Geoarchaeology

March 2015

Report Number: 1415-7

# FARWAY BARROWS, DEVON: TOPOGRAPHIC AND AUGER SURVEYS

# Prepared for Devon County Council

Phil Stastney

ARCA

Department of Archaeology University of Winchester Winchester SO22 4NR http://www.arcauk.com

ABOA

Version	Date	Status*	Prepared by	Author's signature	Approved by	Approver's		
						Signature		
01	10/03/15	E	Phil Stastney	factur				
*I – Inter	*I – Internal draft; E – External draft; F - Final							

# CONTENTS

Figures1
Summary
1. Introduction
2. Methodology
2.1 Topographic survey4
2.2 Auger survey5
2.3 Archive
3. Topographic survey Results
4. Auger survey results 10
5. Discussion
5.1 Western barrow (SM 1010268) 12
5.2 Eastern barrow (SM 1010267) 13
5.3 Conclusions
6. Acknowledgements
7. Bibliography
Appendix 1: Auger Hole sediment logs16

# FIGURES

Figure 1: DEM of the site generated by the topographic survey and
position of SM areas and auger holes7
Figure 2: Lithostratigraphic cross-sections
Figure 3: Modelled thickness of topsoil. Modelled using a Kriging
algorithm with a smoothing filter applied (filter size = 2, iterations
= 3)
algorithm with a smoothing filter applied (filter size = 2, iterations = 3)

#### SUMMARY

A topographic and geoarchaeological auger survey was commissioned by Devon County Council to obtain evidence for the surface morphology and subsurface stratigraphy of two barrows at Farway Hill, Devon. Both barrows are Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SM1010267 and SM1010268).

The topographic survey identified a low (0.20m high) mound measuring approximately 4.7m in diameter at the western site (SM1010268), which was revealed by the auger survey to consist of cobble-sized stones. No evidence for any fine-grained mound material, or any associated ditch features, were encountered in the auger survey. Neither survey revealed any evidence for the eastern barrow (SM1010267).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In February 2015, at the request of Devon County Council (DCC), ARCA carried out topographic and geoarchaeological auger surveys at the site of two Scheduled Bronze Age barrows, Farway Hill, Devon (henceforth 'the site'). The works presented in this report were carried out in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Stastney 2015) which was produced in response to a strategy proposed by English Heritage (EH) (Miller and Straker 2014).
- 1.2 This document presents the results of the field surveys of the two barrows at the site. It is arranged as follows: first a brief account is provided of the geographical, geological and methodological background to the geoarchaeological project; the results of the topographic and auger surveys are then described in detail, followed by a series of conclusions. A bibliography and an appendix containing auger hole stratigraphic logs complete the document.
- 1.3 The site is situated in south-east Devon on the high ground of an extensive Greensand plateau approximately 8km South of Honiton. The two barrows at the site are Scheduled Monuments (SM), with the centres of each SM area cited approximately 28m apart. The western barrow (SM1010268) is centred on NGR SY 1588 9583, and the SM area covers 0.038ha. The eastern barrow (SM1010267) is centred on NGR SY 1590 9582, and the SM area covers 0.031ha, see Figure 1. These barrows are part of a wider group of funerary monuments grouped around Farway Castle, a substantial circular earthwork enclosure which may be broadly contemporary with the barrows (Jones and Quinnell 2008; Riley 2011).
- 1.4 The British Geological Survey (BGS) map the site as lying on bedrock of the Upper Greensand Formation, a Cretaceous deposit dating to approximately 112 - 94my BP, overlain by superficial deposits of the Clay-with-flints Formation, a residual deposit probably formed by the dissolution of Cretaceous and Palaeogene formations during the Neogene and Quaternary Periods (BGS 2014).
- 1.5 Several previous studies have been carried out on the barrows of the wider Farway barrow complex and associated monuments (e.g. Fox 1948; Grinsell 1983; Hutchinson 1880; Jones and Quinnell 2008; Riley 2011). The western barrow (SM1010268) was first Scheduled in January 1951, amended in January

1995; the eastern barrow (SM1010267) was first Scheduled in January 1995 (English Heritage undated). Prior to the topographic and auger surveys described in this report, geophysical surveys (magnetic and electrical resistance) were carried out by ArchaeoPhysica Ltd (Roseveare 2015). Interim results from the latter works informed the methodology of the present works and aided interpretation the results presented in this report.

- 1.6 The overarching aim of the project, outlined in the strategy proposal (Miller and Straker 2014), was to investigate the extant surface morphology and subsurface stratigraphy of the two barrows at the site. To that end, the following objectives were defined:
  - 1.6.1 The aim of the topographic survey was to provide objective evidence of the surface topography of the two barrows and to identify any subtle micro-topographic features. The topographic survey would thus provide an essential baseline for the auger survey and an aide to interpreting the geophysical survey (Stastney 2015, 2).
  - 1.6.2 The aim of the auger survey was to provide detailed descriptions of the measured stratigraphy and to give an indication of the nature and depth of any surviving archaeological stratigraphy at the site (Stastney 2015, 2).

# 2. METHODOLOGY

# 2.1 Topographic survey

- 2.1.1 The WSI (Stastney 2015, 2) originally envisaged the objective survey of two 30m x 30m areas centred on each SM area at the site. Due to the presence of field boundaries encroaching on the north-eastern parts, and coarse vegetation along the southern margins of the eastern barrow (SM1010267), the actual area covered by the survey was revised on-site in consultation with Cressida Whitton (DCC). A single area measuring approximately 58m x 27m was therefore surveyed.
- 2.1.2 Survey was carried out using a Leica System 1200 RTK GPS (minimum accuracy ±0.015m). Points were surveyed every 0.25m along a series of transects at 0.50m spacing across the survey area.

2.1.3 The survey data were processed using Leica GeoOffice and Survey Control Centre software and were processed in AutoCAD and ArcGIS (10.1) to produce a digital elevation model (DEM) and surface plots (see Figure 1).

# 2.2 Auger survey

- 2.2.1 The strategy proposal (Miller and Straker 2014) and the WSI (Stastney 2015, 2) originally envisaged that the auger survey would comprise the drilling of a single, 37m long, west-northwest to east-southeast aligned transect of auger holes (at 3m spacing = 13 auger holes) across both SM areas. However, following receipt of interim geophysics results (see Roseveare 2015) this strategy was revised to target areas of low electrical resistance to the northeast and southwest of the centre of SM1010268.
- 2.2.2 The auger survey therefore comprised the drilling of a total of 24 auger holes in two transects (auger holes generally at 3m spacing): a transect running from northeast to southwest across the centre of SM1010268 (AH4 AH14); and a second northwest to southeast transect running from the centre of SM1010268 across the centre of SM1010267 (AH15 AH24). In addition, three auger holes (AH1 AH3) were drilled outside of the SM areas (north of SM1010267 and northeast of SM1010268) in order to establish the general lithostratigraphic sequence of the site. The position of auger holes at the site is shown in Figure 1.
- 2.2.3 The positions of the auger holes were surveyed using a Leica System 1200 RTK GPS (minimum accuracy ±0.015m).
- 2.2.4 The auger holes were drilled using Eijkelkamp hand auger equipment operated by a crew of two ARCA geoarchaeologists. This equipment comprises a metal T-shaped handle which was fitted with an Edelman-type auger head (70mm diameter x 200mm long). Drilling proceeded from the ground surface until undisturbed geological deposits or an impenetrable obstruction was reached.
- 2.2.5 Sediments recovered in the auger heads were cleaned with a trowel, photographed and described on site using standard geological criteria (Tucker 2011; Jones *et al.* 1999; Munsell Color 2000) and then discarded.
- 2.2.6 Upon completion, each auger hole was backfilled using the arisings from the auger heads.

2.2.7 Positional and lithostratigraphic data from the auger survey were manually entered into a MS Excel spreadsheet and loaded into a RockWorks (RockWare 2012) database which in turn was used to plot the composite cross-section shown in Figure 2.

# 2.3 Archive

2.3.1 The geoarchaeological archive from the site comprises digital records: topographic survey data, DEM raster files, ESRI shapefiles, digital lithostratigraphic records and digital photographs held on the University of Winchester server.



Figure 1: DEM of the site generated by the topographic survey and position of SM areas and auger holes.

#### 3. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY RESULTS

- 3.1 Figure 1 shows the DEM resulting from the topographic survey at the site.
- 3.2 The general topography of the site is characterised by a slope from the highest ground in the northeast of the site (maximum elevation +249.424m OD) to the southwest (minimum elevation +248.426m OD).
- 3.3 The topographic data shows little evidence for the barrows at the site. Such evidence is restricted to a small area (approximately 20 square metres) of raised ground within the western barrow (SM1010268) SM area which is approximately 0.20m-0.25m higher than the surrounding ground. This small raised area corresponds with the stony area (and associated area of high resistance) noted during the geophysics survey carried out at the site by ArchaeoPhysica Ltd (Roseveare 2015).
- 3.4 There was no topographic evidence for any features associated with the eastern barrow (SM 1010267), although parts of the SM area could not be surveyed due to the presence of a field boundary in the north-eastern part of the area, and coarse vegetation along the southern margins of the area.
- 3.5 The only other feature apparent in the topographic data was a subtle ridge (~0.05m higher than the surrounding ground) running parallel with the modern northwest-southeast field boundary.



Figure 2: Lithostratigraphic cross-sections.

#### 4. AUGER SURVEY RESULTS

- 4.1 A total of 24 auger holes were drilled at the site. Auger hole positions are shown in Figure 1, lithostratigraphic cross-sections are shown in Figure 2.
- 4.2 The auger survey encountered a generally consistent sequence of strata comprising black humic topsoil overlying the Clay-With-Flints Formation (stiff yellow brown silt/clay with occasional pebble-sized flints).
- 4.3 The only deviation from this sequence was in AH8, AH9, AH10, and AH21 where the auger refused on cobble-sized stones. AH8, AH9 and AH10 were positioned over the slightly raised area within SM1010268 identified by the topographic survey (see Section 3.3).
- 4.4 The topsoil thickness at the site ranged from 0.10m (AH9) to 0.42m (AH1), with a mean thickness of 0.25m ( $\sigma = 0.07$ ). The topsoil was thinnest in the slightly raised stony area in SM1010268. Topsoil was generally thicker in the eastern part of the site, which was recently covered by coarse scrubby vegetation, and where the topsoil was covered by a layer of partially decomposed plant litter. Figure 3 shows the thickness of topsoil at the site modelled in RockWorks using a Kriging algorithm.
- 4.5 A sharp contact was typically observed between the Clay-With-Flints Fm. and the overlying topsoil in the western part of the site (i.e. within SM1010268 area), which may suggest that this part of the site had been more recently ploughed than the eastern part of the site. In AH22 in the eastern part of the site, the black humic topsoil graded into 0.06m of grey fine sand which in turn was overlying the Clay-With-Flints Fm; this may be related to soil formation processes (i.e. podsolization).
- 4.6 With the exception of the stony area beneath the topsoil encountered in AH8, AH9 and AH10, no other evidence for the presence of barrow SM1010268 was encountered in the auger survey. No convincing evidence for strata related to barrow SM1010267 were encountered; the stone obstruction in AH21 may be conceivably be related to the remnants of barrow SM1010267, but given that there was no apparent difference in the thickness of the overlying topsoil, the stone obstruction may have been an inclusion in the top of the Clay-With-Flints Fm.



Figure 3: Modelled thickness of topsoil. Modelled using a Kriging algorithm with a smoothing filter applied (filter size = 2, iterations = 3).

#### 5. DISCUSSION

#### 5.1 Western barrow (SM 1010268)

- 5.1.1 Evidence for the western barrow is restricted to a low, slightly irregularly-shaped, mound measuring approximately 4.7m in diameter which is *c*.0.20m higher than the surrounding ground. This mound corresponds to the stony area associated with high electrical resistance in the geophysical data (Roseveare 2015), and with the area of shallower topsoil identified by the auger survey. AH8, AH9 and AH10, which were targeted on this mound all refused on large obstructions confirming that this feature is composed of cobble-sized stones.
- 5.1.2 Apart from the presence of cobble-sized stones directly beneath the topsoil, the auger survey did not identify any deposits likely to have been associated with an earthen mound.
- 5.1.3 Auger holes to the northeast (AH5 and AH6) and southwest (AH11, AH12 and AH13) of the stony mound were targeted on discrete areas of low resistance identified in the geophysical survey (Roseveare 2015); however no evidence for any archaeological features (such as a ditch) were revealed in the augering.
- 5.1.4 Given that the auger was not able to penetrate beyond the base of the topsoil in the low mound, it is possible that archaeological deposits or a former land surface are preserved beneath the stones.
- 5.1.5 It appears that all that remains of the western barrow is a small (4.7m diameter x 0.20m high) mound of stones. Given the lack of any fine-grained material overlying the stones, and the absence of any evidence for a surrounding ditch it may be that SM1010268 was never an earthen mound but was instead a cairn.
- 5.1.6 The relative shallowness of the topsoil in the area around the western barrow (compared with the eastern site), and the presence of a sharp contact between the topsoil and the underlying Clay-With-Flints Fm., may be indicative of ploughing in this part of the site which appears to have eroded the barrow.

#### 5.2 Eastern barrow (SM 1010267)

- 5.2.1 No topographic or lithostratigraphic evidence for the eastern barrow was encountered in the topographic and auger surveys.
- 5.2.2 The topsoil in this part of the site was slightly thicker than further to the west; combined with the diffuse contact between the topsoil and Clay-With-Flints Fm. and the growth of scrubby vegetation over the area, this appears to suggest that this area had not been cultivated as recently as the area around the western barrow.

#### 5.3 Conclusions

6.3.1 Topographic and lithostratigraphic evidence for the survival of either barrow at the site is slim and consists only of the low stony mound in the western site. This stony mound may be the remnants of a central cairn within a former earthen barrow or it is possible that the site consisted solely of a stone cairn. There is some potential for the survival of archaeological deposits or a buried land surface beneath the stone mound. The eastern barrow, however, appears to have been totally removed by cultivation at some point in the past.

#### 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 6.1 ARCA would like to thank Anne and Martin Roseveare (ArchaeoPhysica Ltd), Cressida Whitton (Historic Environment Team, DCC), Bill Horner (County Archaeologist, DCC), Charlotte Russell (Heritage at Risk Project Officer, EH), Vanessa Straker (Science Adviser, EH), Keith Miller (Inspector of Ancient Monuments, EH) and Paul Linford (Geophysics Manager, EH) for their help during the course of this project.
- 6.2 Fieldwork was carried out by Nathalie Barrett, Nick Watson and Phil Stastney. The report was written by Phil Stastney (ARCA).

#### 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BGS (2014) British Geological Survey lexicon of named rock units. <u>http://www.bgs.ac.uk/lexicon/</u> (Accessed 24 February 2015).
- English Heritage (undated) The National Heritage List for England. <u>http://www.english-</u> <u>heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-</u> <u>heritage-list-for-england/</u> (Accessed 06 March 2015).
- Fox, A. (1948) The Broad Down (Farway) necropolis and the Wessex Culture in Devon. Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society 4, 1-19.
- Grinsell, L.V. (1983) The barrows of south and east Devon. Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society **41**, 5-46.
- Hutchinson, P.O. (1880) Report on barrows near Sidmouth. Transactions of the Devon Association **12**, 122-151.
- Jones, A.P., Tucker, M.E. and Hart, J.K. (1999) Guidelines and recommendations. In Jones, A.P., Tucker, M.E. and Hart, J.K. (Eds.) *The description and analysis of Quaternary stratigraphic field sections*. Quaternary Research Association technical guide 7, London, 27-76.
- Jones, A. and Quinnell, H. (2008) The Farway barrow complex in east Devon reassessed. *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society* **66**, 27-57.
- Miller, K. and Straker, V. (2014) Proposal for investigation at Farway barrows, Devon. Unpublished document, English Heritage.
- Munsell Color (2000) Munsell soil color charts. Munsell Color, New Windsor (NY).
- Riley, H. Survey at Farway Castle, Farway, Devon: In the footsteps of Peter Orland Hutchinson Project. Available online at: <u>http://www.eastdevonaonb.org.uk/uploads/documents/landsc</u> <u>ape/Bronze%20Age%20Tour/farwayweb.pdf</u> (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- RockWare (2012) Rockworks v15. http://www.rockware.com (Accessed 7 February 2013).
- Roseveare, M.J. (2015) Farway Hill Barrows, Devon: Geophysical Survey Report. Unpublished report, ArchaeoPhysica Ltd, Hereford.

- Stastney, P. (2015) Auger Survey and Topographic Survey, Farway Hill Barrows (SM1010268 & SM1010267), Devon: Methods Statement. Unpublished document, ARCA, University of Winchester.
- Tucker, M.E. (2011) Sedimentary rocks in the field: a practical guide. Fourth Edition. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.

#### **APPENDIX 1: AUGER HOLE SEDIMENT LOGS**

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 1	0.00	0.42	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. Grades into a less humic 7.5 YR 4/2 Brown towards the base. (Topsoil) Grading into:
AH 1	0.42	0.55	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 2	0.00	0.40	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. Grades into a less humic 7.5 YR 4/2 Brown towards base (Topsoil) Grading into:
AH 2	0.40	0.50	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 3	0.00	0.20	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. Sharp boundary to:

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 3	0.20	0.30	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 4	0.00	0.32	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 4	0.32	0.42	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 5	0.00	0.22	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil). Sharp boundary to:
AH 5	0.22	0.32	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 6	0.00	0.23	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 6	0.23	0.33	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 7	0.00	0.25	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 7	0.25	0.35	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 8	0.00	0.18	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil). Borehole ends on rock. Cobble to boulder -sized stone visible at ground level. [Top of W barrow]
AH 8	0.18	0.28	Stone	Obstruction (Rock)
AH 9	0.00	0.10	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil). Borehole ends on cobble of flint.

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 9	0.10	0.20	Stone	Obstruction (Rock)
AH 10	0.00	0.13	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil). Borehole ends on rock.
AH 10	0.13	0.23	Stone	Obstruction (Rock)
AH 11	0.00	0.28	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 11	0.28	0.38	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 12	0.00	0.21	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 12	0.21	0.31	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 13	0.00	0.24	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 13	0.24	0.34	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 14	0.00	0.23	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 14	0.23	0.33	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 15	0.00	0.23	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 15	0.23	0.33	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 16	0.00	0.25	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 16	0.25	0.35	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 17	0.00	0.25	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 17	0.25	0.35	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 18	0.00	0.23	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Ploughsoil) Sharp boundary to:
AH 18	0.23	0.33	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 19	0.00	0.23	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Grading boundary to:
AH 19 AH 19	0.23 0.28	0.28 0.38	Silt/clay Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 4/3 Brown silt/clay. Sharp boundary to: 10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 20	0.00	0.31	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Grading boundary to:
AH 20	0.31	0.35	Silt/clay	10 YR 4/3 Brown wet silt/clay. Sharp boundary to:

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 20	0.35	0.45	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 21	0.00	0.04	Plant litter	7.5 YR 3/2 Dark brown humic litter. (Bracken). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 21	0.04	0.25	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft and wet silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Borehole ends on rock.
AH 21	0.25	0.35	Stone	Obstruction (Rock).
AH 22	0.00	0.04	Plant litter	7.5 YR 3/2 Dark brown humic litter. (Bracken). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 22	0.04	0.22	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 22	0.22	0.28	Sand	10 YR 5/1 Grey very fine sand. Diffuse boundary to:
AH 22	0.28	0.38	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End

Bore	Тор	Base	Lithology	Comments
AH 23	0.00	0.04	Plant litter	7.5 YR 3/2 Dark brown humic litter. (Bracken). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 23	0.04	0.17	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Diffuse boundary to:
АН 23	0.17	0.24	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 4/4 Dark yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Clay with Flints). Grading boundary to:
АН 23	0.24	0.34	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints). End
AH 24	0.00	0.04	Plant litter	7.5 YR 3/2 Dark brown humic litter. (Bracken). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 24	0.04	0.24	Topsoil	7.5 YR 2.5/1 Black, soft silt/clay with frequent granular-sized plant remains and roots. Rare to occasional, subangular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. (Topsoil). Diffuse boundary to:
AH 24	0.24	0.34	Clay-With-Flints	10 YR 4/4 Dark yellowish brown, stiff silt/clay with occasional subrounded rock fragment granules and angular, fine pebble-sized flint clasts. 10 YR 5/3 Brown mottles at top. (Clay with Flints).