwaniuk provided brain size data. F. Bonier, A. Cannon, S.
17 Eglington, R. Freckleton, J. Jokimäki, S. E. Newson, S. Shultz and T. Webb provided discussion
18 and assistance. KLE was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council and the
19 Leverhulme Trust; KJG holds a Royal Society-Wolfson Research Merit Award.

20

21 **References**

- 22 Ball DF, Radford GL, Williams WM (1983) *A land characteristic data bank for Great Britain:*
23 *Occasional Paper No. 13*. Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Bangor.
- 24 Bartlett JG, Mageean DM, O'Connor RJ (2000). Residential expansion as a continental threat to US
25 coastal systems. *Population and Environment*, **21**, 429–468.

- 1 Bonier F, Martin PR, Wingfield JC (2007) Urban birds have broader environmental tolerance.
2 *Biology Letters*, **6**, 670-673.
- 3 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical*
4 *information-theoretic approach*. Springer, New York.
- 5 Chace JF, Walsh JJ (2006) Urban effects on native avifauna: a review. *Landscape and Urban*
6 *Planning*, **74**, 46-49.
- 7 Chamberlain DE, Cannon AR, Toms MP, Leech DI, Hatchwell BJ, Gaston KJ (2009) Avian
8 productivity in urban landscapes: a review and meta-analysis. *Ibis*, **151**, 1-18.
- 9 Cheptou P-O, Carrue O, Rouifed S, Cantarel A (2008) Rapid evolution of seed dispersal in an urban
10 environment in the weed *Crepis sancta*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*,
11 **109**, 3796-3799.
- 12 Clement P, Harris A, Davis J (1993) *Finches and sparrows: an identification guide*. Christopher
13 Helm, London.
- 14 Collier CG (2006) The impact of urban areas on weather. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal*
15 *Meteorological Society*, **132**, 1-25.
- 16 Cramp S, Simmons KEL, Perrins CM (1977-1994) *Handbook of the Birds of Europe, the Middle*
17 *east and North Africa Vols 1-9*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 18 Crick, HQP (1992) A bird habitat coding system for use in Britain and Ireland incorporating aspects
19 of land-management and human activity. *Bird Study*, **39**, 1-12.
- 20 Croci S, Butet A, Clergeau P (2008) Does urbanization filter birds on the basis of their biological
21 traits? *The Condor*, **110**, 223-240.
- 22 Czech B, Krausman PR, Devers PK (2000). Economic associations among causes of species
23 endangerment in the United States. *BioScience*, **50**, 593-601
- 24 Davies ZG, Fuller RA, Loram A, Irvine KN, Sims V, Gaston KJ (2009) Urban domestic gardens
25 (XV): the extent of the resource at a national scale. *Biological Conservation*, **142**, 761-771.

- 1 Devictor V, Julliard R, Couvet D, Lee A, Jiguet F (2007). Functional homogenization effect of
2 urbanization on bird communities. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 741-751.
- 3 Ebinger P (1995) Domestication and plasticity of brain organization in mallards (*Anas*
4 *platyrhynchos*). *Brain, Behavior and Evolution*, **45**, 286–300.
- 5 Evans KL, Greenwood JJD, Gaston KJ (2007) The positive correlation between avian species
6 richness and human population density in Britain is not attributable to sampling bias. *Global*
7 *Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**, 300-304.
- 8 Evans KL, Hatchwell BJ, Parnell M, Gaston KJ (In press) Factors influencing colonisation of urban
9 areas: the blackbird *Turdus merula* as a case study. *Biological Reviews*
- 10 Evans KL, Newson SE, Gaston KJ (2009) Habitat influences on urban avian assemblages. *Ibis*, **151**,
11 19-39.
- 12 Evans KL, van Rensburg BJ, Gaston KJ, Chown SL (2006) People, species richness and human
13 population growth. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **15**, 625-636.
- 14 Freckleton RP (2002) On the misuse of residuals in ecology: regression of residuals versus multiple
15 regression. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **71**, 542-545.
- 16 Friesen LE, Eagles PFJ, MacKay RJ (1995) Effects of residential development on forest dwelling
17 neotropical migrant songbirds. *Conservation Biology*, **9**, 1408–1414.
- 18 Fuller RA, Warren PH, Armsworth PR, Barbosa O, Gaston KJ (2008) Garden bird feeding predicts
19 the structure of urban avian assemblages. *Diversity & Distributions*, **14**, 131–137.
- 20 Fuller RM, Smith GM, Sanderson JM, Hill RA, Thomson AG, Cox R, Brown NJ, Clarke RT,
21 Rothery P, Gerard FF (2002) *Countryside Survey 2000 Module 7 Land Cover Map 2000 Final*
22 *Report CSLCM*. Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Monks Wood.
- 23 García-Berthou E (2001) On the misuse of residuals in ecology: testing regression residuals vs the
24 analysis of covariance. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **70**, 708-711.
- 25 Garland T, Ives AR (2000) Using the past to predict the present: confidence intervals for regression
26 equations in phylogenetic comparative methods. *American Naturalist*, **155**, 346–364.

- 1 Gaston KJ (2003) *The structure and dynamics of geographic ranges*. OUP, Oxford.
- 2 Gaston KJ, Blackburn TM (2000) *Pattern and process in macroecology*. Blackwell Science Ltd.,
3 Oxford.
- 4 Gaston KJ, Blackburn TM, Gregory RD, Greenwood JJD (1998) The anatomy of the interspecific
5 abundance-range size relationship for the British avifauna: I. Spatial patterns. *Ecology Letters*, **1**,
6 38-46.
- 7 Gonzalez-Abraham CE, Radeloff VC, Hawbaker TJ, Hammer RB, Stewart SI, Clayton MK (2007)
8 Patterns of houses and habitat loss from 1937 to 1999 in northern Wisconsin, USA. *Ecological*
9 *Applications*, **17**, 2011-2023.
- 10 Grafen A (1989) The phylogenetic regression. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of*
11 *London B*, **326**, 119–157.
- 12 Gregory RD, Greenwood JJD, Hagemeyer EJM (1998) The EBCC atlas of European breeding
13 birds: a contribution to science and conservation. *Biologia e Conservazione della Fauna*, **102**, 38-
14 49.
- 15 Gregory RD, Gaston KJ (2000) Explanations of commonness and rarity in British breeding birds,
16 separating resource use and resource availability. *Oikos*, **88**, 5515-526.
- 17 Grimm NB, Faeth SH, Golubiewsk NE, Redman CL, Wu J, Bai X, Briggs JM (2008) Global
18 change and the ecology of cities. *Science*, **319**, 756-760.
- 19 Hagemeyer WJM, Blair MJ (1997) *The EBCC atlas of European breeding birds: their distribution*
20 *and abundance*. T & AD Poyser, London.
- 21 Haines-Young RH, Barr CJ, Black HIJ, Briggs DJ, Bunce RGH, Clarke RT, Cooper A, Dawson
22 FH, Firbank LG, Fuller RM, Furse MT, Gillespie MK, Hill R, Hornung M, Howard DC, McCann
23 T, Morecroft MD, Petit S, Sier ARJ, Smart GM, Stott AP, Stuart RC, Watkins JW (2000)
24 *Accounting for nature: assessing habitats in the UK countryside*. Department of the Environment
25 Transport and the Regions, London.

- 1 Hamer AJ, McDonnell MJ (2008) Amphibian ecology and conservation in the urbanising world: a
2 review. *Biological Conservation*, **141**, 2432-2449.
- 3 Hanski I (2001) Population dynamic consequences of dispersal in local populations and in meta-
4 populations. In: *Dispersal* (eds Clobert J, Danchin E, Nichols JD, Dhondt AA), pp. 283–298.
5 Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 6 Healy SD, Rowe C (2007) A critique of comparative studies of brain size. *Proceedings of the Royal
7 Society of London B*, **274**, 453–464.
- 8 Holloway S (1996) *Historical atlas of breeding birds in Britain and Ireland*. T & AD Poyser,
9 London.
- 10 Hurlbert AH, White EP (2007) Ecological correlates of geographical range occupancy in North
11 American birds. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**, 764-773.
- 12 Iwaniuk AN, Nelson JE (2001) A comparative analysis of relative brain size in waterfowl
13 (Anseriformes). *Brain Behavior and Evolution*, **57**, 87–97.
- 14 Iwaniuk AN, Nelson JE (2002) Can endocranial volume be used as an estimate of brain size in
15 birds? *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **80**, 16-23.
- 16 Iwaniuk AN, Nelson JE (2003) Developmental differences are correlated with relative brain size in
17 birds: a comparative analysis. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **81**, 1913–1928.
- 18 Jiguet F, Gadot A-S, Julliard R, Newson SE, Couvet D (2007) Climate envelope, life history traits
19 and the resilience of birds facing global change. *Global Change Biology*, **13**, 1672-1684.
- 20 Jokimäki J, Clergeau P, Kaisanlahti-Jokimäki ML (2002) Winter bird communities in urban
21 habitats: a comparative study between central and northern Europe. *Journal of Biogeography*,
22 **29**, 69-79.
- 23 Jokimäki J, Huhta E (2000) Artificial nest predation and abundance of birds along an urban
24 gradient. *Condor*, **102**, 838-847.
- 25 Kark S, Iwaniuk A, Schilimtzek A, Banker E (2007) Living in the city: can anyone become an
26 'urban exploiter'? *Journal of Biogeography*, **34**, 638-651.

- 1 Lefebvre L, Gaxiola A, Dawson S, Timmermans S, Rosza L, Kabai P (1998) Feeding innovations
2 and forebrain size in Australasian birds. *Behaviour*, **135**, 1077–1097.
- 3 Lefebvre L, Whittle P, Lascaris E, Finkelstein A (1997) Feeding innovations and forebrain size in
4 birds. *Animal Behaviour*, **53**, 549–560.
- 5 Liu J, Daily GC, Ehrlich PR, Luck GW (2003) Effects of household dynamics on resource
6 consumption and biodiversity. *Nature*, **421**, 530–533.
- 7 Lloret F, Medail F, Brundu G, Camarda I, Moragues E, Rita J, Lambdon P, Hulme PE (2005)
8 Species attributes and invasion success by alien plants on Mediterranean islands. *Journal of*
9 *Ecology*, **93**, 512–520.
- 10 Luck GW (2007) A review of the relationships between human population density and biodiversity.
11 *Biological Reviews*, **82**, 607–645.
- 12 Martin TE, Li P (1992) Life-history traits of open-nesting vs cavity-nesting birds. *Ecology*, **73**, 579–
13 592.
- 14 Martins EP (1999) Estimation of ancestral states of continuous characters: a computer simulation
15 study. *Systematic Biology*, **48**, 642–650.
- 16 McDonald RI, Kareiva P, Forman RTT (2008) The implications of current and future urbanization
17 for global protected areas and biodiversity conservation. *Biological Conservation*, **141**, 1695–
18 1703.
- 19 McKinney ML (2006) Urbanization as a major cause of biotic homogenization. *Biological*
20 *Conservation*, **127**, 247–260.
- 21 Mlíkovský J (1989a) Brain size in birds: 1 Tinamiformes through ciconiiformes. *Vestník*
22 *Ceskoslovenska Spolecnosti Zoologicka*, **53**, 33–47.
- 23 Mlíkovský J (1989b) Brain size in birds: 2 Falconiformes through Gaviiformes. *Vestník*
24 *Ceskoslovenska Spolecnosti Zoologicka*, **53**, 200–213.
- 25 Mlíkovský J (1989c) Brain size in birds: 3 Columbiformes through Piciformes. *Vestník*
26 *Ceskoslovenska Spolecnosti Zoologicka*, **53**, 252–264.

- 1 Mlíkovský J (1990) Brain size in birds: 4 Passeriformes. *Acta Societatis Zoologica*
2 *Bohemoslovacae*, **54**, 27–37.
- 3 Møller AP (2009) Successful city dwellers: a comparative study of the ecological characteristics of
4 urban birds in the Western Palearctic. *Oecologia*, **159**, 849-858.
- 5 Møller AP, Jennions MD (2002) How much variance can be explained by ecologists and
6 evolutionary biologists? *Oecologia*, **132**, 492-500.
- 7 Newson SE, Evans KL, Noble DG, Greenwood JJD, Gaston KJ (2008) Use of distance sampling to
8 improve estimates of national population sizes for common and widespread breeding birds in the
9 UK. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **45**, 1330-1338.
- 10 Owens IPF, Bennett PM (2000) Ecological basis of extinction risk in birds: habitat loss versus
11 human persecution and introduced predators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
12 *USA*, **97**, 12144-12148.
- 13 Paradis E, Baillie SR, Sutherland WJ, Gregory RD (1998) Patterns of natal and breeding dispersal
14 in birds. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **67**, 518-536.
- 15 Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K (2004) APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R
16 language. *Bioinformatics*, **20**, 289–290.
- 17 Partecke J, Schwabl I, Gwinner E (2006) Stress and the city: urbanization and its effects on the
18 stress physiology in European Blackbirds. *Ecology*, **87**, 1945-1952.
- 19 Phillips BL, Brown GP, Travis JMJ, Shine R (2008) Reid's paradox revisited: The evolution of
20 dispersal kernels during range expansion. *American Naturalist*, **172**, S34-S48.
- 21 Post E, Forchhammer MC (2008) Climate change reduces reproductive success of an Arctic
22 herbivore through trophic mismatch. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*
23 *B*, **363**, 2369-2375.
- 24 Purvis A, Gittleman JL, Cowlishaw G, Mace GM (2000) Predicting extinction risk in declining
25 species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, **267**, 1947-1952.

- 1 Quinn GP, Keough MJ (2002) *Experimental design and data analysis for biologists*. Cambridge
2 University Press, Cambridge.
- 3 Radeloff VC, Stewart SI, Hawbaker TJ, Gimmi U, Pidgeon AM, Flather CH, Hammer RB &
4 Helmers DP (In press) Housing growth in and near United States protected areas limits their
5 conservation value. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*.
- 6
- 7
- 8 Rannap R, Lohmus A, Briggs L (2009) Niche position, but not niche breadth, differs in two
9 coexisting amphibians having contrasting trends in Europe. *Diversity and Distributions*, **15**, 692-
10 700.
- 11
- 12
- 13 Rasanen K, Hendry AP (2008) Disentangling interactions between adaptive divergence and gene
14 flow when ecology drives diversification. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 624-636.
- 15 Raven MJ, Noble DG, Baillie SR (2007) *The Breeding Bird Survey 2006 BTO Research Report*
16 *471*. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.
- 17 Riley SPD, Busteed GT, Kats LB, Vandergon TL, Lee LFS, Dagit RG, Kerby JL, Fisher RN,
18 Sauvajot RM (2005) Effects of urbanization on the distribution and abundance of amphibians and
19 invasive species in southern California streams. *Conservation Biology*, **19**, 1894-1907.
- 20 Rios RS, Marquis RJ, Flunker JC (2008) Population variation in plant traits associated with ant
21 attraction and herbivory in *Chamaecrista fasciculata* (Fabaceae). *Oecologia*, **156**, 577-588.
- 22 Rodewald AD, Bakermans MH (2006) What is the appropriate paradigm for riparian forest
23 conservation? *Biological Conservation*, **128**, 193–200.
- 24 Sanderson FJ, Donald PF, Pain DJ, Burfield IJ, van Bommel FPJ (2006) Long-term population
25 declines in Afro-Palearctic migrant birds. *Biological Conservation*, **131**, 93–105.

- 1 Seoane J, Carrascal LM (2007) Interspecific differences in population trends of Spanish birds are
2 related to habitat and climatic preferences. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **17**, 111-121.
- 3 Shugart HH, Patten BC (1972) Niche quantification and the concept of niche pattern. In: *Systems*
4 *analysis and simulation ecology* (ed Patten BC), pp. 283-327. Academic Press, New York.
- 5 Shultz S, Bradbury R, Evans KL, Gregory R, Blackburn T (2005) Brain size and resource
6 specialisation predict long-term population trends in British birds. *Proceedings of the Royal*
7 *Society, London B*, **272**, 2305-2311.
- 8 Sims V, Evans KL, Newson SE, Tratalos J, Gaston KJ (2008) Avian assemblage structure and
9 domestic cat densities in urban environments. *Diversity & Distributions*, **14**, 387-399.
- 10 Sol D, Bacher S, Reader SM, Lefebvre L (2008) Brain size predicts the success of mammal species
11 introduced into novel environments. *American Naturalist*, **172**, S63-S71.
- 12 Sol D, Duncan RP, Blackburn TM, Cassey P, Lefebvre L (2005) Big brains, enhanced cognition,
13 and response of birds to novel environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
14 *USA*, **102**, 5306-5307.
- 15 Stewart JR (2004) Wetland birds in the recent fossil record of Britain and northwest Europe. *British*
16 *Birds*, **97**, 33-43.
- 17 Thomas GH (2008) Phylogenetic distributions of British birds of conservation concern.
18 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, **275**, 2077-2083.
- 19 Tratalos J, Fuller RA, Evans KL, Davies RG, Newson SE, Greenwood JJD, Gaston KJ (2007) Bird
20 densities are associated with household densities. *Global Change Biology*, **13**, 1685-1695.
- 21 UN (2008) *World urbanization prospects: the 2007 revision*. United Nations, New York. Available
22 at http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wup2007/2007WUP_Highlights_webpdf.
- 23 Visser ME, Both C, Lambrechts MM (2004) Global climate change leads to mistimed avian
24 reproduction. *Advances in Ecological Research*, **35**, 89-110.
- 25 Wernham C, Toms M, Marchant J, Clark J, Siriwardena G, Baillie S (2002) *The migration atlas:*
26 *movements of the birds of Britain and Ireland*. T & AD Poyser, London.

- 1 Wilcove DS, Wikelski M (2008) Going, going, gone: is animal migration disappearing. *PLoS*
- 2 *Biology*, **6**, e188.
- 3

1 **Table 1** Variables used to calculate niche breadth and niche position, adapted from the
 2 methodology of Gregory & Gaston (2000).
 3

Variable	Description	Source
ALTH	Highest altitude (m)	ITE's land characteristics database from 10km x 10km squares (Ball <i>et al.</i> , 1983)
ALTD	Difference between highest and lowest altitude (m)	"
RIVE	Frequency score of rivers (range 0 – 0.25) from a 5 x 5 grid overlay of square	"
RAIN	Average annual monthly rainfall (mm)	UKCP09 data for 5km x 5km squares for 2006 (http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk)
TEMP	Average annual daily temperature (°C)	"
CLOUD	Average annual hourly (or 3-hourly) total cloud cover (%)	As above but for 2003
CT01	Sea/estuary	CEH's LCM2000 data base, measured as percentage of 1km x 1km square (Fuller <i>et al.</i> , 2002)
CT02	Inland waters	"
CT03	Beach/flats	"
CT04	Saltmarsh/seaweed	"
CT05	Lowland grass heaths	"
CT06	Pasture/amenity turf	"
CT07	Meadows, verges and semi-natural cropped swards	"
CT08	Marsh/rough grassland	"
CT09	Montane/hill grass	"
CT10	Dwarf shrub/grass moorland	"
CT11	Upland dwarf shrub moorland	"
CT12	Bracken	"
CT13	Lowland heath	"
CT14	Scrub/orchard	"
CT15	Deciduous wood	"
CT16	Evergreen wood	"
CT17	Upland bog	"
CT18	Arable land	"
CT19	Ruderal weeds	"
CT22	Bare ground	"
CT23	Felled forest	"
CT24	Lowland bog	"
CT25	Dwarf shrub/grass heath	"

4
5

1 **Table 2** Pearson correlations between four urbanisation indices (logarithmically transformed to
 2 base ten) of 88 native British bird species. Indices are either the density within urban
 3 areas, or the ratio of urban and rural population densities. These indices are calculated
 4 when defining urban areas as those in which each of the ten transect sections are urban
 5 or suburban or when at least six sections met these criteria. $P < 0.0001$ in all cases.
 6

	log ₁₀ urban density_10 sections	log ₁₀ urban density_6 sections	log ₁₀ ratio urban to rural density_10 sections
log ₁₀ urban density_6 sections	0.978	–	–
log ₁₀ ratio urban to rural density_10 sections	0.896	0.846	–
log ₁₀ ratio urban to rural density_6 sections	0.853	0.859	0.938

7

Table 3 Multiple regression analyses of relationships between urbanisation indices of British birds and ecological and life history traits in analyses that restricted data to: (a) the six predictors that were available for all 88 species, and (b) the 55 species for which data were available for all ten predictors. For each of the two sets of analyses, model averaged partial r^2 values are presented when these are ≥ 0.01 for at least one response variable, together with model averaged parameter estimates. For categorical variables parameter estimates are reported for when the species lacks the focal trait and equal zero when a species exhibits the trait.

(a)

response	# models in 95% confidence set	model averaged total r^2	ground-nesting		diet_plants		diet_inverts		migrant		range	
			partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope
log ₁₀ density_6	9	0.471	0.001	+0.043	0.079	-0.643	0.006	-0.152	0.050	+0.584	0.233	+0.001
log ₁₀ density_10	9	0.452	0.002	+0.058	0.069	-0.618	0.003	-0.090	0.052	+0.616	0.225	+0.001
log ₁₀ ratio_6	6	0.318	0.103	+0.351	0.100	-0.360	0.001	-0.018	0.010	+0.097	0.000	0.000
log ₁₀ ratio_10	12	0.283	0.078	+0.319	0.106	-0.395	0.0002	-0.014	0.006	+0.078	0.003	+0.00002

(b)

response	# models in 95% confidence set	model averaged total r^2	ground-nesting		diet_plants		diet_inverts		migrant		log ₁₀ dispersal		log ₁₀ niche position		relative brain size	
			partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope	partial r^2	slope
log ₁₀ density_6	75	0.560	0.001	+0.034	0.089	-0.708	0.007	-0.170	0.003	+0.004	0.035	-0.584	0.253	lin. -3.617 sq. -2.095	0.009	log ₁₀ br_vol +0.042 log ₁₀ bo_size -0.131
log ₁₀ density_10	94	0.480	0.004	+0.107	0.070	-0.649	0.005	-0.152	0.001	+0.027	0.042	-0.680	0.184	lin. -2.179 sq. -2.179	0.004	log ₁₀ br_vol +0.038 log ₁₀ bo_size -0.079
log ₁₀ ratio_6	89	0.423	0.014	+0.099	0.095	-0.330	0.001	-0.024	0.007	+0.071	0.003	-0.055	0.201	lin. -1.893 sq. -1.394	0.002	log ₁₀ br_vol +0.020 log ₁₀ bo_size -0.004
log ₁₀ ratio_10	141	0.366	0.015	+0.111	0.086	-0.331	0.003	-0.048	0.006	+0.073	0.010	-0.122	0.135	lin. -1.744 sq. -1.401	0.004	log ₁₀ br_vol +0.014 log ₁₀ bo_size +0.009

Table 4 Variation in species' traits between British avian species that are present and absent in at least one urbanised 1km x 1km grid cell.

trait	urban definition	mean trait value		T - test
		species present	species absent	
range size (# of occupied 50km squares)	10 urban transect sections	1427 ±39, n = 56	1198 ±72, n = 32	$t = -2.80, P = 0.007$
"	6 urban transect sections	1377 ±40, n = 70	1215 ±97, n = 18	$t = -1.54, P = 0.140$
natal dispersal (log ₁₀)	10 urban transect sections	0.97 ±0.05, n = 43	1.24 ±0.08, n = 12	$t = 2.41, P = 0.020$
"	6 urban transect sections	1.02 ±0.05, n = 48	1.15 ±0.09, n = 7	$t = 0.95, P = 0.350$
annual fecundity	10 urban transect sections	7.63 ±0.44, n = 56	6.66 ±0.55, n = 32	$t = 1.36, P = 0.170$
"	6 urban transect sections	7.31 ±0.39, n = 70	7.11 ±0.71, n = 18	$t = 0.24, P = 0.810$

Figure 1. The relationships between: (a) European range size and urban density; (b) European range size and the ratio of urban and rural densities; (c) logarithmically transformed niche position and urban density; and (d) logarithmically transformed niche position and the ratio of urban and rural densities of British birds. Urban areas are defined as 1km x 1km squares in which at least six of the ten 200m transect sections are urban or suburban. Grey lines indicate the model averaged predicted values whilst holding other continuous variables at their mean values and categorical variables at their most frequently observed values. Defining urban areas as those squares in which each of the transect sections are urban or suburban does not substantially alter the results (Table 2).

