ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SERVICES
WYAS

Land north of Green Dike
Sherburn-In-Elmet
North Yorkshire

Geophysical Survey

September 2006

Report No. 1579

CLIENT
MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd

Rec 24/10/06

S11637
E3917

Land north of Green Dike

Sherburn-in-Elmet

North Yorkshire

Geophysical Survey

Contents

Summary

A geophysical (magnetometer) survey covering approximately 1 hectare was carried out in advance of a proposed development on the eastern outskirts of Sherburn-in-Elmet. Anomalies indicative of agricultural activity and geology have been identified. No anomalies of probable archaeological origin have been noted. On the basis of the geophysical survey the archaeological potential of the site is considered to be low.

Authorised for distribution by:

....

Archaeological Services WYAS

PO Box 30, Nepshaw Lane South, Morley, Leeds LS27 0UG

1. Introduction and Archaeological Background

1.1 Archaeological Services WYAS was commissioned to carry out a geophysical (magnetometer) survey north of Green Dike, Sherburn-in-Elmet, by Sophie Langford of MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd. The site, centred at SE 5040 3345 (see Fig. 1), covered approximately 1 hectare and was bounded by Green Dike to the south, the A162 to the east and the B1222 to the north (see Fig. 2). To the west was open agricultural land separated from the survey area by another dike.

1.2 At the time of survey the survey area was under permanent pasture. No problems were encountered during the fieldwork, which was carried out on August September 1st 2006.

1.3 Topographically the site is located on relatively flat ground at approximately 20m Above Ordnance Datum. The geology comprises Upper Magnesian Limestone overlain by glacial drift Vale of York silts and clays. The soils are slowly permeable stoneless and fine loamy clays classified in the Foggathorpe 2 soil association.

1.4 No information on the archaeological background was provided.

2. Methodology and Presentation of Results

2.1 The general objectives of the geophysical evaluation were:

- to establish the presence, absence, extent and nature of any archaeological features within the defined survey area.

2.2 To achieve this objective detailed magnetometer survey was carried out over the whole of the proposed development site, an area of approximately 1 hectare.

2.3 Detailed magnetometer survey employs the use of a sample trigger to automatically take readings at predetermined points, typically at 0.25m intervals, on traverses 1m apart. These readings are stored in the memory of the instrument and are later downloaded to computer for processing and interpretation. A Bartington Grad601 magnetic gradiometer was used during the survey with readings being taken at 0.25m intervals on zig-zag traverses 1m apart within 20m by 20m grids. The readings were stored in the memory of the instrument and later downloaded to computer for processing and interpretation using Geoplot 3 software. Detailed survey allows the visualisation of weaker anomalies that may not have been identifiable by less rigorous techniques such as magnetic scanning or magnetic susceptibility survey.

2.4 The survey methodology, report and any recommendations comply with guidelines outlined by English Heritage (David 1995) and by the IFA (Gaffney, Gater and Ovenden 2002). All figures reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping are done so with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright.

2.5 A general site location plan, incorporating the 1:50000 Ordnance Survey mapping, is shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the processed magnetometer data superimposed onto a digital map base at a scale of 1:2000. Figures 3 and 4 show the processed (greyscale) and unprocessed (XY trace plot) data whilst Figure 5 is an interpretation of the results. These three figures are all at a scale of 1:1000.

2.6 Technical information on the equipment used, data processing and magnetic survey methodology is given in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 details the survey location information and Appendix 3 describes the composition and location of the site archive.

The figures in this report have been produced following analysis of the data in 'raw' and processed formats and over a range of different display levels. All figures are presented to most suitably display and interpret the data from this site based on the experience and knowledge of Archaeological Services staff.

3. Results and Discussion (Figs 3, 4 and 5)

3.1 A few isolated dipolar anomalies ('iron spikes' - see Appendix 1) have been identified across all parts of the site. These anomalies are indicative of ferrous objects or other magnetic material in the topsoil/subsoil and, although archaeological artefacts may cause them, they are more often caused by modern cultural debris that has been introduced into the topsoil often as a consequence of manuring. The magnetic disturbance along the southern boundary of the survey is caused by the proximity of a barbed wire fence.

3.2 Several linear trend anomalies have been identified aligned either from north to south or east to west. These anomalies are thought to have an agricultural origin being caused by land drains or previous ploughing regimes.

3.3 To the north-east corner of the site a curvilinear area of enhanced (positive) and negative magnetic readings has been identified. The broad nature of this anomaly leads to the interpretation that it has a natural cause being probably due to variation in the composition of the drift geology.

4. Conclusions

4.1 No anomalies thought to be indicative of archaeological activity have been identified on this site.

4.2 On the basis of the magnetometer survey the archaeological potential of the site is considered to be low.

The results and subsequent interpretation of data from geophysical surveys should not be treated as an absolute representation of the underlying archaeological and non-archaeological remains. Confirmation of the presence or absence of archaeological remains can only be achieved by direct investigation of sub-surface deposits.

Bibliography

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

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

Acknowledgements

Project Management

A. Webb BA MIFA

Fieldwork

T. S. Harrison BSc MSc PIFA

J. Gidman BSc

Report

A. Webb BA MIFA

Graphics

T. S. Harrison

Figures

Appendices



Fig. 1. Site location

Fig. 2. Site location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:2000 @ A4)

0 100m



Fig. 3. Processed greyscale magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A4)



Fig. 4. XY trace plot of unprocessed magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A4)



Fig. 5. Interpretation of magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A4)

0 50m

Appendix 1

Magnetic Survey: Technical Information

Magnetic Susceptibility and Soil Magnetism

Iron makes up about 6% of the Earth's crust and is mostly present in soils and rocks as minerals such as maghaemite and haemetite. These minerals have a weak, measurable magnetic property termed magnetic susceptibility. Human activities can redistribute these minerals and change (enhance) others into more magnetic forms so that by measuring the magnetic susceptibility of the topsoil, areas where human occupation or settlement has occurred can be identified by virtue of the attendant increase (enhancement) in magnetic susceptibility. If the enhanced material subsequently comes to fill features, such as ditches or pits, localised isolated and linear magnetic anomalies can result whose presence can be detected by a magnetometer (fluxgate gradiometer).

In general, it is the contrast between the magnetic susceptibility of deposits filling cut features, such as ditches or pits, and the magnetic susceptibility of topsoils, subsoils and rocks into which these features have been cut, which causes the most recognisable responses. This is primarily because there is a tendency for magnetic ferrous compounds to become concentrated in the topsoil, thereby making it more magnetic than the subsoil or the bedrock. Linear features cut into the subsoil or geology, such as ditches, that have been silted up or have been backfilled with topsoil will therefore usually produce a positive magnetic response relative to the background soil levels. Discrete feature, such as pits, can also be detected. Less magnetic material such as masonry or plastic service pipes that intrude into the topsoil may give a negative magnetic response relative to the background level.

The magnetic susceptibility of a soil can also be enhanced by the application of heat. This effect can lead to the detection of features such as hearths, kilns or areas of burning.

Types of Magnetic Anomaly

In the majority of instances anomalies are termed ***'positive'***. This means that they have a positive magnetic value relative to the magnetic background on any given site. However some features can manifest themselves as ***'negative'*** anomalies that, conversely, means that the response is negative relative to the mean magnetic background. Such negative anomalies are often very faint and are commonly caused by modern, non-ferrous, features such as plastic water pipes. Infilled natural features may also appear as negative anomalies on some geological substrates.

Where it is not possible to give a probable cause of an observed anomaly a '?' is appended.

It should be noted that anomalies interpreted as modern in origin might be caused by features that are present in the topsoil or upper layers of the subsoil. Removal of soil to an archaeological or natural layer can therefore remove the cause of the anomaly.

The types of response mentioned above can be divided into five main categories that are used in the graphical interpretation of the magnetic data:

Isolated dipolar anomalies (iron spikes)

These responses are typically caused by ferrous material either on the surface or in the topsoil. They cause a rapid variation in the magnetic response giving a characteristic 'spiky' trace. Although ferrous archaeological artefacts could produce this type of response, unless there is supporting evidence for an archaeological interpretation, little emphasis is normally given to such anomalies, as modern ferrous objects are common on rural sites, often being present as a consequence of manuring.

Areas of magnetic disturbance

These responses can have several causes often being associated with burnt material, such as slag waste or brick rubble or other strongly magnetised/fired material. Ferrous structures such as pylons, mesh or barbed wire fencing and buried pipes can also cause the same disturbed response. A modern origin is usually assumed unless there is other supporting information.

Linear trend

This is usually a weak or broad linear anomaly of unknown cause or date. An agricultural origin, either ploughing or land drains is a common cause.

Areas of magnetic enhancement/positive isolated anomalies

Areas of enhanced response are characterised by a general increase in the magnetic background over a localised area whilst discrete anomalies are manifest by an increased response (sometimes only visible on an XY trace plot) on two or three successive traverses. In neither instance is there the intense dipolar response characteristic exhibited by an area of magnetic disturbance or of an 'iron spike' anomaly (see above). These anomalies can be caused by infilled discrete archaeological features such as pits or post-holes or by kilns. They can also be caused by pedological variations or by natural infilled features on certain geologies. Ferrous material in the subsoil can also give a similar response. It can often therefore be very difficult to establish an anthropogenic origin without intrusive investigation or other supporting information.

Linear and curvilinear anomalies

Such anomalies have a variety of origins. They may be caused by agricultural practice (recent ploughing trends, earlier ridge and furrow regimes or land drains), natural geomorphological features such as palaeochannels or by infilled archaeological ditches.

Methodology: Magnetic Susceptibility Survey

There are two methods of measuring the magnetic susceptibility of a soil sample. The first involves the measurement of a given volume of soil, which will include any air and moisture that lies within the sample, and is termed volume specific susceptibility. This method results in a bulk value that it not necessarily fully representative of the constituent components of the sample. The second technique overcomes this potential problem by taking into account both the volume and mass of a sample and is termed mass specific susceptibility. However, mass specific readings cannot be taken in the field where the bulk properties of a soil are usually unknown and so volume specific readings must be taken. Whilst these values are not fully representative they do allow general comparisons across a site and give a broad indication of susceptibility changes. This is usually enough to assess the susceptibility of a site and evaluate whether enhancement has occurred.

Methodology: Gradiometer Survey

There are two main methods of using the fluxgate gradiometer for commercial evaluations. The first of these is referred to as ***magnetic scanning*** and requires the operator to visually identify anomalous responses on the instrument display panel whilst covering the site in widely spaced traverses, typically 10m apart. The instrument logger is not used and there is therefore no data collection. Once anomalous responses are identified they are marked in the field with bamboo canes and approximately located on a base plan. This method is usually employed as a means of selecting areas for detailed survey when only a percentage sample of the whole site is to be subject to detailed survey.

The disadvantages of magnetic scanning are that features that produce weak anomalies (less than 2nT) are unlikely to stand out from the magnetic background and so will be difficult to detect. The coarse sampling interval means that discrete features or linear features that are parallel or broadly oblique to the direction of traverse may not be detected. If linear features are suspected in a site then the traverse direction should be perpendicular (or as close as is possible within the physical constraints of the site) to the orientation of the suspected features. The possible drawbacks mentioned above mean that negative results from magnetic scanning should be checked with at least a sample detailed magnetic survey (see below).

The second method is referred to as ***detailed survey*** and employs the use of a sample trigger to automatically take readings at predetermined points, typically at 0.5m or 0.25m intervals, on zig-zag traverses 1m apart. These readings are stored in the memory of the instrument and are later dumped to computer for processing and interpretation. Detailed survey allows the visualisation of weaker anomalies that may not have been detected by magnetic scanning.

During this survey a Bartington Grad601 magnetic field gradiometer was used. Readings were taken, on the 0.1nT range, at 0.25m intervals on zig-zag traverses 1m apart within 20m by 20m square grids. The instrument was checked for electronic and mechanical drift at a common point and calibrated as necessary. The drift from zero was not logged.

Data Processing and Presentation

The detailed gradiometer data has been presented in this report in XY trace and greyscale formats. In the former format the data shown is 'raw' with no processing other than grid biasing having been done. The data in the greyscale images has been selectively filtered.

An XY plot presents the data logged on each traverse as a single line with each successive traverse incremented on the Y-axis to produce a 'stacked' plot. A hidden line algorithm has been employed to block out lines behind major 'spikes' and the data has been clipped at 10nT. The main advantage of this display option is that the full range of data can be viewed, dependent on the clip, so that the 'shape' of individual anomalies can be discerned and potentially archaeological anomalies differentiated from 'iron spikes'. Geoplot 3 software was used to create the XY trace plots.

Geoplot 3 software was used to interpolate the data so that 1600 readings were obtained for each 20m by 20m grid. The same program was used to produce the greyscale images. All greyscale plots are displayed using a linear incremental scale.

Appendix 2

Survey Location Information

The site grid was laid out using a Geodimeter 600s total station theodolite and tied in to permanent structures. The survey grids were then superimposed onto an Ordnance Survey digital map base using common boundary walls and other fixed points. Overall there was a good correlation between the local survey and the digital map base and it is estimated that the average 'best fit' error is better than ±1.0m. However, it should be noted that Ordnance Survey co-ordinates for 1:2500 map data have an error of ±1.9m at 95% confidence. This potential error must be considered if co-ordinates are measured off for relocation purposes. Local grid co-ordinates can be supplied if required.

Station	Easting	Northing
A	450375.175	433576.692
B	450319.019	433573.710
C	450411.081	433392.315

Archaeological Services WYAS cannot accept responsibility for errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by a third party or for the removal of any of the survey reference points.

Appendix 3

Geophysical Archive

The geophysical archive comprises:-

- an archive disk containing compressed (WinZip 8) files of the raw data, report text (Word 2000), and graphics files (CorelDraw6 and AutoCAD 2000) files.
- a full copy of the report

At present the archive is held by Archaeological Services WYAS although it is anticipated that it may eventually be lodged with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS). Brief details may also be forwarded for inclusion on the English Heritage Geophysical Survey Database after the contents of the report are deemed to be in the public domain (i.e. available for consultation in the relevant Sites and Monument Record Office).