

archifact

architecture & conservation

limited

www.archifact.co.nz

64 khyber pass road
grafton
auckland 1023
po box 8334
symonds street
auckland 1150
new zealand
p 09. 966 6940
info@archifact.co.nz



fig. 1 Former Marist Juniorate Training College Building (1925-26), Tuakau.
(archifact – architecture & conservation ltd, 2017)

waikato district council
built heritage items for proposed registration

peer review

archifact – architecture & conservation ltd

june, 2018

prepared for:

waikato district council

copyright © archifact – architecture & conservation ltd, 2018

all rights reserved. without limiting the rights under copyright above, no part of this report may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

auckland, june 2018

contents

1. introduction	5
2. methodology	5
3. general comments.....	6
4. individual critique.....	8
4. conclusion.....	22
appendix a – waikato regional policy statement – historic and cultural heritage assessment criteria.....	23



1. introduction

The Waikato District Council (WDC) commissioned **archifact – architecture and conservation Ltd (archifact)** to undertake a Peer Review of a selection of built heritage items previously assessed by Dr Ann Mc Ewan of Heritage Consultancy services. The heritage items are proposed for registration as part of a District Plan review.

2. methodology

In this report we undertake critique of thirteen heritage assessments originally prepared by Dr Ann Mc Ewan of Heritage Consultancy services. Each of the heritage assessments are presented in the form of a “*Historic Heritage Item Record*” on a standardised template. Each property has been supplied with the record form and a digital file with a selection of research sources and photographs.

The historic heritage records are as follows:

item record:	address:	date of preparation:	recommended listing:
Former Waikato co-operative Dairy Company	Ryders Road, Tuakau	15 October 2015	B
Pulham & Begbie Building / Te Kauwhata Four Square	4 Main Road, Te Kauwhata	21 st October 2016	B
Former Cavanagh	67 Ellery Street, Ngaruawahia	18 November 2016	B
Masonic Lodge Te Marama	18 Herschel Street Ngaruawahia	18 November 2016	B
Marist Juniorate Training College Building	139 Dominion Road	15 October 2015	A
Taupiri Post office and Postmaster residence	3 The Crescent, Taupiri	16 November 2015	B
Former Robinson's boarding house	79 Wilton Collieries Road Glen Massey	18 August 2016	B
Huntly Railway Bridge	Huntly	14 June 2016	B
Former Whatawhata School	50 School Road, Whatawhata	14 August 2016	B
Waingaro Hotel	2277 Waingaro Road, Waingaro	19 August 2016	A
Jackson farmhouse	1109 Whaanga Road, Ruapuke	24 August 2016	B
Swann Woolshed	1384 Whaanga Road, Ruapuke	25 August 2016	B
Waipa Hotel	Great South Road, Ngaruawahia	17 November 2016	B

To review the recommendations promoted by Dr. McEwan, we have reviewed the item records and supplementary research records provided. A site visit was taken to each of the properties on the 22nd and 23rd of May 2018. Properties were only viewed from the public realm, we were not given access to enter the property boundaries nor the interior of the buildings with the exception of 139 Dominion Road Tuakau, Former Marist Juniorate Training College building, which was accessed via the owner due to his interest in the proposed listing process.

We understand that the assessment criteria that has been used by Dr. McEwan is that found in the Waikato Regional Plan criteria section 10A table 10-1. (**appendix a**).

In the peer review we have considered:

- Waikato regional plan historic heritage criteria
- Research and sources accessed
- Extent of place as described in the item record
- Recommendation for listing
- Reasons for review comment from WDC

Where applicable we have made comments relative the above areas. We have qualified our support for the registration or continued registration of the heritage items based on the information presented and have noted where we think that more information may be required to be able to fully support any registration promoted.

3. general comments

The thirteen historic heritage records are presented as a brief commentary of the physical description, potential historic and cultural values, and a brief statement of significance. Dr. McEwan has not provided a methodology, nor qualified the degree of research and whether this is, in her opinion sufficient to support listing.

The records do not state that the Waikato Regional Assessment Criteria have been employed. This is an area of potential confusion when reading the records as there are also criteria in the Waikato District Plan for heritage listings.

The Regional Assessment Criteria do not state a threshold for scheduled historic heritage items achieving listing or the threshold for achieving either a Category A or B listing.

The Waikato District Plan *C.a1 Criteria for Heritage Listings* gives a series of differing criteria for which a statement of significance is required and the level significance is determined by the level of significance within the criterion and the number of criteria met.

Clarification of the methodology used to establish a threshold for meeting the criteria and significance in regards to the Waikato Regional Plan (**WRP**) would be helpful for those records which are borderline. We have considered the qualifiers of “*high*”, “*has*”, “*some*” or “*overall*” Dr McEwan has used for establishing the level of significance for each criterion to be undefined and unqualified and clarity on their application would be of assistance.

We understand that the interiors of buildings have not been accessed or assessed. Whilst interiors are not listed nor protected in the District Plan, a number of item

records allude to **Scientific Qualities** which suggests evidence about how the building and its occupants used the building for example “*the way of life of the freemasons in Ngaruawahia*” and “*way of life of the boys and Marist brothers who lived, learn and taught and Lavalla College*” imply values to be recognised in the interiors of these assets. If the interior was to be included in the listing then these qualities would have little significance to the overall listing.

The item records provide a physical description, but don't highlight the significant features above the general physical form in any detail. It is therefore assumed that the asset is considered to be significant in its “totality” unless otherwise stated.

Where there has been a contextual relationship of significance identified to a grouping of previously listed buildings or known historic items, a map identifying these relationships would be helpful to establish this collective value.

4. individual critique

The following critique against the individual records and information provided.

former waikato co-operative dairy company butter factory	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description is accurate.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall significance based on the statements is weighted toward <i>architectural</i> and <i>technological</i> qualities, with only minor significance in other areas. <i>Archaeological</i> significance refers to the Tuakau railway line which, whilst in close proximity to the site and building, is not part of the item in question and should be assessed as a separate item.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An extent of place has not been given as an illustration within the record, but is described as the “whole parcel of land”.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current COC for demolition.
Further comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of modifications / alterations have taken place. Identifying and specifying the significant features in the report would add value and clarity.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for category B is supportable based on the information provided in the record.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

pulham & begbie building (Te kauwhata four square)	archifact comment
Description, historical Research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of “<i>inter-war commercial classism</i>” should be verified
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall significance is weighted toward <i>architectural, cultural, and historical</i>. Cultural significance could be extrapolated further as to why this item contributes to a sense of place. Modification has potentially eroded some of the earlier <i>architectural</i> qualities and should be taken into account. The <i>architectural</i> qualities focus on the street facing façade. This should be reflected in the statement of significance and considered in the listing description.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of place includes the rear site and it is unclear from the information in the physical and historical description why the rear unoccupied parts of the property are significant. The information presented pertains to a smaller extent of place that is more in balance with the criterion which have higher significance.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Owner opposed registration in 2014 review
Further comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record notes a WDC heritage listed item nearby. The township has a very limited number of historical buildings, the WDC criterion of <i>rarity</i> within the context may apply.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for category B is supportable based on the information provided in the record.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

former cavanagh house	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The record emphasises that the Cavanagh family were an early settler family of Ngaruawahia, but doesn't give any points of reference to what makes the Cavanagh family specifically notable as opposed to other families. • A description of the house within its surrounding would be beneficial as it sits very prominently in the street and is of a different scale and massing to other houses of the same era. • The street facing features and form are very prominent. The totality of the form should be recognised.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significance is weighted toward <i>historical</i> in terms of the family and early 20th century development could be expanded. • The cultural significance of "<i>historic continuity</i>" in both Ellery Street and wider area could be expanded to strengthen the argument. • <i>Architectural</i> qualities and the context of the Californian bungalow in Ngaruawahia could be further detailed to support significance.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of place includes the entire site which is justified by the description of the earlier pattern of subdivision.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building integrity. • Further declination of condition could result in unsympathetic repair that could result in loss of fabric and negatively effect values.
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street-facing architectural features and form are very prominent, the totality of the form should be recognised.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendation for the Category B listing is supportable.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

masonic lodge te marama	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No qualification if there were other masonic lodges in the Waikato region for this one to be more or equally significant. No interior assessment, masonic lodge are known for detailed and interesting interiors.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record puts weight toward the <i>architectural and historical</i>. The <i>cultural</i> significance of the local brick manufacturer would fit within a wider context of Waikato brick-making and could be seen as a significant quality, especially if there are a limited number of brick buildings remaining.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record notes that an extent of place has been defined to maintain street views. It should be considered whether a loss of street view would affect historic heritage values as identified.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property in Industrial Zone and property and may be for sale. Lodge no longer in use as Masonic Lodge.
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information on historical and <i>cultural</i> significance of brick making in the area would be of use to further strengthen cultural and <i>historical</i> significance.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for a Category B listing is supportable based on the information provided and a refined extent of place should be considered.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

marist juniorate training college building	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment doesn't demonstrate the vast amount of information that has been supplied about this item. The current owner holds an archive from the Marist Brothers. Dr. McEwan has completed a thesis on the architects of this building. • Physical description is brief for a large building. • A site plan showing the relationship of the building to the wider area would be helpful.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a level of significance identified for all criterion. <i>Architectural, cultural, and historical</i> qualities are considered to be of high significance. • Without assessing and inclusion of interiors to achieve <i>scientific</i> significance for "<i>potential to provide further information about the way of the life of the boys and Marist brothers...</i>" the <i>scientific</i> criterion may be difficult to uphold.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extent of place describes: "<i>The curtilage of the historic school building is limited to its footprint plus sufficient space on all four sides of the building to maintain its appearance and integrity as standalone structure</i>" this concept is supported, but needs to be defined and should be mapped.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner does not support registration. • Our discussions with the owner on site and our explanation of the process and purpose of scheduling indicates the owner may be prepared to support listing.
Further Comment	
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendation for a Category A listing is supported, but clarity on the extent of place and further research of the Marist Brothers' archive should be undertaken.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

taupiri post office and postmaster's residence	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record notes that the extent of alterations and additions are unknown. From the site visit we have concluded the front and side elevations look to be relatively intact and original
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record identifies significance in all criteria, appearing to give most weight to <i>architectural</i> qualities. A comparison to local surviving post office building typologies in the district suggests rarity for its bungalow style, but does not quantify the number of existing or listed buildings or their comparative vintage.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of place had been defined as the property boundaries.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Owner does not support registration
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aesthetic values
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for a Category B listing is supported.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

former robinsons' boarding house	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding area of Glen Massey is identified as having historic character, but what that historic character is is not explained.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall significance relies heavily on the <i>historical</i> qualities of the area and its relationship to the building. The building has little <i>architectural</i> value, has been flood damaged in the past (and remains at risk from its location in a flood plain), and has had considerable modification More <i>historical</i> and <i>cultural</i> qualities may be identified with further research to better qualify significance.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of place described in the report includes entire site to property boundaries. The justification this extent of place requires more evidence to be supportable.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property sits within a flood plain and has been subjected to floods.
Further Comment	
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for Category B would only be supportable if more assessment was given to the remaining historical fabric and a chronology of development could be established.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

huntly railway bridge	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bridge is listed within the district plan, the footbridge seems to not be included as a significant feature and this is has not been defined in the report.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All criterion have been addressed in brief terms.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An extent of place has been defined as the bridge in its entirety and this is appropriate.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landmark qualities and sense of place should be further investigated as well as a comparative analysis of the values of the bridge within the typology (bridges) found in the district.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for the Category B registration is supported based on the information in the record.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

former whatawhata school	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Whatawhata School is listed within the District Plan, the description within the record does not define the significant features noted in District Plan listing. Further historical research into pupils attending could offer further information for <i>history</i> and <i>cultural</i> values.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has provided a statement under each criterion. The statement of significance is weighted toward <i>Architectural</i>, <i>cultural</i>, and <i>historical</i> significance. Comparative analysis of Henry Allright's buildings throughout Auckland and the district would be of assistance. Are any of these buildings remaining / listed?
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report notes that extent of place encompasses the whole land parcel on which the former school building is located in view of the potential archaeological values of the site. Further research should be undertaken to test the extent of place as this could be potentially refined.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it still retain substantial original heritage character.
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst there have been some minor alterations the item has been well maintained and illustrates a number of original features The significant features listed in the DPC schedule are still relevant and legible from the street view.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for a Category B registration is supported based on the information provided.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

waingaro hotel	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not defined if research is sufficient. Further evidence and comparative analysis could assist. • Further research into additions and alterations could determine how much original or later historical fabric of value survives.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All criteria have been addressed. Criteria assessment suggests a weighting toward <i>cultural</i> and <i>historical</i> significance.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of place of place description should be clarified against historic maps and photographs to ensure that the land parcel is the appropriate extent of place.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building integrity
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of the building has not been assessed, however notwithstanding some evident requirements for localised repair the building looks to have been maintained as is evident by its continued use as a hospitality venture.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendation for a Category A registration is supported based on the information provided.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

Jackson farmhouse	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record notes that it is listed within the district plan, but doesn't define the listed significant features (totality). The record describes the item as a "<i>notable feature</i>" in the landscape however it is one of a handful of built items situated amongst a vast and relatively remote area of farmland. This assessment risks inflation of significance of the item.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All criteria are addressed. With an apparent weighting toward higher significance of <i>cultural, historical</i> and <i>architectural</i> qualities.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of place described in the record is appropriate given the historical and cultural qualities described in the record.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Building integrity" The record notes that there have been a number of modifications, some of which have resulted in the loss of original fabric.
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The record puts emphasis on some original features and building fabric. The cumulative loss of fabric and unsympathetic repairs may significantly affect other values that have been identified.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for a continued Category B registration is supported based on the information provided.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

Swann woolshed	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record notes that it is listed within the district plan. The record describes the item as a “<i>notable feature</i>” in the landscape, however it is one of a handful of built items situated amongst a vast and relatively remote area of farmland. This comment risks inflation of the significance of the item. Date of initial inclusion on plan would be helpful to include.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>architectural</i> significance should be re-verified against the criteria as the significance of a “<i>vernacular farm building</i>” within a wider context may be overvalued. <i>Technological</i> significance should be reviewed as it should describe the significance more clearly.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of place that is stated within the report is the mediate setting. But the report does not state the reasons for this extent.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Building Integrity” The building form appears intact, due to the nature of the coastal location is likely to continue to degrade without continued maintenance.
Further Comment	
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for a continued registration as a Category B historic heritage item is supported.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

waipa hotel	archifact comment
Description, historical research, and sources accessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building is described as being one of a grouping of historic buildings in Ngaruawahia which lends a greater weight to the individual item as part of a group and in terms of the context and the desired outcomes for heritage in the Ngaruawahia Township as described in the WDP.
Assessment against WRP criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All criterion have been addressed with statements of significance. The statement for <i>technological</i> significance for “<i>value for its inter-war construction methods and materials</i>” are unsubstantiated and nonspecific and should be more evidentially supported.
Extent of Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of place defined in the report follows the property boundaries, but does not include the veranda which is an important feature.
WDC reason for peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COC for demolition processing by council
Further Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contextual relationship of this building to other listed buildings within the Ngaruawahia township is important to its overall significance as well as those other heritage buildings as a grouping.
Recommendation for listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation for registration as a Category B historic heritage item is supported.

note: Although there may be limitations in the assessments provided, there is sufficient technical information within this assessment to support the justification for the continued inclusion/inclusion of the asset on a Heritage Schedule within the District Plan.

4. conclusion

Each record has been prepared to a level of detail which, whilst brief, is considered sufficiently substantive to adequately represent the item for the purpose of being submitted for inclusion in the plan.

There is risk that the assessor has inflated the level of significance of some criteria where a lesser or nil level of significance is apparent.

The extent of place for a number of properties could be refined if further information was sourced.

Consideration of the protection afforded each place through inclusion in the District Plan should be considered with a sense of the degree of risk each place may be currently under and whether protection threatens contributing to the current risk (e.g. the Jackson Farmhouse and the Swann Woolshed) through a sense of disincentive. By way of balance, consideration should be given by the WDC to meaningful incentives and support (e.g. the former Marist Juniorate Training College Building).

appendix a – waikato regional policy statement – historic and cultural heritage assessment criteria



10A Historic and cultural heritage assessment criteria

Table 10-1: Historic and cultural heritage assessment criteria

When assessing historic and cultural heritage, regard shall be given to the Heritage New Zealand register of historic places, historic areas and wāhi tapu areas and the following:

Archaeological qualities	
Information	The potential of the place or area to define or expand knowledge of earlier human occupation, activities or events through investigation using archaeological methods.
Research	The potential of the place or area to provide evidence to address archaeological research questions.
Recognition or Protection	The place or area is registered by Heritage New Zealand for its archaeological values, or is recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme, or is an 'archaeological site' as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
Architectural Qualities	
Style or type	The style of the building or structure is representative of a significant development period in the region or the nation. The building or structure is associated with a significant activity (for example institutional, industrial, commercial or transportation).
Design	The building or structure has distinctive or special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature. These may include massing, proportion, materials, detail, fenestration, ornamentation, artwork, functional layout, landmark status or symbolic value.
Construction	The building or structure uses unique or uncommon building materials, or demonstrates an innovative method of construction, or is an early example of the use of a particular building technique.
Designer or Builder	The building or structure's architect, designer, engineer or builder was a notable practitioner or made a significant contribution to the region or nation.
Cultural Qualities	
Sentiment	The place or area is important as a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment.
Identity	The place or area is a context for community identity or sense of place, and provides evidence of cultural or historical continuity.
Amenity or Education	The place or area has symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people. The interpretative capacity of the place or area and its potential to increase understanding of past lifestyles or events.
Historic Qualities	
Associative Value	The place or area has a direct association with, or relationship to, a person, group, institution, event or activity that is of historical significance to Waikato or the nation.
Historical Pattern	The place or area is associated with broad patterns of local or national history, including development and settlement patterns, early or important transportation routes, social or economic trends and activities.
Scientific Qualities	
Information	The potential for the place or area to contribute information about an historic figure, event, phase or activity.
Potential – Scientific Research	The degree to which the place or area may contribute further information and the importance of the data involved, its rarity, quality or representativeness.
Technological Qualities	
Technical Achievement	The place or area shows a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular time or is associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements.