Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Prunus laurocerasus* L. Common name: Cherry laurel

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
Social			
1. Restrict human access?	The species has been used ornamentally as a hedging plant and has also been reported to be able to form large thickets in invaded areas (Blood 2001; Webb, Sykes & Garnock-Jones 1988). Therefore this species is concsidered to have the potential to have high nuisance value to both people and vehicles.	**MH**	**MH**
2. Reduce tourism?	Unknown.	**M**	**L**
3. Injurious to people?	There is some conflicting information on the species toxicity, there are reports that the fruit is always toxic and others where it is reported to be edible when ripe, this is probably due to the difference between the wild form and the domesticated varieties (Blood 2007; Çalişir & Aydin 2004; PFAF 2007). If the fruit is bitter it is toxic and if they are eaten can be fatal.	**H**	**MH**
4. Damage to cultural sites?	Unknown.	**M**	**L**
Abiotic			
5. Impact flow?	The species can occur in riparian vegetation, there is no evidence however of it occurring in flowing water and obstructing flow.	**L**	**M**
6. Impact water quality?	The species can occur in riparian vegetation, there is no evidence however of it occurring in water and affecting water quality.	**L**	**M**
7. Increase soil erosion?	The species has a shallow root system (Aussie Gardening 2007).Therefore areas invaded by the species are viewed to have a moderate probability of large scale soil erosion.	**ML**	**ML**
8. Reduce biomass?	The species is reported to be able to form pure stands and generally reduce species richness (Weber 2003). It is unknown however how this affects biomass.	**M**	**L**
9. Change fire regime?	Unknown.	**M**	**L**
Community Habitat			
10. Impact on composition (a) high value EVC	EVC= Riparian Forest (V); CMA= Corangamite ; Bioreg= Otway Plain ; CLIMATE potential=VH. Reported to be able to form pure stands and generally reduce species richness (Weber 2003). Therefore the species is able to form monocultures within the middle strata and impact upon species in the lower strata.	**H**	**MH**
(b) medium value EVC	EVC= Lowland Forest (D); CMA= Corangamite ; Bioreg= Otway Plain ; CLIMATE potential=VH. Reported to be able to form pure stands and generally reduce species richness (Weber 2003). Therefore the species is able to form monocultures within the middle strata and impact upon species in the lower strata.	**H**	**MH**

Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Prunus laurocerasus* L. Common name: Cherry laurel

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
(c) low value EVC	EVC= Wet Forest (LC); CMA= Corangamite ; Bioreg= Otway Ranges; CLIMATE potential=VH. Reported to be able to form pure stands and generally reduce species richness (Weber 2003). Therefore the species is able to form monocultures within the middle strata and impact upon species in the lower strata.	**H**	**MH**
11. Impact on structure?	Reported to be able to form pure stands and generally reduce species richness (Weber 2003). Therefore the species impacts upon more than 60% of the floral strata, as it is able to form monocultures within the middle strata inhibit the growth of species in the lower strata and prevent the regeneration of canopy species.	**MH**	**MH**
12. Effect on threatened flora?	Unknown; the species is however to generally reduce the species richness of the flora at invaded sites (Weber 2003).	**MH**	**L**
Fauna			
13. Effect on threatened fauna?	Unknown.	**MH**	**L**
14. Effect on non-threatened fauna?	Unknown; however the increased food the species provides through the fruit load could support increased populations of aggressive bird species such as currowongs, which could then impact on smaller species.	**M**	**L**
15. Benefits fauna?	Produces a fruit crop which may be of some assistance to bird species (Blood 2001). Shrub species may provide some assistance in terms of shelter.	**M**	**M**
16. Injurious to fauna?	It may be toxic to some species (Blood 2001). It in unknown if they would then consume material of the species and be caused harm.	**M**	**L**
Pest Animal			
17. Food source to pests?	Blackbirds are reported to eat the fruit (Blood 2001).	**ML**	**MH**
18. Provides harbor?	Can form thickets (Weber 2003). The species could therefore provide some harbour to pest species.	**M**	**M**
Agriculture			
19. Impact yield?	Suspected in cases of stock poisoning and if chickens eat material of the plant there eggs are reportedly inedible (Everist 1974) Can kill stock, however this is uncommon as it is reportedly unpalatable to stock and not sort out by them (Connor 1977). Can cause stock death, however this occurs rarely therefore it is considered to have only a minor impact on yield.	**ML**	**MH**
20. Impact quality?	Considered an environmental weed not an agricultural weed, it is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact.	**L**	**M**

Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Prunus laurocerasus* L. Common name: Cherry laurel

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
21. Affect land value?	Considered an environmental weed not an agricultural weed, it is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact.	**L**	**M**
22. Change land use?	Considered an environmental weed not an agricultural weed, it is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact.	**L**	**M**
23. Increase harvest costs?	Considered an environmental weed not an agricultural weed, it is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact.	**L**	**M**
24. Disease host/vector?	Host of Mediterranean fruit fly (Blood 2001).	**M**	**MH**