



# Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Petersfield, Hampshire

Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report

Document Ref.: 277000.02  
Apr 2023



© Wessex Archaeology Ltd 2023, all rights reserved

Unit R6  
Sheaf Bank Business Park  
Prospect Road  
Sheffield  
S2 3EN

[www.wessexarch.co.uk](http://www.wessexarch.co.uk)

Wessex Archaeology Ltd is a company limited by guarantee registered in England, company number 1712772. It is also a Charity registered in England and Wales number 287786, and in Scotland, Scottish Charity number SC042630. Our registered office is at Portway House, Old Sarum Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP4 6EB

#### Disclaimer

The material contained in this report was designed as an integral part of a report to an individual client and was prepared solely for the benefit of that client. The material contained in this report does not necessarily stand on its own and is not intended to nor should it be relied upon by any third party. To the fullest extent permitted by law Wessex Archaeology will not be liable by reason of breach of contract negligence or otherwise for any loss or damage (whether direct indirect or consequential) occasioned to any person acting or omitting to act or refraining from acting in reliance upon the material contained in this report arising from or connected with any error or omission in the material contained in the report. Loss or damage as referred to above shall be deemed to include, but is not limited to, any loss of profits or anticipated profits damage to reputation or goodwill loss of business or anticipated business damages costs expenses incurred or payable to any third party (in all cases whether direct indirect or consequential) or any other direct indirect or consequential loss or damage

## Document Information

Document title	Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Buriton, Hampshire
Document subtitle	Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report
Document reference	277000.02
Client name	The Clancy Group (Brighton)
Address	Lewes Road, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9PY
Site location	Petersfield GU31 5RS
County	Hampshire
National grid reference	Northern extent: 476801 122948 (SU 73780 20287) Southern extent: 474240 120544 (SU 74240 20544)
Statutory designations	
Planning authority	
Planning reference	
WA project name	Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Buriton, Hampshire
WA project code	277000
Date(s) of fieldwork	20 – 23 March 2023
Fieldwork directed by	Filippo Carrozzo & Pamela Warne
Project management by	Tom Richardson
Document compiled by	Lydia Jones
Contributions from	Pamela Warne
Graphics by	Lydia Jones

## Quality Assurance

Issue	Date	Author	Approved by
1	11/04/2023	Lydia Jones	Signature



## Contents

Summary .....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	ii
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project background.....	1
1.2 Scope of document.....	1
1.3 The site.....	1
<b>2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	2
2.2 Summary of the archaeological resource .....	2
2.3 Recent investigations in the surrounding area .....	4
<b>3 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	4
3.2 Aims and objectives.....	4
3.3 Fieldwork methodology .....	5
3.4 Data processing.....	5
<b>4 GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	5
4.2 Gradiometer survey results and interpretation .....	5
<b>5 DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1 Results .....	6
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Cartographic sources.....	8
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Appendix 1 Survey equipment and data processing.....	9
Appendix 2 Geophysical interpretation .....	11
Appendix 3 OASIS form.....	12

## List of Figures

<b>Figure 1</b>	Site location and boundary
<b>Figure 2</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: overall greyscale data
<b>Figure 3</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: overall interpretation
<b>Figure 4</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 001, 002 & 003
<b>Figure 5</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 001, 002 & 003
<b>Figure 6</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 003, 004 & 005
<b>Figure 7</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 003, 004 & 005
<b>Figure 8</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 005, 006, 007, 008, 009 & 010
<b>Figure 9</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 005, 006, 007, 008, 009 & 010
<b>Figure 10</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 011, 012, 013 & 014
<b>Figure 11</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 011, 012, 013 & 014
<b>Figure 12</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 014, 015, 016, 017 & 018
<b>Figure 13</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 014, 015, 016, 017 & 018
<b>Figure 14</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: greyscale LP 018, 019, 020 & 021
<b>Figure 15</b>	Detailed gradiometer survey results: interpretation LP 018, 019, 020 & 021



## Summary

A detailed gradiometer survey was conducted over land at Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Petersfield, Hampshire (located between NGR 476801 122948 (northern extent) and 474240 120544 (southern extent)). The project was commissioned by The Clancy Group with the aim of establishing the presence, or otherwise, and nature of detectable archaeological features in support of a planning application for the development of the site as a pipeline route between the Buriton Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and Petersfield WTW.

The site comprises arable and pasture fields located 350 m north-east of the village of Buriton at the southern extent, and at its northern extent 280 m east of the eastern edge of Petersfield, covering an area of 9.43 ha. The geophysical survey was undertaken between 20 – 23 March 2023. The detailed gradiometer survey has not identified any anomalies that are thought to be archaeological in nature. There are however anomalies related to the agricultural use of the site during the post-medieval period.

Several former mapped field boundaries have been detected which are recorded in the OS first edition (1869) and second edition (1895) mapping and have subsequently been removed. The wider area has been used agriculturally since at least the Iron Age, with an intensification of farming practices in the immediate area during the medieval period. The former field boundaries may therefore originate from a period earlier than the post-medieval.

Variations in the underlying deposits have been detected in the centre of the site, where the underlying geology changes to mudstone.

The remaining identified features were agricultural and likely modern in origin including drains, ploughing trends, magnetic trends and magnetic disturbance.

## Acknowledgements

Wessex Archaeology would like to thank The Clancy Group for commissioning the geophysical survey. The assistance of Adam Watson is gratefully acknowledged in this regard.

The fieldwork was undertaken by Callum Jervis, Filippo Carrozzo, Pamela Warne and Phoebe Baker. Lydia Jones processed the geophysical data, wrote the report, and prepared the illustrations. Lydia Jones and Pamela Warne interpreted the geophysical data. The geophysical work was quality controlled by Rok Plesnicar. The project was managed on behalf of Wessex Archaeology by Tom Richardson.



# Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Buriton, Hampshire

## Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report

### 1 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Project background

1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by The Clancy Group (Brighton) to carry out a geophysical survey at Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Buriton, Hampshire (located between NGR 476801 122948 (northern extent) and 474240 120544 (southern extent)) (**Figure 1**). The survey forms part of an ongoing programme of archaeological works being undertaken in support of a planning application for the development of the site as a pipeline route between the Buriton Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and Petersfield WTW.

#### 1.2 Scope of document

1.2.1 This report presents a brief description of the methodology followed by the detailed survey results and the archaeological interpretation of the geophysical data.

#### 1.3 The site

1.3.1 The site is located between Petersfield in the north-east to Buriton in the south-west, in the county of Hampshire.

1.3.2 The survey comprises 9.43 ha of agricultural land, currently utilised for pasture and arable crops. The site is bounded by Petersfield WTW and further agricultural land to the north-east, the town of Petersfield to the north-west, and further agricultural land to the east and west. The site is bounded by Buriton WTW and the village of Buriton to the south-west, and further agricultural land to the south-east. The site is bisected by the B2146 close to the settlement of Nursted, and by North Lane further south.

1.3.3 The site gradually decreases in elevation from 83 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) at the south-western extent to approximately 50 aOD at its north-eastern extent.

1.3.4 The solid geology varies across the site. In the south (LP\_001 - 009) it comprises calcareous Sandstone and Siltstone of the Upper Greensand Formation. In the centre of the site (LP\_010 - 017) it comprises Mudstone of the Gault Formation. Further north (LP\_018 – southern half of 020) it consists of Sandstone of the Folkestone Formation and Mudstone of Upper Marehill Clay (northern half of LP\_020, and LP\_021). Overlying superficial deposits have not been recorded for much of the southern and central areas of the site. A small inclusion of Clay, silt, sand and gravel of Head deposit has been recorded in LP\_003 – 004, and a band of Clay, silt, sand and gravel of Alluvium deposit has been recorded running east-west across LP\_011 - 013. Sand and gravel of the Sussex Rother Terrace Deposits 3 Member have been recorded in LP\_016 – southern extent of LP\_018, and Sand and gravel of River Terrace Deposits 2 have been recorded in the northern extent of LP\_018 - LP\_021 (BGS 2023).

1.3.5 The soils underlying the site are likely to consist of Stagnogleyic argillic brown earths of the 572k (Bignor) association at LP\_001 – 010, Typical brown calcareous earths of the 511g (Coombe 2) association at LP\_011 – 016 and Typical argillic brown earths of the 571g (Fyfield 4) association at LP\_017 – 021 (SSEW SE Sheet 6 1983). Soils derived from such



geological parent materials have been shown to produce magnetic contrasts acceptable for the detection of archaeological remains through magnetometer survey.

## 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The archaeological and historical background of the site was assessed in a prior desk-based assessment (DBA) (Reis, 2022), which considered the existing archaeological information within a 500 m radius of the proposed pipeline route. The DBA gathered information from various sources including the Historic Environment Record (HER) held by Hampshire County Council and from the Hampshire Record Office (HRO), Historic England, cartographic sources, aerial photographs and LiDAR data. The following background is not exhaustive but is summarised from aspects of the DBA that are considered relevant to the interpretation of the geophysical survey data. There is some variation in distances from assets to site due to small variations in the pipeline route between 2022 (DBA) and 2023 (this report).

### 2.2 Summary of the archaeological resource

2.2.1 Within the 500 m search area there are 2 scheduled monuments, 22 listed buildings and 1 conservation area.

2.2.2 Two scheduled monuments are located 500 m and 600 m west of LP\_017 & LP\_018. They consist of a twin bowl barrow dating from the late Neolithic to Bronze Age (NHLE 1016460) and a bowl barrow and two saucer barrows (NHLE 1016457). The monuments form part of a round barrow cemetery known as the Petersfield Heath Group consisting of 21 monuments, which is considered likely to have been much more extensive before the building of modern housing to the north and east.

2.2.3 The 22 listed buildings are all Grade II. Nine of the buildings are located in the historic core of Buriton 330 m to the south-west of LP\_001. Three of these are from the medieval-post-medieval periods, and the remainder have post-medieval origins. The remainder are isolated agricultural buildings scattered across the search area all originating in the post-medieval period. The closest to the site are those concentrated around the 18th century Nursted Farm which is located immediately to the north of LP006 – 007, and immediately to the west of LP\_008. The listed buildings here comprise farmhouse, stables, cart shed, granary and two barns.

2.2.4 Buriton Conservation Area is located 160 m to the south-east of LP\_001 and contains a number of important listed buildings including The Church of St Mary which dates from the 12-13th centuries and various other medieval and post-medieval buildings.

#### *Mesolithic*

2.2.5 Several archaeological investigations in the wider area have confirmed that Mesolithic communities were attracted to utilising land over Greensand Formation. Five findspots have been found in the search area. One flint scatter was found immediately to the east of LP\_020, one 260 m east of LP\_020, one 245 m north-east of LP\_021 and another 200 m north of LP\_017. A tranchet axe was found 50 m north of LP\_017.

#### *Neolithic*

2.2.6 Two findspots of Neolithic date have been recorded in the search area. An early Neolithic flint arrowhead and pottery sherd were found 120 m west of LP\_017, and a Neolithic finds were discovered during fieldwork 450 m south of LP\_002.

### *Bronze Age*

- 2.2.7 The Scheduled Petersfield Heath Group is mostly located just outside of the 500 m search area, to the north-west of the site. It is the densest concentration of Bronze Age barrows in south-east England and contains 23 surviving barrows, although it is thought to have once contained more. A twin bowl barrow (NHLE 1016460) and a bowl and two saucer barrows (NHLE 1016457) are located just within the search area. Bronze Age finds were discovered during field work 450 m south of LP\_002, and a palstave was found 200 m to the north-west of LP\_002. Three potential barrows have been recorded in the HER 500 m to the north-west of LP\_019 in an area of modern housing.

### *Iron Age – Romano-British*

- 2.2.8 Life between the Iron Age to Roman periods is thought to have not changed much for the majority of the population in the wider area, with field systems, roundhouses and farmsteads continuing in use. Iron Age and Romano-British pottery was found 310 m west of LP\_009 and 450 m to the south of LP\_002 is the location of Buriton Roman Villa.

### *Early medieval*

- 2.2.9 Settlements from the early medieval period are rare, with most evidence in the wider area coming from cemeteries. By the 9th century settlements were established along valleys and as a string of villages along the Greensand. They were associated with a system of common fields and by the 10th century has been formalised into a system of ecclesiastical parishes. There are currently no records from this period however surviving in the search area.

### *Medieval*

- 2.2.10 In this period after the Norman Conquest the wider area (then known as Wessex) saw an expansion of cultivated land (mainly based around corn), agricultural production (mainly sheep husbandry), settlements, trade and so wealth. Settlement in the search area was made up of nucleated settlements set within common arable land located in the valleys. The village of Buriton is not mentioned in this period however is thought that it could have been the principal settlement of the manor of Mapeldurham. Peterfield is also not recorded in the Domesday book but is thought to have formed part of the estate of Mapeldurham.
- 2.2.11 Three medieval – post-medieval listed buildings are located within Buriton (see Section 2.2.3). In addition to this Heath Farm settlement first documented in 1292 AD is located 370 m west of LP\_016. Two trackways (300 m to the south of LP\_002) to the east of Buriton, and a field system (500 m to the north-east of LP\_021) have been identified via aerial photography. Analyses of LiDAR data has identified a field boundary 500 m to the west of LP\_001.

### *Post-medieval*

- 2.2.12 The post-medieval period in the wider area saw the emergence of a modern market economy and a change to farms run by individuals. From 1650 sheepwalks began to be used for arable, evidenced by surviving areas of early enclosure. From the 1800s through to the 1960's the area was known for its hop growing industry. The Portsmouth to London railway line was constructed through the parish of Buriton in 1859. A station was built in Petersfield, but not Buriton. The period saw the expansion of Buriton and Petersfield and the formation of the current agricultural landscape.
- 2.2.13 An infilled pond site is recorded in the south-west corner of LP\_020, previously crossed by footpaths and also recorded as containing a draining ditch running south-east. Curvilinear features following the contours of the slope were identified on aerial photographs in LP\_003.





2.2.14 As well as the various post-medieval listed buildings, many undesignated post-medieval assets are recorded in the search area, mainly concentrated around Buriton and Petersfield. The WTW at Petersfield is first recorded in mapping on the 1932 OS map, and the WTW at Buriton in 1968.

*Undated*

2.2.15 An undated ditch oriented east-west was identified during excavation 130 m north of LP\_020.

2.2.16 Cropmarks are mapped in the DBA (Reis, 2022) to the west of Standbridge Farm, these may be the remnants of field boundaries.

### **2.3 Recent investigations in the surrounding area**

2.3.1 Between 2014 – 2018 geophysical survey and excavation was carried out by the People of the Heath project on the Bronze Age cemetery located on Petersfield Common just over 500 m to the north-west of the site.

2.3.2 In 2018 130 m north of LP\_020 19 trenches were excavated prior to the development of Harrier Way. An undated ditch oriented east-west was identified.

2.3.3 During the National Mapping Programme (NMP) three hollows, considered likely to be post-medieval extraction pits, were identified via aerial photography 480 m south of LP\_002 to the east of Buriton.

## **3 METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 The geophysical survey was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology's in-house geophysics team between the 20 – 23rd March 2023. Field conditions at the time of the survey were overcast and rainy throughout the period of survey. An overall coverage of 9.89 ha was achieved, with reductions due to overgrown areas, field edges and livestock.

### **3.2 Aims and objectives**

3.2.1 The aims of the survey comprise the following:

- To determine, as far as is reasonably possible, the nature of the detectable archaeological resource within a specified area using appropriate methods and practices; and
- To inform either the scope and nature of any further archaeological work that may be required; or the formation of a mitigation strategy (to offset the impact of the development on the archaeological resource); or a management strategy.

3.2.2 In order to achieve the above aims, the objectives of the geophysical survey are:

- To conduct a geophysical survey covering as much of the specified area as possible, allowing for on-site obstructions;
- To clarify the presence/absence of anomalies of archaeological potential; and
- Where possible, to determine the general nature of any anomalies of archaeological potential.

### 3.3 Fieldwork methodology

- 3.3.1 The cart-based gradiometer system used a Carlson RTK GNSS instrument, which receives corrections from a network of reference stations operated by the OS. Such instruments allow positions to be determined with a precision of 0.02 m in real-time and therefore exceeds European Archaeologiae Consilium recommendations (Schmidt *et al.* 2015).
- 3.3.2 The detailed gradiometer survey was undertaken using four Sensys FGM650/3 magnetic gradiometers spaced at 1 m intervals and mounted on a non-magnetic cart. Data were collected with an effective sensitivity of  $\pm 8 \mu\text{T}$  over  $\pm 1000 \text{ nT}$  range at a rate of 100 Hz, producing intervals of 0.02 m along transects spaced 4 m apart.

### 3.4 Data processing

- 3.4.1 Data from the survey were subjected to minimal correction processes. These comprise a 'Destripe' function ( $\pm 5 \text{ nT}$  thresholds), applied to correct for any variation between the sensors, and an interpolation used to grid the data and discard overlaps where transects have been collected too close together.
- 3.4.2 Further details of the geophysical and survey equipment, methods and processing are described in **Appendix 1**.

## 4 GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

### 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The detailed gradiometer survey has identified magnetic anomalies across the site. Results are presented as a series of greyscale plots (**Figs. 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14**) and archaeological interpretations (**Figs. 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 & 15**) at a scale of 1:2000. The data are displayed at -2 nT (white) to +3 nT (black) for the greyscale image.
- 4.1.2 The interpretation of the datasets highlights the presence of ferrous responses, burnt or fired objects, and magnetic trends (**Figs. 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 & 15**). Full definitions of the interpretation terms used in this report are provided in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.1.3 Numerous ferrous anomalies are visible throughout the dataset. These are presumed to be modern in provenance and are not referred to, unless considered relevant to the archaeological interpretation.
- 4.1.4 It should be noted that small, weakly magnetised features may produce responses that are below the detection threshold of magnetometers. It may therefore be the case that more archaeological features may be present than have been identified through geophysical survey.
- 4.1.5 Gradiometer survey may not detect all services present on site. This report and accompanying illustrations should not be used as the sole source for service locations and appropriate equipment (e.g., CAT and Genny) should be used to confirm the location of buried services before any trenches are opened on site.

### 4.2 Gradiometer survey results and interpretation

- 4.2.1 The geophysical survey has identified a number of features, however, none are likely to be associated with archaeological remains.
- 4.2.2 A weak positive linear anomaly has been identified in LP\_003 [**4000**] (**Figure 5**). It traverses the area on an east-west orientation and is 20 m long and 1 m wide. It is visible in the 1869 and 1895 OS mapping as a former field boundary, and as a linear cropmark in satellite imagery (Google Earth, 2023).



- 4.2.3 A strong positive anomaly [4001] has been identified 50 m to the north of 4000 in LP\_003 (Figure 5). It is nearly obscured by the strong magnetic halo to its south caused by a modern service. It measures 2.1 x 3.9 and is in the same place as a former field boundary seen in the 1869 and 1895 OS mapping. The strong signal of the modern service may be obscuring the remainder of this field boundary, alternatively the construction of the service may have destroyed it.
- 4.2.4 A strong fragmentary positive linear anomaly [4002] has been detected in LP\_005 (Figure 7). It is oriented east – west and measures 22.7 m long and between 1.5 - 2.2 m wide. It is visible in the 1869 and 1895 OS mapping as a former field boundary.
- 4.2.5 Various areas of enhanced magnetic signal have been detected across the site in LP\_013 – 015 & 017 (Figs. 11 & 13). They are considered typical of variations on the underlying deposits and the change to mudstone as the solid geology in these fields (see Section 1.3.4).
- 4.2.6 Various areas of magnetic disturbance have been detected across the site. They are considered to be modern and/or agricultural in origin. An area of low magnetic enhancement has been detected in LP\_11 [4003] (Figure 11). It is L-shaped and 40 m long and 7 m wide. It is in an area recorded in the DBA as containing cropmarks. It's origin is not clear but it could be a result of modern activity or potentially differences in the underlying superficial deposits.
- 4.2.7 Strong magnetic linear anomalies on various orientations have been detected within LP\_003, 005 – 007, 009 – 13 & 018 - 021 (Figs. 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 & 15). These are interpreted as modern services. In LP\_012 [4004] (Figure 11) a service has been detected in the same location as a man-made water channel recorded in the 1869 and 1897 OS mapping. The service continues eastwards over into LP\_011 whereas the channel is recorded as turning north. It is therefore either a service laid into or close to the old channel, or is the channel itself infilled with a magnetically enhanced material.
- 4.2.8 Various narrow positive and dipolar anomalies have been detected across the site. These are likely representative of the sites agricultural nature, in the form of cultivation and drainage, however many are too weak and lacking in distinctive morphology for a confident interpretation.

## 5 DISCUSSION

### 5.1 Results

- 5.1.1 The detailed gradiometer survey has not identified any anomalies that are thought to be archaeological in nature. There are however anomalies related to the agricultural use of the site during the post-medieval period.
- 5.1.2 Several former mapped field boundaries have been detected which are recorded in the OS first edition (1869) and second edition (1895) mapping and have subsequently been removed. The wider area has been used agriculturally since at least the Iron Age, with an intensification of farming practices in the immediate area during the medieval period. The former field boundaries may therefore originate from a period earlier than the post-medieval.
- 5.1.3 Variations in the underlying deposits have been detected in the centre of the site, where the underlying geology changes to mudstone.
- 5.1.4 The remaining identified features were agricultural and likely modern in origin including drains, ploughing trends, magnetic trends and magnetic disturbance.





## REFERENCES

### Bibliography

ADS 2013. *Caring for Digital Data in Archaeology: a guide to good practice*. Archaeology Data Service & Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists [CIfA] 2014 *Standards and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey*. Reading, CIfA.

Reis, K G 2022. *Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Hampshire: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*. Archaeology South East (ASE) Version 1

Schmidt, A., Linford, P., Linford, N., David, A., Gaffney, C., Sarris, A. and Fassbinder, J. 2015. *Guidelines for the use of geophysics in archaeology: questions to ask and points to consider*. EAC Guidelines 2, Belgium: European Archaeological Council.

### Online Resources

British Geological Survey 2023. *Geology of Britain Viewer*  
<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> (accessed March 2023)

Google Earth website <http://earth.google.com> (accessed March 2023)

Historic England (HE) <https://historicengland.org.uk> (accessed March 2023)

National Library of Scotland (NLS) <https://maps.nls.uk/geo/explore/> (accessed March 2023)

### Cartographic sources

Ordnance Survey 1983 *Soil Survey of England and Wales Sheet 6, Soils of South East England*. Southampton.



## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 Survey equipment and data processing

#### Survey methods and equipment

The magnetic data for this project were acquired using a non-magnetic cart fitted with four SenSys FGM650/3 magnetic gradiometers. The instrument has four sensor assemblies fixed horizontally 1 m apart allowing four traverses to be recorded simultaneously. Each sensor contains two fluxgate magnetometers arranged vertically with a 0.6 m separation and measures the difference between the vertical components of the total magnetic field within each sensor array. This arrangement of magnetometers suppresses any diurnal or low frequency effects.

The gradiometers have an effective resolution of  $\pm 8 \mu\text{T}$  over  $\pm 1000 \text{ nT}$  range. All of the data were then relayed to a CS35 tablet, running the MONMX program, which is used to record the survey data from the array of FGM650/3 probes at a rate of 20 Hz. The program also receives measurements from a GPS system, which is fixed to the cart at a measured distance from the sensors, providing real time locational data for each data point.

The cart-based system relies upon accurate GPS location data which is collected using a Carlson BRX7 system. This receives corrections from a network of reference stations operated by the Ordnance Survey, allowing positions to be determined with a precision of 0.02m in real-time and therefore exceed the level of accuracy recommended by European Archaeologiae Consilium recommendations (Schmidt *et al.* 2015) for geophysical surveys.

#### Post-processing

The magnetic data collected during the detail survey are downloaded from the Bartington system for processing and analysis using both commercial and in-house software. This software allows for both the data and the images to be processed in order to enhance the results for analysis; however, it should be noted that minimal data processing is conducted so as not to distort the anomalies.

As the scanning data are not as closely distributed as with detailed survey, they are georeferenced using the GPS information and interpolated to highlight similar anomalies in adjacent transects. Directional trends may be removed before interpolation to produce more easily understood images.

Typical data and image processing steps may include:

- Destripe – Applying a zero-mean traverse in order to remove differences caused by directional effects inherent in the magnetometer;
- Destagger – Shifting each traverse longitudinally by a number of readings. This corrects for operator errors and is used to enhance linear features;
- Despiking – Filtering isolated data points that exceed the mean by a specified amount to reduce the appearance of dominant anomalous readings (generally only used for earth resistance data)

Typical displays of the data used during processing and analysis:



- Greyscale – Presents the data in plan view using a greyscale to indicate the relative strength of the signal at each measurement point. These plots can be produced in colour to highlight certain features but generally greyscale plots are used during analysis of the data.
- XY Plot – Presents the data as a trace or graph line for each traverse. Each traverse is displaced down the image to produce a stacked profile effect. This type of image is useful as it shows the full range of individual anomalies. XY plots can be made available upon request.



## Appendix 2 Geophysical interpretation

The interpretation methodology used by Wessex Archaeology separates the anomalies into four main categories: archaeological, modern, agricultural, and uncertain origin/geological.

The archaeological category is used for features when the form, nature and pattern of the anomaly are indicative of archaeological material. Further sources of information such as aerial photographs may also have been incorporated in providing the final interpretation. This category is further sub-divided into three groups, implying a decreasing level of confidence:

- Archaeology – used when there is a clear geophysical response and anthropogenic pattern.
- Possible archaeology – used for features which give a response, but which form no discernible pattern or trend.

The modern category is used for anomalies that are presumed to be relatively modern in date:

- Ferrous – used for responses caused by ferrous material. These anomalies are likely to be of modern origin.
- Modern service – used for responses considered relating to cables and pipes; most are composed of ferrous/ceramic material although services made from non-magnetic material can sometimes be observed.

The agricultural category is used for the following:

- Former field boundaries – used for ditch sections that correspond to the position of boundaries marked on earlier mapping.
- Ridge and furrow – used for broad and diffuse linear anomalies that are considered to indicate areas of former ridge and furrow.
- Ploughing – used for well-defined narrow linear responses, usually aligned parallel to existing field boundaries.
- Drainage – used to define the course of ceramic field drains that are visible in the data as a series of repeating bipolar (black and white) responses.

The uncertain origin/geological category is used for features when the form, nature and pattern of the anomaly are not sufficient to warrant a classification as an archaeological feature. This category is further sub-divided into:

- Increased magnetic response – used for areas dominated by indistinct anomalies which may have some archaeological potential.
- Trend – used for low amplitude or indistinct linear anomalies.
- Superficial geology – used for diffuse edged spreads considered to relate to shallow geological deposits. They can be distinguished as areas of positive, negative, or broad bipolar (positive and negative) anomalies.





## Appendix 3 OASIS form

### Project Details:

<b>Project name</b>		Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Petersfield, Hampshire			
<b>Type of project</b>		Detailed gradiometer survey			
<b>Project description</b>		<p>The detailed gradiometer survey has not identified any anomalies that are thought to be archaeological in nature. There are however anomalies related to the agricultural use of the site during the post-medieval period.</p> <p>Several former mapped field boundaries have been detected which are recorded in the OS first edition (1869) and second edition (1895) mapping and have subsequently been removed. The wider area has been used agriculturally from at least the Iron Age, with an intensification of farming practices in the immediate area during the medieval period. The former field boundaries may therefore originate from a period earlier than the post-medieval.</p> <p>Variations in the underlying deposits have been detected in the centre of the site, where the underlying geology changes to mudstone.</p> <p>The remaining identified features were agricultural and likely modern in origin including drains, ploughing trends, magnetic trends and magnetic disturbance.</p>			
<b>Project dates</b>		<b>Start:</b> 20-03-2023		<b>End:</b> 23-03-23	
<b>Previous work</b>		DBA			
<b>Future work</b>		N/A			
<b>Project Code:</b>	PN277000	<b>HER event no.</b>	If relevant	<b>OASIS form ID:</b>	e.g., wessexar1-514687
		<b>NMR no.</b>	N/A		
		<b>SM no.</b>	N/A		
<b>Planning Application Ref.</b>		N/A			
<b>Site Status</b>		None			
<b>Land use</b>		Agricultural			
<b>Monument type</b>		N/A	<b>Period</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Location:</b>					
<b>Site Address</b>	Petersfield			<b>Postcode</b>	GU31 5RS
<b>County</b>	Hampshire	<b>District</b>	East Hampshire	<b>Parish</b>	Petersfield, Buriton
<b>Study Area</b>	9.89 ha	<b>Height OD</b>	83 – 50 m aOD	<b>NGR</b>	Northern extent: 476801 122948 Southern extent: 474240 120544
<b>Project Creators:</b>					
<b>Name of Organisation</b>		Wessex Archaeology			
<b>Project brief originator</b>		Clancy Group Ltd	<b>Project design originator</b>		Clancy Group Ltd
<b>Project Manager</b>		Tom Richardson	<b>Project Supervisor</b>		Lydia Jones
<b>Sponsor or funding body</b>		Clancy Group Ltd	<b>Type of Sponsor</b>		Private
<b>Project Archive and Bibliography:</b>					
<b>Physical archive</b>	N/A	<b>Digital Archive</b>	Geophysical survey and report	<b>Paper Archive</b>	N/A
<b>Report title</b>	Buriton Pipeline Scheme, Petersfield, Hampshire			<b>Date</b>	2023
<b>Author</b>	Wessex Archaeology	<b>Description</b>	Unpublished report	<b>Report ref.</b>	PN277000.02



Wessex Archaeology Ltd registered office Portway House, Old Sarum Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 6EB  
Tel: 01722 326867 Fax: 01722 337562 info@wessexarch.co.uk www.wessexarch.co.uk



FS 606559