

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

STRATASCAN™



Project name:
Forston Water Treatment Works, Forston, Dorset

Client:
Context One

July 2015

Job ref:
J8538

Report author:
Thomas Richardson MSc ACIfA

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:

Forston Water Treatment Works, Forston, Dorset

Client:

Context One



Job ref:

J8538

Techniques:

**Detailed magnetic survey –
Gradiometry**

Survey date:

22nd June 2015

Site centred at:

SY 667 949

Post code:

DT2 7AA

Field team:

Andrew Bateman BSc (Hons)

Thomas Richardson MSc ACIfA

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

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	3
2.5 Site history and archaeological potential	3
2.6 Survey objectives	4
2.7 Survey methods	4
2.8 Processing, presentation and interpretation of results.....	4
2.8.1 Processing	4
2.8.2 Presentation of results and interpretation.....	5
3 RESULTS	5
3.1 Probable Archaeology.....	5
3.2 Possible Archaeology	6
3.3 Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture.....	6
3.4 Other Anomalies	6
4 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	6
5 CONCLUSION	7
6 REFERENCES	8
APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY & SURVEY EQUIPMENT	9
APPENDIX B – BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETIC SURVEY	10
APPENDIX C – GLOSSARY OF MAGNETIC ANOMALIES.....	11

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:25 000	Location plan of survey area
Figure 02	1:500	Location of survey grids and referencing
Figure 03	1:500	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values
Figure 04	1:500	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data
Figure 05	1:500	Plot of processed gradiometer data
Figure 06	1:500	Abstraction and interpretation of gradiometer anomalies

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 0.35 hectares of grassland. The survey has not identified any anomalies of probable archaeological origin, however this is more likely due to the small survey size limiting a confident interpretation of anomalies than a lack of archaeological activity. A number of possible archaeological anomalies may relate to the Roman villa identified by previous excavations. The remaining anomalies are modern in origin relating to a service and disturbance from the adjacent water treatment works.

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 Context One.

2.2 *Site location*

The site is located to the west of the A352, Forston, Dorset at OS ref. SY 667 949.

2.3 *Description of site*

The survey area is approximately 0.35 hectares of grassland. The site lies on an east facing slope with no obstructions.

2.4 *Geology and soils*

The underlying geology is Newhaven Chalk Formation – Chalk (British Geological Survey website). There is no recorded drift geology (British Geological Survey website).

The overlying soils are known as Andover 1, which are typical brown rendzinas. These consist of calcareous silty soils over chalk on slopes and crests (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 5 South West England).

2.5 *Site history and archaeological potential*

Extract from 'Forston Contact Tank Protection, Charminster, Dorset An Archaeological Watching Brief' (Context One 2008), conducted around the water treatment works to the immediate north of the survey site:

As noted by the Senior Archaeologist at Dorset County Council when commenting on the proposed works, a substantial Roman building (DSMR Charminster No. 29), probably a villa, is located in the field immediately to the south of the Site (current survey area). The precise location and extent of this structure - it is useful to think of it as a farm house with adjacent barns and possibly industrial buildings, perhaps around a farmyard - is not known', but

structural remains were located within 50m of the Site boundary. Such complexes of buildings can easily occupy 1ha of land, so there was good reason to believe that important archaeological remains might be located within the area of the works.

Archaeological work in the 1890s first established the presence of the building and located a polychrome mosaic floor. Subsequent excavation, in 1960, did not relocate the mosaic but did find flint walls, a furnace flue, hypocaust tile and wall plaster all suggesting the presence of a villa. Associated finds indicated occupation of the building during the 2nd – 4th centuries AD. Iron Age pottery was also recovered suggesting that the villa may have been pre-dated by earlier occupation. An inhumation was also located during the later work.

The valley is also characterised by deserted medieval settlements (e.g. DSMR Charminster No. 22 A and B, No. 23 & No. 24) - which may be of Saxon origin- and their associated fields. The later are characterised by substantial strip lynchets organised in blocks, or furlongs (e.g. DSMR Charrminster No. 28 D).

The watching brief identified evidence of Roman settlement activity, likely related to the Romano-British villa, in the form of pits with Romano-British pottery and bricks contained in the in-fill. Some evidence for Iron Age settlement was also identified, with a curvilinear ditch thought to possibly relate to a round house.

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 likelihood of a Roman villa being present on the site, 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. *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)

A 'deslope' process was then applied to remove the halo effect caused by strong magnetic disturbance in the area. Whilst this makes some of the data clearer it has the potential to remove, as well as create anomalies in the data; therefore any anomalies seen in the processed plot should be treated with a degree of caution.

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, together with a greyscale plot of the processed data. 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 Forston water treatment works has identified a number of anomalies that have been characterised as being of a *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

No probable archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

3.2 *Possible Archaeology*

- 1 Two positive area anomalies. These are indicative of cut features, such as pits, but could also be caused by disturbance related to former settlement in the area, such as former floor surfaces.
- 2 Four positive linear anomalies. These are indicative of former cut features, such as ditches, and may be of archaeological origin.
- 3 Four small discrete positive anomalies. These are indicative of small former cut features, such as backfilled pits, and may be of archaeological or natural origin.
- 4 A positive linear anomaly seen in the processed data. This is indicative of a former cut feature such as a ditch, and may be of archaeological origin.

3.3 *Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture*

No medieval or post-medieval agriculture has been identified within the survey area.

3.4 *Other Anomalies*

- 5 A high amplitude positive linear anomaly with associated negative response in the east of the site. This is indicative of an underground service.
- 6 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.

4 **DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT**

Chalk geologies, such as those at Forston, generally give good response to magnetic survey, as evidenced by the number of possible archaeological anomalies seen. There is a large a 'halo' effect caused by magnetic disturbance from the nearby water treatment works, which has the potential to mask weaker archaeological anomalies. Further processing of the data has removed the majority of this effect and revealed a further linear anomaly, however potential for this to create and remove anomalies should be considered when looking at the processed data. Overall, the survey can be said to have been effective in identifying archaeological anomalies, however the small size of the survey area makes confident interpretation of anomalies difficult.

5 CONCLUSION

The survey at Forston has not identified any anomalies of probable archaeological origin, however this is due more to the small survey size than a lack of activity in the area. A number of possible archaeological anomalies, indicative of cut features and possible former floor surfaces, have been identified. Given the evidence for archaeological activity in the area from previous excavations, it is likely that some of the anomalies identified do relate to settlement activity in the area, but a more confident interpretation of individual anomalies is limited by the extents of the survey area. The remaining anomalies are modern in origin relating to a service and disturbance from the adjacent water treatment works.

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*.
<http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/nodefiles/Geophysics2010.pdf>

Context One, 2008. *Forston Contact Tank Protection, Charminster, Dorset An Archaeological Watching Brief*

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

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

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




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 ($\pm 3nT$) 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 ($\pm 250nT$) 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 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.

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

STRATASCAN™

