LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

DETAILED MAGNETOMETER SURVEY

Report Number: 1099 May 2015

LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

Detailed Magnetometer Survey

Prepared for:
Mr Max Short
Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd
Berwick House
Baylham
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP6 8RF

By:
Timothy Schofield HND BSc PCIfA

Britannia Archaeology Ltd
115 Osprey Drive
Stowmarket, Suffolk,
IP14 5UX
T: 01449 763034
info@britannia-archaeology.com
www.britannia-archaeology.com
Registered in England and Wales: 7874460

May 2015

Site Code	BUC 098	**NGR**	TM 2420 4180
Planning Ref.	Pre-application	**OASIS**	britanni1-210590
Approved By	Dan McConnell	**DATE**	May 2015

The material contained within this report was prepared for an individual client and solely for the benefit of that client and the contents should not be relied upon by any third party. Britannia Archaeology Ltd will not be held liable for any loss or damage, direct, indirect or consequential, through misuse of, or actions based on the material contained within by any third party.

The results and interpretation of the report cannot be considered an absolute representation of the archaeological or any other remains. In the case of geophysical surveys the data collected, and subsequent interpretation is a representation of anomalies recorded by the survey instrument. Britannia Archaeology Ltd will not be held liable for any errors of fact supplied by a third party, or guarantee the proper maintenance of the survey stations.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In May 2015 Britannia Archaeology Ltd undertook a detailed fluxgate gradiometer survey over c.1.5 hectares of land adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk, in two paddocks ahead of the proposed development of ten houses with associated access.

A fairly wide range of anomalies were prospected during the survey, many of which are likely to have an archaeological origin. Of particular note is the curvilinear anomaly that is located where a cropmark (BUC 027) has been recorded on air photographs in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record. Eight positive linear anomalies recorded within the dataset may relate to post-medieval cropmarks of remnant field boundaries (BUC 070) recorded in the field to the west. Twelve Discrete positive anomalies indicative of rubbish pits and two thermoremnant responses, interpreted as areas of burning or large buried ferrous objects, were also prospected. It is possible that the thermoremnant responses may relate to the location of the former WWII radar station (BUC 071).

The full range of anomalies should be targeted to investigate the interpretations given within this report, with particular attention focused on those of potential archaeological origin.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In May 2015, Britannia Archaeology Ltd (BA) undertook a detailed fluxgate gradiometer survey over *c.*1.5 hectares of land adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk (NGR TM 2420 4180) in two separate paddocks (Figure 1).

This survey was commissioned by Mr Max Short of Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd in response to a brief issued by SCCAS/CT (Abraham, R. dated 15th April 2015) for a geophysical survey over the proposed development of ten houses with associated access. The weather was mainly sunny and windy with outbreaks of rain.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located in a paddocked field to the south of Street Farm in Bucklesham, Suffolk, at a height between 20 and 30m aOD. It is bounded to the east by rear gardens of dwellings along Levington Lane, to the south by properties, hedgerows and trees on Field View, to the west by trees and hedgerows and to the north by wooden buildings associated with Street Farm.

The bedrock geology is described as Red Crag Formation Sand, a sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 2 to 4 million years ago in the Quaternary and Neogene Periods in shallow seas deposited as mud, sand, silt and gravel (BGS, 2015).

Superficial deposits are described as Kesgrave Catchment Subgroup Sand and Gravel river terrace deposits formed up to 3 million years ago in the Quaternary Period when the landscape was dominated by rivers. Sand and gravel detritus was deposited in channels, with fine silt and clay from overbank floods forming floodplain alluvium, and some bogs depositing peat (BGS, 2015).

2.1 Site Visit 5th May 2015

A site visit was undertaken to assess the suitability of the field for detailed geophysical survey and to undertake a risk assessment. The field was set-aside to pasture and covered in fairly short grass (DP1). It was split into separate paddocks by wooden and electric fences. Ferrous items that may affect the magnetometers sensors had been moved to the sites periphery prior to the survey (DP2). A wooden structure present in the centre of the field reduced the size of the survey area available; all livestock were removed prior to the survey (DP3).

DP1

Site Shot, Looking South towards the Properties on Field View.

DP2

Site Shot, Looking West Towards the Hedgerow.

DP3

Site Shot, Looking South-South-East Towards Trees and Properties on Field View.

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

The archaeological investigation is to be carried out on the recommendation of the local planning authority, following guidance laid down by the National Planning and Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLD 2012). The relevant local planning policy is the *Suffolk Coastal Local Plan; incorporating First and Second Amendments* (March 2006) which is due to be replaced with the *Suffolk Coastal Local Development Framework* in the near future.

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The site is located within a landscape containing cropmarks that are visible on air photographs. These cropmarks include a distinct undated ring ditch (BUC027) and field boundaries and enclosures (BUC070) both present in the immediately adjacent field to the west. Finds and features of prehistoric, Roman, medieval and post-medieval origin have been found in close proximity to the village of Bucklesham. The paddocks are also situated on a former WWII radar station (BUC071). The site overall has a high potential for archaeological remains to be present (Brief, Section 2.1).

5.0 PROJECT AIMS

A non-intrusive geophysical survey is required of the development; this is likely to lead to a programme of trial trenching to enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. However, any decision about the need for (and extent of) trial trenching will be taken following the geophysical survey (Brief Section 3.1) and by the relevant planning authority.

6.0 METHODOLOGY

6.1 Instrument Type Justification

Britannia Archaeology Ltd employed a Bartington Dual Grad 601-2 fluxgate gradiometer to undertake the survey, because of its high sensitivity and rapid ground coverage. The surveyors noted that that the background magnetic susceptibility signature was relatively low and a suitable zero station was located with ease.

6.2 Instrument Calibration

One hour was allowed in the morning for the magnetometers sensors to settle before the start of the first grid. The instrument was zeroed after every three to five grids to minimise the effect of sensor drift. An area with a relatively low magnetic reading was chosen to calibrate the instrument; this same point was used to zero the sensors throughout the survey providing a common zero point. The survey was undertaken during sunny periods which caused a degree of sensor drift and the characteristic parallel traverse 'striping' that is present within the raw dataset (Figure 2).

6.3 Sampling Interval and Grid Size

The sampling interval was set at 0.25m along 1m traverse intervals, providing 4 readings a metre, the magnetometer survey was undertaken within 20 x 20m grids.

6.4 Survey Grid Location

The survey grid was set out to the Ordnance Survey OSGB36 datum to an accuracy of ±0.1m employing a Leica Viva Glonnass Smart Rover GS08 real time kinetic (RTK) survey system. Data were converted to the National Grid Transformation OSTN02 and the instrument was regularly tested using stations with known ETRS89 coordinates. The grids were positioned on a north-east to south-west alignment (Figure 1).

6.5 Data Capture

Instrument readings were recorded on an internal data logger that were downloaded to a laptop at midday followed by a second download at the end of the survey. The grid order was recorded on a BA pro-forma to aid in the creation of the data composites. Data were filed in job specific folders. These data composites were checked for quality on site by BA, allowing grids to be re-surveyed if necessary. The data were backed up onto an external storage device in the office and finally a remote server at the end of the day.

6.6 Data Presentation and Processing

Data are presented in both raw and processed data plots in greyscale format (Figures 2 and 3). An XY trace plot of the processed data has also been included (Figure 4).

The raw data plots are presented with no processing, and were clipped to produce a uniform greyscale plot, processed data schedules are also displayed below. Two separate grid composites were employed (Buckle 1 and Buckle 2) due to the presence of a fence that separated the two paddocks.

Buckle 1

Raw Data:
Data Clipping: -3 to +3nT;
Display Clipping: +/- 3 standard deviations.

Processed Data:
De-stripe: Median Sensors: All;
Data Clipping: -2 to +2nT;
Display Clipping: +/- 3 standard deviations.

Buckle 2

Raw Data:
Data Clipping: -3 to +3nT;
Display Clipping: +/- 3 standard deviations.

Processed Data:
De-stripe: Median Sensors: All;
Data Clipping: -2 to +2nT;
Display Clipping: +/- 3 standard deviations.

An interpretation plan characterising the anomalies recorded can be found at Figure 5, drawing together the evidence collated from both greyscale and XY trace plots (Figures 2, 3 and 4). All figures are tied into the National Grid and printed at an appropriate scale.

6.7 Software

Raw data were downloaded using DW Consulting's Archeosurveyor v2.5.16.0 and will be stored in this format as raw data. The software used to process the data and produce the composites was also DW Consulting's Archeosurveyor v2.5.16.0. Datasets were exported into AutoCAD and placed onto the local survey grid. Interpretation plots were then produced using AutoCAD.

6.8 Grid Restoration

Britannia Archaeology Ltd did not position any reference stations within the field, three virtual geo-referenced survey stations are presented in Figure 1 that will allow the survey grid and anomalies to be accurately targeted.

7.0 RESULTS & DISCUSSION

High numbers of isolated dipolar ('iron spike') responses (yellow hatched circles) were present within both paddocks, they are likely to relate to ferrous material lost within the fields during its use as a paddock and previously as a WWII radar station (BUC 071). It is possible that these responses could also be caused by archaeological artefacts.

Six areas of magnetic disturbance (brown hatching) were recorded on the periphery of the surveyed areas; they are all likely to relate to ferrous material present within the fences, and around the extant wooden structure in the western paddock.

Two thermoremnant responses (magenta hatching) in the eastern paddock are present where slight depressions were noted by the surveyors. It is possible that fires have been burnt within these locations or that large ferrous items are buried here below the surface. It could also be possible that they are associated with the location of the former WWII radar station (BUC 071).

Twelve positive discrete anomalies (orange hatching) indicative of potential rubbish pits were recorded within both paddocks; they could be modern in origin or be related to the linear or curvilinear anomalies prospected during the survey.

A series of positive parallel and linear anomalies (red hatching) recorded within both paddocks are indicative of remnant field boundary ditches, the majority of which are orientated north-east to south-west and perpendicular (with a single positive linear aligned north-west to south-east). These linears are potentially an extension of the post-medieval cropmarks (BUC 070) recorded in the field immediately west.

Of particular note is the positive curvilinear anomaly that has been prospected on the western boundary where a cropmark visible on air photographs and interpreted as an undated ring ditch, potentially a large round barrow (BUC 027) is recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER). This anomaly is 2m wide and curves out beyond the western field boundary.

8.0 CONCLUSION

A fairly wide range of anomalies were prospected during the survey, many of which are likely to have an archaeological origin. Of particular note is the curvilinear anomaly that is located where a cropmark (BUC 027) has been recorded on air photographs. Eight positive linear anomalies recorded within the dataset may relate to post-medieval cropmarks of remnant field boundaries (BUC 070) recorded in the field to the west. Twelve Discrete positive anomalies indicative of rubbish pits and two thermoremnant responses, interpreted as areas of burning or large buried ferrous objects, were also prospected. It is possible that the thermoremnant responses may relate to the site of the former WWII radar station (BUC 071).

The full range of anomalies should be targeted to investigate the interpretations given within this report, with particular attention focused on those of potential archaeological origin.

9.0 PROJECT ARCHIVE AND DEPOSITION

A full archive will be prepared for all work undertaken in accordance with guidance from the *Selection, Retention and Dispersion of Archaeological Collections,* Archaeological Society for Museum Archaeologists, 1993. Arrangements will be made for the archive to be deposited with the relevant museum/HER Office.

10.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Britannia Archaeology Ltd would like to thank Mr Max Short of Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd for commissioning the survey and to Rachael Abraham of SCCAS/CT for her input throughout the project.

Bibliography

Ayala. G. *et al*. 2004. *Geoarchaeology; Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record*. English Heritage.

Clark. A. J. 1996. *Seeing Beneath the Soil, Prospecting Methods in Archaeology*. BT Batsford Ltd, London.

David. A. 1995. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation: Research and Professional Services Guidelines*. No.1. English Heritage.

David. A. *et al*. 2008. *Geophysical Survey In Archaeological Field Evaluation,* Second Edition. English Heritage.

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*

Gaffney. C, Gater. J. and Ovenden. S. 2002. *The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations*. IFA Technical Paper No. 6.

Gaffney. C. and Gater. J. 2003. *Revealing the Buried Past, Geophysics for Archaeologists*. Tempus Publishing Ltd.

Gurney, D. 2003. *Standards for Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14.

Institute for Archaeologists. 2011. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*.

Linford. N. 2006. Notes from an English Heritage Seminar.

Schmidt. A. 2001. *Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice*. Archaeology Data Service. Oxbow Books.

Whitten. D.G.A. 1978. *The Penguin Dictionary of Geology*. Penguin Books Ltd. London.

Witten. A.J. 2006. *Handbook of Geophysics and Archaeology*. Equinox Publishing Ltd. London.

Websites

The British Geological Survey, 2013, (Natural Environment Research Council) – Geology of Britain Viewer - www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion2=1#maps

APPENDIX 1 METADATA SHEETS

Raw Data Buckle 1

Filename	Buckle 1 R.xcp
Description	
Instrument Type	Grad 601-2 (Gradiometer)
Units	nT
Surveyed by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Assembled by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Direction of 1st Traverse	135 deg
Collection Method	ZigZag
Sensors	2 @ 1.00m spacing.
Dummy Value	32702.00
Dimensions	
Composite Size (readings)	240 x 100
Survey Size (meters)	60.00m x 100.00m
Grid Size	20.00m x 20.00m
X Interval	0.25m
Y Interval	1.00m
Stats	
Max	3.00
Min	-3.00
Std Dev	1.61
Mean	-0.19
Median	-0.10
Composite Area	0.60ha
Surveyed Area	0.36ha
Program	
Name	ArcheoSurveyor
Version	2.5.16.0

Processed Data Buckle 1

Filename	Buckle 1 P.xcp
Description	
Instrument Type	Grad 601-2 (Gradiometer)
Units	nT
Surveyed by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Assembled by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Direction of 1st Traverse	135 deg
Collection Method	ZigZag
Sensors	2 @ 1.00m spacing.
Dummy Value	32702.00
Dimensions	
Composite Size (readings)	240 x 100
Survey Size (meters)	60.00m x 100.00m
Grid Size	20.00m x 20.00m
X Interval	0.25m
Y Interval	1.00m
Stats	
Max	2.00
Min	-2.00
Std Dev	1.17
Mean	-0.24
Median	-0.19
Composite Area	0.60ha
Surveyed Area	0.36ha
Program	
Name	ArcheoSurveyor
Version	2.5.16.0

Buckle 1 Grids

Source Grids: 15			
1	Col:0	Row:0	grids\11.xgd
2	Col:0	Row:1	grids\12.xgd
3	Col:0	Row:2	grids\13.xgd
4	Col:0	Row:3	grids\14.xgd
5	Col:0	Row:4	grids\15.xgd
6	Col:1	Row:0	grids\06.xgd
7	Col:1	Row:1	grids\07.xgd
8	Col:1	Row:2	grids\08.xgd
9	Col:1	Row:3	grids\09.xgd
10	Col:1	Row:4	grids\10.xgd
11	Col:2	Row:0	grids\01.xgd
12	Col:2	Row:1	grids\02.xgd
13	Col:2	Row:2	grids\03.xgd
14	Col:2	Row:3	grids\04.xgd
15	Col:2	Row:4	grids\05.xgd

Raw Data Buckle 2

Filename	Buckle 2 R.xcp
Description	
Instrument Type	Grad 601-2 (Gradiometer)
Units	nT
Surveyed by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Assembled by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Direction of 1st Traverse	135 deg
Collection Method	ZigZag
Sensors	2 @ 1.00 m spacing.
Dummy Value	32702.00
Dimensions	
Composite Size (readings)	320 x 100
Survey Size (meters)	80.00m x 100.00m
Grid Size	20.00m x 20.00m
X Interval	0.25m
Y Interval	1.00m
Stats	
Max	3.00
Min	-3.00
Std Dev	1.27
Mean	0.04
Median	0.01
Composite Area	0.80ha
Surveyed Area	0.59ha
Program	
Name	ArcheoSurveyor
Version	2.5.16.0

Processed Data Buckle 2

Filename	Buckle 2 P.xcp
Description	
Instrument Type	Grad 601-2 (Gradiometer)
Units	nT
Surveyed by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Assembled by	TPS/DPM on 5/19/2015
Direction of 1st Traverse	135 deg
Collection Method	ZigZag
Sensors	2 @ 1.00m spacing.
Dummy Value	32702.00
Dimensions	
Composite Size (readings)	320 x 100
Survey Size (meters)	80.00m x 100.00m
Grid Size	20.00m x 20.00m
X Interval	0.25m
Y Interval	1.00m
Stats	
Max	2.00
Min	-2.00
Std Dev	1.01
Mean	0.04
Median	0.00
Composite Area	0.80ha
Surveyed Area	0.59ha
Program	
Name	ArcheoSurveyor
Version	2.5.16.0

Buckle 2 Grids

Source Grids: 20			
1	Col:0	Row:0	grids\31.xgd
2	Col:0	Row:1	grids\32.xgd
3	Col:0	Row:2	grids\33.xgd
4	Col:0	Row:3	grids\34.xgd
5	Col:0	Row:4	grids\35.xgd
6	Col:1	Row:0	grids\26.xgd
7	Col:1	Row:1	grids\27.xgd
8	Col:1	Row:2	grids\28.xgd
9	Col:1	Row:3	grids\29.xgd
10	Col:1	Row:4	grids\30.xgd
11	Col:2	Row:0	grids\21.xgd
12	Col:2	Row:1	grids\22.xgd
13	Col:2	Row:2	grids\23.xgd
14	Col:2	Row:3	grids\24.xgd
15	Col:2	Row:4	grids\25.xgd
16	Col:3	Row:0	grids\16.xgd
17	Col:3	Row:1	grids\17.xgd
18	Col:3	Row:2	grids\18.xgd
19	Col:3	Row:3	grids\19.xgd
20	Col:3	Row:4	grids\20.xgd

APPENDIX 2 TECHNICAL DETAILS

MAGNETOMETER

The magnetometer differs from the 'active' magnetic susceptibility meter by being a 'passive' instrument. Rather than injecting a signal into the ground it detects slight variations in the Earth's magnetic field caused by cultural and natural disturbance (Clark).

Thermoremanent magnetism is produced when a material containing iron oxides is strongly heated. Clay for example has a high iron oxide content that in a natural state is weakly magnetic, when heated these weakly magnetic compounds become highly magnetic oxides that a magnetometer can detect.

The demagnetisation of iron oxides occurs above a temperature known as the Curie point; for example haematite has a Curie point of 675 Celsius and magnetite 565C. At the time of cooling the iron oxides become permanently re-magnetised with their magnetic properties re-aligned in the direction of the Earth's magnetic field (Gaffney and Gater). The direction of the Earth's magnetic field shifts over time and these subtle alignment differences can be recorded. Kilns, hearths, baked clay and ovens can reach Curie point temperatures, and are the strongest responses apart from large iron objects that can be detected. Other cultural anomalies that can be prospected include occupation areas, pits, ditches, furnaces, sunken feature buildings, ridge and furrow field systems and ritual activity (David, 2011). Commonly recorded anomalies include modern ferrous service pipes, field drainage pipes, removed field boundaries, perimeter fences and field boundaries.

Fluxgate Gradiometers

Fluxgate gradiometers are sensitive instruments that utilise two sensors placed in a vertical plane, spaced 1 metre apart. The sensor above reads the Earth's magnetic (background) response while the sensor below records the local magnetic field. Both sensors are carefully adjusted to read zero before survey commences at a 'zeroing' point, selected for its relatively 'quiet' magnetic background reading. When differences in the magnetic field strength occur between the two sensors a positive or negative reading is logged. Positive anomalies have a positive magnetic value and conversely negative anomalies have a negative magnetic value relative to the site's magnetic background. Examples of positive magnetic anomalies include hearths, kilns, baked clay, areas of burning, ferrous material, ditches, sunken feature buildings, furrows, ferrous service pipes, perimeter fences and field boundaries. Negative magnetic anomalies include earthwork embankments, plastic water pipes and geological features.

The instruments are usually held approximately 0.30m to 0.50m above the ground surface and can detect to a depth of between 1-2metres. Best practice dictates that the optimal direction of traverse in Britain is east to west.

Magnetic Anomalies

Linear trends
Linear trends can be both positive and negative magnetic responses. If they are broad, relatively weak or negative in nature they may be of agricultural or geological origin, for example periglacial channels, land drains or ploughing furrows. If the responses are strong positive trends they are more likely to be of archaeological origin. Archaeological settlement ditches tend to be rich in highly magnetic iron oxides that accumulate in them via anthropogenic activity and humic backfills. Conversely surviving banks will be negative in nature, the material is derived from subsoil deposits that are less likely to be positively magnetic. Curvilinear trends can also be recorded and are indicative of archaeological structures such as drip-gullies.

Discrete anomalies
Discrete anomalies appear as increased positive responses present within a localised area. They are caused by a general increase in the amount of magnetic iron oxides present within the humic back-fill of for example a rubbish pit.

'Iron spike' anomalies
These strong isolated dipolar responses are usually caused by ferrous material present in the topsoil horizon. They can have an archaeological origin but are usually introduced into the topsoil during manuring.

Areas of magnetic disturbance
An area of magnetic disturbance is usually associated with material that has been fired. For example areas of burning, demolition (brick) rubble or slag waste spreads. They can also be caused by ferrous material, e.g. close proximity to barbwire or metal fences and field boundaries, buried services, pylons and modern rubbish deposits.

APPENDIX 3 WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION
DETAILED MAGNETOMETER SURVEY

Project Number: 1108 6th May 2015

LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

Written Scheme of Investigation
Detailed Magnetometer Survey

Prepared for:
Mr Max Short
Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd
Berwick House
Baylham
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP6 8RF

By:
Timothy Schofield HND BSc PCIfA

Britannia Archaeology Ltd
115 Osprey Drive
Stowmarket, Suffolk,
IP14 5UX
T: 01449 763034
info@britannia-archaeology.com
www.britannia-archaeology.com
Registered in England and Wales: 7874460

6th May 2015

Site Code	tbc	**NGR**	TM 242 418
Planning Ref.	Pre-application	**OASIS**	britanni1-210590
Approved By	Matthew Adams	**DATE**	May 2015

 Project Number: 1108

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been prepared by Britannia Archaeology Ltd (BA) on behalf of Mr Max Short of Artisan Planning & Property Services Ltd in response to a design brief (Abraham, R. 15th April 2015) for a geophysical survey over the proposed development of ten houses with associated access, on land (1.5ha) adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk (NGR TM 242 418).

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located in one paddocked field to the south of Street Farm in Bucklesham, Suffolk, at a height of between 20 and 30m aOD. It is bounded to the east by the rear gardens of dwellings along Levington Lane, to the south by properties, hedgerows and trees on Field View, to the west by trees and hedgerows and to the north by wooden buildings associated with Street Farm.

The bedrock geology is described as Red Crag Formation Sand, a sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 2 to 4 million years ago in the Quaternary and Neogene Periods in shallow seas deposited as mud, sand, silt and gravel (BGS, 2015).

Superficial deposits are described as Kesgrave Catchment Subgroup Sand and Gravel river terrace deposits formed up to 3 million years ago in the Quaternary Period when the landscape was dominated by rivers. Sand and gravel detritus was deposited in channels, with fine silt and clay from overbank floods forming floodplain alluvium, and some bogs depositing peat (BGS, 2015).

2.1 Site Visit 5th May 2015

A site visit was undertaken to assess the suitability of the field for detailed geophysical survey and to undertake a risk assessment. The field was set-aside to pasture and covered in fairly short grass (DP1). It was split into separate paddocks by wooden and electric fences. Ferrous items that may affect the magnetometers sensors were extant at ground level (DP2). A wooden structure present in the centre of the field reduces the size of the survey area available, a horse was grazing the central paddock that will have to be removed prior to the survey (DP3).

DP1

Site Shot, Looking South Towards the Properties on Field View.

DP2

Site Shot, Looking West Towards the Hedgerow.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

DP3

Site Shot, Looking South-South-East Towards Trees and Properties on Field View.

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

The archaeological investigation is to be carried out on the recommendation of the local planning authority, following guidance laid down by the National Planning and Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLD 2012). The relevant local planning policy is the *Suffolk Coastal Local Plan; incorporating First and Second Amendments* (March 2006) which is due to be replaced with the *Suffolk Coastal Local Development Framework* in the near future.

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLG March 2012)

The NPPF recognises that 'heritage assets' are an irreplaceable resource and planning authorities should conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance when considering development. It requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. The key areas for consideration are:

- The significance of the heritage asset and its setting in relation to the proposed development;
- The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance;
- Significance (of the heritage asset) can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction, or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification;

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

- Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred;

- Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

3.2 Suffolk Coastal District Council (Policy AP7. 31st March 2006)

The local plan for the Suffolk Coastal District deals with development on archaeological sites in section AP7, this states the following:

In considering planning applications, outline or detailed, for development that might affect sites that are known or are likely to contain archaeological remains, the Council will require the following. Where necessary, these should be preceded by a professional archaeological assessment as to the likelihood that remains might be encountered and their importance.

- a field evaluation in those cases where the assessment suggests that important archaeological remains may exist but it is unable to be precise about their nature or extent. The field evaluation shall be carried out by an approved archaeological contractor in accordance with a specification agreed with the Council;

- the preservation of archaeological remains in situ where the assessment and/or field evaluation indicate that the remains are important. Even where lesser remains exist, consideration must be given to the desirability of preserving them in situ;

- adequate arrangements for "preservation by record" - a recording of the archaeological remains that would be lost in the course of works for which permission is being sought - in those cases where arguments in favour of the development outweigh the significance of the remains;

- Development that would adversely affect a Scheduled Ancient Monument, its setting or remains will not be permitted.

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The site is located within a landscape containing cropmarks that are visible on air photographs. These cropmarks include a distinct undated ring ditch (BUC020) and field boundaries and enclosures (BUC070) all present to the west of site. Finds and features of prehistoric, Roman, medieval and post-medieval origin have also been found in close proximity to the village of Bucklesham. The field is situated on a former WWII radar station site (BUC071). Overall there is a high potential for archaeological remains to be present on site (Brief, Section 2.1).

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

5.0 PROJECT AIMS

A non-intrusive geophysical survey is required of the development; this is likely to lead to a programme of trial trenching to enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. However, any decision about the need for, and extent of, trial trenching will be taken following the geophysical survey (Brief Section 3.1).

6.0 METHODOLOGY

6.1 Fieldwork

A detailed fluxgate gradiometer survey is required over *c.*1.5 Hectares, scheduled to be undertaken in May 2015.

6.2 Instrument Type Justification

Britannia Archaeology Ltd will employ a Bartington Dual Grad 601-2 fluxgate gradiometer to undertake the survey, because of its high sensitivity and rapid ground coverage. The soils and underlying geology are receptive to magnetometer survey, but good results are heavily dependent on the contrast between the fills of a feature (with humic and charcoal rich deposits providing the best results) and the relative weakness of the local magnetic background field.

6.3 Instrument Calibration

The Magnetometer will be left on for a minimum of 20 minutes in the morning for the sensors to settle before any recorded survey takes place. Sensor heights will be measured and equalised at the start of the first day so that a consistent height above the ground is maintained during the survey. Each sensor shall be positioned on the same side of the instrument throughout the survey. The instrument shall be zeroed after every three grids to minimise the effect of sensor drift. An area shall be chosen with low magnetic susceptibility to calibrate the instruments sensors, this same point shall be used to zero the sensors throughout the survey providing a common zero point.

6.4 Sampling Interval and Grid Size

The sampling interval shall be 0.25m along 1m traverse intervals, within 20 x 20m grids.

6.5 Survey Grid Location

The survey grid shall be set out to the Ordnance Survey OSGB36 datum to an accuracy of ±0.01m employing a Leica Viva Glonnass Smart Rover GS08. Data will be converted to the National Grid Transformation OSTN02, and the instrument will be regularly tested using stations with known ETRS89 coordinates. The grid will be located parallel to the long axis of the proposed development to allow for ease of survey.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

6.6 Data Capture

The grid order will be recorded on a BA pro-forma so that the composite plan can be inputted at the close of the day. Instrument readings will be recorded on an internal data logger, downloaded to a laptop at midday and in the evening. Data will be filed in job specific folders, broken up into daily data sets. All data will then be backed up onto an external storage device and finally a remote server. Raw data composites will be uploaded into an AutoCAD drawing and then printed out daily. This will allow BA to check data quality and to re-survey any grids if necessary.

6.7 Data Presentation and Processing

Only minimal processing of the datasets shall be undertaken, typically de-spike and zero mean traverse. Raw and processed greyscale plots shall be produced for comparison, this ensures that no anomalies are processed out of the original data set. An XY trace plot consisting of raw and processed data will be used in combination with raw and processed greyscale data. An interpretation plan characterising the anomalies shall be produced drawing on the evidence collated from the greyscale and XY trace plots. All figures will be tied into the National Grid and printed at an appropriate scale.

6.8 Software

The software used to process the data and produce the composites will be DW Consulting's Terrasurveyor v2.0. Datasets will be exported into AutoCAD and placed onto their corresponding grid positions. An interpretation plot will then be produced using AutoCAD.

7.0 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The prepared client/archive report will be commensurate with the results of the fieldwork, and will be consistent with the principles of the *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment* (*MoRPHE*), English Heritage, Edmund Lee, 2006 (minor revisions 2009), *Geophysical Survey In Field Evaluation,* English Heritage, Andrew David *et al*, 2008, and the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*, Institute for Archaeologists, 2011, containing the following:

- *Summary*. A concise summary of the work undertaken and the results.
- *Introduction*. Introduction to the project including the reasons for work, funding, planning background.
- *Background*. The history, layout and development of the site.
- *Aims and Objectives*.
- *Methodology*. Survey strategy and techniques used.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

- *Results*. Detailed description of findings outlining the nature, location and extent of the anomalies.
- *Discussion and Conclusions*. A synopsis interpreting the anomalies, impact assessment, site potential, possible locations of subsequent trial trenches.
- *Bibliography*.
- *Appendices*. Technical Details, Geo-referencing Information, Metadata Sheet, HER/OASIS Summary Sheet.
- *Illustrative Material*. Raw Data Plots, Processed Data Plots, XY Trace Plots, Interpretation Plots, Photographs.

Digital copies will be supplied to the client and the digital version of the final report will be submitted to the Suffolk Historic Environment Record in due course (including a vector plan and AutoCAD .dxf file) and the National Monuments Record (NMR). A .pdf version will be uploaded to the ADS website and an OASIS form will be completed online and sent to the HER.

8.0 PROJECT ARCHIVE AND DEPOSITION

A full archive will be prepared for all work undertaken in accordance with guidance from the *Selection, Retention and Dispersion of Archaeological Collections,* Archaeological Society for Museum Archaeologists, 1993. Arrangements will be made for the archive to be deposited with the relevant museum/HER Office.

9.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY

BA operates a comprehensive Health and Safety Policy in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive. BA operates under the Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers (FAME) *Health and Safety Field Manual*, which is regularly updated by supplements.

BA are covered by employer's liability, public liability and professional indemnity insurance arranged through Towergate Insurance (see Appendix 2).

9.1 Code of Practice, Risk Assessment and Site Induction

BA's Code of Practice covers all aspects of survey work and ensures all risks are adequately controlled. A site visit will be undertaken and an assessment of the potential risks highlighted, a full site risk assessment will be produced based on this information. The assessment of risk is continually monitored and this document can be updated if any change in risk occurs. A copy of the Risk Assessment is kept on site, read and countersigned by all staff and visitors during the BA site induction.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

BA will liaise with the contractor or client on arrival and will follow any additional Health and Safety instructions given.

A qualified First Aider will be present on every site.

All BA staff members are CSCS registered.

10.0 RESOURCES

All archaeological projects are undertaken by a team of professional qualified archaeologists, a synopsis can be found at Appendix 3. Full CVs are available on request.

All site work will be undertaken by a Project Officer (with a field team if required) in close communication with a Project Manager. This project officer will also be responsible for post-survey publication.

11.0 TIMETABLE AND PROGRAMME OF WORK

The geophysical survey is scheduled to be undertaken in May 2015 and report production will commence thereafter. Preliminary greyscale and interpretation plots shall be issued at the end of the survey. It is understood that the client is aware of the working methods and provision has been made to allow access to undertake the survey as required.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

Bibliography

Ayala. G. *et al*. 2004. *Geoarchaeology; Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record*. English Heritage.

Clark. A. J. 1996. *Seeing Beneath the Soil, Prospecting Methods in Archaeology*. BT Batsford Ltd, London.

David. A. 1995. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation: Research and Professional Services Guidelines*. No.1. English Heritage.

David. A. *et al*. 2008. *Geophysical Survey In Archaeological Field Evaluation*, Second Edition. English Heritage.

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*

Gaffney. C, Gater. J. and Ovenden. S. 2002. *The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations*. IFA Technical Paper No. 6.

Gaffney. C. and Gater. J. 2003. *Revealing the Buried Past, Geophysics for Archaeologists*. Tempus Publishing Ltd.

Gurney, D. 2003. *Standards for Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14.

Institute for Archaeologists. 2011. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*.

Linford. N. 2006. Notes from an English Heritage Seminar.

Schmidt. A. 2001. *Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice*. Archaeology Data Service. Oxbow Books.

Whitten. D.G.A. 1978. *The Penguin Dictionary of Geology*. Penguin Books Ltd. London.

Witten. A.J. 2006. *Handbook of Geophysics and Archaeology*. Equinox Publishing Ltd. London.

Websites

The British Geological Survey, 2013, (Natural Environment Research Council) – Geology of Britain Viewer - www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion2=1#maps

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

APPENDIX 1 TECHNICAL DETAILS

MAGNETOMETER

The magnetometer differs from the 'active' magnetic susceptibility meter by being a 'passive' instrument. Rather than injecting a signal into the ground it detects slight variations in the Earth's magnetic field caused by cultural and natural disturbance (Clark).

Thermoremanent magnetism is produced when a material containing iron oxides is strongly heated. Clay for example has a high iron oxide content that in a natural state is weakly magnetic, when heated these weakly magnetic compounds become highly magnetic oxides that a magnetometer can detect.

The demagnetisation of iron oxides occurs above a temperature known as the Curie point; for example haematite has a Curie point of 675 Celsius and magnetite 565C. At the time of cooling the iron oxides become permanently re-magnetised with their magnetic properties re-aligned in the direction of the Earth's magnetic field (Gaffney and Gater). The direction of the Earth's magnetic field shifts over time and these subtle alignment differences can be recorded. Kilns, hearths, baked clay and ovens can reach Curie point temperatures, and are the strongest responses apart from large iron objects that can be detected. Other cultural anomalies that can be prospected include occupation areas, pits, ditches, furnaces, sunken feature buildings, ridge and furrow field systems and ritual activity (David, 2011). Commonly recorded anomalies include modern ferrous service pipes, field drainage pipes, removed field boundaries, perimeter fences and field boundaries.

Fluxgate Gradiometers

Fluxgate gradiometers are sensitive instruments that utilise two sensors placed in a vertical plane, spaced 1 metre apart. The sensor above reads the Earth's magnetic (background) response while the sensor below records the local magnetic field. Both sensors are carefully adjusted to read zero before survey commences at a 'zeroing' point, selected for its relatively 'quiet' magnetic background reading. When differences in the magnetic field strength occur between the two sensors a positive or negative reading is logged. Positive anomalies have a positive magnetic value and conversely negative anomalies have a negative magnetic value relative to the site's magnetic background. Examples of positive magnetic anomalies include hearths, kilns, baked clay, areas of burning, ferrous material, ditches, sunken feature buildings, furrows, ferrous service pipes, perimeter fences and field boundaries. Negative magnetic anomalies include earthwork embankments, plastic water pipes and geological features.

The instruments are usually held approximately 0.30m to 0.50m above the ground surface and can detect to a depth of between 1-2metres. Best practice dictates that the optimal direction of traverse in Britain is east to west.

Magnetic Anomalies

Linear trends
Linear trends can be both positive and negative magnetic responses. If they are broad, relatively weak or negative in nature they may be of agricultural or geological origin, for example periglacial channels, land drains or ploughing furrows. If the responses are strong positive trends they are more likely to be of archaeological origin. Archaeological settlement ditches tend to be rich in highly magnetic iron oxides that accumulate in them via anthropogenic activity and humic backfills. Conversely surviving banks will be negative in nature, the material is derived from subsoil deposits that is less likely to be positively magnetic. Curvilinear trends can also be recorded and are indicative of archaeological structures such as drip-gullies.

Discrete anomalies
Discrete anomalies appear as increased positive responses present within a localised area. They are caused by a general increase in the amount of magnetic iron oxides present within the humic back-fill of for example a rubbish pit.

'Iron spike' anomalies
These strong isolated dipolar responses are usually caused by ferrous material present in the topsoil horizon. They can have an archaeological origin but are usually introduced into the topsoil during manuring.

Areas of magnetic disturbance
An area of magnetic disturbance is usually associated with material that has been fired. For example areas of burning, demolition (brick) rubble or slag waste spreads. They can also be caused by ferrous material, e.g. close proximity to barbwire or metal fences and field boundaries, buried services, pylons and modern rubbish deposits.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

APPENDIX 2 INSURANCE DETAILS

	Employers Liability Insurance	**Public Liability**	**Professional Indemnity**
Insurer	Towergate Insurance	Towergate Insurance	Towergate Insurance
Extent of Cover	£10,000,000	£2,000,000	£2,000,000
Policy Number	000436	000436	201101352/1236

APPENDIX 3 STAFF

The following members of staff have the skills and experience necessary to undertake the supervision of archaeological work as required in the brief. All have a wide range of experience on a variety of site types.

Archaeologist **Adam Leigh BA (Hons)**

Qualifications: University of Reading, BA (Hons) History (2008-2011)

Experience: Adam joined Britannia Archaeology in early 2015 as an Archaeologist and has four years' experience within commercial archaeology. After graduating from Reading with First Class Honours, Adam began his career in archaeology processing finds recovered from sites across East Anglia. In 2012 he became responsible for supervising the processing of finds and working with specialists to produce post excavation assessments. Adam has also worked closely with archivists and has experience in preparing archives for deposition across the region. In his time within commercial archaeology he has learned a wide range of fieldwork skills on numerous sites within and beyond the East Anglia. Adam's main research interests lie in the archaeology and history of the medieval period that stemmed from his higher education studies.

Senior Project Manager **Dan McConnell BSc (Hons)**

Qualifications: University of Bournemouth, BSc (Hons) Archaeology (1995-1998)

Experience: Dan is a Senior Project Manager at Britannia Archaeology and has seventeen years commercial archaeological experience. He took part in several archaeological projects in the north of England from the late 1980's onwards, including the Wharram Percy Research Project and Mount Grace Priory excavations. Within commercial archaeology he has been involved with many small to large scale archaeological projects in the United Kingdom and Ireland including major infrastructure schemes. Since relocating to East Anglia in 2004 he has carried out and managed several small to large scale excavations across the south and east of England. In 2008 Dan became a County Archaeologist for the Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team before joining Britannia in 2014. His main research interests focus on the early pre-historic period (in particular the Neolithic) of the British-Isles and late post-medieval archaeology.

Senior Project Manager **Martin Brook BA (Hons) PCIfA**

Qualifications: University of Leicester, BA (Hons) Archaeology (2003 – 2006)

Experience: Martin is a Senior Project Manager at Britannia Archaeology and has ten years commercial archaeological experience. He specialises in logistical project management, archiving and fieldwork. He has carried out numerous excavations and evaluations throughout East Anglia and the Midlands, and works closely with local and national museums when archiving sites. His research interests are focused on the British Iron age specifically funerary traditions in the south of England and in East Yorkshire.

Land Adjacent To Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Written Scheme of Investigation

Martin specialises in metalwork finds from the period, specifically those associated with grave goods and personal adornment.

Director **Timothy Schofield HND BSc PCIfA**

Qualifications: University of Bournemouth, BSc Archaeological Studies (1999-2000)
Yeovil College, HND Practical Archaeology (1997-1999)

Experience: Tim is the Co-Director of Britannia Archaeology and has fifteen years post-graduation archaeological experience. He specialises in geophysical survey, topographic survey, computer aided design and archaeological excavation. He has carried out numerous surveys and excavations across the UK. His research interests focus mainly on prehistoric and post-Roman archaeology and in the use and application of modern technological advances in archaeology.

Director **Matthew Adams BA (Hons) ACIfA**

Qualifications: University of Durham, BA (Hons) Classical Studies (1997- 2000)

Experience: Matt is the Co-Director of Britannia Archaeology and has ten years commercial archaeology experience. He was involved in several archaeological projects in the midlands from the mid 1990's onwards and in the North East of England as an undergraduate. Since 2007 he has been based in East Anglia where he has specialised in all areas of practical field work, running numerous projects both large and small. He is also an experienced surveyor, GIS and AutoCAD operator. Matt was an occasional contributor to the popular TV series Time Team and is experienced at presenting talks and seminars to interested organisations. His main research interests focus on transitional periods and include the late Iron Age and early Romano-British period, and the late Roman and early Anglo-Saxon period in Britain and the late Aegean Bronze Age in Crete.

APPENDIX 4 OASIS FORM

OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England

List of Projects | Manage Projects | Search Projects | New project | Change your details | HER coverage | Change country | Log out

Printable version

OASIS ID: britanni1-210590

Project details

Project name	Land Adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk; Detailed Magnetometer Survey.
Short description of the project	In May 2015 Britannia Archaeology Ltd undertook a detailed fluxgate gradiometer survey over c.1.5 hectares of land adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk, in two paddocks ahead of the proposed development of ten houses with associated access. A fairly wide range of anomalies were prospected during the survey, many of which are likely to have an archaeological origin. Of particular note is the curvilinear anomaly that is located where a cropmark (BUC 027) has been recorded on air photographs in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record. Eight positive linear anomalies recorded within the dataset may relate to post-medieval cropmarks of remnant field boundaries (BUC 070) recorded in the field to the west. Twelve Discrete positive anomalies indicative of rubbish pits and two thermoremnant responses, interpreted as areas of burning or large buried ferrous objects, were also prospected. It is possible that the thermoremnant responses may relate to the location of the former WWII radar station (BUC 071). The full range of anomalies should be targeted to investigate the interpretations given within this report, with particular attention focused on those of potential archaeological origin.
Project dates	Start: 19-05-2015 End: 19-05-2015
Previous/future work	No / Yes
Any associated project reference codes	P1108 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	R1099 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	BUC 098 - Sitecode
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Other 15 - Other
Monument type	RING DITCH ANOMALY Uncertain
Monument type	DITCH TYPE ANOMALIES Uncertain
Monument type	PIT TYPE ANOMALIES Uncertain
Significant Finds	NONE None
Methods &	"Geophysical Survey"

techniques	
Development type	Housing estate
Prompt	National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF
Position in the planning process	Pre-application
Solid geology (other)	Red Crag Formation Sand
Drift geology (other)	Kesgrave Catchment Sand and Gravel
Techniques	Magnetometry

Project location

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK SUFFOLK COASTAL BUCKLESHAM Land Adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk
Study area	1.50 Hectares
Site coordinates	TM 2420 4180 52.02865732 1.26865921541 52 01 43 N 001 16 07 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 20.00m Max: 30.00m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Britannia Archaeology Ltd
Project brief originator	Local Planning Authority (with/without advice from County/District Archaeologist)
Project design originator	Timothy Schofield
Project director/manager	Timothy Schofield
Project supervisor	Timothy Schofield
Type of sponsor/funding body	Landowner
Name of sponsor/funding body	Mr Brandon Fosker

Project archives

Physical Archive Exists?	No
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk HER
Digital Contents	"Survey"
Digital Media available	"Geophysics","Survey","Text"
Paper Archive	Suffolk HER

recipient	
Paper Contents	"Survey"
Paper Media available	"Report","Survey ","Unpublished Text"

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Land Adjacent to Street Farm, Bucklesham, Suffolk; Detailed Magnetometer Survey
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Schofield, T. P.
Other bibliographic details	R1099
Date	2015
Issuer or publisher	Britannia Archaeology Ltd
Place of issue or publication	Stowmarket
Description	A4 Bound Report with A3 Fold-out Figures
URL	www.britannia-archaeology.com

Entered by	Tim Schofield (tim@britannia-archaeology.com)
Entered on	10 July 2015

OASIS: Please e-mail Historic England for OASIS help and advice
© ADS 1996-2012 Created by Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012
Cite only: http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm for this page





N

STATION	EASTING	NORTHING
01	624129.767	241780.507
02	624141.970	241859.570
03	624257.515	241821.500

	Survey Grid Location
	Site Boundary

NGR:	REPORT NUMBER:
TM 2420 4180	1099

PROJECT:
LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

CLIENT:
Artisan Planning & Property Services

DESCRIPTION:
SITE, SURVEY GRID & GEOREFERENCING INFORMATION PLAN

BRITANNIA ARCHAEOLOGY LTD
115 OSPREY DRIVE, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK
IP14 5UX
T: 01449 763034
E: info@britannia-archaeology.com
W: www.britannia-archaeology.com

SCALE: 1:1000 (0 – 50m)

PLOT:	APPROVED:	VERSION:
A3	DPM	01
DATE:	AUTHOR:	FIGURE:
MAY 2015	TPS	01



N

+3nT

-3nT

Site Boundary

NGR: TM 2420 4180

REPORT NUMBER: 1099

PROJECT:
LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

CLIENT:
Artisan Planning & Property Services

DESCRIPTION:
RAW MAGNETOMETER GREYSCALE PLOT

BRITANNIA ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

115 OSPREY DRIVE, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK
IP14 5UX

T: 01449 763034
E: info@britannia-archaeology.com
W: www.britannia-archaeology.com

SCALE: 1:500 — 0 — 25m

PLOT:	APPROVED:	VERSION:
A3	DPM	01

DATE:	AUTHOR:	FIGURE:
MAY 2015	TPS	02



N

+2nT

-2nT

Site Boundary

NGR: TM 2420 4180

REPORT NUMBER: 1099

PROJECT:
LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

CLIENT:
Artisan Planning & Property Services

DESCRIPTION:
PROCESSED MAGNETOMETER GREYSCALE PLOT

BRITANNIA ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

115 OSPREY DRIVE, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK
IP14 5UX

T: 01449 763034
E: info@britannia-archaeology.com
W: www.britannia-archaeology.com

SCALE: 1:500 — 0 — 25m

PLOT:	APPROVED:	VERSION:
A3	DPM	01

DATE:	AUTHOR:	FIGURE:
MAY 2015	TPS	03



N

15nT/cm	Scale Interval
	Site Boundary

NGR: TM 2420 4180

REPORT NUMBER: 1099

PROJECT:
LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

CLIENT:
Artisan Planning & Property Services

DESCRIPTION:
PROCESSED MAGNETOMETER XY TRACE PLOT

BRITANNIA ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

115 OSPREY DRIVE, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK
IP14 5UX

T: 01449 763034
E: info@britannia-archaeology.com
W: www.britannia-archaeology.com

SCALE: 1:500 — 0 — 25m

PLOT:	APPROVED:	VERSION:
A3	DPM	01

DATE:	AUTHOR:	FIGURE:
MAY 2015	TPS	04

N

	Positive Curvilinear Anomaly, Archaeology
	Positive Linear Anomaly, Archaeology
	Positive Discrete Anomaly, Archaeology?
	Thermo-remnant Response, Area Of Burning
	Area of Magnetic Disturbance, Modern
	Isolated Dipolar Responses
	Site Boundary

NGR: TM 2420 4180

REPORT NUMBER: 1099

PROJECT:
LAND ADJACENT TO STREET FARM, BUCKLESHAM, SUFFOLK

CLIENT:
Artisan Planning & Property Services

DESCRIPTION:
INTERPRETATION PLOT OF MAGNETOMETER ANOMALIES

BRITANNIA ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

115 OSPREY DRIVE, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK
IP14 5UX

T: 01449 763034
E: info@britannia-archaeology.com
W: www.britannia-archaeology.com

SCALE: 1:500 (0 – 25m)

PLOT:	APPROVED:	VERSION:
A3	DPM	01
DATE:	AUTHOR:	FIGURE:
MAY 2015	TPS	05