



Entrant

Project Address

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 **100**. 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 anticipated outcomes for the planting scheme; plant list reflects consideration of the design intent and client's budget.	Excellent – applicant provided comprehensive information regarding design intent, reasoning for plant selection, and information that was provided to the client for ongoing maintenance.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub-Total

/10

Plants				
Plant Scale - 2D 2D set out of plants in relationship to space the plants are located	Poor – no planned 2D set-out in evidence.	Adequate – some evidence of thought given to set out but haphazard or overcrowded at installation.	Good – plants spaced evenly in relation to quantity supplied and space available.	Excellent – exceptional degree of planned set out demonstrated pre installation to ensure excellent coverage appropriate for space and plant species.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				
Plant Scale - 3D 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 3D 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				
Quality of Plant Selection	Poor – plant selection including invasive growth	Adequate – species and size as specified but consideration for	Good – quality stock selected and installed,	Excellent – exceptional care in stock selection, shape,

Selection of plants in relation to design intent, and site and environmental conditions	habits, declared weeds species. Poor choice for site / location.	existing plants and site not evidenced.	some consideration given to value for budget and design aesthetics.	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 NOTE FOR JUDGES: Entry documents must indicate that at least 85 % of the intended plants specified have been installed. Provide reason why any changes have been made e.g. supply issues, and what species were substituted for which				
Quality of Planting Techniques 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				
Overall Impact of Planting, Degree of Creative 'Wow' 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

/65

Design Delivery - Focus is now on the design as it has been built

Context Evaluates the strength of connection between the design and the site and taking in to account the integration of exiting trees as part of the surrounds (if applicable)	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, 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				
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				

Material Selection Evaluates appropriate use of pavers, stone, timber, garden edging, rockwork, etc. within the softscape	Poor – materials that are inferior and not suitable for their application are used consistently throughout.	Adequate – materials are of moderate quality and suitable for their application but nothing more.	Good – materials are of high quality and suitable for their application and enhance the aesthetic.	Excellent – materials are of the highest quality and most suitable for their application, enhance the aesthetic and sit well within the design philosophy e.g., use of recycled timber in a ‘green’ garden.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				

Sub-Total

/25

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		
TOTAL	/100	%

Judge name(s) _____

Judges Signature(s) _____

Date of Judging _____