



Pinchbeck Lincolnshire

Geophysical Survey Report

(Magnetic Survey – Heritage)

Version 1.0

Project code: PBL201

Produced for:

RPS Consulting

Lead Author:

MJ Roseveare, Senior Geophysicist

BSc(Hons) MSc MEAGE FGS MCIfA



25th March 2021



Pinchbeck Lincolnshire

Digital data

Item and version	Sent to	Sent date
CAD – Vector Elements 1.0		

Audit

Version	Author	Checked	Date
Interim			
1.0	MJ Roseveare	ACK Roseveare	25 th March 2021

Project metadata

Project Code	PBL201
Client	RPS Consulting
Fieldwork Dates	8 th March 2021
Field Personnel	Phase SI
Data Processing Personnel	ACK Roseveare
Reporting Personnel	MJ Roseveare
Report Date	25 th March 2021
Report Version	1.0

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 RPS Consulting to prospect land southeast of Pinchbeck in Lincolnshire for features of archaeological interest. Survey was undertaken using an array of fluxgate sensors on a wheeled cart, tracked by GNSS.

Nothing of archaeological interest was found. Background magnetic variation from the superficial geology was significant and a steel utility crosses the centre of the site. The position of a former enclosure boundary depicted in 1843 but not thereafter was confirmed.



Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Context.....	1
2.1 Environment.....	1
2.2 Heritage.....	1
3 Discussion.....	2
3.1 Character & Principal Results.....	2
3.1.1 Introduction.....	2
3.1.2 Data.....	2
3.1.3 Geology and land use.....	2
3.1.4 Archaeology.....	2
3.2 Conclusions.....	2
3.3 Caveats.....	2
4 Methodology.....	4
4.1 Magnetic Principles.....	4
4.1.1 Physical concepts.....	4
4.1.2 Instrumentation.....	4
4.2 Magnetic Survey.....	5
4.2.1 Technical equipment.....	5
4.2.2 Monitoring & quality assessment.....	5
4.3 Magnetic Data Processing.....	5
4.3.1 Procedure.....	5
4.4 Magnetic Interpretation	6
4.4.1 Introduction.....	6
4.4.2 The contribution from geology and soils.....	6
4.4.3 Agricultural inputs.....	6
4.4.4 Features of archaeological interest.....	6
4.5 Glossary.....	7
4.6 Selected reference.....	8
4.7 Archiving and dissemination.....	8
5 Supporting information.....	10
5.1 Standards and quality (archaeology).....	10
5.2 Key personnel	11

Drawing	Title
DWG 01	Site Location
DWG 02	Vertical Magnetic Gradient Data
DWG 03	Interpretation

1 Introduction

A survey was commissioned by RPS Consulting to prospect land southeast of Pinchbeck in Lincolnshire for features of archaeological interest. Survey was undertaken using an array of fluxgate sensors on a wheeled cart, tracked by GNSS. Survey was undertaken of an area of approximately 1.6 hectares within a single field that was fairly overgrown and bounded by steel mesh fencing.

Country	England
County	Lincolnshire
Nearest Settlement	Pinchbeck
Central Co-ordinates	524692, 325073

2 Context

2.1 Environment

Soilscapes Classification	Loamy and clayey soils of coastal flats with naturally high groundwater (21)
Superficial 1:50000 BGS	Tidal Flat Deposits - Clay And Silt
Bedrock 1:50000 BGS	Oxford Clay Formation - Mudstone
Topography	Relatively flat
Hydrology	Unknown
Current Land Use	Fallow
Historic Land Use	Mixed agricultural
Vegetation Cover	Scrub, overgrown
Sources of Interference	Steel Heras fencing

2.2 Heritage

Various online resources were consulted, principally the Heritage Gateway website (accessed 25/03/2021) and old OS map editions from the 1880s until the present day. In addition Myk Flitcroft supplied an extract from H. Upton's '*Plan of the Old Inclosures of that part of Pinchbeck in the County of Lincoln lying on the North and South Side of the River Glen*', dated 1843, found in an archaeological assessment report (No. 62/13) by Archaeological Project Services' '*Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of Land at Wardentree Lane, Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire*' dated June 2013.

The Heritage Gateway revealed two monument records close to the site, both pertaining to the field south of the road along the southern edge of the survey. Record HER 25834 mentions the discovery of medieval pottery during a walkover and record HER 25835 is for another investigation by Archaeological Project Services (116/14) that records various post-medieval ditch fills and a small number of earlier ones with late Iron Age pottery.

The 1843 plan revealed that the survey area at that date was subdivided and this division had been removed prior to OS map editions from the 1880s, after which there is no significant change.

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 shown on DWG 03.

3.1.2 Data

The data is affected by a strongly magnetic utility that passes north to south across the centre of the site in that some streaking in the direction of travel to both sides is evident. As might be expected there is some localised distortion of the anomaly form due to the fluxgate technology used.

Despite this, the data is serviceable and overall magnetic contrast is reasonable, with clear contributions from both the superficial geology and narrow ditch fills, the latter contributing 1 – 3 nT to the magnetic field.

3.1.3 Geology and land use

Apart from the underground utility [2] the dominant character of the data is due to the superficial geology, so variation within the coastal flat deposits that blanket a considerable area around the site. Broad lateral changes within this are likely to represent former undulations and channels and the more smooth textured band [3] curving across the site could be silty fills within a former channel or similar feature.

There is no evidence for former cultivation and the only other agricultural type anomalies are the perpendicular pair of narrow ditch fills [1] that can be equated with the boundary depicted in 1843 and removed prior to the 1880s OS map edition.

3.1.4 Archaeology

There is no magnetic evidence for features of archaeological interest, although isolated and discrete pit fills, should they exist, could be masked by similar size and amplitude anomalies from natural sources.

3.2 Conclusions

There is evidence for agrarian use only with no magnetic indications of former settlement or industry. Whether medieval cultivation was once present is uncertain but seems likely given the presence of medieval ditch fills across the road to the south.

3.3 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	Vertical gradient of vertical field component
Instrument	Array of Foerster 4.032 Ferex CON 650 gradiometers
Configuration	8 sensors on a handcart
Sensitivity	> 1 nT (manufacturer's specification)
QA Procedure	Continuous observation
Spatial resolution	0.5m between lines, 0.10 – 0.15m 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	Foerster	
Drift and heading reduction	Proprietary	Reduction of mean followed by 2 nd order polynomial
Interpolation to regular grid	Proprietary	0.25 x 0.25m

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
GeoSoc	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

Acronym / term	Type	Definition
nT	Physical quantity	SI unit nano-Tesla of magnetic flux density
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
- Milsom, J, 2003, "Field Geophysics", 3rd edition, The Geological Field Guide Series, Wiley
- Rawlins, B G *et al*, 2012, "The advanced soil geochemical atlas of England and Wales". British Geological Survey, Keyworth
- 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

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
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.	
Anne Roseveare, BEng(Hons) DIS MISoilSci	Operations Manager, Environmental Geophysicist, Data Analyst
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.	
Daniel Lewis, MA BA(Hons) ACIfA	Consultant Archaeologist
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.	
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.	




PBL201 Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire
DWG 01 Site Location

Orthographic Scale: 1:10000 @ A4 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
File: PBL201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2021 OS OpenData Crown Copyright




Magnetic Survey



PBL201 Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire DWG 02 Vertical Magnetic Gradient Data

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A4 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
File: PBL201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2021





PBL201 Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire

DWG 03 Interpretation

Orthographic Scale: 1:1500 @ A4 Spatial Units: Meter. Do not scale off this drawing
File: PBL201.map Copyright TigerGeo Limited 2021