

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

sumo

Survey

**GEOPHYSICS FOR
ARCHAEOLOGY &
ENGINEERING**

**School Lane, Milford on Sea,
Hampshire**

Client
Southampton City Council

Survey Report
SOR10802

Date
February 2017

Incorporating
GSB PROSPECTION LTD
and
STRATASCAN LTD

Issuing Office

SUMO Services Ltd
Vineyard House
Upper Hook Road
Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire
WR8 0SA
T: 01684 592266
geophysics@sumoservices.com
www.sumoservices.com

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:
**School Lane, Milford on Sea,
Hampshire**

SUMO Job reference:
SOR10802

Client:
Southampton City Council

Survey date:
27 January 2017

Report date:
February 2017

Field co-ordinator:
Stephen Weston BA (Hons)

Field Team:
Adam Clark BA (Hons)
James Lorimer BA (Hons)

Report written by:
Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)

CAD illustrations by:
Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)

Project Manager:
Simon Haddrell BEng AMBCS PFIfA

Report approved by:
David Elks MSc ACIfA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Appendix A Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Appendix B Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	1:25 000	Location plan of survey area
Figure 2	1:1500	Location of survey grids and referencing
Figure 3	1:1500	Greyscale plot of data
Figure 4	1:750	Greyscale plot of data - north
Figure 5	1:750	Greyscale plot of data - south
Figure 6	1:1500	Interpretation of magnetic anomalies
Figure 7	1:750	Interpretation of magnetic anomalies - north
Figure 8	1:750	Interpretation of magnetic anomalies - south

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 gradiometry survey was carried out over approximately 3ha of arable land. A possible rectilinear enclosure and further linear responses have been detected, along with discrete anomalies of uncertain origin. The remaining features include possible former field boundaries, ploughing and disturbance from nearby ferrous objects.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

SUMO Surveys 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 **Southampton City Council**.

2.2 Site details

NGR / Postcode	SZ 291 926 / SO41 0SU
Location	The survey areas are located to the north of Milford on Sea, Hampshire. Lymington Road (B3058) forms the northern and western boundaries of the areas, with open agricultural land in-between. Milford on Sea C of E Primary School lies immediately to the north of the southern survey area.
HER/SMR	Hampshire
District	New Forest
Parish	Milford on Sea CP
Topography	Generally flat
Current Land Use	Arable
Weather Conditions	Overcast, dry
Geology	Solid: Headon Beds and Osborne Beds (undifferentiated) – clay, silt and sand. Superficial: River Terrace Deposits (undifferentiated) – sand and gravel (British Geological Survey website).
Soils	Efford 1 Association (571s). These are typical argillic brown earths (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 6, South East England)
Archaeology	Within a 1km radius of the site a number of prehistoric, medieval and WWII remains are recorded (Hampshire HER, 2017). A complex of ring ditches and a burial of possible Bronze Age date are recorded approximately 500m south-east of the site (59918, 59916, 20782). Further cropmark enclosures and linear features (62920, 35166, 58181) of likely prehistoric date are also recorded in this area. A medieval mill pond (55162) and mill site (36480) are recorded approximately 800m to the south-west. WWII remains nearby include a pillbox (27528, anti-invasion defence (58845) and a bomb crater (59205).
Survey Methods	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
Study Area	3 ha

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) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2002 & ClfA 2014).

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 and colour-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 is divided into two survey areas (North and South); where considered appropriate, specific anomalies have been given numerical labels [1], [2] and these appear in the text below, as well as on the Interpretation Figure(s).

4.1 **Probable Archaeology**

No magnetic responses have been recorded that could be interpreted as being of probable archaeological interest.

4.2 **Possible Archaeology**

Weak, positive linear anomalies [1] appear to form a rectilinear enclosure in the southern area. Given the quantity of prehistoric cropmark features within relatively close proximity of the site an archaeological origin is possible, though it is also possible that the responses are associated with agricultural activity, i.e. field boundaries/ploughing.

Further weak positive linear and curvilinear anomalies [2] may be indicative of former cut features, though the weak nature of the responses makes further interpretation difficult. It is possible that the features could also be of agricultural or natural origin.

4.3 **Former Field Boundary**

A positive linear anomaly with associated negative response runs approximately east-west through the southern survey area. This lies on the same orientation as the current field system, and as such may relate to a former field boundary that is not visible on available historic OS mapping.

Further positive linear anomalies in the north may also relate to former field boundaries, but are not visible on available mapping.

4.4 **Agricultural – Ploughing, Land drains**

Closely spaced, magnetically weak, parallel linear anomalies in both the north and south sites are likely a result of modern agricultural activity, such as ploughing.

4.6 **Uncertain**

Several discrete positive responses [3] in the north-west and south-east corners of the southern area are of uncertain origin. It is possible that these relate to former backfilled pits, though this interpretation is tentative at best. They may be of natural origin; similar responses are known across superficial sand and gravel deposits, though they could equally be a result of modern agricultural activity.

A positive linear anomaly in the northern area is also of uncertain origin. This may be related to a former cut feature, though a more recent agricultural origin is more likely given its orientation in line with possible field boundaries and ploughing.

4.7 ***Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance***

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 or the colour-scale plots. These responses are characteristic of small pieces of ferrous debris (or brick / tile / igneous rocks) 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

English Heritage Guidelines (EH 2008) Table 4 states that the average magnetic response over clay, silt and sand is variable. However, the detection of several possible archaeological responses, including a possible enclosure feature, suggests that this survey is likely to have been effective.

6 CONCLUSION

The survey at Milford on Sea has identified a possible former rectilinear enclosure and further linear anomalies of potential archaeological or agricultural origin. Possible former field boundaries and evidence of ploughing indicate that the site has a more recent agricultural past. Several discrete anomalies may relate to former pits, but could equally be of natural or modern origin.

7 REFERENCES

- BGS 2017 British Geological Survey *website*:
(<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>)
Geology of Britain viewer [Accessed 14/02/2017].
- 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
- 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/>
- 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
- Hampshire
CC 2017 *Hampshire Historic Environment Record [online]* Available through:
www.hants.gov.uk/landplanninganddevelopment/environment/historicenvironment/historicenvironmentrecord [Accessed 14/02/2017]
- SSEW
1983 *Soils of England and Wales. Sheet 6, South East England*. Soil Survey of England and
Wales, Harpenden.

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.

<i>Archaeology / Probable Archaeology</i>	This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the responses 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 & 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 & 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 may lead and empty into larger diameter pipes, 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 are indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) or the fill of the trench can cause weaker magnetic responses which can be identified from their uniform linearity.
<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 / Natural</i> or (in the case of linear responses) <i>Possible Archaeology / 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 0.1 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000 (nT), 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; 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 feature. The difference between the two sensors will relate to the strength of a magnetic field created by this 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 and disturbance from modern services.



- Archaeological
- Geophysical
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Building
- Topographic
- Utility Mapping

SUMO Services Ltd, incorporated under the laws of England and Wales,
Company Registration No.4275993.
Registered Office Unit 8 Hayward Business Centre, New Lane, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2NL