



ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SERVICES
WYAS

**Land north of Papplewick Lane
Hucknall
Nottinghamshire**

Geophysical Survey

Report no. 2518

October 2013

Client: The Environmental Dimension Partnership



Land north of Papplewick Lane Hucknall Nottinghamshire

Geophysical Survey

Summary

A geophysical (magnetometer) survey covering approximately 12 hectares was carried out on the north-eastern edge of Hucknall to inform the determination of an outline planning application for residential and associated development. The survey has identified anomalies indicative of land drains, sub-surface pipes/drains and recent agricultural activity. No anomalies of obvious archaeological potential have been identified although there is a broad area of magnetic disturbance for which a definite origin is unclear. However, on balance this is considered likely to be of modern origin. On the basis of the geophysical survey the archaeological potential of the site is considered to be low.



ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SERVICES
WYAS

Report Information

Client: The Environmental Dimension Partnership
Address: 14 Inner Courtyard, Whiteway Farmhouse, The Whiteway,
Cirencester, Gloucester, GL7 7BA
Report Type: Geophysical Survey
County: Nottinghamshire
Grid Reference: SK 5440 5050
Period(s) of activity: Post-medieval/modern
Report Number: 2518
Project Number: 4117
Site Code: PAP13
OASIS ID: archaeol11- 160285
Planning Application No.:
Museum Accession No.: n/a
Date of fieldwork: September 2013
Date of report: October 2013
Project Management: Sam Harrison BSc MSc AIfA
Fieldwork: Tom Fildes BA
Christopher Sykes BA MSc
Dan Waterfall BA
Report: David Harrison BA MSc MIfA
Illustrations: David Harrison and Tom Fildes
Photography: Christopher 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



Contents

Report information	ii
Contents.....	iii
List of Figures	iv
List of Plates	iv
1 Introduction	1
Site location, topography and land-use	1
Soils and Geology.....	1
2 Archaeological Background.....	1
3 Aims, Methodology and Presentation	2
4 Results and Discussion.....	3
5 Conclusions.....	4

Figures

Plates

Appendices

Appendix 1: Magnetic survey: technical information

Appendix 2: Survey location information

Appendix 3: Geophysical archive

Bibliography

List of Figures

- 1 Site location (1:50000)
- 2 Survey location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:2500)
- 3 Overall interpretation of geophysical survey showing contour data (1:2500)
- 4 Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Sector 1 (1:1250)
- 5 XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Sector 1 (1:1250)
- 6 Interpretation of magnetometer data: Sector 1 (1:1250)
- 7 Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Sector 2 (1:1250)
- 8 XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Sector 2 (1:1250)
- 9 Interpretation of magnetometer data: Sector 2 (1:1250)

List of Plates

Plate 1 General view of Field 1, looking south

Plate 2 General view of Field 2, looking north-west

Plate 3 General view of Field 3, looking south-west

1 Introduction

Archaeological Services WYAS (ASWYAS) were commissioned by The Environmental Dimension Partnership (the Client), on behalf of their client, Co-Operative Group, to undertake a geophysical (magnetometer) survey of land at Hucknall, 11 km north of Nottingham (see Fig. 1), prior to the submission of a planning application for a proposed housing development. The work was undertaken in accordance with a Project Design (Harrison, 2013) supplied to and approved by the Client and Nottinghamshire County Council, with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and in line with current best practice (David *et al* 2008). The survey was carried out between September 18th and September 20th 2013 in order to provide additional information on the archaeological potential of the site.

Site location, topography and land-use

The Proposed Development Area (PDA) comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land situated on the north-eastern periphery of Hucknall, centred at SK 5440 5050 (see Fig. 2), which is bounded by the River Leen to the east, housing to the south and west and by agricultural land to the north. The PDA covers three fields over a combined area of 12 hectares. At the time of survey the land was under arable cultivation having been recently ploughed (see plates). The site is situated on a gentle east-facing slope at approximately 75m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) towards the west of the PDA and 69m aOD at the River Leen.

Soils and geology

The underlying bedrock comprises limestone of the Cadeby Formation. There are no recorded superficial deposits (British Geological Survey 2013). The soils in this area are classified in the Aberford association, characterised as well-drained, fine loams. Within the east of the PDA, adjacent to the River Leen, the soils are classified in the Isleham 2 association, characterised as sandy and peaty soils which are affected by groundwater with a risk of seasonal waterlogging (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).

2 Archaeological Background

An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (CgMs 2009) identified no heritage assets within the PDA and few within the immediate surrounding landscape. Warp Mill, an 18th century corn mill at the south-eastern extent of the site, is identified on the Nottinghamshire HER as being of local interest (M/L2645). The assessment concludes that the site has a low archaeological potential for the presence of unrecorded archaeological remains from all periods.

3 Aims, Methodology and Presentation

The main aim of the geophysical survey was to provide sufficient information to establish the presence/absence, character and extent of any archaeological remains to be impacted by the proposed development, and for further evaluation or mitigation proposals, if appropriate, to be recommended. To achieve this aim a magnetometer survey covering all available areas of the PDA was carried out, an area of 12 hectares.

The general objectives of the geophysical survey were:

- to provide information about the nature and possible interpretation of any magnetic anomalies identified;
- to therefore determine the presence/absence and extent of any buried archaeological features; and
- to prepare a report summarising the results of the survey.

Magnetometer survey

The site grid was laid out using a Trimble VRS differential Global Positioning System (Trimble 5800 model). Bartington Grad601 magnetic gradiometers were used during the survey, taking 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 (OS) mapping, is shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 is a large scale (1:2500) survey location plan displaying the processed magnetic data. An overall interpretation drawing, including contour data, is shown in Figure 3, also at a scale of 1:2500. Detailed data plots ('raw' and processed) and full interpretative figures are presented at a scale of 1:1250 in Figures 4 to 9 inclusive.

Further technical information on the equipment used, data processing and survey methodologies is given in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Appendix 3 describes the composition and location of the site archive.

The survey methodology, report and any recommendations comply with the Project Design (Harrison 2013) 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 (see Figs 4 to 9 inclusive)

Numerous anomalies have been identified by the geophysical survey within a variable magnetic background. The anomalies identified by the survey fall into a number of different types and categories according to their origin and these are discussed below and cross-referenced to specific examples highlighted on the interpretative figures.

Ferrous Anomalies

Ferrous responses, either as individual ‘spike’ anomalies or more extensive areas of magnetic disturbance, are typically caused by modern ferrous (magnetic) debris, either on the ground surface or in the plough-soil, or are due to the proximity of magnetic material in field boundaries, buildings or other above ground features. Little importance is normally given to such anomalies, unless there is any supporting evidence for an archaeological interpretation as ferrous debris or material is common on rural sites, often being present as a consequence of manuring or tipping/infilling. Throughout the PDA individual iron ‘spike’ anomalies are common but there is no obvious pattern or clustering to their distribution to suggest anything other than a random background scatter of ferrous debris in the soil. Magnetic disturbance at the perimeters of the site is due to the presence of ferrous material within the adjacent boundaries, fences and buildings.

Throughout Field 1 and Field 3, seven high magnitude linear dipolar anomalies, **A – G**, locate sub-surface service pipes, whereas isolated dipolar anomalies, **H**, within Field 3, are caused by pylons at these locations, sited along the route of an overhead power line.

Agricultural Anomalies

Analysis of historical mapping shows that the division and layout of fields within the PDA has altered little over the past 170 years, albeit with the removal of three field boundaries from within Field 3. None of these former field boundaries have been identified by the survey. It is unclear whether this is due to the complete removal of these boundaries by the plough, or whether the boundaries remain masked by later agricultural activity.

Series of faint parallel linear trend anomalies have been identified on differing alignments throughout the PDA. Broader trends within Field 1 are due to the medieval and post-medieval agricultural practice of ridge and furrow cultivation. The anomalies are due to the magnetic contrast between the now soil-filled furrows and the former ridges. In all other instances, the trends are aligned broadly parallel with the 19th century boundaries (see above)

and are due to modern ploughing. Higher magnitude linear anomalies, appearing on a number of differing alignments, are thought to be indicative of field drains.

Geological Anomalies

Throughout the site small discrete areas of enhanced magnetic response have been identified. These anomalies are interpreted as geological in origin, being due to localised variation in the composition of the soils. Of particular note is a fragmentary sinuous anomaly, **I**, which is clearly visible towards the north of Field 3. The anomaly is orientated south-west/north-east, in keeping with the east-facing gradient, and is thought to indicate a former silt-filled water channel, perhaps originating from a former spring towards the centre of the field. Google Earth images show crop-growth variation in this location.

Modern Anomalies

At the western extent of the possible former water channel described above, a broad area of increased magnetic response, **J**, has been identified. The area corresponds to a variation in topography (see contour data on Fig. 3) and therefore it is possible that it is due to geological outcropping. However, a modern interpretation is preferred with the response thought to result from tipping/infilling, perhaps to aid drainage.

5 Conclusions

No anomalies of archaeological potential have been identified by the survey. Anomalies indicative of post medieval and modern ploughing reflect the orientation of the 19th century field boundaries. Several service pipes and land drains have been identified throughout the PDA, and a possible former water channel can be seen towards the centre of the site.

Consequently, on the basis of the geophysical survey, the archaeological potential of the site is assessed as being low, corroborating the conclusions of the desk-based assessment.

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. Survey location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:2500 @ A3)




Fig. 3. Overall interpretation of geophysical survey showing contour data (1:2500 @ A3)

0 40m




Fig. 4. Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Sector 1 (1:1250 @ A3)



Fig. 5. XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Sector 1 (1:1250 @ A3)

0 25m






Fig. 7. Processed greyscale magnetometer data; Sector 2 (1:1250 @ A3)




Fig. 8. XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data; Sector 2 (1:1250 @ A3)

0 25m






Plate 1. General view of Field 1, looking south



Plate 2. General view of Field 2, looking north-west



Plate 3. General view of Field 3, looking south-west

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 approximately 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 the 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 has 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.

Geoplot 3 software was used to interpolate the data so that 3600 readings were obtained for each 30m by 30m grid. 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 co-ordinates are measured off hard copies of the mapping rather than using the digital co-ordinates.

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

Appendix 3: 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 2008) 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 the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record).

Bibliography

- British Geological Survey, 2013. www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html . (Viewed October 1st 2013)
- CgMs, 2009. *Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Land north of Papplewick Lane, Hucknall*. CgMs Client Report Ref: 11134/09/01
- 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
- Harrison, D. 2013. *Land north of Papplewick Lane, Papplewick, Nottinghamshire; Geophysical Survey Project Design* Unpublished ASWYAS Document
- Institute for Archaeologists, 2010. *Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey*. IfA
- Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soil Survey of England and Wales: Soils of Midland and Western England*, Sheet 3