

Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex

Geophysical Survey (Magnetic)

by Rebecca Constable and Tim Dawson

Site Code: BHH12/173

(TQ 1520 3170)

Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex

Geophysical Survey (Magnetic) Report

For M J Gleeson Group plc

by Rebecca Constable and Tim Dawson

Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd

Site Code BHH 12/173

October 2015

Summary

Site name: Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex

Grid reference: TQ 1520 3170

Site activity: Magnetometer survey

Date and duration of project: 7th - 10th September 2015

Project manager: Sean Wallis

Site supervisor: Tim Dawson

Site code: BHH 12/173

Area of site: 9.3ha

Summary of results: A variety of magnetic anomalies were identified, several of which may represent buried features of archaeological origin. In addition to these, several strong anomalies were recorded which match with field boundaries plotted on 19th century maps of the area. Another anomaly of note was a large circular area with a strong magnetic reading located towards the centre of the site which represents a bomb crater dating to the Second World War.

Location of archive: The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading in accordance with TVAS digital archiving policies.

This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder. All TVAS unpublished fieldwork reports are available on our website: www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp.

Report edited/checked by: Steve Ford ✓ 05.11.15

Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex A Geophysical Survey (Magnetic)

by Rebecca Constable and Tim Dawson

Report 12/173b

Introduction

This report documents the results of a geophysical survey (magnetic) carried out on an irregular plot of land to the north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex (TQ 1520 3170) (Fig. 1). The work was commissioned by Mr Mark Jackson of M J Gleeson Group plc, Sentinel House, Harvest Crescent, Ancells Business Park, Fleet, Hampshire GU51 2UZ.

Planning permission (DC/13/2408) has been gained on appeal (APP/Z3825/A/14/2224668) from Horsham District Council to construct new housing and a care home on across an area currently occupied by two fields. As subject to a condition which requires the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, consisting of geophysical survey and subsequent targeted trenching. This is in accordance with the Department for Communities and Local Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012), and the District's policies on archaeology. The field investigation was carried out to a specification approved by Mr Martin Brown, Principal Archaeologist at WYG. The fieldwork was undertaken by Tim Dawson, Anna Ginger, Naomi Humphreys, David Sanchez and Clara Schonfeld between 7th and 10th September 2015 and the site code is BHH 12/173.

The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading in accordance with TVAS digital archiving policies.

Location, topography and geology

The development area is irregular in plan, covering an area of *c*.9.3 ha, and is centred on NGR TQ 1520 3170 (Fig. 2). It is bounded to the south-west and south by residential housing and the Shelley Arms public house, and to the west, north and east by farmland and woodland. There is a stream just beyond the northern boundary. The site is largely composed of two arable fields, which are separated by a north-south footpath. This footpath follows a former parish boundary, and a hedge and ditch were noted to the side of it. Most of the site is surrounded by hedges which are interspersed with mature trees. A rectangular area at the southern end of the site, which fronts onto Horsham Road, currently consists of overgrown vegetation. The site generally slopes down towards the north-west, and the height above Ordnance Datum varies from about 48m in the south-east

corner to 35m in the north-west corner. According to the British Geological Survey (BGS 1972), the underlying geology consists of Horsham Stone formation of the Wealden clay.

The weather during the survey period was dry and sunny although it had rained during the preceding week, leaving the ground soft and wet although this soon dried out.

Site history and archaeological background

The site itself was the subject of a desk-based assessment (Wallis 2012) which, in summary, concluded that it lies within an immediate area of apparently modest archaeological potential where there are no previously recorded archaeological sites or finds. However, it is considered likely that this absence reflects an absence of investigation rather than necessarily an absence of past human activity.

The site, along with surrounding areas consisting of underlying Wealden clay geology, is not believed to have been exploited or settled extensively until Medieval times (Brandon 1978). It is unclear as to whether this belief is founded from a genuine lack of pre-Medieval occupation, a geology not conducive to the formation of crop marks, or, as mentioned above, due to a lack of systematic investigation being undertaken. The presence of possible archaeological anomalies would be unexpected in the case of a lack of pre-Medieval settlement, in contrast to the presence of c.19th century field boundaries. While the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) does not record the presence of finds or features of any period within 1km of the site the Horsham area is noted for its Mesolithic finds (Holgate 2003; 29–35), and it has an extensive distribution of iron-working sites, particularly of the Roman and Saxon periods, with a notable concentration around Crawley. Cartographic evidence suggests that the site area itself has been farmland since the 19th century, meaning any sub-surface archaeological finds are not likely to have been disturbed, and should have survived.

Methodology

Sample interval

Data collection required a temporary grid to be established across the survey area using wooden pegs at 20m intervals with further subdivision where necessary. Readings were taken at 0.25m intervals along traverses 1m apart. This provides 1600 sampling points across a full $20m \times 20m$ grid (English Heritage 2008), providing an appropriate methodology balancing cost and time with resolution. The survey grids for the two fields were aligned with the major axis of each area, and as such differ slightly in comparison. The grid was successfully laid

out across the site area without any obstructions, excepting a small rectangular area on the southern site boundary which could not be accessed, and subsequently the area could not be surveyed (Fig. 2).

The Grad 601-2 has a typical depth of penetration of 0.5m to 1.0m. This would be increased if strongly magnetic objects have been buried in the site. Under normal operating conditions it can be expected to identify buried features >0.5m in diameter. Features which can be detected include disturbed soil, such as the fill of a ditch, structures that have been heated to high temperatures (magnetic thermoremnance) and objects made from ferro-magnetic materials. The strength of the magnetic field is measured in nano Tesla (nT), equivalent to 10^{-9} Tesla, the SI unit of magnetic flux density.

Equipment

The purpose of the survey was to identify geophysical anomalies that may be archaeological in origin in order to inform a targeted archaeological investigation of the site prior to development. The survey and report generally follow the recommendations and standards set out by A Schmidt's in his Guide to Good Practice (Schmidt 2011), English Heritage (2008) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2002, 2011, 2014).

Magnetometry was chosen as a survey method as it offers the most rapid ground coverage and responds to a wide range of anomalies caused by past human activity. These properties make it ideal for the fast yet detailed surveying of an area.

The detailed magnetometry survey was carried out using a dual sensor Bartington Instruments Grad 601-2 fluxgate gradiometer. The instrument consists of two fluxgates mounted 1m vertically apart with a second set positioned at 1m horizontal distance. This enables readings to be taken of both the general background magnetic field and any localised anomalies with the difference being plotted as either positive or negative buried features. All sensors are calibrated to cancel out the local magnetic field and react only to anomalies above or below this base line. On this basis, strong magnetic anomalies such as burnt features (kilns and hearths) will give a high response as will buried ferrous objects. More subtle anomalies such as pits and ditches, can be seen from their infilling soils containing higher proportions of humic material, rich in ferrous oxides, compared to the undisturbed subsoil. This will stand out in relation to the background magnetic readings and appear in plan following the course of a linear feature or within a discrete area.

A Trimble Geo7x handheld GPS system with sub-decimetre real-time accuracy was used to tie the site grid into the Ordnance Survey national grid. This unit offers both real-time correction and post-survey processing; enabling a high level of accuracy to be obtained both in the field and in the final post-processed data. Data gathered in the field was processed using the TerraSurveyor software package. This allows the survey data to be collated and manipulated to enhance the visibility of anomalies, particularly those likely to be of archaeological origin. The table below lists the processes applied to this survey, full survey and data information is recorded in Appendix 1.

Process Clip from -1.8 to 2.2 nT	Effect Enhance the contrast of the image to improve the appearance of possible archaeological anomalies.
Interpolate: y doubled	Increases the resolution of the readings in the y axis, enhancing the shape of anomalies.
De-stripe: median, all sensors	Removes the striping effect caused by differences in sensor calibration, enhancing the visibility of potential archaeological anomalies.
De-spike: threshold 1, window size 3×3	Compresses outlying magnetic points caused by interference of metal objects within the survey area.
De-stagger: all grids, both by -1 intervals	Cancels out effects of site's topography on irregularities in the traverse speed.

Once processed, the results are presented as a greyscale plot shown in relation to the site (Fig. 3), followed by a second plan to present the abstraction and interpretation of the magnetic anomalies (Fig. 4). Anomalies are shown as colour-coded lines, points and polygons. The grid layout and georeferencing information (Fig. 2) is prepared in EasyCAD v.7.58.00, producing a .FC7 file format, and printed as a .PDF for inclusion in the final report.

The greyscale plot of the processed data is exported from TerraSurveyor in a georeferenced portable network graphics (.PNG) format, a raster image format chosen for its lossless data compression and support for transparent pixels, enabling it to easily be overlaid onto an existing site plan. The data plot is combined with grid and site plans in QGIS 2.6.1 Brighton and exported again in .PNG format in order to present them in figure templates in Adobe InDesign CS5.5, creating .INDD file formats. Once the figures are finalised they are exported in .PDF format for inclusion within the finished report.

Results

Various magnetic anomalies were found spanning the entire site area, ranging from strong positive anomalies of probable agricultural origin to weaker positive anomalies of probable archaeological origin [Fig. 5]. Positive anomalies commonly represent buried cut features, such as pits and ditches. These can be of archaeological or agricultural origin.

Western Field:

Numerous magnetic anomalies were recorded in the western field. The most striking anomalies [Fig. 5:1-5] form a series of parallel and perpendicular linears on an approximate SW-NE [1 and 3]/SE-NW [4 and 5] and W-E

[2] alignment. These are most likely of agricultural origin and suggest the outline of individual field boundaries. The linear anomalies recorded were compared to a 19th century tithe map of the area [Fig. 6]; the general alignment of the anomalies lines up reasonably with the field boundaries shown on the map.

Three positive anomalies in the western field form lines parallel to the probable field boundaries **[8-9]**, suggesting that they may be chronologically associated with the boundaries, and, as such, are likely also of agricultural origin. It is reasonable to assume that the anomalies were formed by agricultural furrows caused by ploughing, rather than deliberately cut archaeological features, due to their alignment with the field boundaries.

Numerous positive anomalies were recorded in the western field that seem to represent archaeological cut features. Two anomalies **[12 and 14]** are particularly interesting, as they are irregular in shape (incomplete, sub/semi circular respectively) and do not seem to correspond with the linear anomalies representing the field boundaries. It is probable that these irregular anomalies were earlier cut features, and as such may be of archaeological interest.

Three other linear positive anomalies appear to be of probable archaeological, not agricultural, origin [7, 13 and 16]. As with the anomalies [12 and 14], discussed above, these probable archaeological anomalies do not appear to be aligned with the field boundaries. It is likely, then, that they represent earlier buried cut features of archaeological origin, rather than agricultural anomalies. Two of these anomalies are linear, on a W-E [16] and SW-NE [13] alignment respectively, and could represent the outline of earlier boundaries or enclosures. The third [7] is also a linear anomaly, aligned SSW to NNE, but is capped at its northern end by another linear anomaly on a WNW-ESE alignment. As with the above anomalies, it is likely that this is an earlier archaeological feature, likely outlining the corner of an enclosure or boundary.

In the area where two positive anomalies representing field boundaries intersect [2 and 5], there appear to be two linear anomalies representing a small enclosure in the corner of a field [10 and 11]. One of these linears appears as a strong positive anomaly [10], whereas the other [11] appears as a weaker positive anomaly. The anomalies do not meet, and, therefore, may not actually be associated, although they appear to represent an enclosure.

A weak positive anomaly is also present towards the south-west corner of the site [15]. This anomaly appears to represent a small enclosure, as it is comprised of three short linears forming an incomplete square. This is seemingly not aligned or associated with any of the other anomalies. Due to the lack of association with the anomalies of known agricultural origin, and also the shape of this anomaly, it may be of archaeological origin.

In the north-west corner of the site is a weak linear positive anomaly [6] that is on a similar alignment to the anomalies representing the field boundaries. As such, it would appear to be associated. However, there is no evidence of this linear anomaly on the 19th century tithe map, suggesting that it may have been from an earlier date, and had been removed by the time the map was created.

Four discrete positive anomalies were also recorded in the western field [17, 18, 19 and 20]. These discrete anomalies are small and circular in shape. It is likely that they are of archaeological origin, and are most likely buried pits.

There are a number of areas in the western field that have been subject to magnetic disturbance caused by nearby metal objects or services **[22 and 23]**. One of these areas **[22]** of disturbance is thought to be a bomb crater described by locals as having been caused by a stray German bomb dropped during the Second World War, which would explain the high concentration of magnetic disturbance. It is likely that the other area of disturbance **[23]** was caused by the excavation of a geotechnical test pit immediately prior to the geophysical survey.

The final positive anomaly in the western field, along the northern end of the site, appears to be of geological origin [21]. This anomaly is an irregular linear shape that is unlikely to have been man-made. The shape of the anomaly suggests that it was a geological or natural feature, such as a stream, that had a higher organic content and therefore a stronger magnetic signature than the background magnetic field.

Numerous ferrous spikes can be seen distributed across the western field. These ferrous spikes are caused by ferrous objects found in the surface layer, or sub-surface, of the site. Common ferrous objects include human waste, such as broken metal from old ploughs; highly possible on sites such as this, which have been used as farmland for a prolonged period of time.

Eastern Field:

In comparison to the western field, the eastern field did not have many positive anomalies, of either geological, agricultural or archaeological origin. As with the western field, though to a lesser degree, the eastern field shows a number of ferrous spikes, indicating the presence of metal objects either on or just below the surface of the site.

Two sets of positive anomalies were recorded in the southern part of the eastern field **[27 and 28]**, which are parallel to each other. These anomalies are on a different alignment to the field boundaries represented in the western field, but are similar in size and appearance to some of the positive anomalies of archaeological origin previously discussed **[6, 7, 8 and 9]**. Therefore, it is possible that the anomalies in the eastern field are

also archaeological in origin. However, as the anomalies of in the eastern field are on a different alignment to those in the western field, they are probably not associated,.

At the northern end of the eastern field are two intersecting linear positive anomalies, which form a T-shape **[24 and 25]**. These anomalies appear to be buried cut features of archaeological origin, but do not appear to be associated with those in the western field, and as such are probably of a different date. They do not appear to be on a similar alignment to the previously mentioned linear positive anomalies, and so are not likely to be associated with them.

The final positive anomaly in the eastern field is also a linear [26], but is on an entirely different alignment to the other linear anomalies in both fields. This is likely to be a buried cut feature of probable archaeological origin.

A large area of magnetic disturbance was recorded in the south-western corner of the field. This is likely caused by the close proximity of steel field gates and the fencing which separated the field from the adjacent property.

Conclusion

Despite the expected low archaeological potential of the site, numerous positive anomalies were recorded in both the western and eastern fields. A number of the linear anomalies match the placement of field boundaries on a 19th century tithe map, and so, consequently, can be attributed to the modern era. However, a large percentage of the anomalies cannot be seen on the tithe map, and are not aligned with the positive anomalies representing the field boundaries. It is likely that these anomalies are from an earlier date, and are buried cut features of archaeological origin. An anomaly of note is a large area of magnetic disturbance, likely to be a bomb crater dating to the Second World War. Also recorded were several areas of magnetic disturbance, which commonly indicates the presence of buried or nearby ferrous objects. It is possible that these areas may mask weaker anomalies of archaeological origin.

References

BGS, 1972, British Geological Survey, 1:50,000 Sheet 301, Solid and Drift Edition, Keyworth

CIfA, 2002, The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluation, IFA Paper No. 6, Reading

CIfA, 2011, Standard and Guidance: for archaeological geophysical survey, Reading

CIfA, 2014, Standard and Guidance: for archaeological geophysical survey, Reading

NPPF, 2012, National Planning Policy Framework, Dept Communities and Local Government, London

Schmidt, A, (ed) 2011, *Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice*, AHDS, http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Geophysics Toc

Wallis, S, 2012, 'Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex: Desk-based heritage assessment', Thames Valley Archaeological Services report 12/173, Brighton

English Heritage, 2008, *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation*, English Heritage, Portsmouth (2nd edn)

Appendix 1. Survey and data information

Programme:			44 Col:5 R
Name:	TerraSurveyor		45 Col:6 R
Version:	3.0.25.0		46 Col:6 R
			47 Col:6 R
Western Field:			48 Col:6 R
Raw data			49 Col:6 R
NT	515015 15 121910 (1		50 Col:6 R
Northwest corner:	515015.15, 131819.61	m	51 Col:6 R
Southeast corner:	515315.15, 151539.01	n	52 Col:0 R
Collection Of 1st 1r	averse: 92.74 deg		53 Col:0 K
Concertion Method	$2 \otimes 100 \text{ m spacing}$		55 Col:6 P
Dummy Value:	2 @ 1.00 in spacing.		56 Col:6 P
Dunning value.	2047.3		57 Col:6 R
Dimensions			58 Col:7 R
Composite Size (re	adings): 1200 x 280		59 Col:7 R
Survey Size (meter	(x): $300 \text{ m x } 280 \text{ m}$		60 Col:7 R
Grid Size:	20 m x 20 m		61 Col:7 R
X Interval:	0.25 m		62 Col:7 R
Y Interval:	1 m		63 Col:7 R
			64 Col:7 R
Stats			65 Col:7 R
Max:	97.32		66 Col:7 R
Min:	-100.00		67 Col:7 R
Std Dev:	6.87		68 Col:7 R
Mean:	-0.43		69 Col:7 R
Median:	-0.35		70 Col:7 R
Composite Area:	8.4 ha		71 Col:8 R
Surveyed Area:	5.3949 ha		72 Col:8 R
			73 Col:8 R
Source Grids: 157			74 Col:8 R
I Col:0 Row:2	grids\01w.xgd		75 Col:8 R
2 Col:0 Row:3	grids\02-a.xgd		76 Col:8 R
5 Col:0 Row:4	grids\03.xgd		79 Col:8 R
4 Col.0 Row.5	grids/04.xgd		70 Col.8 R
6 Col:1 Row:2	grids/06 xgd		80 Col·8 R
7 Col:1 Row:3	orids\07 xod		81 Col:8 R
8 Col:1 Row:4	grids\08 xgd		82 Col:8 R
9 Col:1 Row:5	grids\09.xgd		83 Col:8 R
10 Col:1 Row:6	grids\10.xgd		84 Col:9 R
11 Col:2 Row:2	grids\11.xgd		85 Col:9 R
12 Col:2 Row:3	grids\12.xgd		86 Col:9 R
13 Col:2 Row:4	grids\13.xgd		87 Col:9 R
14 Col:2 Row:5	grids\14.xgd		88 Col:9 R
15 Col:2 Row:6	grids\15.xgd		89 Col:9 R
16 Col:3 Row:2	grids\16.xgd		90 Col:9 R
17 Col:3 Row:3	grids\17.xgd		91 Col:9 R
18 Col:3 Row:4	grids\18.xgd		92 Col:9 R
19 Col:3 Row:5	grids\19.xgd		93 Col:9 R
20 Col:3 Row:6	grids\20.xgd		94 Col:9 R
21 Col:4 Row:1	grids\21.xgd		95 Col.9 K
22 Col:4 Row:2	grids\22.xgd		90 Col:10
23 Col:4 Row.3	grids\23.xgd		98 Col:10
24 Col:4 Row:4	orids\25 xod		99 Col·10
26 Col:4 Row:6	grids/26 xgd		100 Col·10
27 Col·4 Row·7	grids\27 xgd		101 Col·10
28 Col:4 Row:8	grids\28.xgd		102 Col:10
29 Col:4 Row:9	grids\29.xgd		103 Col:10
30 Col:4 Row:10	grids\30.xgd		104 Col:10
31 Col:4 Row:11	l grids\31.xgd		105 Col:10
32 Col:4 Row:12	2 grids\32.xgd		106 Col:10
33 Col:5 Row:1	grids\35.xgd		107 Col:11
34 Col:5 Row:2	grids\50.xgd		108 Col:11
35 Col:5 Row:3	grids\51.xgd		109 Col:11
36 Col:5 Row:4	grids\52.xgd		110 Col:11
37 Col:5 Row:5	grids\53.xgd		111 Col:11
38 Col:5 Row:6	grids\54.xgd		112 Col:11
39 Col:5 Row:7	grids\55.xgd		113 Col:11
40 Col:5 Row:8	grids\56.xgd		114 Col:11
41 Col:5 Row:9	grids\5/.xgd		115 Col:11
42 Col:5 Row:10	grids\58.xgd		116 Col:11

44	Col:5	Row:12 grids\60.xgd
45	Col·6	Row: 0 grids 33 xgd
10	C-1.0	Deres 1 anide/24 and
40	C01.0	Row.1 grids\54.xgd
47	Col:6	Row:2 grids\36.xgd
48	Col:6	Row:3 grids\37.xgd
49	Col·6	Row:4 grids\38 yad
50	C-1.0	Derry 5 anida 20 and
50	C01:0	Row:5 grids\39.xgd
51	Col:6	Row:6 grids\40.xgd
52	Col:6	Row:7 grids\41.xgd
53	Col·6	Row: 8 gride 42 vgd
51	Calif	Row 0 grids 42 wad
54	C01.0	Kow.9 gilds/45.xgu
55	Col:6	Row:10 grids\44.xgd
56	Col:6	Row:11 grids\45.xgd
57	Col:6	Row:12 grids\46.xgd
58	Col·7	Row:0 grids/61 xgd
50	Col:7	Powel gride/62 word
59	C01.7	Row.1 gilds/02.xgu
60	Col:/	Row:2 grids\63.xgd
61	Col:7	Row:3 grids\64.xgd
62	Col:7	Row:4 grids\65.xgd
63	Col·7	Row:5 grids/66 xgd
61	Cali7	Devue gride/67 ved
04	C01:7	Row.o grids\07.xgd
65	Col:/	Row:/ grids\68.xgd
66	Col:7	Row:8 grids\69.xgd
67	Col:7	Row:9 grids\70.xgd
68	Col·7	Row: 10 grids\71 xgd
60	Col.7	Down11 grids\72 wad
09	C01.7	Kow.11 grids\/2.xgd
/0	Col:/	Row:12 grids\//3.xgd
71	Col:8	Row:0 grids\47.xgd
72	Col:8	Row:1 grids\48.xgd
73	Col·8	Row? grids\49 xgd
74	Col.0	Davu2 grids\74 vad
/4	C01:8	Kow.5 grids\/4.xgd
75	Col:8	Row:4 grids\/5.xgd
76	Col:8	Row:5 grids\76.xgd
77	Col:8	Row:6 grids\77.xgd
78	Col·8	Row:7 grids\78 xgd
70	Colve	Power gride/70 wad
19	C01.8	Row.8 grids//9.xgd
80	Col:8	Row:9 grids\80.xgd
81	Col:8	Row:10 grids\81.xgd
82	Col:8	Row:11 grids\82.xgd
83	Col·8	Row-12 grids\83 xgd
84	Col·0	Row:1 gride/05 vgd
07	C 1 0	
85	C01:9	Row:2 grids\96.xgd
86	Col:9	Row:3 grids\97.xgd
87	Col:9	Row:4 grids\98.xgd
88	Col:9	Row:5 grids\99.xgd
80	Col·9	Row: 6 gride \100 yad
00	C 1 0	
90	C01:9	Row:/ grids\101.xgd
91	Col:9	Row:8 grids\102.xgd
92	Col:9	Row:9 grids\103.xgd
93	Col:9	Row:10 grids\104.xgd
94	Col·9	Row-11 grids\105 xgd
05	Col·9	Row:12 gride/106 yed
00	C-1.1(Derry 2 mid-\94 med
96	Col: 10	0 Row:2 grids\84.xgd
97	Col:10) Row:3 grids\85.xgd
98	Col:10) Row:4 grids\86.xgd
99	Col:10) Row:5 grids\87.xgd
100) Col·1	0 Row 6 grids 88 xgd
100	Calil	0 Barry 7 arida 80 yad
101		0 Row./ gilds/69.xgu
102	2 Col:1	0 Row's grids/90 yod
103		o now.o gnasoo.xga
104	B Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd
105	3 Col:1 4 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd
	8 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93 xgd
104	8 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids\91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids\92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids\93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids\94.xgd
106	8 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd
106	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd
106 107 108	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 8 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd
106 107 108 109	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 7 Col:1 8 Col:1 9 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd
106 107 108 109 110	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 3 Col:1 9 Col:1 0 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids\91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids\92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids\93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids\94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids\107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids\108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids\109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids\110.xgd
106 107 108 109 110	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 3 Col:1 9 Col:1 9 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd
106 107 108 109 110 111	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 3 Col:1 9 Col:1 9 Col:1 1 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd
106 107 108 109 110 111 112	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 3 Col:1 9 Col:1 0 Col:1 1 Col:1 2 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd 1 Row:6 grids/112.xgd
106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 3 Col:1 9 Col:1 9 Col:1 1 Col:1 2 Col:1 2 Col:1	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd 1 Row:6 grids/112.xgd 1 Row:7 grids/113.xgd
106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 8 Col:1 9 Col:1 9 Col:1 1 Col:1 1 Col:1 2 Col:1 3 Col:1 4 Col:1 4 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 C	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd 1 Row:6 grids/112.xgd 1 Row:7 grids/113.xgd 1 Row:8 grids/114.xgd
106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115	3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 Col:1 5 Col:1 7 Col:1 7 Col:1 9 Col:1 9 Col:1 1 Col:1 1 Col:1 1 Col:1 2 Col:1 3 Col:1 4 Col:1 5 C	0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:9 grids/91.xgd 0 Row:10 grids/92.xgd 0 Row:11 grids/93.xgd 0 Row:12 grids/94.xgd 1 Row:1 grids/107.xgd 1 Row:2 grids/108.xgd 1 Row:3 grids/109.xgd 1 Row:4 grids/110.xgd 1 Row:5 grids/111.xgd 1 Row:6 grids/112.xgd 1 Row:8 grids/114.xgd 1 Row:9 grids/115.xgd

43	Col:5	Row:11	grids\59.xgd
75	001.5	100.11	gilus (5).Agu

117 Col:11	Row:11 grids\117.xgd
118 Col:11	Row:12 grids\118.xgd
119 Col:12	Row:1 grids\140.xgd
120 Col:12	Row:2 grids\141.xgd
121 Col:12	Row:3 grids\142.xgd
122 Col:12	Row:4 grids\143.xgd
123 Col:12	Row:5 grids\144.xgd
124 Col:12	Row:6 grids\145.xgd
125 Col:12	Row:7 grids\146.xgd
126 Col:12	Row:8 grids\147.xgd
127 Col:12	Row:9 grids\148.xgd
128 Col:12	Row:10 grids\149.xgd
129 Col:12	Row:11 grids\150.xgd
130 Col:12	Row:12 grids\151.xgd
131 Col:12	Row:13 grids\152.xgd
132 Col:13	Row:1 grids\119.xgd
133 Col:13	Row:2 grids\120.xgd
134 Col:13	Row:3 grids\121.xgd
135 Col:13	Row:4 grids\122.xgd
136 Col:13	Row:5 grids\123.xgd
137 Col:13	Row:6 grids\124.xgd
138 Col:13	Row:7 grids\125.xgd
139 Col:13	Row:8 grids\126.xgd
140 Col:13	Row:9 grids\127.xgd
141 Col:13	Row:10 grids\128.xgd
142 Col:13	Row:11 grids\129.xgd
143 Col:13	Row:12 grids\130.xgd
144 Col:13	Row:13 grids\131.xgd
145 Col:14	Row:1 grids\153.xgd
146 Col:14	Row:2 grids\154.xgd
147 Col:14	Row:3 grids\155.xgd
148 Col:14	Row:4 grids\156.xgd
149 Col:14	Row:5 grids\157.xgd
150 Col:14	Row:6 grids\132.xgd
151 Col:14	Row:7 grids\133.xgd
152 Col:14	Row:8 grids\134.xgd
153 Col:14	Row:9 grids\135.xgd
154 Col:14	Row:10 grids\136.xgd
155 Col:14	Row:11 grids\137.xgd
156 Col:14	Row:12 grids\138.xgd
157 Col:14	Row:13 grids\139.xgd

Processed data

Stats 2.20 Max: Min: -1.80 0.86 0.04 Std Dev: Mean: Median: 0.01 Composite Area: Surveyed Area: 8.4 ha 5.382 ha

Processes: 6

- Processes: 6
 1 Base Layer
 2 DeStripe Median Sensors: All
 3 De Stagger: Grids: All Mode: Both By: -3 intervals
 4 Despike Threshold: 1 Window size: 3x3
 5 Interpolate: Y Doubled.
 6 Clip from -1.80 to 2.20 nT

<u>Eastern Field:</u> Raw Data

Dimensions

Composite Size (readings):	40)0	х	280	
Survey Size (meters):	1(00	m	х	280	m

Grid Size:	20 m x 20 m
X Interval:	0.25 m
Y Interval:	1 m
Stats Max: Min: Std Dev: Mean: Median: Composite	97.03 -100.00 4.01 -0.47 -0.59 Area: 2.8 ha
Surveyed A	rea: 1.9479 na
1 Col:0 1	Row:0 grids\01.xgd
2 Col:0 1	Row:1 grids\02.xgd
3 Col:0 1	Row:2 grids\03.xgd
4 Col:0 1	Row:3 grids\04.xgd
5 Col:0 1	Row:4 grids\05.xgd
6 Col:0 1	Row:5 grids\06.xgd
7 Col:0 1	Row:5 grids\06.xgd
8 Col:0 1	Row:7 grids\08.xgd
8 Col:0 1	Row:7 grids\08.xgd
9 Col:0 1	Row:8 grids\09.xgd
10 Col:0	Row:9 grids\10.xgd
10 Col:0 11 Col:0 12 Col:0 13 Col:0 14 Col:0 15 Col:1 16 Col:1 17 Col:1 18 Col:1 19 Col:1 20 Col:1 21 Col:1 22 Col:1 23 Col:1 24 Col:1 25 Col:1 26 Col:1 27 Col:1 28 Col:1 29 Col:2 30 Col:2 31 Col:2 32 Col:2	Row:9 grids\10.xgd Row:10 grids\11.xgd Row:10 grids\11.xgd Row:12 grids\13.xgd Row:12 grids\13.xgd Row:13 grids\14.xgd Row:0 grids\16.xgd Row:2 grids\17.xgd Row:2 grids\17.xgd Row:3 grids\18.xgd Row:4 grids\19.xgd Row:5 grids\20.xgd Row:6 grids\21.xgd Row:6 grids\21.xgd Row:7 grids\22.xgd Row:9 grids\23.xgd Row:9 grids\25.xgd Row:10 grids\25.xgd Row:11 grids\25.xgd Row:12 grids\25.xgd Row:12 grids\27.xgd Row:13 grids\28.xgd Row:13 grids\28.xgd Row:1 grids\29.xgd Row:2 grids\30.xgd Row:3 grids\31.xgd Row:4 grids\32.xgd
32 Col:2 33 Col:2 34 Col:2	Row:5 grids\33.xgd
35 Col:2	Row:0 grids\35.xgd
36 Col:2	Row:7 grids\35.xgd
37 Col:2	Row:8 grids\36.xgd
38 Col:2	Row:10 grids\38.xgd
39 Col:2	Row:11 grids\39.xgd
40 Col:2	Row:12 grids\40.xcd
41 Col:2	Row:13 grids\41.xgd
42 Col:3	Row:2 grids\42.xgd
43 Col:3	Row:3 grids\43.xgd
44 Col:3	Row:4 grids\44.xgd
45 Col:3	Row:5 grids\45.xgd
46 Col:3	Row:6 grids\46.xgd
47 Col:3	Row:7 grids\47.xgd
48 Col:3	Row:8 grids\49.xgd
49 Col:3	Row:9 grids\51.xgd
50 Col:3	Row:10 grids\52.xgd
51 Col:3	Row:11 grids\53.xgd
52 Col:3	Row:12 grids\54.xgd
53 Col:3	Row:13 grids\55.xgd
54 Col:4	Row:7 grids\48.xgd
55 Col:4	Row:8 grids\50.xgd

Processed Data

Stats	
Max:	2.20
Min:	-1.80
Std Dev:	0.67

Mean:	0.02
Median:	0.00
Composite Area:	2.8 ha
Surveyed Area:	1.9434 ha

- Processes: 5
 1 Base Layer
 2 DeStripe Median Sensors: All
 3 De Stagger: Grids: All Mode: Both By: -2 intervals
 4 Despike Threshold: 1 Window size: 3x3
 5 Clip from -1.80 to 2.20 nT















Plate 1. West field, looking north-west from south-eastern corner.



Plate 2. West field, looking west from north-eastern corner.



Plate 3. East field, looking north from southern edge.



Plate 4. East field, looking south from north-western corner.

Land north of Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, 2015 Geophysical Survey (Magnetic) Plates 1 - 4.



BHH 12/173b

TIME CHART

Calendar Years

Modern	AD 1901
Victorian	AD 1837
Post Medieval	AD 1500
Medieval	AD 1066
Saxon	AD 410
Roman Iron Age	AD 43 BC/AD 750 BC
	1200 DC
Bronze Age: Late	1300 BC
Bronze Age: Middle	1700 BC
Bronze Age: Early	2100 BC
Neolithic: Late	3300 BC
Neolithic: Early	4300 BC
Mesolithic: Late	6000 BC
Mesolithic: Early	10000 BC
Palaeolithic: Upper	30000 BC
Palaeolithic: Middle	70000 BC
Palaeolithic: Lower	2,000,000 BC ↓





TVAS (South) 77a Hollingdean Terrace, Brighton Sussex, BN1 7HB

> Tel: 01273 554198 Fax: 01273 564043 Email: south@tvas.co.uk Web: www.tvas.co.uk