discrete anomaly at the centre of the barrow is also tentatively interpreted. Prior to the current project this feature was not previously known although it is of probable Bronze Age date and may be the low earthwork mound recorded by the AP and LiDAR survey (Deegan 2021).

AAA13 (Illus 312 to 314)

Also recorded in F130 is AAA13 which comprises a single small (approximately 10m x 10m) square enclosure or barrow centred at NGR 491445, 442840. A linear ditch type anomaly extends westwards from the north-western corner of the enclosure/barrow. This feature is not previously recorded.

AAA14 (Illus 315 to 317)

AAA14 is centred at NGR 489530, 440850 in F135c. Four rectilinear enclosures are recorded to the immediate east of the extant boundary with four pit type responses both within and immediately adjacent to the enclosures also being recorded. Although mostly 'masked' by the high magnetic background caused by 'green waste' spread in the adjoining field, F135b, vague linear anomalies hint at the continuation of the enclosure complex west of the current field boundary. These features are not previously known assets although fragmentary cropmarks outside the survey corridor but within the same field are recorded and interpreted as of likely Iron Age or Roman date. These cropmarks are recorded as MHU22686 on the HER.

AAA15 (Illus 318 to 320)

Although the magnetic responses are weak and no clear pattern can be discerned a series of short, fragmentary, and ephemeral linear and curvilinear anomalies are recorded in F179, centred at NGR 476250, 430900. Previous survey for the CCS project recorded similar fragmentary anomalies immediately north of the current survey corridor. These anomalies clearly correlate with recently recorded extensive cropmarks which have been interpreted as indicative of 'a sizable Roman settlement comprising many rectilinear enclosures, fields and boundaries' (Deegan 2021) which is recorded as MHU 3198 and MHU22505.

AAA16 (Illus 321 to 323)

AAA16, centred at NGR 466820, 427100, in F220 comprises discontinuous linear anomalies probably locating several small enclosures. Discrete anomalies recorded predominantly in the southernmost enclosure are also interpreted as of possible archaeological origin. These features are not recorded as cropmarks.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. CONSTRAINTS/LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations or constraints which could potentially have reduced the possibility of identifying archaeological anomalies, if present, during this survey and these factors are reviewed below.

The first is the overall effectiveness of magnetometry as a technique. Magnetometry is the most widely used geophysical survey technique in archaeology as it can quickly evaluate large areas and, under favourable conditions, identify a wide range of archaeological features including infilled cut features such as large pits, gullies and ditches, hearths, and areas of burning and kilns and brick structures. It is therefore good at locating settlements of all periods, prehistoric field systems and enclosures and areas of industrial or modern activity, amongst others. It is less successful in identifying smaller features such as post-holes and small pits (except when using a non-standard sampling interval), unenclosed (prehistoric) settlement sites and graves/burial grounds. However, it is by far the single most useful technique. Other geophysical techniques are useful and can provide good results but on a reduced range of features and so are generally only used when a particular type of feature or target is likely to be encountered.

Magnetometer survey is also susceptible to the potential 'masking' effect from the spreading of 'green' waste as a soil improver, a growing problem in archaeological magnetic surveys. This material often includes ferrous debris. It can also be highly magnetic due to the breakdown of the organic material during the decomposition process, although this effect decreases over time. Only five fields have been affected by the spreading of green waste, a very small percentage of the overall survey area. However, the potential masking effects are