

2EE02 EEW - HS2 Phase 2a Early Environmental Works

# Site 181 – Geophysics Survey Report Heritage Non-intrusive Survey Reports Group 009

Document no: 2EE02-BAF-EV-PLN-A000-000016

Revision	Author	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Reason for revision
C01	Matt Berry	Sam Harrison	Alistair Webb	31/10/2022	1 <sup>st</sup> Issue

Methodology	Project Plan Site Code
Gradiometer (Magnetometer) Survey	2a20DMARMG

Security classification: OFFICIAL

HS2 Ltd - Code 1 - Accepted

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Project Background	2
2.2	Scope of Document	2
2.3	The Site	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Archaeological Background</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Summary of the archaeological resource	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	Magnetometry	6
4.2	Aims and Objectives	6
4.4	Fieldwork Methodology	6
4.5	Data processing	7
<b>5</b>	<b>Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1	Gradiometer survey results and interpretation	8
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>Annex 1: Magnetometer survey</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Annex 2: Geophysical Interpretation</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Annex 3: OASIS Form</b>	<b>21</b>

### List of Figures

- Figure 1** Site location and GPS swaths  
**Figure 2** Processed greyscale magnetometer data  
**Figure 3** XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data  
**Figure 4** Interpretation of magnetometer data

## 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1.1 This document comprises a Final Report for a non-intrusive geophysical survey on the route of the proposed Phase 2a of High Speed Two (HS2) covering land proposed for development or likely to be impacted during the scheme as part of the Early Environmental Works (EEW) package. This report contains the results of a magnetometer survey undertaken on 25th January 2022 at Site 181 within Group 009.
- 1.1.2 The aim of the survey is to establish the presence/absence, extent and character of detectable archaeological remains within the proposed route of HS2 Phase 2a. The scope of the surveys is dependent upon securing access to the land and for the areas to be suitable for survey.
- 1.1.3 EEW group 009 is located within the area of Marston, to the north of the town of Stafford, Staffordshire. Site 181 is located 250m north of Marston Farm, to the north-west of Woodhill Farm and the area required for geophysical survey consists of two separate parcels immediately north of Yarlet Lane totalling approximately 2.5ha.
- 1.1.4 EEW Group 009 falls within a Recognised Archaeological Zone (RAZ), specifically RAZ 18. This is defined as containing evidence of the north portion of a deserted medieval village at Marston.
- 1.1.5 The survey has not identified any anomalies of definite or possible archaeological origin. The only anomaly of note in the data is a likely service pipe running alongside Yarlet Lane.
- 1.1.6 No magnetic anomalies have been detected in either of the parcels which could represent ridge and furrow or linear features associated with historic boundaries and/or former watercourses as identified in LiDAR data and/or aerial photographs. Similarly, no anomalies have been recorded which may relate to the DMV at Marston which is located nearby in the vicinity of the junction of Marston Lane and Yarlet Lane.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Project Background

- 2.1.1 HS2 is a new railway network proposed by the Government to provide a new link between London, the West Midlands, the East Midlands, South Yorkshire, Leeds and Manchester. HS2 Phase 2a comprises approximately 36 miles of railway starting at Fradley at its southern end and connects with the West Coast Main Line (WCML), south of Crewe, to allow HS2 services to join the existing network and call at Crewe Station.
- 2.1.2 The overall framework within which archaeological work will be undertaken is set out in the draft Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMR) for HS2 Phase 2a. Accordingly, the nominated undertaker or any contractors will be required to implement certain control measures in relation to archaeology before construction work begins.
- 2.1.3 The works have been undertaken in accordance with Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI, HS2 2019a) and conform with current best practice and guidance for geophysical surveys as outlined in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey (CIfA 2014) and European Archaeologiae Consilium Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Archaeology (EAC 2016).
- 2.1.4 The selection of areas required for geophysical survey included as part of this Early Environmental Works (EEW) package are set out in location specific Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) based on Groups containing individual sites. HS2 Ltd has provided each EEW site along the Phase 2a route with a unique identifier Site Code.
- 2.1.5 Within EEW Group 009 (HS2 2021) the Site Code for geophysical survey is:
- Site 181: 2a20DMARMG

### 2.2 Scope of Document

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

### 2.3 The Site

- 2.3.1 Site 181 is located 250m north of Marston Farm, to the north-west of Woodhill Farm and consists of two separate parcels immediately north of Yarelt Lane. The site is centred at NGR 392018 328124 and encompasses c.4.0ha area of which approximately 2.5ha is required for geophysical survey (Figure 1).
- 2.3.2 The separate parcels form an irregular L-shape occupying the extent of a curtailed strip field with an extant pond feature. The northernmost parcel was under grazed pasture and the parcel adjacent Yarelt Lane contained unmanaged pasture at the time of survey. Full coverage of the Site was achieved.
- 2.3.3 Modern Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping indicates that there is a gradual eastward slope across the site from c.120m above Ordnance Datum (aOD), in the south-west site corner, to c.115m OD

in the north site extent, and c.112m aOD in the south-east site corner.

- 2.3.4 The solid geology across Site is recorded as mudstone of the Mercia Mudstone Group. No superficial deposits are recorded across the Site (BGS 2021).
- 2.3.5 The soils covering the Site area classified in Soilscape 8 Association described as slightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage (Cranfield University 2020).
- 2.3.6 Average responses of magnetometer surveys over mudstones are generally poor but results can be very variable depending on the nature and depth of overlying deposits if present (English Heritage 2008; Table 4). It remains that magnetometry was the most appropriate geophysical technique for evaluating the Site taking account of the limitations noted in Section 4.3 below.

## 3 Archaeological Background

### 3.1 Summary of the archaeological resource

3.1.1 The following archaeological background summarises details from the Location Specific Written Scheme of Investigation (LSWSI, HS2 2021) together with information from publicly available online resources and other in-house resources.

3.1.2 The assessment and determination of the significance of archaeological assets is defined by Chapter 10 of the HS2 Ltd EIA Scope and Methodology Report (HS2 2017a).

3.1.3 The Recognised Archaeological Zones (RAZ) represent a high-level indication of likely concentrations of archaeological remains across the Phase 2a route. The location and spatial extent of RAZs has been determined using HS2 Environmental Statement (ES) Cultural Heritage information (HS2 2017b) and subsequent survey data.

3.1.4 The HS2 Phase 2a GWSI: HERDS document identifies that the EEW Group falls within a Recognised Archaeological Zone (RAZ). Specifically, RAZ 18 which is defined as containing evidence of the north portion of a deserted medieval village at Marston, particularly likely in the area of extensive earthworks near the junction of Marston Lane and Yarlet Lane.

3.1.5 The HS2 ES (2017b) and Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) has identified four archaeological assets within or immediately adjacent to Site 181, they comprise:

- Earthwork remains of medieval ridge and furrow, identified on aerial photography from the 1960s in the area to the north of Marston (HER MST5670). Such evidence would be of low significance.
- The south-eastern extent of Site 181 overlaps with the indicative area of a possible deserted medieval village (DMV; HER MST2494/COY130). An extensive area of broad ridge and furrow may also be extant. Evidence of medieval settlement would be of moderate significance.
- Immediately south of Yarlet Lane is the isolated farmstead of Marston New Farm (present-day Grange Farm). The building was of possible late 18th century date, and originally laid out around a regular courtyard with additional detached buildings (HER MST17395/COY134). The farmhouse and the western side of the original courtyard range are still present, but the remainder of the original buildings appear to have been replaced with new agricultural buildings.
- Immediately south of Yarlet Lane is an area of linear earthworks and ridge and furrow features to the north-west of the Marston DMV (COY135). These features are thought to be medieval would likely be of low significance.

- 3.1.6 The 1790 Marston Estate map and the 1838 Marston Tith map show the sites of Group 009 within a landscape which resembles the still present field arrangements, though a now removed lane 'to Erson Moor' crosses the south-eastern corner of Site 181. By the time of the 1881 Ordnance Survey the lane has been removed, and the landscape and field divisions are comparable those still present. No features of archaeological interest are recorded on available historic mapping.
- 3.1.7 The CA 2: Colwich to Yarlet: Cultural heritage survey report (HS2 2017c) noted that no geophysical survey work has been undertaken within the immediate vicinity of the EEW Group area.
- 3.1.8 Historic Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping from the late 19th and early 20th century shows a landscape comparable to that seen today, though with the extent of Tixall Park being clearly marked. No other unrecorded assets of potential interest are recorded on available historic mapping.
- 3.1.9 CA 2: Colwich to Yarlet: Cultural heritage survey report (HS2 2017c) noted that no geophysical survey work has been undertaken within the immediate vicinity of the EEW Group area, nor is any advised to have been subsequently undertake to date.
- 3.1.10 LiDAR/Remote sensing survey/aerial photography data (HS2 2017c) identified five features within or adjacent to Site 181 which comprise:
- A faint, sinuous linear feature, running roughly south-east to north-west, which may represent a former boundary or the route of an extinct water course (LiDAR ID 2109). The feature is not recorded on early Ordnance Survey mapping. This feature would likely be of low significance.
  - A very faint linear feature aligned roughly north-west to south-east, which is thought to represent a former field boundary (LiDAR ID 2112). The feature is not recorded on early Ordnance Survey mapping. This feature would likely be of low significance.
  - A very faint linear feature, aligned roughly north-west to south-east, which is thought to represent a former field boundary (LiDAR ID 2113). The feature is not recorded on early Ordnance Survey mapping. This feature would likely be of low significance.
  - A very faint linear feature aligned roughly north-west to south-east, which is thought to represent a former field boundary (LiDAR ID 2114). The feature is not recorded on early Ordnance Survey mapping. This feature would likely be of low significance.
  - An area containing parcels of possible, faint ridge and furrow, measuring approximately 353m × 200m (LiDAR ID 2116). This feature would likely be of low significance.

## 4 Methodology

### 4.1 Magnetometry

Magnetic survey methods rely on the ability of a variety of instruments to measure very small magnetic fields associated with buried archaeological remains. A feature such as a ditch, pit or kiln can act like a small magnet, or series of magnets, that produce distortions (anomalies) in the earth's magnetic field. In mapping these slight variations, detailed plans of sites can be obtained as buried features often produce reasonably characteristic anomaly shapes and strengths (Gaffney and Gater 2003). Further information on soil magnetism and the interpretation of magnetic anomalies is provided in Annex 1 and Annex 2 respectively.

### 4.2 Aims and Objectives

4.2.1 The aims of the survey comprise the following:

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

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

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

### 4.3 Assumptions and limitations

Magnetometry is the most widely used geophysical survey technique in archaeology as it can quickly evaluate large areas and, under favourable conditions, identify a wide range of archaeological features including infilled cut features such as large pits, gullies and ditches, hearths, and areas of burning and kilns and brick structures. It is therefore good at locating settlements of all periods, prehistoric field systems and enclosures and areas of industrial or modern activity, amongst others. It is less successful in identifying smaller features such as post-holes and small pits (except when using a non-standard sampling interval), unenclosed (prehistoric) settlement sites and graves/burial grounds. Magnetometry has the potential to rapidly confirm the presence/absence of a wide range of potential archaeological remains within the site and was thus chosen as the most appropriate technique in this instance.

### 4.4 Fieldwork Methodology

OFFICIAL

- 4.4.1 The survey was undertaken using four Bartington Grad601 sensors mounted at 1m intervals (1m traverse interval) onto a rigid carrying frame. The system was programmed to take readings at a frequency of 10Hz (allowing for a 10-15cm sample interval) on roaming traverses (swaths) 4m apart (Figure 1). These readings were stored on an external weatherproof laptop and later downloaded for processing and interpretation. The system was linked to a Trimble R8s Real Time Kinetic (RTK) differential Global Positioning System (dGPS) outputting in NMEA mode to ensure a high positional accuracy for each data point, in accordance with EAC guidelines (EAC 2016).
- 4.4.2 Unenclosed areas were surveyed using the co-ordinates of the pre-determined Site boundary visible as an outline on the MLGrad601 software during data collection.
- 4.4.3 MLGrad601 (Geomar Software Inc.) software was used to collect the data.

## 4.5 Data processing

- 4.5.1 Data collected using RTK GPS-based methods cannot be produced without minimal processing of the data. The minimally processed data has been interpolated to project the data onto a regular grid and de-striped to correct for slight variations in instrument calibration drift and any other artificial data.
- 4.5.2 A high pass filter has been applied to the greyscale plots to remove low frequency anomalies (relating to survey tracks and modern agricultural features) to maximise the clarity and interpretability of the archaeological anomalies.
- 4.5.3 The data has also been clipped to remove extreme values and to improve data contrast.
- 4.5.4 MultiGrad601 (Geomar Software Inc.) software was used to export the survey data files.
- 4.5.5 Terrasurveyor V3.0.37.0 (DWConsulting) software was used to process and export graphical plots the data.

## 5 Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation

### 5.1 Gradiometer survey results and interpretation

- 5.1.1 The magnetometer survey was carried out on the 25th January 2022 and covered an area of 2.5ha.
- 5.1.2 Fully processed (greyscale) data, minimally processed data (XY trace plot) and interpretative plans are presented at a scale of 1:2,000 in Figures 2 – 7 inclusive.
- 5.1.3 The magnetic background is homogenous across the two parcels likely a result of the underlying mudstone geology.
- 5.1.4 Findings from both parcels are limited to faint linear trend anomalies identifying agricultural ploughing patterns, areas of magnetic disturbance at field boundaries and a service pipe (181-001) indicated by a high magnitude linear anomaly located alongside Yarlet Lane.
- 5.1.5 Sporadic discrete low magnitude and dipolar 'spike' anomalies likely have natural and modern causes respectively and are of no archaeological interest. An area of magnetic disturbance towards the western end of the southern parcel identifies tipping/infilling of rubble at the field entrance.

## 6 Discussion

- 6.1.1 The survey has not identified any anomalies of definite or possible archaeological origin. The only anomaly of note in the data is a likely service pipe running alongside Yarlet Lane.
- 6.1.2 No magnetic anomalies have been detected in either of the parcels which could represent ridge and furrow or linear features associated with historic boundaries and/or former watercourses as identified in LiDAR data and/or aerial photographs.
- 6.1.3 Similarly, no anomalies have been recorded which may relate to the DMV at Marston which is located nearby in the vicinity of the junction of Marston Lane and Yarlet Lane.

## References

### Bibliography

British Geological Survey (BGS) 2022 Geology of Britain 3D <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/> accessed 18th July 2022

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2014 Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey (Reading)  
[https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics\\_3.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_3.pdf) accessed 18th July 2022

Cranfield University 2020 Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institute Soilscales  
<http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscales/> accessed 18th July 2022

English Heritage 2008 Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation

Europae Archaeologia Consillium (EAC) 2016 EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology: Question to Ask and Points to Consider (Namur, Belgium) <https://www.europae-archaeologiae-consilium.org/eac-guidlines> accessed 18th July 2022

Gaffney C & Gater J 2003 Revealing the Buried Past: Geophysics for Archaeologists Stroud

HS2 Ltd, 2017a High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe). Environmental Statement. Volume 5: Technical appendices. Environment Impact Assessment Scope and Methodology Report (CT-001-001). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/scope-and-methodology-report-for-hs2-phase-2a>

HS2 Ltd, 2017b High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe). Environmental Statement. Volume 5: Technical appendices. CA2: Colwich to Yarlet. Gazetteer of heritage assets. (CH-002-002) Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-2a-environmental-statement#volume-5:-environmental-reports-and-maps-by-community-area>

HS2 Ltd, 2017c High Speed Two Phase 2a (West Midlands-Crewe). Background Information and Data. CA2: Colwich to Yarlet. Cultural heritage survey reports. (BID-CH-004-002) Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-2a-environmental-statement#volume-5:-environmental-reports-and-maps-by-community-area>

HS2 2019a HS2 Phase 2a Written Scheme of Investigation for EI-711 Surveys Package 1: Magnetometry (HS2-HS2-EV-MST-A000001)

HS2 Ltd, 2019b High Speed Two Phase 2a (West Midlands-Crewe). Background Information and Data. Cultural heritage survey data used in the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 and Additional Provision 2 Environmental Statement. (BID-CH-004-000). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2a-background-information-and-data-cultural-heritage-february-2019>

HS2, 2021, Phase 2a LS-WSI: EEW Group 009, EEW Sites 181, 187, 188 and 189 (HS2 Document no:

2EE01-BAF-EV-PRO-A000-000015, Revision: 07)

## Annex 1: Magnetometer survey

### Magnetic susceptibility and soil magnetism

Iron makes up about 6% of the earth's crust and is mostly present in soils and rocks as minerals such as maghaemite and haematite. These minerals have a weak, measurable magnetic property termed magnetic susceptibility. Human activities can redistribute these minerals and change (enhance) others into more magnetic forms so that by measuring the magnetic susceptibility of the topsoil, areas where human occupation or settlement has occurred can be identified by virtue of the attendant increase (enhancement) in magnetic susceptibility. If the enhanced material subsequently comes to fill features, such as ditches or pits, localised isolated and linear magnetic anomalies can result whose presence can be detected by a magnetometer (fluxgate gradiometer).

In general, it is the contrast between the magnetic susceptibility of deposits filling cut features, such as ditches or pits, and the magnetic susceptibility of the topsoil, subsoil and rock, into which these features have been cut, which causes the most recognisable responses. This is primarily because there is a tendency for magnetic ferrous compounds to become concentrated in the topsoil, thereby making it more magnetic than the subsoil or the bedrock. Linear features cut into the subsoil or geology, such as ditches, that have been silted up or have been backfilled with topsoil will therefore usually produce a positive magnetic response relative to the background soil levels. Discrete feature, such as pits, can also be detected.

The magnetic susceptibility of a soil can also be enhanced by the application of heat. This effect can lead to the detection of features such as hearths, kilns, or areas of burning

## Annex 2: Geophysical Interpretation

Most anomalies are termed 'positive'. This means that they have a positive magnetic value relative to the magnetic background on any given site. However, some features can manifest themselves as 'negative' anomalies that, conversely, means that the response is negative relative to the mean magnetic background.

Where it is not possible to give a probable cause of an observed anomaly a '?' is appended. It should be noted that anomalies interpreted as modern in origin might be caused by features that are present in the topsoil or upper layers of the subsoil. Removal of soil to an archaeological or natural layer can therefore remove the feature causing the anomaly.

The types of response mentioned above can be divided into five main categories that are used in the graphical interpretation of the magnetic data:

### **Isolated dipolar anomalies (iron spikes)**

These responses are typically caused by ferrous material either on the surface or in the topsoil. They cause a rapid variation in the magnetic response giving a characteristic 'spiky' trace. Although ferrous archaeological artefacts could produce this type of response, unless there is supporting evidence for an archaeological interpretation, little emphasis is normally given to such anomalies, as modern ferrous objects are common on rural sites, often being introduced into the soil during manuring.

### **Areas of magnetic disturbance**

These responses can have several causes often being associated with burnt material, such as slag waste or brick rubble or other strongly magnetised/fired material. Ferrous structures such as pylons, mesh or barbed wire fencing and buried pipes can also cause the same disturbed response. A modern origin is usually assumed unless there is other supporting information.

### **Lightning-induced remnant magnetisation (LIRM)**

LIRM anomalies are thought to be caused in the near surface soil horizons by the flow of an electrical current associated with lightning strikes. These observed anomalies have a strong bipolar signal which decreases with distance from the spike point and often appear as linear or radial in shape.

### **Linear trend**

This is usually a weak or broad linear anomaly of unknown cause or date. These anomalies are often caused by agricultural activity, either ploughing or land drains being a common cause.


### **Areas of magnetic enhancement/positive isolated anomalies**

Areas of enhanced response are characterised by a general increase in the magnetic background over a localised area whilst discrete anomalies are manifest by an increased response (sometimes only visible on an XY trace plot) on two or three successive traces. In neither instance is there the intense dipolar response characteristic exhibited by an area of magnetic disturbance or of an 'iron spike' anomaly (see above). These


anomalies can be caused by infilled discrete archaeological features such as pits or post-holes or by kilns. They can also be caused by pedological variations or by natural infilled features on certain geologies. Ferrous material in the subsoil can also give a similar response. It can often therefore be very difficult to establish an anthropogenic origin without intrusive investigation or other supporting information.


## **Linear and curvilinear anomalies**

Such anomalies have a variety of origins. They may be caused by agricultural practice (recent ploughing trends, earlier ridge and furrow regimes or land drains), natural geomorphological features such as palaeochannels or by infilled archaeological ditches




HS2 Ltd - Code 1 - Accepted










HS2 Ltd - Code 1 - Accepted





## Annex 3: OASIS Form

### Project Details:

<b>Project name</b>	Phase 2a Heritage Non-intrusive Surveys Report: Group 009 Site 181 Geophysics survey report	
<b>Type of project</b>	Geophysical Survey, MAGNETOMETRY SURVEY	
<b>Project description</b>	<p>The survey was undertaken using four Bartington Grad601 sensors mounted at 1m intervals (1m traverse interval) onto a rigid carrying frame. The system was programmed to take readings at a frequency of 10Hz (allowing for a 10-15cm sample interval) on roaming traverses (swaths) 4m apart. These readings were stored on an external weatherproof laptop and later downloaded for processing and interpretation. The system was linked to a Trimble R8s Real Time Kinetic (RTK) differential Global Positioning System (dGPS) outputting in NMEA mode to ensure a high positional accuracy for each data point, in accordance with EAC guidelines (EAC 2016).</p> <p>EEW Group 009 falls within a Recognised Archaeological Zone (RAZ), specifically RAZ 18. This is defined as containing evidence of the north portion of a deserted medieval village at Marston. The survey has not identified any anomalies of definite or possible archaeological origin. The only anomaly of note in the data is a likely service pipe running alongside Yarlet Lane. No magnetic anomalies have been detected in either of the parcels which could represent ridge and furrow or linear features associated with historic boundaries and/or former watercourses as identified in LiDAR data and/or aerial photographs. Similarly, no anomalies have been recorded which may relate to the DMV at Marston which is located nearby in the vicinity of the junction of Marston Lane and Yarlet Lane.</p>	
<b>Project dates</b>	<b>Start:</b> 25-Jan-2022	<b>End:</b> 25-Jan-2022
<b>Previous work</b>	N/A	

<b>Future work</b>		N/A			
<b>Project Code:</b>	Group 009 Site 181	<b>HER event no.</b>			

		<b>NMR no.</b>		<b>OASIS form ID:</b>	hs2headl1-509438
		<b>SM no.</b>			
<b>Planning Application Ref.</b>					
<b>Site Status</b>		None			
<b>Land use</b>		Arable and Pasture			
<b>Monument type</b>		N/A	<b>Period</b>	N/A	

**Project Location:**

<b>Site Address</b>	located 250m north of Marston Farm, to the north-west of Woodhill Farm			<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>County</b>	Staffordshire	<b>District</b>	Stafford	<b>Parish</b>	Marston
<b>Study Area</b>	2.5ha	<b>Height OD</b>	Between 112 and 115m Above Ordnance Datum	<b>NGR</b>	SJ 92100 28147

**Project Creators:**

<b>Name of Organisation</b>	HS2 Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd				
<b>Project brief originator</b>	HS2		<b>Project design originator</b>	HS2	
<b>Project Manager</b>	Alistair Webb		<b>Project Supervisor</b>	Matt Berry	
<b>Sponsor or funding body</b>	Balfour Beatty		<b>Type of Sponsor</b>	Client	

**Project Archive and Bibliography:**

<b>Physical archive</b>	N/A	<b>Digital Archive</b>	Geophysical survey and report	<b>Paper Archive</b>	N/A
<b>Report title</b>	Phase 2a Heritage Non-intrusive Surveys Report: Group 009 Site 181 Geophysics survey report			<b>Date</b>	31/10/2022
<b>Author</b>	Headland Archaeology	<b>Description</b>	PDF/A	<b>Report ref.</b>	

