GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

STRATASCAN™

SUMO Survey Services
SUMO Group Member

Project name:
Land East of Hailsham, East Sussex

Client:
Orion Heritage

Job ref:
J10401

October 2016

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name: **Land East of Hailsham, East Sussex** Client: **Orion Heritage**	Job ref: **J10401**
Survey date: **3-5 October 2016**	Report date: **October 2016**
Field team: **Robert Knight** BA (Hons) **Stewart Hawthorne** BA (Hons) **Samuel Wood**	Project Manager: **Simon Haddrell** BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA
Report written by: **Dr John Gater** MCIfA FSA	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:	Amendments:
V1 27/10/2016	

SUMO Survey Services

SUMO Group Member

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

LIST OF FIGURES

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The survey at Hailsham has identified a few anomalies of *possible* archaeological interest; they may indicate ditch lengths and pits, but a more precise interpretation is not possible.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

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

2.2 Site Details

NGR / Postcode	TQ 602 091 / BN27 2SJ
Location	The site lies on the eastern outskirts of Hailsham, occupying fields between Marshfoot Lane in the north, Little Marshfoot Farm in the south, residential homes in the south-west and further fields to the east.
HER/SMR	East Sussex
District	Wealden, East Sussex
Parish	Hailsham CP
Topography	Mostly flat
Current Land Use	Grassland
Weather Conditions	Fine, dry
Soils	The overlying soils are borderline between Wickham 1 (711e) in the west, (slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged fine silty over clayey soils) and Newchurch 2 (814c) in the east (stoneless mainly calcareous clayey soils with groundwater controlled by ditches and pumps) (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 6 South East England).
Geology	The underlying geology is Weald Clay Formation – Mudstone with no recorded drift deposits (British Geological Survey website).
Archaeology	No details available.
Survey Methods	Detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry)
Study Area	c. 18.3 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 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 Hailsham has identified a number of anomalies that have been characterised as being of *possible* archaeological origin. The following list of numbered anomalies refers to numerical labels on the interpretation plots.

4.1 Probable Archaeology

No probable archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

4.2 Possible Archaeology

A cluster of magnetic anomalies **[1]** comprising short linear and curvilinear responses and well-defined discrete anomalies; the former are possible ditch and gulley-like features, while the latter could be pits or similar cut-features. As such they could be of archaeological interest but the anomalies do not form a clear pattern or form which might aid their interpretation. As they stand the features appear to be plough-damaged.

4.3 Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture

The area under investigation overlaps with low lying, agricultural land which is managed by a series of water pumps, water courses and drains; these also functioned as former or still-extant field boundaries. Anomalies **[2]** represent former drainage channels / boundaries which are marked on the 1875 Ordnance Survey map; the magnetic response is clearly associated with the infilled features. A similar magnetic anomaly is apparent **[3]** but this is not marked on mapping.

A former boundary is depicted by the linear responses **[4]** and this appears on old maps and as a trackway on Google imagery. A possible former field boundary **[5]** is visible in the north of the site.

Land drains and ploughing lines are visible following a north-south alignment in the north, and a northwest–southeast alignment in the middle fields.

The anomalies **[6]** would appear to represent an old course of a drainage channel which has been straightened to form the existing, now adjacent channel / boundary.

4.4 Other Anomalies

Bands of sinuous anomalies **[7]** running across the northern field are pedological or geological in origin, they have the appearance of terracettes.

A number of isolated anomalies, some linear, others more discrete in shape **[8]** fall into the category of uncertain origin. In the absence of a wider archaeological context, a natural or agricultural origin seems more probable, but there is nothing in the results to provide a definitive interpretation.

Several pipes **[9]** have been detected. An area of magnetic disturbance **[10]** has no immediate explanation; soil marks are visible on Google imagery in this area but there is no obvious indication that the soil has been stripped in this area. The results are typical of areas where green waste has been spread over fields.

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.

A number of magnetic 'spikes' (typically strong positive values with associated negative response) indicate ferrous metal objects. These are likely to be modern rubbish.

5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Mudstones are in generally fair to good for magnetic survey. In this instance the detection of features which could be archaeological, plus former field boundaries, drainage channels and past ploughing, indicates that the magnetic survey is providing a good picture of the buried features.

6 CONCLUSION

A cluster of anomalies may be of archaeological interest; they could be associated with short ditch lengths and possibly pits, but they form no recognisable pattern, which casts some doubt on the interpretation.

Other anomalies are easier to interpret and reflect filled-in water channels, former boundaries, plough lines, drains, pipes and areas of ferrous disturbance.

7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., *website*: (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 27/10/2016]

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 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 *Grad*601-2
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.

Archaeology/Probable Archaeology	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.
Possible Archaeology	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.
Industrial / Burnt-Fired	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.
Former Field Boundary (probable & possible)	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.
Ridge & Furrow	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.
Agriculture (ploughing)	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
Land Drain	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.
Natural	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
Magnetic Disturbance	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.
Service	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.
Ferrous	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.
Uncertain Origin	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 *Possible Archaeology* and *Possible Natural* or (in the case of linear responses) *Possible Archaeology* and *Possible Agriculture*; 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.

Survey services you can rely on

sumo Survey Services

Your Survey Partner

For a complete and complementary range of survey services.

Survey services
you can rely on

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