GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Client
Adderbury Parish Council

Survey Report
13015

Date
July 2018

SUMO Geophysics Ltd
Cowburn Farm
Market Street
Thornton
Bradford
BD13 3HW
T: 01274 835016

SUMO Geophysics Ltd
Vineyard House
Upper Hook Road
Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire
WR8 0SA
T: 01684 592266

geophysics@sumoservices.com
www.sumoservices.com

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:
North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

SUMO Job reference:
13015

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Survey date:
28 June 2018

Report date:
18 July 2018

Field co-ordinator:
Tom Cockcroft MSc

Field Team:
Aoife O'Reilly BA MSc
David Stockwell BA

Report written by:
Rebecca Davies BSc

CAD illustrations by:
Rebecca Davies BSc

Project Manager:
Simon Haddrell BEng AMBCS PCIfA

Report approved by:
Dr John Gater BSc DSc(Hon) MCIfA FSA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A detailed magnetometer survey was conducted over approximately 3ha of rough pasture in Adderbury, Oxfordshire. No definite archaeological anomalies have been identified. Possible archaeological features have been detected, comprising two potential trackways and other ditch-like features. A possible sub-circular feature is also visible, though its exact origin remains unclear. Ridge and furrow is visible across the site.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

SUMO Geophysics Ltd were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for the development of sports pitches. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by **Adderbury Parish Council**.

2.2 Site details

NGR / Postcode	SP 462 350 / OX17 3EY
Location	The site is located to the west of Adderbury, Oxfordshire, and is situated immediately north of Milton Road.
HER/SMR	Oxfordshire
District	Cherwell
Parish	Adderbury CP
Topography	Mostly level
Current Land Use	Rough pasture / disused land
Geology	Solid: Marlstone Rock Formation - Ferruginous Limestone and Ironstone. Superficial: none recorded (BGS 2018).
Soils	Banbury Association (544) - well drained brashy fine and coarse ferruginous soils over ironstone (SSEW 1983).
Archaeology	A previous geophysical survey (TG 2016) on the land immediately to the east, identified a number of anomalies representing remains of archaeological features, comprising circular anomalies, pit/post-holes, a trackway and a large linear ditch. The archaeological features recorded on the adjacent site have been subject to an archaeological excavation which recorded a small complex of ritual monuments probably dating to the Early Bronze Age period, along with a trackway of Roman date and a medieval hollow-way. The Early Bronze Age monuments comprised the truncated remains of a hengiform enclosure of approximately 16m diameter, of which only the ditches survived, associated with a close-set post-ring of substantial sub-circular postholes with a central pit/posthole and an off-centre sub-rectangular pit containing burnt timbers (CA 2016).
Survey Methods	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
Study Area	3 ha

2.3 Aims and Objectives

To locate and characterise any anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the study area; to investigate if features from immediately to the east extend into the survey area.

3 METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION

3.1 Standards & Guidance

This report and all fieldwork have been conducted in accordance with the latest guidance documents issued by Historic England (EH 2008) (then English Heritage), the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA 2014) and the European Archaeological Council (EAC 2016).

3.2 Survey methods

Detailed magnetic survey was chosen as an efficient and effective method of locating archaeological anomalies.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1.0m	0.25m

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A and B.

3.3 Data Processing

The following basic processing steps have been carried out on the data used in this report:

De-stripe; de-stagger; interpolate

3.4 Presentation of results and interpretation

The presentation of the results includes a 'minimally processed data' and a 'processed data' greyscale plot. Magnetic anomalies are identified, interpreted and plotted onto the 'Interpretation' drawings.

When interpreting the results, several factors are taken into consideration, including the nature of archaeological features being investigated and the local conditions at the site (geology, pedology, topography etc.). Anomalies are categorised by their potential origin. Where responses can be related to other existing evidence, the anomalies will be given specific categories, such as: *Abbey Wall* or *Roman Road*. Where the interpretation is based largely on the geophysical data, levels of confidence are implied, for example: *Probable*, or *Possible Archaeology*. The former is used for a confident interpretation, based on anomaly definition and/or other corroborative data such as cropmarks. Poor anomaly definition, a lack of clear patterns to the responses and an absence of other supporting data reduces confidence, hence the classification *Possible*.

4 RESULTS

4.1 *Probable / Possible Archaeology*

4.1.1 Two pairs of positive, parallel linear anomalies with approximate 10m spacings are visible on an approximate north-south alignment. These could be representative of former trackways and, given that the previous geophysical survey to the east revealed evidence similar responses, an archaeological origin is deemed likely.

4.1.2 Positive linear anomalies running directly east-west across the site have also been assigned a possible archaeological origin. These appear to form continuations of linear anomalies detected in the previous geophysical survey to the east, and are likely to be a result of former cut features such as ditches.

4.2 *Uncertain*

4.2.1 A weak, poorly defined sub-circular anomaly is visible in the east of the area and is of uncertain origin. The close proximity of circular features detected in previous magnetometer data means that an archaeological origin is possible. A linear response is also interpreted as uncertain, although it is possible that the anomaly is simply a differently aligned agricultural furrow (see 4.5.1 below).

4.3 *Agricultural – Ridge and Furrow*

4.3.1 Slightly curved, parallel linear anomalies are present in the data across the site. These are typical of responses associated with former medieval ridge and furrow cultivation. It is possible that this agricultural activity may have truncated some of the archaeological anomalies, and the resulting data may be masking more ephemeral features.

4.4 *Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance*

4.4.1 Ferrous responses close to boundaries are due to adjacent fences and gates. Smaller scale ferrous anomalies ("iron spikes") are present throughout the data and are characteristic of small pieces of ferrous debris (or brick / tile) in the topsoil; they are commonly assigned a modern origin. Only the most prominent of these are highlighted on the interpretation diagram.

5 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

5.1 Historic England guidelines (EH 2008) Table 4 states that the average magnetic response on ferruginous limestone is generally good. The results from this survey indicate the presence of possible trackways and a sub-circular feature, along with evidence of ridge and furrow cultivation indicate the technique has been effective. However, the data are relatively noisy as a result of the ferruginous geology and soils, which may result in weaker archaeological responses being masked.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 The survey at Adderbury revealed two pairs of linear anomalies which are probably related to former trackways. Further linear anomalies appear to form continuations of ditch-like features detected in a previous magnetometer survey (TG 2016) immediately to the east. Based largely on the results of the earlier survey, a sub-circular anomaly may have archaeological origins, though could equally be a result of agricultural activity. Ridge and furrow cultivation is present across the site and may be masking some features. A few small ferrous anomalies are likely to be a result of modern rubbish within the topsoil.

7 REFERENCES

BGS 2018 British Geological Survey, Geology of Britain viewer [Accessed 18/07/2018] *website*: (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps)

CA 2016 *Land North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire - Archaeological Evaluation.* Cotswold Archaeology; unpublished report. Ref. 16649.

CIfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey.* Amended 2016. CIfA Guidance note. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf

EAC 2016 *EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology,* European Archaeological Council, Guidelines 2.

EH 2008 *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation.* English Heritage, Swindon https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geophysical-survey-in-archaeological-field-evaluation/geophysics-guidelines.pdf/

SSEW 1983 *Soils of England and Wales. Sheet 6, South East England*. Soil Survey of England and Wales, Harpenden.

TG 2016 *Land North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire - Geophysical Survey Report.* TigerGeo; unpublished report. Ref. MRA161.



N

Site Location

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Site Location Diagram

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Project:
13015 - North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Scale:
0 metres 1000
1:25000 @ A3

Fig No:
01



N

Survey Area - showing 30m grid

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Location of Survey Area

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Project:
13015 - North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Scale:
0 metres 62.5
1:1250 @ A3

Fig No:
02



N

+2nT

-2nT

sumo Survey

GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Project:
13015 - North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Scale:
0 metres 62.5
1:1250 @ A3

Fig No:
03



N

KEY

	Possible archaeology (discrete anomaly / trend)
	Uncertain Origin (discrete anomaly / trend)
	Agriculture (ridge and furrow)
	Ferrous

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Project:
13015 - North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Scale:
0 metres 62.5
1:1250 @ A3

Fig No:
04



N

+5nT

-5nT

sumo Survey
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY & ENGINEERING

Title:
Minimally Processed Data - Greyscale Plot

Client:
Adderbury Parish Council

Project:
13015 - North of Milton Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire

Scale:
0 metres 62.5
1:1250 @ A3

Fig No:
05

Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Grid Positioning
For hand held gradiometers the location of the survey grids has been plotted together with the referencing information. Grids were set out using a Trimble R8 Real Time Kinematic (RTK) VRS Now GNSS GPS system.

An RTK GPS (Real-time Kinematic Global Positioning System) can locate a point on the ground to a far greater accuracy than a standard GPS unit. A standard GPS suffers from errors created by satellite orbit errors, clock errors and atmospheric interference, resulting in an accuracy of 5m-10m. An RTK system uses a single base station receiver and a number of mobile units. The base station re-broadcasts the phase of the carrier it measured, and the mobile units compare their own phase measurements with those they received from the base station. This results in an accuracy of around 0.01m.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1m	0.25m

Instrumentation: Bartington *Grad* 601-2
Bartington instruments operate in a gradiometer configuration which comprises fluxgate sensors mounted vertically, set 1.0m apart. The fluxgate gradiometer suppresses any diurnal or regional effects. The instruments are carried, or cart mounted, with the bottom sensor approximately 0.1-0.3m from the ground surface. At each survey station, the difference in the magnetic field between the two fluxgates is measured in nanoTesla (nT). The sensitivity of the instrument can be adjusted; for most archaeological surveys the most sensitive range (0.1nT) is used. Generally, features up to 1m deep may be detected by this method, though strongly magnetic objects may be visible at greater depths. The Bartington instrument can collect two lines of data per traverse with gradiometer units mounted laterally with a separation of 1.0m. The readings are logged consecutively into the data logger which in turn is daily down-loaded into a portable computer whilst on site. At the end of each site survey, data is transferred to the office for processing and presentation.

Data Processing

Zero Mean Traverse	This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero. The operation removes striping effects and edge discontinuities over the whole of the data set.
Step Correction (De-stagger)	When gradiometer data are collected in 'zig-zag' fashion, stepping errors can sometimes arise. These occur because of a slight difference in the speed of walking on the forward and reverse traverses. The result is a staggered effect in the data, which is particularly noticeable on linear anomalies. This process corrects these errors.

Display

Greyscale/ Colourscale Plot	This format divides a given range of readings into a set number of classes. Each class is represented by a specific shade of grey, the intensity increasing with value. All values above the given range are allocated the same shade (maximum intensity); similarly, all values below the given range are represented by the minimum intensity shade. Similar plots can be produced in colour, either using a wide range of colours or by selecting two or three colours to represent positive and negative values. The assigned range (plotting levels) can be adjusted to emphasise different anomalies in the data-set.

Interpretation Categories

In certain circumstances (usually when there is corroborative evidence from desk-based or excavation data) very specific interpretations can be assigned to magnetic anomalies (for example, *Roman Road, Wall,* etc.) and where appropriate, such interpretations will be applied. The list below outlines the generic categories commonly used in the interpretation of the results.

Archaeology / Probable Archaeology	This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the responses are clearly or very probably archaeological and /or if corroborative evidence is available. These anomalies, whilst considered anthropogenic, could be of any age.
Possible Archaeology	These anomalies exhibit either weak signal strength and / or poor definition, or form incomplete archaeological patterns, thereby reducing the level of confidence in the interpretation. Although the archaeological interpretation is favoured, they may be the result of variable soil depth, plough damage or even aliasing as a result of data collection orientation.
Industrial / Burnt-Fired	Strong magnetic anomalies that, due to their shape and form or the context in which they are found, suggest the presence of kilns, ovens, corn dryers, metal-working areas or hearths. It should be noted that in many instances modern ferrous material can produce similar magnetic anomalies.
Former Field Boundary (probable & possible)	Anomalies that correspond to former boundaries indicated on historic mapping, or which are clearly a continuation of existing land divisions. Possible denotes less confidence where the anomaly may not be shown on historic mapping but nevertheless the anomaly displays all the characteristics of a field boundary.
Ridge & Furrow	Parallel linear anomalies whose broad spacing suggests ridge and furrow cultivation. In some cases, the response may be the result of more recent agricultural activity.
Agriculture (ploughing)	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
Land Drain	Weakly magnetic linear anomalies, quite often appearing in series forming parallel and herringbone patterns. Smaller drains may lead and empty into larger diameter pipes, which in turn usually lead to local streams and ponds. These are indicative of clay fired land drains.
Natural	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
Magnetic Disturbance	Broad zones of strong dipolar anomalies, commonly found in places where modern ferrous or fired materials (e.g. brick rubble) are present. They are presumed to be modern.
Service	Magnetically strong anomalies, usually forming linear features are indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) or the fill of the trench can cause weaker magnetic responses which can be identified from their uniform linearity.
Ferrous	This type of response is associated with ferrous material and may result from small items in the topsoil, larger buried objects such as pipes, or above ground features such as fence lines or pylons. Ferrous responses are usually regarded as modern. Individual burnt stones, fired bricks or igneous rocks can produce responses similar to ferrous material.
Uncertain Origin	Anomalies which stand out from the background magnetic variation, yet whose form and lack of patterning gives little clue as to their origin. Often the characteristics and distribution of the responses straddle the categories of *Possible Archaeology* / *Natural* or (in the case of linear responses) *Possible Archaeology* / *Agriculture*; occasionally they are simply of an unusual form.

Where appropriate some anomalies will be further classified according to their form (positive or negative) and relative strength and coherence (trend: weak and poorly defined).

Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

Detailed magnetic survey can be used to effectively define areas of past human activity by mapping spatial variation and contrast in the magnetic properties of soil, subsoil and bedrock. Although the changes in the magnetic field resulting from differing features in the soil are usually weak, changes as small as 0.1 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000 (nT), can be accurately detected.

Weakly magnetic iron minerals are always present within the soil and areas of enhancement relate to increases in *magnetic susceptibility* and permanently magnetised *thermoremanent* material.

Magnetic susceptibility relates to the induced magnetism of a material when in the presence of a magnetic field. This magnetism can be considered as effectively permanent as it exists within the Earth's magnetic field. Magnetic susceptibility can become enhanced due to burning and complex biological or fermentation processes.

Thermoremanence is a permanent magnetism acquired by iron minerals that, after heating to a specific temperature known as the Curie Point, are effectively demagnetised followed by re-magnetisation by the Earth's magnetic field on cooling. Thermoremanent archaeological features can include hearths and kilns; material such as brick and tile may be magnetised through the same process.

Silting and deliberate infilling of ditches and pits with magnetically enhanced soil creates a relative contrast against the much lower levels of magnetism within the subsoil into which the feature is cut. Systematic mapping of magnetic anomalies will produce linear and discrete areas of enhancement allowing assessment and characterisation of subsurface features. Material such as subsoil and non-magnetic bedrock used to create former earthworks and walls may be mapped as areas of lower enhancement compared to surrounding soils.

Magnetic survey is carried out using a fluxgate gradiometer which is a passive instrument consisting of two sensors mounted vertically 1m apart. The instrument is carried about 30cm above the ground surface and the top sensor measures the Earth's magnetic field whilst the lower sensor measures the same field but is also more affected by any localised buried feature. The difference between the two sensors will relate to the strength of a magnetic field created by this feature, if no field is present the difference will be close to zero as the magnetic field measured by both sensors will be the same.

Factors affecting the magnetic survey may include soil type, local geology, previous human activity and disturbance from modern services.



- Archaeological
- Geophysical
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Building
- Topographic
- Utility Mapping

SUMO Services Ltd, incorporated under the laws of England and Wales,
Company Registration No.4275993.
Registered Office Unit 8 Hayward Business Centre, New Lane, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2NL