

## Victorian Landscape Awards Judging Sheet for Softscaping in the Landscape Category

**Note for judges**

Awards Allocated: Gold, Silver & Bronze

|                |
|----------------|
| <b>Entrant</b> |
|                |

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <b>Project Address</b> |
|                        |

**Note to Category Judge:**

This category is for softscaping incorporating both design (or planting plans) and installation. Some hard elements may still be present in the project however **the emphasis is on the softscaping and the creative use of plants.**

Each entry gets a mark out of **65**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.

| <b>Plants</b>   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Plant Scale</b><br>Scale of plants within the space in relationship to the surrounding landscape elevations  | Poor – no evidence to suggest scale and space considered past installation.                                       | Adequate – some thought in evidence for early stages of growth in relation to scale, not for longer term. | Good – selection of plants and installation demonstrate consideration for scale and space over a period of time. | Excellent – exceptional level of attention demonstrated in plant choice and installation in reference to scale to ensure excellent coverage and shape and size over a period of time. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 1 2 3 4   | 5 6 7 8   | 9 10   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments  |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Quality of Plant Selection</b><br>Selection of plants in relation to design intent, and site and environmental conditions  | Poor – plant selection including invasive growth habits, declared weeds species. Poor choice for site / location. | Adequate – species and size as specified but consideration for existing plants and site not evidenced.    | Good – quality stock selected and installed, some consideration given to value for budget and design aesthetics. | Excellent – exceptional care in stock selection, shape, installation location, and health demonstrated particularly in relation to existing plants.                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 1 2 3 4 5   | 6 7 8 9 10  | 11 12 13 14 15   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments<br><b>NOTE FOR JUDGES:</b><br>Entry documents must indicate that at least 85 % of the intended plants specified have been installed.<br>Provide reason why any changes have been made e.g. supply issues, and what species were substituted for which. |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Quality of Planting Techniques</b><br>How the plants have been planted, correct face forward, mulched, and thought given to ongoing watering needs and maintenance. Staking, tree protection and pruning applied to plants at time of planting.  | Poor – poor installation, evidence of plants deteriorating, mulch is crowding plants.                         | Adequate – plants installed as required but spacing and pruning may be an issue in the future.   | Good – plants installed as required with some thought to facing and ongoing maintenance.   | Excellent – exceptional installation, level of detail regarding facing, relationship to other plants, plants in great health, well mulched.   |
|   | 0   | 1 2 3 4 5  | 6 7 8 9 10   | 11 12 13 14 15  |
| Comments  |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Overall Impact of Planting, Degree of Creative 'Wow'</b><br>Looks at the design, installation and detail of the planted area including adequate spacing, placement and plant health. Evaluates how the plant selection and combination of textures, form and colour contrast have contributed to the final effect. | Poor – unimaginative plant selection with no visual impact due to poor plant selection, spacing and placement | Adequate – a number of plants have not been installed as per the design and are not healthy. Spacing could be an issue in the future and the plants provide minimal visual impact. | Good – excellent presentation of plants with most installed as per the design and look healthy. The plants have added good visual form, texture and colour contrast, but lack extra creative edge to give the full 'wow' factor. | Excellent – outcome beyond expectation – 'wow'. Innovative use of plants, creative plant choices in exceptional health and have added form, texture and colour contrast with outstanding visual impact. Installed as per the design with optimum placement and spacing. |
|   | 0   | 1 2 3 4 5  | 6 7 8 9 10   | 11 12 13 14 15  |
| Comments  |   |  |  |   |

**Sub-Total**

**/55**

| <b>Design</b>   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Complexity</b><br>Evaluates how the design handles some or many factors including site levels, site use, materials, statutory requirements, use of plants to edit out unwanted views or soften harsh exteriors | Poor – the design fails to reconcile basic elements and does not address site specific aspects. | Adequate – the design reconciles a few basic elements – e.g. the utility area has been separated from the entertaining area, basic screening has been incorporated. | Good – the design delivers on many aspects include changing levels, competing uses, a diverse range of materials, addresses editing or enhancing views, and is within the constraints of statutory planning. | Excellent – the design reconciles every element: changing levels, a diverse range of materials, competing uses, editing or enhancing site views, and is within the constraints of statutory planning. |
|   | 0   | 1 2   | 3 4  | 5   |
| Comments  |   |   |  |   |

**Sub-Total**

**/5**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**TOTAL**

**/60**

**%**

**Judge name(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Judges Signature(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

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