

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

STRATASCAN™



Project name:
Land East of Tiverton

Client:
Cotswold Archaeology

April 2014

Job ref:
J6605

Report author:
Thomas Richardson MSc AIFA

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:

Land East of Tiverton

Client:

Cotswold Archaeology



Job ref:

J6605

Techniques:

Detailed magnetic survey

Survey date:

**10th-14th June 2013,
13th-20th November 2013,
2nd January 2014, 20th March 2014**

Site centred at:

SS 981 128

Post code:

EX16 4NH

Checked by:

David Elks MSc AIFA

Field team:

Sean Parker BSc(Hons), **Steve Hamflett** MSc,
Thomas DeSalle MSc, **Aidan Rossiter** BSc(Hons),
Josh Jones BSc(Hons), **Adam Green**,
Andy Bateman, **John Pykett**,
Robert Knight BSc(Hons), **Stephen Weston**,
Stephen Chetwynd BA (Hons), **James Slater**,
Tom Worthington, **Robert Billington**,
John Little

Project manager:

Simon Haddrell BEng(Hons) AMBCS PIFA

Report written By:

Thomas Richardson MSc AIFA

CAD illustrations by:

Thomas Richardson MSc AIFA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	2
1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS	3
2 INTRODUCTION	3
2.1 Background synopsis.....	3
2.2 Site location	3
2.3 Description of site	3
2.4 Geology and soils	4
2.5 Site history and archaeological potential	4
2.6 Survey objectives	5
2.7 Survey methods	5
2.8 Processing, presentation and interpretation of results.....	5
2.8.1 Processing	5
2.8.2 Presentation of results and interpretation.....	5
3 RESULTS.....	6
3.1 Probable Archaeology.....	6
3.2 Possible Archaeology	7
3.3 Other Anomalies	7
4 CONCLUSION	8
5 REFERENCES	9
APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY & SURVEY EQUIPMENT	10
APPENDIX B – BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETIC SURVEY	11
APPENDIX C – GLOSSARY OF MAGNETIC ANOMALIES.....	12

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:3000	Site location, survey area and referencing
Figure 02	1:3000	Colour plot of minimally processed gradiometer data showing extreme values – overview
Figure 03	1:1250	Colour plot of minimally processed gradiometer data showing extreme values – north
Figure 04	1:1250	Colour plot of minimally processed gradiometer data showing extreme values – west
Figure 05	1:1250	Colour plot of minimally processed gradiometer data showing extreme values – east
Figure 06	1:1250	Colour plot of minimally processed gradiometer data showing extreme values – south
Figure 07	1:3000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – overview
Figure 08	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – north
Figure 09	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – west
Figure 10	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – east
Figure 11	1:1250	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – south
Figure 12	1:3000	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer data – overview
Figure 13	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer data – north
Figure 14	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer data – west
Figure 15	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer data – east
Figure 16	1:1250	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer data – south

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 68.5 hectares of pasture. The survey at Tiverton has identified a number of anomalies of probable archaeological origin. A ring ditch, enclosures, and an area of ridge and furrow cultivation have been identified, as well as a number of later field boundaries. There are also a number of other anomalies that may be of archaeological origin but this cannot be determined with any degree of confidence. The remaining anomalies are either modern or geological in origin. Modern agricultural activity can be seen across the site as well as areas of scattered magnetic debris, underground services and modern ferrous objects.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 *Background synopsis*

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

2.2 *Site location*

The site is located near Tiverton at OS ref. SS 981 128.

2.3 *Description of site*

The survey area is approximately 68.5 hectares of undulating pasture. The survey was completed in four phases due to access issues related to livestock on the land. There were a number of small obstructions across the site, which are listed below:

- Field 2 – an area of boggy ground around gate in southern boundary
- Field 11 – pile of manure in south of field
- Field 13 – an electric fence in the west of the field
- Field 15 – animal feeders in the north of the field
- Field 16 – areas of boggy ground
- Field 17 – an area of boggy ground

There are also saplings in Field 7; however these did not cause any obstruction to the survey.

2.4 **Geology and soils**

The underlying geology is Tidcombe Sand Member - Sandstone (British Geological Survey website). The superficial deposits for the site are River Terrace Deposits (undifferentiated) – Sand and Gravel, and Colluvium – Diamicton. The superficial deposits run through the centre of the site, with no deposits recorded in the north or south of the site. An area of Alluvium – Clay, Silt and Sand is also present in Field 19 (British Geological Survey website).

The overlying soils are known as Bromsgrove which are typical brown earths. These consist of well drained reddish coarse loamy soils mainly over soft sandstone, but deep in places (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 5 South West England).

2.5 **Site history and archaeological potential**

Extract from 'Land East of Tiverton, Devon Written Scheme of Investigation for a Geophysical Survey' (Cotswold Archaeology 2012):

2.2 The site is within an area covered by previous archaeological works associated with Tiverton Eastern Urban Expansion Area (AC Archaeology 2009). Work included desk-based assessment, sample areas of geophysical survey and trial trenching. The geophysical survey included parts of four fields within the site. Due to the difficulty of leaving out discrete areas within fields and matching different sets of data the entire site will be covered by the new survey. The trial trenching included five trenches within the site.

2.3 The results of the AC Archaeology 2009 assessment which are directly relevant to the site are summarised below.

2.4 A Scheduled Neolithic long barrow lies to the east of the northern parcel of the site. In the south-western part of the northern parcel, a ring ditch has been identified by a cropmark, and its presence confirmed by trial trenching. A scatter of Neolithic or Bronze Age flint has been recorded to the south of the ring ditch, and two further scatters are recorded in the northern parcel to the north and north-west of the ring ditch. In the north-westernmost part of the parcel, cropmarks were recorded, but no features were uncovered there during the excavation of a trial trench.

2.5 Two scatters of flint and chert have been recorded in the northern part of the central parcel, as well as a Palaeolithic handaxe. No features were uncovered during the excavation of a trial trench in this area.

2.6 The site of a former chapel is thought to lie in the south-western area of the southwestern parcel of land, which was recorded on the Tithe Map. No evidence of this structure is now visible above ground.

2.7 In the southernmost parcel of the site, a group of fieldnames with the element 'Great Black Park' are recorded on the Tithe Map. The element 'black' can be indicative of areas of former settlement.

2.6 **Survey objectives**

The objective of the survey was to locate any features of possible archaeological origin using non-intrusive techniques.

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 Institute for Archaeologists document *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*.

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 A.

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. <i>Destripe</i> | (Removes striping effects caused by zero-point discrepancies between different sensors and walking directions) |
| 2. <i>Destagger</i> | (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 at Tiverton 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 circular anomaly cut by the boundary between Fields 2 and 3. There is a gap in the southern side of the circle. This is related to a Prehistoric or Roman ring ditch identified by the archaeological report and English Heritage's Pastscape monument number 1038691.
- 2** A positive circular anomaly in Field 10 with a large opening in its eastern side. This is indicative of a former cut feature and is probably related to a Prehistoric enclosure.
- 3-4** Positive linear anomalies in the west of Fields 2 and 13. These are indicative of former cut features and are likely to be related to former enclosures or field boundaries. Anomaly 3 has been previously excavated (AC Archaeology 2009) with no anomaly being located. However the response and formation of the anomaly in the geophysical data would suggest that it is of archaeological origin.
- 5-14** A number of positive linear anomalies across the site. These linear anomalies are probably related to former field boundaries not present on available mapping.
- 15-17** Positive linear anomalies in Fields 1, 2, 7 and 20. These are related to former field boundaries present on available historic mapping of the site. Anomalies 14 and 15 are on mapping from 1889-1983, whilst 16 is on mapping from 1889-1938.
- 18-19** Widely spaced curving parallel linear anomalies in Fields 14 and 18. These are indicative of ridge and furrow cultivation.

3.2 Possible Archaeology

- 20-78 & 112-115** A number of positive linear anomalies across the site. These anomalies are indicative of former cut features and may be of archaeological origin.
- 79-101 & 116** A number of discrete positive anomalies across the site. These anomalies are indicative of small former cut features such as filled in pits. They may be of archaeological origin.
- 102-105** A number of negative linear anomalies in Fields 1, 3, 4, 12 and 14. These anomalies are indicative of former bank or earthwork features. They may be of archaeological origin.

3.3 Other Anomalies

- 106** Closely spaced parallel linear anomalies across the site. This is related to modern agricultural activity such as ploughing.
- 107** Areas of magnetic variance in Fields 2, 4, 6, 8, 12 and 20. These anomalies are likely to be of geological or pedological origin.
- 108** Areas of low amplitude dipolar responses in Fields 2, 7, 11 and 15. These anomalies are indicative of scattered magnetic debris, which is likely to be of modern origin.
- 109** High amplitude bipolar linear anomalies in Fields 3, 7, 9 and 13. These are indicative of underground services.
- 110** 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.
- 111** A number of magnetic 'spikes' (strong focussed values with associated antipolar response) indicate ferrous metal objects. These are likely to be modern rubbish.

4 CONCLUSION

The survey at Tiverton has identified a number of anomalies of potential archaeological origin. A Prehistoric or Roman ring ditch (Anomaly 1) and a probable Prehistoric enclosure (Anomaly 2) suggest the site was settled during the Prehistoric period. The large number of former field boundaries (Anomalies 3-17) and areas of ridge and furrow cultivation (Anomalies 18-19) suggest that the area has been used as agricultural land since the medieval period. There are a number of other anomalies that may be of archaeological origin across the site; however it is not possible to determine their origin with any degree of confidence.

The remaining anomalies are not thought to be of archaeological origin and are likely to be of modern or geological origin. Areas of modern agricultural activity can be seen across the site. The remaining anomalies relate to scattered magnetic debris, modern ferrous objects and underground services.

5 REFERENCES

AC Archaeology, 2009. *Tiverton Eastern Urban Expansion Area Centred on NGR SS985128 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment and Evaluation*

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.

Cotswold Archaeology, 2012. *Land East of Tiverton, Devon Written Scheme of Investigation for a Geophysical Survey*

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 5 South West England*.

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

English Heritage. *Pastscape*

<http://www.pastscape.org.uk/>

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

APPENDIX A – 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 B – 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 C – 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



depressions in the ground.


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

Magnetic debris




Magnetic debris consists of numerous dipolar responses spread over an area. If the amplitude of response is low ($\pm 3\text{nT}$) 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 ($\pm 250\text{nT}$) 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 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 10m² 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.

STRATASCAN™



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