



ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
SERVICES  
WYAS

**Land at Spooner Row  
norfolk**

**Geophysical Survey**

Report no. 2432

January 2013

Client: NPS Archaeology



# Land at Spooner Row Norfolk

## Geophysical Survey

### *Summary*

*A geophysical (magnetometer) survey, covering approximately 4 hectares, was carried out on two parcels of land to the north and south of Spooner Row, prior to the determination of a planning application for a proposed development of the land. Anomalies indicative of 19th century field boundaries, recent agricultural activity and variations in the superficial geological deposits have been identified. No anomalies of archaeological potential have been identified. Based on the geophysical survey the site is interpreted as having a low archaeological potential.*



ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
SERVICES  
WYAS

## Report Information

Client: NPS Archaeology  
Address: Scandic House, 85 Mountergate, Norwich, NR1 1PY  
Report Type: Geophysical survey  
Location: Land at Spooner Row  
County: Norfolk  
Grid Reference: TM 099 976 and TM 096 969  
Period(s) of activity represented:  
Report Number: 2432  
Project Number: 4015  
Site Code: SPR12  
HER Event No.: -  
OASIS ID: archaeol11-143258  
Planning Application No.: pre-application  
Museum Accession No.: n/a  
Date of fieldwork: January 2013  
Date of report: January 2013  
Project Management: Sam Harrison BSc MSc AIfA  
Fieldwork: James Lawton BSc MSc PIfA  
Chris Sykes BA MSc  
Orlando Prestidge BA MA PIfA  
Report: David Harrison BA MSc MIfA  
Illustrations: David Harrison  
Photography: Chris Sykes  
Research: n/a

Authorisation for  
distribution: -----



© Archaeological Services WYAS 2013  
PO Box 30, Nepshaw Lane South, Morley, Leeds LS27 0UG  
Telephone: 0113 383 7500.  
Email: [admin@aswyas.com](mailto:admin@aswyas.com)



## Contents

Report Information .....	ii
Contents .....	iii
List of Figures .....	iv
List of Plates .....	iv
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Site location, topography and land-use .....	1
Geology and soils .....	1
<b>2 Archaeological background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Aims, Methodology and Presentation .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Magnetometer survey .....	2
Reporting .....	2
<b>4 Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5 Conclusions.....</b>	<b>3</b>

### Figures

### Plates

### Appendices

- Appendix 1: Magnetic survey: technical information
- Appendix 2: Survey location information
- Appendix 3: Raw XY trace plot data
- Appendix 4: Data repeatability
- Appendix 5: Geophysical archive

### Bibliography

### **List of Figures**

- 1 Site location (1:50000)
- 2 Site location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:4000)
- 3 Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000)
- 4 XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000)
- 5 Interpretation of magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000)
- 6 Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000)
- 7 XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000)
- 8 Interpretation of magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000)

### **List of Plates**

- Plate 1 General view of Area 1, looking east  
Plate 2 General view of Area 2, looking south-east

## **1 Introduction**

Archaeological Services WYAS was commissioned by David Whitmore of NPS Archaeology to undertake a geophysical (magnetometer) survey of two areas at Spooner Row (see Fig. 1), in advance of the submission of a planning application for a proposed development of the site. The scheme of work was undertaken in accordance with the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The survey was carried out on January 3rd 2013.

### **Site location, topography and land-use**

The proposed development areas (PDA's), centred at TM 099 976 and TM 096 969, are situated on relatively flat ground at about 47m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) and are located on both the north-eastern (Area 1) and south-eastern (Area 2) peripheries of Spooner Row (see Fig. 2). Area 1 is bounded to the west by Chapel Road and Area 2 is bounded to the west by Bunwell Road. The PDA's cover approximately 4 hectares. Both areas were under a short cereal crop at the time of the survey (Plate 1 and Plate 2).

### **Geology and soils**

The underlying solid geology comprises chalk of the Lewes Nodular, Seaford, Newhaven and Culver Chalk Formations overlain by superficial deposits of Diamicton (British Geological Survey, 2013). The soils in Area 1 are classified in the Burlingham 1 association whereas the soils in Area 2 are classified in the Beccles 1 association - both being characterised as slowly permeable, seasonally waterlogged loams (Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983).

## **2 Archaeological background**

No archaeological background is available at the time of writing.

## **3 Aims, Methodology and Presentation**

The general aim of the geophysical survey was to establish and clarify the nature of the archaeological resource within the PDA.

Specifically the survey sought to provide information about the nature and possible interpretation of any anomalies identified during the survey and thereby determine the presence or absence and likely extent of any buried archaeological remains.

The information from the geophysical survey will enable further evaluation and/or mitigation measures, if required, to be designed in advance of the proposed development.

## **Magnetometer survey**

Bartington Grad601 instruments were used to take readings at 0.25m intervals on zig-zag traverses 1m apart within 30m by 30m grids so that 3600 readings were recorded in each grid. These readings were stored in the memory of the instrument and later downloaded to computer for processing and interpretation. Geoplot 3 (Geoscan Research) software was used to process and present the data. Further details are given in Appendix 1.

## **Reporting**

A general site location plan, incorporating the 1:50000 Ordnance Survey mapping is shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 presents a more detailed site location showing the processed magnetometer data at a scale of 1:4000. The processed magnetometer greyscale data, the minimally processed XY trace plot data and interpretation figures are presented at a scale of 1:1000 in Figures 3 to 8 inclusive.

Further technical information on the equipment used, data processing and survey methodologies are given in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Trace plots of the 'raw' data and data repeatability plots are included in Appendix 3 and Appendix 4. Appendix 5 describes the composition and location of the site archive.

The survey methodology, report and any recommendations comply with the methodology and guidelines outlined by English Heritage (David *et al.* 2008) and by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2010). All figures reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping are with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (© Crown copyright).

The figures in this report have been produced following analysis of the data in 'raw' and processed formats and over a range of different display levels. All figures are presented to most suitably display and interpret the data from this site based on the experience and knowledge of Archaeological Services staff.

## **4 Results and Discussion**

### ***Ferrous anomalies***

Isolated dipolar ('iron spike') anomalies have been identified throughout the survey areas. These anomalies are typically caused by ferrous (magnetic) material, either on the ground surface or in the topsoil horizon, which causes rapid variations in the magnetic readings giving a characteristic 'spiky' XY trace. Unless there is supporting evidence for an archaeological interpretation little importance is normally attributed to such anomalies, as modern ferrous objects are common on rural sites, often being present as a consequence of manuring or tipping/infilling. There is no obvious clustering to these anomalies that might suggest some potential significance and they are therefore interpreted as being due to random ferrous debris.

Broad areas of magnetic disturbance at the perimeters of the survey areas is caused by ferrous material and pylons within and adjacent to the field boundaries.

### ***Geological anomalies***

Numerous discrete anomalies, characterised as localised areas of magnetic enhancement, have been identified throughout Area 1 and Area 2. The low magnitude, widespread distribution and lack of any apparent pattern suggests these anomalies have a geological origin, being due to localised variations in the underlying superficial deposits and/or soils. However, due to the composition of the superficial geology and soils, an archaeological origin for some of these anomalies cannot be dismissed.

### ***Agricultural anomalies***

Clear linear and curvilinear anomalies within the south of Area 2 correspond to former field boundaries depicted on the first edition Ordnance Survey map and are unlikely to be of any archaeological significance. The series of parallel linear trend anomalies identified in an east-west orientation are typical of field drains whilst the north-east/south-west aligned trends represent former plough furrows, probably caused by modern ploughing. Curvilinear trends have been identified skirting the western perimeters of Area 1 and Area 2. These trends are typically caused by ploughing headlands from modern agricultural practices.

Within the south of Area 1, a fragmented linear anomaly has been identified. The anomaly is not depicted on first edition or later Ordnance Survey mapping but may indicate an extension of the boundary to the south.

## **5 Conclusions**

Only anomalies caused by recent agricultural activity and geological variation have been identified on this site. No anomalies of obvious archaeological potential have been identified in the survey. Therefore, based on the results of the geophysical survey the site is interpreted as having a low archaeological potential.

***The results and subsequent interpretation of data from geophysical surveys should not be treated as an absolute representation of the underlying archaeological and non-archaeological remains. Confirmation of the presence or absence of archaeological remains can only be achieved by direct investigation of sub-surface deposits.***






Fig. 1. Site location




Fig. 2. Site location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:4000 @ A3)




Fig. 3. Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000 @ A4)



Fig. 4. XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000 @ A4)




Fig. 5. Interpretation of magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000 @ A4)

0 40m




Fig. 6. Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000 @ A4)

0 40m



Fig. 7. XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000 @ A4)




Fig. 8. Interpretation of magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000 @ A4)







*Plate 1. General view of Area 1, looking east*



*Plate 2. General view of Area 2, looking south-east*

## **Appendix 1: Magnetic survey - technical information**

### **Magnetic Susceptibility and Soil Magnetism**

Iron makes up about 6% of the Earth's crust and is mostly present in soils and rocks as minerals such as maghaemite and haemetite. These minerals have a weak, measurable magnetic property termed magnetic susceptibility. Human activities can redistribute these minerals and change (enhance) others into more magnetic forms so that by measuring the magnetic susceptibility of the topsoil, areas where human occupation or settlement has occurred can be identified by virtue of the attendant increase (enhancement) in magnetic susceptibility. If the enhanced material subsequently comes to fill features, such as ditches or pits, localised isolated and linear magnetic anomalies can result whose presence can be detected by a magnetometer (fluxgate gradiometer).

In general, it is the contrast between the magnetic susceptibility of deposits filling cut features, such as ditches or pits, and the magnetic susceptibility of topsoils, subsoils and rocks into which these features have been cut, which causes the most recognisable responses. This is primarily because there is a tendency for magnetic ferrous compounds to become concentrated in the topsoil, thereby making it more magnetic than the subsoil or the bedrock. Linear features cut into the subsoil or geology, such as ditches, that have been silted up or have been backfilled with topsoil will therefore usually produce a positive magnetic response relative to the background soil levels. Discrete feature, such as pits, can also be detected. The magnetic susceptibility of a soil can also be enhanced by the application of heat and the fermentation and bacterial effects associated with rubbish decomposition. The area of enhancement is usually quite large, mainly due to the tendency of discard areas to extend beyond the limit of the occupation site itself, and spreading by the plough. An advantage of magnetic susceptibility over magnetometry is that a certain amount of occupational activity will cause the same proportional change in susceptibility, however weakly magnetic is the soil, and so does not depend on the magnetic contrast between the topsoil and deeper layers. Susceptibility survey is therefore able to detect areas of occupation even in the absence of cut features. On the other hand susceptibility survey is more vulnerable to the masking effects of layers of colluvium and alluvium as the technique, using the Bartington system, can generally only measure variation in the first 0.15m of ploughsoil.

### **Types of Magnetic Anomaly**

In the majority of instances anomalies are termed 'positive'. This means that they have a positive magnetic value relative to the magnetic background on any given site. However some features can manifest themselves as 'negative' anomalies that, conversely, means that the response is negative relative to the mean magnetic background.

Where it is not possible to give a probable cause of an observed anomaly a '?' is appended.

It should be noted that anomalies interpreted as modern in origin might be caused by features that are present in the topsoil or upper layers of the subsoil. Removal of soil to an archaeological or natural layer can therefore remove the feature causing the anomaly.

The types of response mentioned above can be divided into five main categories that are used in the graphical interpretation of the magnetic data:

#### *Isolated dipolar anomalies (iron spikes)*

These responses are typically caused by ferrous material either on the surface or in the topsoil. They cause a rapid variation in the magnetic response giving a characteristic 'spiky' trace. Although ferrous archaeological artefacts could produce this type of response, unless there is supporting evidence for an archaeological interpretation, little emphasis is normally given to such anomalies, as modern ferrous objects are common on rural sites, often being present as a consequence of manuring.

#### *Areas of magnetic disturbance*

These responses can have several causes often being associated with burnt material, such as slag waste or brick rubble or other strongly magnetised/fired material. Ferrous structures such as pylons, mesh or barbed wire fencing and buried pipes can also cause the same disturbed response. A modern origin is usually assumed unless there is other supporting information.

#### *Linear trend*

This is usually a weak or broad linear anomaly of unknown cause or date. These anomalies are often caused by agricultural activity, either ploughing or land drains being a common cause.

#### *Areas of magnetic enhancement/positive isolated anomalies*

Areas of enhanced response are characterised by a general increase in the magnetic background over a localised area whilst discrete anomalies are manifest by an increased response (sometimes only visible on an XY trace plot) on two or three successive traverses. In neither instance is there the intense dipolar response characteristic exhibited by an area of magnetic disturbance or of an 'iron spike' anomaly (see above). These anomalies can be caused by infilled discrete archaeological features such as pits or post-holes or by kilns. They can also be caused by pedological variations or by natural infilled features on certain geologies. Ferrous material in the subsoil can also give a similar response. It can often therefore be very difficult to establish an anthropogenic origin without intrusive investigation or other supporting information.

#### *Linear and curvilinear anomalies*

Such anomalies have a variety of origins. They may be caused by agricultural practice (recent ploughing trends, earlier ridge and furrow regimes or land drains); natural geomorphological features such as palaeochannels or by infilled archaeological ditches.

### **Methodology: Magnetic Susceptibility Survey**

There are two methods of measuring the magnetic susceptibility of a soil sample. The first involves the measurement of a given volume of soil, which will include any air and moisture that lies within the sample, and is termed volume specific susceptibility. This method results in a bulk value that is not necessarily fully representative of the constituent components of the sample. For field surveys a Bartington MS2 meter with MS2D field loop is used due to its speed and simplicity. The second technique overcomes this potential problem by taking into account both the volume and mass of a sample and is termed mass specific susceptibility. However, mass specific readings cannot be taken in the field where the bulk properties of a soil are usually unknown and so volume specific readings must be taken. Whilst these values are not fully representative they do allow general comparisons across a site and give a broad indication of susceptibility changes. This is usually enough to assess the susceptibility of a site and evaluate whether enhancement has occurred.

### **Methodology: Gradiometer Survey**

There are two main methods of using the fluxgate gradiometer for commercial evaluations. The first of these is referred to as *magnetic scanning* and requires the operator to visually identify anomalous responses on the instrument display panel whilst covering the site in widely spaced traverses, typically 10m apart. The instrument logger is not used and there is therefore no data collection. Once anomalous responses are identified they are marked in the field with bamboo canes and located on a base plan. This method is usually employed as a means of selecting areas for detailed survey when only a percentage sample of the whole site is to be subject to detailed survey.

The disadvantages of magnetic scanning are that features that produce weak anomalies (less than 2nT) are unlikely to stand out from the magnetic background and so will be difficult to detect. The coarse sampling interval means that discrete features or linear features that are parallel or broadly oblique to the direction of traverse may not be detected. If linear features are suspected in a site then the traverse direction should be perpendicular (or as close as is possible within the physical constraints of the site) to the orientation of the suspected features. The possible drawbacks mentioned above mean that a 'negative' scanning result should be validated by sample detailed magnetic survey (see below).

The second method is referred to as *detailed survey* and employs the use of a sample trigger to automatically take readings at predetermined points, typically at 0.25m intervals, on zig-zag traverses 1m apart. These readings are stored in the memory of the instrument and are later dumped to computer for processing and interpretation. Detailed survey allows the visualisation of weaker anomalies that may not have been detected by magnetic scanning.

During this survey a Bartington Grad601 magnetic gradiometer was used taking readings on the 0.1nT range, at 0.25m intervals on zig-zag traverses 1m apart within 30m by 30m square

grids. The instrument was checked for electronic and mechanical drift at a common point and calibrated as necessary. The drift from zero was not logged.

### **Data Processing and Presentation**

The detailed gradiometer data has been presented in this report in XY trace and greyscale formats. In the former format the data shown is 'raw' with no processing other than grid biasing having been done. The data in the greyscale images has been interpolated and selectively filtered to remove the effects of drift in instrument calibration and other artificial data constructs and to maximise the clarity and interpretability of any archaeological anomalies.

An XY plot presents the data logged on each traverse as a single line with each successive traverse incremented on the Y-axis to produce a 'stacked' plot. A hidden line algorithm has been employed to block out lines behind major 'spikes' and the data have been clipped. The main advantage of this display option is that the full range of data can be viewed, dependent on the clip, so that the 'shape' of individual anomalies can be discerned and potentially archaeological anomalies differentiated from 'iron spikes'. Geoplot 3 software was used to create the XY trace plots. The same program was used to produce the greyscale images. All greyscale plots are displayed using a linear incremental scale.

## **Appendix 2: Survey location information**

The site grid was laid out using a Trimble VRS differential Global Positioning System (Trimble 5800 model). The accuracy of this equipment is better than 0.01m. The survey grids were then super-imposed onto a base map provided by the client to produce the displayed block locations. However, it should be noted that Ordnance Survey positional accuracy for digital map data has an error of 0.5m for urban and floodplain areas, 1.0m for rural areas and 2.5m for mountain and moorland areas. This potential error must be considered if coordinates are measured off hard copies of the mapping rather than using the digital coordinates.

*Archaeological Services WYAS cannot accept responsibility for errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by a third party. Archaeological Services WYAS cannot accept responsibility for errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by a third party.*

## **Appendix 3: Raw XY trace plot data**



XY trace plot of raw magnetometer data; Area 1 (1:1000 @ A4)





*XY trace plot of raw magnetometer data; Area 2 (1:1000 @ A4)*

## **Appendix 4: Data repeatability**

# Data Repeatability

JOB NUMBER	4015	SITE CODE	SPR13	JOB NAME	Spoooner Row, Norfolk
------------	------	-----------	-------	----------	-----------------------



03/01/2013 Grid surveyed at 09:00 and 13:30

## **Appendix 5: Geophysical archive**

The geophysical archive comprises:-

- an archive disk containing compressed (WinZip 8) files of the raw data, report text (Microsoft Word 2000), and graphics files (Adobe Illustrator CS2 and AutoCAD 2007) files; and
- a full copy of the report.

At present the archive is held by Archaeological Services WYAS although it is anticipated that it may eventually be lodged with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS). Brief details may also be forwarded for inclusion on the English Heritage Geophysical Survey Database after the contents of the report are deemed to be in the public domain (i.e. available for consultation in Norfolk Historic Environment Record).

## **Bibliography**

BGS, 2013. <http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyviewer/> (Viewed January 30th 2013)

David, A., N. Linford, P. Linford and L. Martin, 2008. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation: Research and Professional Services Guidelines (2nd edition)* English Heritage

IfA, 2010. *Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey.*

Institute for Archaeologists

Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983, Soils of Eastern England, Sheet 4.