

An archaeological gradiometer survey

Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon

Centred on NGR 304960,113560

Report: 150623

15 July 2015

Ross Dean BSc MSc MA MCIfA

Substrata

Archaeological Geophysical Surveyors Orchard Lodge, Cornborough Road Westward Ho! Bideford Devon EX39 1GX Tel: 07788627822 Email: geophysics@substrata.co.uk Web: substrata.co.uk Client: Friends Life Ltd c/o AXA Real Estate Investment Managers UK Ltd 155 Bishopsgate London EC2M 3XJ

Archaeological Consultants: Mills Whipp Projects Ltd. 40 Bowling Green Lane London EC1R 0NE Telephone: 020 7415 7000/7023/7044 Email: info@millswhipp.com

Contents

1.	Survey description and summary	. 1
2.	Survey aims and objectives	. 2
3.	Standards	. 2
4.	Site description	. 2
5.	Archaeological background	. 3
6.	Results, discussion and conclusions	. 5
7.	Disclaimer and copyright	10
8.	Acknowledgements	10
9.	Bibliography	10
App	endix 1 Figures	11
App	endix 2 Analysis tables	28
App	endix 3 Methodology	31
App	endix 4 Data processing	32

Figures

Figure 1: location map	12
Figure 2: survey areas	13
Figure 3: survey interpretation, all areas	14
Figure 4: survey interpretation, areas 1 to 3	15
Figure 5: survey interpretation, areas 4 and 5	16
Figure 6: survey interpretation, area 6	17
Figure 7: survey interpretation, area 7 and area 8 A to C, area 9 A and B	18
Figure 8: survey interpretation, area 8 D to F, area 9 C	19
Figure 9: survey interpretation, area 9 D and E	20
Figure 10: shade plot of processed data, all areas	21
Figure 11: shade plot of processed data, areas 1 to 3	22
Figure 12: shade plot of processed data, areas 4 and 5	
Figure 13: shade plot of processed data, area 6	
Figure 14: shade plot of processed data, area 7 and area 8 A to C, area 9 A and B	25
Figure 15: shade plot of processed data, area 8 D to F, area 9 C.	
Figure 16: shade plot of processed data, area 9 D and E	

Tables

Table 1: Historical Landscape Characterisation	3
Table 2: data analysis, areas 1 to 6	29
Table 3: data analysis, areas 7 to 9	30
Table 4: methodology summary	31
Table 5: gradiometer survey - processed data metadata	32

Accompanying CD-ROM

Report Copies of report figures	Adobe PDF format Adobe PDF format
Raw and processed grid & composite files	. DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 formats
Minimal processing data plots and metadata	. DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 formats
Final data processing data plots and metadata	. DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 formats
GIS project, shape files and classification schema	
GIS project	Manifold 8 '.map' file
GIS shape files	ESRI standard
GIS classification schema	Adobe PDF format
AutoCAD version of the survey interpretation	AutoCAD DXF

1 Survey description and summary

1.1 Survey

Type:	twin-sensor fluxgate gradiometer
Date:	between 1 December 2014 and 1 April 2015
Area:	79 ha
Project Manager:	Ross Dean BSc MSc MA MCIfA, Partner, Substrata
Lead surveyor:	Mark Edwards BA, Partner, Substrata

1.2 Client

Friends Life Ltd, c/o AXA Real Estate Investment Managers UK Ltd, 155 Bishopsgate, London EC2M 3XJ

1.3 Commissioning agent

Mills Whipp Projects Ltd, 40 Bowling Green Lane, London EC1R 0NE on behalf of Friends Life Ltd. c/o AXA Real Estate Investment Managers UK Ltd.

- 1.4 Location Site: Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5 Burlescombe, Halburton (survey areas 9D and 9E) Civil Parish: District: Mid Devon County: Devon Nearest Postcode: **EX16 7EL** NGR: ST 049 135 304960,113560 (point) Ordnance Survey E/N:
- 1.5 Archive

 Alchive	
OASIS number:	substrat1-215993
Archive:	At the time of writing, the archive of this survey will be held by
	Substrata and will be deposited with the ADS in due course.

1.6 Introduction

This report was commissioned by Mills Whipp Projects Ltd on behalf of Friends Life Ltd in order to help establish the cultural heritage and archaeological implications of a proposal for a construction project at the above site. The location of the proposed application area is shown in Figure 1.

The application site comprises 90ha of mixed farmland of which 79ha was available for survey. The survey land was subdivided into twenty-six fields. For the purposes of data analysis, these fields were split into nine separate land parcels based on land ownership at the time of the survey (Figure 2).

1.7 Summary

2 Survey aims and objectives

2.1 Overview

The magnetometer survey will seek to record the presence or absence of potential archaeological remains at the site so as to allow an appropriate mitigation strategy to be employed. A confidence rating for the survey results will be an integral part of the report.

2.2 Objectives

The magnetometer survey is intended to indicate the potential presence of archaeological remains. In particular it will assess the nature, distribution, degree of survival and, if possible, the potential of sub-surface features and deposits. It should recover as much information as possible on the extent, date, phasing, character, function, status and significance of the site.

3 Standards

The standards used to complete this survey are defined by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a) and English Heritage (2010). The codes of approved practice that were followed are those of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014b) and Archaeology Data Service/Digital Antiquity Guides (undated). The document text was written using the house style of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, undated).

4 Site description

The solid geology across the site is rock of the Triassic Aylesbeare Mudstone Group. Generically, this group comprises reddish-brown silty mudstone and clayey siltstone. Clayey fine-grained sandstone occurs locally and, less commonly, local deposits of clean, fine- to medium-grained sandstone are found (British Geological Survey, undated).

The superficial geology on the western side of the application area is not recorded in the source used. On the eastern side of the area the solid geology is overlain by Quaternary River Terrace Deposits. Typically these comprise sand and gravel, locally with lenses of silt, clay or peat (ibid).

The soils on the western side of the application area are lightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage. Those on the eastern side are loamy soils. Both soil types have naturally high groundwater.

The application area lies comprises 90ha of mixed farmland situated between 80 and 90m above Mean Ordnance Datum. The land was subdivided into twenty-six fields. For the purposes of data analysis, these fields were split into nine separate land parcels based on land ownership at the time of the survey (Figure 2).

5 Archaeological background

The following is a short summary of information obtained from the Devon Historical Environment Record (DHER) as presented in the Historical England on-line resource Heritage Gateway (Historic England, undated). Designated and non-designated heritage assets within 1000m of the designated centre of the application area were assessed. Those relevant to the analysis of the survey data are briefly discussed below.

5.1 General observations

There are a number of HER entries concerned with Post-medieval and Modern buildings of historic interest and features associated with the railway to the west of the site. The remaining entries not discussed below record Medieval (1066 AD to 1539 AD) and Post Medieval to Modern (1540 AD to 2013 AD) structures or features associated with agricultural and small-scale industrial activities such as quarry pits, a dew pond, field boundaries, drainage ditches and other earthworks, sluices, a possible water meadow and former orchards. An estate boundary possibly dating to the 10th century AD (DHER entry MDV15694) and parish boundaries are also recorded.

Entries concerning evidence of Prehistoric activities are absent within the search area apart from the finding of a Prehistoric flint axe, thought to be Neolithic (between 4000 BC and 2201 BC), found to the west of the application area during construction of the North Devon Link Road in 1984 (MDV22736).

5.2 Relevant DHER entries within the application area

Although not recorded in the survey dataset, some sub-circular crop marks were recorded in the north-eastern half or area 2 from aerial photographs taken between 2006-7 and 2010. These cropmarks were assessed as typical of those that form over geological features (MDV103554).

The site of Medieval strip fields is shown on 19th century maps south of Tiverton Parkway Station (MDV73524) covering parts of survey areas 7A, 7B and 9A (MDV73524). Magnetic anomaly groups 33, 52 and 53 may relate to these relatively early field patterns. The Enclosure Award for Leonard Moor was issued in 1864 (MDV21048).

Pieces of iron tap slag were incorporated into the porch and external rendering of the 19th century Leonard Moor Cottages later known as Turnpike Cottages, to the east and adjacent to area 9E (MDV58407). No evidence of iron production or working was recorded in the survey dataset.

(continued)

5.3 Historic landscape characterisation

Area	Sub-area	HLC – Modern	HLC – Post-medieval
		A characterisation of the landscape of Devon	A characterisation of the landscape of Devon as it was in the late 19th Century
1		Modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields	Post-medieval enclosures
		wodern enclosures adapting post medieval neids	i ost modevu enclosures
2		Modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields	Post-medieval enclosures
3		Modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields	Medieval enclosures based on strip fields
4		Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
5	All areas	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
6	All areas	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
7	All areas	Modern enclosures adapting medieval fields	Medieval strip-enclosures
8	All areas	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
9	А	Modern enclosures adapting medieval fields & Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures & Medieval strip-enclosures
	В	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
	С	Modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields	Post-medieval enclosures
	D	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures
	Е	Post-medieval enclosures	Post-medieval enclosures

Table 1: Historical Landscape Characterisation (HLC) (Devon County Council, undated)

Notes:

Modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields: Modern enclosures that have been created by adapting earlier fields of probable post-medieval date.

Modern enclosures adapting medieval fields: These modern fields have been created out of probable medieval enclosures. The sinuous medieval boundaries survive in places.

Post-medieval enclosures: Enclosures of post-medieval date. Fields laid out in the C18th and C19th commonly have many surveyed dead-straight field boundaries

Medieval enclosures based on strip fields: This area was probably first enclosed with hedge-banks during the later middle ages. The curving form of the hedge-banks suggests that earlier it may have been farmed as open strip-fields

Medieval strip-enclosures: These narrow, curving strip-enclosures derive from the enclosure of open-field strips with hedge-banks during the later middle ages

6 Results, discussion and conclusions

This survey was designed to record magnetic anomalies. The anomalies themselves cannot be regarded as actual archaeological features and the dimensions of the anomalies shown do not represent the dimensions of any associated archaeological features. The analysis presented below identifies and characterises anomalies and anomaly groups that may relate to archaeological deposits and structures.

The terms 'archaeological features' and 'archaeological deposits' refer to any artefacts, material deposits or disturbance of natural deposits thought to be the result of human activity and not undertaken as recent land maintenance or farming.

The reader is referred to section 7.

6.1 Results

Figure 2 in Appendix 1 shows the sub-division of the survey area into fields grouped in land parcels based on land ownership at the time of the survey. Figure 3 shows the interpretation of the survey data for the entire application area. Figures 4 to 9 show the survey interpretation at larger scales. They include the anomaly groups identified as relating to archaeological deposits along with their numbers. Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 2 are extracts of the detailed analysis of the survey data which is provided in the attribute tables of the GIS project on the accompanying CD-ROM and in the project archive.

Figures 3 to 9 and Tables 1 and 2 comprise the analysis of the survey data. Plots of the processed data are provided in Figures 10 to 16.

6.1.1 General points (Figures 3 and 10)

6.1.1.1 Magnetic anomaly groups

The mapped magnetic anomalies are presented as anomaly groups with a degree of certainty as to their archaeological, modern or natural characterisation provided in Figures 3 to 9 and Tables 1 and 2.

Not all anomalies or anomaly groups identified in Tables 1 and 2 are necessarily discussed below. All identified anomaly groups are recorded in the GIS project on the accompanying CD-ROM.

6.1.1.2 Survey limitations

The western edges of survey areas 1 and 2 were in use as vehicle parks and soil dumps for work being undertaken on the M5 slip road adjacent to the survey area and so could not be surveyed.

Data collection along the survey area edges was restricted as shown in the figures due to the presence of magnetic materials in and adjacent to field and roadside boundaries. Strong magnetic responses mapped close to the field and roadside boundaries are likely to relate to these materials except where otherwise indicated in the analysis.

6.1.1.3 Survey exclusions

Anomalies thought to relate to natural features were not mapped except in the case of springs which can be a focus for archaeological activities. A former palaeochannel or water-course was also recorded as it may have been used as a channel for a service pipe resulting in some clear and unusual anomaly patterns in survey area 8A.

Recent man-made objects such as manholes, water management equipment, drains, cables and other services were mapped where they comprised significant magnetic responses across the dataset that needed clarification. If mapped, they are listed in

Table 1 but are not discussed below unless they are associated with archaeological features or deposits.

6.1.1.4 General interpretation notes

The anomalies of area 1A imply that this field contains deposits of rubble and other material, probably associated with the construction of the adjacent M5 motorway. This is also probably true of anomaly group **54** in area 9A but in this case the deposit has further archaeological significance and so is discussed below.

A number of the survey areas have datasets exhibiting regular, parallel trends. These are likely to be the result of relatively recent ploughing. Anomalies indicating disturbance resulting from historical ploughing activities were mapped and are listed in Tables 1 and 2.

There are numerous anomaly groups that could be interpreted as relating to large postholes or pits although most will have natural origins. Anomalies of this sort are only mapped as potential archaeology if they are clustered in groups or otherwise form recognisable patterns.

6.1.2 Areas 1, 2 and 3 (Figures 4 and 11, Table 1)

Anomaly group 2 represent a Devon Bank field boundary (comprising a stone-revetted earthen bank and flanking ditches) mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1962.

Group 4 represents a former field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1993. It is likely that groups 6 and 8 are also associated with this boundary. Groups 5, 7 and 8 probably represent deposits of rubble. These may be infill and, speculatively, the deposits may contain stone and other materials from the former mapped field boundary.

The relatively recent high-contrast linear group **1002** is most likely to reflect either a service pipe or cable or possibly wire fence material following the line of a former field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1993.

Group 11 is a strong dipole ferrous response indicating iron or steel beneath the surface. It is spatially associated with a spring or wet area (group 2001) but the archaeological significance of the relationship cannot be established and such a strong ferrous response is likely to reflect relatively recent iron-rich material.

Group 3 is on the same orientation as group 2 and extant field boundaries. It is most likely to reflect a field boundary removed before the publication of the Ordnance Survey First Edition map in 1889.

Groups 1 and 10 represent linear deposits that are usually associated with field and enclosure boundaries of unknown archaeological provenance.

6.1.3 Areas 4 and 5 (Figures 5 and 12, Table 1)

Most of the magnetic anomaly groups mapped as archaeological in areas 4 and 5 represent linear deposits that are usually associated with field and enclosure boundaries of unknown archaeological provenance Given their various orientations, it is possible that more than one phase of past enclosures are represented by these anomaly groups.

Group 17 (area 4) probably to relate to former ridge-and-furrow ploughing. Given the anomaly groups' relatively straight trends, its is possible that a later phase of ridge-and-furrow cultivation is represented using smaller teams of oxen or horses and more efficient plough technology compared to earlier Medieval ploughing practice. Group

16 (area 4) may represent a former plough headland perhaps later used as a field boundary as it seems to act as a terminus to the traces of ridge-and-furrow.

Group **22** (area 5B) may represent an archaeological deposit such as a filled ditch or a relatively recent ploughed out service trench.

6.1.4 Area 6 (Figures 6 and 13, Table 1)

Most of the magnetic anomaly groups mapped as archaeological in area 6 represent linear deposits that are usually associated with field and enclosure boundaries of unknown archaeological provenance. Area 6A contains a greater concentration of potential archaeological deposits than the other fields. Given their various orientations, it is possible that more than one phase of past enclosures are represented by these anomaly groups.

Group 27 (area 6A) may represent a sub-circular deposit which can be associated with archaeological features such as ring-ditches and round-houses. In this case, the anomaly groups are not clearly defining a sub-circular pattern and it may be that the disturbance of the sub-soils is of recent origin. Only further archaeological investigations can qualify these anomalies further.

Group **31** (area 6F) may represent either a linear deposit disturbed by later ploughing or a linear series of pits of archaeological significance. The shape and distribution of the anomalies makes a disrupted linear deposit more likely. This group has an orientation apparently at odds with the trends of the extant and recorded Post-medieval fields. As such it may represent an older phase of land use.

6.1.5 Area 7, area 8 A to C, area 9 A and B (Figures 7 and 14, Table 2)

Magnetic anomaly groups **33** (area 7A), **34** and **35** (area 7B) coincide with and are likely to represent former field boundaries mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1962. They lie within a Medieval strip field system recorded in the Devon County Council Historic Environment Record (DCC HER) MDV73524.

Group **54** is an area of relatively large magnitude mixed anomalies that represent rubble and other debris which are most likely to be related to the construction of the adjacent M5 motorway. The north-western edge of this large anomaly group retains the shape of a former field boundary mapped by the ordnance survey between 1889 and 1993.

The remaining anomalies mapped as archaeological represent linear deposits that are usually associated with ridge-and-furrow ploughing and field and enclosure boundaries. These groups lie east of and adjacent to a Medieval strip field system discussed above (MDV73524) and may well represent deposits and features associated with that system. Groups **36**, **42**, **45**, **52** and **53** lie on a different orientation to the majority of these groups and, even though 52 and 53 lie within the area of Medieval strip field system, these anomalies may represent one or more earlier agrarian phases.

6.1.6 Area 8 D to F, area 9C (Figures 8 and 15, Table 2)

Anomaly group 47 represents a former field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1962 and group 60 represents a field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1993.

Groups **48** and **58** relate to anomaly group represent deposits of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups often represent demolition deposits or recently made-up ground.

6.1.7 Area 9 D and E (Figures 9 and 16, Table 2)

Group **61** represents a former Devon Bank field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1980.

Group **62** represents a disrupted linear deposit of unknown archaeological provenance. This group has an orientation apparently at odds with the trends of the extant and recorded Post-medieval fields. As such it may represent an older phase of land use.

6.2 Discussion

There is a distinct concentration of the anomaly groups assessed as representing potential archaeological features or deposits in the northwest and west of the application area. The contrast with the eastern and southern parts is marked (Figures 3 and 10). It is most likely that the majority of these anomalies represent Medieval strip fields and associated cultivation practices along with Post-Medieval former field boundaries. Eight of the anomaly groups (31 in area 6F, 36 in 7B, 42 in 8B, 52 and 53 in 9A, 59 in 9C and 62 in 9D) have orientations at odds with the extant fields and may represent odd remnants of older phases of land enclosure.

This distribution approximately corresponds to a change in the superficial geology discussed in section 4 with the solid geology of the Triassic Aylesbeare Mudstone Group which underlie the entire site being overlain by deposits of Quaternary River Terrace Deposits on the eastern half of the application area. The superficial geology on the western side is not mapped in the sources consulted. The superficial geology pattern is reflected in the distribution of the two soil types found across the site (Section 4).

The distribution in archaeologically relevant magnetic anomalies could be explained as a result of agrarian practice and/or magnetic response differences between subsoils resulting from the geological environment although this cannot be concluded with certainty without a better understanding of the nature of the superficial deposits on the western side of the survey area. Given that the effective depth of recording of the magnetic survey technique employed here and in most archaeological surveys in the UK is 1 to 1.5m below ground level, an appreciation of the depth of the superficial deposits across the application area would also be required to understand the influence of the geological environment on the clear distribution of the mapped magnetic anomalies.

Given the survey anomaly group distributions and that the historic landscape analysis for the eastern fields concludes that they are most likely to be Post-medieval in origin (Section 5, Table 1), it is possible, bearing in mind the caveats discussed above, that the eastern side of the application area was not subject to the same level of Medieval agriculture as the western side. Alternatively or in addition, the eastern fields may have been subject to deeper disturbance during relatively recent ploughing.

6.3 Conclusions

The magnetic contrast was sufficient to differentiate sixty-one anomaly groups representing potential archaeological deposits or features. Of these, one group may represent a partial sub-circular archaeological feature such as a round-house or ringditch but the group is not clearly defined and may equally relate to ground disturbance around an animal feeder or other recent agricultural activities. One group is most likely to represent a linear deposit such as a ditch disrupted by later ploughing but could represent a series of linear pits. Six areas of disturbed ground and/or rubble were mapped across the site and these are most likely to represent relatively recent ground-infill and demolished former field boundaries. Ten anomaly groups represent former field boundaries recorded on historical Ordnance Survey maps. The remaining anomaly groups have linear and occasional curvilinear patterns that typically represent former land division and agricultural practices. There is a clear concentration of such anomalies on the western side of the application area adjacent to an area of Medieval strip fields recorded in the Devon County Council Historical Environment Record (MDV73524). The majority of these anomalies are assessed as being of likely Medieval and Post-Medieval origin although there is a fragmented scattering of anomaly groups that may belong to earlier phases of land management.

The distribution of archaeological anomaly groups approximately follows the division of superficial geological deposits across the site and is likely to reflect associated differences in past agricultural practice although the influence of the depth of superficial deposits on the detection of magnetic anomalies is unknown. The magnetic anomalies almost exclusively related to agricultural features representing field systems and other deposits associated with modern activity. With one unlikely exception, the recorded anomalies are not thought to represent settlement and associated features or other evidence of intense, historical land use.

7 Disclaimer and copyright

The description and discussion of the results presented in this report are the authors, based on his interpretation of the survey data. Every effort has been made to provide accurate descriptions and interpretations of the geophysical data set. The nature of archaeological geophysical surveying is such that interpretations based on geophysical data, while informative, can only be provisional. Geophysical surveys are a cost-effective early step in the multi-phase process that is archaeology. The evaluation programme of which this survey is part may also be informed by other archaeological assessment work and analysis. It must be presumed that more archaeological features will be evaluated than those specified in this report.

Ross Dean, trading as Substrata, will assign copyright to the client upon written request but retains the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports as defined in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (Chapter IV, s.79).

8 Acknowledgements

Substrata would like to thank Mike Hutchinson of Mills Whipp Projects Ltd for managing the commissioning of this survey and for his subsequent project management.

9 Bibliography

Archaeology Data Service/Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice: Geophysical Data in Archaeology [Online], Available: http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Geophysics_Toc [May 2015]

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (undated) (Chartered Institute for Archaeologist) (Chartered Institute for Archaeologist) (Chartered Instit

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a) Reading: Author [Online], Available: http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/ default/files/node-files/CIfAS&GGeophysics 1.pdf [May 2015]

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014b) Author [Online], http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/CodesofConduct.pdf [May 2015]

Clark, A. (2000)

Devon Council (undated) Devon

Dean, R. (2014)

English Heritage (2010) [[Online], Available: https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geophysical-survey-in-archaeological-field-evaluation/geophysics-guidelines.pdf/ [May 2015]

Historic England (undated) [] [Online], Available: http:// www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/ [June 2015]

Appendix 2 Figures

General Guidance

The anomalies represented in the survey plots provided in this appendix are magnetic anomalies. The apparent size of such anomalies and anomaly patterns are unlikely to correspond exactly with the dimensions of any associated archaeological features.

A rough rule for interpreting magnetic anomalies is that the width of an anomaly at half its maximum reading is equal to the width of the buried feature, or its depth if this is greater (Clark, 2000: 83). Caution must be applied when using this rule as it depends on the anomalies being clearly identifiable and distinct from adjacent anomalies. In northern latitudes the position of the maximum of a magnetic anomaly will be displaced slightly to the south of any associated physical feature.



British Grid

Difficient Off

centre X: 305018.15 m, centre Y: 113617.70 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:10000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 1: location map

Substrata



Diffion On

centre X: 305018.15 m, centre Y: 113617.70 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:6000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 2: survey areas

Substrata



British Grid

centre X: 305018.15 m, centre Y: 113617.70 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:6000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.
- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposit

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 3: survey interpretation, all areas

Substrata



Notes:

1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.

2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.

3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.

4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposits.

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

centre X: 305191.98 m, centre Y: 114141.31 m



- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposits.

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 5: survey areas 4 and 5 (area 5C has no significant anomalies)



Diffion One

centre X: 305104.14 m, centre Y: 113585.81 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:1700 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.
- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposit

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 6: survey interpretation, area 6



Difficit Offici

centre X: 304645.61 m, centre Y: 113574.38 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:2500 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.
- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposit

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 7: survey interpretation, area 7, area 8 A to C, area 9 A and B



Diffion One

centre X: 305002.41 m, centre Y: 113391.61 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:2000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.
- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposit

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 8: survey interpretation, area 8 D to F, area 9C



DIRIGH OIL

centre X: 304915.38 m, centre Y: 112957.58 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:1700 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 3. Representative; not all instances are mapped.
- 4. Anomalies likely to represent geological or other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential archaeological events or deposit

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 9: survey interpretation, area 9 D and E



Diffion On

centre X: 305018.15 m, centre Y: 113617.70 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:6000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 10: shade plot of processed data, all areas

Substrata



An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623



An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 12: shade plot of processed data, areas 4 and 5

centre X: 305104.14 m, centre Y: 113585.81 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:1700 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 13: shade plot of processed data, area 6

Substrata

Diffion On

centre X: 304645.61 m, centre Y: 113574.38 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:2500 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 7: shade plot of processed data area 7, area 8 A to C, area 9 A and B

Substrata

centre X: 305002.41 m, centre Y: 113391.61 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:2000 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 15: shade plot of processed data, area 8 D to F, area 9 C

Substrata

centre X: 304915.38 m, centre Y: 112957.58 m

Copyright Substrata 2015. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:1700 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

Figure 16: shade plot of processed data, area 9 D and E

Substrata

Appendix 2 Analysis tables

Site: An archaeological gradiometer survey

Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

survey	sub-	anomaly	associated	anomaly characterisation	anomaly form	additional archaeological	comments
area	area	group	anomalies	certainty & class		characterisation	
1	A	1001		possible, high contrast linear		ferrous-rich cable, pipe or drain	anomaly groups likely represent a former fence or service such as an iron pipe along the line of a field bou mapped between 1889 and at least 1993
2	i i	1		possible, positive	disrupted linear		
		2		likely, pos/neg/pos	linear	former field boundary	anomaly group coincides with a former Devon Bank field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey betw
		3		possible, positive	disrupted linear		
		4		likely, positive	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly group coincides with a former field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and
		5		possible, mixed spread	irregular	stony deposit or rubble	anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups ofter deposits or recently made-up ground
		6		likely, mixed spread	linear	stony deposit or rubble	anomaly group coincides with a former field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and
		7		possible, mixed spread	irregular	stony deposit or rubble	anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups ofter deposits or recently made-up ground
		8		possible, mixed spread	irregular	stony deposit or rubble	anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups ofter deposits or recently made-up ground
		9		likely, ferrous response	linear	ferrous material associated with a former field boundary	
		1002		possible, high contrast linear	disrupted linear	ferrous-rich cable, pipe or drain	anomaly groups likely represent a former fence or service such as an iron pipe along the line of a field bou between 1889 and at least 1993
3		10		possible, positive	disrupted linear		
		11		possible, ferrous response		ferrous material	
		2001		possible, weak broad dipole		spring	
4		12		possible, positive	disrupted linear		anomaly group appears to be a north-eastern extension of an extant field boundary is most likely to represe field boundary of unknown date and removed before the Ordnance Survey First Edition map of 1889
		13		possible, positive	linear		
		14	15	possible, negative	linear		
		15	14	possible, positive	linear		
		16		possible, positive	disrupted linear	ploughing headland	
		17		possible, repeated parallels		ridge-and-furrow traces	
		1003		possible, low contrast linear		service trench	
		2002		possible, weak broad dipole		spring	
5	Α	18		possible, positive	disrupted linear		anomaly group may represent archaeological deposits, field drains or traces of ridge-and-furrow ploughing
		19		possible, negative	disrupted linear		anomaly group may represent archaeological deposits, field drains or traces of ridge-and-furrow ploughing
		20		possible, positive	disrupted linear		
5	D	21		possible, positive	linear		anomaly group may represent archaeological deposits, field drains or traces of ridge-and-furrow ploughing
3	В	22		possible, mixed linear	lincor		
0	A	23		possible, positive	Inear	plaughing handland	
		24		possible, positive	curviineai	ridge and furrow traces	
		23		possible, repeated parallels		ridge and furrow traces	
		20		possible, repeated parallels	partial aub aircular		anomaly group is not alour out and may concern a sub aircular archaeological depositor yery recent may
		27		possible, positive			an animal feeder or a coincidental arrangement of otherwise non-related anomalies
6	C	28		possible, positive	linear		
6	E	29		possible, positive	disrupted linear		
6	F	30		possible, terrous response		terrous material	
		31		possible, positive	disrupted linear	linear deposit or linear pit sequence	anomaly group is most likely to represent a linear deposit of unknown provenance but may represent a sec

	supporting evidence
oundary	Ordnance Survey 1889 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
etween 1889 and 1962	OS maps 1889 1:2500 to 1962 1:10560
and at least 1993	OS maps 1889 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ten represent demolition	
and at least 1993	OS maps 1889 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ten represent demolition	
en represent demolition	
oundary mapped	Ordnance Survey 1889 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
esent a former	OS maps 1889 1:2500
ing	
-	
ing	
agnetic response from	
equence of pits	

Site: An archaeological gradiometer survey Westwood, land adjoining junction 27, M5, Devon Ordnance Survey E/N: 304960,113560 (point) Report: 150623

survey sub	- anomaly	associated anomaly characterisation	anomaly form	additional archaeological	comments	supporting
area are	a group	anomalies certainty & class		characterisation		
7 A	32	possible, repeated parallels		ridge-and-furrow traces		
	33	likely, negative	linear	former field boundary	anomaly group within a Medieval strip field system recorded in the HER and coincides with a field boundary mapped	DCC HER
					between 1889 and 1962	OS maps 1
7 B	34	35 likely, positive	linear	former field boundary	anomaly group is likely to represent linear deposit associated with a former field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1962	OS maps 1
	35	34 likely, mixed spread	broad linear	former field boundary	anomaly group is likely to represent rubble and ground disturbance associated with the clearing of a former field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1962	OS maps 1
	36	possible, positive	linear			
	37	7 possible, positive	linear	linear deposit,		
		A		possible ploughing headland		
	38	possible, repeated parallels		ridge-and-furrow traces		
8 A	39	possible, mixed spread	irregular	stony deposit or rubble	anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups often represent demolition deposits or recently made-up ground	
	40	possible, positive	linear			
	41	possible, repeated parallels		ridge-and-furrow traces		
	1004	2003 possible low contrast linear		service	service such as a water nine laid along a former stream bed	
	2003	1004 possible, sinuous broad linear		filled palaeochannel	anomaly groups are indicative of a length of former stream bed with a relatively modern fill of material such as brick and stone and possibly a service pipe	
8 B	42	possible, positive	disrupted linear			
	43	possible, pos/neg/pos	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly group typical of a Devon Bank field boundary comprising a stone revetted earthen bank with flanking ditches	
	44	possible, repeated parallels		ridge-and-furrow traces		
8 C	45	possible, positive	curvilinear		it is unclear whether this group represents an archaeological deposit or recent ground disturbance but a curvilinear cropmark thought to represent a Medieval field boundary was recorded to the northeast of area 5C west of New Houndaller Farm	DCC HER
	46	possible, repeated parallels		ploughing traces	anomaly groups may represent ridge-and-furrow or later ploughing	
8 D	47	likely, positive	disrupted linear	former field boundary	these faint anomaly groups coincide with a former field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1962	OS maps 1
8 F	48	possible, mixed spread	stony deposit or rubble		anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups often represent demolition deposits or recently made-up ground	
	1005	possible, regular narrow linears		field drains		
	1006	possible, high contrast linear		ferrous-rich cable, pipe or drain		
	1007	possible, low contrast linear		service trench		
9 A	49	possible, positive	disrupted linear		anomaly group represents either ridge-and-furrow or a former field boundary	
	50) possible, pos/neg/pos	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly group may represent a Devon Bank field boundary comprising a stone revetted earthen bank with flanking ditches	
	51	possible, pos/neg/pos	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly groups are typical of those representing a former Devon Bank field boundary comprising a stone revetted earthen bank with flanking ditches	
	52	nossible nositive	linear		anomaly group within a Medieval strip field system recorded in the HER	DCC HER
	53	nossible positive	linear		anomaly group within a Medieval strip field system recorded in the HER	DCC HER
	54	possible, mixed spread	irregular	area of disturbed ground and rubble	anomaly groups indicate disturbed ground and rubble landfill; the north-western edge of the anomaly group corresponds with a former field boundary mapped between 1889 and 1980 but ramoved before 1993	OS maps 1
	54	possible reneated narallels		ridge-and-furrow traces	is not real country inapped control 1007 and 1700 out tentored before 1775	
9 R	56	b possible positive	linear			
<u></u>	57	nossible nos/neg/nos	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly groups are most likely to represent a former field boundary, possibly a Devon Bank, removed before 1889	
	1008	nossible regular narrow linears	uisrupteu intea	field drains or		
	1000	possible, regular harrow intears		nloughing disturbance		
9 C	58	possible, mixed spread	irregular	area of disturbed ground and rubble	anomaly group represents a deposit of rubble or stony material of unknown provenance; such groups often represent demolition deposits or recently made-up ground	
	59	possible, positive	disrupted linear			
	60	likely positive	disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly group coincides with a former field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1969 and as part	OS maps 1
			and ap tou moul		of a field lane between 1971 to at least 1993	00
9 D	61 62	likely, pos/neg/pos	linear disrupted linear	former field boundary	anomaly group coincides with a former Devon Bank field boundary mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1889 and 1980	OS maps 1
	1009	possible, regular narrow linears		field drains		
-	1010	possible, high contrast linear		ferrous-rich cable, nine		
	1010	possione, ingli contrast inical		or drain		
	1011	possible, high contrast linear		ferrous-rich cable, pipe		
	2004	possible week breed diret-		or utalli		
	2004	possible, weak broad dipole		spring		

entry MDV73524,
89 1:2500 to 1962 1:10560
89 1:2500 to 1962 1:10560
89 1:2500 to 1962 1:10560
ntry MDV107691
80 1:2500 to 1062 1:10560
89 1.2300 10 1902 1.10300
ntry MDV73524
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 39 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 39 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 39 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000
ntry MDV73524 ntry MDV73524 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000 89 1:2500 to 1993 1:10000

Appendix 3 Methodology Summary

Table 4: methodo	logy summary
------------------	--------------

Documents

Survey methodology statement: Dean (2014)

Methodology

- 1. The work was undertaken in accordance with the survey methodology statement. The geophysical (gradiometer) survey was undertaken with reference to standard guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) and Archaeology Data Service/ Digital Antiquity Guides (undated).
- 2. The survey grid location information and grid plan was recorded as part of the project in a suitable GIS system.
- 3. Data processing was undertaken using appropriate software, with all anomalies being digitised and geo-referenced. The final report included a graphical and textual account of the techniques undertaken, the data obtained and an archaeological interpretation of that data and conclusions about any likely archaeology.

Grid

DGPS set-out using pre-planned survey grids and Ordnance Survey coordinates.

- Geo-referenced and recorded using digital map tiles.
- Spectra Precision PM5V2 GPS with external antenna and survey pole and DigiTerra Explorer 7 as the survey control program.

Equipment Bartington Instruments grad601-2	Data Capture
Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation Software	
IntelliCAD Technology Consortium IntelliCAD 7.2	
DW Consulting TerraSurveyor3	
Manifold System 8 GIS	
Microsoft Corp. Office Excel 2013	
Microsoft Corp. Office Publisher 2013	
Adobe Systems Inc. Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro Extended	h

Appendix 4 Data processing

Note: converting the gradiometer data into ESRI GIS files imposed an x=y interpolation on the entire dataset