

Victorian Landscape Awards Industry Awards Judging Sheet for Non-Built Creative Design

Note for judges

Awards Allocated: Gold, Silver & Bronze

Landscape Design of any size property – this is an open category

Entrant	Project Address

Note to Category Judge:

The emphasis is on design documentation only. This category is for non real life design projects. This is an opportunity for designers to creative their own brief.

Each entry will be judged on design practices only, with no reference to construction or built works.

Each entry gets a mark out of **70**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.

The entrant MAY NOT enter their own property.

Graphic Representa	tion			
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, with scale. Excellent – the graphics are very clear communicates the project in plan and dimensions (possibly animation), with scale. Demonstrates drawings for different audiences – client, contract statutory. Separates information on separate sheets to cater for particular audience – e.g. planting plan for electrician etc.	l in 3 th tors, to lar
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8 9 10	
Comments		•		

Sub-Total /10

Design Development											
Responsiveness of the Design to the Brief Evaluates the quality of information collected and how this is translated into the design	Poor – no brief evident / brief ignored.	include	s limit desig n req	edinfo gn resp uirem		clearly	nds to m	and the	design	includes ex	the design brief cellent detail and responds to all 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, consideration of screening for both desired and undesired views.	Poor – the design does not function well, it is mundane, a poor take on old worn out trends. Little to no aesthetic, function or screening considerations.	trends	ns, it on the table to the table to the table ta	delivers easona brings able. No nof ae	scurrent ble nothing Minimal sthetic,	well, it on cur approp outcor aesthe	the de introdu rent tre oriate so mes, de tics and client.	ices a no ends, de creenin livers g functio	ew take elivers g ood	and innovat	ell, it is exciting
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments											
Hard Surface Design Evaluates the incorporation of hard surfaces (and subsequent material selection) appropriate to the aspect, purpose, and general conditions	Poor – hard surfaces are not appropriate to the site, do not relate to theme or client requirements and material selections are inappropriate	Adequa conside surfaces not del impact potenti Materia average	rations is giver a contract or capal al funals specifications.	n to ha ven bu ny aes pitalisa ctiona	t does thetic e on lity.	surface provid have b	- suitab es engag e functi een ins oriate m	ge the onality	eye, and with	well conside the design a	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments	0			3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
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	1 Adequa	2 te – t y suit:	he plar able fc	nt palette r aspect	Good - suitabl and co though achiev	- the pla e for pu ndition it throu e aims i reaks et	anting d rpose, s, has t gh wel e scree	esign is aspect een I to	Excellent – 100% fit for conditions, planting sch	the planting is purpose and with a strong

Sub-Total /40

Design Aesthetic								
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.		here is a weak es the direction	Good – there evident whic design.		Excellent – there is a clear theme that ties everything together.		
	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. No sense of proportion or depth.	out does fun proportion a	and depth have ered but could	functions we proportion a	design set out II, looks in nd consideration ident. Design is	Excellent – the des out functions extre well, is well balanc exhibits very good proportion and scal elements work harmoniously.	mely ed and
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Comments		1				Excellent – materia	als and
Material Selection / Styling Options Evaluates appropriate selection and clear noted documentation for pavers, stone, timber, pots, artwork, focal points, furniture, textures, colour schemes etc.	Poor – material and styling options are not suitable for their application or have not been clearly marked on the design.	styling opt moderates application	 materials and ions have a suitability for thein with basic ation describing n. 	options have suitability for application documental each option	or their with strong ution describing n clearly. Material options are of a y with good	styling options are for their application impeccable docume describing each opticlearly-e.g., productions colour, size, supplies	perfect n with entation tion t name, er etc. g options uality
	0	1	2 3 4	5 6	7 8	9 10	
Sub-Total ADDITIONAL COMME	NTS						/20
TOTAL					/70	%	
Judges name(s)							
Judges Signature(s)							

Date of Judging _____