**2018 Landscaping Victoria Master Landscapers
Industry Awards Judging Sheet for Design Categories**

Landscape Design up to 60m2
Landscape Design >60m2 and <200m2
Landscape Design over 200m2

Entrant	Project Address

Note to Category Judge:
The emphasis is on design and should never be confused with the quality of construction, although this will have some influence on how the design is graded.

Each entry gets a mark out of 105. If the entrant is the client or the client is uncontactable, delete point value. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked in this way.

Preliminary Checklist *(Office Only)*

	Yes	No	Comment
Registered Builder in correct category for the works Registered domestic builder in structural landscaping or unlimited accepted			
Systems up to standard (Worksafe requirement)			
Entry Checklist Completed			
Dropbox Folder Complete			
Overall submission complete			

If any items above are NO, please request further information if not submitted with 7 days from request. Project does not qualify for the industry awards. Do not go further with entry until all 'Yes' fields are complete.

Criteria

Awards Application				
Overall Professionalism of Application & Quality of Information	Poor – application is incomplete, difficult to read / understand.	Adequate – application contains the bare minimum information to describe the project.	Good – application describes the project well with clear project information, a good set of drawings / specifications, and includes all applicable documentation.	Excellent – application describes the project to the highest standards, with very clear project information, a powerful set of drawings which may include 3d representation, comprehensive specifications, and includes all applicable documentation.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Quality of Graphic Communication	Poor – difficult to read / understand, no scale.	Adequate – the graphics are legible, communicates project in plan only with scale.	Good – the graphics are clear, communicates the project in plan and in 3 dimensions, with scale.	Excellent – the graphics are very clear, communicates the project in plan and in 3 dimensions (possibly animation), with scale. Demonstrates drawings for different audiences – client, contractors, statutory. Separates information onto separate sheets to cater for particular audience – e.g. planting plan for gardener, lighting plan for electrician etc.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Quality of specification	Poor – absent or sketchy, missing most of the detail.	Adequate – provides just enough information either embedded on the drawings or as a separate document, that allows the project to be quoted and built – possibly requiring some clarification.	Good – provides good support to the drawings allowing quoting and construction with little or no clarification.	Excellent – provides comprehensive support to the drawings (usually as a separate document) which allows quoting and construction with no further clarification.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub-Total **/25**

Design Development				
Client Satisfaction with the Design Process	Poor – client not satisfied.	Adequate – design ok but failed to address all client's needs, the client is moderately satisfied.	Good – client was satisfied with overall result, but designer met expectations without surprise.	Excellent – designer nailed client's needs and exceeded expectations with a design solution that really wowed the client.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				
Timeliness of Design Process Evaluates whether the design process and each of its milestones is delivered within client expectation	Poor – the design process was tardy / disjointed.	Adequate – the design process hit most forecast timelines.	Good – the design process met all forecast timelines.	Excellent – the design process ran like clockwork and exceeded client expectations.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				
Responsiveness of Design to Brief Evaluates the quality of information collected from the client and how this is translated into the design	Poor – no brief evident / brief ignored.	Adequate – the design responds to the main requirements of the brief, but misses some detail.	Good – the design responds to all aspects of the brief.	Excellent – the design responds to all aspects of the brief and exceeds client expectations.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Creative Response of Design Evaluates the overall impression of the design, considering innovative use of materials, clever resolution of function, a high aesthetic etc	Poor – the design does not function well, it is mundane, a poor take on old worn out trends.		Adequate – the design functions, it delivers current trends to a reasonable standard but brings nothing new to the table.		Good – the design functions well, it introduces a new take on current trends.		Excellent – the design functions well, it is exciting and innovative.
	0		1	2	3	4	5
Comments							
Plant Design Evaluates the selection of plants appropriate to the aspect, purpose, and general conditions	Poor – planting is not appropriate for the conditions found on site, and does not relate to theme, or client requirements ie maintenance		Adequate – the plant palette is mostly suitable for aspect and purpose, if somewhat uninspired		Good – the planting design is suitable for purpose, aspect and conditions, has been thought through well to achieve aims ie screening, windbreaks etc		Excellent – the planting is 100% fit for purpose and conditions, and there is excellent visual impact in the planting scheme
	0		1	2	3	4	5
Comments							

Sub Total **/25**

Design Aesthetic - Focus is now on the design as it has been built							
Context Evaluates the strength of connection between the design and the site	Poor – the design has no sympathy with the surrounds / architecture.		Adequate – the design has some connection with the surrounds / architecture.		Good – the design has a good connection with the surrounds / architecture.		Excellent – the design has a strong connection to the surrounds / architecture.
	0		1	2	3	4	5
Comments							
Theme Evaluates the strength of a theme to tie the design together	Poor – there is no link (or theme) that guides the direction of the design.		Adequate – there is a weak link that guides the direction of the design.		Good – there is a theme evident which directs the design.		Excellent – there is a clear theme that ties everything together.
	0		1	2	3	4	5
Comments							
Complexity Evaluates how the design handles some or many factors including site levels, site use, materials and / or statutory	Poor – the design fails to reconcile just a few basic elements.		Adequate – the design reconciles a few basic elements – e.g. the utility area has been separated from the entertaining area.		Good – the design reconciles several elements which may include changing levels, competing uses, a diverse palate of materials, and within the constraints of statutory planning.		Excellent – the design reconciles many elements across changing levels, competing uses, a diverse palate of materials, and within the constraints of statutory planning.
	0		1	2	3	4	5

Comments				

Set Out Evaluates whether the set out facilitates appropriate function, looks balanced, and is in proportion	Poor – the design set out does not function as required, looks awkward and is out of scale.	Adequate – the design set out does function but looks a bit awkward and is out of scale.	Good – the design set out functions well, looks in proportion with appropriate scale.	Excellent – the design set out functions very well, exhibits good proportion and scale.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments				

Scale & Proportion Evaluates a feeling of symmetry for geometric gardens, and considers 3rd dimension with proportion and depth	Poor – no sense of proportion or depth.	Adequate – proportion / depth has been considered.	Good – a balanced design, good proportions / scale is evident.	Excellent – well balanced, very good proportions and scale – all elements work harmoniously
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments				

Material Quality Evaluates appropriate use of pavers, stone, timber, plants, etc.	Poor – materials that are inferior and not suitable for their application are used consistently throughout.	Adequate – materials are of moderate quality and suitable for their application but nothing more.	Good – materials are of high quality and suitable for their application and enhance the aesthetic.	Excellent – materials are of the highest quality and the most suitable for their application, enhance the aesthetic and sit well within the design philosophy e.g. use of recycled timber in a 'green' garden.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments				

Overall Creative Response Evaluates the overall impression of the built project, considering innovative use of materials, clever resolution of function, a high aesthetic, etc.	Poor – the project does not function well, it is mundane, a poor take on old worn out trends.	Adequate – the project functions, it delivers current trends to a reasonable standard but brings nothing new.	Good – the project functions well, it introduces a new take on current trends.	Excellent – the project functions well, it is exciting and innovative – has 'wow' factor.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments				

Subtotal **/35**

Design Function

Movement Through Site Evaluates how pedestrian and vehicle movement is handled by the design	Poor – movement through the site is confusing, there is a conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.	Adequate – movement through the site has been resolved to some extent but not very legible.	Good – movement through the site has been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent – movement through the site has been well resolved, there is no conflict, the site reads very clearly.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Active / Passive Zones Evaluates how active play areas and quiet passive spaces are handled by the design	Poor – there has been no resolution of active / passive zones.	Adequate – active / passive zones have been resolved to some extent but there may be some concerns over conflict with other uses.	Good – active / passive zones have been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent – active / passive zones have been well resolved, there is no conflict, the site reads very clearly.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Utility Zones Evaluates how areas such as clotheslines and bins are handled	Poor – there has been no resolution of utility zones.	Adequate – utility zones have been resolved to some extent but there may be some concerns over conflict with other uses / or overlooking.	Good – utility zones have been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent - utility zones have been well resolved, there is no conflict / overlooking.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Screening Evaluates how the design screens unwanted views and highlights others	Poor – there has been no attempt to screen unwanted views or highlight desirable views.	Adequate – unsightly views have been screened in a basic fashion / desired views may have been overlooked.	Good – unsightly views have been well screened / desired views have been framed.	Excellent – unsightly views have been well screened / desired views have been framed and feel part of the landscape.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Subtotal   **/20**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
TOTAL	
	/105

Judges name(s)_____

Judges Signature(s)_____

Date of Judging _____