



Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk

Geophysical Survey Report

(Caesium Vapour Magnetic – Archaeology)

Version 1.1

Project code: SQH201

HER Event: ENF147483

OASIS: tigergeo1-381387

CNF: 48906

Produced for:

Andrew Josephs Associates

Lead Author:

ACK Roseveare, Operations Manager

BEng(Hons) DIS MISoilSci



March 2020



Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk

Digital data

Item and version	Sent to	Sent date
CAD – Vector Elements 1.1	Andrew Josephs	17/02/20

Audit

Version	Author	Checked	Date
Interim			
1.0	ACK Roseveare	J Smith	17/02/20
1.1	D Lewis		23/03/20

Project metadata

Project Code	SQH201
Client	Andrew Josephs Associates
Fieldwork Dates	16 - 24 January 2020
Field Personnel	ACK Roseveare, A Gereá
Data Processing Personnel	J Smith, A Gereá
Reporting Personnel	ACK Roseveare, MJ Roseveare
Report Date	March 2020
Report Version	1.1

TigerGeo Limited

TigerGeo Limited - Registered in England & Wales 09895326 - D-U-N-S 22-127-7456
Registered Office: 2 Wyevale Business Park, Kings Acre, Hereford, Herefordshire HR4 7BS UK
+44 (0) 1989 477 020 – www.tigergeo.com - @TigerGeoUK – also on LinkedIn & Facebook
EuroGPR Member 129, licensed to undertake radar survey in the UK by OFCOM – 1065067/1

This report and all associated data remain the exclusive property of TigerGeo Limited until paid for



Non-Technical Summary

A survey was commissioned by Andrew Josephs Associates to prospect land at Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, for buried structures of potential archaeological interest. Survey was undertaken using an ATV-towed and GNSS-tracked non-gradiometric array of caesium vapour magnetometers on a non-magnetic platform.

There are few potential features of likely archaeological interest identified, though there is evidence for former land management and hydrological effects. The most obvious of the former is the possible hengiform feature identified in the NMP: there is a further possible small enclosure about 300m east of this and, in the south-eastern field near the metal detecting findspot, parts of a potential group of enclosures.



Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Context.....	1
2.1 Environment.....	1
2.2 Heritage.....	1
3 Discussion.....	3
3.1 Character & Principal Results.....	3
3.1.1 Introduction.....	3
3.1.2 Data.....	3
3.1.3 Geology.....	3
3.1.4 Land use.....	3
3.1.5 Archaeology.....	3
3.2 Catalogue	4
3.3 Conclusions.....	5
3.4 Caveats.....	5
4 Methodology.....	7
4.1 Magnetic Principles.....	7
4.1.1 Physical concepts.....	7
4.1.2 Instrumentation.....	7
4.2 Magnetic Survey.....	8
4.2.1 Technical equipment.....	8
4.2.2 Monitoring & quality assessment.....	8
4.3 Magnetic Data Processing.....	8
4.3.1 Procedure.....	8
4.4 Magnetic Interpretation	9
4.4.1 Introduction.....	9
4.4.2 The contribution from geology and soils.....	9
4.4.3 Agricultural inputs.....	9
4.4.4 Features of archaeological interest.....	9
4.5 Glossary.....	10
4.6 Selected reference.....	11
4.7 Archiving and dissemination.....	11
5 Supporting information.....	13
5.1 Standards and quality (archaeology).....	13
5.2 Key personnel	14

Drawing	Title
DWG 01	Site Location
DWG 02 a-e	Magnetic Data - TMI
DWG 03 a-e	Interpretation
DWG 04	Interpretation - Vector

1 Introduction

TigerGeo was commissioned by Andrew Josephs Associates to prospect land at Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, for buried structures of potential archaeological interest. Survey was undertaken using an ATV-towed and GNSS-tracked non-gradiometric array of caesium vapour magnetometers on a non-magnetic platform.

Survey was undertaken within five fields, covering an area of approximately 46 hectares, in open fields to the north of the current extraction/working area of the quarry. The small field on the west side and a strip down the west side of the south-western field were unsurveyable due to standing maize crop. A small area to the south of the water tower was occupied by a geotechnical team, so not surveyed, and two small areas of surveyable ground within the western fields were left unsurveyed due to equipment issues (coarse sandy soil caused unprecedented wear on the towed array).

Country	England
County	Norfolk
Nearest Settlement	Horstead
Central Co-ordinates	625892,318726

2 Context

2.1 Environment

Soilscapes Classification	Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils (6)
Superficial 1:50000 BGS	Happisburgh Glacigenic Formation - Sand And Gravel (HPGL)
Bedrock 1:50000 BGS	Wroxham Crag Formation - Sand And Gravel (WRCG)
Topography	Flat and slightly sloping, rising to local high point at water tower
Hydrology	Freely draining
Current Land Use	Agricultural - Arable
Historic Land Use	Agricultural - Mixed
Vegetation Cover	None in N two fields and SE field, emerging winter cereal in other two. Field and area with standing maize not surveyed.
Sources of Interference	Minimal effects from traffic on adjacent roads, no interference visible from overhead cables crossing the site

2.2 Heritage

A review of the data held on the Norfolk Historic Environment record (HER) confirms that there are previously recorded heritage assets within and around the site. These are non-designated assets and include cropmarks of potential archaeological interest, agricultural related features and an area of potential WWII activity.

Norfolk HER data ordered by the client includes digital data from the NMP (National Mapping Programme) and findspots. The following items are within or directly adjacent to the survey area.

Crossing the south-western field is a straight linear cropmark almost north-south (50787 – MNF56073), which does not relate to any Ordnance Survey mapping.

Within the northern part of the south-eastern field "metal-detecting in 2013 recovered a medieval coin and two post-medieval tokens" (58438 – MNF65145) and in the adjacent field to the north (just outside the survey area) "metal detecting recovered a 13th century bronze buckle plate depicting a lion or a similar animal and a 14th century buckle or ring brooch pin with a possible stylised animal head terminal" (28123 – MNF28123).

Close to the road in the north-western field is a "site of possible hengiform ring ditch of doubtful

archaeological origin" (24977 – MNF24977). The "background geology of the area being conducive to the formation of curvilinear marks" is the reason given for doubt. Within the western part of the north-eastern field there is a similar item recorded (50782 - MNF56078).

The north-eastern field also contains part of (50779 – MNF56067), rectilinear cropmarks of probable post-medieval field boundaries.

Previous archaeological investigation to the south of the current survey area in 2003-4 included geophysical (magnetic) survey (ENF95515) and trial trenching (ENF95518), and excavation in 2007-8 (ENF122599); 2015 (ENF143406) and 2017 (ENF145794) (MOLA, 2017).

3 Discussion

3.1 Character & Principal Results

3.1.1 Introduction

The following paragraphs represent an interpretive summary of the survey. The numbers in square brackets refer to individual anomalies described in detail in the catalogue below and shown on DWG 03 onwards.

3.1.2 Data

The data quality is good, with little impact from adjacent traffic and no effects visible from overhead cables.

3.1.3 Geology

The superficial deposits of sand and gravel were expected to contribute a varied background texture. The British Geological Survey G-Base dataset, based on 5km resolution, records a relatively low iron content (1.3% Fe) so background magnetic contrast has potential to be slight.

There is a natural mottling across the survey area [2], due to local variations in deposition of sand and gravel. Some of the small discrete enhanced anomalies [1] appear similar to pit fills, though these are likely to be of natural origin, e.g. tree throws. As seen in the 2017 excavations to the south (MOLA, 2017), these may contain archaeologically datable fills.

The soil change [4] occupies approximately the lowest lying area within these two fields, forming a very shallow gully leading off the plateau to the west (see also [5 and 6]) and downhill to the area with larger magnetic variation [3]. The soil type is free-draining and quite sandy and this effect is likely to be hydrological, with a likely slight accumulation of the siltier fraction of the topsoil in this downhill zone leading to a local increase in magnetic enhancement.

3.1.4 Land use

Former boundary [10] may have been short-lived or only a cropping change: it appears on one recent aerial photograph and the 1971 edition of the Ordnance Survey map, but there is no trace of this in the magnetic data.

The cultivation striation [7, 8 and 9] may be recent, as it is regular, closely spaced and some aligns with current planting. It wasn't visible in the northern fields, though whether this is due to a slight difference in topsoil (even sandier) is not evident.

By contrast, the likely former boundaries [11, 12 and 13] do not appear on former mapping yet are visible in the magnetic data. The almost north-south element coincides with the cropmark 50787 – MNF56073. Linears [14, 15 and 16] may have an agricultural origin but do not have an obvious association with mapped field boundaries. These may yet be related to cropmarks recorded by the NMP thought to represent unmapped post-medieval boundaries. Short linears [32] have a slightly different magnetic character and may also have an agricultural origin.

Items [18-21] are likely all to be telegraph poles or similar (some are current).

Other ferrous and debris items [22 – 26] appear to be related to 1940s structures and activity within and immediately adjacent to the survey area, and [17] coincides approximately with a spread of debris in the soil, also a disturbed area on a 1940s aerial photograph.

3.1.5 Archaeology

The pair of curving ditches [27] forming an open-ended oval correspond with that identified in the NMP. The ditch fills are distinct from the surrounding background texture, so seem more likely to have an anthropogenic origin. However, the similarly mapped feature in the NMP at [28] has no magnetic trace.

A possibly comparable feature is identified at [31], though, due to the less distinct form of the anomalies and similarity to likely natural variation around it, it may be considered less likely to be of archaeological interest.

The possible ditch fills [29 and 30] may form part of a group of enclosures. If so, their proximity to the two metal detecting findspots may be of note. However, this is a tentative identification due the locally higher amplitude anomalies in the apparent background texture [3].

3.2 Catalogue

Cat ID	Data Class	Anomaly Class	Form Class	Feature Class	Feature Sub-Class	Comments
1	TMI	Enhanced	Discrete (group)	Natural		Anomalies similar to pit fills, likely to be tree throws or similar
2	TMI	Texture	Area	Natural		Variable deposition of sands and gravels, also visible on some aerial photographs
3	TMI	Texture	Area	Natural		As [2] but more strongly magnetic in this area
4	TMI	Variable	Area	Natural		More mottled texture, likely be due to local hydrological effects within local low point, see also [3, 5 and 6]
5	TMI	Variable	Area	Natural		With [6] likely continuation of [4] from broad flat area
6	TMI	Variable	Area	Natural		With [5] likely continuation of [4] from broad flat area
7	TMI	Variable	Linear - continuous (group)	Agricultural	Cultivation	Sample area, potentially due to recent cultivation, see also [8 and 9]
8	TMI	Variable	Linear - continuous (group)	Agricultural	Cultivation	Sample area, potentially due to recent cultivation, see also [7 and 9]
9	TMI	Variable	Linear - continuous (group)	Agricultural	Cultivation	Sample area, potentially due to recent cultivation, see also [7 and 8]
10	NMP			Agricultural		Field / cropping boundary shown on recent aerial photograph and in NMP - no geophysical trace
11	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Agricultural	Ditch	With [12] likely field boundary (also NMP), possibly ditch otherwise accumulation of topsoil against a former boundary
12	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Agricultural	Ditch	With [11] likely field boundary (also NMP), possibly ditch otherwise accumulation of topsoil against a former boundary
13	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Agricultural	Ditch	Possibly ditch otherwise accumulation of topsoil against a former boundary, similar to [11 and 12]
14	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Fill	Ditch	Straight linear fill, may be agricultural, e.g. boundary or drain
15	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Fill		Straight linear fill, may be agricultural, e.g. boundary or drain

Cat ID	Data Class	Anomaly Class	Form Class	Feature Class	Feature Sub-Class	Comments
16	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Fill		Straight linear fill, may be agricultural, e.g. boundary or drain
17	TMI	Strong variable	Area	Debris		Scattered material in topsoil probably associated with 1940s structure
18	TMI	Strong enhanced	Discrete	Ferrous		Likely telegraph pole or similar, see also [19, 20, 21]
19	TMI	Strong enhanced	Discrete	Ferrous		Likely telegraph pole or similar, see also [18, 20, 21]
20	TMI	Strong enhanced	Discrete	Ferrous		Likely telegraph pole or similar, see also [18, 19, 21] – also present on 1940s aerial photograph
21	TMI	Strong enhanced	Discrete	Ferrous		Likely telegraph pole or similar, see also [18, 19, 20]
22	TMI	Strong variable	Discrete	Debris		Likely contains ferrous element, coincides directly with discrete structure on 1940s aerial photograph
23	TMI	Strong variable	Area	Debris		Likely contains ferrous element, coincides with oval area c. 20 m x 25 m on 1940s aerial photograph
24	TMI	Strong variable	Area	Debris		Spread of debris (perhaps ceramic building material) immediately north of structure on 1940s aerial photograph
25	TMI	Strong variable	Area	Debris		Related to structure on 1940s aerial photograph with apparent line of debris running c. 50m to south
26	TMI	Strong variable	Area	Debris		Coincides directly with discrete structure on 1940s aerial photograph
27	TMI	Strong enhanced	Linear - continuous (group)	Fill	Ditch	Pair of curving possible ditch fills forming an oval 22 m x 18 m, gap and E and W ends, corresponds with NMP
28	NMP			?		Site of NMP thing apparently like [27] though not evident in data
29	TMI	Strong enhanced	Linear - continuous (group)	Fill	Ditch?	Linear possible ditch fills, potentially forming a corner, though note surrounding background texture [3]
30	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous	Fill	Ditch?	Linear possible ditch fill, see also [29]
31	TMI	Strong enhanced	Linear - continuous	Fill		Linear possible ditch fill, subrectangular c. 17 m across
32	TMI	Enhanced	Linear - continuous (group)	Fill		Pair of parallel linear anomalies of irregular width

3.3 Conclusions

There are few potential features of likely archaeological interest identified, though there is evidence for former land management and hydrological effects. The most obvious of the former is the possible hengiform feature identified in the NMP: there is a further possible small enclosure about 300m east of this and, in the south-eastern field near the metal detecting findspot, parts of a potential group of enclosures.

3.4 Caveats

Geophysical survey is reliant upon the detection of anomalous values and patterns in physical properties of the ground, e.g. magnetic, electromagnetic, electrical, elastic, density and others. It does not directly detect underground features and structures and therefore the presence or absence of these within a geophysical interpretation is not a direct indicator of presence or absence in the ground. Specific points to consider are:

- some physical properties are time variant or mutually interdependent with others;
- for a buried feature to be detectable it must produce anomalous values of the physical property being measured;
- any anomaly is only as good as its contrast against background textures and noise within the data.

TigerGeo will always attempt to verify the accuracy and integrity of data it uses within a project but at all times its liability is by necessity limited to its own work and does not extend to third party data and information. Where work is undertaken to another party's specification any perceived failure of that specification to attain its objective remains the responsibility of the originator, TigerGeo meanwhile ensuring any possible shortcomings are addressed within the normal constraints upon resources.

4 Methodology

4.1 Magnetic Principles

4.1.1 Physical concepts

Magnetic survey for any purpose relies upon the generation of a clear magnetic anomaly at the surface, i.e. strong enough to be detected by instrumentation and exhibiting sufficient contrast against background variation to permit diagnostic interpretation. The anomaly itself is dependent upon the chemical properties of a particular volume of ground, its magnetic susceptibility and hence induced magnetic field, the strength of any remanent magnetisation, the shape and orientation of the volume of interest and its depth of burial. Finally the choice and configuration of measurement instrumentation will affect anomaly size and shape.

Sites present a complex mixture of these factors and for some the causative affects are not known. However, depth of burial and size are usually fairly constrained and background susceptibility can be estimated (or measured). The degree of remanent magnetisation is harder to predict and depends on both the natural magnetic properties of the soil and any chemical processes to which it has been subjected. Fortunately heat will raise the susceptibility of most soils and topsoil tends to be more magnetic than subsoil, by volume.

It is hard to draw reliable conclusions about what sort of geology is supportive of magnetic survey as there are many factors involved and in any case magnetic response can vary across geological units as well as being dependent upon post-deposition and erosional processes. In general a relatively non-magnetic parent material contrasting with a magnetisable erosion product, i.e. one which contains iron in the form of oxides and hydroxides, will allow archaeological structures to exhibit strong magnetic contrast against their surroundings and especially if the soil has been heated or subjected to certain processes of fermentation. In the absence of either, magnetic enhancement becomes entirely reliant upon the geochemistry of the soil and enhancement will often be weaker and more variable.

Analysis of the British Geological Survey (BGS) Geochemical Atlas (G-Base) for total soil iron reveals that for England and Wales 50% of the samples (the interquartile range) lie between 1.9% and 3.6% percentage iron with the median at 2.7%.

The principal magnetic iron mineral is the oxide magnetite which sometimes occurs naturally but is more often formed during the heating of soil. Subsequent cooling yields a mixture of this, non-magnetic oxide haematite and another magnetic oxide, maghaemite. Away from sources of heat, other magnetic iron minerals include the sulphides pyrite and greigite while in damp soils complex chemistry involving the hydroxides goethite and lepidocrocite can create strong magnetic anomalies. There are thus a number of different geochemical reaction pathways that can both augment and reduce the magnetic susceptibility of a soil. In addition, this susceptibility may exhibit depositional patterns unrelated to visible stratigraphy.

Most structures of archaeological interest detected by magnetic survey are fills within negative or cut features. Not all fills are magnetic and they can be more magnetic or less magnetic than the surrounding ground. In addition, it is common for fills to exhibit variable magnetic properties through their volume, basal primary silt often being more magnetic than the material above it due to the increased proportion of topsoil within it. However, a fill containing burnt soil may be much more magnetic than this primary silt and sometimes a feature that has contained standing water can produce highly magnetic silts through mechanical depositional processes (depositional remanent magnetisation, DRM).

A third structural factor in the detection of buried structures is the depth of topsoil over the feature. As fills sink, the hollow above accumulates topsoil and hence a structure can be detected not through its own magnetisation but through the locally deeper topsoil above it. The volume of soil required depends upon the magnetic susceptibility of the soil but just a few centimetres are often sufficient. Such a thin deposit can, however, easily be lost through subsequent erosion by natural factors or ploughing.

4.1.2 Instrumentation

The use of the magnetic sensors in non-gradiometric (vertical) configuration avoids measurement sensitisation to the shallowest region of the soil, allowing deeper structures, whether natural or otherwise to

be imaged within the sensitivity of the instrumentation. This also allows the detection of shallow broad variations in magnetic susceptibility that might have archaeological significance. Suppression of ambient noise and temporal trends is reduced and therefore need reduction during processing.

The theoretical slightly reduced lateral resolution inherent to using non-gradiometric sensor arrays is practically not an issue and especially if processing includes a vertical pseudo-gradient conversion. The non-gradiometric system is thus overall a more capable configuration than the short gradiometers often used for archaeological studies.

Caesium instrumentation has a greater sensitivity than fluxgate instruments, however, at the 10 Hz sampling rate used here this increase in sensitivity is limited to about one order of magnitude. Greater benefit is obtained from a better signal-to-noise ratio meaning that sub-nanoTesla measurement is more practically achieved.

The array system is designed to be non-magnetic and to contribute virtually nothing to the magnetic measurement, whether through direct interference or through motion noise.

4.2 Magnetic Survey

4.2.1 Technical equipment

Measured variable	Magnetic flux density / nT (Total Magnetic Intensity / nT after removal of regional trend)
Instrument	Array of Geometrics G858 Magmapper caesium magnetometers
Configuration	Non-gradiometric transverse array (4 sensors, ATV towed)
Sensitivity	0.03 nT @ 10 Hz (manufacturer's specification)
QA Procedure	Continuous observation
Spatial resolution	1.0m between lines, 0.25m mean along line interval

4.2.2 Monitoring & quality assessment

The system continuously displays all incoming data as well as line speed and spatial data resolution per acquisition channel during survey. Rest mode system noise is therefore easy to inspect simply by pausing during survey, and the continuous display makes monitoring for quality intrinsic to the process of undertaking a survey. Rest mode test results (static test) are available from the system.

4.3 Magnetic Data Processing

4.3.1 Procedure

All data processing is minimised and limited to what is essential for the class of data being collected, e.g. reduction of orientation effects, suppression of single point defects (drop-outs or spikes) etc. The processing stream for this data is as follows:

Process	Software	Parameters
Measurement & GNSS receiver data alignment	Proprietary	
Temporal reduction, regional field suppression	Proprietary	Bandpassed 0.3 – 10.0s
Gridding	Surfer	Kriging, 0.25m x 0.25m
Smoothing	Surfer	Gaussian lowpass 3x3 data (0.75m)
Pseudo-gradient conversion	Proprietary	1m vertical

Potential field processing procedures are used where possible on gridded data from the above processing, allowing simulation of vertical gradient data, separation of deep and shallow magnetic sources, etc. The initial processing uses proprietary software developed in conjunction with the multisensor acquisition system. Gridded data is ported as data surfaces (not images) into Manifold GIS for final imaging, contouring and detailed analysis. Specialist analysis is undertaken using proprietary software.

4.4 Magnetic Interpretation

4.4.1 Introduction

Numerous sources are used in the interpretive process, which takes into account shallow geological conditions, past and present land use, drainage, weather before and during survey, topography and any previous knowledge about the site and the surrounding area. Old Ordnance Survey mapping is consulted and also older sources if available. Geological information (for the UK) is sourced only from British Geological Survey resources and aerial imagery from online sources. LiDAR data is usually sourced from the Environment Agency or other national equivalents, SAR from NASA and other topographic data from original survey.

Information from nearby surveys is consulted to inform upon local data character, variations across soils and near-surface geological contexts. Published data from other surveys may also be used if accompanied by adequate metadata.

Interpretation of magnetic data is undertaken using total intensity data, vertical pseudo-gradient and where relevant, shallow field, component models in parallel although for clarity only a subset of these may be presented in the report.

4.4.2 The contribution from geology and soils

On some sites, e.g. some gravels and alluvial contexts, there will be anomalies that can obscure those potentially of archaeological interest. They may have a strength equal to or greater than that associated with more relevant sources, e.g. ditch fills, but can normally be differentiated on the basis of anomaly form coupled with geological understanding. Where there is ambiguity, or relevance to the study, these anomalies will be included in this category.

Not all changes in geological context can be detected at the surface, directly or indirectly, but sometimes there will be a difference evident in the geophysical data that can be attributed to a change, e.g. from alluvium to tidal flat deposits, or bedrock to alluvium. In some cases the geophysical difference will not exactly coincide with the geological contact and this is especially the case across transitions in soil type.

Geophysical data varies in character across areas, due to a range of factors including soil chemistry, near surface geology, hydrology and land use past and present. These all contribute to the texture of the data, i.e. a background character against which all other anomalies are measured.

4.4.3 Agricultural inputs

Coherent linear dipolar enhancement of magnetic field strength marking ditch fills, narrow bands of more variable magnetic field or changes in apparent magnetic susceptibility, are all included within the category of former field boundaries if they correlate with those depicted on the Tithe Map or early Ordnance Survey maps. If there is no correlation then these anomaly types are not categorised as a field boundaries.

Banded variations in apparent magnetic susceptibility caused by a variable thickness of topsoil, depositional remanent magnetisation of sediments in furrows or susceptibility enhancement through heating (a by product of burning organic matter like seaweed) tend to indicate past cultivation, whether ridge-based techniques, medieval ridge and furrow or post medieval 'lazy beds'. Modern cultivation, e.g. recent ploughing, is not included.

In some cases it is possible to identify drainage networks either as ditch-fill type anomalies (typically 'Roman' drains), noisy or repeating dipolar anomalies from terracotta pipes or reduced magnetic field strength anomalies from culverts, plastic or non-reinforced concrete pipes. In all cases identification of a herring bone pattern to these is sufficient for inclusion within this category.

4.4.4 Features of archaeological interest

Any linear or discrete enhancement of magnetic field strength, usually with a dipolar character of variable strength, that cannot be categorised as a field boundary, cultivation or as having a geological origin, is classified as a fill potentially being of archaeological interest. Fills are normally earthen and include an often

invisible proportion of heated soil or topsoil that augments local magnetic field strength. Inverted anomalies are possible over non-earthen fills, e.g. those that comprise peat, sand or gravel within soil. This category is subject to the 'habitation effect' where, in the absence of other sources of magnetic material, anomaly strength will decrease away from sources of heated soil and sometimes to the extent of non-detectability.

Former enclosure ditches that contained standing water can promote enhanced volumetric magnetic susceptibility through depositional remanence and remain detectable regardless of the absence of other sources of magnetic enhancement.

Anything that cannot be interpreted as a fill tends to be a structure, or in archaeological terms, a feature. This category is secondary to fills and includes anomalies that by virtue of their character are likely to be of archaeological interest but cannot be adequately described as fills. Examples include strongly magnetic bodies lacking ferrous character that might indicate hearths or kilns. In some cases anomalies of ferrous character may be included.

On some sites the combination of plan form and anomaly character, e.g. rectilinear reduced magnetic field strength anomalies, might indicate the likely presence of masonry, robber trenches or rubble foundations. Other types of structure are only included if the evidence is unequivocal, e.g. small ring ditches with doorways and hearths. In some circumstances a less definite category may be assigned to the individual anomalies instead.

It is sometimes possible to define different areas of activity on the basis of magnetic character, e.g. texture and anomaly strength. These might indicate the presence of middens or foci within larger complexes. This category does not indicate a presence or absence of discrete anomalies of archaeological interest.

4.5 Glossary

Acronym / term	Type	Definition
A	Physical quantity	SI unit Amp of electric current
BGS	Organisation	British Geological Survey
CIfA	Organisation	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
dB	Physical quantity	Decibel, unit of amplification / attenuation
DRM	Process	Depositional Remanent Magnetisation
EAGE	Organisation	European Association of Geoscientists and Engineers
EGNOS	Technology	European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service
ERT	Technology	Electrical resistivity tomography
ETRS89	Technology	European Terrestrial Reference System (defined 1989)
ETSI	Organisation	European Telecommunications Standards Institute
EuroGPR	Organisation	European Ground Penetrating Radar Association, the trade body for GPR professionals
G-BASE	Data	British Geological Survey Geochemical Atlas
GeolSoc	Organisation	Geological Society of London, the chartered body for the geological profession
GNSS	Technology	Global Navigation Satellite System
GPR	Technology	Ground penetrating radar
GPS	Technology	Global Positioning System (US)
inversion	process	A combination of forward and backward modelling intended to construct a 2D or 3D model of the physical distribution of a variable from data measured on a 1D or 2D surface. It is fundamental to ERT survey
IP	Physical quantity	Induced polarisation (or chargeability) units mV/V or ms
m	Physical quantity	SI unit metres of distance
mbgl	Physical quantity	Metres below ground level
MHz	Physical quantity	SI unit mega-Hertz of frequency
MS	Physical quantity	Magnetic susceptibility, unitless
mS	Physical quantity	SI unit milli-Siemens of electrical conductivity
nT	Physical quantity	SI unit nano-Tesla of magnetic flux density

Acronym / term	Type	Definition
OFCOM	Organisation	The Office of Communications, the UK radio spectrum regulator
Ohm	Physical quantity	SI unit Ohm of electrical resistance
OS	Organisation	Ordnance Survey of Great Britain
OSGB36	Data	The OS national grid (Great Britain)
OSTN15	Technology	Current coordinate transformation from ETRS89 to OSGB36 co-ordinates
RDP	Physical quantity	Relative Dielectric Permittivity, unitless
RTK	Technology	Real Time Kinematic (correction of GNSS position from a base station)
s	Physical quantity	SI unit seconds of time
TMI	Physical quantity	Total magnetic intensity (measured flux density minus regional flux density)
TRM	Process	Thermo-Remanent Magnetisation
V	Physical quantity	SI unit Volt of electric potential
WGS84	Data	World Geodetic System (defined 1984)

4.6 Selected reference

- Aspinall, A, *et al*, 2008, "Magnetometry for Archaeologists", Geophysical Methods for Archaeology, Altamira Press
- Blakely, R J, 1996, "Potential Theory in Gravity and Magnetic Applications", Cambridge University Press
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 (Updated 2016), "Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey" Reading
- David, A, *et al*, 2008, "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation", English Heritage
- Gaffney, C, *et al*, 2002, "Technical Note 6: The use of geophysical techniques in archaeological evaluations", Institute for Archaeologists (now CIfA)
- Medlycott, M (ed.) 2011, "Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England" East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 24
- Milsom, J, 2003, "Field Geophysics", 3rd edition, The Geological Field Guide Series, Wiley
- MOLA, 2017, "Archaeological observation and excavation of land on the Trafford Estate, Horstead, Norfolk" Report 18/45 Site code HTE15
- Rawlins, B G *et al*, 2012, "The advanced soil geochemical atlas of England and Wales". British Geological Survey, Keyworth
- Robertson, D, *et al*, 2018 "*Standards for Development-led Archaeological Projects in Norfolk*" Norfolk County Council
- Schmidt, A, 2013, "Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice", ADS
- Scollar, I, 1990, "Archaeological Prospecting and Remote Sensing", Topics in Remote Sensing 2, Cambridge University Press
- Tarling, D H, *et al*, (ed.), 1999, "Palaeomagnetism and Diagenesis in Sediments", Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 151
- Telford, W M, *et al*, 1990, "Applied Geophysics", 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press
- TigerGeo, 2020, "Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk: Specification for Geophysical Survey" unpublished specification for survey (Caesium Vapour Magnetic – Archaeology)

4.7 Archiving and dissemination

An archive is maintained for all projects, access to which is permitted for research purposes. Copyright and intellectual property rights are retained by TigerGeo on all material it has produced, the client having full licence to use such material as benefits their project. Where required, digital data and a copy of the report

can be archived in a suitable repository, e.g. the Archaeology Data Service, in addition to our own archive.

The archive contains all survey and project data, communications, field notes, reports and other related material including copies of third party data (e.g. CAD mapping, etc.) in digital form. Many are in proprietary formats while report components are available in PDF format.

The client will determine the distribution path for reporting, including to the end client, other contractors, local authority etc., and will determine the timetable for upload of the project report to the OASIS Grey Literature library or supply of report or data to other archiving services, taking into account end client confidentiality.

TigerGeo reserves the right to display data rendered anonymous and un-locatable on its website and in other marketing or research publications.

5 Supporting information

5.1 Standards and quality (archaeology)

TigerGeo is developing an Integrated Management System (IMS) towards ISO certification for ISO9001, ISO14001 and OHSAS18001/ISO45001. For work within the archaeological sector TigerGeo has been awarded CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) Registered Organisation status.

A high standard of client-centred professionalism is maintained in accordance with the requirements of relevant professional bodies including the Geological Society of London (GeoSoc) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). Senior members of TigerGeo are professional members of the GeoSoc (FGS), CIfA (MCIfA & ACIfA grades) and other appropriate bodies, including the European Association of Geoscientists and Engineers (EAGE) Near Surface Division (MEAGE) and the Institute of Professional Soil Scientists (MISoilSci).

In addition TigerGeo is a member of EuroGPR and all ground penetrating and other radar work is in accordance with ETSI EG 202 730.

The management team at TigerGeo have almost 50 years of combined experience of near surface geophysical project design, survey, interpretation and reporting, based across a wide range of shallow geological contexts. Added to this is the considerable experience of our lead geophysicists in a variety of commercial and academic roles. All geophysical staff have graduate and in many cases also post-graduate relevant qualifications pertaining to environmental geophysics from recognised centres of academic excellence.

During fieldwork there is always a fully qualified (to graduate or post-graduate level) supervisory geophysicist leading a team of other geophysicists and geophysical technicians, all of whom are trained and competent with the equipment they are working with. Data processing and interpretation is carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced geophysicist under the direct supervision and guidance of the Senior Geophysicist. All work is monitored and reviewed throughout by the Senior Geophysicist who will appraise all stages of a project as it progresses.

Data processing and interpretation adheres to the scientific principles of objectiveness and logical consistency. A standard set of approved external sources of information, e.g. from the British Geological Survey, the Ordnance Survey and similar sources of data, in addition to previous TigerGeo projects, guide the interpretive process. Due attention is paid to the technical constraints of method, resolution, contrast and other geophysical factors.

There is a strong culture of internal peer-review within TigerGeo, for example, all reports pass through a process of authorship, technical review and finally proof-reading before release to the client. Technical queries resulting from TigerGeo's work are reviewed by the Senior Geophysicist to ensure uniformity of response prior to implementing any edits, etc.

Work is undertaken in accordance with the high professional standards and technical competence expected by the Geological Society of London and the European Association of Geoscientists and Engineers.

All work for archaeological projects is also conducted in accordance with the following standards and guidance:

- David et al, "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation", English Heritage, 2008;
- "Standard and guidance for Archaeological Geophysical survey", Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 (Updated 2016);

and TigerGeo meets with ease the requirements of English Heritage in their 2008 Guidance "Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation" section 2.8 entitled "Competence of survey personnel".


5.2 Key personnel

Martin Roseveare, MSc BSc(Hons) MEAGE FGS MCIfA	Senior Geophysicist, Director
<p>Martin specialised (MSc) in geophysical prospection for shallow applications and since 1997 has worked in commercial geophysics. Elected a GeolSoc Fellow in 2009 he is now working towards achieving CSci. A member of the European Association of Geoscientists & Engineers, he has served on the EuroGPR and CIfA GeoSIG committees and on the scientific committees of the 10th and 11th Archaeological Prospection conferences. He has reviewed papers for the EAGE Near Surface conference, was a technical reviewer of the Irish NRA geophysical guidance and is a founding member of the ISSGAP soils group. Professional interests include the application of geophysics to agriculture and the environment, e.g. groundwater and geohazards. He is also a software writer and equipment integrator with significant experience of embedded systems.</p>	
Anne Roseveare, BEng(Hons) DIS MISoilSci	Operations Manager, Environmental Geophysicist, Data Analyst
<p>On looking beyond engineering, Anne turned her attention to environmental monitoring and geophysics. She is a Member of the British Society of Soil Science / Institute of Professional Soil Scientists (BSSS/IPSS) and has specific areas of interest in soil physics & hydrology, agricultural applications and industrial sites. Working in shallow geophysics since 1998, Anne is a founding member of the ISSGAP soils group, also was the founding Editor of the International Society for Archaeological Prospection (ISAP). Specifications, logistics, health and safety, data handling & analysis are integral parts of her work, though she is happily distracted by the possibilities of discovering lost cities, hillwalking, dance and good food.</p>	
Jennifer Smith, MSc	Fieldwork Manager, Environmental Geophysicist
<p>Jen developed an interest in all aspects of topographical and geophysical survey whilst studying for a MSc in Archaeological Science at the University of Bristol. During her studies she obtained valuable experience in the use of and data analysis for various terrestrial geophysical techniques as well as develop her interest further by adding marine geophysical techniques to her working theoretical knowledge. She has worked as a near-surface geophysicist within archaeology for several years and has developed a good knowledge of UK geology. Outside of work, Jen is currently learning Java code but is easily distracted by keeping fit, exploring the world or some other hobby.</p>	
Daniel Lewis, MA BA(Hons) ACIfA	Consultant Archaeologist
<p>Daniel studied archaeology at the University of Nottingham and worked in field archaeology for many years, managing urban and rural fieldwork projects in and around Herefordshire. When the desk became more appealing he jumped into the world of consulting, working on small and large multi-discipline projects throughout England and Wales. At the same time, he returned to University, gaining an MA in Historic Environment Conservation. With experience in the heritage sector since 1998, Daniel has a diverse portfolio of skills. Here he ensures that geophysical work within the heritage sector is well grounded in archaeology. His spare time includes much running up mountains.</p>	
Luigi Benente, MSc	Consultant Environmental Geophysicist
<p>Luigi is an experienced geologist specialized in geophysics, who gained a blend of practical and technical experience within explorations carried out in Italy, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Uzbekistan, Thailand and Nigeria. Resourceful and hardworking with a positive attitude in problem solving, he has the ability to lead a team through challenging tasks, organizing people and equipment in order to hit the goal in safety and with time conscious professionalism. He is attracted to discover hidden things within the earth and after celebrating with friends, good wine, good beer and lots of food he is able to repair most broken things...</p>	

Alexandra Gereaa, MSc, BSc, PhD Candidate

Geophysical Processor & Analyst


Alexandra has a BSc in Geophysics and an MSc in Applied Geo-biology and is in the final stages of a PhD in the UK after living in Portugal for six months working on her master's degree. Since 2008 she has used most mainstream processing applications across electrical, magnetic and radar methods. She combines a love of nature and science and is currently studying plant roots in agricultural environments using geophysical methods. When not doing that she enjoys travelling, hiking, nature, yoga, books, foreign languages and cats. A few years ago she found a passion for electronics and started building different devices including intelligent gardening systems and coding in Python.



SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 01 Site Location

Orthographic Scale: 1:10000 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020 OS OpenData Crown Copyright & Database Right 2020






SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 02a Magnetic Data (Total Magnetic Intensity) - Northwest

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020






SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 02b Magnetic Data (Total Magnetic Intensity) - North Centre

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020






SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 02c Magnetic Data (Total Magnetic Intensity) - Southwest

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020






SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 02d Magnetic Data (Total Magnetic Intensity) - South Centre

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020





SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 02e Magnetic Data (Total Magnetic Intensity) - Southeast

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020



625375 m 625400 m 625425 m 625450 m 625475 m 625500 m 625525 m 625550 m 625575 m 625600 m 625625 m 625650 m 625675 m 625700 m 625725 m 625750 m 625775 m 625800 m 625825 m 625850 m 625875 m 625900 m 625925 m 625950 m




625375 m 625400 m 625425 m 625450 m 625475 m 625500 m 625525 m 625550 m 625575 m 625600 m 625625 m 625650 m 625675 m 625700 m 625725 m 625750 m 625775 m 625800 m 625825 m 625850 m 625875 m 625900 m 625925 m 625950 m

SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
DWG 03a Interpretation - Northwest

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020





SQH201 Stanninghall Quarry, Horstead, Norfolk
 DWG 03b Interpretation - North Centre

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A3 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
 File: tg_SQH201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2020

