

## GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

**Land off Barton Road, Barlestoke**

Client

**Pegasus Group**

For

**Leicestershire County Council**

Survey Report

**SUMO-03370**

Date

**June 2021**



## **Survey Report 03370: Land off Barton Road, Barlestone**

<b>Survey dates</b>	10 June 2021
<b>Field co-ordinator</b>	Robert Knight BA MA
<b>Field Team</b>	Liam Brice-Bateman BA
<b>Report Date</b>	25 June 2021
<b>CAD Illustrations</b>	Thomas Cockcroft MSc
<b>Report Author</b>	Thomas Cockcroft MSc
<b>Project Manager</b>	Simon Haddrill BEng AMBCS PCIfA
<b>Report approved</b>	Dr John Gater BSc DSc(Hon) MCIfA FSA
<b>SUMO Geophysics Ltd</b> Cowburn Farm Market Street Thornton Bradford BD13 3HW	<b>SUMO Geophysics Ltd</b> Vineyard House Upper Hook Road Upton upon Severn Worcestershire WR8 0SA
T: 01274 835016	T: 01684 592266
<p><a href="http://www.sumoservices.com">www.sumoservices.com</a> <a href="mailto:geophysics@sumoservices.com">geophysics@sumoservices.com</a></p>	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	LIST OF FIGURES	1
2	SURVEY TECHNIQUE	1
3	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	2
4	INTRODUCTION	2
5	RESULTS	3
6	DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	3
7	CONCLUSION	4
8	REFERENCES	4

Appendix A      Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Methods, Processing and Presentation

Appendix B      Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

### 1. LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	NTS	Site Location
Figure 02	1:1500	Magnetometer Survey – Greyscale Plots
Figure 03	1:1500	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Colour Plot
Figure 04	1:1500	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Interpretation
Figure 05	1:2500	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Interpretation / Google Earth / Extract from the Plan of the Township of Osbaston 1850
Figure 06	1:1200	Minimally Processed Data – Greyscale Plots
Figure 07	1:1200	XY Trace Plots (clipped at +/-15nT)
Figure 08	1:1200	XY Trace Plots (clipped at +/-50nT)

### 2. SURVEY TECHNIQUE

Detailed magnetic survey (magnetometry) was chosen as the most efficient and effective method of locating the type of archaeological anomalies which might be expected at this site.

Bartington Grad 601-2

Traverse Interval 1.0m

Sample Interval 0.25m

### 3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

3.1 A magnetometer survey of 3.3 ha of land off Barton Road, Barlestorne has not recorded any magnetic responses that could be interpreted as being of definite archaeological interest. Numerous uncertain linear and curvilinear trends are visible in the magnetic data which are most likely to be due to agricultural and natural processes. A zone of magnetic disturbance in Area 2 corresponds with the location of a former building that is recorded on historic mapping.

### 4 INTRODUCTION

4.1 **SUMO Geophysics Ltd** were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for development. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by **Pegasus Group** on behalf of **Leicestershire County Council**.

#### 4.2 Site details

NGR / Postcode	SK 41966 05695 / CV13 0HL
Location	The site is located 3km north-east of Market Bosworth and 3km north-west of Newbold Verdon. The survey area is bounded to the west by Hinckley Road, to the south by Barton Road and to the east by houses off Gregory Road.
HER	Leicestershire County Council
District	Hinckley and Bosworth
Parish	Osbaston Civil Parish
Topography	Flat
Current Land Use	Arable agriculture
Geology (BGS 2021)	Bedrock: Gunthorpe Member – mudstone Superficial: Oadby Member – diamicton Glaciofluvial Deposits, Mid Pleistocene - sand and gravel
Soils (CU 2021)	Soilscape 18: Slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base-rich loamy and clayey soils.
Archaeology (PG 2020)	There is evidence of prehistoric activity in the study area comprising Mesolithic to Bronze Age flint fragments recorded during fieldwalking and evaluation and the findspot of a Bronze Age axe. However, there is no evidence to suggest that similar finds are present within the site. Romano-British activity is recorded in the study area which comprises a potential Roman field system identified during evaluation and a number of pottery sherds recorded during fieldwalking and evaluation. Again, there is no evidence to suggest that similar finds or features are present within the site. The survey area lies to the west of Barlestorne, which was established during the medieval period and it most likely formed part of the agricultural hinterland during this time. The site is not considered likely to contain remains of medieval settlement and the potential for significant archaeological remains of medieval date is considered to be low.
Survey Methods	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
Study Area	3.3 ha

#### 4.3 Aims and Objectives

To locate and characterise any anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the study area.

## 5 RESULTS

### 5.1 ***Probable / Possible Archaeology***

5.1.1 No magnetic responses have been recorded that could be interpreted as being of definite archaeological interest.

### 5.2 ***Uncertain***

5.2.1 Numerous magnetically weak linear and curvilinear trends have been detected in the survey and have been assigned to the category of *Uncertain*. They lack the defined morphology of anomalies that would normally be interpreted as being of archaeological interest. Both survey areas have been affected by green waste (see 5.3), which has hindered the interpretation of the trends. However, they are likely to be due to a combination of agricultural and natural processes.

### 5.3 ***Green Waste***

5.3.1 Green waste can have a marked effect on the results of magnetic surveys and has been recognised as an issue for some time (Gerrard *et al* 2015). However, not all green waste is the same, so it is impossible to predict in advance any potentially detrimental effects; it depends on the quantity of inorganic contaminants, including batteries, pieces of metal cans and other ferrous items which result in spurious anomalies or 'noise'. Unfortunately, most of the survey area has been disturbed in this instance.

### 5.4 ***Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance***

5.4.1 A small zone of magnetic disturbance is visible in the magnetic data located in the north-west of Area 2. A building is recorded on historic mapping (see Figure 05) in the vicinity of this disturbance; consequently, is it likely that any remaining foundations and/or debris associated with the building's removal have caused the response.

5.4.2 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.

## 6 DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

6.1 Historic England guidelines (EH 2008) Table 4 states that the typical magnetic response on the local soils / geology is variable. The results from this survey indicate the presence of uncertain linear trends. Green waste is also present within both surveys areas and may have masked any weaker anomalies of archaeological interest, if present.

## 7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The magnetometer survey has not recorded any magnetic responses that could be interpreted as being of definite archaeological interest. Several magnetically weak linear trends have been recorded in both areas and are likely to be due to a combination of agricultural and natural processes. Increased levels of background 'noise' throughout the dataset is due to green waste; this could have masked any weaker anomalies, if present. A zone of magnetic disturbance in Area 2 corresponds with the location of a former building that is recorded on historic mapping.

## 8 REFERENCES

BGS 2021 British Geological Survey, Geology of Britain viewer [accessed 25/06/2021] website: (<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion1=1#maps>)

ClfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey*. Amended 2016. ClfA Guidance note. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading [http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGGeophysics\\_2.pdf](http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGGeophysics_2.pdf)



CU 2021 The Soils Guide. Available: www.landis.org.uk. Cranfield University, UK. [accessed 25/06/2021] website: <http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/ukso/home.html>

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/>


Gerrard *et al* 2015 *Green Waste and Archaeological Geophysics*, Gerrard, James; Caldwell, Liz and Kennedy, Alisa, Journal of Archaeological Prospection, 22, 139 –142 (Wiley)

PG 2020 *Land North of Barton Road, Barlestorne: Heritage Statement*. Pegasus Group, Cirencester





Reproduced from Ordnance Survey's 1:25 000 map of 1998 with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Crown Copyright reserved. Licence No: 100018665

	Survey Areas	
--	--------------	--



Title:	Site Location	
Client:	Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council	
Project:	03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestoke	
Scale:	NOT TO SCALE	Fig No: 01





Title: Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plots

Client: Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council

Project: 03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestoke

Scale: 0 metres 75 1:1500 @ A3

Fig No: 02



Title: Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Colour Plot

Client: Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council

Project: 03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestoke

Scale: 0 metres 75 1:1500 @ A3



Fig No: 03






KEY	
	Uncertain Origin (discrete anomaly / trend)
	Magnetic disturbance
	Ferrous



Title:	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Interpretation	
Client:	Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council	
Project:	03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestow	
Scale:	0 metres	75
	1:1500 @ A3	
	Fig No: 04	



KEY	
	Uncertain Origin (discrete anomaly / trend)
	Magnetic disturbance
	Ferrous
 <b>SUMO</b> <b>Survey</b> <b>GEOPHYSICS FOR</b> <b>ARCHAEOLOGY &amp;</b> <b>ENGINEERING</b>	
Title: Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plot / Interpretation / Google Earth / Extract from the Plan of the Township of Osbaston 1850	
Client: Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council	
Project: 03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestone	
Scale: 0 metres 125 1:2500 @ A3	
Fig No: 05	



**SUMO**  
Survey  
GEOPHYSICS FOR  
ARCHAEOLOGY &  
ENGINEERING


Title:  
Minimally Processed Data - Greyscale Plots

Client:  
Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire  
County Council


Project:  
03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestorne

Scale:  
0 metres 60  
1:1200 @ A3

Fig No:  
06



Title:	XY Trace Plots (clipped at +/-15nT)		
Client:	Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council		
Project:	03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestone		
Scale:	0	metres	60
	1:1200 @ A3		
	Fig No: 07		



Title:	XY Trace Plots (clipped at +/-50nT)		
Client:	Pegasus Group on behalf of Leicestershire County Council		
Project:	03370 - Land off Barton Road, Barlestorne		
Scale:	0	metres	60
	1:1200 @ A3		
	Fig No: 08		

### 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 (CIIfA 2014) and the European Archaeological Council (EAC 2016).

### 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.
-----------------------------	---

## **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.

## 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.

<i>Archaeology / Probable Archaeology</i>	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.
<i>Possible Archaeology</i>	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.
<i>Industrial / Burnt-Fired</i>	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.
<i>Former Field Boundary (probable &amp; possible)</i>	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.
<i>Ridge &amp; Furrow</i>	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.
<i>Agriculture (ploughing)</i>	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
<i>Land Drain</i>	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.
<i>Natural</i>	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
<i>Magnetic Disturbance</i>	Broad zones of strong dipolar anomalies, commonly found in places where modern ferrous or fired materials (e.g. brick rubble) are present.
<i>Service</i>	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.
<i>Ferrous</i>	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.
<i>Uncertain Origin</i>	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 <i>Possible Archaeology / Natural</i> or (in the case of linear responses) <i>Possible Archaeology / Agriculture</i> ; 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