

## 2024 Victorian Landscape Awards Judging Sheet for Commercial Construction Categories



**Note for judges**

**Awards Allocated: Gold, Silver & Bronze**

Commercial Landscape Construction under \$1,000,000

Commercial Landscape Construction over \$1,000,000

<b>Entrant</b>

<b>Project Address</b>

**Note to Category Judge:**

The **emphasis is on construction and project management** 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 **155**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.

### 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**

#### General

Contractual Obligations	Poor – no evidence of any contractual obligations presented.	Average – some evidence of contractual obligations presented.	Adequate – some listing of contractual obligations evident within the works documentations.	Good – contractual obligations clearly defined and presented within the works documentation.	Excellent – contractual obligations, covering all areas listed above, in a concessive well documented way presented in the works documentation. Variations clearly outlined and documented.
Covers a wide area and depending on the scope of works, contract work or subcontracted work, the following list needs to be considered: clear definition of scope of works; OHS obligations - covering workforce, the public and equipment used during construction. Environmental obligation: covering noise, dust, vegetation, waste and erosion, and sediment control. Cultural and heritage considerations. Permits – local, state and federal. Licensing - state including compliance certificates. Industry agreements and union conditions. Timelines and contingencies. Quality control - Australian Standards (AS, ISO). Subcontractors obligations. Compliance Certificates					
	0 1	2 3 4	5 6 7	8 9	10
Comments					

<b>Overall Impression</b> Presentation, wow factor, first impressions based on initial visual impact. Remembering that a well designed and constructed project will appear as if it was always there.	Poor – the project does not bounce of the land with no memorable stand out reaction.	Adequate – the project provides a positive response with a general sense of enjoyment / memorable reaction.	Good – the project engages the viewer and creates a memorable first impression that requires time to absorb.	Excellent – the project owns the space, engages the viewer and provides a memorable first impression that excites and inspires an emotive response.
	0 1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8 9	10 11 12 13	14 15
Comments				

Subtotal

/25

Construction					
<b>Set Out 2D/3D</b> 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					
<b>Material Quality</b> 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					
<b>Gaps &amp; Joins</b> Evaluates attention to detail in paving, brick work, carpentry, concrete and associated structural landscape works	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					

<p><b>Cuts</b> Evaluates the attention to detail and construction skill in areas of paving, decking, walling, concrete and outdoor structural works</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Average – visual signs of inconsistency between some trades and others i.e. paving cuts good but decking poor. A standard level of complexity to the project with low density of structure just completed to industry standards.</p>	<p>Adequate – cuts are relatively consistent but lack some polish. A project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.</p>	<p>Good – cuts are of a good level with no initial visual concerns; closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.</p>	<p>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.</p>
	0	1 2 3	4 5	6 7 8	9 10
<p>Comments</p>					
<p><b>Control Joints</b> Evaluates the appropriate use of control joints to all rigid structures i.e. brickwork, concrete, etc</p>	<p>Poor – no consideration made for movement control, signs of cracking evident and imminent.</p>	<p>Average – some control joints evident but in correct use and inadequate amount. Joints finished to an ok level. Future cracking potentially imminent.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
	0	1 2 3	4 5	6 7 8	9 10
<p>Comments</p>					
<p><b>Drainage</b> Evaluates the effective use of drainage systems appropriate to structure, location and soil type</p>	<p>Poor – visual signs of water damage or potential damage, no evident consideration for drainage.</p>	<p>Adequate – basic drainage considered and implemented to an ok level. Water runoff apparent to correct point.</p>	<p>Good – evidence of well considered drainage provision, no evidence of water pooling, structure appears stable.</p>	<p>Excellent – innovative solutions considered to maximise stability of hard element to ensure longevity. Comprehensive drainage system implemented.</p>	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	
<p>Comments</p>					

<b>Degree of Difficulty</b> 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 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					

**Subtotal**

**/75**

<b>Soft Construction</b>						
<b>Set Out 2D/3D</b> Evaluates the set out of soft elements such as plant material and lawns as per plan, and level management of plant layout and mulch / soil levels as per plans and specifications	Poor – plants are inconsistent in their spacing and set out, lawn is inconsistent to plans plant arrangement lacks 3 dimensional consideration, plants are being choked by mulch, soil level too low behind raised walls, soil / mulch too high and spilling over..	Adequate – the plant material has been generally set out to plan, however spacing is a little inconsistent. 3D levels are good and plant vertical layout shows potential.	Good – the plant material shows no signs of poor set out, visually installed well. Finished levels are well presented and plant vertical layout has good form and balance.	Excellent – the plant material has been set out and installed to the highest standard with no flaws or lay out issues. All soft elements are fresh, correct in level and the vertical plant structure compliments the environment perfectly		
	0 1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10		
Comments						
<b>Soil Preparation</b> 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 6	7 8	9 10		
Comments						

<b>Quality of Stock</b> General health of plants and lawns, quality of stock used initially and health of plants now should be assessed	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 may be 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 6	7 8	9 10
Comments				
<b>Maintenance</b> Evaluates the overall success of Maintenance – address plant health, chemical use weed management, horticultural skills etc.  <i>(Judges: Mark as NA if entrant does not carry out maintenance)</i>	Poor – the initial appearance of the project would not support the suggestion that a maintenance program is in place. Poor pruning, inconsistent lawns and edging, poor plant health etc.	Adequate – project is neatly maintained but skills demonstrated are adhoc with room for improvement in some areas.	Good – a well thought out and utilised maintenance program in place demonstrating knowledge of best practice in garden maintenance, skills appropriate to achieve desired outcome	Excellent understanding of specific site and green life needs. Exemplary maintenance illustrates the contractor actively participates in the development of the required care to continually allow the project to achieve best practice results.
	0 1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15
Comments				

**Subtotal**

**/45**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>/155</b>	<b>%</b>

Judges name \_\_\_\_\_

Judges Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Judging \_\_\_\_\_