



Entrant

Project Address

Note to Category Judge:
 Is this project COMPLIANT? If **NO**, the entry is ineligible. Do not proceed with judging.
The Member or Sub-contractor MUST hold a valid DB-L in Swimming Pool Construction

The **emphasis is on the design and construction of the pool/spa**. The integrity and success of the design will have an impact on the successful construction, therefore each aspect is integral to how the project is graded.

Each entry gets a mark out of **185**. 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.

Criteria

Awards Application					
Overall Professionalism of Application & Quality of Information	Poor – application is incomplete, difficult to read / understand.	Average – 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					

Sub-Total

/5

Graphic Representation						
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 has either at least one elevation or shows the pool in 3 dimensions. Drawings should show and be too 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.
	0	1	2	3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments						

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 pool/spa design has no connection 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 and other landscape environment.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10	
Comments											
Degree of Difficulty Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the swimming pool and or spa build taking into consideration the design documentation, access, unique, innovative construction practices.	Poor – the project is straight forward, 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 technically that require a high level of skill or innovation.				Good – the project offers elements that require a good technical skill sets that have been executed well.				Very Good – the project offers a number of challenges 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											
Equipment Location Evaluates the functionality, design, serviceability and ease of operation. Noise and screening considerations to be evaluated.	Poor – design shows a lazy approach resulting in unsightly equipment not being screened properly, poor access for servicing & function	Adequate – design makes some consideration to appropriate location, functionality and view of equipment				Good - design makes a very good attempt to consider appropriate location, functionality and view of equipment, but could have taken another step further				Excellent – design shows clever problem-solving ideas. Equipment is perfectly positioned allowing efficiency and function as well as serviceability	
	0	1	2	3	4	5					
Comments											
Environmental Evaluates the consideration of the environment. Covers, low energy usage equipment, water consumption.	Poor – no pool cover, high energy usage for equipment inc heating unit, no rain water tank for water neutral option, pool oversized for space	Average – some aspects of environmental consideration have been delivered				Good – on the whole, good consideration to environmental aspects, but one element may not have been addressed, or some better choices were available				Excellent – water neutral pool, thermal blanket, solar to assist heating, low energy consumption on equipment, low chemical usage via ionic system	
	0	1	2	3	4	5					
Comments											

Design Development - Focus is now on the design brief and how drawings achieve the desired outcome.				
Responsiveness of the Design to the Client 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 brief includes limited information and the design responds to the main requirements of the brief, but misses some detail.	Good – the design brief is clearly stated and the design responds to most aspects of the brief.	Excellent – the design brief includes excellent detail and the design responds to all aspects of the brief.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
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 – it has the ‘wow’ factor.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				
Set Out 3D Floor gradients, steps and other transitional element of the swimming pool and or spa.	Poor – Design fails to meet basic criteria. Poor entry and function, gradients conflict with the overall intention of the pool function	Adequate	Good	Excellent – swim, rest and play areas are beautifully balanced, design demonstrates thoughtful consideration for the end user
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub Total

/30

Construction											
Set Out Floor gradients, steps and other transitional element of the swimming pool and/or spa, waterproofing, position of skimmer boxes, aesthetic of skimmer box lids	Poor – levels are inconsistent, pool/spa does not sit well within the surrounds, no consideration to skimmer box location etc	Average -			Good – the pool works in well with other garden elements, steps are well placed Excellent – all aspects of set out are perfect resulting in a pool that sits well with other garden elements. Detailed right down to the skimmer box which is beautifully integrated into the area and barely noticeable.						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments											

Material Selection Evaluates the quality and suitability of all materials used in the swimming pool and/or spa.	Poor – materials are not suitable to the pool environment (i.e. not suitable for abrasive salt or chlorinated water)	Average – some consideration has been given to material appropriateness but not in every area			Good – materials selected are almost all suitable, perhaps one misses the mark			Excellent – material selection addresses the pool environment and will stand the test of time			
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments											

Interior Finish Evaluates attention to detail in the tiling and or interior finish or the swimming pool and/or spa.	Poor – tiling is not square, too many cuts, uneven placement evident and accentuated by poor grouting technique	Adequate - Too many unnecessary cuts and uniformity of tile sizes differ, some inconsistency in placement of tile sheets resulting in patchwork effect			Good – minimal tile cuts, consistent placement, good grouting, overall very good effort			Excellent – hardly any tile cuts, grouting is consistent and matches or complements tiles perfectly								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Comments																

Internal Fit-Off Evaluates the attention to detail of internal fitting placement. Heights, spacings colour and aesthetics considerations.	Poor – no systems evident as to where suctions and returns are placed	Adequate - Relevant internal fittings have some sort of system			Good - Functioning of the pool and aesthetics have well considered			Excellent - Innovative positioning and material selection of fittings		
	0	1	2	3	4	5				
Comments										

Equipment Installation	Poor – little to no consideration of functionality through the	Adequate – room for improvement on functionality, design and installation of			Good – equipment is fit for purpose, operates well, consideration has been			Excellent - Equipment is perfectly installed allowing efficiency and function as		
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Evaluates the functionality, design and quality of the installation. Consider level of pipes, cleaning, serviceability (accessibility) and ease of operation. Noise considerations, Vermin proofing considerations, positioning of solar panels (if applicable) and size and performance of hydraulics	installation, and poor installation of equipment.	equipment. Some consideration to placement of solar panels, vermin proofing of equipment, serviceability, operation and noise. Better equipment choices could have been made	given to most aspects but could have been a little better to be excellent.	well as serviceability, and is barely audible from the project space when operating. Perfect number of pumps and valves for the pool size.
	0	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Degree of Difficulty Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the swimming pool and or spa build taking into consideration the design documentation, access, unique, innovative construction practices.	Poor – the project is straight forward, 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 technically that require a high level of skill or innovation.	Good – the project offers elements that require a good technical skill sets that have been executed well.	Very Good – the project offers a number of challenges 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					

Compliance Evaluates the compliance of heater clearances, plant room ventilation, and equipment set out.	Obvious non-compliance issues	Average – minor non-compliance issues	Good – shows no signs of any compliance issues	Excellent – to the highest standard with no evident flaws.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Environmental Evaluates the consideration of the environment. Use of covers, low energy equipment, lighting, water consumption.	Poor – no pool cover, high energy usage for equipment inc heating unit, no rain water tank for water neutral option, pool oversized for space	Average – some aspects of environmental consideration have been delivered	Good – on the whole, good consideration to environmental aspects, but one element may not have been addressed, or some better choices were available	Excellent – water neutral pool, thermal blanket, solar to assist heating, low energy consumption on equipment, low chemical usage via ionic system
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Lighting Evaluates the placement and number of lights. Consideration given to heights, spacings, working operation and lighting all areas of the swimming pool and/or spa..	Poor – pool has inappropriate illumination and fails to provide ambience, light positioning offers poor results, controls are hard to access	Average – minimal success with lighting resulting in an average result to create ambience, controls are accessible but could have been placed so much better	Good – great attempt has been made, lighting is suitable and well placed	Excellent – perfect balance resulting in stunning ambience, creating an inviting atmosphere. Controls are easy to access and well considered
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				
Overall Impression 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 blend into its surrounds, and provides no memorable initial reaction.	Average – 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
Comments				

Subtotal /100

Was a building permit required for this project?	Yes / No / NA	Was a building permit obtained?	Yes / No / NA
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:			
TOTAL		/185	%

Judges name(s) _____

Judges Signature(s) _____

Date of Judging _____

