2023 Victorian Landscape Awards
Judging Sheet for The Nic van Diemen Award

VICTORIAN LANDSCAPE AWARDS 2023

Entrant	Project Address

Note to Category Judge:

This award is an open category for Members who have been with Landscaping Victoria for less than five years, and are first-time entrants to the awards program.

There is no size restriction, no dollar restriction or category restriction.
The award will be bestowed upon an entrant whose efforts in delivering their project embodies the Association values of Quality, Pride and Professionalism.

Please select the applicable category for the entry, then go to the appropriate criteria in this document.

Each entry gets a mark out of **125**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.
The entrant MAY NOT enter their own property.

Circle or highlight the appropriate category for the entry as per the Summary document in the Judges Folder.

Design Entry	YES	Construction Entry	YES	Maintenance /Softscaping Entry	YES

Awards Application – to be completed for ALL entries

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.
	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 connect with the land with no memorable stand out reaction.	Adequate – 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 11 12 13	14 15

Comments

Sub-Total   **/25**

Personal/Professional Development – to be completed for ALL entries

Entrants will have written this element in a separate document – **RECORD** the marks here

Where do you feel you need to improve/develop from an industry viewpoint? How do you think you will achieve this?	Poor – unable or only just able to identify any personal or professional areas for development	Adequate – entrant shows some thought in the response and can articulate some areas for development, and has given some consideration to training, or other solutions to improve	Excellent – entrant is able to articulate in detail where they see a need for improvement and have considered, and taken action on making improvements already
	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

If you are successful in winning this Award, what will it mean to you and how do you think it will impact on your business?	Poor – entrant does not seem to appreciate the opportunities that arise from a win	Adequate – entrant would be thrilled to win but hasn't given much thought as to how they can use the win to good effect	Excellent – entrant has given thought to how they can capitalize on their win and sees the opportunity it presents
	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Sub-Total **/15**

DESIGN ENTRIES ONLY

Graphic Representation

Quality of Graphic Communication and specification	Poor – difficult to read / understand, no scale, specs are sketchy and missing detail	Adequate – the graphics are legible, communicates project in plan only with scale, provides just enough info for the project to be quoted and built – requiring some clarification.	Good – the graphics are clear, communicates the project in plan and in 3 dimensions, with scale allowing quoting and construction with minimal clarification...	Excellent – the graphics are very clear, communicates the project in plan and in 3D, with scale. Demonstrates drawings for different audiences – client, contractors, statutory. Separates information to cater for e.g. planting plan for gardener, lighting plan for electrician etc. Quoting and construction can be carried out with no further clarification needed.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Design Development, Function and Aesthetic

Creative Response of Design Evaluates overall impression of the design, considering response to client brief, 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. Misses some detail of client brief.	Good – the design functions well due to a clear brief, 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, responds to all aspects of the brief, 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 i.e. screening, windbreaks etc.	Excellent – notes on preparing / improving the soil onsite have been addressed the planting is 100% fit for purpose and conditions, and there is excellent visual impact in the planting scheme.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Context & Theme Evaluates the strength of connection between the design and the site, plus strength of theme to tie the design together	Poor – the design has no connection with the surrounds / architecture. There is no link (or theme) that guides the direction of the design.	Adequate – the design has some connection with the surrounds / architecture. There is a weak link that guides the direction of the design.	Good – the design has a good connection with the surrounds / architecture. There is a theme evident which directs the design.	Excellent – the design has a strong connection to the surrounds / architecture and 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

Overall Impact of Plants				
Looks at the design 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 –the plants do not look healthy and have 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 – most plants have been installed as per the design and look healthy. The plants have added good visual form, texture and colour contrast.	Excellent – the planting is installed as per the design with optimum placement and spacing. Plant choices demonstrate excellent health and have added form, texture and colour contrast with outstanding visual impact.
	0	1 2	3 4	5

Comments

Material Selection				
Evaluates appropriate use of pavers, stone, timber, plants, etc.	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

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	10

Comments

Use of Zones				
Evaluates how active play areas and quiet passive spaces as well as utility zones (such as clotheslines and bins) are handled by the design	Poor – there has been no resolution of active / passive / utility zones.	Adequate – active / passive /utility zones have been resolved to some extent but there may be some concerns over conflict with other uses.	Good – active / passive /utility zones have been resolved and this is quite apparent.	Excellent – active / passive /utility zones have been well resolved, there is no conflict, the site reads very clearly.
	0	1 2	3 4	10

Comments

Subtotal for Design Entry   /80

CONSTRUCTION ENTRIES ONLY

Was a building permit required for this project?	Yes / No / NA	Was a building permit obtained?	Yes / No / NA

Construction

Set Out 2D/3D Evaluates the project set out in a 2D form i.e. 90 degrees	Poor – the set out has missed critical datum that is evident via awkward cuts, not built to plan or focal point miss placement.	Adequate – the project has been generally built to plan however shows a lack of finer detail / technical challenge throughout.	Good – the project shows no signs of poor set out and all elements are built to the plan with a good level of technical skill.	Excellent – the project is of a high technical level with all items being meticulously set out to millimetre precision.
	0 1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10

Comments

Material Selection Evaluates the quality of all materials used (this is about final material selection not specification)	Poor – the quality of material shows obvious visual and structural flaws such as cracked pavers, split decking boards, inappropriate use of materials for their intended purpose.	Adequate – materials are performing well but are showing signs of future issues or were poorly chosen: evident by things like band marks, imperfections, used upside down, defective etc	Good – the materials have provided good value for money with long term viability, have been used appropriately and are in a good, well presented current state.	Excellent – the materials used are of the highest quality that the budgets allow, have a great long term future, have been used appropriately and are in an excellent current state.
	0	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Gaps & Joins Evaluates attention to detail in paving, brick work, carpentry, and so on	Poor – gaps are inconsistent, irregular with no attention to detail, grout falling out or missing / decking boards lifting and the above visually harm the overall project potential. Easy project, done poorly.	Average – inconsistency between some trades and others i.e. paving gaps good but decking poor. A standard level of complexity to the project with low density of structure.	Adequate – gaps are relatively consistent but lack polish. Project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.	Good – gaps and joints are of a good level with no initial visual concerns; closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.	Excellent – all construction gaps and joints are of the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project was of a high level of complexity, high density of structure, carried out to the highest level.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10

Comments

Cuts Evaluates the attention to detail and construction skill in areas of paving, decking, walling and outdoor structures	Poor – cuts are inconsistent, irregular with no attention to detail; causing gaps to be inconsistent that visually harm the overall project potential. An easy project, done poorly.	Average –signs of inconsistency between mediums ie. paving cuts good but decking poor. A standard level of complexity to the project with low density of structure just completed to industry standards.	Adequate – cuts are relatively consistent but lack some polish. A project of medium complexity / degree of difficulty and density of structure.	Good – cuts are of a good level with no initial visual concerns; closer inspection finds a little room for improvement.	Excellent – all cuts and workmanship are of the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project was of a high level of complexity, high density of structure, carried out to the highest level.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10

Comments

Control Joints Evaluates the appropriate use of control joints to all rigid structures	Poor – no consideration made for movement control, signs of cracking evident and imminent.	Average – some control joints evident but in correct use and inadequate amount. Joints finished to an ok level. Future cracking potentially imminent.	Adequate – control joints have been used appropriately and are relatively consistent but lack some polish.	Good – control joints used appropriately and to a good level with no initial visual concerns or long-term potential for cracking, closer inspection sees room to improve.	Excellent – all control joints have been considered and implemented to the highest level with no visual signs of flaws. The project had high level of complexity.
	0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10

Comments

Drainage Evaluates how well drainage systems have been installed and finished in hard construction areas	Poor – evidence of water pooling or running in wrong direction. Implications for future problems.	Adequate – some evidence of drainage but not sufficient for project size.	Good – effective drainage system installed no pooling, no evidence of dampness around constructed areas.	Excellent – effective drainage system installed and working efficiently. Installation finished very well.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Degree of Difficulty Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the individual structures, overall project taking into consideration the design documentation, access, unique, innovative construction practices	Poor – the project is straight forward, low in structure, 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 technical structures that require a high level of skill or innovation.	Good – the project offers one or two key structure that requires a good technical skill sets that have been executed well. Other structures are of a standard level of difficulty.	Very Good – the project offers challenging structures 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

Soil Preparation Evaluates the soil preparation on site from an environmental, budget, drainage and plant health point of view	Poor – existing poor soil remains with no consideration for the incoming plants therefore rendering poor plant health. Drainage not considered.	Adequate – removal of old with imported soil being used to improve growing medium, some consideration for drainage implemented. No thought given to improving existing soil as an option.	Good – effective drainage installed a combination of existing and imported soil used to create appropriate growing medium. Addresses budgetary and environmental considerations with plant health being of a high level.	Excellent – effective drainage installed and existing / new soil used to create growing medium specific for the planting palette with PH testing or the like being evident.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Quality of Stock General health of plants and lawns	Poor – there is evidence of poor drainage (wet feet), pests and diseases, lack or inconsistency of growth thatching or girdling in pots. Plants installed with no care.	Adequate – plants look generally healthy but some sections visible where drainage or inappropriate plant selection has been used.	Good – plants look well, have been appropriately selected, carefully planted and displayed a good growth rate. Care shown for orientation and installation techniques.	Excellent – plants are lush, healthy and thriving. Key features have been hand selected and installed to create perfect form and structure for the space.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Sub Total for Construction Entry   **/100**

MAINTENANCE/SOFTSCAPING ENTRIES ONLY

Skills

Maintenance / Horticultural Manual Skills Evaluates how well the garden has been physically managed including pruning, mowing, rubbish removal, fertilizing, pest control	Poor – pruning poor, lawn mown inconsistently, edging not consistent, evidence of uneven fertilising resulting in poor plant and lawn health or death, pests evident.	Adequate – garden is neatly maintained but skills demonstrated are adhoc with room for improvement in some areas.	Good – skills demonstrated show knowledge of best practice in garden maintenance, pruning appropriate to achieve desired outcome, plants and lawn in good health, hedging straight and well clipped, no evidence of pest management issues.	Excellent – contractor demonstrates excellent skills with maintenance works and garden is immaculate, without looking 'over maintained'. Excellent understanding of specific site and green life needs.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Plant Scale - 2D/3D 2D set out of plants in relationship to space the plants are located, and elevations	Poor – no evidence to suggest set out scale and space considered beyond installation	Adequate – some thought given to set out and later growth scale but overcrowded at installation and minimal long-term prospects	Good – plants spaced evenly in relation to quantity supplied and space available, demonstrating consideration for scale and space over time	Excellent – exceptional degree of planned set out demonstrated pre installation to ensure excellent coverage appropriate for space, plant species, coverage, shape and size over time.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10

Comments

Quality of Plant Selection 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 evident.	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

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

Comments

Mulch in Garden Beds Judge to assess if sufficient mulch is installed evenly to garden beds (50mm-70mm)	Poor – no mulch evident in garden beds, or conversely too much mulch resulting in rot issues at base of plants/trees.	Adequate – inconsistent depth of coverage of low quality mulch in garden beds, foreign objects present in mulch.	Good – good coverage of quality mulch to all garden beds but lacks detailing around plants and objects.	Excellent – good depth of quality mulch to all garden beds with all areas detailed and no build up around plant bases.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Drainage Evaluates how well drainage systems have been installed and finished in hard construction areas	Poor – evidence of water pooling or running in wrong direction. Implications for future problems.	Adequate – some evidence of drainage but not sufficient for project size.	Good – effective drainage system installed no pooling, no evidence of dampness around constructed areas.	Excellent – effective drainage system installed and working efficiently. Installation finished very well.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Soil Preparation Evaluates the soil preparation on site from an environmental, budget, drainage and plant health point of view	Poor – existing poor soil remains with no consideration for the incoming plants therefore rendering poor plant health. Drainage not considered.	Adequate – removal of old with imported soil being used to improve growing medium, some consideration for drainage implemented. No thought given to improving existing soil as an option.	Good – effective drainage installed a combination of existing and imported soil used to create appropriate growing medium. Addresses budgetary and environmental considerations with plant health being of a high level.	Excellent – effective drainage installed and existing / new soil used to create growing medium specific for the planting palette with PH testing or the like being evident.
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub Total for Maintenance/Softscaping Entry   **/70**

JUDGES: Complete the line ONLY relevant to the category indicated on page 1	Application Section ALL ENTRIES	Development Section ALL ENTRIES	Category Specific Criteria			PERCENTAGE
Design Entry	**/25**	**/15**	**/80**	TOTAL	**/120**	**%**
Construction Entry	**/25**	**/15**	**/100**	TOTAL	**/140**	**%**
Maintenance/Softscaping Entry	**/25**	**/15**	**/70**	TOTAL	**/110**	**%**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Judges name(s)_____

Judges Signature(s)_____

Date of Judging _____