MAGNETOMETER SURVEY AT WEOBLEY, HEREFORD

Survey no. 32/81

Dates of fieldwork: 23-4 Nov 198

NG: SO 40155154

(HWCM 1069, Herefordshire no. 208)

This plot of ground in a market garden was surveyed to test whether a medieval pottery kiln lies within the site of a proposed new glasshouse. Pottery and wasters found in an earlier trench provide evidence of a kiln nearby but its location is unknown.

The plan enclosed shows the survey chart representing traverses plotted with a fluxgate magnetometer at 1m intervals across an area  $17 \times 30m$ . Much of this area is undisturbed but some of it is obscured by interference, and so there is a possibility that significant features might be concealed.

Soil conditions appear to be favourable for magnetic detection. The topsoil magnetic susceptibility reading was high (at  $157 \times 10^{-0}$  SI units/kg) and contrasts well with the subsoil (40 x  $10^{-0}$ ), and this means that any other features present in addition to kilns should also be detectable. A kiln could give a strong magnetic anomaly as seen at the bottom right of the plot, but this is also where there is most interference: The anomaly at A has the sharp positive and negative peaks characteristic of a piece of iron. The anomaly at B is wider, but after the chart was plotted it was found to be caused by a stack of metal pipes in the hedge. When these were removed the magnetometer response was seen to be quiet to within about 4m of the right-hand edge of the plot. The remaining disturbance could be caused by the corrugated iron shed alongside, but burnt material if present could also contribute. Two auger borings were therefore made and both produced charcoal fragments. These holes lie close to the original find-spot but neither

There are only slight variations in the recorded instrument signal elsewhere in the plot, and there is no anomaly of the strength that would be expected from a ditch or pit in these soil conditions. The anomaly at C is caused by the greenhouse.

The next field (to the S) was also tested by scanning with the magnetometer, but appeared to be undisturbed except where again there was interference from buildings and fences.

## CONCLUSIONS

The survey findings serve to restrict the area of concern to the extreme right-hand side of the plot, where the response from any kiln present would be confused with that from the corrugated iron shed. The charcoal found by augering here was consistent with the character of the earlier finds, but it failed to demonstrate that the kiln necessarily lies within the area surveyed. The scanning showed that the site does not appear to extend any distance into the next field to the S. The kiln might therefore lie further to the W (where the ground is already obstructed by another glasshouse), or significant features might be restricted to the immediate vicinity (4-5m radius?) of the corrugated iron shed.

A. Bartlett, A. David

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Geophysics Section Department of the Environment

Date of report: 1 March 1083

