



2022

Royal Norfolk Show

Garden Village Exhibitor Information Awards & Judging



Kristopher Harper MHort (RHS), MCIHort, FLS
Head Judge

Contents

Awards & Judging Category's.....	2
Show Themes for 2022.....	2
Awards for Exhibits.....	2
Best in Show Awards.....	2
Category's and Judging Criteria's	2
Judging Guidance	3
Judging Times	3
Advising Judges of any significant changes (Exhibitor Comments)	3
Show Garden Judging and Design Brief	3
Exhibitors' presence during judging	3
Award Feedback.....	3
Discussion with Judges.....	3
Judging Criteria	4
Trade Stand (Horticultural/Floral) Judging Criteria	4
School Show Garden Judging Criteria	5
Show Garden Judging Criteria	6

All information contained in this booklet is correct at time of print, subject to review.
Last Updated: 17 March 2022.

Awards & Judging Category's

Show Themes for 2022

The shows' overall themes for 2022 are "Homegrown", "Local Living" and "Farming Champions".

Awards for Exhibits

Each exhibit is judged on its own merit against the judging criteria for its category.

Depending on the total number of points the exhibit receives based on the judging criteria it will be awarded the appropriate award as indicated on the judging criteria.

The awards are Gold, Silver-Gilt, Silver and Bronze. If an exhibit is judged to be below Bronze standard, no award will be made.

Best in Show Awards

In addition to the awards detailed above the special awards detailed below will be made to one exhibitor in the respective category, at the discretion of the judging panel.

- Best Show Garden
- Best School Garden
- Best Horticultural Exhibit

Categories and Judging Criteria's

Below are the details of the category of exhibit and the judging criteria that will be used.

Category	Judging Criteria used
Horticultural Exhibits	Trade Stand (Horticultural/Floral)
Show Gardens	Show Garden
School Gardens	School Show Garden

Judging Guidance

Judging Times

Please note times specified are subject to change on the day.

Judging will commence at 7am on Wednesday 29th June.

School Gardens will be judged from 11am onwards, this is to allow time for teachers and students to arrive so they can speak to the Judging panel prior to Judging.

Advising Judges of any significant changes (Exhibitor Comments)

An exhibitor comment form will be given/emailed to each exhibitor prior to the show. This form is the exhibitor's opportunity to highlight any specific difficulties, positives, or unusual aspects of your exhibit.

The details you highlight will not influence the judging of your final exhibit to the judging criteria but will allow you an opportunity to highlight things you may like to draw to the attention of the judges.

This form needs to be submitted to the Head Judge no later than 7pm on Tuesday 28th June.

Show Garden Judging and Design Brief

Show gardens are judged against the respective judging criteria and the designer's brief. The brief document is not judged, but the judges will consider if the designer has done what they detailed in the brief as part of the overall exhibit.

The Show Garden Brief:

- A minimum 300-word description of your show garden concept
- Include a sketch in any form of your initial plans
- Any additional information
- Plant List

Exhibitors' presence during judging

All exhibitors must leave the area when exhibits are being judged.

The only exception to this is the 'School Gardens'. Discussion with the students is important and encouraged. The judges would like to hear from at least 3 students who can give a brief resume of their garden, design, and build. The judges will allow approximately 5-10 minutes for students and staff to brief the judges before they will be asked to leave/step back from their exhibit to allow the judges to judge their exhibit.

Award Feedback

You will receive a copy of your judging panels, judging form before the end of the show.

Discussion with Judges

Exhibitors will have the opportunity to discuss their exhibits and seek advice on how to improve them during the afternoon on Wednesday 29 June. The Head Judge (or a nominated representative) of the relevant judging panel will visit each exhibit, giving all exhibitors the chance to obtain verbal feedback.

Judging Criteria

Trade Stand (Horticultural/Floral) Judging Criteria					
Criteria	Excellent (4)	Very good (3)	Good (2)	Satisfactory (1)	Poor (0)
<p>1 Plants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Colour and texture ▪ Quality ▪ Health (pests and disease) ▪ Nomenclature/identification ▪ Association and relevance ▪ Range 	Plants are in first class condition and may involve unusual/rare plants, and/or represent diversity in a single genus as appropriate to the exhibit. Plants are free from pests and diseases	Plants are almost in first class condition but are not properly developed and/or the representative range of plants could be broader. Plants are free from pests and diseases	Plants are well grown but are either immature or lack freshness. May be minimal evidence of pests and diseases. Some of the plant associations/ colours/ textures require enhancement	Plants are immature or of mediocre quality. There may be some evidence of pests and diseases or damage. Inappropriate plant associations	Plants are of insufficient quality and/or are affected by pests and diseases. Plants require extensive/ considerable husbandry to develop from their current state.
<p>2 Overall impression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact (including creativity/ theatre/artistic effect) ▪ Unity, balance and scale ▪ Design, colour and texture ▪ Finish – pots, edging, labels ▪ Stand well-filled/ space well-used 	The exhibit has creative ‘wow’ factor and incorporates well executed design and balance with an accomplished level of details and finish. Creates a very high level of interest for visitors	The exhibit may have some creative elements and is well designed. A high degree of attention to detail and finish. Creates a high level of interest for visitors	The exhibit incorporates competent design but does not necessarily have ‘wow’ factor and/ or a balanced feel/ creativity. Some elements of finish may be lacking but it is still likely to maintain a reasonable level of interest for visitors	The exhibit lacks ‘wow’ factor and/ or overall design and finish. Moderate interest for visitors	Little care has been taken to design the exhibit or to show the best aspects of the plants. There has been little attention to detail or finish. Little to minimal interest for visitors
<p>3 Endeavour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Levels of difficulty in ▪ Creating display ▪ Props ▪ Difficulty in growing plants ▪ Originality/ new ideas 	The exhibitor has resourcefully planned, scheduled, sourced, and assembled all of the elements. There has been original and careful thought in the use of props, and great care taken in presenting and growing plants to a state of perfection taking into account seasonality, degree of difficulty in propagation, rarity of the assembly of a diverse collection	The exhibitor has carefully planned and sourced the elements, but it is a regular display which moves between shows/a formulaic approach. Or a highly original approach but design not fully realised. It is likely that the props have been used/ seen before. The plants are near to perfection taking into account seasonality, degree of difficulty in propagation, rarity of the assembly of a diverse collection	The exhibit is of a competent standard but lacks special or extraordinary effort in the design, assembly or in the growing of the plants for the exhibit. The plants will not necessarily be difficult to propagate and are likely to reflect the season. The collection is unlikely to include diverse or rare plants	The exhibit is of a basic standard where limited effort appears to have been made in the design, assembly or growing of the plants for the exhibit. The plants are relatively available and easily propagated. There is little diversity or rarity of the plants displayed	The display has been simply produced and insufficient effort appears to have been made in the design, assembly or growing of the plants
Award	Gold	Silver-Gilt	Silver	Bronze	No Award
Points	12-11	10-8	7-6	5-3	2-0

School Show Garden Judging Criteria				
Criteria	Excellent (4)	Very good (3)	Good (2)	Satisfactory (1)
1 Plants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality and home grown ▪ Colour and choice ▪ Free from pests and diseases ▪ Association and relevance to garden 	Plants are in first class condition, and have either been grown, or grown-on, by the school. There is no sign of any pests or diseases and, where appropriate, the plants are in flower. The choice of plants is extremely relevant to the garden and represent a broad range of seasonal interest, both during and outside of the show dates.	Plants are in very good condition, and the majority have been grown, or grown-on, by the school. There is minimal sign of pests or diseases and, where appropriate, the majority of plants are in flower. The choice of plants is, in the majority, relevant to the garden and represent a good range of seasonal interest, both during and outside of the show dates.	Plants are in good condition, and have generally either been grown, or grown-on, by the school. There are very few signs of any pests or diseases and some of the plants are in flower. The choice of plants are generally relevant to the garden and represent a range of seasonal interest, for the show period	Plants are in acceptable condition, and some have either been grown, or grown-on, by the school. Signs of pests or diseases are visible, and plants may not be in flower. Some of the plants link to the garden and are of some seasonal interest for the show period.
2 Overall impression <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact (Inc. wow factor and theatre) ▪ Design ▪ Colour and texture ▪ Relevance to theme ▪ Balance and scale. 	The garden is creative and has a wow factor that incorporates well executed design and balance, with a focus on detail. The garden provides a clear and substantial link to the theme and creates a very high level of interest for the visitors.	The garden is something different and will catch visitors' eyes. The design works well and is detailed. The garden provides a clear and obvious link to the theme and creates good levels of interest for the visitors.	The garden avoids clichés and visitors will stop and look at it. The design answers the brief fully and has some interesting details. The garden provides a link to the theme that is interpretable after a little explanation and creates a small level of impact on the visitors.	The garden meets the brief but is rather predictable. The design and materials are basic and contain limited amounts of detail. The theme requires explanation to be understood and visitors may not stop and stand to look at this garden.
3 Children's Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Children's creativity ▪ Children's innovation ▪ Children's design ▪ Children's planting skills and artwork ▪ All above points being age appropriate. 	It is clear that the children have taken a significant role in all aspects of the garden and have led the creativeness of the project. Adults have taken a guiding role and have not imposed their own will on the garden. The garden (design through to final product) is appropriate for the ages and range of abilities of the children.	It is clear that the children have taken a predominantly significant role in all aspects of the garden and have led much of the creativeness of the project. Adults have taken a guiding role and have only imposed their own will on the garden in one or two instances. The garden (design through to final product) is generally appropriate for the ages and range of abilities of the children.	It is clear that the children have taken a role in the majority of the aspects of the garden and have greatly contributed to the creativeness of the project. Adults have taken a leading role but have not imposed their own will on that many aspects of the garden. The garden (design through to final product) is general appropriate for the ages or range of abilities of the children.	It is obvious that adults have taken the lead in most aspects of the garden. Adults have taken a significant role and have generally imposed their own will on the garden. The garden (design through to final product) does not generally seem appropriate for the ages and range of abilities of the children.
4 Finish <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recycling and upcycling ▪ Hard landscaping and choice of materials ▪ Appearance of permanence ▪ Level, and attention to, detail ▪ Use of space. 	Great care and consideration is evident in the sourcing of materials used and what they will be used for after the show. Although only a temporary feature the garden looks permanent and makes best use of the space that has been allocated to it. The final details in the garden has been excellently considered and executed.	Care and consideration is evident in the sourcing of the majority of materials used, and what they will be used for after the show. Although only a temporary feature the garden looks almost permanent and makes very good use of the space that has been allocated to it. The final details in the garden have been considered and executed.	An acceptable quantity of the materials has been sourced from carefully considered sources, with some thought about their use after the show. Although only a temporary feature the garden has a degree of permanence about it, and makes reasonable use of the space that has been allocated to it. The final detail in the garden is acceptable.	Materials have been sourced for their convenience and it is unclear as to how they be used after the show. The garden is a temporary feature, and this comes across in the construction. The space could be used much more successfully. The garden lacks any noticeable level of detail in the finished product.
Award	Gold	Silver-Gilt	Silver	Bronze
Points	16-14	13-10	9-6	5-0

Show Garden Judging Criteria					
Criteria	Excellent (4)	Very good (3)	Good (2)	Satisfactory (1)	Poor (0)
1 Realisation of client's brief <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity ▪ Delivery 	First-rate and clear realisation of brief with no apparent discrepancies between brief and completed garden	Strong realisation of brief with minor discrepancies between brief and completed garden	Adequate realisation of brief with minor discrepancies between brief and completed garden	Ambiguous realisation of brief with some significant discrepancies between brief and completed garden	Lack of relevance or relationship of brief to completed garden
2 Ambition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Atmosphere ▪ Flair ▪ Originality ▪ Impact ▪ Theatre 	Excellent degree of ambition with no apparent issues	Very high degree of ambition with minor issues	Adequate degree of ambition with some noticeable issues	Underlying degree of ambition but with some significant issues	No sense of ambition or showmanship
3 Overall impression <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attention to detail ▪ Choice of materials ▪ Polish and dressing 	Excellent overall impression with no apparent issues of attention to detail	Very good overall impression with minor weak areas lacking attention to detail	Favourable overall impression with some noticeable weak areas requiring attention to detail	Weak overall impression with significant areas requiring greater attention to detail	Garden incomplete
4 Design, layout plan of garden <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dimensions ▪ Scale ▪ Unity 	Excellent layout plan of garden, with no apparent flaws	Very good layout plan with some minor flaws	Good layout plan with some noticeable flaws	Weak layout plan with some significant flaws	Major issues with layout plan
5 Design, 3D and spatial composition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scale ▪ Mass and void ▪ Volume ▪ Balance 	Excellent spatial balance and scale, with no apparent issues	Very good spatial balance and scale, with minor issues	Largely acceptable spatial balance and scale, but with some noticeable issues	Weak spatial balance and scale, with some significant issues	Major design issues with poor spatial balance and scale
6 Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of build and finish 	Excellent build quality and finish demonstrating craftsmanship, flair and skill with no apparent fault in construction	Very good build quality and finish with minor faults in construction that reflect in the aesthetic finish to work	A generally good finish in build quality with some construction faults that could be improved to enhance the build finish	Variable build quality and finish across garden with notable faults in the construction detail	Lack of coherence in choice of materials, poor build quality and finish
7 Planting design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual impact ▪ Colour ▪ Texture ▪ Form ▪ Composition 	Excellent planting design with no apparent errors in composition	Very good planting design with minor errors in composition	Good planting design with some noticeable errors in composition	Sufficient planting design with some significant errors in composition	Little or no tangible evidence of planting design, composition or visual impact
8 Planting associations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevance ▪ Cultural requirements ▪ Sustainability 	Excellent planting associations with no apparent inaccuracies in plant selection	Very good planting associations with minor inaccuracies in plant selection	Good planting associations with some noticeable inaccuracies in plant selection	Weak planting associations with significant inaccuracies in plant selection	Small or inadequate stock, poor quality plants and specimens and inadequate coverage
9 Planting implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality ▪ Health ▪ Density 	Excellent quality plants with no imperfections and appropriate density for design intentions	Very good quality plants with few imperfections and mainly appropriate density for design intentions	Good quality plants with some minor imperfections and/or some inconsistency in density for design intentions	Generally undersized plants of insufficient quality and/or quantity for design intentions	Inferior plants inadequate for purpose. Affected by pests and diseases. Unsatisfactory on all counts
Award	Gold	Silver-Gilt	Silver	Bronze	No Award
Points	36-28	27-23	22-19	18-15	14-0

