



**Land at Rockliffe Park
Hurworth-on-Tees
County Durham**

Geophysical Survey

June 2007

Report No. 1699

Northern Archaeological Associates Ltd.

Land at Rockliffe Park

Hurworth-on-Tees

County Durham

Geophysical Survey

Contents

1. Introduction and Archaeological Background
2. Methodology and Presentation
3. Results
4. Discussion and Conclusions

Bibliography

Acknowledgements

Figures

Plates

Appendices

Summary

A geophysical (magnetometer) survey covering 6 hectares was carried out on land at Rockliffe Park, Hurworth-on-Tees, in advance of a proposed golf course development. The survey has identified numerous anomalies although the majority are interpreted as being due to variation in the drift geology/soils or agricultural activity. A possible sub-square enclosure has been identified although this interpretation is considered tentative.

Authorised for distribution by:

.....

ISOQAR ISO 9001:2000

Cert. No. 125/93

© ASWYAS 2007

Archaeological Services WYAS

PO Box 30, Nepshaw Lane South, Morley, Leeds LS27 0UG

1. Introduction and Archaeological Background

- 1.1 Archaeological Services WYAS was commissioned by Mr Paul Johnson of Northern Archaeological Associates Ltd to carry out a geophysical (magnetic) survey on land approximately 5km south of Darlington, County Durham (see Fig. 1) in advance of a proposed golf course development.
- 1.2 The application area is situated south of St Cuthbert's Hospital (centred at NZ 301 089) and in total covered approximately 112 hectares. The geophysical survey sampled only a small part of the site covering 6 hectares in three separate blocks (see Fig. 2). These blocks were positioned to sample parts of the site that would be affected by landscaping works; Area C covered the site of a proposed lake. Area A was re-positioned following consultation with the client to avoid ongoing groundworks. Area A was under pasture and Areas B and C were fallow with stubble at the time of the fieldwork (between May 16th and May 18th 2007). No problems were encountered during the survey.
- 1.3 The site is situated at approximately 25m above Ordnance Datum (OD) on a meander of the River Tees that borders the site to the south and east. Area A was situated on the steepest part of the site with Area B and C being relatively flat, the land sloping to the south and east towards the river. The underlying solid geology comprises Sherwood Sandstone overlain by glacial till to the north of Area A and River Terrace deposits cover the remainder of the site. The soils are classified in the Wick 1 association being described as deep, well-drained, coarse loams and sands.
- 1.4 The prehistoric period is poorly represented in the immediate area of the site. The Romano-British period tends to see the higher ground of the river terraces to the north and south of the proposed development area occupied and the site may lie within the area of a Roman estate relating to the villa at Dalton. It is considered that the potential for the proposed development to encounter archaeological deposits or features originating in this period is moderate (NAA 2006).
- 1.5 There are no recorded finds or sites originating in the pre-Conquest period within the proposed development area or in the near vicinity. Evidence for the village of Hurworth having its origins in the Anglo-Saxon period is restricted to that provided by its place-name. However, it is considered that there is some potential for groundworks associated with the proposed development to encounter archaeological deposits or features originating in the medieval or post-medieval periods, but that these are likely to relate to past agricultural practices (NAA 2006).

2. Methodology and Presentation

- 2.1 The general aim of the survey was to obtain information that would contribute further to an evaluation of the archaeological potential of the site by determining the presence or absence of buried archaeological remains in the defined survey areas.
- 2.2 More specific objectives were to:-

- provide information about the nature and possible interpretation of any magnetic anomalies identified by the survey.
 - clarify the extent of any possible archaeological remains.
- 2.3 In order to achieve these aims and objectives it was proposed that detailed (recorded) magnetometer survey would be undertaken at three locations, each of 2 hectares, where intrusive landscaping works were planned.
- 2.4 Detailed survey employs the use of a sample trigger to automatically take readings at predetermined points, typically at 0.25m intervals, on traverses 1m apart. These readings are stored in the memory of the instrument and are later downloaded to computer for processing and interpretation. Further details are given in Appendix 1. Detailed survey allows the visualisation of weaker anomalies that may not have been readily identifiable by magnetic scanning.
- 2.5 A Bartington Grad601 magnetic gradiometer was used during the survey with readings being taken at 0.25m intervals on zig-zag traverses 1m apart within 20m by 20m grids. The readings were stored in the memory of the instrument and later downloaded to computer for processing and interpretation using Geoplot 3 software.
- 2.6 The survey methodology, report and any recommendations comply with guidelines outlined by English Heritage (David 1995) and by the IFA (Gaffney, Gater and Ovenden 2002) and were agreed with the Assistant Archaeology Officer for Durham County Council, advisor to the local planning authority, prior to the start of the survey. All figures reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping are done so with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (© Crown copyright).
- 2.7 A general site location plan, incorporating the 1:50000 Ordnance Survey mapping, is shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the processed magnetometer data superimposed onto an Ordnance Survey map base at a scale of 1:5000. The processed (greyscale) and unprocessed (XY trace plot) data, together with accompanying interpretation diagrams, are presented in Figures 3 to 11 inclusive at a scale of 1:1000.
- 2.8 Technical information on the equipment used, data processing and magnetic survey methodology is given in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 details the survey location information and Appendix 3 describes the composition and location of the site archive.

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.

3. Results and Discussion

General

- 3.1 Numerous ferrous ('iron spike') anomalies have been located within the site. These anomalies are indicative of ferrous objects or other magnetic material in the topsoil/subsoil and, although archaeological artefacts may cause them, they

are more often caused by modern cultural debris that has been introduced into the topsoil often as a consequence of manuring, public access or modern infilling.

- 3.2 More extensive clusters of ferrous responses combine to produce areas of magnetic disturbance that have been identified in several locations. This disturbance is due to accumulations of ferrous debris particularly along field boundaries as in the north of Area A.
- 3.3 Present in all of the areas are linear trend anomalies; these anomalies are interpreted as being agricultural in origin. It is thought that the most frequent and closely spaced are caused by agricultural activity and reflect the direction of the most recent ploughing regime, whilst those further apart are due to ridge and furrow ploughing where the anomalies are caused by the magnetic contrasts between infilled furrows and former ridges.

Area A (Figs 3, 4 and 5)

- 3.4 Three parallel, linear anomalies have been identified in Area A, all aligned north-west/south-east, parallel with the contour lines. The general magnetic background also levels out to the south of the two most northerly anomalies. These anomalies are not considered to be archaeological in nature but are probably due to a combination of topographic and geological factors including the accumulation of soil along the base of slopes (the land slopes down to the south and east) and/or the change in drift deposits represented by the boundary that separates the glacial till drift deposits to the north from the river terrace deposits to the south
- 3.5 The most southerly of these three anomalies bisects a sub-square area, approximately 30m by 30m, that is defined by weak, discontinuous linear anomalies. These anomalies may be indicative of infilled ditches describing a small enclosure. However, this interpretation is extremely tentative particularly as the possible response from the ditch that would form the southern side of this 'enclosure' is masked by the strong magnetic disturbance adjacent to what is thought to be an infilled field boundary shown on the 1857 Ordnance Survey mapping.

Area B (Figs 6, 7 and 8)

- 3.6 The northern half of this area is characterised by more linear trends indicative of the direction of the most recent ploughing regime.
- 3.7 South of the fence numerous discrete magnetic anomalies (small areas of enhanced magnetic response) have been identified. It is considered likely that these anomalies are due to localised variation in the composition of the drift geology or soils although an archaeological origin should not be completely dismissed.

Area C (Figs 9, 10 and 11)

- 3.8 A broad, weakly contrasting, anomaly has been noted in the east of Area C running north-west/south-east. This anomaly is similar to those present in Area A and is again considered to be either due to variations in the drift geology or to topographic effects. It appears to interrupt the response from the strong

linear anomalies caused by ridge and furrow ploughing that are present across the whole of Area C.

- 3.9 Oblique to the ridge and furrow ploughing are three linear anomalies aligned either north/south or east/west to the western half of the block. Also present are several discrete areas of enhanced magnetic response. An archaeological cause for any of these anomalies cannot be discounted but modern (linear anomalies) or geological (discrete anomalies) causes are considered more likely.

4. Conclusions

- 4.1 Although numerous anomalies have been identified across the three sample survey areas the majority are due to agricultural activity and variations in the topography and drift geology across the site.
- 4.2 The rectangular anomaly to the south of Area A is probably anthropogenic but whether this is archaeological or the product of more recent activity cannot be stated with any certainty. However, the identification and proximity of a field boundary on a broadly similar alignment on the 1857 first edition Ordnance Survey mapping may suggest a more recent origin.

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.

Bibliography

- David, A., 1995. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation: Research and Professional Services Guidelines* No. 1. English Heritage
- Gaffney, C., Gater, J. and Ovenden, S. 2002. *The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations*. IFA Technical Paper No. 6
- NAA., 2007. *Rockliffe Park, Hurworth-on-Tees, County Durham: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Unpubl. Client Report

Acknowledgements

Project Management

A. Webb BA MIFA

Fieldwork

E. Heapy BSc

J. Gidman BSc

Report

T. S. Harrison BSc MSc PIFA

A. Webb

Graphics

T. S. Harrison

E. Heapy

Figures

- Figure 1 Site location (1:50000)
- Figure 2 Site location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:5000)
- Figure 3 Processed greyscale magnetometer data: Area A (1:1000)
- Figure 4 XY trace plot showing unprocessed magnetometer data: Area A (1:1000)
- Figure 5 Interpretation of magnetometer data: Area A (1:1000)
- Figure 6 Processed greyscale magnetometer data: Area B (1:1000)
- Figure 7 XY trace plot showing unprocessed magnetometer data: Area B (1:1000)
- Figure 8 Interpretation of magnetometer data: Area B (1:1000)
- Figure 9 Processed greyscale magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000)
- Figure 10 XY trace plot showing unprocessed magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000)
- Figure 11 Interpretation of magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000)

Appendices

Appendix 1 Magnetic Survey: Technical Information

Appendix 2 Survey Location Information

Appendix 3 Geophysical Archive




Fig. 1. Site location

Reproduced with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Archaeological Services WYAS: licence LA076406, 2007.




Fig. 2. Site location showing greyscale magnetometer data (1:5000 @ A3)

0 200m




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



Fig. 4. XY trace plot of unprocessed magnetometer data: Area A (1:1000 @ A4)





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



509000



Reproduced from the digital mapping supplied by the client.

© ASWVAS 2007.
Archaeological Services, WY & S
PO Box 30, Nepshay Lane South, Morley, LS27 0UG
Tel: 0113 983 7500 Fax: 0113 983 7501

429750

Fig. 6. Processed greyscale magnetometer data: Area B (1:1000 @ A4) 0 40m



Fig. 7. XY trace plot of unprocessed magnetometer data: Area B (1:1000 @ A4)



509000

TYPE OF ANOMALY	INTERPRETATION
•	FERROUS MATERIAL
	FERROUS MATERIAL
	GEOLOGY ?
---	RIDGE AND FLURROW
---	AGRICULTURAL




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




Fig. 9. Processed greyscale magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000 @ A4)




Fig. 10. XY trace plot of unprocessed magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000 @ A4)

0 40m




Fig. 11. Interpretation of magnetometer data: Area C (1:1000 @ A4)

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. Less magnetic material such as masonry or plastic service pipes that intrude into the topsoil may give a negative magnetic response relative to the background level.

The magnetic susceptibility of a soil can also be enhanced by the application of heat. This effect can lead to the detection of features such as hearths, kilns or areas of burning.

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. Such negative anomalies are often very faint and are commonly caused by modern, non-ferrous, features such as plastic water pipes. Infilled natural features may also appear as negative anomalies on some geological substrates.

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. An agricultural origin, either ploughing or land drains is 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. 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 20m by 20m 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 1600 readings were obtained for each 20m by 20m 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 Geodimeter 600s total station theodolite and tied in to the corners of buildings and other permanent landscape features and to temporary reference points (survey marker stakes) that were established and left in place following completion of the fieldwork for accurate geo-referencing. The locations of the temporary reference points are shown on Figure 2 and the Ordnance Survey grid co-ordinates tabulated below. The internal accuracy of the survey grid relative to these markers is better than 0.05m. The survey grids were then superimposed onto a map base provided by the client as a 'best fit' to produce the displayed block locations. Overall there was a good correlation between the local survey and the digital map base and it is estimated that the average 'best fit' error is better than $\pm 1.5\text{m}$. However, it should be noted that Ordnance Survey co-ordinates for 1:2500 map data have an error of $\pm 1.9\text{m}$ at 95% confidence. This potential error must be considered if co-ordinates are measured off for relocation purposes.

Station	Easting	Northing
A	429444.82	509070.09
B	429584.04	509153.95
C	429689.11	509051.59
D	429733.38	509034.97
E	429942.24	508868.26
F	430325.48	508915.82

Archaeological Services WYAS cannot accept responsibility for errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by a third party or for the removal of any of the survey reference points.

Appendix 3

Geophysical Archive

The geophysical archive comprises:-

- an archive disk containing compressed (WinZip 8) files of the raw data, report text (Word 2000), and graphics files (Adobe Illustrator, CorelDraw6 and AutoCAD 2000) files.
- 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 will 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 relevant Sites and Monument Record Office).