

# *Lullula arborea* (Woodlark)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 10:50:23

## 1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	1552	Displaying males	1997	Full survey	Wotton SR & Gillings S. 2000. The status of breeding Woodlarks <i>Lullula arborea</i> in Britain in 1997. <i>Bird Study</i> 47: 212-224.
E	1552	Displaying males	1997	Full survey	Wotton SR & Gillings S. 2000. The status of breeding Woodlarks <i>Lullula arborea</i> in Britain in 1997. <i>Bird Study</i> 47: 212-224.
NI					
S					

<b>W</b>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="Displaying males"/>	<input type="text" value="1997"/>	<input type="text" value="Full survey"/>	Wotton SR & Gillings S. 2000. The status of breeding Woodlarks <i>Lullula arborea</i> in Britain in 1997. <i>Bird Study</i> 47: 212-224.

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

## 2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
<b>UK</b>	<input type="text" value="Increasing"/>	<input type="text" value="Informed guess"/>	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)
<b>E</b>	<input type="text" value="Increasing"/>	<input type="text" value="Informed guess"/>	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)

<b>NI</b>	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		
<b>S</b>	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		
<b>W</b>	Lost (pre BAP publication)	Full survey	Sitters HP, Fuller RJ, Hoblyn RA, Wright MT, Cowie N & Bowden CGR. 1996. The Woodlark Lullula arborea in Britain: population trends, distribution and habitat occupancy. Bird Study 43: 172-187.

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

### 3. Status of knowledge

To what extent is our scientific knowledge of the habitat / species (e.g research information, autecological knowledge, knowledge for effective re-introduction or habitat restoration/re-creation) sufficient to deliver the plan targets?

Please give an assessment for the UK overall but if there is significant difference in knowledge between different countries this should be noted.

**Status of knowledge:** Knowledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed.

**Notes:**

Priorities for further research: further work investigating the impact of human-related disturbance on heath-nesting woodlarks; gaining a better understanding of the inter-relationships between forest, heath and arable-nesting woodlarks, with the aim of informing landscape-scale management practices; investigating the migratory movements of woodlarks during the winter months; assessing the implications of continuous cover forestry systems for forest-nesting birds.

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 18, 2002

---

## 4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

### T1: Maintain a population of at least 1500 breeding pairs of woodlark

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	Target achieved	1500		Informed guess	No
<b>E</b>	Target achieved	1500		Informed guess	No
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				
<b>S</b>	Not applicable				
<b>W</b>	Not applicable				

**T2: Maintain the existing range of at least 90 ten km squares.**

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Occupied 10 km sq.

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
--	----------	--------	---------	----------	------------

<b>UK</b>	Target achieved	90		Informed guess	No
<b>E</b>	Target achieved	90		Informed guess	No
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				
<b>S</b>	Not applicable				
<b>W</b>	Not applicable				

**T3: Increase the range of the woodlark from 90 to 120 ten km squares, including the recolonisation of Wales and south-west England, by 2008.**

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

2008

Target units:

Occupied 10 km sq.

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	Unknown	120			No
<b>E</b>	Unknown	118			No

<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				
<b>S</b>	Not applicable				
<b>W</b>	No progress	2		Informed guess	No

**T4: Increase the population size by 2008.**

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: 2008

Target units: Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	Unknown n				No
<b>E</b>	Unknown n				No
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				
<b>S</b>	Not applicable				

<b>W</b>	No progress			Informed guess		No
----------	-------------	--	--	----------------	--	----

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002

Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Friday, December 20, 2002

---

## 5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

### Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

- 2.1 An estimated 40% of England's lowland heathland has been lost since the 1950s. This has led to a loss of feeding and nesting habitats for woodlarks. Whilst losses to afforestation and agriculture have declined, threats from roads and housing developments continue.
- 2.2 Woodlarks require a mosaic of bare ground or short vegetation for feeding, and tussocks of vegetation with disturbed ground for nest sites. Lack of appropriate management can lead to sites becoming unsuitable for the species. Rabbits play a key role in creating bare ground and short grass at many sites, and their decline following myxomatosis in the 1950s may have played a significant part in the decline of the woodlark.
- 2.3 In Devon woodlarks breed on farmland, using mosaics of set-aside, arable and horticultural crops, unimproved rough pasture and other marginal habitats. Most of the territories are on moderate to steep slopes. More intensive management, for example reseeding and fertiliser application which would decrease bare ground feeding areas, or conversion to other uses, have been cited as causes of the decline in Devon.

2.4 Severe winter weather and, in particular, snow cover has had an adverse impact on winter survival. The hard winters of 1962/63 and 1981/82 had considerable impact on woodlark populations on the southern heathlands.

## Keyworded factors:

To add factors click the add button, to delete factors check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture   Abandonment of marginal land
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture   Re-seeding of pastures / grassland
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development   Housing infrastructure
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice   Inappropriate heathland management
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice   Loss of open areas
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry   Inappropriate timing of forestry rotation
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Human disturbance   Other recreation / tourism
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Natural disasters   Temperature extremes
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Pollution - land   Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)

## 6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

<b>Constraint 1:</b>	
<b>Constraint keyword:</b>	<b>Country:</b>
Species and habitat management   Habitat quality declining (including due to poor management)	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
<b>Solution:</b>	<b>Solution type:</b>
The HLF-funded Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage (THH) programme, and restoration programmes operated by major heathland owners - often drawing on European funds (LIFE) or agri-environment payments - should restore a large proportion of the low land heathland resource to favourable condition by 2008. Post-THH, a sustainable source of funding ongoing heathland management needs to be identified and secured to ensure that the gains made are not lost.	Funding and incentive schemes
<b>Able to resolve:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Species and habitat management | Woodland / forestry management - causing problems

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

Solution:

A proactive approach is needed to ensure that those commercial forests (both public and private) where the forestry management system is a critical determinant of woodlark numbers, continue to operate to long-term management plans that aim to maintain the value of the site to woodlarks (for some, this is a requirement of the SPA designation).

Solution type:

Management

Able to resolve:

## Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Funding and incentives | Agricultural schemes - changes needed to structure / payments

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

<p>If the decline of woodlarks on farmland in south-west England is to be reversed, changes to farming practices are needed. The reinstatement of more extensive practices, covering both pasture and arable, grant-aided through agri-environment schemes with prescriptions tailored to the needs of woodlarks, would increase the area available for nesting and foraging.</p>	<p>Funding and incentive schemes</p>
<p><b>Able to resolve:</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 29, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on 20 December 2002

---

## 7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forest Enterprise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on 20 December 2002

---

## 8. Other Groups/Organisations

Please list any additional groups/organisations that are actively involved in implementing your action plan. (This is to try to assess which groups are involved where there is no steering group and any additional contributors). If you do not have any other organisations involved, [click here](#).

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	British Trust for Ornithology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	Defence Estates
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forestry Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hampshire Ornithological Society
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildlife Trusts

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on 20 December 2002

---

## 9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reciprocal attendance at meetings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Development of collaborative projects

**Other (please specify):**

LBAPs have a potential role to play in advocating general heathland conservation policy to Local Planning Authorities.

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 18, 2002

---

>

## 10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

**Success 1:**

Description:	Country:
<p>A good relationship between the Lead Partner organisation and the statutory Contact Point has led to an improved understanding of the nature of the threat to woodlarks, and of what is required to overcome both threats and constraints to plan progress. The nature of the relationship has allowed progress to be made without the need for a formal steering group.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W</p>

**Keyword:**

Partnership | Statutory agency involvement



**Success 2:**

**Description:**

The efforts of the statutory conservation agencies and non-governmental organisations to defend low land heathland from the pressures of development have resulted in some notable successes. The siting of new buildings and associated infrastructure next to important heaths has been prevented, by demonstrating the potential for negative effects on the presence of, amongst others, woodlarks.

**Country:**

- UK
- E
- NI
- S
- W

**Keyword:**

Policy, legislation and designation | Other



**Success 3:**

**Description:**

**Country:**

A good understanding has been developed of how forestry management practices influence woodlark use of commercial forestry plantations. Discussions are ongoing as to how to ensure that key commercial forests remain of value to woodlarks while meeting production targets, focussing on those forestry-nesting populations designated as SPAs.

UK  E  NI  S  W

**Keyword:**

Species and habitat management | Woodland / forestry management improvement

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 29, 2002  
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

Thankyou for answering the questions. You have not yet completed all of the questions. You can go back and answer the additional ones or edit the ones you have already answered whenever you want.

**Sign-off:**

When you have completed all of the questions that you are able to, you must sign off your reporting.

I agree that the steering group (if present) have agreed the information in this report and that the following contact point has also signed it off:

<b>Contact point:</b>	Rod Leslie	<b>email:</b>	rod.leslie@for
<b>Your name:</b>	David Hoccom		
<b>Date:</b>	20 December		