

Project name: Angelinos Pipeline, Oxfordshire

> Client: Skanska

October 2015

Job ref: J8928

Report author: Thomas Richardson MSc ACIfA

# **GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT**

Project name: Angelinos Pipeline, Oxfordshire Client: Skanska



Job ref: **J8928**  Field team: Lukasz Krawec BSc, Jay Griffiths BA (Hons), Jack Larner, Alexis Thouki MA, Christian Adams BA (Hons), Rosie Everett BA (Hons)

Techniques: Detailed magnetic survey – Gradiometry

Survey date: 9th-16th September, 21st September - 9th October & 19th-20th October 2015

Site centred at: SP 466 271

Post code: OX15 OTY Project manager: Simon Haddrell BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA

Report written By: Thomas Richardson MSc ACIFA

CAD illustrations by: Thomas Richardson MSC ACIFA

Checked by: David Elks MSc ACIFA

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LI	LIST OF FIGURES									
1	SUN	JMMARY OF RESULTS								
2	INT	RODUCTION6								
	2.1	Background synopsis								
	2.2	Site location6								
	2.3	Description of site								
	2.4	Geology and soils6								
	2.5	Site history and archaeological potential6								
	2.6	Survey objectives								
	2.7	Survey methods7								
	2.8	Processing, presentation and interpretation of results7								
	2.8.	1 Processing7								
	2.8.	2 Presentation of results and interpretation7								
3	RES	ULTS								
	3.1	Probable Archaeology								
	3.2	Possible Archaeology9								
	3.3	Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture9								
	3.4	Other Anomalies								
4	DAT	A APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT								
5	CON	ICLUSION								
6	6 REFERENCES									
Α	APPENDIX A – GEOLOGY AND SOILS									
A	APPENDIX B – METHODOLOGY & SURVEY EQUIPMENT									
Α	APPENDIX C – BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETIC SURVEY									
Α	APPENDIX D – GLOSSARY OF MAGNETIC ANOMALIES									

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 01	1:3000	Site location, survey area & referencing
Figure 02	1:3000	Survey area & referencing
Figure 03	1:3000	Survey area & referencing
Figure 04	1:3000	Survey area & referencing
Figure 05	1:3000	Survey area & referencing
Figure 06	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 1-2
Figure 07	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 1-2
Figure 08	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – viewports 1-2
Figure 09	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 3-4
Figure 10	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 3-4
Figure 11	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – viewports 3-4
Figure 12	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 5-6
Figure 13	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 5-6
Figure 14	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – viewports 5-6
Figure 15	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 7-8
Figure 16	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 7-8
Figure 17	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – viewports 7-8
Figure 18	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 9-10
Figure 19	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 9-10
Figure 20	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 9-10
Figure 21	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – viewports 11
Figure 22	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 11
Figure 23	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – viewports 11

Figure 24	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 12-13
Figure 25	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 12-13
Figure 26	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 12-13
Figure 27	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 14-15
Figure 28	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 14-15
Figure 29	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 14-15
Figure 30	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 16-17
Figure 31	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 16-17
Figure 32	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 16-17
Figure 33	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 18
Figure 34	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 18
Figure 35	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 18
Figure 36	5 1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 19-20
Figure 37	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 19-20
Figure 38	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 19-20
Figure 39	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 21-22

Figure 40	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 21-22
Figure 41	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 21-22
Figure 42	1:1250	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values –
		viewports 23-24
Figure 43	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – viewports 23-24
Figure 44	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies –
		viewports 23-24

## 1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 55.4 hectares of mixed arable and grassland, along a proposed pipeline running for 18.5km. The survey has identified areas of probable prehistoric settlement activity and enclosures, as well as the route of a Roman road (Akeman Street) and a possibly Romano-British enclosure. A number of possible archaeological anomalies are seen along the route, some of which may be evidence of further settlement activity, however the narrow nature of the survey makes a more confident interpretation difficult. Areas of ridge and furrow cultivation have been detected in the north and centre of the route, mostly around Deddington, North Aston, and Middle Aston. This suggests that these areas are likely to have been used for agricultural purposes since the medieval period. The remaining anomalies are natural or modern in origin, relating to underground services, trackways, scattered magnetic debris, ferrous objects, and fencing.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

## 2.1 Background synopsis

Stratascan were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for a proposed pipeline. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by Skanska.

## 2.2 Site location

The route runs from Tackley at OS ref. SP 460 186 to Milton at OS ref. SP 452 349, covering 18.5km. The site is centred at OS ref. SP 466 271.

## 2.3 Description of site

The survey area is approximately 61.8ha, covering a 30m wide strip running for 18.5km. However areas of road, buildings, and overgrown field boundaries reduced the surveyable area to approximately 55.4ha of mixed agricultural and grassland.

## 2.4 Geology and soils

Tables showing the geology and soils for the site can be found in Appendix A. The geology of the site is mostly limestone across the south of the site, with areas of sandstone and mudstone across the centre, and limestone and ironstone in the north.

## 2.5 Site history and archaeological potential

The Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) records a number of monuments in the area surrounding the route of the pipeline. A number of areas of prehistoric activity are seen including find spots, areas of Iron Age settlement, and a possible Iron Age Banjo enclosure. Roman activity is recorded as including possible villas, areas of settlement, and field systems.

The Roman road of Akeman Street is also seen crossing the route in the south. The remaining records relate to medieval and post-medieval activity, which is mostly agricultural with a number of post-medieval buildings (Oxfordshire County Council 2015).

## 2.6 Survey objectives

The objective of the survey was to locate any features of possible archaeological origin in order that they may be assessed prior to development.

## 2.7 Survey methods

This report and all fieldwork have been conducted in accordance with both the English Heritage guidelines outlined in the document: *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation, 2008* and with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists document Standard and *Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey.* 

Given the potential for prehistoric and Roman activity, detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry) was used as an efficient and effective method of locating archaeological anomalies. More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix B.

## 2.8 Processing, presentation and interpretation of results

## 2.8.1 Processing

Processing is performed using specialist software. This can emphasise various aspects contained within the data but which are often not easily seen in the raw data. Basic processing of the magnetic data involves 'flattening' the background levels with respect to adjacent traverses and adjacent grids. Once the basic processing has flattened the background it is then possible to carry out further processing which may include low pass filtering to reduce 'noise' in the data and hence emphasise the archaeological or man-made anomalies.

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

1.	Destripe	(Removes striping effects caused by zero-point discrepancies between different sensors and walking directions)
2.	Destagger	(Removes zigzag effects caused by inconsistent walking speeds on sloping, uneven or overgrown terrain)

## 2.8.2 Presentation of results and interpretation

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

## 3 **RESULTS**

The detailed magnetic gradiometer survey conducted along the Angelinos pipeline route has identified a number of anomalies that have been characterised as being either of a *probable* or *possible* archaeological origin.

The difference between *probable* and *possible* archaeological origin is a confidence rating. Features identified within the dataset that form recognisable archaeological patterns or seem to be related to a deliberate historical act have been interpreted as being of a probable archaeological origin.

Features of possible archaeological origin tend to be more amorphous anomalies which may have similar magnetic attributes in terms of strength or polarity but are difficult to classify as being archaeological or natural.

The following list of numbered anomalies refers to numerical labels on the interpretation plots.

## 3.1 **Probable Archaeology**

- 1 A positive linear anomaly in the north of Field 1. This is indicative of a former cut feature, and is likely a ditch related to the Roman Akeman Street.
- **2** Positive linear and curvilinear anomalies in the south of Fields 19 and 20. These are indicative of former cut features, and are likely to relate to former settlement activity. The anomalies appear to form a complex of enclosures likely related to the possible Banjo enclosure recorded in the HER.
- **3** A number of small, discrete, positive anomalies in Fields 19 and 20. These are indicative of small former cut features, such as backfilled pits, and are likely related to the settlement activity seen in Anomaly 2.
- **4** Positive linear anomalies in the north of Field 20. These are indicative of former cut features, and are likely related to former enclosure features. These may relate to the settlement activity seen in Anomalies 2 and 3.
- **5** Two parallel liner positive anomalies in the south-west of Field 23. These are indicative of former cut features, and likely relate to a double ditch feature.
- 6 A positive sub-rectilinear anomaly in the north of Field 25. This is indicative of a former cut feature, and is likely related to a former enclosure.
- 7 A positive curvilinear anomaly in the centre of Field 26. This is indicative of a former cut feature, and is likely of archaeological origin. The feature possibly forms part of a larger enclosure, however the extents of the survey area make a more confident interpretation difficult.

- 8 A right angled linear anomaly in the centre of Field 29. This is indicative of a former cut feature, and is likely related to a former enclosure.
- **9** Positive linear and curvilinear anomalies in the centre of Field 29. This is indicative of a former cut feature. Although the feature's exact origin is unknown it is likely to be archaeological. Due to the extents of the survey area it is not clear whether Anomalies 8 and 9 are contemporary with each other.
- **10** A positive curvilinear anomaly in the north of Field 48, and a positive linear anomaly in the south of Field 49. These are indicative of a former cut feature, and are likely to form two sides of an enclosure.

## 3.2 **Possible Archaeology**

- **11-23** A number of positive linear anomalies along the route of the survey. These are indicative of former cut features, and may be of either archaeological or natural origin. The extents of the survey area make more confident interpretation difficult.
- **24-51** A number of positive linear anomalies along the route. These are indicative of former cut features, and may be of either archaeological or agricultural origin. The extents of the survey area make more confident interpretation difficult.
- **52-58** Areas of small, discrete, positive anomalies along the route of the survey. These are indicative of small former cut features, such as backfilled pits, and may be of archaeological or natural origin.
- **59-60** Areas of positive responses in the north of Field 31 and the south of Field 32. These are indicative of former cut features, and may relate to former settlement activity or be natural in origin.
- **61** A negative linear anomaly in the south of Field 48. This is indicative of former bank or earthwork feature, and may be of either archaeological or natural origin. The extents of the survey area make more confident interpretation difficult.

## 3.3 Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture

- **62** A positive linear anomaly in the west of Field 28. This is likely related to a former field boundary not present on available mapping.
- **63-65** Three positive linear anomalies in Fields 23, 26 and 28. These relate to former field boundaries present on available mapping 1881-1955.
- 66 Areas of widely spaced, curving, parallel linear anomalies along the route of the survey. These are indicative of ridge and furrow cultivation.

67 Areas of closely spaced, parallel linear anomalies along the route of the survey. These are indicative of modern agricultural activity, such as ploughing.

## 3.4 Other Anomalies

- **68** A number of high amplitude, bipolar linear anomalies along the route of the survey. These are indicative of underground services, such as pipes or cables.
- **69** Positive linear anomalies in Fields 12 and 13, 23, 37 and 38, and 40. These relate to modern trackways.
- 70 A large number of areas of magnetic variation along the route of the survey. These anomalies are likely to be geological or pedological in origin. Areas of natural pitting are present across much of the area, as would be expected with a limestone bedrock across the majority of the site.
- 71 Areas of scattered magnetic debris in Fields 15, 23, 30, and 37. These are likely to be modern in origin.
- 72 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.
- **73** A number of magnetic 'spikes' (strong focussed values with associated antipolar response) indicate ferrous metal objects. These are likely to be modern rubbish.

## 4 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Limestone covers the majority of the site and generally gives good responses to magnetic survey. Sandstone and mudstone geologies, such as those seen around the centre of the site, can give variable responses. Archaeological features are mostly seen between Fields 19 and 29; an area covered by limestone, mudstone, and sandstone. This would suggest that each of these geologies is suitable for magnetic survey. This combined with the number of possible archaeological responses and areas of ridge and furrow cultivation seen along the route of the survey would suggest that the survey has been effective for the majority of the area. There are areas covered by strong geological response, such as in Field 54, which may be masking weaker archaeological responses. A similar effect is caused by magnetic disturbance from underground services, which is particularly evident in Fields 4-9. Whilst these effects reduce the area of data visible, any archaeological anomalies are still likely to be visible in adjacent unaffected areas, it is therefore thought to be unlikely that any archaeology is being masked.

## 5 **CONCLUSION**

The survey along the route of the Angelinos pipeline has identified a number of probable and possible archaeological anomalies. The majority of the probable archaeology is located in an area between Fields 19 and 29 (Anomalies 2-9), and mostly comprises probable prehistoric settlement activity and enclosures. The route of a Roman road (Akeman Street) is evident as a ditch in the south of the site, whilst evidence of a possibly Romano-British enclosure is evident in the north. A number of possible archaeological anomalies are seen along the route, some of which may be evidence of further settlement activity, however the narrow nature of the survey makes a more confident interpretation difficult. Areas of ridge and furrow cultivation have been detected in the north and centre of the route, mostly around Deddington, North Aston, and Middle Aston. This suggests that these areas are likely to have been used for agricultural purposes since the medieval period.

A large number of geological anomalies are present across the site. This is normal for limestone and sandstone geologies, which are liable to weathering. The remaining anomalies are modern in origin. These relate to underground services, trackways, scattered magnetic debris, ferrous objects, and fencing.

## 6 **REFERENCES**

British Geological Survey South Sheet, 1977. *Geological Survey Ten Mile Map, South Sheet First Edition* (*Quaternary*). Institute of Geological Sciences.

British Geological Survey, 2001. *Geological Survey Ten Mile Map, South Sheet, Fourth Edition (Solid)*. British Geological Society.

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

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. <u>http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/nodefiles/Geophysics2010.pdf</u>

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

Oxfordshire County Council, 2015. *Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record*. Available from www.oxfordshire.gov.uk [Accessed on 22/10/2015]

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 6 South East England.

## **APPENDIX A** – GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Field Number	Geology	Drift Geology	Soil	Soil Type	Soil Description
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	Cornbrash Formation - Limestone	None Recorded	Elmton 1	Calcareous fine loamy soil	Calcareous fine loamy soil over limestone. Some non-calcareous and calcareous clayey soils.
8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Great Oolite Group – Interbedded Limestone And [subequal/subordinate] Argillaceous Rocks	None Recorded	Aberford	Calcareous fine loamy soil	Shallow, locally brashy, well drained calcareous fine loamy soils over limestone. Some deeper calcareous soils in colluvium.
15	Chipping Norton Limestone Formation – Ooidal Limestone	None Recorded	Frilford	Sandy and coarse loamy soils	Well drained sandy and coarse loamy soils. Some ferruginous sandy and some coarse loamy soils.
16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22	Great Oolite Group – Interbedded Limestone And [subequal/subordinate] Argillaceous Rocks	None Recorded	Frilford	Sandy and coarse loamy soils	Well drained sandy and coarse loamy soils. Some ferruginous sandy and some coarse loamy soils.
23, 24	Horsehay Sand Formation - Sandstone	None Recorded	Frilford	Sandy and coarse loamy soils	Well drained sandy and coarse loamy soils. Some ferruginous sandy and some coarse loamy soils.
25, 26	Horsehay Sand Formation - Sandstone	None Recorded	Aberford	Calcareous fine loamy soil	Shallow, locally brashy, well drained calcareous fine loamy soils over limestone. Some deeper calcareous soils in colluvium.

27	Horsehay Sand Formation - Sandstone	None Recorded	Wickham 2	Fine silty or loamy over clayey soils	Fine loamy over clayey, fine silty over clayey and clayey soils. Small areas of slowly permeable calcareous soils.
28	Whitby Mudstone Formation - Mudstone	None Recorded	Wickham 2	Fine silty or loamy over clayey soils	Fine loamy over clayey, fine silty over clayey and clayey soils. Small areas of slowly permeable calcareous soils.
29	Succession of sandstones, mudstones and limestones. From South to North; Whitby Mudstone, Horsehay Sand, Marlstone, and Dyrham Formation of interbedded silt and Sand	None Recorded	Wickham 2	Fine silty or loamy over clayey soils	Fine loamy over clayey, fine silty over clayey and clayey soils. Small areas of slowly permeable calcareous soils.
30, 31	Charmouth Mudstone Formation - Mudstone	None Recorded	Wickham 2	Fine silty or loamy over clayey soils	Fine loamy over clayey, fine silty over clayey and clayey soils. Small areas of slowly permeable calcareous soils.
32	Dyrham Formation - Interbedded silt and Sand	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
33, 34, 35, 36	Marlstone Rock Formation – Ferruginous Limestone and Ironstone	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.

37	Dyrham Formation - Interbedded silt and Sand	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
38	Charmouth Mudstone Formation - Mudstone	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
39	Marlstone Rock Formation – Ferruginous Limestone and Ironstone	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
40, 41, 42, 43, 44	Whitby Mudstone Formation - Mudstone	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 54	Marlstone Rock Formation – Ferruginous Limestone and Ironstone	None Recorded	Banbury	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils	Brashy fine and coarse loamy ferruginous soils over ironstone. Some deep fine loamy over clayey soils with slowly permeable subsoils.
49, 50, 52, 53	Whitby Mudstone Formation - Mudstone	None Recorded	Denchworth	Clayey soils with similar fine loamy over clayey soils	Seasonally waterlogged clayey soils with similar fine loamy over clayey soils. Some fine loamy over clayey coils and some calcareous clayey soils.

## **APPENDIX B** – METHODOLOGY & SURVEY EQUIPMENT

#### Grid locations

The location of the survey grids has been plotted together with the referencing information. Grids were set out using a Leica 705auto Total Station and referenced to suitable topographic features around the perimeter of the site or a Leica Smart Rover RTK GPS.

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. A SmartNet RTK GPS uses Ordnance Survey's network of over 100 fixed base stations to give an accuracy of around 0.01m.

#### Survey equipment and gradiometer configuration

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 using an appropriate instrument.

The mapping of the anomaly in a systematic manner will allow an estimate of the type of material present beneath the surface. Strong magnetic anomalies will be generated by buried iron-based objects or by kilns or hearths. More subtle anomalies such as pits and ditches can be seen if they contain more humic material which is normally rich in magnetic iron oxides when compared with the subsoil.

To illustrate this point, the cutting and subsequent silting or backfilling of a ditch may result in a larger volume of weakly magnetic material being accumulated in the trench compared to the undisturbed subsoil. A weak magnetic anomaly should therefore appear in plan along the line of the ditch.

The magnetic survey was carried out using a dual sensor Grad601-2 Magnetic Gradiometer manufactured by Bartington Instruments Ltd. The instrument consists of two fluxgates very accurately aligned to nullify the effects of the Earth's magnetic field. Readings relate to the difference in localised magnetic anomalies compared with the general magnetic background. The Grad601-2 consists of two high stability fluxgate gradiometers suspended on a single frame. Each gradiometer has a 1m separation between the sensing elements so enhancing the response to weak anomalies.

#### Sampling interval

Readings were taken at 0.25m centres along traverses 1m apart. This equates to 3600 sampling points in a full 30m x 30m grid.

#### Depth of scan and resolution

The Grad 601-2 has a typical depth of penetration of 0.5m to 1.0m, though strongly magnetic objects may be visible at greater depths. The collection of data at 0.25m centres provides an optimum methodology for the task balancing cost and time with resolution.

#### Data capture

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.

## **APPENDIX C** – BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETIC SURVEY

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.

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.

## **APPENDIX D** – GLOSSARY OF MAGNETIC ANOMALIES

#### Bipolar



A bipolar anomaly is one that is composed of both a positive response and a negative response. It can be made up of any number of positive responses and negative responses. For example a pipeline consisting of alternating positive and negative anomalies is said to be bipolar. See also dipolar which has only one area of each polarity. The interpretation of the anomaly will depend on the magnitude of the magnetic field strength. A weak response may be caused by a clay field drain while a strong response will probably be caused by a metallic service.

#### Dipolar



This consists of a single positive anomaly with an associated negative response. There should be no separation between the two polarities of response. These responses will be created by a single feature. The interpretation of the anomaly will depend on the magnitude of the magnetic measurements. A very strong anomaly is likely to be caused by a ferrous object.

#### Positive anomaly with associated negative response

See bipolar and dipolar.

#### **Positive linear**



A linear response which is entirely positive in polarity. These are usually related to in-filled cut features where the fill material is magnetically enhanced compared to the surrounding matrix. They can be caused by ditches of an archaeological origin, but also former field boundaries, ploughing activity and some may even have a natural origin.

#### Positive linear anomaly with associated negative response



A positive linear anomaly which has a negative anomaly located adjacently. This will be caused by a single feature. In the example shown this is likely to be a single length of wire/cable probably relating to a modern service. Magnetically weaker responses may relate to earthwork style features and field boundaries.

#### Positive point/area



These are generally spatially small responses, perhaps covering just 3 or 4 reading nodes. They are entirely positive in polarity. Similar to positive linear anomalies they are generally caused by in-filled cut features. These include pits of an archaeological origin, possible tree bowls or other naturally occurring depressions in the ground.

#### Magnetic debris



Magnetic debris consists of numerous dipolar responses spread over an area. If the amplitude of response is low (+/-3nT) then the origin is likely to represent general ground disturbance with no clear cause, it may be related to something as simple as an area of dug or mixed earth. A stronger anomaly (+/-250nT) is more indicative of a spread of ferrous debris. Moderately strong anomalies may be the result of a spread of thermoremanent material such as bricks or ash.

#### **Magnetic disturbance**



Magnetic disturbance is high amplitude and can be composed of either a bipolar anomaly, or a single polarity response. It is essentially associated with magnetic interference from modern ferrous structures such as fencing, vehicles or buildings, and as a result is commonly found around the perimeter of a site near to boundary fences.

#### **Negative linear**



A linear response which is entirely negative in polarity. These are generally caused by earthen banks where material with a lower magnetic magnitude relative to the background top soil is built up. See also ploughing activity.

#### Negative point/area

Opposite to positive point anomalies these responses may be caused by raised areas or earthen banks. These could be of an archaeological origin or may have a natural origin.

#### **Ploughing activity**



Ploughing activity can often be visualised by a series of parallel linear anomalies. These can be of either positive polarity or negative polarity depending on site specifics. It can be difficult to distinguish between ancient ploughing and more modern ploughing. Clues such as the separation of each linear, straightness, strength of response and cross cutting relationships can be used to aid this, although none of these can be guaranteed to differentiate between different phases of activity.

#### Polarity

Term used to describe the measurement of the magnetic response. An anomaly can have a positive polarity (values above 0nT) and/or a negative polarity (values below 0nT).

#### Strength of response

The amplitude of a magnetic response is an important factor in assigning an interpretation to a particular anomaly. For example a positive anomaly covering a  $10m^2$  area may have values up to around 3000nT, in which case it is likely to be caused by modern magnetic interference. However, the same size and shaped anomaly but with values up to only 4nT may have a natural origin. Colour plots are used to show the amplitude of response.

#### Thermoremanent response

A feature which has been subject to heat may result in it acquiring a magnetic field. This can be anything up to approximately +/-100 nT in value. These features include clay fired drains, brick, bonfires, kilns, hearths and even pottery. If the heat application has occurred in situ (e.g. a kiln) then the response is likely to be bipolar compared to if the heated objects have been disturbed and moved relative to each other, in which case they are more likely to take an irregular form and may display a debris style response (e.g. ash).

#### Weak background variations



Weakly magnetic wide scale variations within the data can sometimes be seen within sites. These usually have no specific structure but can often appear curvy and sinuous in form. They are likely to be the result of natural features, such as soil creep, dried up (or seasonal) streams. They can also be caused by changes in the underlying geology or soil type which may contain unpredictable distributions of magnetic minerals, and are usually apparent in several locations across a site.



	,				
N	Issue No	. Date	Ameno	lments Descrij	ption
	-	-	-		
			© Stratasc	an Ltd	
/		S REFER	RENCIN	G INFO	RMATION
	A	446006	37 218	386.96	
	D	446025	22 210		
my FJ	D	440025.		250.04	
h the	C	446057.	67, 219:	334.21	
	D	446078.	46, 2193	355.84	
<pre>\f</pre>	E	446120.	88, 219	356.67	
	F	446183.	26, 2194	421.54	
	G	446217.	26, 219	506.92	
	Н	446229.	02, 219	565.75	
	Ι	446237.	84, 219	646.37	
	T	446253.	12, 219	945.98	
	ĸ	446226	19, 220	034.52	
		446996	10, 220	101 50	
	L	440220.	19, 220	184.52	
	M	446257.	89, 2202	229.24	
	N	446274.	12, 2203	378.36	
	0	446250.	79, 2204	441.26	
·	Р	446270.	26, 220	620.20	
	Q	446308.	55, 220′	717.77	
	R	446321.	71, 220	897.28	
	S	446328.	30, 2209	987.04	
	Т	446337.	07, 221	106.72	
	U	446318.	32, 2212	210.23	
	V	446352.	52, 221	417.43	
	W	446365	42, 221	510.36	
	v	446374	67 221	599.88	
	<u>л</u>	440374.		249.00	
	Y	440377.		542.00	
	Z	446377.	53, 221	732.66	
	AA	446397.	09, 2218	854.35	
	AB	446316.	01, 2223	327.45	
	AC	446302.	56, 222	558.00	
	AD	446291.	79, 222	887.82	
	AE	446320.	96, 2229	918.82	
	Job No	J8928	3	Survey I SE	Date P-OCT 15
	Client		-		
			SKAN	NSKA	
	Projec	t Title			
		ANGE	LINOS	S PIPI	ELINE.
		0	XFOR	DSHI	RE
	Subje	ct			
		AREA	& RE	FEREI	NCING
				AS	CAN
	(	GEOPHYS Al	SICS FO	R ARCH	AEOLOGY NG
	UP	INEYARD H Ton upon	IOUSE SEVERN	T: 0 E: info@	1684 592266 stratascan.co.uk
		WR8 OS	SA	WWW.S	tratascan.co.uk
	G	PR		ALCANISHTO	
	S	UMO	SUMO	<mark>⊘</mark> µms	ay er an
	Same	Services	GROUP MEMBER	ISO 9001 certified	UKAS OCAUM 078 UKAS UKAS UKAS UKAS UKAS UKAS UKAS UKAS
	Scale		m 30	60 90	120 150 180m
	Plot	Δ1	Checked	by GF	Issue No.
	Date	T 15	Drawn b	y R	Figure No.
			<u> </u>		<u> </u>



N	Issue No.	Date	Amend	ments <sub>Descrij</sub>	ption
	-		0.0		
			© Stratasca	n Ltd	
	0	S REFERI	ENCINO	G INFO	RMATION
	AF	446305.6	6, 2233	98.58	
	AG	446300.2	1, 2235	47.95	
	AH	446300.2	7, 2237	27.95	
	AI	446306.4	0, 2237	70.55	
	AJ	446318.4	6, 2238	59.74	
	AK	446301.0	6, 2239	19.73	
Ω	ΔΙ	446338.2	8 2240	33.81	
		116369 1	0 2241	13 75	
		446475 1	1 9949	62.20	
		446475.1	7 2243	38 12	
	AU	446542 4	7 9944	07.12	
		440545.4	A 0045	57.12	
	AQ	440545.7	4, 2245	20.47	
BZ	AR	446546.0	5, 2246	76.44	
	AS	446565.5	3, 2247	33.82	
	AT	446713.5	0, 2249	94.79	
	AU	446786.2	3, 2250	28.57	
	AV	446904.1	7, 2250	06.43	
	AW	446750.7	9, 2250	95.70	
	AX	446766.9	6, 2252	14.60	
	AY	446769.2	6, 2252	74.28	
	AZ	446758.8	1, 2254	53.98	
	BA	446729.4	6, 2255	12.09	
	BB	446738.8	4, 2256	31.72	
	BC	446774.8	1, 2256	74.39	
	BD	446808.8	5, 2257	89.46	
	BE	446787.4	1, 2258	20.08	
	BF	446789.2	6, 2258	50.02	
	BG	446791.1	7, 2259	22.71	
	BH	446787.7	0, 2260	42.66	
	BI	446783.1	1, 2260	99.54	
	BJ	446760.7	4, 2262	78.14	
	BK	446809.1	3, 2261	33.03	
	Job No	J8928		Survey I SE	Date P-OCT 15
	Client				
			SKAN	SKA	
OS REFERENCING INFORMATION	Projec	t Title			
446794.17. 226252.09		ANGEL	LINOS	5 PIPI	ELINE,
446730.04. 226328.32	C1- *		rurl	JSHII	ĸĽ
<b>446731.55. 226508.31</b>	Subjec	ε <b>ι</b>			
446820.04. 226327.56		SUI	RVEY	AREA	A &
P 446821.54, 226507.56		RE	FERE	NCIN	IG
<b>446719.17</b> , 226738.12	<b>C</b>	133 M	151		CAN
R 446631.61, 226895.39	• <i>.</i> )/.	GEOPHYS	ICS FOR	ARCH	AEOLOGY
<b>5</b> 446643.15, 226951.74	V	AN INEYARD HO	D ENGI DUSE	NEERII T: 0	NG 1684 592266 stratescon scul
<b>[</b> 446648.62, 227011.49	UΡ	WR8 OSA	JE V EKIN	www.s	tratascan.co.uk
U 446651.36, 227041.37	Ğ	<b>PR</b>		ALCISTER D RECANISATIO	
V 446656.83, 227101.12	S		SUMO	<i>o</i> lime	da olime do
V 446613.27, 226954.48	Sarvey	Services C	GROUP IEMBER	ISO 9001 certified	VILAS CONTINUE 078
x 446624.22, 227073.98	Scale 1·3		30 6	30    90	120 150 180m
Y 446664.23, 227156.95	Plot	A1	Checked	by E	Issue No. 01
Z 447206.44, 227413.86	Date	CT 15	Drawn by Tł	2	Figure No. 02



	Amendments       Issue No.     Date     Description
$\prec$	OS REFERENCING INFORMATION
	CA 447278.943, 227459.40
	CB 447276.51, 227549.36
	CC 447276.45, 227607.78
	CD 447281.71, 227817.72
	CE 447282.47, 227847.71
	CF 447285.47.227967.67
	CC 447315.85 227985.44
	CU 447315.00, 227001.40
	Ch 447433.70, 227991.40
	CI 447288.03, 228048.92
H	CJ 447298.15, 228288.70
	CK 447272.43, 228329.58
	CL 447299.76, 228383.00
	CM 447327.09, 228436.41
	CN 447436.39, 228650.08
	CO 447436.51, 228707.85
	<b>CP</b> 447357.60, 228798.25
	CQ 447318.14, 228843.46
	CR 447278.69, 228888.66
	CS 447230.78, 228900.97
	CT 447005.36, 228818.60
	CU 446926.40, 228834.46
	CV 446689.74, 228874.35
	CW 446601.69, 228875.48
	CX 446548.25, 229170.68
	CY 446549.56, 229263.73
	CZ 446367.00, 229538.64
	DA 446309.80, 229585.25
$\langle \langle \langle \langle \rangle \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle \rangle \rangle $	DB 446225.92, 229617.88
	DC 446177.36, 229640.86
	DD 446047.05, 229715.15
	DE 446023.28, 229753.07
	DF 445962.01, 230046.75
	Job No. Survey Date SEP-OCT 15
	Client
	SKANSKA
	Project Title
	ANGELINOS PIPELINE,
	OXFORDSHIRE
	Subject
	SURVEY AREA &
	REFERENCING
	CHEVED A TELA COART
	GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY
	AND ENGINEERING VINEYARD HOUSE T: 01684 592266
	UPTON UPON SEVERN E: info@stratascan.co.uk WR8 OSA www.stratascan.co.uk
	GPR SUSTR
	GROUP MEMBER MEMBER
	Scale     0m     30     60     90     120     150     180m
	1:3000 Checked by Issue No.
	AI DGE 01   Date Drawn by Figure No.
	UUI 15   IK   U3



	Amendments       Issue No.     Date     Description					
		© Stratascan Ltd				
		KEV				
	Area una					
	Area uns	Surveyable				
	OS REFER	ENCING INFC	ORMATION			
	OG 445883.	38, 230095.09				
	OH 445675.	76, 230126.59				
	<b>DI</b> 445617.	26, 230139.36				
	<b>DJ</b> 445473.	08, 230180.73				
	<b>OK</b> 445489.	16, 230207.32				
	DL 445490.	07, 230237.30				
	M 445491.	90, 230297.28				
	N 445492.	81, 230327.26				
	<b>445493</b> .	56, 230401.42				
	<b>OP</b> 445494.3	85, 230641.41				
	Q 445487.	90, 230684.54				
	R 445474.	94, 230743.12				
	<b>S</b> 445452.	13, 230707.35				
	OT 445445.	65, 230736.64				
	U 445437.	87, 230780.97				
	V 445422.	44, 230960.31				
	W 445417.	29, 231020.09				
$\backslash$	<b>X</b> 445396.	71, 231259.21				
	<b>Y</b> 445396.	71, 231259.21				
	DZ 445391.	57, 231318.99				
	CA 445376.	13, 231498.32				
	<b>EB</b> 445369.	26, 231767.62				
	<b>C</b> 445403.	00, 231558.20				
	D 445399.	25, 231768.17				
	EE   445369.52, 231794.76     EF   445345.63, 231812.90     EG   445339.87, 231854.94     EH   445292.08, 231891.21					
	EI 445240.					
	EJ 445220.	18, 232105.91	Date			
	J8928	S SE	P-OCT 15			
		SKANSKA				
	oject Title					
× × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×	ANGE	LINOS PIP	FLINE			
	OZ	XFORDSHI	RE			
K 445243.17, 232168.93	ubject					
L 445236.36, 232228.54	CL					
445234.49, 232271.33	SU RI	KVEY AREA FFFRFNCIN	A & IG			
N 445255.75, 232450.07	101					
0 445228.11, 232501.30	3	ATAS	CAN			
P 445211.78, 232710.66	GEOPHYS Al Vinevadd y	ND ENGINEERI	AEULUGY NG 1684 502266			
Q 445237.02, 232772.81	VINEYARD H UPTON UPON WR8 OS	SEVERN E: info@ A www.s	stratascan.co.uk tratascan.co.uk			
R 445230.02, 232862.54		CUSTERS)				
5 445220.46, 232882.67		Red NISKING				
1 445251.02, 232912.22 1 445207 23 232946 93		SUMO GROUP MEMBED	UKAS LISO 14001 certified			
V 445236.78, 232941.77	<b>Services</b>	n 30 60 90	078 UNVELANT			
W 445251.27, 233030.59	1:3000	Checked by	Issue No.			
X 445263.80, 233119.71	AI ate OCT 15	DGE Drawn by TR	UI Figure No. ΩΔ			





![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_58_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Figure_0.jpeg)

# 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

![](_page_66_Picture_6.jpeg)

HA

UKAS

**Ims** 

ISO 9001 certified UKA

IMS

ISO 14001 certified

![](_page_66_Picture_7.jpeg)