2018 Landscaping Victoria Master Landscapers Industry Awards
Judging Sheet for Hard Structures in the Landscape

Entrant	Project Address

Note to Category Judge:
The emphasis is on construction skill and methodology. Both Domestic and Commercial applications are eligible for entry. All hard surfaces within the job will fall under the assessment – it is not possible to isolate one single element (if required that single element can be entered into 'Feature in the Landscape'.

Each entry gets a mark out of 95. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked in this way.

If compulsory requirements such as a record of the entrant being a Registered Building Practitioner, or if a building permit was required but not obtained or supplied, this project should be assessed as ineligible for consideration.

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 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub-Total **/10**

Construction

Set Out 2D Evaluates the project set out in a 2D form i.e. 90 degrees	Poor – the set out has missed critical datum that is evident via awkward cuts, not built to plan or focal point miss placement.	Adequate – the project has been generally built to plan however shows a lack of finer detail / technical challenge throughout.	Good – the project shows no signs of poor set out and all elements are built to the plan with a good level of technical skill.	Excellent – the project is of a high technical level with all items being meticulously set out to millimetre precision.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				
Set Out 3D Gradients, steps and other transitional element of the hard structures	Poor – there are instant visual flaws in elevated structures, uneven steps, steps that don't comply to building codes, visual puddles on paving / garden areas.	Adequate – steps are managed well and there is no visual water runoff issues, walls are to the correct height and structural requirements, however the project lacks polish.	Good – levels are managed well and there are no issues with water, building codes and all level transition elements are managed well.	Excellent – levels flow to a high level and have been managed to the highest standards.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				
Material Quality Evaluates the quality of all materials used	Poor – the quality of material shows obvious visual and structural floors such as cracked pavers, split decking boards, inappropriate use of materials for their intended purpose.	Adequate – materials are performing well but are showing signs of future issues.	Good – the materials have provided good value for money with long term viability, have been used appropriately and are in a good, well presented current state.	Excellent – the materials used are of the highest quality that the budgets allow, have a great long term future, have been used appropriately and are in an excellent current state.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Gaps & Joins Evaluates attention to detail in paving, brick work, carpentry, etc	Poor – gaps are inconsistent, irregular with no attention to detail, grout falling out or missing / decking boards lifting and the above visually harm the overall project potential. Easy project, done poorly.	Average – inconsistency between some trades and others i.e. paving gaps good but decking poor. A standard level of complexity to the project with low density of structure.	Adequate – gaps are relatively consistent but lack polish. Project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.	Good – gaps and joints are of a good level with no initial visual concerns; closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.	Excellent – all construction gaps and joints are of the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project was of a high level of complexity, high density of structure, carried out to the highest level.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10
Comments					
Cuts Evaluates the attention to detail and construction skill in areas of paving, decking, walling, concrete and outdoor structures	Poor – cuts are inconsistent, irregular with no attention to detail; causing gaps to be inconsistent that visually harm the overall project potential. An easy project, done poorly.	Average – visual signs of inconsistency between some trades and others ie. paving cuts good but decking poor. A standard level of complexity to the project with low density of structure just completed to industry standards.	Adequate – cuts are relatively consistent but lack some polish. A project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.	Good – cuts are of a good level with no initial visual concerns; closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.	Excellent – all cuts and workmanship are of the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project was of a high level of complexity, high density of structure, carried out to the highest level.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10
Comments					

Control Joints Evaluates the appropriate use of control joints to all rigid structures	Poor – no consideration made for movement control, signs of cracking evident and imminent.	Average – some control joints evident but in correct use and inadequate amount. Joints finished to an ok level. Future cracking potentially imminent.	Adequate – control joints have been used appropriately and are relatively consistent but lack some polish. A project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.	Good – control joints are used appropriately and to a good level with no initial visual concerns or long term potential for cracking, closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.	Excellent – all control joints have been considered and implemented to the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project was of a high level of complexity, high density of structure, carried out to the highest level.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10
Comments					

Drainage Evaluates the effective use of drainage systems appropriate to structure, location and soil type	Poor – visual signs of water damage or potential damage, no evident consideration for drainage.	Adequate – basic drainage considered and implemented to an ok level. Water runoff apparent to correct point.	Good – evidence of well considered drainage provision, no evidence of water pooling, structure appears stable.	Excellent – innovative solutions considered to maximise stability of hard element to ensure longevity. Comprehensive drainage system implemented.
	0	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10	11 12 13 14 15
Comments				

Degree of Difficulty Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the landscape project taking into consideration individual structures within the project may have been undertaken by others, overall project taking into consideration the design documentation, access, unique, innovative construction practices	Poor – the project is straight forward, low in structure, one dimensional as far as diverse skill sets go, with no real challenging, technical, unique structural elements.	Average – the project is diverse with skill sets but simple in format. Elements are executed well but there are no real standout technical structures that require a high level of skill or innovation.	Good – the project offers one or two key structure that requires a good technical skill sets that have been executed well. Other structures are of a standard level of difficulty.	Very Good – the project offers several challenging structures and set out detail. A diverse level of unique, innovative skill sets have been exercised to a high level throughout the project.	Excellent – the project displays technical brilliance throughout with a high level of diversity, detail, innovative, unique skills that push the boundaries of the industry and trades.
	0	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10	11 12 13 14 15	16 17 18 19 20
Comments					

Subtotal **/85**

Was a building permit required for this building element? **Yes / No**	**Was a building permit obtained?** **Yes / No / NA**
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:	

TOTAL	**/95**	**%**

Judges name(s)_____

Judges Signature(s)_____

Date of Judging _____