GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Land adjacent to Chediston Street, Halesworth, Suffolk

Client
CgMs Consulting Ltd

Survey Report
10989

Date
March 2017

Issuing Office

SUMO Services Ltd
Cowburn Farm
Market Street
Thornton
Bradford
BD13 3HW
T: 01274 835016
geophysics@sumoservices.com
www.sumoservices.com

Incorporating

GSB PROSPECTION LTD

and

STRATASCAN LTD

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:
Land off Chediston Street, Halesworth, Suffolk

SUMO Job reference:
10989

Client:
CgMs Consulting Ltd

Survey dates:
8-10 March 2017

Report date:
March 2017

Field co-ordinator:
Tom Cockcroft MSc

Field Team:
David Stockwell BA

Report written by:
Dr John Gater BSc DSc(Hon) MCIfA FSA

CAD illustrations by:
Jon Tanner BSc MSc PCIfA

Project Manager:
Jon Tanner BSc MSc PCIfA

Report approved by:
Dr John Gater BSc DSc(Hon) MCIfA FSA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

DIGITAL CONTENT (Archive Data)

- Minimally Processed Greyscale Images and XY Trace Plots in DWG format
- DWG Viewer
- Digital Copies of Report Text and Figures (both PDF and native formats)

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Apart from a few former field boundaries, the geophysical survey has not identified any archaeological features. A former sand pit, an old horse racing track and other modern features dominate the results.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

SUMO Services Ltd 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 Ltd**.

2.2 Site details

NGR / Postcode	TM 379 771 / IP19 8TQ
Location	The site is on the north-western outskirts of Halesworth, Suffolk, and is bounded to the north by Chediston Street and Roman Way to the east. Agricultural fields lie to the west, with residential properties to the south.
HER/SMR	Suffolk
OASIS Ref.	gsbprosp1-278330
HER Parish Code	HWT 052
HER Event Number	ESF25462
District	Waveney DC
Parish	Halesworth CP
Topography	Gently undulating
Current Land Use	Pasture
Weather	Overcast and sunny
Geology / Soils	Bedrock: Craig group – sand. Superficial deposits: Lowestoft Formation sand and gravel (diamicton in the south of the site) (BGS 2017).
Archaeology	"...the study site is considered to have a high theoretical potential for Roman evidence, a moderate potential for Prehistoric, Anglo Saxon and Medieval and a low potential for Post-Medieval..." (CgMs 2016).
Survey Methods	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
Study Area	9ha

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 (EH 2008) (then English Heritage) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2002 & CIfA 2014).

3.2 Survey methods

Detailed magnetic survey was chosen as an efficient and effective method of locating archaeological anomalies.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1.0m	0.25m

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A

3.3 Data Processing

The following basic processing steps have been carried out on the data used in this report:

De-stripe
De-stagger
Interpolate

3.4 Presentation of results and interpretation

. The presentation of the results for each site involves a grey-scale and colour-scale plot of processed data. Magnetic anomalies are identified, interpreted and plotted onto the 'Interpretation' drawings. The minimally processed data are provided as a greyscale image in the Archive Data Folder with an XY trace plot in CAD format. A CAD viewer is also provided.

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 other existing evidence, the anomalies will be given specific categories, such as: *Abbey Wall* or *Roman Road*. Where the interpretation is based largely on the geophysical data, levels of confidence are implied, 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

4.1 *Probable Archaeology / Possible Archaeology*

No magnetic responses have been recorded that could be interpreted as being of archaeological interest.

4.2 *Former Field Boundary*

Three former field boundaries are visible in the data as linear magnetic responses. Anomalies [1] and [2] are recorded on the 1884 OS map whilst [3] is marked on the 1938 map. The latter may simply coincide with the limit of allotments / gardens marked at this location.

Linear anomaly [4] appears to be appended to [1] forming a small rectilinear enclosure though nothing is visible on early mapping to support this interpretation. It seems unlikely that the feature is of any great antiquity.

4.3 *Agricultural – Ploughing, Land drains*

There is no evidence for medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, though a few narrowly spaced parallel linear anomalies probably indicate modern ploughing.

4.4 *Natural / Geological / Pedological / Topographic*

A narrow curving band of amorphous responses [5] is typical of natural magnetic anomalies recorded on sands and gravels.

An area of magnetic disturbance [6] coincides with the location of a former sandpit visible on mapping between 1888 and 1957, but infilled by 1972. Modern debris including general rubbish has been dumped on the site of the pit and this accounts for some of the disturbance.

4.5 *Race Track*

A former horse racing track is clearly visible in the data [7] and it survives as a feature on the ground. It is also visible on Google imagery as a clear image.

4.6 *Uncertain*

There are several linear trends in the data, especially in the eastern part of the site; they could be agricultural, or related to the horse racing track. As such, a more precise interpretation is not possible.

4.7 *Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance*

Ferrous responses close to boundaries are largely due to adjacent fences and gates, though a linear in the north-east corner marks a service pipe and manhole cover. A large metal container and farm machinery has added to the ferrous responses.

Smaller scale ferrous anomalies ("iron spikes") are present throughout the data and their form is best illustrated in the XY trace plots. These responses are characteristic of small pieces of ferrous debris (or brick / tile) in the topsoil and are commonly assigned a modern origin. Only the most prominent of these are highlighted on the interpretation diagram.

5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

5.1 English Heritage Guidelines (EH 2008) Table 4 states that the average magnetic response on sands and gravels is variable but good in places. In this instance, the detection of former field boundaries suggests that the survey is likely to have detected any archaeological features, if present.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 The magnetic data are quite noisy and largely reflect relatively recent activity on the site, such as the old sand pit, modern dumping and the race-horse track. A few former field boundaries have been identified but there are no responses indicative of archaeological features.

7 REFERENCES

BGS 2017 British Geological Survey *website*: (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps) Geology of Britain viewer [Accessed 15/03/2017].

CgMS 2016 *Land adj. to Chediston Street, Halesworth, Suffolk, IP19,* Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, MP/MS/22873, CgMS Consulting Ltd, unpublished report.

CIfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey.* Amended 2016. CIfA Guidance note. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf

EH 2008 *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation.* English Heritage, Swindon https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geophysical-survey-in-archaeological-field-evaluation/geophysics-guidelines.pdf/

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

N

Site Location

Title:

Site Location Diagram

Client:

CgMs Consulting Ltd.

Project:

10989 Land Adjacent to
Chediston Street, Halesworth

sumo Survey

GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Scale: 0 metres 2000

1:50000 @ A4

Fig No: 1



Magnetometer Survey Area
Showing 30m Grids

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Location of Survey Area

Client:
CgMs Consulting Ltd.

Project:
10989 Land Adjacent to
Chediston Street, Halesworth

Scale:
0 metres 80
1:2000 @ A3

Fig No:
2

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Magnetometer Survey
Greyscale Plot

Client:
CgMs Consulting Ltd.

Project:
10989 Land Adjacent to
Chediston Street, Halesworth

Scale:
0 metres 80
1:2000 @ A3

Fig No:
3

- Horse Race Track
- Uncertain Origin (trend)
- Former Field Boundary - Mapped
- Former Field Boundary - Conjectural
- Natural
- Ploughing
- Pipe
- Magnetic Disturbance
- Ferrous

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title: Magnetometer Survey Interpretation

Client: CgMs Consulting Ltd.

Project: 10989 Land Adjacent to Chediston Street, Halesworth

Scale: 0 metres 80
1:2000 @ A3

Fig No: 4

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 (De-stagger)	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 responses 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 may lead and empty into larger diameter pipes, 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.
Service	Magnetically strong anomalies, usually forming linear features are indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) or the fill of the trench can cause weaker magnetic responses which can be identified from their uniform linearity.
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* / *Natural* or (in the case of linear responses) *Possible Archaeology* / *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 0.1 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000 (nT), 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; 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 feature. The difference between the two sensors will relate to the strength of a magnetic field created by this 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 and disturbance from modern services.

OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England

Printable version

OASIS ID: gsbprosp1-278330

Project details

Project name	Land Adjacent to Chediston Street, Halesworth,Suffolk
Short description of the project	Geophysical (magnetometer) survey of approximately 9ha.
Project dates	Start: 08-03-2017 End: 10-03-2017
Previous/future work	Not known / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	10989 - Contracting Unit No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Other 15 - Other
Monument type	NONE None
Monument type	NONE None
Significant Finds	NONE None
Significant Finds	NONE None
Development type	Housing estate
Prompt	National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF
Position in the planning process	Pre-application
Solid geology	NORWICH CRAG, RED CRAG AND CHILLESFORD CLAY
Drift geology	SAND AND GRAVEL OF UNCERTAIN AGE OR ORIGIN
Techniques	Magnetometry

Project location

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK WAVENEY HALESWORTH Land Adjacent to Chediston Street, Halesworth
Postcode	IP19 8TQ
Study area	9 Hectares
Site coordinates	TM 637990 277180 51.884785122651 1.833878442767 51 53 05 N 001 50 01 E Point

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Sumo Services
Project brief originator	Consultant
Project design originator	Sumo Services

Project director/manager	Sumo Services
Project supervisor	SumoServices
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer
Name of sponsor/funding body	Christchurch Property Company Ltd.

Project archives

Physical Archive Exists?	No
Digital Archive recipient	Sumo Services
Digital Contents	"Survey"
Digital Media available	"Geophysics"
Paper Archive recipient	Sumo Services
Paper Contents	"Survey"
Paper Media available	"Plan","Report","Survey "

Entered by	Sumo Services (info@gsbsumo.com)
Entered on	6 March 2017

OASIS:

Please e-mail Historic England for OASIS help and advice



- Archaeological
- Geophysical
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Building
- Topographic
- Utility Mapping

SUMO Services Ltd, incorporated under the laws of England and Wales,
Company Registration No.4275993.
Registered Office Unit 8 Hayward Business Centre, New Lane, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2NL