2018 Landscaping Victoria Master Landscapers Industry Awards
Judging Sheet for Residential Construction Categories

Residential Landscape Construction up to $50,000
Residential Landscape Construction $50,000 to $150,000
Residential Landscape Construction $150,000 to $300,000
Residential Landscape Construction over $300,000

Entrant	**Project Address**

Note to Category Judge:

The emphasis is on construction and should never be confused with the integrity and success of the design, although this will have some influence on how the project is graded.

Each entry gets a mark out of 120. 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 completed			
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 run off 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	6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Material Quality Evaluates the quality of all materials used	Poor – the quality of material shows obvious visual and structural flaws 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	6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Gaps & Joins Evaluates attention to detail in paving, brick work, carpentry, and so on	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 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 how well drainage systems have been installed and finished in hard construction areas	Poor – evidence of water pooling or running in wrong direction. Implications for future problems.	Adequate – some evidence of drainage but not sufficient for project size.	Good – effective drainage system installed no pooling, no evidence of dampness around constructed areas.	Excellent – effective drainage system installed and working efficiently. Installation finished very well.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Degree of Difficulty Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the individual structures, 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 a number of 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

Sub Total   **/90**

Soft Construction				
Set Out 2D Evaluates the set out of soft elements such as plant material and lawns	Poor – plants are inconsistent in their spacing and set out, lawn is inconsistent to plans.	Adequate – the plant material has been generally set out to plan, however spacing is a little inconsistent.	Good – the plant material shows no signs of poor set out and visually all elements have been installed well.	Excellent – the plant material has been set out and installed to the highest standard with no findable flaws or lay out issues.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Set Out 3D (Levels) Evaluates the level management of plant layout and mulch / soil levels	Poor – the plant arrangement lacks 3 dimensional considerations, plants are being chocked by mulch, soil level too low behind raised walls, soil / mulch too high and spilling over.	Adequate – finished soil / mulch levels are good and plants vertical layout shows potential.	Good – all finished levels are well presented and plant vertical layout has good form and balance.	Excellent – all soft elements are fresh, correct in level and the vertical plant structure compliments the environment perfectly.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Soil Preparation Evaluates the soil preparation on site from an environmental, budget, drainage and plant health point of view	Poor – existing poor soil remains with no consideration for the incoming plants therefore rendering poor plant health. Drainage not considered.	Adequate – removal of old with imported soil being used to improve growing medium, some consideration for drainage implemented. No thought given to improving existing soil as an option.	Good – effective drainage installed a combination of existing and imported soil used to create appropriate growing medium and level management. This encompasses the environmental and budgetary considerations with plant health being of a high level.	Excellent – effective drainage installed and existing / new soil used to create growing medium specific for the planting palette with PH testing or the like being evident.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Quality of Stock General health of plants and lawns	Poor – there is evidence of poor drainage (wet feet), pests and diseases, lack or inconsistency of growth due to poor plant purchases, thatching or girdling in pots. Plants installed with no care.	Adequate – plants look generally healthy but there maybe a selected section where drainage or inappropriate plant selection has been used. Initial stock quality was of an ok standard in shape and form.	Good – plants look well, have been appropriately selected, carefully planted and displayed a good growth rate. Good quality initial stock with care shown for orientation and installation techniques.	Excellent – plants are lush, healthy and thriving in their appropriate environments. Key features have been hand selected and installed to create perfect form and structure for the space.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Subtotal   **/20**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		
TOTAL	**/120**	**%**

Judges name(s)_____

Judges Signature(s)_____

Date of Judging _____