

An archaeological magnetometer survey

# Land at West Buckland junction A361, Devon

Centred on NGR: 265600,129590

Report: 1806WES-R-1

Ross Dean BSc MSc MA MCIfA Mark Edwards BA

23 August 2018

Substrata Ltd Langstrath Goodleigh Barnstaple Devon EX32 7LZ Tel: 01271 342721 Email: geophysics@substrata.co.uk Web: substrata.co.uk Client Devon County Council Matford Offices County Hall Topsham Road Exeter EX2 4QD

# Contents

1.	Introduction	.1			
2.	Client	.1			
3.	Copyright	.1			
4.	Survey type and location	.1			
5.	Summary	.1			
6.	Aims and objectives	.2			
7.	Standards	.2			
8.	Methodology	.2			
9.	Survey Area	.2			
10.	Archaeological background	.3			
11.	Results	.3			
12.	Discussion	.4			
13.	Conclusions	.5			
14.	Disclaimer	.5			
15.	Archive	.5			
16.	Acknowledgements	.5			
17.	Bibliography	.5			
Appendix 1 Figures					
Appendix 2 Tables					
App	endix 3 Project archive contents	Appendix 3 Project archive contents			

# Figures

Figure 1: location map	8
Figure 2: survey interpretation	9
Figure 3: shade plot of processed data	10
Figure 4: contour plot of processed data	11
Figure 5: shade plot of minimally processed data	12
Figure 6: survey grid plan and location	13

# Tables

Table 1: data analysis	15
Table 2: methodology information	16
Table 3: processed data metadata	17
Table 4: minimally processed data metadata	18
Table 5: example geological test pit and borehole logs from the route of the A361 south of	
the Survey Area	19

#### 1 Introduction

This report presents the results of an archaeological geophysical survey at the site listed in Section 4 and shown in Figure 1, hereafter referred to as the 'Survey Area'. It was commissioned by Devon County Council in support of a proposed development. The commissioning of this report was in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework, Chapter 16, Paragraph 189 (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2018).

The survey and report were completed in compliance with a Survey Method Statement (Dean, 2018).

#### 2 Client

Devon County Council, Matford Offices, County Hall, Topsham Road, Exeter EX2 4QD

#### 3 Copyright

Substrata Ltd shall retain full copyright as defined in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with all rights reserved, excepting that it hereby provides an exclusive licence to the Client for the use of the report by the Client in all matters directly relating to the project. Any document produced to meet planning requirements may be freely copied for planning, development control, education and research purposes without recourse to the Copyright owner subject to all due and appropriate acknowledgements being provided. This report contains material that is non-Substrata Limited copyright or the intellectual property of third parties. Such material is labelled with the appropriate copyright and is non-transferrable by Substrata Ltd.

© Substrata Ltd 2018

4 Survey type and location

4.1	Survey						
	Method:	shallow depth magnetometer survey					
	Instrument:	twin-sensor fluxgate gradiometer					
	Date:	18 and 20 July 2018					
	Area:	2.4ha					
4.2	Location						
	Location:	Land at West Buckland junction, A361					
	Civil Parish:	East and West Buckland					
	District:	North Devon					
	County:	Devon					
	Nearest postcode:	EX32 0SB					
	Survey centre NGR:	SS 65600 29590					
	Survey centre NGR (E/N):	265600,129590					
	Historic environment designation:	None					
	OASIS ID:	substrat1-325628					

5 Summary

A magnetometer survey was selected to provide a relatively fast and cost-effective evaluation of any buried archaeology across the Survey Area (see Section 14). The magnetic anomaly groups pertaining to potential buried archaeology were georeferenced to the Ordnance Survey National Grid, mapped, characterised and assigned with an appropriate degree of certainty in conformance with the survey aims and objectives set out in Section 6.

The differences in magnetic responses across the Survey Area were sufficient to be able to differentiate between anomalies representing possible buried archaeology and background magnetic responses.

Fifteen magnetic anomaly groups were characterised as representing potential archaeological deposits. Of these, three groups are likely to represent field boundaries recorded on the 1840

Tithe Map but not on later historic Ordnance Survey maps. Three groups may depict linear archaeological deposits such as ditches. They are straight and on a different orientation to surrounding extant field boundaries that have likely medieval origins. They have not been recorded on historic maps dating from 1840 onwards. Three additional groups have comparable characteristics and may represent similar buried archaeology. Two groups may indicate the presence archaeological pits although natural origins cannot be ruled out. One group may represent a curvilinear deposit such as a ditch. It is not clear whether or not this group conforms to the pattern of the surrounding field boundaries but it does conform to the contours of the land within the field. Three groups may represent linear archaeological deposits of uncertain provenance.

#### 6 Aims and objectives

#### 6.1 Aims

- 1. Within the framework set out in Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a), complete an archaeological geophysical survey and report which will, as far as possible, establish the presence or absence, extent and character of any buried archaeology within the Survey Area.
- 2. Provide sufficient information on the nature of any archaeological remains to facilitate the assessment of their interest and any implications for the proposed development.

#### 6.2 Objectives

- 1. Complete a magnetometer survey across the Survey Area.
- 2. Identify any magnetic anomalies that may be related to buried archaeology.
- 3. Within the limits of the technique and dataset, archaeologically characterise any such anomalies or patterns of anomalies.
- 4. Accurately record the location of the identified anomalies.
- 5. Produce a report based on the survey that is sufficiently detailed to inform any subsequent development on the survey area about the location and possible archaeological character of the recorded anomalies.

#### 7 Standards

The standards used to complete this survey are defined by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a) and Historic England (2008). The codes of approved practice that were followed are those of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014b) and Archaeology Data Service (undated).

#### 8 Methodology

The magnetometer survey was undertaken in accordance a Survey Method Statement (Dean, 2018) to achieve the aims and objectives set out in Section 6 using the standards and guidance specified in Section 7. The survey method was selected to provide a relatively fast and cost-effective evaluation of any buried archaeology across the Survey Area (see Section 14).

Data processing was undertaken using appropriate software (Table 2), with all anomalies being digitised and geo-referenced. The final report (this document) includes 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. The survey and report conform to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists standard for geophysical survey (CIFA, 2014a).

#### 9 Survey Area

#### 9.1 Location and description

The Survey Area is part of a single field to the north of the A361 at the West Buckland junction to the east of Barnstaple (Figure 1). The field is bounded by hedges and wire fencing.

The Survey Area was under grass at the time of the survey.

#### 9.2 Geology

The bedrock across the Survey Area is mudstone of the Carboniferous and Devonian Pilton

Mudstone Formation. Generically, these rocks are grey mudstones and siltstones with thin- to thick-bedded, locally calcareous sandstones and beds and lenses of limestone. Sandstones are thickest and predominate in the lower half of the formation, whereas mudstones predominate in the upper half. Table 5 includes a description of the near-surface bedrock close to the Survey Area. The superficial geology is not recorded in the source used (British Geological Survey, undated).

A site-relevant example of a geotechnical log and borehole log of near-surface deposits are provided in Table 5 (ibid).

#### 9.3 Soils

The topsoil is 'Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils' with (LandIS, undated).

- 10 Archaeological background
- 10.1 Historic landscape characterisation

'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 (Devon County Council, undated).

#### 10.2 Statement of research

The Devon County Council Historic Environment Record was examined via the Heritage Gateway (Historic England, undated) to gain an appreciation of historic assets pertinent to the geophysical survey data within approximately 500m of the survey area perimeter. Whilst providing a useful context for the data analysis, this source is not comprehensive and detailed publication of the information in commercial reports is not permitted.

#### 11 Results

#### 11.1 Scope and definitions

This survey was designed to record magnetic anomalies. A magnetic anomaly is a local variation in the Earth's magnetic field. Such variations can result from variations in the magnetic properties of the underlying solid geology, superficial geology and other near-surface deposits including those altered and created by past human activities. Near-surface artefacts can also create magnetic anomalies.

The dimensions of magnetic anomalies mapped as representing potential buried archaeology do not represent the dimensions of any associated archaeology.

The analysis presented below identifies and characterises anomalies and anomaly groups that may relate to buried archaeology.

#### 11.2 Analysis

Figure 2 shows the interpretation of the survey data and includes the anomaly groups identified as possibly relating to archaeological deposits along with their identifying numbers. Table 1 is an extract of the detailed analysis of the survey data sourced from the attribute tables of the GIS project provided in the project archive.

Figure 2 and Table 1 comprise the analysis of the survey data.

Figures 3 and 4 are plots of the processed data as specified in Table 3. Figure 5 is a plot of minimally processed data as specified in Table 4. Figure 6 shows the location of the survey grid and grid data files.

#### 12 Discussion

#### 12.1 General points

#### Scope

Not all anomalies or anomaly groups identified in Table 1 are necessarily discussed below. All identified anomaly groups are recorded in the GIS project held in the survey archive.

#### Data collection

Data collection along the survey area edges was restricted as shown in the figures due to the presence of magnetic materials within and adjacent to boundaries. Strong magnetic responses mapped close to the boundaries are likely to relate to these materials except where otherwise indicated in Figure 2 and Table 1.

#### Anomaly characterisation

There are a number of anomaly groups that could be interpreted as relating to large postholes or pits although most will have natural origins. Anomalies of this sort are mapped as potential archaeology when they are associated with other significant anomaly groups or otherwise formed recognisable patterns as listed in Table 1.

Anomalies thought to relate to natural features and recent man-made objects such as manholes, water management equipment, drains, cables and other services are only mapped where they comprise significant magnetic responses across the dataset that need clarification.

Numerous dipole magnetic anomalies are present within the dataset. These are likely to represent recent ferrous objects. They are only mapped if they could influence the analysis of anomaly groups thought to have an archaeological origin.

#### Data trends

An approximately north-south multiple linear trend in the data (Figures 3 and 4) is likely to relate to relatively recent ploughing.

12.2 Data relating to historic maps and other records

Referring to Figure 2, magnetic anomaly groups 1, 2 and 11 represent field boundaries recorded on the 1840 Chittlehampton (Leary, detached) Tithe Map but not on historic Ordnance Survey maps. These groups conform to the general trends of adjacent, extant field boundaries with the exception of those related to the A361 and the earlier, now removed, Devon and Somerset Railway line (1871-3 to 1966).

In general, the field boundaries in the vicinity were probably first enclosed with hedge-banks during the later middle ages (Section 10.1) which implies that these anomaly groups represent former field boundaries dating from the later middle ages and removed prior to the mapping completed for the 1889 Ordnance Survey 1:2500 First Edition map of the area.

#### 12.3 Data with no previous archaeological provenance

Magnetic anomaly groups 4, 8, and 12, and possibly groups 10, 13 and 14, are on a different orientation to the nearby extant field boundaries and are very clear in the dataset. It is unlikely that these anomaly groups represent recent ground disturbance and so they may indicate the presence of archaeological deposits such as ditches.

Groups 5 and 7 are distinct in the dataset and may represent archaeological pits although a natural origin cannot be ruled out.

Group 9 may represent a curvilinear deposit such as a ditch. It is not clear whether or not this group conforms to the pattern of the surrounding field boundaries but it does conform to the contours of the land within the field.

Groups 3, 6 and 15 may represent linear archaeological deposits such as ditches.

#### 13 Conclusions

The differences in magnetic responses across the Survey Area were sufficient to be able to differentiate between anomalies representing possible buried archaeology and background magnetic responses.

Fifteen magnetic anomaly groups were characterised as representing potential archaeological deposits. Of these, three groups (1, 2 and 11) are likely to represent field boundaries recorded on the 1840 Tithe Map but not on later historic Ordnance Survey maps. Three groups (4, 8, 12) may depict linear archaeological deposits such as ditches. They are straight and on a different orientation to surrounding extant field boundaries that have likely medieval origins. They have not been recorded on historic maps dating from 1840 onwards. Three additional groups (10, 13 and 14) have comparable characteristics and may represent similar buried archaeology. Two groups (5 and 7) may indicate the presence archaeological pits although natural origins cannot be ruled out. One group (9) may represent a curvilinear deposit such as a ditch. It is not clear whether or not this group conforms to the pattern of the surrounding field boundaries but it does conform to the contours of the land within the field. Three groups (3, 6 and 15) may represent linear archaeological deposits of uncertain provenance.

#### 14 Disclaimer

The description and discussion of the results presented in this report are the authors', based on their 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.

#### 15 Archive

- 15.1 Online Access to the Index of archaeological investigationS (OASIS) OASIS ID: substrat1-325628 The OASIS entry has been completed and the boundary file and report uploaded with six months delay in publication.
- 15.2 Substrata Limited archive A full archive of this survey will be held by Substrata Limited on cloud and local hard drive storage as specified in Appendix 3.
- 15.3 Archaeological Data Service (ADS) Depending on local authority policy, an archive may be deposited with the ADS as specified in Appendix 3.
- 15.4 Historic Environment Record (HER) Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, a PDF or printed copy of the report will be submitted to the appropriate HER within six months of completion.
- 16 Acknowledgements

Substrata would like to thank Stephen Reed, Senior Historic Environment Officer, Devon County Council, for commissioning us to complete this survey.

17 Bibliography

Archaeology Data Service (undated). Archaeology Data Service/Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice: Geophysical Data in Archaeology, 2nd Edition [online]. Available at: http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Geophysics Toc [Accessed 13 Jul. 2018]

British Geological Survey (undated). *Geology of Britain viewer*, 1:50000 scale data [online]. Available at: http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discovering Geology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html

[Accessed 13 Aug. 2018]

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a). *Standard and guidance archaeological geophysical survey* [online]. Available at: http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ CIfAS&GGeophysics\_1.pdf [Accessed 13 Jul. 2018]

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014b). *Code of conduct* [online]. Available at http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CodesofConduct.pdf [Accessed 13 Jul. 2018]

Clark, A. (2000). Seeing Beneath the Soil, Prospecting methods in archaeology. London: Routledge

Devon County Council (undated). *Historic Environment, environment and planning* [online]. Available at https://new.devon.gov.uk/historicenvironment/ [Accessed 13 Aug. 2018]

Dean, R. (2018). *Magnetometer survey method statement. Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon.* Substrata Ltd unpublished document 1806WES-M-1

Historic England (undated). *Heritage Gateway* [online]. Available at: http:// www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/ [Accessed 25 Jul. 2018]

Historic England (2008). *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation* [online]. Available at: https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geophysical-survey-in-archaeological-field-evaluation/geophysics-guidelines.pdf/ [Accessed 13 Jul. 2018]. LandIS (undated) *Cranfield Soils and Agrifood Institute Soilscapes* [online]. Available: http:// www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/ [Accessed 13 Aug. 2018]

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018). *National Planning Policy Framework* [online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/728643/Revised\_NPPF\_2018.pdf [Accessed 13 Aug. 2018]

## Appendix 1 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.





Geophysical survey: Copyright Substrata Limited. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2018. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

#### Scale: 1:800 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

#### Notes:

- 1. All interpretations are provisional and represent potential archaeological deposits.
- 2. 'Anomaly type' is a description of the magnetic anomaly. See the report text or GIS for an archaeological characterisation.
- 3. Anomalies designated "likely archaeology" have supporting evidence e.g. historical maps and or visible earthworks.
- 4. Not all instances are mapped.
- 5. Anomalies likely to represent recent deposits or ground disturbance, or geological and other natural deposits are not mapped unless relevant to potential buried archaeology.

An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

Figure 2: survey interpretation



British Grid centre X: 265585.84 m, centre Y: 129581.24 m Geophysical survey: Copyright Substrata Limited. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2018. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:800 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

Figure 3: shade plot of processed data



**British Grid** centre X: 265578.93 m, centre Y: 129585.08 m

Geophysical survey: Copyright Substrata Limited. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2018. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:800 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

Figure 4: contour plot of processed data



Geophysical survey: Copyright Substrata Limited. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2018. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:800 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

Figure 5: shade plot of minimally processed data



British Grid centre X: 265585.84 m, centre Y: 129581.24 m

Geophysical survey: Copyright Substrata Limited. Base map: Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2018. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Scale: 1:800 @ A3. Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing

An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

Figure 6: survey grid plan and location

Appendix 2 Tables

#### An archaeological magnetometer survey Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR: 265600,129590 Report: 1806WES-R-1

anomaly	anomaly characterisation	anomaly form	additional archaeological	comments	supporting evidence
group	certainty & class		characterisation		
1	likely, positive/negative/positive	curvilinear	field boundary - possible Devon Bank	anomaly group coincides with, and likely represents, a field boundary recorded on the tithe map but not	1840 Chittlehampton (Leary, detached),
				on later historic OS maps	Ordnance Survey 1889 1:2500 and later maps
2	likely, positive/negative/positive	disrupted curvilinear	field boundary - possible Devon Bank	anomaly group coincides with, and likely represents, a field boundary recorded on the tithe map but not	1840 Chittlehampton (Leary, detached),
				on later historic OS maps	Ordnance Survey 1889 1:2500 and later maps
3	possible, positive	disrupted linear	archaeological deposits or recent ground disturbance		
4	possible, positive	disrupted return		anomaly group is well defined and does not conform with the trend of extant adjacent field boundaries	Devon County Council Historic Landscape
		-		which are likely to be based on medieval strip fields enclosed in the later middle ages	Characterisation
5	possible, positive	oval	archaeological or natural deposit	there are a number of similar anomaly groups in the data, this is included in the analysis as being	
				one of two particularly well-defined responses	
6	possible, positive	disrupted curvilinear	archaeological or natural deposits		
7	possible, positive	oval	archaeological or natural deposit	there are a number of similar anomaly groups in the data, this is included in the analysis as being	
				one of two particularly well-defined responses	
8	possible, positive	linear			
9	possible, positive	curvilinear			
10	possible, positive	linear		anomaly group appears to be on a similar orientation to group 12	
11	likely, positive	disrupted curvilinear	field boundary - possible ditch	anomaly group coincides with, and likely represents, a field boundary recorded on the tithe map but not	1840 Chittlehampton (Leary, detached),
				on later historic OS maps	Ordnance Survey 1889 1:2500 and later maps
12	possible, positive	disrupted linear		anomaly group is well defined and does not conform with the trend of extant adjacent field boundaries	Devon County Council Historic Landscape
				which are likely to be based on medieval strip fields enclosed in the later middle ages	Characterisation
13	possible, positive	disrupted linear		anomaly group appears to be on a similar orientation to group 4	
14	possible, positive	linear		anomaly group appears to be on a similar orientation to group 4	
15	possible, positive	disrupted linear			

Table 1: data analysis

<ul> <li>Grid</li> <li>Method of Fixing: DGPS set-out using pre-planned survey grids and Ordnance Survey coordinates.</li> <li>Composition: 30m by 30m grids</li> <li>Recording: Geo-referenced and recorded using digital map tiles.</li> <li>DGPS used: Spectra Precision PM5V2 GPS with external antenna and survey pole and DigiTerra Explorer 7 as the survey control program.</li> </ul>			
<b>Equipment</b> Instrument: Bartington Instruments grad601-2 Firmware: version 6.1	Data Capture Sample Interval: 0.25m Traverse Interval: 1 metre Traverse Method: zigzag Traverse Orientation: GN		
Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation Software IntelliCAD 8.4 DW Consulting TerraSurveyor3 Manifold System 8 GIS Microsoft Corp. Office 365: Excel, Publisher, Word Adobe Systems Inc Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro Extended			

Table 2: methodology information

Instrument Type: Units: Direction of 1 Collection Me Sensors: Dummy Valu Program Name: Version:	Instrument         Type:       Bartington Grad-601 gradiometer         Units:       nT         Direction of 1st Traverse: see below         Collection Method:       ZigZag         Sensors:       2 @ 1.00 m spacing, each with 1m separation         Dummy Value:       32702         Program       Name:         Name:       TerraSurveyor         Version:       3.0.33.6				
Statistics Max: Min: Std Dev: Mean: Median:	146.76 -148.75 6.16 0.19 0.00	<ul> <li>Processing</li> <li>I Base Layer</li> <li>Clip at 2.00 SD</li> <li>DeStripe Median Sensors: Grids: All</li> <li>4 De Stagger: Grids: b18.xgd b17.xgd By: 0 intervals, 50.00cm</li> <li>5 De Stagger: Grids: b2.xgd By: 0 intervals, 25.00cm</li> <li>6 De Stagger: Grids: SubGrid (Area: Top 64, Left 120, Bottom 75, Right 239) By: 0 intervals, -25.00cm</li> <li>8 De Stagger: Grids: b3.xgd By: 0 intervals, 25.00cm</li> <li>9 De Stagger: Grids: b3.xgd By: 0 intervals, 25.00cm</li> <li>10 De Stagger: Grids: b3.xgd By: 0 intervals, 25.00cm</li> <li>10 De Stagger: Grids: b3.xgd By: 0 intervals, 25.00cm</li> <li>10 De Stagger: Grids: SubGrid (Area: Top 30, Left 480, Bottom 49, Right 599) By: 0 intervals, -25.00cm</li> <li>11 De Stagger: Grids: SubGrid (Area: Top 32, Left 120, Bottom 53, Right 239) By: 0 intervals, 50.00cm</li> <li>12 Move (Area: Top 46, Left 579, Bottom 47, Right 599) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>13 Move (Area: Top 46, Left 578, Bottom 49, Right 597) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>14 Move (Area: Top 72, Left 240, Bottom 73, Right 359) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>15 Move (Area: Top 76, Left 241, Bottom 71, Right 358) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>16 Move (Area: Top 80, Left 241, Bottom 71, Right 358) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>17 Move (Area: Top 90, Left 241, Bottom 91, Right 358) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>19 Move (Area: Top 104, Left 243, Bottom 105, Right 266) to X 2, Y 0</li> <li>20 Move (Area: Top 140, Left 243, Bottom 137, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>22 Move (Area: Top 146, Left 241, Bottom 137, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>23 Move (Area: Top 144, Left 243, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>24 Move (Area: Top 144, Left 244, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>25 Move (Area: Top 144, Left 244, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>26 Move (Area: Top 144, Left 244, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>27 Move (Area: Top 144, Left 244, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>28 Move (Area: Top 148, Left 241, Bottom 147, Right 359) to X -2, Y 0</li> <li>29 Move (Area: Top 148, Left 241, Bottom</li></ul>			

Table 3: processed data metadata

Instrument						
Type: Bartington C	Type: Bartington Grad-601 gradiometer					
Units: n	Т					
Direction of 1st Traverse: s	ee below					
Collection Method: Z	igZag					
Sensors: 2	ⓐ 1.00 m spacing, each with 1m separation					
Dummy Value: 3	2702					
Program						
Name: TerraS	Name: TerraSurveyor					
Version: 3.0.33.6						
Statistics	Processing					
Max: 293.22	1 Base Layer					
Min: -294.21	2 Clip at 4.00 SD					
Std Dev: 9.27	•					
Mean: -0.04	Interpolate match x & y double is imposed on export to the GIS					
Median: -0.10						

Table 4: minimally processed data metadata

# Site: Land at West Buckland junction, A361, Devon Centred on NGR 265600,129590

BGS ID	BGS	NGR	method	strata	depth	level	thickness
	reference	(E/N)			(m)	(m aOD)	(m)
706800	SS62NE110	265600,129470	mechanical	dark brown TOPSOIL			0.30
			excavator	firm to stiff orange CLAY with occasional grey patches	0.30 to 1.00	114.20 to 113.50	0.70
				firm to stiff light grey/orange brown (mottled) CLAY with occasional completely decomposed SHALE and	1.00 to 2.00	113.50 to 112.50	1.00
				silty SHALE. Also some gravel sized fragments of highly weathered silty SHALE			
				highly weathered dark grey SHALE and GRAVEL in a light grey/light brown silty clay matrix 'Damp'	2.00 to 2.70	112.50 to 111.80	0.70
				light grey, thickly laminated, well jointed, highly weathered SHALE, moderately weak, becoming	2.70 to 3.65	111.80 to 110.25	0.95
				strong below 3.20m			
				end of trial pit			
706801	SS62NE111	265530,129470	borehole	brown sandy TOPSOIL			0.05
				brown silty CLAY	0.05 to 0.45	115.10 to 114.70	0.40
				brown gravelly CLAY with fragments of siltstone and shale completely weathered shale and SILTSTONE	0.45 to 1.80	114.70 to 113.35	1.35
				dark grey completely to highly weathered SHALE (recovered as a shale gravel in a silty matrix)	1.80 to 2.90	113.35 to 112.25	1.10
				dark grey, closely jointed, thinly cleaved, moderately to slightly weathered, fissile SHALE weak	2.90 to 7.30	112.25 to 107.85	4.40
				dark grey to light grey, thickly laminated to thinly bedded fresh, SILTSTONE, moderately strong to strong	7.30 to 8.20	107.85 to 106.95	0.90
				light grey stringers crosscutting bedding.			
				end of borehole			

Table 5: example geological test pit and borehole logs from the route of the A361 south of the Survey Area (British Geological Survey, undated).

## Appendix 3 Project archive contents

A3.1 Substrata Limited archive

A full archive of this survey will be held by Substrata Limited on cloud and local hard drive storage as follows:

Report:	Adobe PDF (.pdf), Microsoft Publisher (.pub)
Raw grid date files:	DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 (.xgd) and
	XYZ (.dat)
Minimally processed data composite files:	DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 (.xgd) and ESRI ASCII (.asc)
Final data processing composite files:	DW Consulting TerraSurveyor 3 (.xgd) and
	ESRI ASCII (.asc)
GIS project:	GIS project Manifold 8 (.map)
Survey interpretation:	ESRI shape files
AutoCAD version of the survey interpretation:	AutoCAD (.dwg)
(if generated)	
All project working files:	IntelliCAD 8.4
	Microsoft Corp. Office 365: Excel, Publisher, Word
	Adobe Systems Inc Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro
	Extended

A3.2 Online Access to the Index of archaeological investigationS (OASIS) Metadata: online form Georeferenced survey boundary file: ESRI shape file Report: Adobe PDF (.pdf)

A3.3 Archaeological Data Service Depending on local authority policy, an archive may be deposited with the ADS as follows:

Raw data composite file: Processed data plot: Survey grid plot: Details of data processing: Interpretation plot: Metadata: XYZ file rendered images in TIFF format image in TIFF format image in TIFF format rendered images in TIFF format Microsoft Excel format

A3.4 Historic Environment Record (HER) Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, a PDF copy of the report will be submitted to the appropriate HER within 6 months of the completion of this report via the

OASIS process or by other means, depending on the relevant HER process.