2023 Victorian Landscape Awards
Industry Awards Judging Sheet for DOCUMENTED Design

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 real life design projects based on real client briefs, that have been prepared by the entrant, but not necessarily built (for reasons such as: client did not proceed with the build, the plans will not be built for some time, or it is a staged project etc.)

A Design Agreement/Contract MUST be included in the entry documentation, as must site photos (or video) illustrating the existing site and its structures.
Each entry will be judged on design practices only, with no reference to construction or built works.

Each entry gets a mark out of **115**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.
The entrant MAY NOT enter their own property.

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 most 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, including an Agreement
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Sub-Total   **/10**

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 in 3 dimensions, with 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. Separates information onto separate sheets to cater for particular audience – e.g. planting plan for gardener, lighting plan for electrician etc.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Quality of specification	Poor – absent or sketchy, missing most of the detail.	Adequate – provides just enough information either embedded on the drawings or as a separate document, that allows the project to be quoted and built – requiring some clarification.	Good – provides good support to the drawings allowing quoting and construction with minimal clarification. Includes good	Excellent – provides comprehensive support to the drawings (usually as a separate document) which allows quoting and construction with no further clarification.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Sub-Total **/20**

Design Development

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, 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.	Adequate – the design functions, it delivers current trends to a reasonable standard but brings nothing new to the table. Minimal consideration of aesthetic, function and screening.	Good – the design functions well, it introduces a new take on current trends, delivers appropriate screening outcomes, delivers good aesthetics and functionality for the client.	Excellent – the design functions well, it is exciting and innovative, highly aesthetic – it has the 'wow' factor.
	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	Adequate – some consideration to hard surfaces is given but does not deliver any aesthetic impact or capitalise on potential functionality. Materials specified are average.	Good – suitable hard surfaces engage the eye, provide functionality and have been installed with appropriate materials	Excellent – hard surfaces are well considered, enhancing the design aesthetic and functionality of the space, with materials selected further enhancing the outcome.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

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	Adequate – the plant palette is mostly suitable for aspect and purpose, if somewhat uninspired	Good – the planting design is suitable for purpose, aspect and conditions, has been thought through well to achieve aims ie screening, windbreaks etc	Excellent – the planting is 100% fit for purpose and conditions, with a strong planting scheme which should produce excellent results.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub-Total /40

Design Aesthetic

Context Evaluates the strength of connection between the design and the existing site and its structures.	Poor – the 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.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

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.	Adequate – there is a weak link that guides the direction of the design.	Good – there is a theme evident which directs the design.	Excellent – there is a clear theme that ties everything together.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Complexity Evaluates how the design handles some or many factors including site levels, site use, materials and / or statutory	Poor – the design fails to reconcile just a few basic elements.	Adequate – the design reconciles a few basic elements – e.g. the utility area has been separated from the entertaining area.	Good – the design reconciles several elements which may include changing levels, competing uses, a diverse range of materials, and is within the constraints of statutory planning.	Excellent – the design reconciles many elements across changing levels, competing uses, a diverse range of materials, and is within the constraints of statutory planning.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
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.	Adequate – the design set out does function and proportion and depth have been considered but could be improved.	Good – the design set out functions well, looks in proportion and consideration of scale is evident. Design is balanced	Excellent – the design set out functions extremely well, is well balanced and exhibits very good proportion and scale. All elements work harmoniously.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
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.	Adequate – materials and styling options have a moderate suitability for their application with basic documentation describing each option.	Good – materials and styling options have a good suitability for their application with strong documentation describing each option clearly. Materials and styling options are of a high quality with good aesthetic appeal.	Excellent – materials and styling options are perfect for their application with impeccable documentation describing each option clearly- e.g., product name, colour, size, supplier etc. Materials and styling options are of a very high quality with excellent aesthetic appeal.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Sub-Total   **/30**

Design Function				
Movement Through Site Evaluates how pedestrian and vehicle movement is handled by the design	Poor – movement through the site is confusing, there is a conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.	Adequate – movement through the site has been resolved to some extent but is not very clear.	Good – movement through the site has been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent – movement through the site has been well resolved, there is no conflict, the site reads very clearly.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Active / Passive Zones Evaluates how active play areas and quiet passive spaces are handled by the design	Poor – there has been no resolution of active / passive zones.	Adequate – active / passive zones have been resolved to some extent but there may be some concerns over conflict with other uses.	Good – active / passive zones have been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent – active / passive zones have been well resolved, there is no conflict, the site reads very clearly.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Utility Zones Evaluates how areas such as clotheslines and bins are handled	Poor – there has been no resolution of utility zones.	Adequate – utility zones have been resolved to some extent but there may be some concerns over conflict with other uses / or overlooking.	Good – utility zones have been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent - utility zones have been well resolved, there is no conflict / overlooking.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Subtotal   **/15**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		
TOTAL	**/115**	**%**

Judges name(s)_____

Judges Signature(s)_____

Date of Judging _____