

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

STRATASCAN™



Project name:
Land off Fordham Road, Isleham, Cambridgeshire

Client:
CgMs Consulting

Job ref:
J10714

January 2017

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name: Land off Fordham Road, Isleham, Cambridgeshire Client: CgMs Consulting	Job ref: J10714
Survey date: 21-22 December 2016	Report date: January 2017
Field team: Robert Knight BA (Hons) Paul Bracken BA (Hons) Olivier Vansassenbrouck MSc	Project Manager: Simon Haddrell BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA
Report written by: Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)	Report approved by: David Elks MSc ACIfA
CAD illustrations by: Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)	Site Director: Dr John Gater MCIfA FSA
Version number and issue date: V1 24/01/2017	Amendments:



STRATASCAN LTD
Vineyard House Upper Hook Road Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire WR8 0SA United Kingdom

T: 01684 592266 F: 01684 594142
info@stratascansumo.com www.stratascan.co.uk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	1
2	INTRODUCTION	1
3	METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION.....	2
4	RESULTS	3
5	DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	3
6	CONCLUSION	4
7	REFERENCES	5
	Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method.....	6
	Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory	8

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:1000	Site location, survey area & referencing
Figure 02	1:1000	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values
Figure 03	1:1000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data
Figure 04	1:1000	Interpretation of gradiometer anomalies

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 8.3 hectares of arable farmland and grassland. No probable archaeological anomalies have been detected. A possible sub-circular anomaly may be of archaeological interest, though its exact origin is unknown. Evidence of ploughing and possible former field boundaries suggest the site has an agricultural past.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

Stratascan were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for residential development. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by CgMs Consulting.

2.2 Site Details

NGR / Postcode	TL 640 738 / CB7 5PW
Location	The site is located in the south-west of Isleham, Cambridgeshire. Fordham Road forms the south-eastern boundary of the site, with residential housing and an industrial estate to the west, and sports pitches to the east.
HER/SMR	Cambridgeshire
District	East Cambridgeshire
Parish	Isleham CP
Topography	Mostly flat
Current Land Use	Mixed arable and pasture
Weather Conditions	Cloudy, dry
Soils	The overlying soils across the majority of the site are known as Wantage 2 which are typical grey rendzinas. The soils across the northern and southern edges of the site are known as Swaffham Prior, which are typical brown calcareous earths. The Wantage 2 soils consist of calcareous silty soils over argillaceous chalk, while the Swaffham Prior soils consist of fine loamy soils over chalk rubble (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 4 Eastern England).
Geology	The underlying geology comprises chalk of Zag Chalk Formation. No drift geology is present on the site (British Geological Survey website).
Archaeology	Cambridgeshire HER records a single heritage asset within the survey area, a Palaeolithic handaxe (MCB19231). Aerial photograph assessment to the west of the site identifies a number of circular cropmarks, interpreted as Bronze Age ring ditches, though none of the features have been further investigated (CgMs, 2017).
Survey Methods	Detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry)
Study Area	c. 8.3 hectares

2.3 Aims and objectives

To locate and characterise any anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the study area.

3 METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION

3.1 Standards & Guidance

This report and all fieldwork have been conducted in accordance with the latest guidance documents issued by Historic England (2008) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2002 & 2014).

Stratascan Ltd are a Registered Organisation with the ClfA and are committed to upholding its policies and standards.

3.2 Survey methods

Due to the possible nearby Bronze Age remains, detailed magnetic survey was used as an efficient and effective method of locating archaeological anomalies.

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A.

3.3 Processing

The following schedule shows the basic processing carried out on the data used in this report:

1. *De-stripe*
2. *De-stagger*

3.4 Presentation of results and interpretation

The presentation of the data for each site involves a plot of the minimally processed data as a greyscale plot and a colour plot showing extreme magnetic values. Magnetic anomalies have been identified and plotted onto the 'Interpretation of Anomalies' drawing.

When interpreting the results several factors are taken into consideration, including the nature of archaeological features being investigated and the local conditions at the site (geology, pedology, topography etc.). Anomalies are categorised by their potential origin. Where responses can be related to very specific known features documented in other sources, this is done (for example: Abbey Wall, Roman Road). For the generic categories levels of confidence are indicated, for example: probable, or possible archaeology. The former is used for a confident interpretation, based on anomaly definition and/or other corroborative data such as cropmarks. Poor anomaly definition, a lack of clear patterns to the responses and an absence of other supporting data reduces confidence, hence the classification "possible".

4 RESULTS

The detailed magnetic gradiometer survey conducted at Isleham has not identified any anomalies that have been characterised as being of *probable* or *possible* archaeological origin.

4.1 *Probable/Possible Archaeology*

No probable or possible archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

4.2 *Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture*

Closely spaced, parallel linear anomalies are visible across the site, and are related to modern agricultural activity such as ploughing.

A small number of weak linear anomalies [1] at right-angles to one another are possibly related to former field boundaries, though they are not visible on available historic OS mapping.

4.3 *Other Anomalies*

A weak, positive, sub-circular anomaly [2] in the west of the area, is of unknown origin. It is possible that the response is archaeological, especially given the circular cropmarks interpreted as ring-ditches nearby. However, the response is very weak and may also be of agricultural origin; its exact origin cannot be determined with confidence.

Areas of enhanced magnetic response [3] in the south of the area are likely to be natural in origin. The form of the responses, having identified a possible rectilinear anomaly, may suggest an anthropogenic origin, though the anomalies are typical in appearance of natural responses found across chalk geologies.

Two negative linear anomalies and a positive linear anomaly [4] in the centre of the area are likely to be related to underground services. The negative responses are likely indicative of a non-ferrous pipe, while the positive response may relate to a service trench.

Areas of magnetic disturbance are the result of substantial nearby ferrous metal objects such as fences and underground services. These effects can mask weaker archaeological anomalies, but on this site have not affected a significant proportion of the area.

5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Chalk geologies, such as those across the site, generally provide good results for magnetic survey. The detection of agriculture along with possible former field boundaries and a possible sub-circular response suggests that the survey has been effective.

6 CONCLUSION

The survey at Isleham has not identified any anomalies of probable archaeological interest. Evidence of modern ploughing and former field boundaries indicate that the site has a largely agricultural past. A single, possible sub-circular anomaly, may be of archaeological origin, though the weak nature of the response makes further interpretation difficult. The remaining responses are natural or modern, with the modern features including underground services and magnetic disturbance from nearby ferrous objects such as fences and pylons.

7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., *website*:
(<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 23/01/2017]

CgMs Consulting, 2017. *Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment – Land off Fordham Road, Isleham, Cambridgeshire* – unpublished report

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. (http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GGeophysics_1.pdf)

English Heritage, 2008. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation*.

IfA 2002. The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations, IFA Paper No 6, C. Gaffney, J. Gater and S. Ovenden. Institute for Archaeology, Reading

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 4 Eastern England*

Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Grid Positioning

For hand held gradiometers the location of the survey grids has been plotted together with the referencing information. Grids were set out using a Trimble R8 Real Time Kinematic (RTK) VRS Now GNSS GPS system.

An RTK GPS (Real-time Kinematic Global Positioning System) can locate a point on the ground to a far greater accuracy than a standard GPS unit. A standard GPS suffers from errors created by satellite orbit errors, clock errors and atmospheric interference, resulting in an accuracy of 5m-10m. An RTK system uses a single base station receiver and a number of mobile units. The base station re-broadcasts the phase of the carrier it measured, and the mobile units compare their own phase measurements with those they received from the base station. This results in an accuracy of around 0.01m.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1m	0.25m

Instrumentation: Bartington *Grad601-2*

Bartington instruments operate in a gradiometer configuration which comprises fluxgate sensors mounted vertically, set 1.0m apart. The fluxgate gradiometer suppresses any diurnal or regional effects. The instruments are carried, or cart mounted, with the bottom sensor approximately 0.1-0.3m from the ground surface. At each survey station, the difference in the magnetic field between the two fluxgates is measured in nanoTesla (nT). The sensitivity of the instrument can be adjusted; for most archaeological surveys the most sensitive range (0.1nT) is used. Generally, features up to 1m deep may be detected by this method, though strongly magnetic objects may be visible at greater depths. The Bartington instrument can collect two lines of data per traverse with gradiometer units mounted laterally with a separation of 1.0m.

The readings are logged consecutively into the data logger which in turn is daily down-loaded into a portable computer whilst on site. At the end of each site survey, data is transferred to the office for processing and presentation.

Data Processing

Zero Mean Traverse This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero. The operation removes striping effects and edge discontinuities over the whole of the data set.

Step Correction (Destagger) When gradiometer data are collected in 'zig-zag' fashion, stepping errors can sometimes arise. These occur because of a slight difference in the speed of walking on the forward and reverse traverses. The result is a staggered effect in the data, which is particularly noticeable on linear anomalies. This process corrects these errors.

Display

Greyscale/ Colourscale Plot This format divides a given range of readings into a set number of classes. Each class is represented by a specific shade of grey, the intensity increasing with value. All values above the given range are allocated the same shade (maximum intensity); similarly all values below the given range are represented by the minimum intensity shade. Similar plots can be produced in colour, either using a wide range of colours or by selecting two or three colours to represent positive and negative values. The assigned range (plotting levels) can be adjusted to emphasise different anomalies in the data-set.

Interpretation Categories

In certain circumstances (usually when there is corroborative evidence from desk based or excavation data) very specific interpretations can be assigned to magnetic anomalies (for example, *Roman Road, Wall*, etc.) and where appropriate, such interpretations will be applied. The list below outlines the generic categories commonly used in the interpretation of the results.

<i>Archaeology/Probable Archaeology</i>	This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the response are clearly or very probably archaeological and /or if corroborative evidence is available. These anomalies, whilst considered anthropogenic, could be of any age.
<i>Possible Archaeology</i>	These anomalies exhibit either weak signal strength and / or poor definition, or form incomplete archaeological patterns, thereby reducing the level of confidence in the interpretation. Although the archaeological interpretation is favoured, they may be the result of variable soil depth, plough damage or even aliasing as a result of data collection orientation.
<i>Industrial / Burnt-Fired</i>	Strong magnetic anomalies that, due to their shape and form or the context in which they are found, suggest the presence of kilns, ovens, corn dryers, metal- working areas or hearths. It should be noted that in many instances modern ferrous material can produce similar magnetic anomalies.
<i>Former Field Boundary (probable & possible)</i>	Anomalies that correspond to former boundaries indicated on historic mapping, or which are clearly a continuation of existing land divisions. Possible denotes less confidence where the anomaly may not be shown on historic mapping but nevertheless the anomaly displays all the characteristics of a field boundary.
<i>Ridge & Furrow</i>	Parallel linear anomalies whose broad spacing suggests ridge and furrow cultivation. In some cases the response may be the result of more recent agricultural activity.
<i>Agriculture (ploughing)</i>	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
<i>Land Drain</i>	Weakly magnetic linear anomalies, quite often appearing in series forming parallel and herringbone patterns. Smaller drains will often lead and empty into larger diameter pipes and which in turn usually lead to local streams and ponds. These are indicative of clay fired land drains.
<i>Natural</i>	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
<i>Magnetic Disturbance</i>	Broad zones of strong dipolar anomalies, commonly found in places where modern ferrous or fired materials (e.g. brick rubble) are present. They are presumed to be modern.
<i>Service</i>	Magnetically strong anomalies usually forming linear features indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) cause weaker magnetic responses and can be identified from their uniform linearity crossing large expanses.
<i>Ferrous</i>	This type of response is associated with ferrous material and may result from small items in the topsoil, larger buried objects such as pipes, or above ground features such as fence lines or pylons. Ferrous responses are usually regarded as modern. Individual burnt stones, fired bricks or igneous rocks can produce responses similar to ferrous material.
<i>Uncertain Origin</i>	Anomalies which stand out from the background magnetic variation, yet whose form and lack of patterning gives little clue as to their origin. Often the characteristics and distribution of the responses straddle the categories of <i>Possible Archaeology</i> and <i>Possible Natural</i> or (in the case of linear responses) <i>Possible Archaeology</i> and <i>Possible Agriculture</i> ; occasionally they are simply of an unusual form.

Where appropriate some anomalies will be further classified according to their form (positive or negative) and relative strength and coherence (trend: weak and poorly defined).

Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

Detailed magnetic survey can be used to effectively define areas of past human activity by mapping spatial variation and contrast in the magnetic properties of soil, subsoil and bedrock. Although the changes in the magnetic field resulting from differing features in the soil are usually weak, changes as small as 0.2 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000nT, can be accurately detected.

Weakly magnetic iron minerals are always present within the soil and areas of enhancement relate to increases in *magnetic susceptibility* and permanently magnetised *thermoremanent* material.

Magnetic susceptibility relates to the induced magnetism of a material when in the presence of a magnetic field. This magnetism can be considered as effectively permanent as it exists within the Earth's magnetic field. Magnetic susceptibility can become enhanced due to burning and complex biological or fermentation processes.

Thermoremanence is a permanent magnetism acquired by iron minerals that, after heating to a specific temperature known as the Curie Point, are effectively demagnetised followed by re-magnetisation by the Earth's magnetic field on cooling. Thermoremanent archaeological features can include hearths and kilns and material such as brick and tile may be magnetised through the same process.

Silting and deliberate infilling of ditches and pits with magnetically enhanced soil creates a relative contrast against the much lower levels of magnetism within the subsoil into which the feature is cut. Systematic mapping of magnetic anomalies will produce linear and discrete areas of enhancement allowing assessment and characterisation of subsurface features. Material such as subsoil and non-magnetic bedrock used to create former earthworks and walls may be mapped as areas of lower enhancement compared to surrounding soils.

Magnetic survey is carried out using a fluxgate gradiometer which is a passive instrument consisting of two sensors mounted vertically 1m apart. The instrument is carried about 30cm above the ground surface and the top sensor measures the Earth's magnetic field whilst the lower sensor measures the same field but is also more affected by any localised buried field. The difference between the two sensors will relate to the strength of a magnetic field created by a buried feature, if no field is present the difference will be close to zero as the magnetic field measured by both sensors will be the same.

Factors affecting the magnetic survey may include soil type, local geology, previous human activity, disturbance from modern services etc.

Your Survey Partner

For a complete and complementary
range of survey services

*Survey services
you can rely on*

Archaeological
As Built Records
BIM Ready 3D Models
Boundary Disputes
CCTV
Geophysical
Laser Scanning
Measured Building
Pipeline Routes
Railway
Retrofit
Setting Out
Statutory Plan Collation
Topographic
Utility Mapping
UXO Detection
Void Detection

STRATASCAN LTD

Vineyard House Upper Hook Road Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire WR8 0SA United Kingdom

T:01684 592266 F: 01684 594142

info@stratascan.co.uk www.stratascan.co.uk

STRATASCAN™



SUMO
Group
Member

