



Pool Design category. See separate sheet for Pool Construction category

<b>Entrant</b>

<b>Project Address</b>

**Note to Category Judge:**

The **emphasis is on the pool design** and should never be confused with the quality of construction, although this will have some influence on how the design is graded.

Each entry gets a mark out of **105**. This is converted into a percentage and then ranked against other entries.

**The entrant MAY NOT enter their own property.**

<b>Is the project COMPLIANT?</b>	<b>Yes / No / NA</b>	<b>If <span style="background-color: #FF0000; color: white;">NO</span>, the entry is ineligible. Do not proceed with judging.</b>
----------------------------------	----------------------	---

**Criteria**

Awards Application											
<b>Overall Professionalism of Application &amp; Quality of Information</b>	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, has included a set of drawings and most applicable documentation.	Excellent – application describes the project to the highest standards, with very clear project information, a full set of drawings and includes all applicable documentation.					
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments											

**Sub-Total**

**/10**

Graphic Representation											
<b>Quality of Graphic Communication</b>	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 has either at least one elevation or shows the pool in 3 dimensions. Drawings should show and be too 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.					
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comments											

<b>Quality of specification</b>	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.	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

<b>Design Development - Focus is now on the design brief and how drawings achieve the desired outcome.</b>				
<b>Responsiveness of the Design to the Client Brief</b> 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				
<b>Creative Response of Design</b> Evaluates the overall impression of the design, considering innovative use of materials, clever resolution of function, a high aesthetic etc	Poor – the design does not function well, it is mundane, a poor take on old worn out trends.	Adequate – the design functions, it delivers current trends to a reasonable standard but brings nothing new to the table.	Good – the design functions well, it introduces a new take on current trends.	Excellent – the design functions well, it is exciting and innovative – it has the 'wow' factor.
	0	1 2	3 4	5
Comments				
<b>Set Out 3D</b> Floor gradients, steps and other transitional element of the swimming pool and or spa.	Poor – Design fails to meet basic criteria. Poor entry and function, gradients conflict with the overall intention of the pool function	Adequate	Good	Excellent – swim, rest and play areas are beautifully balanced, design demonstrates thoughtful consideration for the end user
	0	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	9 10
Comments				

Sub Total

/25

<b>Design Aesthetic - Focus is now on the design as it has been built</b>																					
<b>Context</b> Evaluates the strength of connection between the design and the site	Poor – the pool/spa 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 and other landscape environment.																
	0	1	2	3	4	5															
Comments																					
<b>Degree of Difficulty</b> Evaluates the overall degree of difficulty of the swimming pool and or spa build taking into consideration the design documentation, access, unique, innovative construction practices.	Poor – the project is straight forward, 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 technically that require a high level of skill or innovation.		Good – the project offers elements that require a good technical skill sets that have been executed well.	Very Good – the project offers a number of challenges 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																					
<b>Equipment Location</b> Evaluates the functionality, design, serviceability and ease of operation. Noise and screening considerations to be evaluated.	Poor – design shows a lazy approach resulting in unsightly equipment not being screened properly, poor access for servicing & function	Adequate – design makes some consideration to appropriate location, functionality and view of equipment		Good - design makes a very good attempt to consider appropriate location, functionality and view of equipment, but could have taken another step further	Excellent – design shows clever problem-solving ideas. Equipment is perfectly positioned allowing efficiency and function as well as serviceability																
	0	1	2	3	4	5															
Comments																					
<b>Environmental</b> Evaluates the consideration of the environment. Covers, low energy usage equipment, water consumption.	Poor – no pool cover, high energy usage for equipment inc heating unit, no rain water tank for water neutral option, pool oversized for space	Average – some aspects of environmental consideration have been delivered		Good – on the whole, good consideration to environmental aspects, but one element may not have been addressed, or some better choices were available	Excellent – water neutral pool, thermal blanket, solar to assist heating, low energy consumption on equipment, low chemical usage via ionic system																
	0	1	2	3	4	5															
Comments																					

<b>Lighting</b> Evaluates the placement and number of lights. Consideration given to heights, spacings, working operation and lighting all areas of the pool or spa.	Poor – pool has inappropriate illumination and fails to provide ambience, light positioning offers poor results, controls are hard to access	Average – minimal success with lighting resulting in an average result to create ambience, controls are accessible but could have been placed so much better	Good – great attempt has been made, lighting is suitable and well placed	Excellent – perfect balance resulting in stunning ambience, creating an inviting atmosphere. Controls are easy to access and well considered
	0	1    2	3    4	5
Comments				
<b>External Finishes within 1000mm of shell</b> Evaluates the quality and suitability of external finishes associated with the swimming pool and or spa.	Poor – little to no thought given to surface slip factors, longevity of materials near water’s edge, surface prone to salt attack (salt pools only) poor drainage options. Surface extremely hot underfoot.	Average – some consideration to appropriateness of materials but still displays potential issues for the user, and long-term effects of chemical deterioration	Good – fewer blisters for the user through good material choices, finishes are thoughtful	Excellent – design not only addresses all issues but also uses clever options with stunning texture and finishes.
	0	1    2    3    4	5    6    7    8	9    10
Comments				

**Subtotal**

**/50**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**TOTAL**

**/105**

**%**

**Judges name(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

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

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