

# GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

# sumo

Survey

**GEOPHYSICS FOR  
ARCHAEOLOGY &  
ENGINEERING**

**Papplewick Lane, Hucknall,  
Nottinghamshire**

Client  
**University of Leicester  
Archaeological Services**

For  
**Bellaway Homes East Midlands**

Survey Report  
**11229**

Date  
**May 2017**

Incorporating  
**GSB PROSPECTION LTD**  
and  
**STRATASCAN LTD**

SUMO Services Ltd  
Cowburn Farm  
Market Street  
Thornton  
Bradford  
BD13 3HW  
T: 01274 835016

SUMO Services Ltd  
Vineyard House  
Upper Hook Road  
Upton upon Severn  
Worcestershire  
WR8 0SA  
T: 01684 592266

[geophysics@sumoservices.com](mailto:geophysics@sumoservices.com)  
[www.sumoservices.com](http://www.sumoservices.com)

## GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:  
**Papplewick Lane, Hucknall,  
Nottinghamshire**

SUMO Job reference:  
**11229**

Client:  
**University of Leicester  
Archaeological Services**

For:  
**Bellaway Homes East Midlands**

Survey date:  
**27 April – 3 May 2017**

Report date:  
**18 May 2017**

Field co-ordinator:  
**Tom Cockcroft** MSc  
**Olivier Vansassenbrouck** MSc

Field Team:  
**Andrew Edwards** BSc MSc  
**Rebecca Vickers** BSc  
**Jonathan Hunter**

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

CAD illustrations by:  
**Rebecca Davies** BSc

Project Manager:  
**Simon Haddrell** BEng AMBCS PCIfA

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	1
2	INTRODUCTION	1
3	METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION	2
4	RESULTS	3
5	DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	4
6	CONCLUSION	4
7	REFERENCES	4

Appendix A Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Appendix B Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	1:25 000	Site Location Diagram
Figure 2	1:2000	Location of Survey Area
Figure 3	1:2000	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot - Overview
Figure 4	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey – Greyscale Plot - Area 1
Figure 5	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey – Greyscale Plot - Area 2
Figure 6	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey – Greyscale Plot - Area 3
Figure 7	1:2000	Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation - Overview
Figure 8	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation - Area 1
Figure 9	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation - Area 2
Figure 10	1:1250	Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation - Area 3

## DIGITAL CONTENT (Archive Data)

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

## 1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed magnetometer survey was conducted over approximately 13ha of arable farmland. Several linear anomalies of uncertain origin have been detected and, although some may appear to form an enclosure this seems unlikely. The remaining features include a former field boundary, evidence of ploughing and disturbance from modern ferrous objects, such as services and nearby fences.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Background synopsis

**SUMO Services Ltd** were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for residential development. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by **University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS)** on behalf of **Bellaway Homes East Midlands**.

### 2.2 Site details

<b>NGR / Postcode</b>	SK 545 505 / NG15 8EL
<b>Location</b>	The site is located to the north-east of Hucknall, to the south-east of Linby and to the south of Papplewick, Nottinghamshire.
<b>HER/SMR</b>	Nottinghamshire
<b>District</b>	Gedling
<b>Parish</b>	Linby CP
<b>Topography</b>	The site is predominantly at c.75m AOD, with a general fall from west to east.
<b>Current Land Use</b>	Arable
<b>Weather</b>	Sunny, some clouds
<b>Geology</b>	Solid: Cadeby Formation – Dolostone (magnesian limestone). Superficial: None recorded (BGS 2017).
<b>Soils</b>	Aberford Association (511a), shallow, locally brashy, well drained calcareous fine loamy soils over limestone (SSEW 1983).
<b>Archaeology</b>	There is an absence of evidence for prehistoric or Roman activity within the area surrounding the site, and as such it is considered that the site has a low potential for remains of these periods. The site is likely to have been marginal land on the periphery of the settlements of Linby and Papplewick during the medieval period (CgMs 2009).
<b>Survey Methods</b>	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
<b>Study Area</b>	13ha

### 2.3 Aims and Objectives

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

### 3 METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION

#### 3.1 Standards & Guidance

This report and all fieldwork have been conducted in accordance with the latest guidance documents issued by Historic England (EH 2008) (then English Heritage), the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA 2014) and the European Archaeological Council (EAC 2016).

#### 3.2 Survey methods

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

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

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A.

#### 3.3 Data Processing

The following basic processing steps have been carried out on the data used in this report:  
De-stripe; de-stagger; interpolate

#### 3.4 Presentation of results and interpretation

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

When interpreting the results, several factors are taken into consideration, including the nature of archaeological features being investigated and the local conditions at the site (geology, pedology, topography etc.). Anomalies are categorised by their potential origin. Where responses can be related to other existing evidence, the anomalies will be given specific categories, such as: *Abbey Wall* or *Roman Road*. Where the interpretation is based largely on the geophysical data, levels of confidence are implied, for example: *Probable*, or *Possible Archaeology*. The former is used for a confident interpretation, based on anomaly definition and/or other corroborative data such as cropmarks. Poor anomaly definition, a lack of clear patterns to the responses and an absence of other supporting data reduces confidence, hence the classification *Possible*.

## 4 RESULTS

*The survey has been divided into three survey areas (Areas 1-3).*

### 4.1 ***Uncertain***

4.1.1 While positive linear anomalies in the north of Area 3 might appear to form part of an incomplete sub-rectangular or trapezoidal enclosure, an archaeological explanation seems unlikely due to the lack of known archaeological remains within close proximity of the site.

4.1.2 Sinuous bands of enhanced magnetic response are visible in Areas 1 and 2. It is possible that the responses are of natural origin, possibly related to palaeo-channels or former watercourses, however their exact origin cannot be determined with confidence,

4.1.3 Several linear anomalies scattered across Areas 1 and 2 are also of uncertain origin. It is possible that they relate to small ditches or gullies, though this interpretation is tentative at best. It is more likely that they are agricultural (i.e. boundaries or drains) or natural in origin.

### 4.2 ***Former Field Boundary***

4.2.1 A positive linear anomaly runs approximately northeast-southwest in Area. This corresponds with a former field boundary, visible on historic OS mapping from 1880 to 1886.

### 4.3 ***Agricultural – Ploughing, Land drains***

4.3.1 Evidence of ploughing is visible across the site, in the form of closely spaced, magnetically weak, parallel linear anomalies.

### 4.4 ***Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance***

4.4.1 High amplitude linear responses running across Areas 1 and 2 are related to underground services, with the majority corresponding with sewer routes marked on the topographic base mapping.

4.4.2 Areas of magnetic disturbance in the south of Area 2 and centre of Area 1 are likely to be a result of modern ferrous rubbish within the topsoil.

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

## 5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 Historic England guidelines (EH 2008) Table 4 states that the average magnetic response on magnesian limestone is good . The presence of several linear anomalies of uncertain origin in the data suggests it is likely that the technique has detected any archaeological features, if present.

## 6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The survey at Papplewick Lane has identified no definite archaeological features. Linear anomalies have been detected, which may be of interest, though these are more likely to be agricultural or natural. Evidence of ploughing has been detected across the site, along with a former field boundary, underground services and disturbance from nearby ferrous objects.

## 7 REFERENCES

- BGS 2017 British Geological Survey, Geology of Britain viewer [Accessed 18/05/2017].  
website: (<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>)
- CgMs 2009 *Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Land North of Papplewick Lane, Hucknall.* CgMs Consulting, unpublished report.
- ClfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey.* Amended 2016. ClfA Guidance note. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading  
[http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf)
- EAC 2016 *EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology,* European Archaeological Council, Guidelines 2.
- EH 2008 *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation.* English Heritage, Swindon  
<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geophysical-survey-in-archaeological-field-evaluation/geophysics-guidelines.pdf/>
- SSEW 1983 *Soils of England and Wales. Sheet 3, Midland and Western England.* Soil Survey of England and Wales, Harpenden.