

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

# STRATASCAN™



Project name:  
**Doveleat, Chinnor, Oxfordshire**

Client:  
**CgMs Consulting**

Job ref:  
**J10478**

**November 2016**

## GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name: <b>Doveleat, Chinnor Oxfordshire</b> Client: <b>CgMs Consulting</b>	Job ref: <b>J10478</b>
Survey date: <b>28 October 2016</b>	Report date: <b>November 2016</b>
Field team: <b>Lukasz Krawec</b> BSc <b>Adam Clark</b>	Project Manager: <b>Simon Haddrell</b> BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA
Report written by: <b>Rebecca Davies</b> BSc (Hons)	Report approved by: <b>David Elks</b> MSc ACIfA
CAD illustrations by: <b>Rebecca Davies</b> BSc (Hons)	Site Director: <b>Dr John Gater</b> MCIfA FSA
Version number and issue date: <b>V1</b>   <b>16/11/2016</b>	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](http://www.stratascan.co.uk)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:25 000	Location plan of survey area
Figure 02	1:1000	Location of survey grids and referencing
Figure 03	1:1000	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values
Figure 04	1:1000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data
Figure 05	1:1000	Interpretation of gradiometer anomalies

## 1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 2.5 hectares of grassland. No features of archaeological origin have been detected. Three small, discrete anomalies are of uncertain origin though are unlikely to be archaeological. The remaining responses are modern and are a result of nearby ferrous metal objects.

## 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

<b>NGR / Postcode</b>	SP 757 013 / OX39 4EP
<b>Location</b>	The site is located to the north-east of Chinnor, Oxfordshire.
<b>HER</b>	Oxfordshire
<b>District</b>	South Oxfordshire
<b>Parish</b>	Chinnor CP
<b>Topography</b>	Level
<b>Current Land Use</b>	Grassland
<b>Weather Conditions</b>	Cloudy
<b>Soils</b>	The overlying soils are known as Coombe 2 which are typical brown calcareous soils. These consist of well drained calcareous fine silty soils over chalk or chalk rubble (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 6 South East England).
<b>Geology</b>	The underlying geology comprises chalk of West Melbury Chalk Formation. No drift geology is recorded (British Geological Survey website).

<b>Archaeology</b>	<p>Extract from “Land at Doveleat, Chinnor, Oxon – Heritage Assessment” (CgMs Consulting, 2016):</p> <p><i>“Assessment of the area of the proposed development undertaken in 2016, comprising desk based data gathering, indicates that there is no prospect of nationally significant archaeology at the development site. Archaeology has been found in the vicinity and the landscape patterning does indicate the potential presence of some, possibly, Roman period evidence locally.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, low or slight potential has been identified for prehistoric, Iron Age and medieval evidence. In terms of direct impact, therefore, assessment has demonstrated that there is potential for archaeology within the proposed development site but no potential for archaeology of national significance.”</i></p>
<b>Survey Methods</b>	Detailed magnetic survey
<b>Study Area</b>	c. 2.5 ha

### 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 CIfA and are committed to upholding its policies and standards.

### 3.2 Survey methods

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 Chinnor has not identified any anomalies that have been characterised as being of *probable* or *possible* archaeological origin. The following list refers to the interpretation plots.

### 4.1 ***Probable Archaeology***

No probable archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

### 4.2 ***Possible Archaeology***

No possible archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

### 4.3 ***Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture***

No evidence of medieval or post-medieval agriculture have been identified within the survey area.

### 4.4 ***Other Anomalies***

Three small, discrete positive linear anomalies in the north of the site are indicative of former cut features, though their exact origin is uncertain. It is possible that these are of archaeological origin, though the lack of other similar anomalies and low archaeological potential suggest they are unlikely to be archaeological. Areas of magnetic disturbance around the site are the result of substantial nearby ferrous metal objects, such as fences and a telegraph pole.

## 5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Chalk geologies generally provide good results for magnetic survey, though some variability has been found with West Melbury Marly Chalk. The lack of archaeological anomalies detected corroborates with information in the desk-based assessment of the site having a low potential for archaeological remains, and as such it is likely that the survey has been effective.

## 6 CONCLUSION

The survey at Chinnor has not identified any anomalies of archaeological origin, corresponding with the low potential for archaeological remains outlined by the desk-based assessment. A small number of anomalies of uncertain origin have been detected though seem unlikely to be archaeological. The remaining responses are modern and are a result of nearby ferrous objects such as fences and telegraph poles.

## 7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., *website*:  
(<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 15/11/2016]

CgMs Consulting, 2016. *Land at Doveleat, Chinnor, Oxon – Heritage Assessment*

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. ([http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CifAS&GGeophysics\\_1.pdf](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 6 South East 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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