

Client: CgMs Consulting

Job ref: **J10510** 

November 2016

# **GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT**

Project name:	Job ref:	
Bridgwater Gateway – Compass	J10510	
House		
Client:		
CgMs Consulting		
Survey date:	Report date:	
7 November 2016	November 2016	
Field team:	Project Manager:	
Edward Cox MSc	Simon Haddrell BEng(Hons) AMBCS PCIFA	
Stewart Hawthorn BA (Hons)		
Report written by:	Report approved by:	
Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)	David Elks MSc ACIFA	
CAD illustrations by:	Site Director:	
Rebecca Davies BSc (Hons)	Dr John Gater MCIFA FSA	
Version number and issue date:	Amendments:	
<b>V1</b> 29/11/2016		

# **STRATASCAN LTD**

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



T: 01684 592266 F: 01684 594142 info@stratascansumo.com <u>www.stratascan.co.uk</u>

Client: CgMs Consulting

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	1
2	INTRODUCTION	1
	METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION	
4	RESULTS	3
5	DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	3
6	CONCLUSION	4
7	REFERENCES	5
App	pendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method	6
App	pendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory	8

Job ref: **J10510** 

Date: November 2016

# **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 01 1:25 000 Location plan of survey area

Figure 02 1:1000 Referencing, colour plot, minimally processed data & interpretation

Client: CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016

Job ref: **J10510** 

## 1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed gradiometry survey was conducted over approximately 0.3 hectares of grassland. The survey has not identified any archaeological anomalies. An underground service and areas of magnetic disturbance as a result of nearby ferrous objects are the only responses that have been detected.

## **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

## 2.2 Site Details

Z.Z Site Details			
NGR / Postcode	ST 299 340 / TA6 6PP		
Location	e site is located on land adjacent to Taunton Road (A38), just off ction 24 of the M5 motorway.		
HER/SMR	Somerset		
District	Sedgemoor		
Parish	North Petherton CP		
Topography	Level		
Current Land Use	Grassland		
Weather Conditions	Sunny and dry		
Soils	The overlying soils are known as Whimple 3 which are typical stagnogleyic argillic brown earths. These consist of reddish fine loamy or fine silty over clayey soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 5 South West England).		
Geology	The underlying geology comprises mudstone and halite stone of Mercia Mudstone Group. The drift geology is not recorded (British Geological Survey website).		
Archaeology	A previous geophysical survey (Stratascan, 2010) has been carried out or land immediately north of the site. The survey identified a complex arrangement of rectilinear enclosures, indicative of multi-phase settlement activity. The anomalies identified in the geophysics have undergone subsequent trial trenching (Cotswold Archaeology, 2010 whereby deposits dating from the Bronze Age to the 13 <sup>th</sup> Century were identified.		

Client: CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016

Job ref: **J10510** 

Survey Methods	Detailed magnetic survey (gradiometry)	
Study Area	0.3 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 (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 large number of archaeological remains identified to the north of the site through previous geophysical survey and trial trenching, 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".

Job ref: **J10510** CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016 Client:

#### **RESULTS** 4

The detailed magnetic gradiometer survey conducted at Bridgwater has not identified any anomalies that have been characterised as being of a probable or possible archaeological origin. The following list refers to numerical labels on the interpretation plots.

#### 4.1 **Probable Archaeology**

No probable archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

#### Possible Archaeology 4.2

No possible archaeology has been identified within the survey area.

#### 4.3 Medieval/Post-Medieval Agriculture

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

#### **Other Anomalies** 4.4

A strong, bipolar linear anomaly in the north-eastern area is likely to be related to a modern underground service, such as a pipe or cable. Areas of magnetic disturbance across both areas area a result of substantial nearby ferrous objects, such as fencing.

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

Mudstone geologies, such as those present across the site, can provide variable results for magnetic survey. However, survey results from the surrounding area clearly demonstrate the successful identification of archaeological activity across this area with this survey technique (Stratascan, 2010; Cotswold Archaeology, 2010). In this instance, the data from the site is largely dominated by strong ferrous responses; the effect of which has the potential to mask weaker archaeological anomalies. Given that a number of archaeological anomalies have been detected in a previous survey immediately to the north, it is possible that the disturbance is masking weaker anomalies.

Client: CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016

Job ref: **J10510** 

# 6 **CONCLUSION**

The survey at Compass House, Bridgwater has not identified any archaeological anomalies. Although areas of the survey have been dominated by strong ferrous responses (potentially masking archaeological features), where these do not occur, no potential archaeological anomalies are present. The survey has identified an underground service and areas of magnetic disturbance as a result of nearby ferrous objects.

Client: CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016

Job ref: **J10510** 

## 7 REFERENCES

British Geological Survey, n.d., website:

(http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps) Geology of Britain viewer. [Accessed 28/11/2016]

Chartered Institute For Archaeologists. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. (http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GGeophysics 1.pdf)

Cotswold Archaeology, 2010. Land Adjacent to Junction 24 of the M5, Bridgwater, Somerset – Archaeological Evaluation

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 5 South West England

Stratascan, 2010. Hinkley Off Site Developments – Geophysical Survey Report (J2676)

Job ref: **J10510** CqMs Consulting Date: November 2016 Client:

# **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**

7ero Mean Traverse **Step Correction** (Destagger)

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. 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.

**Geophysical Survey Report** 

Project Name: Bridgwater Gateway - Compass House

Client: CgMs Consulting Date: November 2016

## **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 This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the response are clearly or very Archaeology probably archaeological and /or if corroborative evidence is available. These anomalies,

whilst considered anthropogenic, could be of any age.

Job ref: **J10510** 

willist considered antihopogenic, 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 / Strong magnetic anomalies that, due to their shape and form or the context in which they Burnt-Fired are found, suggest the presence of kilns, ovens, corn dryers, metal- working areas or

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 Anomalies that correspond to former boundaries indicated on historic mapping, or which

(probable & possible) 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 Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with

(ploughing) 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).

Client: CqMs Consulting

# **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.

Job ref: **J10510** 

Date: November 2016

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

