




 Site Boundary



Scale at A4: 1:7,500



Figure 14:
2013 Google Earth View



 Site Boundary



Scale at A4: 1:7,500



Figure 15:
Site as Existing

Appendix 1

Geophysical Survey Report

Sumo Survey 2017

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

sumo

Survey

GEOPHYSICS FOR
ARCHAEOLOGY &
ENGINEERING

**Land North of Water Lane,
Angmering, West Sussex**

Client
CgMs Consulting Ltd
For
Rydon Homes and Gleeson Homes

Survey Report
11606

Date
October 2017

Incorporating
GSB PROSPECTION LTD
and
STRATASCAN LTD

SUMO Services Ltd
Cowburn Farm
Market Street
Thornton
Bradford
BD13 3HW

SUMO Services Ltd
Vineyard House
Upper Hook Road
Upton upon Severn
Worcestershire
WR8 0SA

GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT

Project name:
**Land North of Water Lane,
Angmering**

SUMO Job reference:
11606

Client:
CgMs Consulting Ltd
For:
Rydon Homes and Gleeson Homes

Survey date:
14-16, 23-26 August 2017

Report date:
1 September 2017

Field co-ordinator:
Robert Knight BA
Steph Rhodes BSc FGS

Field Team:
James Lorimer BA
Robert Smail PhD
Laura Gilling MSc
Beth Williams MA

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

CAD illustrations by:
Jon Tanner BSc MSc PCIfA

Project Manager:
Jon Tanner BSc MSc PCIfA

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	1
2	INTRODUCTION	1
3	METHODS, PROCESSING & PRESENTATION	2
4	RESULTS	3
5	DATA APPRAISAL & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	3
6	CONCLUSION	4
7	REFERENCES	4

Appendix A Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Appendix B Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 01	1:25 000	Site Location Diagram
Figure 02	1:3000	Location of Survey Areas
Figure 03	1:2500	Magnetometer Survey - Greyscale Plots
Figure 04	1:2500	Magnetometer Survey - Interpretation

DIGITAL CONTENT (Archive Data)

- Minimally Processed Greyscale Images and XY Trace Plots in DWG format
- DWG Viewer
- Digital Copies of Report Text and Figures (both PDF and native formats)

1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A magnetometer survey was carried out at Angmering covering an area of 22.6ha in size. No responses of archaeological interest were identified. Three former field boundaries were recorded and a large ferrous pipe. One area would appear to have had green waste spread across the field.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background synopsis

SUMO Services Ltd were commissioned to undertake a geophysical survey of an area outlined for residential development. This survey forms part of an archaeological investigation being undertaken by **CgMs Consulting Ltd** on behalf of **Rydon Homes and Gleeson Homes**.

2.2 Site details

NGR / Postcode	TQ 075 052 / BN16 4EW
Location	The survey area is located 6km north west of Goring-by-Sea and 2km north of East Preston. The north of the survey area is bound by the A27, the west by buildings situated on Dapper's Lane, and the south by Water Lane (A280). The east of the site is bound by a wooded area and Angmering Motorsports Ltd, Oval Race Club circuit.
HER/SMR	West Sussex
District	Arun
Parish	Angmering CP
Topography	Sloping downhill from 40m AOD in the north to 15m AOD in the south
Current Land Use	Arable
Weather	Variable
Geology	Solid: London Clay Formation - clay, silt and sand. Superficial: none recorded (BGS 2017).
Soils	Wickham 4 Association (711h), slowly permeable seasonally waterlogging fine loamy over clayey and fine silty over clayey soils associated with similar clayey soils. (SSEW 1983)
Archaeology	The study site is considered to have a low potential for all periods, seemingly located away from settlement, in agricultural land. Centuries of past ploughing are likely to have had a widespread negative impact on any subsurface horizons (CgMs 2017).
Survey Methods	Magnetometer survey (fluxgate gradiometer)
Study Area	22.6 ha

2.3 Aims and Objectives

To locate and characterise any anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the study 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
Magnetometer	Bartington Cart System	1.0m	0.125m

More information regarding this technique is included in Appendix A.

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 for each site involves a grey-scale plot of processed data. Magnetic anomalies are identified, interpreted and plotted onto the 'Interpretation' drawings. The minimally processed data are provided as a greyscale image in the Archive Data Folder with an XY trace plot in CAD format. A CAD viewer is also provided.

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

The survey has been divided into six survey areas (Areas 1- 6); Specific anomalies have been given numerical labels [1] [2] which appear in the text below, as well as on the Interpretation Figure(s). Parts of Area 3 and all of Area 5 were unsurveyable.

4.1 **Probable / Possible Archaeology**

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

4.2 **Uncertain**

- 4.2.1 Several linear trends have been noted in the data; although they are classified as being of uncertain origin, they are not thought to be archaeological. They are probably agricultural or modern interventions.

4.3 **Former Field Boundary**

- 4.3.1 A clear linear magnetic response [1] running across Area 2 coincides with a field boundary visible on the 1839 Tithe map. The partial trend [2] in the data appears to equate with another boundary visible on the same Tithe map. The 1806 Ordnance Survey map shows a boundary feature in the north of Area 6 where there is a magnetic response [3]. Other former boundaries on historic mapping have not been identified.

4.4 **Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance**

- 4.4.1 Magnetic disturbance in Area 1 is a result of topsoil disposal from the A27 Patching Junction Improvement (MWS4163 – CgMs 2017). A ferrous pipe traverses Areas 1 and 4. The cause of the ferrous responses in the middle of Area 6 is unknown but it is almost certainly modern in origin.
- 4.4.2 Ferrous responses close to boundaries are due to adjacent fences and gates. Smaller scale ferrous anomalies ("iron spikes") are present throughout the data and their form is best illustrated in the XY trace plots. These responses are characteristic of small pieces of ferrous debris (or brick / tile) in the topsoil and 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 London clay is poor but variable. Given that the technique has identified at least three former boundaries, it is likely to have detected any surviving archaeological features (see 6.1 below).

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The survey at Angmering has identified three former field boundaries, but nothing of archaeological interest. Given that earlier geophysical survey work at Angmering identified a complex of features (GSB 2016), and no similar responses have been recorded here, it can be said with confidence that the absence of archaeological features is genuine.

7 REFERENCES

- BGS 2017 British Geological Survey, Geology of Britain viewer [accessed 23/08/2017] *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%26GGeophysics_2.pdf
- CgMs 2017 *Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, Land North of Water Lane, Angmering, West Sussex*. CgMs Consulting. London
- 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/>
- GSB 2016 *Geophysical Survey Report, Water Lane*, GSB Prospection Ltd, Report G1613, unpublished.
- SSEW 1983 *Soils of England and Wales. Sheet 6, South East England*. Soil Survey of England and Wales, Harpenden.



Site Location

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey's 1:25 000 map of 1998 with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office. Crown Copyright reserved. Licence No: AL 50125A



Title:

Site Location Diagram

Client:

CgMs Consulting Ltd.


Project:

11606 Land North of Water Lane, Angmering

Scale:

0 metres 1250
1:25000 @ A3




Fig No:
01




	Magnetometer Survey Areas [hand-held] showing 30m grids
	Magnetometer Survey Areas [cart]
	Survey Areas



Title:	Location of Survey Areas
Client:	CgMs Consulting Ltd.
Project:	11606 Land North of Water Lane, Angmering
Scale:	0 metres 150 1:3000 @ A3
Fig No:	02



Title:	Magnetometer Survey Greyscale Plots
Client:	CgMs Consulting Ltd.
Project:	11606 Land North of Water Lane, Angmering
Scale:	0 metres 125 1:2500 @ A3
Fig No:	03



	KEY			Title: Magnetometer Survey Interpretation	
	Uncertain Origin (trend)			Client: CgMs Consulting Ltd.	
	Former Field Boundary - Corroborated (discrete anomaly / trend)			Project: 11606 Land North of Water Lane, Angmering	
	Pipe			Scale: 0 metres 125 1:2500 @ A3	
	Ferrous / Magnetic Disturbance			Fig No: 04	

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	This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero.
Traverse	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.

<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 & 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 & 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.