



ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
SERVICES  
WYAS

**Athelstane Crescent  
Edenthorpe  
Doncaster  
South Yorkshire**

**Geophysical Survey**

Report no. 2573

February 2014

Client: Prospect Archaeology Ltd



**Athelstane Crescent  
Edenthorpe  
Doncaster  
South Yorkshire**

**Geophysical Survey**

*Summary*

*A geophysical (magnetometer) survey, covering approximately 2 hectares, was carried out north of Athelstane Crescent, Edenthorpe, to inform the determination of a full planning application for the proposed development of the site. Against a very variable magnetic background linear anomalies indicative of infilled ditches forming part of a brickwork field system of probable Iron Age/Roman date have been identified. On the basis of the survey the archaeological potential of the site is assessed as moderate.*



ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
SERVICES  
WYAS

**Report Information**

Client: Prospect Archaeology Ltd  
Address: Prospect House, Garden Lane, Sherburn-in-Elmet, Leeds,  
North Yorkshire, LS25 6AT  
Report Type: Geophysical Survey  
Location: Athelstane Crescent, Edenthorpe  
County: South Yorkshire  
Grid Reference: SE 6186 0713  
Period(s) of activity: Iron Age?/Roman?  
Report Number: 2573  
Project Number: 4201  
Site Code: EDT14  
OASIS ID: archaeol11- 170931  
Planning Application No.:  
Museum Accession No.: n/a  
Date of fieldwork: January 2014  
Date of report: February 2014  
Project Management: Alistair Webb BA MIfA  
Fieldwork: Chris Sykes BSc MSc  
Dan Waterfall BA  
Report: Alistair Webb  
Illustrations: Sam Harrison BSc MSc MIfA  
Photography: Chris Sykes  
Research: n/a

Authorisation for  
distribution:

  
-----



Cert. No. 125

© Archaeological Services WYAS 2014  
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
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Site location, topography and land-use .....	1
Soils and Geology.....	1
<b>2 Archaeological Background.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Aims, Methodology and Presentation .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4 Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5 Conclusions.....</b>	<b>4</b>

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 (1:2000)
- 3 Processed greyscale magnetometer data (1:1000)
- 4 XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data (1:1000)
- 5 Interpretation of magnetometer data (1:1000)

### **List of Plates**

Plate 1 General view of survey area, looking north

Plate 2 General view of survey area, looking north-west

## **1 Introduction**

Archaeological Services WYAS (ASWYAS) were commissioned by Nansi Rosenberg of Prospect Archaeology Limited (the Client), to undertake a geophysical (magnetometer) survey of land in Edenthorpe, immediately north-east of Doncaster (see Fig. 1), prior to the determination of a planning application for the proposed development of the site. The work was undertaken in accordance with a Project Design (Harrison 2014) supplied to and approved by the Client, 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 on January 31st 2014 in order to provide additional information on the archaeological potential of the site.

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

The Proposed Development Area (PDA) is situated midway between Edenthorpe and Kirk Sandall on open ground to the north of Athelstane Crescent (see plates), centred at SE 6186 0713. The PDA comprises a pentagonal block of land covering 2 hectares and is bounded by housing to the south and south-west, Canon Popham School to the west and open ground to the north and east (see Fig. 2). The site is relatively flat at approximately 10m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).

### **Soils and geology**

The underlying bedrock geology comprises Nottingham Castle Sandstone Formation overlain by undifferentiated river terrace sands and gravels (British Geological Survey 2014). The soils are classified in the Newport 1 association being characterised as deep, well-drained sands and coarse loams (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).

## **2 Archaeological Background**

The PDA is located in a landscape of archaeological potential predominantly known for its cropmark field systems of the brickwork type which comprise large rectilinear fields of Late Iron Age and Roman date (see Fig. 2).

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

The main aim of the geophysical survey was to provide sufficient information to enable an assessment to be made of the impact of development on potential sub-surface archaeological remains, and for further evaluation or mitigation proposals, if appropriate, to be recommended. To achieve this aim a magnetometer survey covering the whole of the PDA was carried out, an area of approximately 2 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 (1:2000) location plan displaying the processed magnetometer data and superficial deposits. Large scale data plots of both the processed (greyscale) and minimally processed (X–Y trace plot) data are presented at a scale of 1:1000 in Figure 3 and Figure 4. Figure 5 is an interpretation of the data at the same scale.

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 2014) and guidelines outlined by English Heritage (David *et al.* 2008) and by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2013). 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 3, 4 and 5)

The anomalies identified by the survey fall into three different categories according to their interpreted origin. Each category is discussed below and cross-referenced to specific examples and locations within the site, where appropriate.

### **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 with large bands of magnetic disturbance around the periphery of the site and a very large disturbed area to the southern corner of the site. None of these anomalies are considered to be of any archaeological interest being due to modern activity.

A high magnitude linear anomaly, **A**, aligned north-west/south-east, extends across the site from Athelstane Crescent in the south. This anomaly is caused by a sub-surface pipe, probably a drain or sewer.

### **Geological Anomalies**

In the parts of the site not affected by the magnetic disturbance the data is characterised by numerous discrete anomalies (areas of enhanced magnetic response). These anomalies are interpreted as geological in origin, being caused by variations in the superficial deposits and soils.

### **Archaeological/Archaeological? Anomalies**

Against this highly perturbed background four linear anomalies, indicative of infilled ditches, have been identified. In the western half of the site parallel anomalies **B** and **C**, about 35m apart, are aligned south-west/north-east. At right angles to these two anomalies in the eastern half of the site are two further anomalies, **D** and **E**. All these anomalies broadly correspond with the alignment of the cropmarks to the immediate east and west of the PDA (see Fig. 2), although none of the anomalies has previously been identified as a cropmark. It is worth noting that the perturbed magnetic background precludes the identification of any non-linear anomalies that might have an archaeological origin.



## 5 Conclusions

The survey has identified anomalies caused by infilled ditches forming part of the characteristic brickwork field system identified as cropmarks in the immediate and wider landscape. The effects of large areas of magnetic disturbance, due to modern activity, and the variability of the superficial deposits and soils mean that it would be very difficult to identify or confidently interpret any relatively weak anomalies which might be caused by archaeological features, if present.

On the basis of the magnetometer survey, the archaeological potential of the site is considered to be moderate.

*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. 3. Processed greyscale magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A3)






Fig. 4. XY trace plot of minimally processed magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A3)




Fig. 5. Interpretation of magnetometer data (1:1000 @ A3)



*Plate 1. General view of survey area, looking north*



*Plate 2. General view of survey area, looking north-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 South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record).

## **Bibliography**

- British Geological Survey, 2014. [www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html](http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html) . (Viewed February 4th 2014)
- 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, S. 2014. *Land at Edenthorpe, South Yorkshire; Geophysical Survey Project Design* Unpublished ASWYAS Document
- Institute for Archaeologists, 2013. *Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey*. IfA
- Soil Survey of England and Wales, 1983. *Soil Survey of England and Wales: Soils of Northern England*, Sheet 1