



Winslade Park, Clyst St Mary Devon

Geophysical Survey Report

Produced for Absolute Archaeology

Project code WCD141

18th November 2014

**R Fry, Geophysicist BA(Hons) MSc
MJ Roseveare, Senior Geophysicist
BSc(Hons) MSc MEAGE FGS MIFA**

ArchaeoPhysica Ltd 

Kitchener's, Home Farm, Harewood End, Hereford HR2 8JS
Tel. +44 (0) 1989 730 564 www.archaeophysica.com



Non-Technical Summary

A magnetic survey was commissioned by Absolute Archaeology to prospect land at Winslade Park, Clyst St. Mary, Devon for buried structures of archaeological interest.

The survey has found extensive areas of strongly magnetic material typical of made ground and this might mask more weakly magnetic structures. Extant sports facilities are in some places associated with underground structure. Within the northern area of the survey, a series of enhanced magnetic field linear anomalies may be of archaeological interest and are likely to represent a former field system or similar enclosures. Two wide linear reduced field anomalies are likely to mark buried structures, e.g. large non-magnetic pipes or culverts or possibly former road surfaces.

Digital Data

| Item | Sent to | Sent date |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| CAD – Vector Elements | Sam Driscoll | 18 th November 2014 |
| | | |

Audit

| Version | Author | Checked | Date |
|-------------|--------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Interim | R Fry | | 30 th October 2014 |
| Draft Final | R Fry | MJ Roseveare | 18 th November 2014 |
| Final | | | |
| Revision | | | |
| OASIS | | | |



Table of Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Location..... | 1 |
| 2 | Context | 1 |
| 2.1 | Archaeology..... | 1 |
| 2.2 | Environment..... | 1 |
| 3 | Methodology | 2 |
| 3.1 | Survey..... | 2 |
| | 3.1.1 Technical equipment..... | 2 |
| | 3.1.2 Monitoring & quality assessment..... | 2 |
| 3.2 | Data processing..... | 2 |
| | 3.2.1 Procedure..... | 2 |
| 3.3 | Interpretation resources..... | 2 |
| 3.4 | Interpretive classes..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.1 Introduction..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.2 Agriculture – boundaries..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.3 Agriculture – cultivation..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.4 Agriculture – drains..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.5 Archaeology – fills..... | 3 |
| | 3.4.6 Archaeology – other discrete..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.7 Archaeology – structures..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.8 Archaeology – zones..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.9 Geology – discrete..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.10 Geology – zones..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.11 Services..... | 4 |
| | 3.4.12 Texture..... | 4 |
| 3.5 | Standards & guidance..... | 5 |
| 4 | Discussion | 6 |
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 6 |
| 4.2 | Principles..... | 6 |
| | 4.2.1 Instrumentation..... | 6 |
| 4.3 | Character & principal results..... | 6 |
| | 4.3.1 Geology..... | 6 |
| | 4.3.2 Land use..... | 7 |
| | 4.3.3 Archaeology..... | 7 |
| 4.4 | Conclusions..... | 7 |
| 4.5 | Caveats..... | 7 |
| 4.6 | Bibliography & selected reference..... | 8 |
| 5 | Appendices | 9 |
| 5.1 | Project metadata..... | 9 |
| 5.2 | Archiving..... | 9 |
| 5.3 | ArchaeoPhysica..... | 9 |
| | 5.3.1 The company..... | 9 |
| | 5.3.2 Senior Geophysicist: Martin J Roseveare, MSc BSc(Hons) MEAGE FGS MIfA..... | 10 |
| | 5.3.3 Operations Manager: Anne CK Roseveare, BEng(Hons) DIS..... | 10 |
| | 5.3.4 Geophysicist: Robert Fry, MSc BA(Hons), PhD candidate..... | 10 |
| | 5.3.5 Geophysicist: Samuel Purvis, MSc BSc(Hons) | 10 |



1 Introduction

Land at Winslade Park, Clyst St Mary, Devon was surveyed to prospect for buried structures of archaeological interest. 4.7ha of land was surveyed across a park and sports fields.

1.1 Location

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Country | England |
| County | Devon |
| Nearest Settlement | Clyst St Mary |
| Central Co-ordinates | 297765, 90264 |

2 Context

2.1 Archaeology

The area surveyed does not include any HER find spots or sites of known archaeological potential. A Desk-Based Assessment written prior to the geophysical survey over the broader development area (Baker 2014) concluded that within the survey area, there was limited potential for Prehistoric, Roman, Medieval or Post-medieval periods.

The park contained within the survey area may have been used in the Second World War for storage in preparation for the D-Day Landings. The exact location for this activity is however unclear (Baker 2014, 8).

2.2 Environment

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Superficial 1: 50000 BGS | None Recorded |
| Bedrock 1:50000 BGS | Dawlish Sandstone Formation - Sandstone (DAS) |
| Topography | Relatively flat |
| Hydrology | Presumed artificially drained (sports ground) |
| Current Land Use | Parks and Sports pitches |
| Historic Land Use | Agricultural - mixed |
| Vegetation Cover | Grass |
| Sources of Interference | None |

The magnetic susceptibility of the soils (recorded as sands and loams within UKSO) across the site is usually suitable for the detection by magnetic survey of archaeological remains cut into natural soil strata. Natural magnetic susceptibility may be fairly low. The strength of anomalies produced will be dependant on form and depth, as well as the magnetic contrast of the material making up the archaeological features. Natural variations and accumulations of soil within the survey areas may also be detectable.



3 Methodology

3.1 Survey

3.1.1 Technical equipment

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Measured variable | Magnetic flux density / nT |
| Instrument | Array of Geometrics G858 Magmapper caesium magnetometers |
| Configuration | Non-gradiometric transverse array (4 sensors, ATV towed) |
| Sensitivity | 0.03 nT @ 10 Hz (manufacturer's specification) |
| QA Procedure | Continuous observation |
| Spatial resolution | 1.0m between lines, 0.3m mean along line interval |

3.1.2 Monitoring & quality assessment

The system continuously displays all incoming data as well as line speed and spatial data resolution per acquisition channel during survey. Rest mode system noise is therefore easy to inspect simply by pausing during survey, and the continuous display makes monitoring for quality intrinsic to the process of undertaking a survey. Rest mode test results (static test) are available from the system.

3.2 Data processing

3.2.1 Procedure

All data processing is minimised and limited to what is essential for the class of data being collected, e.g. reduction of orientation effects, suppression of single point defects (drop-outs or spikes) etc. The processing stream for this data is as follows:

| Process | Software | Parameters |
|--|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Measurement & GNSS receiver data alignment | Proprietary | |
| Temporal reduction, regional field suppression | Proprietary | High pass 5s/nT, Low pass 0.3s/nT |
| Gridding | Surfer | Kriging, 0.25m x 0.25m |
| Smoothing | Surfer | Gaussian lowpass 3x3 data |
| Imaging and presentation | Manifold GIS | |

The initial processing uses proprietary software developed in conjunction with the multisensor acquisition system. Gridded data is ported as data surfaces (not images) into Manifold GIS for final imaging and detailed analysis. Specialist analysis is undertaken using proprietary software.

General information on processes commonly applied to data can be found in standard text books and also in the 2008 English Heritage Guidelines "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation" at http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Geophysical_LoRes.pdf.

ArchaeoPhysica uses more advanced processing for magnetic data using potential field techniques standard to near-surface geophysics. Details of these can be found in Blakely, 1996, "Potential Theory in Gravity and Magnetic Applications", Cambridge University Press.

All archived data includes process metadata.

3.3 Interpretation resources

Numerous sources are used in the interpretive process which takes into account shallow geological conditions, past and present land use, drainage, weather before and during survey, topography and any previous knowledge about the site and the surrounding area. Old Ordnance Survey mapping is consulted

- magnetics, electromagnetics, electrical resistance, GPR, topography, landscape & GIS -



and also older sources if available. Geological information is sourced only from British Geological Survey resources and aerial imagery from online sources. Topographic data is usually sourced from the Environment Agency (LiDAR) unless derived from original ArchaeoPhysica survey.

Information from nearby ArchaeoPhysica surveys is consulted to inform upon local data character, variations across soils and near-surface geological contexts. Published data from other contractors may also be used if accompanied by adequate metadata.

3.4 Interpretive classes

3.4.1 Introduction

Key to interpretation is separation of each anomaly into broad classes, namely whether caused by agricultural processes (e.g. ploughing, composting, drainage etc.), geological factors or whether a structure of archaeological interest is likely. Within these anomalies are in turn classified by whether they most likely represent a fill or a drain, or a region of differing data texture, etc. More detailed descriptions are included below.

The actual means of classification is based upon geophysical understanding of anomaly formation, the behaviour of soils, landscape context and structural form. For example, to consider just one form of anomaly: weakly dipolar discrete magnetic anomalies of small size are likely to have shallow non-ferrous sources and are therefore likely to be pits. Larger ones of the same class could also be pits or locally-deeper topsoil but if strongly magnetic could also be hearths. Strongly dipolar discrete anomalies are in all cases likely to be ferrous or similarly magnetic debris, although small repeatedly heated and in-situ hearths can produce similar anomalies.

3.4.2 Agriculture – boundaries

Coherent linear dipolar enhancement of magnetic field strength marking ditch fills, narrow bands of more variable magnetic field or changes in apparent magnetic susceptibility, are all included within this category if they correlate with boundaries depicted on the Tithe Map or early Ordnance Survey maps. If there is no correlation then these anomaly types are not categorised as a field boundaries.

3.4.3 Agriculture – cultivation

Banded variations in apparent magnetic susceptibility caused by a variable thickness of topsoil, depositional remanent magnetisation of sediments in furrows or susceptibility enhancement through heating (a by product of burning organic matter like seaweed) tend to indicate past cultivation, whether ridge-based techniques, medieval ridge and furrow or post medieval 'lazy beds'. Modern cultivation, e.g. recent ploughing, is not included.

3.4.4 Agriculture – drains

In some cases it is possible to identify drainage networks either as ditch-fill type anomalies (typically 'Roman' drains), noisy or repeating dipolar anomalies from terracotta pipes or reduced magnetic field strength anomalies from culverts, plastic or non-reinforced concrete pipes. In all cases identification of a herring bone pattern to these is sufficient for inclusion within this category.

3.4.5 Archaeology – fills

Any linear or discrete enhancement of magnetic field strength, usually with a dipolar character of variable strength, that cannot be categorised as a field boundary, cultivation or as having a geological origin, is classified as a fill potentially being of archaeological interest. Fills are normally earthen and include an often invisible proportion of heated soil or topsoil that augments local magnetic field strength. Inverted anomalies are possible over non-earthen fills, e.g. those that comprise peat, sand or gravel within soil. This category is



subject to the 'habitation effect' where, in the absence of other sources of magnetic material, anomaly strength will decrease away from sources of heated soil and sometimes to the extent of non-detectability.

Former enclosure ditches that contained standing water can promote enhanced volumetric magnetic susceptibility through depositional remanence and remain detectable regardless of the presence of other sources of magnetic material.

3.4.6 Archaeology – other discrete

This category is secondary to fills and includes anomalies that by virtue of their character are likely to be of archaeological interest but cannot be adequately described as fills. Examples include strongly magnetic bodies lacking ferrous character that might indicate hearths or kilns. In some cases anomalies of ferrous character may be included.

3.4.7 Archaeology – structures

On some sites the combination of plan form and anomaly character, e.g. rectilinear reduced magnetic field strength anomalies, might indicate the likely presence of masonry, robber trenches or rubble foundations. Other types of structure are only included if the evidence is unequivocal, e.g. small ring ditches with doorways and hearths. In some circumstances a less definite category may be assigned to the individual anomalies instead.

3.4.8 Archaeology – zones

On some sites it is possible to define different areas of activity on the basis of magnetic character, e.g. texture and anomaly strength. These might indicate the presence of middens or foci within larger complexes. This category does not indicate a presence or absence of anomalies possibly of archaeological interest.

3.4.9 Geology – discrete

On some sites, e.g. some gravels and alluvial contexts, there will be anomalies that can obscure those potentially of archaeological interest. They may have a strength equal to or greater than that associated with more relevant sources, e.g. ditch fills, but can normally be differentiated on the basis of anomaly form coupled with geological understanding. Where there is ambiguity, or relevance to the study, these anomalies will be included in this category.

3.4.10 Geology – zones

Not all changes in geology can be detected at the surface, directly or indirectly, but sometimes there will be a difference evident in the geological data that can be attributed to a change, e.g. from alluvium to tidal flat deposits, or bedrock to alluvium. In some cases the geophysical difference will not exactly coincide with the geological contact and this is especially the case across transitions in soil type.

3.4.11 Services

All overhead (OH) and underground (UG) services are depicted where these are detectable in the data or may influence aspects of the interpretation.

3.4.12 Texture

Geophysical data varies in character across areas, due to a range of factors including soil chemistry, near surface geology, hydrology and land use past and present. Where these variations are of interest or relevance to the study they are included in this category.



3.5 Standards & guidance

All work was conducted in accordance with the following standards and guidance:

- David et al, "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation", English Heritage, 2008.
- "Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation", Institute for Archaeologists, 2008.

In addition, all work is undertaken in accordance with the high professional standards and technical competence expected by the Geological Society of London and the European Association of Geoscientists and Engineers.

All personnel are experienced surveyors trained to use the equipment in accordance with the manufacturer's expectations. All aspects of the work are monitored and directed by fully qualified professional geophysicists.



4 Discussion

4.1 Introduction

The sections below first discuss the geophysical context within which the results need to be considered and then specific features or anomalies of particular interest. Not all will be discussed here and the reader is advised to consult the graphical elements of this report.

4.2 Principles

In general, topsoil is more magnetic than subsoil which can be slightly more magnetic than parent geology, whether sands, gravels or clays, however, there are exceptions to this. The reasons for this are natural and are due to biological processes in the topsoil that change iron between various oxidation states, each differently magnetic. Where there is an accumulation of topsoil or where topsoil has been incorporated into other features, a greater magnetic susceptibility will result.

Within landscapes soil tends to accumulate in negative features like pits and ditches and will include soil particles with thermo-remanent magnetization (TRM) through exposure to heat if there is settlement or industry nearby. In addition, particles slowly settling out of stationary water will attempt to align with the ambient magnetic field at the time, creating a deposit with depositional remanent magnetization (DRM).

As a consequence, magnetic survey is nearly always more a case of mapping accumulated magnetic soils than structures which would not be detected unless magnetic in their own right, e.g. built of brick or tile. As a prospecting tool it is thus indirect. Fortunately, the mechanisms outlined above are commonplace and favoured by human activity and it is nearly always the case that cut features will alter in some way the local magnetic field.

4.2.1 Instrumentation

The use of the magnetic sensors in non-gradiometric (vertical) configuration avoids measurement sensitisation to the shallowest region of the soil, allowing deeper structures, whether natural or otherwise to be imaged within the sensitivity of the instrumentation. However, this does remove suppression of ambient noise and temporal trends which have to be suppressed later during processing. When compared to vertical gradiometers in archaeological use, there is no significant reduction in lateral resolution when using non-gradiometric sensor arrays and the inability of gradiometers to detect laminar structures is completely avoided.

Caesium instrumentation has a greater sensitivity than fluxgate instruments, however, at the 10 Hz sampling rate used here this increase in sensitivity is limited to about one order of magnitude.

The array system is designed to be non-magnetic and to contribute virtually nothing to the magnetic measurement, whether through direct interference or through motion noise. There is, however, some limited contribution from the towing ATV.

4.3 Character & principal results

4.3.1 Geology

The magnetic contrast across the site has been sufficient for the detection of anomalies of archaeological interest. Within the northern half of the survey, a relatively 'flat' background texture has allowed for clear anomalies of potential archaeological interest to be identified. Where more modern activity is present across the site (especially within areas [1] & [2] / [3]) it is clear that archaeological anomalies would not have been detectable.



4.3.2 Land use

The survey has identified many magnetic field anomalies, of which many relate to the modern land-use of the site.

Strong, variable magnetic field anomalies within areas highlighted [1] & [2] are large spreads of ferrous debris. It seems likely that these are areas of made-ground and may be related to landscaping for the sports pitches and recreation areas. It is also possible that they relate in some way to the occupation of the park in preparation for the D-Day landings. The area indicated at [2] has an abrupt edge along [3] which might have been associated with a change of slope and also a drain depicted on the 1972 OS mapping of the area.

The strong, variable magnetic field linear anomaly depicted at [4] is likely to represent an underground service although its function is unknown.

A pair of reduced magnetic field linear anomalies [5] and [6] in the northern part of the area are slightly unusual and would be typical of a large voided structure or ones made of a large quantity of non-magnetic material. Their identification is uncertain but large culverts or buried road surfaces are both possibilities.

Within the southern part of the survey area, many parallel weakly enhanced magnetic field anomalies extend around the extant cricket pitch. These are likely to represent ceramic field drains.

The survey has been affected by modern activity relating to the recreational grounds, with an area of enhanced magnetic field linear anomalies [8] seemingly relating to the extant cricket pitches, and strongly enhanced magnetic anomalies [9], [10], [11] & [12] caused by extant football goalposts.

4.3.3 Archaeology

A series of linear enhanced magnetic field anomalies [13], [14], [15] & [16] are likely to be of archaeological interest. The anomalies are likely to present ditch-fills and may relate to a former field system or large enclosure (c.50m x 100m) across the site. Nothing to explain these has been seen on old editions of Ordnance Survey maps and thus presumably pre-date creation of the parkland.

4.4 Conclusions

The survey has revealed areas of made ground of unknown date and evidence for land drainage and perhaps major services or former road surfaces. Of more obvious potential archaeological interest are a set of linear ditch fills defining at least one enclosure, perhaps the remains of a field system.

4.5 Caveats

Geophysical survey is a systematic measurement of some physical property related to the earth. There are numerous sources of disturbance of this property, some due to archaeological features, some due to the measuring method, and others that relate to the environment in which the measurement is made. No disturbance, or 'anomaly', is capable of providing an unambiguous and comprehensive description of a feature, in particular in archaeological contexts where there are a myriad of factors involved.

The measured anomaly is generated by the presence or absence of certain materials within a feature, not by the feature itself. Not all archaeological features produce disturbances that can be detected by a particular instrument or methodology. For this reason, the absence of an anomaly must never be taken to mean the absence of an archaeological feature. The best surveys are those which use a variety of techniques over the same ground at resolutions adequate for the detection of a range of different features.

Where the specification is by a third party ArchaeoPhysica will always endeavour to produce the best possible result within any imposed constraints and any perceived failure of the specification remains the responsibility of that third party.

Where third party sources are used in interpretation or analysis ArchaeoPhysica will endeavour to verify their accuracy within reasonable limits but responsibility for any errors or omissions remains with the originator.



Any recommendations are made based upon the skills and experience of staff at ArchaeoPhysica and the information available to them at the time. ArchaeoPhysica is not responsible for the manner in which these may or may not be carried out, nor for any matters arising from the same.

4.6 Bibliography & selected reference

Aspinall *et al*, 2008. "Magnetometry for Archaeologists", Geophysical Methods for Archaeology, Altamira Press

Baker, D., 2014, "Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: Winslade Park, Clyst St. Mary, Devon" Absolute Archaeology. Code: AARC127/13/DBA

Blakely, 1996, "Potential Theory in Gravity and Magnetic Applications", Cambridge University Press

David *et al*, 2008, "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation", English Heritage

Gaffney *et al*, 2002, "Technical Note 6: The use of geophysical techniques in archaeological evaluations", Institute for Archaeologists

Milsom, 2003, "Field Geophysics", 3rd edition, The Geological Field Guide Series, Wiley

Schmidt, A., 2013, "Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice", ADS

Scollar, 1990, "Archaeological Prospecting and Remote Sensing", Topics in Remote Sensing 2, Cambridge University Press

Tarling *et al* (ed.), 1999, "Palaeomagnetism and Diagenesis in Sediments", Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 151

Telford *et al*, 1990, "Applied Geophysics", 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press



5 Appendices

5.1 Project metadata

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Project Name | Winslade Park, Clyst St Mary, Devon |
| Project Code | WCD141 |
| Client | Absolute Archaeology |
| Fieldwork Dates | 28 th October 2014 |
| Field Personnel | S Purvis, D Rouse |
| Data Processing Personnel | R Fry |
| Reporting Personnel | R Fry, M Roseveare |
| Draft Report Date | 18 th November 2014 |
| Final Report Date | |

5.2 Archiving

ArchaeoPhysica maintains an archive for all its projects, access to which is permitted for research purposes. Copyright and intellectual property rights are retained by ArchaeoPhysica on all material it has produced, the client having full licence to use such material as benefits their project. Access is by appointment only and some content is restricted and not available to third parties

Archive formation is in the spirit of Schmidt, A., 2013, "Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice", ADS.

ArchaeoPhysica has a policy of contributing in time to the ADS Grey Literature library, usually after about six months post-dating release of the report. In addition, extracts of data images may be used, without reference to their source, in marketing and similar material. In these cases anything that might identify the project or client is removed.

5.3 ArchaeoPhysica

5.3.1 The company

ArchaeoPhysica has provided geophysical survey to archaeologists since 1998 and is consequently one of the oldest specialist companies in the sector. It has become one of the most capable operations in the UK, undertaking 1000 hectares of magnetic survey per annum. In addition 2D & 3D electrical, low frequency electromagnetic and radar surveys are regularly undertaken across the UK, also overseas. ArchaeoPhysica is the most established provider of caesium vapour magnetic survey in Europe, and holds probably the largest archaeological archive of total field magnetic data in the world. Unusually for the archaeological sector, key staff are acknowledged qualified geophysical specialists in their own right and regularly contribute to in-house and other research projects. For a number of years the company taught applied geophysics to Birkbeck College (London) undergraduate and post-graduate archaeology students, and developed a new and comprehensive course for the College.

All work is undertaken by qualified and experienced geophysicists who have specialised in the detection and mapping of near surface structures in archaeology and other disciplines using a wide variety of techniques. There is always a geophysicist qualified to post-graduate level on site during fieldwork and all processing and interpretation is undertaken under the direct influence of either the same individual or someone of similar qualifications and experience.

ArchaeoPhysica meets with ease the requirements of English Heritage in their 2008 Guidance "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation" section 2.8 entitled "Competence of survey personnel". The company is one of the most experienced in European archaeological prospection and is a key professional player. It only employs people with recognised geoscience qualifications and capable of becoming Fellows of

- magnetics, electromagnetics, electrical resistance, GPR, topography, landscape & GIS -



the Geological Society of London, the Chartered UK body for geophysicists and geologists.

5.3.2 Senior Geophysicist: Martin J Roseveare, MSc BSc(Hons) MEAGE FGS MifA

Martin specialised (MSc) in geophysical prospection for shallow applications at the University of Bradford in 1997 and has worked in commercial geophysics since then. He was elected a Fellow of the Geological Society of London in 2009 and is also a full member of the Institute of Archaeologists. He has taught applied geophysics for Birkbeck College's archaeological degree students for a number of years. Professional interests outside archaeology include the application of geophysics to agriculture, also geohazard monitoring and prediction. He also has considerable practical experience of the improvement and integration of geophysical hardware and software. At ArchaeoPhysica Martin carries overall responsibility for all things geophysical and is often found writing reports or buried in obscure software and circuit diagrams. He was elected onto the EuroGPR and IfA GeoSIG committees in Autumn 2013.

5.3.3 Operations Manager: Anne CK Roseveare, BEng(Hons) DIS

On looking beyond engineering, Anne turned her attention to environmental monitoring and geophysics and has since been applying specialist knowledge of chemistry & fluid flow to soils. She is member of the British Society of Soil Science and is interested in the use of agricultural applications of geophysics. Anne was the founding editor of the International Society for Archaeological Prospection (ISAP) and has spent many years walking fields in parallel lines. Much of her time now is spent managing complicated scheduling and logistics for ArchaeoPhysica, overseeing safety procedures and data handling, while dreaming of interesting places around the world to undertake surveys, including researching the urban archaeology of Asia.

5.3.4 Geophysicist: Robert Fry, MSc BA(Hons), PhD candidate

Rob studied Archaeology B.A.(Hons.) at the University of Reading from 2004-07 where his research was heavily influenced by geophysical techniques and work included organising and leading the magnetic survey of Silchester Roman Town. Following university, he joined the British School at Rome, conducting magnetic surveys in Spain, Italy and Libya. After working briefly as a geophysicist at Wessex Archaeology, Rob became Project Officer of The Silchester Mapping Project at the University of Reading. Since then, he has gained an MSc in Archaeological Prospection from the University of Bradford. He is now writing up his PhD thesis in time-lapse geophysical monitoring techniques and analysis as part of the DART Project. Rob is currently the editor of ISAP News. At ArchaeoPhysica Rob is normally found in the field or in the office besieged by colossal quantities of survey data.

5.3.5 Geophysicist: Samuel Purvis, MSc BSc(Hons)

Sam studied Archaeology at The University of Bradford before progressing to a Masters in Archaeological Prospection. His primary research focus is on electromagnetic methods of shallow survey and is an expert with the newest multicoil electromagnetic instrumentation. Sam's main role at ArchaeoPhysica is technical, collecting high quality data, maintaining systems and keeping the show on the road.