GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

STRATASCAN™

SUMO Survey Services
SUMO Group Member

Project name:

Ixworth Road, Thurston

Client:

CgMs Consulting Ltd

Job ref:

J10551

December 2016

OASIS Reference: stratasc1-267947
HER Parish Code: THS 030
HER Event Number: ESF 24986

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name: **Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk** Client: **CgMs Consulting Ltd**	Job ref: **J10551**
Survey date: **9-11 November 2016**	Report date: **December 2016**
Field team: **Joe Perry** **Rob Usher** **Tom Cockroft** **Becky Vickers**	Project Manager: **Simon Haddrell** BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA
Report written by: **Rebecca Davies** BSc (Hons)	Report approved by: **David Elks** MSc ACIfA
CAD illustrations by: **Rebecca Davies** BSc (Hons)	Site Director: **Dr John Gater** MCIfA FSA
Version number and issue date:	Amendments:
V1 01/12/2016	

SUMO Group Member

STRATASCAN LTD
Vineyard House Upper Hook Road Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire WR8 0SA United Kingdom

T: 01684 592266 F: 01684 594142
info@stratascansumo.com www.stratascan.co.uk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 12 hectares of arable land. Two linear anomalies mark the line of a probable Roman Road in the west of the site; they probably mark the line of Peddars Way. No other responses are of definite archaeological interest.

The remaining magnetic responses are related to an old field boundary, former quarry pits and natural variations in the local chalk. A few anomalies are of uncertain origin, but these too could be due to digging natural outcrops in the chalk.

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 CgMs Consulting Limited.

2.2 Site Details

NGR / Postcode	TL 916 661 / IP31 3QA
Location	The survey area lies approximately 6km east of Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, on the northern outskirts of the village of Thurston. The area investigated is roughly rectangular in shape bounded by Ixworth Road to the east, Mill Lane and residential properties to the west, school playing fields to the south and agricultural land to the north.
HER/SMR	Suffolk
Unitary Authority	Mid Suffolk
Parish	Thurston CP
Topography	Mostly level
Current Land Use	Arable
Weather Conditions	Cloudy, dry
Soils	Swaffham Prior (511e) well drained calcareous coarse and fine loamy soils over chalk rubble (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 2 Wales).
Geology	The underlying geology comprises various Chalk Formations overlain by localised outcrops of Lowestoft Formation and Cover Sands (British Geological Survey website).

Archaeology	The site is considered to have a moderate archaeological potential for remains associated with the Late Prehistoric and Romano-British periods and a limited potential for all other periods (CgMs 2016).
Survey Methods	Detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry)
Study Area	c. 12.7 hectares

2.3 Aims and objectives
To locate and characterise any anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the study area.

3 METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION

3.1 Standards & Guidance
This report and all fieldwork have been conducted in accordance with the latest guidance documents issued by Historic England (2008) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2002 & 2014).

Stratascan Ltd are a Registered Organisation with the CIfA and are committed to upholding its policies and standards.

3.2 Survey methods
Detailed magnetic survey was used as an efficient and effective method of locating archaeological anomalies.

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A.

3.3 Processing
The following schedule shows the basic processing carried out on the data used in this report:
1. *De-stripe*
2. *De-stagger*

3.4 Presentation of results and interpretation
The presentation of the data for each site involves a plot of the minimally processed data as a greyscale plot and a colour plot showing extreme magnetic values. Magnetic anomalies have been identified and plotted onto the 'Interpretation of Anomalies' drawing.

When interpreting the results several factors are taken into consideration, including the nature of archaeological features being investigated and the local conditions at the site (geology, pedology, topography etc.). Anomalies are categorised by their potential origin. Where responses can be related to very specific known features documented in other sources, this is done (for example: Abbey Wall, Roman Road). For the generic categories levels of confidence are indicated, for example: probable, or possible archaeology. The former is used for a confident interpretation, based on anomaly definition and/or other corroborative data such as cropmarks. Poor anomaly definition, a lack of clear patterns to the responses and an absence of other supporting data reduces confidence, hence the classification "possible".

4 RESULTS

The detailed magnetic gradiometer survey conducted at Thurston has identified a few anomalies that have been characterised as being of *probable* archaeological origin. The following list of numbered anomalies refers to labels on the interpretation plots.

4.1 *Probable Archaeology / Probable*

Two positive, parallel linear anomalies **[1]** in the south-western limits of the survey area are indicative of former cut features, probably ditches. They disappear out of the survey grid to the north under the gardens of two houses and a short, less well-defined linear anomaly **[2]** probably marks the re-appearance of the easternmost ditch. The features represent a probable Roman road and are most likely the line of Peddars Way, which was thought to run adjacent to the western boundary of the site (see CgMs 2016: p10 – 4.4.1).

4.2 *Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture*

There is no evidence for any ridge and furrow cultivation in the data.

4.3 *Other Anomalies*

A linear magnetic anomaly **[3]** coincides with the line of a former field boundary visible on the 1887 to 1958 OS maps, but gone by 1978. These maps also mark the location of two pits (possibly for chalk or clay) at the end of this boundary and to the north, near Stone cottage; the magnetic disturbances at **[4]** and **[5]** are clearly associated with the backfilled pits. Another area of disturbance **[6],** although not marked on the old mapping, is visible as soil mark on Google imagery and it appears identical to the other pits. As such **[6]** is thought to be a third pit.

A number of strong positive and negative linear anomalies **[7]** are difficult to interpret. The lack of any recognisable shape or form would seem to rule out an archaeological interpretation; similarly the strength of the responses is greater than would be expected for natural responses on a chalk bedrock. As such they could be an agricultural effect but this interpretation is tentative. It is possible the responses relate to former digging activities, associated with the quarry pits.

Areas of amorphous magnetic anomalies **[8]** are typical of the responses normally associated with a chalk bedrock; when compared to [7] they are clearly much weaker but the pattern is similar. This would support an interpretation that the responses at [7] do mark when attempts have been made to dig out the chalk / clay.

Areas of magnetic disturbance around the edge of the site are a result of nearby fencing.

5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Chalk geologies are classified as good for detecting buried features and in this instance the mapping of probable Roman ditches, along with former a field boundary, clay / chalk pits and the natural geology demonstrates the value of the magnetic survey.

6 CONCLUSION

The survey at Ixworth has identified a probable Roman Road, Peddars Way, but no obvious associated settlement.

Former clay / chalk pits have been mapped, along with a former field boundary.

A few uncertain responses have been identified, along with anomalies resulting from variations in the chalk bedrock.

7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., *website*: (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 30/11/2016]

CgMs 2016 *Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, Land West of Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk.* Report CC/22068, CgMs Consulting, unpublished.

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey. (*http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GGeophysics_1.pdf)

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

IfA 2002. The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations, IFA Paper No 6, C. Gaffney, J. Gater and S. Ovenden. Institute for Archaeology, Reading

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 2 Wales England*

Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Grid Positioning
For hand held gradiometers the location of the survey grids has been plotted together with the referencing information. Grids were set out using a Trimble R8 Real Time Kinematic (RTK) VRS Now GNSS GPS system.

An RTK GPS (Real-time Kinematic Global Positioning System) can locate a point on the ground to a far greater accuracy than a standard GPS unit. A standard GPS suffers from errors created by satellite orbit errors, clock errors and atmospheric interference, resulting in an accuracy of 5m-10m. An RTK system uses a single base station receiver and a number of mobile units. The base station re-broadcasts the phase of the carrier it measured, and the mobile units compare their own phase measurements with those they received from the base station. This results in an accuracy of around 0.01m.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1m	0.25m

Instrumentation: Bartington *Grad*601-2
Bartington instruments operate in a gradiometer configuration which comprises fluxgate sensors mounted vertically, set 1.0m apart. The fluxgate gradiometer suppresses any diurnal or regional effects. The instruments are carried, or cart mounted, with the bottom sensor approximately 0.1-0.3m from the ground surface. At each survey station, the difference in the magnetic field between the two fluxgates is measured in nanoTesla (nT). The sensitivity of the instrument can be adjusted; for most archaeological surveys the most sensitive range (0.1nT) is used. Generally, features up to 1m deep may be detected by this method, though strongly magnetic objects may be visible at greater depths. The Bartington instrument can collect two lines of data per traverse with gradiometer units mounted laterally with a separation of 1.0m.

The readings are logged consecutively into the data logger which in turn is daily down- loaded into a portable computer whilst on site. At the end of each site survey, data is transferred to the office for processing and presentation.

Data Processing

Zero Mean Traverse	This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero. The operation removes striping effects and edge discontinuities over the whole of the data set.
Step Correction (De-stagger)	When gradiometer data are collected in 'zig-zag' fashion, stepping errors can sometimes arise. These occur because of a slight difference in the speed of walking on the forward and reverse traverses. The result is a staggered effect in the data, which is particularly noticeable on linear anomalies. This process corrects these errors.

Display

Greyscale/ Colourscale Plot	This format divides a given range of readings into a set number of classes. Each class is represented by a specific shade of grey, the intensity increasing with value. All values above the given range are allocated the same shade (maximum intensity); similarly all values below the given range are represented by the minimum intensity shade. Similar plots can be produced in colour, either using a wide range of colours or by selecting two or three colours to represent positive and negative values. The assigned range (plotting levels) can be adjusted to emphasise different anomalies in the data-set.

Interpretation Categories

In certain circumstances (usually when there is corroborative evidence from desk based or excavation data) very specific interpretations can be assigned to magnetic anomalies (for example, *Roman Road, Wall,* etc.) and where appropriate, such interpretations will be applied. The list below outlines the generic categories commonly used in the interpretation of the results.

Archaeology/Probable Archaeology	This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the response are clearly or very probably archaeological and /or if corroborative evidence is available. These anomalies, whilst considered anthropogenic, could be of any age.
Possible Archaeology	These anomalies exhibit either weak signal strength and / or poor definition, or form incomplete archaeological patterns, thereby reducing the level of confidence in the interpretation. Although the archaeological interpretation is favoured, they may be the result of variable soil depth, plough damage or even aliasing as a result of data collection orientation.
Industrial / Burnt-Fired	Strong magnetic anomalies that, due to their shape and form or the context in which they are found, suggest the presence of kilns, ovens, corn dryers, metal- working areas or hearths. It should be noted that in many instances modern ferrous material can produce similar magnetic anomalies.
Former Field Boundary (probable & possible)	Anomalies that correspond to former boundaries indicated on historic mapping, or which are clearly a continuation of existing land divisions. Possible denotes less confidence where the anomaly may not be shown on historic mapping but nevertheless the anomaly displays all the characteristics of a field boundary.
Ridge & Furrow	Parallel linear anomalies whose broad spacing suggests ridge and furrow cultivation. In some cases the response may be the result of more recent agricultural activity.
Agriculture (ploughing)	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
Land Drain	Weakly magnetic linear anomalies, quite often appearing in series forming parallel and herringbone patterns. Smaller drains will often lead and empty into larger diameter pipes and which in turn usually lead to local streams and ponds. These are indicative of clay fired land drains.
Natural	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
Magnetic Disturbance	Broad zones of strong dipolar anomalies, commonly found in places where modern ferrous or fired materials (e.g. brick rubble) are present. They are presumed to be modern.
Service	Magnetically strong anomalies usually forming linear features indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) cause weaker magnetic responses and can be identified from their uniform linearity crossing large expanses.
Ferrous	This type of response is associated with ferrous material and may result from small items in the topsoil, larger buried objects such as pipes, or above ground features such as fence lines or pylons. Ferrous responses are usually regarded as modern. Individual burnt stones, fired bricks or igneous rocks can produce responses similar to ferrous material.
Uncertain Origin	Anomalies which stand out from the background magnetic variation, yet whose form and lack of patterning gives little clue as to their origin. Often the characteristics and distribution of the responses straddle the categories of *Possible Archaeology* and *Possible Natural* or (in the case of linear responses) *Possible Archaeology* and *Possible Agriculture*; occasionally they are simply of an unusual form.

Where appropriate some anomalies will be further classified according to their form (positive or negative) and relative strength and coherence (trend: weak and poorly defined).

Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

Detailed magnetic survey can be used to effectively define areas of past human activity by mapping spatial variation and contrast in the magnetic properties of soil, subsoil and bedrock. Although the changes in the magnetic field resulting from differing features in the soil are usually weak, changes as small as 0.2 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000nT, can be accurately detected.

Weakly magnetic iron minerals are always present within the soil and areas of enhancement relate to increases in *magnetic susceptibility* and permanently magnetised *thermoremanent* material.

Magnetic susceptibility relates to the induced magnetism of a material when in the presence of a magnetic field. This magnetism can be considered as effectively permanent as it exists within the Earth's magnetic field. Magnetic susceptibility can become enhanced due to burning and complex biological or fermentation processes.

Thermoremanence is a permanent magnetism acquired by iron minerals that, after heating to a specific temperature known as the Curie Point, are effectively demagnetised followed by re-magnetisation by the Earth's magnetic field on cooling. Thermoremanent archaeological features can include hearths and kilns 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.

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