

**A14 IMPROVEMENT
ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON, CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

**Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys
of Areas GP1 to GP7 (2008)
and Proposed Reservoir Sites (2009)**

A.D.H. Bartlett

Surveyed by:

Bartlett-Clark Consultancy

**25 Estate Yard, Cuckoo Lane,
North Leigh,
Oxfordshire OX29 6PW
01865 200864**

for:

**Cambridge Archaeological Unit
Department of Archaeology
Downing Street
Cambridge CB2 3DZ**

on behalf of:

Atkins Heritage and Costain Skanska Joint Venture

A14 Improvement

Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys 2008-9

Summary

This report describes geophysical surveys carried out to test for evidence of archaeological features at sites on and near the route of the proposed A14 Improvement in Cambridgeshire. The surveys were done in two phases (November – December 2008, and April 2009). The findings from both phases have previously been reported on separately, but are now combined for the record in this report.

Seven locations (identified as sites GP1 - GP7) on the line of the proposed A14 Improvement were surveyed in 2008. Numerous areas of magnetic activity were detected, but the findings which are most likely to be archaeologically significant were seen in areas GP1 and GP2. The findings at GP1 include ditched enclosures, which form a continuation of an archaeological site previously surveyed further to the west in the same field. The survey results at GP2 show traces of additional ditched enclosures, together with clusters of magnetic anomalies suggesting settlement remains.

Areas of probably non-archaeological magnetic activity were seen at sites GP3 and GP4, together with linear features which could be former ditches (or perhaps drains) at GP5. Possible traces of ridge and furrow were seen at GP6 and GP7, as well as strong natural magnetic anomalies at GP6, and recent disturbances at GP7.

There do not, therefore, appear to be any strong or clearly defined concentrations of detectable archaeological features in the areas surveyed in 2008, other than the enclosures in GP1 and the probable settlement remains at GP2.

Additional geophysical surveys were carried out in April 2009 at the proposed sites of three drainage reservoirs (R1 – R3), which are also to be constructed as part of the A14 improvement scheme. The main archaeological findings were at site R2 (Lolworth), where the survey detected a series of ditched enclosures with associated occupation features. The response from site R1 (Brampton) was dominated by strong magnetic disturbances of probably recent origin. Findings from site R3 (Bar Hill) were minimal.

A.D.H. Bartlett

Bartlett - Clark Consultancy

19 June 2009

Contents

Introduction	3
The Site	3
Survey Procedure	5
Results	
2008 Survey	7
2009 Survey	10
Conclusions	11
Appendix (inventory of selected findings)	14

Illustrations

Figures in this report have been grouped by sites (to simplify the merging of the two previous reports). For each site there is a sequence of plans at different scales, as follows:

1	Grey scale data plots	1:2000
2	Graphical plots of magnetometer survey data (with interpretation)	1:1250
3	Survey data (grey scale plots) shown with adjacent sections of survey by Pre-Construct Geophysics, and cropmark interpretation	1:5000
4	Summary plans showing interpretation of survey findings	1:2500

The sequence of figures in the report is therefore:

Figure K1	Combined key plan showing 2008 and 2009 survey locations
Figures 1.1 to 7.4	Plans as above for 2008 surveys
Figures R1.1 to R3	Plans as above for 2009 surveys
Figures MS_2008-9	Magnetic susceptibility data plots

A14 IMPROVEMENT

ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys of Areas GP1 to GP7, 2008 and of Proposed Reservoir Sites, 2009

Introduction

This report presents results from geophysical surveys done on or adjacent to the route of the proposed A14 Improvement in Cambridgeshire. The surveys were done in two phases, which were previously reported on separately, and are now combined in this report.

Both phases of this investigation were commissioned by Cambridge Archaeological Unit on behalf of Atkins Heritage and Costain Skanska Joint Venture, and were carried out according to specifications as stated in the project brief issued by Atkins Heritage in August 2008 [1]. The initial surveys were done in two stages at seven previously unsurveyed locations (designated GP1 to GP7) along the route in November-December 2008, with findings as described in our report of 23 December [2].

Further surveys were done in April 2009 at the proposed sites of three drainage reservoirs (referred to here as R1 to R3). Fieldwork for the reservoir surveys was done between 6-16 April 2009. These surveys were previously reported on in May 2009 [3].

Previous investigations of the route have included an aerial photographic assessment [4], and a geophysical survey done by Pre-Construct Geophysics early in 2008 [5]. This initial survey covered as much of the route as was accessible at that time. Data plots from the Pre-Construct survey are included alongside the grey scale plots of the present surveys where they fall within the boundaries of the figures in this report

For the purposes of this combined report the previous plans have been re-numbered and bound together in sequence (2008 and then 2009), and the text similarly merged. Much of the report which follows is reproduced from the two earlier reports.

The Route

Location and topography

The complete route of the proposed improvement scheme is described in the brief as extending for c. 43km from the A14 near Ellington (TL 186 718). It crosses the A1 near Brampton, and converges with the present A14 route near Fenstanton. It then follows the

existing road to Fen Ditton, north east of Cambridge.

Survey areas GP1 to GP6 are located on arable farmland within an 11km section of the route between the A1 and Fenstanton (as shown on figure K1). Area GP7 covers surviving fields between existing roads at the A14 / M11 junction near Girton.

The elevation along the route varies a little from c. 20m OD at areas GP1 and GP7 to 11m OD at the lowest lying site, which is GP6.

The three reservoir sites (which are referred to for convenience in this report as R1, R2 and R3) are located near Brampton, Lolworth and Bar Hill (from west to east along the route). All three sites are open farmland.

The Brampton site (R1) is located to the west of the proposed new road alignment, and centred at NGR TL 195710 near to the NW end of the proposed route. The southern part of the reservoir area (as indicated by a red outline on figure R1.1) lies also within the boundary of a proposed gravel extraction site, which is currently the subject of a separate archaeological evaluation and geophysical survey commissioned by Lafarge Aggregates Ltd. Coverage for the present survey was therefore limited to the northern part of the site, as represented by the grey scale plot in figure R1.1.

Site R2 is located at Clare College Farm (TL 367648) between the existing A14 and Lolworth village. R3 is a little to the east of R2 at TL 381642, and is immediately to the north of the A14 and of Bar Hill. Total survey coverage at the three sites was a little over 17 ha. [The survey boundaries in places extend a little beyond the reservoir outlines because it is easier to survey in complete blocks than to terminate the coverage at an irregular boundary on open ground.]

Geology

The underlying bedrock is Oxford Clay towards the western end of the route (sites GP1-6), and Upper Greensand at site GP7. The quality of the magnetic response from the survey is likely to be determined largely by the variety of drift deposits which are present along much of the route. These include river terrace gravels around site GP1, alluvium in the Great Ouse valley at GP2, and Boulder Clay elsewhere. Sites GP1 and GP2 both produced clear archaeological findings, as did an area adjacent to GP1 which was included in the Pre-Construct survey. Reservoir site R1 is also on the river terrace gravels a little to the northwest of GP1, and R2 and R3 are on Upper Greensand.

The strength of magnetic activity on drift deposits varies, but productive surveys have often been undertaken in site conditions comparable to those along this route. Magnetic susceptibility readings which were collected during the survey were mainly in a range between 10 and 30 ($\times 10^{-5}$ SI), which is sufficiently high to permit the generally satisfactory detection of archaeological features.

It is sometimes the case on glacial drift deposits that naturally magnetic stones are present in the soil. These can give rise to magnetic anomalies, or areas of increased

small-scale background disturbance in the survey plots. Some of the natural magnetic anomalies may resemble small archaeological features, although they are often distinguishable by their random plan and distribution.

Archaeological Background

Findings from the aerial photographic study and earlier geophysical survey are summarised in the project brief. Cropmarks indicate widespread areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation, as well as various ditched enclosures and field systems. These are particularly concentrated on gravel deposits to the south of Hemingford Grey and Fenstanton (i.e. near area GP6). The Pre-Construct geophysical survey [5] produced results consistent with the AP evidence, as well as additional findings. These included various enclosure complexes with associated ditches and pits. Such findings are usually characteristic of late prehistoric or Roman settlement activity.

Both phases of the surveys reported on here have also produced additional findings not previously identified from cropmarks (as at GP1, GP2 and R2).

Cropmark features (as reproduced from mapping supplied to us by the client) are included for comparison, together with some of the Pre-Construct geophysical survey plots and recent grey scale plots in the 1:5000 scale figures (figure 3 in the set of plans for each survey location). These plans show there are few cropmark features near to sites R1 and R2, but there is a site some distance to the east of R3, which is also intersected by ridge and furrow.

Survey Procedure

Magnetometer survey

The magnetometer survey followed standard procedures for work of this kind, as specified in the brief, and described in the Method Statement for the project [6]. Readings were collected using Bartington 1m fluxgate magnetometers, and are plotted at 25cm intervals along transects 1m apart. The results of the survey are shown as grey scale plots at 1:2000 scale (figure 1 for each survey), and as graphical (x-y trace) plots at 1:1250 scale (figure 2 for each survey). [Data plots for larger areas may be divided into sections: figs 1.2.1, 1.2.2, etc, for site GP1, figure 2.]

The survey plots show the magnetometer readings after standard treatments which include adjustment for irregularities in line spacing caused by variations in the instrument zero setting, and slight linear smoothing. Additional 2D low pass filtering has been applied to the grey scale plot to reduce background noise levels.

The magnetometer responds to cut features such as ditches and pits when they are silted with topsoil, which usually has a higher magnetic susceptibility than the underlying natural subsoil. It also detects the thermoremanent magnetism of fired materials, notably baked clay structures such as kilns or hearths, and so responds preferentially to the

presence of ancient settlement or industrial remains. It is also strongly affected by ferrous and other debris of recent origin.

Presentation

An interpretation of the findings is shown superimposed on the graphical plots (fig 2 for each site), and is reproduced separately to provide a summary of the findings (figure 4 for each site). Features as marked on these plans include a limited number of magnetic anomalies thought to be of potential archaeological significance (in red). These include some which could be interpreted as silted pits or ditches, as well as former field boundaries. Magnetic anomalies which appear most probably to be of geological origin are outlined in orange/brown. Not all of these can confidently be interpreted as natural, and some may need further investigation to establish their precise origin.

Some strong magnetic anomalies at sites GP2 and GP6 appear to be of natural origin, and are outlined in brown. There are strong magnetic disturbances also at site R1, which may be of recent (or possibly natural) origin. These are also indicated in brown. Possible cultivation effects are shown on the summary plans in green, and pipes in blue. Strong magnetic anomalies which are likely to be of recent and non-geological origin are also outlined in a light blue. These include various disturbances near to boundaries, and disturbed areas at GP7. [The strong disturbances at site R1 are less clearly caused by ferrous debris than those at GP7, and so are indicated in brown rather than blue.] Some, but not all, of the many narrow but strong individual magnetic anomalies which are likely to be caused by scattered small iron objects are also indicated in blue.

Survey location

The survey was located by reference to a grid of temporary markers at each site. This was aligned either with the OS grid or site boundaries, as convenient. The survey grid was set out and tied in each case to national grid co-ordinates by means of a differential GPS system. OS co-ordinates of map locations can be read from the AutoCAD version of the plans which can be supplied with this report, and used to re-locate features in the field.

Magnetic susceptibility survey

The magnetometer surveys were supplemented by a background magnetic susceptibility survey with readings taken at 20m intervals using a Bartington MS2 meter and field sensor loop. The results are presented as plots of shaded squares of density proportional to the readings in figures MS2008 and MS2009.

Susceptibility surveying can provide a useful complement to a magnetometer survey, and indicates the strength of response which is likely to be obtained. It can also be used to provide a broad indication of previously occupied or disturbed areas in which burning associated with past human occupation has enhanced the magnetic susceptibility of the topsoil, although this cannot be relied upon, and the readings are often affected by non-archaeological factors, including geology and land use.

Results

2008 Survey

Area GP1

Previously identified archaeological findings in the vicinity of this site include the enclosures and settlement remains seen in the pre-Construct geophysical survey, which was located immediately to the west of areas GP1b and GP1c. Cropmarks and other geophysical findings suggest that enclosures also extend to the west of the A1 (figure 1.3).

Findings from the present survey include some distinct ditch-like features in area GP1c (as marked by red broken lines and outlines, and labelled at A and B in figure 1.4). There are other possible, but less distinct, linear features (at C and D) in areas GP1b and GP1a.

A few individual pit-like features are outlined in red in GP1c (of which the most distinct is at E). There are few such features in GP1b, but perhaps rather more in GP1a. The difficulty in interpreting the smaller magnetic anomalies in GP1a is that they are widely scattered and there is little clear distinction between stronger ones (in red), and smaller (perhaps natural) ones in orange. It is possible therefore that some of the features in GP1a are caused by magnetic stones in the gravel. The magnetic susceptibility readings are higher in GP1a than in GP1c (figure MS2008), which could be consistent with the presence of a gravel outcrop.

A large pipe (as marked in blue in figure 1.4) was detected in GP1b-c. This aligns with a cropmark feature interpreted as a ditch (figure 1.3).

Area GP2

This survey covered an additional strip of ground (between the drain and railway at the east of the site) in addition to the area as initially specified.

Area GP2 is of archaeological interest because it is located near to an apparent ancient settlement site, which was detected in the Pre-Construct survey immediately to the east of the railway (figure 2.3). The possibility that archaeological activity might continue towards the river could not be decided without the new survey. Various magnetic disturbances are visible in the survey plots, of which the potentially most significant are the linear features (AA, BB on figure 2.4), and clusters of pit-like magnetic anomalies in the centre of the survey area (CC). These together suggest the presence of ditched enclosures containing occupation features. There is also an area of raised magnetic susceptibility readings in this central part of the site (figure MS2008). This could be consistent with the presence of occupation remains in this area.

Other findings may be natural or non-archaeological. Irregular linear features near to the

river (DD) are perhaps comparable to the strong and apparently natural magnetic anomalies seen on fenland at site GP6 (and at other similar locations in the Pre-Construct survey).

Strong disturbances near to the drain (EE) are probably recent. A few possible pit-like features were seen in the section of the survey near to the railway, but these are widely dispersed. The main group of findings in area GP2 (as defined by features AA, BB, CC) therefore appears to form a separate focus of archaeological activity to that seen previously to the east of the railway. Linear cultivation effects can be seen at various locations in the survey (as indicated by green broken lines). Most of these align with current field boundaries (rather than with ridge and furrow as recorded from cropmarks: see figure 2.4).

Area GP3

Findings here include distinct cultivation effects which probably indicate traces of ridge and furrow (as marked in green on figure 3.4). The ridge and furrow is at 90 degrees to a cropmark feature which intersects the site, but was not detected in the survey (broad green line in figure 3.3).

Other features are magnetic anomalies indicating a former boundary (at G in figure 3.4), and a single weak linear feature which does not align with any existing boundary, and could be a ditch or drain (at H).

A few individual magnetic anomalies (in red) could represent pits, but they do not appear to form any significant groups or concentrations.

A cluster of magnetic disturbances around J is made up of small individual magnetic anomalies of a kind often caused by magnetic stones in gravel (as perhaps seen also in GP1a).

A line of strong magnetic disturbances (in blue) is probably caused by hardcore spread along the track in the eastern half of the survey.

Area GP4

The survey here again detected possible ridge and furrow (shown in green in figure 4.4). This changes orientation at the field boundary near to the west end of the survey.

There is a dense cluster of magnetic disturbances around a large central anomaly at K. This could in part be a natural effect (as suggested at J in GP3), but many of the individual magnetic anomalies are stronger than at J, and they are surrounded by an unusual number of ferrous anomalies (blue). These disturbances may therefore relate to a surface scatter of burnt stone or slag with post-medieval or modern pottery which was seen during the fieldwork. The magnetic anomalies here do not conform to any interpretable plan, but it remains a possibility that they could indicate the location of a relatively recent structure or activity.

Area GP5

A distinct linear feature at L, and a weaker parallel one at M could perhaps be former ditches but (as at H in GP3) they could also be non-ferrous pipes or drains. It is perhaps possible, if L is a ditch, that it could form part of an enclosure with the further linear anomaly at N, but N should perhaps rather be interpreted as a cultivation feature (because it is only slightly stronger than others nearby).

An area of varied readings at the east of the survey includes some possible pit-like features, as at O, but it is unclear whether these represent more than random disturbances (perhaps indicating a ploughing headland) near to the field boundary. No findings are recorded from the aerial photographs near to this site (figure 5.3).

Area GP6

This site contains extensive magnetic activity, but little of it appears to be archaeologically significant. A cropmark enclosure complex is located nearby to the west of area GP6a, but it does not appear to extend to within the survey area. Traces of ridge and furrow are visible in much of the southern half of the survey. The parallel linear features at P are stronger than the ridge and furrow, and are differently oriented. They could perhaps therefore be field drains.

The most conspicuous finding is a large area of strong and irregular, but approximately linear, magnetic anomalies (as at Q, and outlined in brown) towards the east and north of the survey. Disturbances of this kind are sometimes seen in surveys of waterlogged or fenland sites (and appear to be present also in the Pre-Construct survey about 1km to the west: see figure 6.3). They presumably occur here because this is the lowest-lying survey area along the route. The magnetic anomalies may represent silted paleochannels, or variable depths of silting on previously waterlogged ground.

Area GP7

There are some erratic and probably recent magnetic anomalies (at R) at the north end of GP7a, and strong recent disturbances near the southern boundary (S). This field perhaps also contains weak traces of ridge and furrow.

Some slightly more distinct ridge and furrow is visible in GP7b, where there is also a ditch-like linear feature at T.

The southern half of each of the fields within site GP7b is dominated by strong and probably recent magnetic disturbances (as outlined in blue around U, V). These could be caused by a spread of rubble or hardcore, together with numerous ferrous objects. They suggest this area could have served as a construction site during previous road works.

2009 Survey

Site R1 (Brampton)

The survey data from this site is more difficult than usual to interpret because there is strong magnetic activity across much of the site. This is made up of individual small strong magnetic anomalies, as outlined in brown in figure 1.4. The magnetic disturbances are most concentrated towards the east side of the field, where a scatter of brick and other rubble is visible on the ground. This suggests that debris from demolished buildings is present in this part of the field. Magnetic susceptibility values are also raised in this area.

Concentrations of small strong magnetic anomalies as shown in figure 1.4 can be seen to extend in broad bands across much of the field. Such widespread disturbances must represent more than debris from buildings at the east of the field. Magnetic effects of this kind can sometimes be natural, and have been seen in other surveys on gravel soils (where they are caused by naturally magnetic stones in the gravel), but the presence of rubble at this site suggests otherwise. The effects are not as strong as at site GP7 in the previous survey, which contained a lot of ferrous debris, and appears to have been used as a road construction camp, but they could perhaps relate to wartime activities in the area. The evaluation area is near to the Brampton RAF camp (which is still in use to the east of the A1), and contains concrete tracks of possible wartime date, but we do not know if this area was ever the site of military installations. We have seen similar magnetic disturbances in at least one other previous survey of a former airfield where debris from demolished buildings and runways was scattered in the soil, and an explanation of this kind may be applicable here.

The presence of the strong disturbances does not wholly exclude the possibility of identifying archaeological features, particularly linear ditch-like magnetic anomalies which may remain visible in the grey scale plot, against a noisy background. Findings which can cautiously be identified in the survey include linear features as outlined in red at A (as labelled on figure R1.4). These are defined by alignments of particularly strong magnetic anomalies, and so could perhaps indicate a ditch or boundary containing strongly magnetic debris (of probably recent origin) in the fill.

Other alignments of features are indicated (in blue) at B and C. These could perhaps be pipes, but are perhaps more likely to represent series of separate objects, such as subsurface remains of metal fence posts.

Some possible pit-like features (or natural silted hollows) are indicated (in orange) towards the south of the field, but this interpretation is uncertain against the disturbed background.

Site R2 (Lolworth)

Findings at this site are much more conclusive than at site R1. Strong and non-

archaeological magnetic disturbances are found only along the track which crosses the survey area to the east of the farm, and near to the southern boundary and electricity poles. Background disturbances are otherwise limited to a sparse scatter of ferrous objects, as is usually to be found on farmland.

The more significant findings are a sequence of circular and rectilinear enclosures running from east to west across the western half of the site, and linked by a ditch-like linear feature D. There is a further more isolated enclosure in the eastern part of the site at E. This and other enclosures contain internal features suggesting the presence of settlement features, although these are not present in dense concentrations.

There is no clear correspondence between the magnetic susceptibility survey (fig MS_2009) and the magnetometer findings. This would be consistent with the possibility (as suggested by the limited density of features within the enclosures) that occupation here was not necessarily very intensive.

The ditches and enclosures which were detected by the survey were not identified as cropmarks (figure R2.3).

There is a scatter of small and probably natural magnetic anomalies (as indicated in orange) towards the west of the survey area around F. North-south cultivation effects are visible across much of the western half of the survey.

Site R3 (Bar Hill)

This site is located some 400m west of a large cropmark settlement, and is intersected by north-south cropmark ridge and furrow (figure R3.3). The ridge and furrow was detected clearly by the survey, but findings otherwise were limited to weak and pit-like, but probably natural, features at G (figure R3.4), and ferrous objects.

Conclusions

2008 Survey

The most significant archaeological findings are probably the ditches or enclosures (A, B) in GP1c, perhaps with others (at D) in GP1a, and a possible occupation site at GP2. The findings in GP1 do not seem to be associated with any particular concentration of other features, although there are a few pit-like magnetic anomalies scattered across the site. It is therefore likely that the survey areas contain some outlying enclosures associated with the previously detected site immediately to the west, but are outside the main area of activity.

Area GP2 appears to contain traces of ditched enclosures (AA and BB), together with distinct clusters of pit-like magnetic anomalies (e.g. CC). These results suggest a further area of occupation activity some 400-500m to the west of the previously identified archaeological site in the field east of the railway.

The magnetic disturbances (J) in GP3 could be mainly natural, and are perhaps caused by an outcrop of magnetic gravel. A similar but stronger disturbed area (K) in GP4 may be associated with some comparatively recent activity, as is suggested by a surface scatter of burnt debris and pottery.

A possible enclosure could perhaps be constructed from linear features (L and N) in GP5, but they are perhaps more probably cultivation effects and drains. There may be pit-like features (O) to the east of GP5, but their significance is unclear.

We have seen strong irregular magnetic anomalies as at (Q) in GP6 in previous surveys in fenland conditions, and assume they are caused by natural variations in the depth of silt.

There may be a ditch (anomaly T) in area GP7b, but the magnetic disturbances otherwise appear to be of recent origin.

2009 Survey

The main archaeological findings from the three reservoir surveys are at site R2, where there is a well-defined sequence of ditched enclosures. These are probably associated with a limited number of settlement features within and around the enclosures.

The response from site R1 is dominated by strong magnetic interference of probably recent (but perhaps partly natural) origin. Debris from demolished buildings would account for the most concentrated disturbances at the east of the field, but magnetic activity is widespread in the surrounding area. It would therefore be interesting to know if there is any record of WW2 installations connected with Brampton RAF camp in this area. Some alignments are visible in the disturbances, and may relate to former boundaries, but a possibility remains that any individual archaeological features which may be present could be obscured by the disturbed magnetic background.

Significant findings at site R3 are probably limited to ridge and furrow.

Report by:

A.D.H. Bartlett BSc MPhil

Bartlett - Clark Consultancy
Specialists in Archaeogeophysics
25 Estate Yard
Cuckoo Lane, North Leigh
Oxfordshire OX29 6PW

01865 200864

22 June 2009

P. Cottrell BA MA supervised the fieldwork for both phases this project. Data processing was done by P. Cottrell and F. Prince. Fieldwork was undertaken also by C. Oatley.

References

- [1] A14 Improvement Ellington to Fen Ditton. Brief for Archaeological Evaluation and Geophysical Survey. Job Number 5062774; Document ref A14 E2FD. Atkins Heritage, August 2008.
- [2] A14 Improvement Ellington to Fen Ditton, Cambridgeshire. Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys of Areas GP1 to GP7. Report by A. Bartlett, Bartlett Clark Consultancy, for Cambridge Archaeological Unit. Revised to include GP2: 23 December 2008.
- [3] A14 Improvement Ellington to Fen Ditton, Cambridgeshire. Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys of Proposed Reservoir Sites. Report by A. Bartlett, Bartlett Clark Consultancy, for Cambridge Archaeological Unit. 22 May 2009.
- [4] The aerial photographic assessment is referred to in the brief as by Air Photo Services, 2003, with results included in the Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report (WSP Civils, 2006).
- [5] Geophysical Survey. By Pre-Construct Geophysics for WSP Civils, April 2008.
- [6] A14 Improvement Ellington to Fen Ditton. Method Statement for Archaeological Geophysical Survey. Bartlett-Clark Consultancy with Cambridge Archaeological Unit; 24 October 2008.

A14 Improvement: Geophysical Surveys of Areas GP1 to GP7 and R1 to R3

Appendix: Inventory of Selected Findings

This list includes findings of potential archaeological interest as noted in the text of this report, and labelled on the summary plans (figure 4 for each site). The grading (1-4) given alongside each entry refers to the reliability of the geophysical evidence rather than the archaeological significance of the findings.

- Grade 1: Distinct magnetic anomalies of probable archaeological origin.
- Grade 2: Magnetic anomalies possibly including natural or recent disturbances, but which could in part be archaeologically significant.
- Grade 3: Weak, isolated or apparently natural features; not necessarily archaeologically significant.
- Grade 4: Magnetic anomalies of probably non-archaeological origin.

Feature

Grade

2008 Survey

Area GP1

A,B	Probable ditches / enclosures in area GP1c.	1
C	Possible weak ditches in GP1b.	2-3
D	Part of a possible enclosure in GP1a.	1-2
E	Pit-like features (as outlined in red) in GP1c.	1-2
F	Some pit-like features in GP1a may be archaeological, but others are likely to be natural.	2-3

Area GP2

AA	Distinct ditch-like feature, perhaps forming part of an enclosure.	1
BB	Possible weaker ditches.	1-2
CC	Clusters of pit-like magnetic anomalies, perhaps enclosed in part by ditches at AA, BB.	1
DD	Irregular linear features: perhaps silted watercourses.	4
EE	Magnetically disturbed area near drain: probably recent.	4

Area GP3

G	Magnetic anomalies on probable former boundary.	1
H	Weak ditch-like linear feature (or perhaps a non-ferrous pipe or drain).	3
J	Cluster of small magnetic anomalies: perhaps a gravel outcrop in topsoil.	3

Area GP4

K	Magnetically disturbed area: perhaps relates to burnt stone and (post – medieval / recent) pottery scatter.	2
---	---	---

Area GP5

L	Ditch or former boundary (or perhaps drain).	2
M	Weak linear feature parallel to L.	2-3
N	Linear feature could form part of an enclosure with L, but is probably a cultivation effect.	3
O	Magnetic disturbances, including some possible pit-like features near ditch.	2-3

Area GP6

P	Parallel linear magnetic anomalies: perhaps field drains.	3
---	---	---

Q	Irregular strong magnetic anomalies: probably representing natural variations in depth of silt.	4
---	---	---

Area GP7

R	Group of magnetic anomalies: perhaps mainly recent.	3
---	---	---

S	Strong magnetic disturbances: recent.	4
---	---------------------------------------	---

T	Possible ditch-like feature.	2
---	------------------------------	---

U, V	Strong recent disturbances.	4
------	-----------------------------	---

2009 Survey

Site R1

A	Possible ditches containing strongly magnetic debris in fill.	2
---	---	---

B, C	Alignments of strong magnetic anomalies: perhaps pipes, or remains of metal fence posts.	4
------	--	---

Site R2

D	Ditch-like linear feature (road ditch ?) forming southern boundary to sequence of ditched enclosures.	1
---	---	---

E	Additional isolated enclosure in east of survey area.	1
---	---	---

Site R3

G	Weak pit-like magnetic anomalies. Possibly natural.	3
---	---	---