

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

# STRATASCAN™



Project name:  
**Muxton, Shropshire**

Client:  
**Mott MacDonald**

Job ref:  
**J10375**

**November 2016**

## GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name: <b>Muxton, Shropshire</b> Client: <b>Mott MacDonald</b>	Job ref: <b>J10375</b>
Survey date: <b>26 October – 2 November 2016</b>	Report date: <b>November 2016</b>
Field team: <b>Robert Knight</b> BA (Hons) <b>Stewart Hawthorn</b> BA (Hons) <b>Lukasz Krawec</b> BSc <b>Adam Clark</b> BA (Hons) <b>Stephanie Rhodes</b> BSc	Project Manager: <b>Simon Haddrell</b> BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIfA
Report written by: <b>Rebecca Davies</b> BSc (Hons)	Report approved by: <b>David Elks</b> MSc ACIfA
CAD illustrations by: <b>Rebecca Davies</b> BSc (Hons)	Site Director: <b>Dr John Gater</b> MCIfA FSA
Version number and issue date:	Amendments:
<b>V1</b> 21/11/2016	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>METHODS, PROCESSING &amp; PRESENTATION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>DATA APPRAISAL &amp; CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method.....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory .....</b>	<b>8</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:2000	Site location, survey area & referencing
Figure 02	1:2000	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – overview
Figure 03	1:1000	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – north
Figure 04	1:1000	Colour plot of gradiometer data showing extreme values – south
Figure 05	1:2000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – overview
Figure 06	1:1000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – north
Figure 07	1:1000	Plot of minimally processed gradiometer data – south
Figure 08	1:2000	Interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – overview
Figure 09	1:1000	Interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – north
Figure 10	1:1000	Interpretation of gradiometer anomalies – south

## 1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 23.7 hectares of arable farmland and grassland. No archaeological anomalies have been detected. Evidence of ridge and furrow, modern ploughing and the detection of former field boundaries and land drains suggest that the site has a largely agricultural past. A number of anomalies are of uncertain origin, possibly a result of agricultural activity or of other modern origin. The remaining features include natural magnetic variation, a backfilled pond, underground services and magnetic disturbance from nearby ferrous metal objects.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Background synopsis

Stratascan were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for residential development, along with the construction of a primary school and associated infrastructure. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by Mott MacDonald.

### 2.2 Site Details

<b>NGR / Postcode</b>	SJ 710 146 / TF2 8DL
<b>Location</b>	The survey area lies to the north of Muxton, Shropshire, at the north-eastern edge of Telford. The site comprises one large field to the north of New Trench Road (A518), and some smaller fields to the south of New Trench Road.
<b>HER/SMR</b>	Shropshire
<b>Unitary Authority</b>	Telford and Wrekin
<b>Parish</b>	The northern field lies in Lilleshall CP. The southern field lies in Donnington and Muxton CP.
<b>Topography</b>	Mostly level, slight incline across the survey area.
<b>Current Land Use</b>	Arable, grassland.
<b>Weather Conditions</b>	Cloudy, small amounts of light rain.
<b>Soils</b>	The overlying soils are known as Salwick which are typical stagnogleyic argillic brown soils. These consist of deep reddish fine loamy soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 3 Midland and Western England).

<b>Geology</b>	The underlying geology is Bridgnorth Sandstone Formation - sandstone. The drift geology comprises Glaciofluvial Deposits of sand and gravel, and Devensian Till (British Geological Survey website).
<b>Archaeology</b>	<p>Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments (Mott MacDonald, 2016) for both the northern and southern areas state the following:</p> <p>“During the medieval and post-medieval periods the [northern] Application Site was just outside of Lubstree Park, first created during the early 13th century; a mixed area of woodland and open spaces. During the medieval and post-medieval periods, the Application Site would have mainly been used either for recreational purposes (such as hunting) or perhaps later agricultural use. Ridge and Furrow may leave a trace across the Application Site, but such remains are considered to be of low value.”</p> <p>“The [southern] Application Site is partially within the northern limits of the medieval settlement of Muxton, which had two neighbourhoods, with one along the Wellington Road (a medieval routeway). It is considered that the majority of the Application Site would have been used for recreational purposes (such as hunting) and then later for agriculture. Any ridge and furrow earthworks (which may have existed) have been ploughed flat.”</p>
<b>Survey Methods</b>	Detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry)
<b>Study Area</b>	31.7 ha – c. 8 hectares could not be surveyed due to overgrown vegetation and horse paddocks

### 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

Due to the potential for medieval agricultural remains, 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 Muxton has not identified any anomalies that have been characterised as being of *probable* or *possible* archaeological origin. The following list of numbered anomalies refers to numerical labels on the interpretation plots.

### 4.1 Probable Archaeology

No probable archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

### 4.2 Possible Archaeology

No possible archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

### 4.3 Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture

Two positive linear anomalies [1-2] in the northern field are associated with former field boundaries, visible on available historic OS mapping from 1882 to 1954. A further linear anomaly [3] in the southern area is related to a former drainage ditch / field boundary, also visible on available mapping from 1882 to 1954. Further positive linear anomalies [4] across the north and south of the site may be related to former field boundaries, but are not visible on available mapping.

A small area of widely spaced, parallel linear anomalies [5] in the south-west of the northern area, are indicative of ridge and furrow cultivation. Further closely spaced, parallel linear anomalies [6] across the site are likely to be related to modern agricultural activity, such as ploughing.

#### 4.4 **Other Anomalies**

A discrete area of strong magnetic debris [7] in the south of the site is related to a backfilled pond. The pond is visible on available historic OS mapping from 1882 to 1954. Weak, bipolar linear anomalies [8] across the northern area are related to land drains.

A series of positive linear and discrete anomalies [9] in the centre of the northern area are of uncertain origin. The responses show similar characteristics to those of the former field boundary and land drains nearby, though they appear on a different orientation. It is unlikely that these are of archaeological origin, though further interpretation is difficult. Further positive linear and discrete anomalies [10] and a strong linear anomaly [11] in the far south of the site are also of uncertain origin. It is possible that these may be agricultural or modern in origin, though their exact origin cannot be determined with confidence.

A strong bipolar linear anomaly [12] is visible in the south-west of the site, and is associated with an underground service such as a pipe or cable. A negative linear anomaly [13] running along the southern edge of the northern field is likely to be associated with a plastic pipe.

Areas of enhanced magnetic variation across the northern area are likely to be natural in origin. Small areas of magnetic debris in both the northern and southern areas are likely to be modern. Areas of magnetic disturbance around the edges of the survey area are related to substantial nearby ferrous objects, such as a fencing, while smaller ferrous responses across the site are likely to be modern rubbish.

## 5 **DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT**

Sandstone geologies, along with superficial deposits of sand, gravel and till, can provide variable results for magnetic survey. In this instance, the data shows evidence of agricultural activity, along with a small number of anomalies of uncertain origin. Given that agricultural remains were expected; it can be determined that the data provides a good indication of buried features across the site.

## 6 **CONCLUSION**

The survey at Muxton has not identified any anomalies of archaeological origin. Evidence of ridge and furrow, modern ploughing and the detection of former field boundaries and land drains suggest that the site has a largely agricultural past. This corresponds with information from the desk-based assessments of the area, whereby evidence of historic agriculture was expected to be found. A number of anomalies are of uncertain origin, possibly a result of agricultural activity or other modern origin. The remaining features include natural magnetic variation, a backfilled pond, underground services and magnetic disturbance from nearby ferrous metal objects.

## 7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., *website*:  
(<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 21/11/2016]

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. ([http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GGeophysics\\_1.pdf](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

Mott MacDonald, 2016. *Land to the North of the A518, Muxton, Shropshire – Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*

Mott MacDonald, 2016. *Land to the South of the A518, Muxton, Shropshire – Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 3 Midland and Western 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 *Grad601-2*

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	This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero. The
Traverse	operation removes striping effects and edge discontinuities over the whole of the data set.
Step Correction	When gradiometer data are collected in 'zig-zag' fashion, stepping errors can sometimes
(Destagger)	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.

<i>Archaeology/Probable Archaeology</i>	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.
<i>Possible Archaeology</i>	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.
<i>Industrial / Burnt-Fired</i>	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.
<i>Former Field Boundary (probable &amp; possible)</i>	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.
<i>Ridge &amp; Furrow</i>	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.
<i>Agriculture (ploughing)</i>	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
<i>Land Drain</i>	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.
<i>Natural</i>	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
<i>Magnetic Disturbance</i>	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.
<i>Service</i>	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.
<i>Ferrous</i>	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.
<i>Uncertain Origin</i>	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 <i>Possible Archaeology</i> and <i>Possible Natural</i> or (in the case of linear responses) <i>Possible Archaeology</i> and <i>Possible Agriculture</i> ; 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.

*Survey services you can rely on*

## Your Survey Partner

For a complete and complementary range of survey services.

*Survey services  
you can rely on*

- Archaeological
- As Built Records
- Boundary Disputes
- CCTV
- Geophysical
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Building
- Pipeline Routes
- Railway
- Retrofit
- Setting Out
- Statutory Plan Collation
- Topographic
- Utility Mapping
- UXO Detection
- Void Detection

