

## Minutes of the Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting - 25<sup>th</sup> February 2011

The meeting was held in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum on Friday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2011 at 11am.

### **Present**

Norman Palmer (Chairman)  
John Cherry  
Peter Clayton  
David Dykes  
Tim Pestell

Roger Bland (BM)  
Caroline Lyons (BM)  
Helen Loughlin (DCMS)  
Janina Parol (BM)  
Ian Richardson (BM)

### Apologies

Trevor Austin  
Ian Carradice

### **Item 1: Minutes of the meeting of Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2011**

Amendments were made and the minutes were passed as a true record of the meeting.

### **Item 2: Objects**

#### **Bronze Age artefacts**

##### **1. Bronze Age gold ornament from Glemsford, Suffolk (2010 T590)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £280-£300; the Committee viewed the ornament in light of this and agreed that its rarity as a Bronze Age item of gold contributed to its value but did not accept the suggested comparison to the gold hair rings in Ms [REDACTED]'s report. Owing to the ornament's diminutive nature, the Committee felt that a more appropriate figure was £200. Moyse's Hall Museum hopes to acquire.

##### **2. Late Bronze Age copper alloy objects from Long Bredy, Dorset (2009 T649)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £200; one of the finders submitted comments. The Committee viewed the collection in light of this, acknowledging the finder's submission. It felt that with respect to the sword hilt mentioned, there was a certain commercial appeal to this item. The Committee agreed with the suggestions of the valuer for the other items, and recommended £225. Dorset County Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **Iron Age artefacts**

##### **3. Iron Age gold alloy bracelet from Towton area, North Yorkshire (2010 T350)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £25,000-£30,000; the provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £20,000. The finders' solicitor submitted comments.

The Committee viewed the bracelet in light of these. It found the piece to be attractive and collectible, and acknowledged a certain demand for items of this nature on the market. Of the comparisons cited by [REDACTED] the Committee felt the first and second *comparanda* to be the most relevant. The Committee felt it could benefit from further explanation from Ms [REDACTED] as to the rationale behind the range of figures suggested, given her comparison of the bracelet to the Iron Age torc from the Diss area recently auctioned for £44,000 at Spink's and her comment that 'one could argue that wearable bracelets are more sought after by buyers of ancient jewellery than wearable neck torcs'. The Committee asked the Secretariat to write to Ms [REDACTED] for clarification.

The Committee received, after making inquiry by telephone, assurances from [REDACTED] that his valuation made incorrect reference to a sale, and that it was indeed the Spink's sale of October 2010, where the Diss area Iron Age neck torc sold for £44,000, to which he referred in his report. With that in mind, the Committee asked the Secretariat to write to Mr [REDACTED] for an elaboration of the rationale employed in suggesting a figure for the bracelet of less than half that of the torc, which Mr [REDACTED] stated to have been of identical construction.

It was acknowledged at the time that the neck torc from the Diss area referred to by both Ms [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] was substantially larger than the bracelet in question, being twice the size and four times heavier. Before making a recommendation on the value of this item, the Committee resolved to wait for the responses from Ms [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED]. It also instructed the Secretariat to seek a third provisional valuation for this item. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

Question to [REDACTED] – The Treasure Valuation Committee accepts your likening of this piece to figures 1 and 2 of your report. Given that you state that it is arguable that wearable bracelets are more desirable than wearable neck torcs and that bracelet prices are not calculated solely on size and weight, the Committee would appreciate any further comments on the justification of valuing this bracelet at half the value of the *comparandum* provided (the Diss torc), auctioned at Spink's in Autumn 2010.

Question to [REDACTED] – The Treasure Valuation Committee now understands that the *comparandum* suggested in this report is the Diss torc, auctioned at Spink's in Autumn 2010 for £44,000. The Committee would appreciate further elucidation as to why your suggested value is less than half that of the value the torc realised at auction.

### **Roman artefacts**

#### **4. Roman gold earring from Market Weighton area, East Riding of Yorkshire (2009 T716)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £70-£80. The Committee viewed the item in light of this and, finding the earring to be attractive, recommended £90. Hull & East Riding Museum Service hopes to acquire.

#### **5. Roman (possibly) silver finger-ring from Goring by Sea, West Sussex (2009 T492)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £35-£40. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £35. Rustington Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **6. Roman silver finger-ring from Long Ashton, North Somerset (2009 T134)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60. The Committee inspected the finger-ring with this in mind and, owing to the item's condition, recommended £50. North Somerset Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **7. Roman (possibly) silver finger-ring from Storrington, West Sussex (2008 T739)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £10-£12. The Committee examined the finger-ring in light of this and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £10. Storrington Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **8. Roman silver finger-ring from Darran, Valley, Caerphilly (10.02)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-120. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and felt that it had a substantial hoop but suffered from the lack of an intaglio, and recommended £90. Caerphilly County Borough Museums hopes to acquire.

#### **9. Roman silver mount from Llantrisant Fawr, Monmouthshire (09.15)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150-£170. The Committee inspected the mount with this in mind and found it pleasing, but noted that the suggested comparable objects in Ms [REDACTED] report were more artistic. It suggested £140. National Museum Wales hopes to acquire.

#### **10. Roman silver pin head from Yscir, Powys (10.01)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the item, noting that it had been vigorously cleaned. The Committee drew upon personal knowledge of having seen a complete example of such a pin with a duck-figure terminal, retailing at £150 at a recent trade fair. It also pointed to a comparable item it had valued previously (2007 T258 from Carlisle, Cumbria; *Portable Antiquities & Treasure Annual Report 2007*, item 96; PAS ID: NCL-0061D8; valued at £50), though the item currently at issue was felt to be more attractive. The Committee recommended £160. Brecknock Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **11. Roman gold finger-ring from Acton Bridge, Cheshire (2010 T293)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £2,500. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and commented on the fine intaglio and substance in the hoop. It mentioned another similar ring, though

with flawed intaglio, that had previously been valued (2005 T276 from Denton with Wootton, Kent; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, item 120; PAS ID: KENT-8F44B2; valued £1650). The Committee felt that the valuer has cited a good parallel in his report, and, in agreement with Mr [REDACTED] it recommended £2,500. Grosvenor House Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Early Medieval artefacts**

#### **12. Anglo-Saxon silver buckle loop from Swindon area, Wiltshire (2009 T86)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60-£70. The Committee viewed the buckle in light of this, noting the small size but lack of corrosion, and in agreement with the provisional valuer recommended £65. Wiltshire Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **13. Early Medieval gold bead fragment from Stanstead Abbots, Hertfordshire (2009 T598)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£120, and the Committee inspected the bead in light of this. Owing to the item's extremely small size, which makes identification difficult and detracts from its appeal, the Committee recommended £70. Ware Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **14. Late Saxon silver strap end from Wittlesey, Cambridgeshire (2006 T73)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75. The Committee viewed this strap end in light of the information, and felt that it was a pleasing artefact. Noting that complete strap-ends are regularly seen to achieve prices in the region of £150, the Committee felt that the suggested value seemed fair. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £75. Peterborough Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **15. Late Saxon silver-gilt fragment from Market Rasen area, Lincolnshire (2010 T28)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee took account of this as it inspected the item. It agreed that the interesting object was probably Carolingian, and that the central setting made for an appealing piece that would likely attract attention on the market. The Committee recommended £90. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

#### **16. Early Medieval gold button or fitting from Northleach, Gloucestershire (2008 T646)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £400-£450. The Committee examined the button in light of this, agreed that had a good substance and was likely to be Anglo-Saxon, and in agreement with the provisional valuer recommended £450. Corinium Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **17. Early Medieval gold disc from Wix area, Essex (2009 T395)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,500-£1,800. The Committee considered the disc in light of this. It agreed that the workmanship may have been better than the parallels suggested (as Ms [REDACTED] argued) but fundamentally the piece was incomplete and thin; those *comparanda* cited by Ms [REDACTED] were all complete. For a closer comparison, the Committee drew attention to a similar fragmentary Early Medieval pendant it had previously valued (2009 T142 from Tolleshunt Major, Essex; PAS ID: ESS-7E4F06; valued at £550) though 2009 T142 was noted not to have a central setting. Taking account of all of this, the Committee recommended £1,400. Colchester & Ipswich Museum service hopes to acquire.

#### **18. Early Medieval silver-gilt buckle from Doynton, South Gloucestershire (2010 T39)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £850-£950; the finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the buckle in light of these.

The Committee agreed that the buckle was a handsome piece, with pleasing, distinct decoration and it commented that the silver was in good condition and had not oxidized. The Committee felt that the first example in Ms [REDACTED]'s report was the most relevant, and weighed the characteristics of these items against one another; the Doynton buckle was silver-gilt but incomplete, whereas the Gothic buckle in the Hermann Historica Auction was complete, with a tongue, but of bronze composition (and was unsold at 800 Euros).

The Committee agreed with the Finder that the other examples cited by Ms [REDACTED] bore little relation to the Doynton buckle. However, it found nothing further in the Finder's submission which would suggest an

uplift in Ms [REDACTED]'s suggested figure. In agreement with the provisional valuation, the Committee recommended £850. Bristol City Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **19. Early Medieval gold finger-ring from York area, North Yorkshire (2009 T223)**

The first provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £45,000; the second provisional valuer Judith [REDACTED] suggested £18,000-£22,000. The Museum and the Finder submitted comments. The Committee took account of these as it inspected the finger-ring, noting the remarkable range in the two suggested valuations, part of which it attributed to nature of this piece; as both valuers and the finder observed, it was difficult to find a close parallel to this ring in the market. The Committee felt that the large central sapphire added to the appeal of this wearable item, but also took notice of the missing sections of red glass. On balance, the Committee felt that a figure between the two suggestions was accurate, and it recommended £35,000. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

#### **20. Anglo-Saxon gold coin pendant from Billericay area, Essex (2009 T496) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £1,200; the Museum had submitted comments. The Committee requested a second provisional valuation (13/1/11). The second provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £320. The Finder submitted comments.

The Committee examined the pendant in light of this and took account of the [REDACTED]'s submission and the Museum's earlier comments. The Committee agreed that the pendant is an 'object' and not a piece of circulating currency, but it expressed the view that as a critical component of the pendant is in fact an Early Medieval coin, whose appeal would be greatest among numismatists, the contribution of the coin to the overall value of the piece should be accounted for.

The Committee noted that in some instances the incorporation of a coin into an ancient item adds to that item's appeal; in other circumstances, where for instance the rarity of the coin may make it an artefact of considerable worth *numismatically*, the modification of the coin into a brooch may detract from its value.

In this instance, the Committee agreed that Mr [REDACTED]'s suggestion concentrated too heavily on the numismatic value of the piece and that not enough weight had been given to the overall appeal of the piece as an item of jewellery. The Committee took account of the wear suffered by the item but felt that the effect of this factor on the attraction of the piece was less than Mr [REDACTED] had estimated.

On balance, the Committee was minded to recommend £750. Chelmsford Museum hopes to acquire

#### **21. Anglo-Saxon gold finger-ring and lead spindle whorl from west Yorkshire area (2009 T221) - addenda to 2008 T553 - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

[REDACTED] had valued this item at £85,010; [REDACTED] had valued this item at £28,000-£32,000. The Committee recommended £60,010 (1/10/10). The Finder and Landowner's solicitor submitted a challenge on their behalf.

The Committee viewed this ring again (as the added value of the spindle whorl seems to have been accepted) and duly considered the points raised in the solicitor's submission. It sought to reassure those parties that it had duly considered both of the provisional valuations and that the figure previously recommended took account of the concerns expressed by the solicitor. The Committee reaffirmed its position that the value recommended for the ring in question gave full credit to the significance and rarity of this find, and was in proper proportion to the figure that the Committee felt was accurate for the other star item in this hoard (the ring from 2008 T553).

With respect to the source of the rattling within the ring in question, the Committee took advice from the British Museum's Department of Conservation and Scientific Research. This department confirmed that at the time of the curatorial inspection of the object, it had been X-rayed from five positions with the most powerful X-ray machine at the museum, but that those images had failed to portray the interior of the ring. The advice of the scientists at the museum was that the only other non-invasive method of investigating the interior of the ring would be to have the item subjected to an industrial CT scan, but that even that test is unlikely to be informative.

The Committee commented that it would be both inappropriate in terms of its responsibility to ensure due care was

taken of the object, and disproportionate to any reasonably expected prospect of an increase in the value of the item, to initiate any attempt to extricate the source of the rattle, as this would likely damage the ring. Finally, the Committee accepted that there was nothing on the outside of the ring to suggest that it contained an item of any significance, other than as an internal support for the bezel. As the Committee felt that it did not have sufficient assurance that a CT scan or any other non-invasive procedure would produce conclusive results in demonstrating the source of the rattle, it resolved to maintain its original recommendation of £60,010 for this case, without instructing further examination of the concealed component.

The Committee concluded that, apart from the question of the rattle, which was the only new and material point to have been raised since the Committee's last consideration of this case, there was nothing in the letter to cause the Committee to depart from its original value of £60,010.

Leeds Museum hopes to acquire.

## **22. Viking Weight set with Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt pendant from Tadcaster, North Yorkshire (2009 T206) - 4<sup>th</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £700-800; The Finder had submitted comments regarding the valuation and the division of the reward. The original Landowner had submitted comments regarding the division of the reward. The Museum had submitted comments regarding the valuation; the Finder had responded to the Museum's comments. The Committee requested a second provisional valuation (12/08/10) and responded to issues regarding the division of reward. The second provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £500; the Landowner had submitted comments. The Committee agreed to recommend a valuation of £500. It also requested that the Secretariat write to the finder and club with various questions (26/11/10). The Finder and the metal detecting club have submitted comments with regards to the questions put to them.

The Committee viewed the material again in light of this. It maintained its previous recommendation of £500 for the weight, but in determining the apportionment of the reward it discussed whether there was any cause to recommend an abatement of Mrs [REDACTED]'s share. The Committee was inclined to believe that the delay in reporting the item as Treasure was due to genuine doubt on Mrs [REDACTED]'s behalf that the weight contained enough previous metal to be a candidate for Treasure. The Committee was also prepared to accept that Mrs [REDACTED] had not deliberately misrepresented the agreement to which she was party concerning the division of the reward, and noted that she was now happy to accept the normal division of 50% of the value to each party. With that in mind, the Committee found no occasion to depart from the normal practice of recommending that 50% of the reward be paid to the Finder and 50% to the landowner (that being the person who owned the land at the time of the discovery). The British Museum hopes to acquire.

## **Medieval artefacts**

### **23. Medieval silver pendant cross from Lichfield, Staffordshire (2009 T338)**

[REDACTED] has valued this item at £75. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this, and in agreement with the provisional valuer recommended £75. Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent, hopes to acquire.

### **24. Medieval silver-gilt crucifix from Winterbourne Kingston, Dorset (2010 T139)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee inspected the pendant with this in mind and found the modelling of the figure to be crude but appealing. It noticed the trace of a loop to enable suspension and felt that an uplift in the suggested value was warranted. It recommended £250. Dorset County Museum hopes to acquire.

### **25. Medieval silver-gilt coin brooch from Claxby with Moorsby, Lincolnshire (2010 T466)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £90. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and, in agreement with the suggested value, recommended £90. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

**26. Medieval silver annular brooch from Montgomery, Powys (09.03)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee examined the brooch in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer recommended £100. Old Bell Museum, Montgomery, hopes to acquire.

**27. Medieval silver-gilt annular brooch from East Riding area, East Riding of Yorkshire (2010 T310)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £300; the Committee viewed the brooch in light of this. Expressing concern over the degree of wear to this item, the Committee recommended £250. Hull & East Riding Museum hopes to acquire.

**28. Late Medieval/ Early Post-Medieval gold clasp from Carew, Pembrokeshire (09.17)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £200. The Committee examined the object with this in mind and took account of the logic employed by Mr [REDACTED]. In common with him, the Committee felt the aesthetic appeal of the object was limited, and it recommended £190. Scolton Manor Museum hopes to acquire.

**29. Medieval silver-gilt iconographic finger-ring from Ashington, West Sussex (2008 T629)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60; the Finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the object in light of this and found the clear carving of the saint, with remnants of enamelling on the shoulder of the ring and the presence of an attractive, scalloped hoop, to lend more appeal to the item than had been accounted for in Mr [REDACTED]'s report.

The Committee considered this ring alongside another iconographic ring (2008 T497 from Wantage area, Oxfordshire; PAS ID: IOW-8CF9E7) which was very worn but valued at £150. On balance, the Committee recommended £300 for the finger-ring from Ashington. Horsham Museum hopes to acquire.

**30. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Wantage area, Oxfordshire (2008 T497)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and noted the dull silver colour and the heavy wear of the item. This ring was looked at alongside another iconographic ring (2008 T629 from Ashington, West Sussex; PAS ID: SUSS-9E63B4; valued at £300) which was in much better condition and depicted a clear carving of saint. In comparison, the suggested value of the ring in question was felt to have been overstated, and the Committee recommended £150. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**31. Medieval silver finger-ring from Drayton Bassett, Staffordshire (2010 T91)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100; The Committee viewed the finger-ring with this in mind and expressed regret at the ring's current incomplete state. The Committee recommended £80. Tamworth Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

**32. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring fragment from Grove, Oxfordshire (2009 T540)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£150. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the fragment and agreed with the valuer's comment regarding the difficulty of selling an object in this condition at auction. The Committee felt that survival of an inscription lent some attraction to the piece, and it recommended £90. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**33. Medieval gold finger-ring from Backwell, North Somerset (2010 T40)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,600. The Committee inspected the ring in light of this and found the emerald small but beautifully formed. It noted that the ring was suffering from a few scrapes. The Committee further observed that sapphire rings of this type are more common than those set with emeralds, and on balance it felt that the suggested value was reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £1600. North Somerset Museum hopes to acquire.

**34. Medieval gold finger-ring from Tendring area, Essex (2009 T110) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £2,000. The Committee had drawn attention to comparisons from a recent sale, on 9 September 2010 by TimeLine Auctions, of a series of gold Post-Medieval rings (see lots 890-895). Though later in date, these rings were felt to be broadly similar in terms

of attraction to the piece in question, and the prices realised in the auction ranged from £800 to £1600. The Committee requested a second provisional valuation (13/1/11).

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £380. The Committee viewed the ring again in light of this and took account of the light weight of the ring and the substantial wear it had been subjected to. The Committee recommended £600. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**35. Late Medieval gold finger-ring from North Petherton, Somerset (2009 T416) - 3<sup>rd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] had suggested £4,000. On viewing the ring, the Committee was concerned that the suggested value did not correlate with its own expectations as to what this ring was worth. The Committee requested a second provisional valuation (12/08/10).

The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] had suggested £500. The Committee requested a third provisional valuation. (26/11/10)

The third provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £650. The Committee inspected the ring again and took account of these valuations. It commented that the symbols were attractive and that this ring would command certain attention on the market, but agreed that Ms [REDACTED]'s suggested figure was too high. The Committee found Mr [REDACTED]'s suggested comparisons and reasoning convincing, and considering all of the information, it recommended £750. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

**Post-Medieval artefacts**

**36. Post-Medieval silver toothpick/earscoop fragment from Bronnington, Wrexham (09.12)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the silver fragment and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £75. Wrexham Museum hopes to acquire.

**37. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress fitting from Brawdy, Pembrokeshire (09.10)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee viewed the fitting in light of this and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £50. Scolton Manor Museum hopes to acquire.

**38. Post-Medieval silver dress fitting from Carhampton, Somerset (2009 T635)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee inspected the fitting in light of this and, whilst questioning the aesthetic appeal of this piece, considered that as the fitting represented a new type the suggested value was reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £50. Somerset County Museum hopes to acquire.

**39. Post-Medieval silver cap badge from Great Hale, Lincolnshire (2010 T203)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee examined the badge in light of this and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £50. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

**40. Post-Medieval silver hooked tag from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T570)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40. The Committee viewed the hooked tag in light of this and concluded that its unusual nature justified a modest uplift in the suggested value. The Committee recommended £50. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**41. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress accessory from Colchester area, Essex (2009 T502)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£150. The Committee viewed the dress accessory in light of this, commenting that the curious piece would attract some attention in the market. In agreement with the provisional valuer the Committee recommended £100. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

#### **42. Post-Medieval gold posy ring from Avon (2009 T371)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £400. The Committee examined the ring in light of this and commented on its delicate nature and distorted state, which the Committee felt would lower its appeal. The Committee recommended £300. Bath Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **43. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Rowington, Warwickshire (2009 T375) - 4<sup>th</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] had suggested £8,000; the Finder had submitted comments. The Committee requested a second provisional valuation (12/08/10). The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] had suggested £1,500-£2,000; the Finder had submitted further comments. The Committee requested a third provisional valuation (26/11/10). The third provisional valuer, [REDACTED] had suggested £600; the Finder and Landowner had submitted further comments. The Committee recommended £2,000 (13/01/11).

The Finder submitted a challenge. The Committee considered the ring again in light of the Finder's most recent submission. It was not inclined to attach any weight to the speculation that the letters inscribed on the ring reflected an historical association with Pinley Abbey. Having previously considered the matter of the distortion to the ring, the Committee saw nothing further in the Finder's submission to cause it to depart from its previous recommendation of £2,000. Warwickshire Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Item 3: Coins**

#### **Iron Age coins**

#### **44. Iron Age gold staters (9) from Chartham, Kent (2008 T610) - 2<sup>nd</sup> addenda to 1999/2000 Chartham, Kent**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £2,890. The Committee inspected the coins in light of this and, noting that Mr [REDACTED] had accounted for recent auction precedents and the condition of the staters, it found itself in agreement with the suggested value, and recommended £2,890. Canterbury Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **Roman coins**

#### **45. Roman silver coins (4) from Yscir, Powys (09.20)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £85. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and, commenting that Mr [REDACTED]'s report was well-supported, recommended in agreement with him £85. Brecknock Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **46. Roman coin hoard (10) from Uttlesford area, Essex (2009 T3) - addenda to 2009 T465**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,750-£2,000. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the hoard. It found the condition of the three *solidi* to be appealing, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £1800. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **47. Roman coin hoard (7) and Roman gold finger-ring from Uttlesford area, Essex (2009 T465) - addenda to 2009 T3**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £730-850 for the coins; the provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £3,500-£4,000 for the ring.

The Committee inspected the items in light of this.

In terms of the coins, the Committee felt that Mr [REDACTED] had allocated an accurate range for the group. As the *solidus* of Honorius was nicely preserved, the Committee recommended £850 for the group.

When the Committee inspected the ring it took note of the item's compressed state. The Committee further observed that the *comparanda* supplied by Ms [REDACTED] were of much better quality than the piece in question; on the other hand, it had previously valued at a lower figure similar Roman gold rings that were in a worse state. Balancing the more expensive items suggested as comparisons by Ms [REDACTED] with the less dear rings previously valued by the Committee, the Committee felt that an accurate figure for the ring in question was



£2,900.

In total the Committee recommended £3,750 for this case. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **48. Roman coin hoard (2905) from East Sussex area (2006 T4) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £48,060 for the entire hoard, and £9,736 for a selection of fifty coins. It had been requested that the Committee make a recommendation for a) the entire hoard and b) the 50 coin selection, itemised in the manner of the provisional valuer.

The Finder (Mr [REDACTED]s) and the Landowner (Mr [REDACTED]) had made submissions regarding the apportionment of the reward, and the Finder submitted a private valuation. On the strength of those submissions, the Committee resolved to ask the Finder several direct questions (13/1/11).

The Finder responded to the Secretariat's letter and the Landowner supplied further comments on this response. The Committee considered all of this information as it discussed the case.

In terms of the valuation, the British Museum is interested only in acquiring a selection of the coins. The Committee re-examined the coins and consulted the provisional valuation, taking notice of the private valuation submitted by the Finder. The Committee pointed out that the updated suggestion for the Cornelia Supera coin was higher than an earlier suggestion, but this was felt to reflect the fact that this coin is superior to both examples existing in the British Museum's collection and that this is only the second of its kind to have been found in the United Kingdom. For the selection, the Committee felt the breakdown was accurate and the justification was sound, though the Committee commented that some conservation would have to be undertaken, and should be accounted for. It therefore recommended £9,200.

For the record, the Committee felt it would be wise to agree a figure for the whole hoard, in the event that a museum could be found to purchase the rest of the coins. It recommended £46,010, which included the value of the pot.

The Committee then considered the proper apportionment of the reward as between Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED]. Since Mr [REDACTED] had alleged that Mr [REDACTED] did not, at relevant times, have permission to detect on the land where the coins were found, the Committee was obliged to determine whether there existed sufficient cause to recommend an abatement of Mr [REDACTED]s share of the reward. Upon reviewing the evidence before it, the Committee observed that Mr Symonds did not deny having recovered the first two coins (of Gordian III) before seeking permission to detect from the Mr [REDACTED]. The Committee further observed that by an email dated 28<sup>th</sup> December 2005 Mr [REDACTED] had granted only qualified future permission for the Finder to return to the site in order to conduct a further search. In that email, Mr [REDACTED] had required Mr [REDACTED] to notify Mr [REDACTED] of his next intended visit and to enable Mr [REDACTED] to accompany Mr [REDACTED] on Mr [REDACTED]'s next search of Mr [REDACTED]'s land. The Committee further observed that Mr [REDACTED] had not in terms denied either the setting of these conditions by Mr [REDACTED] or Mr [REDACTED]'s knowledge of them. Having regard to these matters, and taking account of the possibility that emails between Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] may have crossed on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2005, the Committee concluded on a balance of probabilities that Mr [REDACTED] had visited Mr [REDACTED]s land on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2005 in breach of the conditions imposed by Mr [REDACTED] and that Mr [REDACTED] had been aware of those conditions at that time. The Committee further noted that Mr [REDACTED] did report his finds to the Finds Liaison Officer and that he did come forward in good faith and make the finds known to Mr [REDACTED]. Nonetheless the Committee felt that Mr [REDACTED] should have sought permission from the owner of the land before the commencement of any detecting at all, and should have complied with the later conditions imposed by Mr [REDACTED]. The Committee accordingly recommended that Mr [REDACTED]'s portion of the reward be reduced by 10%, with that amount to be added to Mr [REDACTED]s share.

The recommended apportionment, then, in relation to the value was:

£5,060 to Mr [REDACTED] and

£4,140 to Mr [REDACTED]

The recommended apportionment in relation to the value of the whole hoard was:

£25,305.50 to Mr [REDACTED] and

£20,704.50 to Mr [REDACTED]

It was brought to the Committee's attention that the British Museum has the funds available to purchase this selection only until 31 March. In the absence of full agreement to the recommendation from the interested parties, the Committee therefore asked the Secretariat to seek agreement from the parties to the recommended value of the selection, £9,200, and acknowledged that any disagreements with the apportionment may be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

### Medieval coins:

#### [Peter Clayton left the room]

#### **49. Medieval silver coins (16) from Kings Langley area, Hertfordshire (2009 T125) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] had suggested £775. The Committee asked the Secretariat to seek more information from the British Museum curator with regard to the prospect that the coins had been cleaned; it also asked the Secretariat to write to the Finder and Landowner in this case for more information regarding the Finder's permission to detect on the land where the coins were found. (26/11/10)

The British Museum, Conservation Department, submitted comments with regards to the condition of the coins. The Landowner provided two submissions, the first with regard to the Finder's permission to detect, the second describing where the byelaws are physically situated. The Finder provided three submissions, the first from his father, the second regarding the condition of the coins and permission to detect, the third regarding the byelaws notice board. The Finder also provided images of the notice boards that were circulated at the meeting.

The Committee examined the coins again and considered the various submissions. It first pointed out that the portion of the submission by the Finder's father which referred to the prospect of publicity would not constitute a factor in the Committee's decision on this case. The Committee asked the Secretariat to advise the Finder's father in very clear terms that the Committee is not influenced by such matters.

As to the value of the coins, the Committee found Mr [REDACTED]'s suggestions to be reasonable, but felt that a modest uplift was called for and recommended £800.

With regards to the cleaning of the coins, the Committee noted with concern that the statements received from the British Museum's Conservation Department and from the Finder both confirmed that the coins had been heavily cleaned in places. On balance, the Committee accepted that the Finder's actions did not appear to have been motivated by a desire to do deliberate damage to the coins and saw no cause to abate his reward on this account, though it resolved to give warning to the Finder that in the future the Finder should take care to ensure that the cleaning of items of Treasure should be left to conservation professionals in order to prevent the loss of potentially important material. (In any case, items of Treasure are to be valued by the Committee in the condition in which they were discovered, and should be cleaned and conserved only after being acquired by a museum.)

In respect of the Finder's lack of permission to use a metal detector on common land belonging to the Dacorum Borough Council, the Committee accepted several of the points raised by the Finder and the Finder's father, namely: that the manner in which the Chipperfield Common byelaws are displayed in the carpark, and the damage to and penetration of water into their display case, make them difficult to read; that the byelaws prohibiting certain forms of digging or cutting on the land impose no specific prohibition on the use of metal detectors; and that the Millenium Map housed in Chipperfield Village Hall promotes the local heritage through the display of finds of portable antiquities but fails to mention that using a metal detector on council land is prohibited. The Committee recommended that if the Council wishes to implement effectively its evident opposition to the use of metal detectors on such common land, it should consider making specific reference to such an embargo in its byelaws and ensuring that the signage displaying the byelaws is properly drafted, managed and maintained.

Notwithstanding these considerations, the Committee took the view that anyone engaged in the hobby of metal detecting should be aware that it is his or her constant responsibility to ensure that permission to detect

on a given piece of land has been granted by the owner of that land, and that this permission should be secured prior to the commencement of any searching. This principal is outlined in the Treasure Act Code of Practice but is also accepted by the National Council for Metal Detecting and most Metal Detecting clubs.

With that in mind, and taking account of the fact that the finder had displayed honesty in reporting an accurate findspot for the coins, the Committee was minded to recommend an abatement of 10% of the Finder's share of the reward, to be allocated to the Landowner.

Therefore the reward was recommended to be distributed as follows:

Landowner (Dacorum Council): £440

Finder: £360

Dacorum Heritage Trust hopes to acquire.

**[Peter Clayton re-entered the room]**

### **Post-Medieval coins:**

#### **50. Post-Medieval silver coin hoard and pottery vessel from Bedale area, North Yorkshire (2009 T459)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250, consisting of £120 for the Edward VI shilling, £80 for the Philip IV coin and £50 for the two broken vessels. The Committee inspected the hoard and vessels in light of this and agreed that Mr [REDACTED] report was thorough and reasoned. In agreement with the provisional valuation, the Committee recommended £250. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **51. Spanish-American gold coins from South East Lincoln area, Lincolnshire (2010 T271)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £6,650. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and commented on the balanced valuation from Mr [REDACTED] which attributed proper weight to the interest that these coins would generate on the market. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £6,650. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

### **Item 4: Norfolk Cases [Tim Pestell left the room]**

#### **52. Early Medieval silver pin fragment from Narborough area, Norfolk (2010 T351)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20-£25. The Committee viewed the pin in light of this and felt the suggested range was reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £25. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **53. Early Medieval silver strap end from Fakenham area, Norfolk (2010 T331)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £220-£250. The Finder submitted comments. The Committee inspected the strap end in light of this and took account of the Finder's submission. It noted that the item was mostly complete but worn, and in agreement with the provisional valuer's well-supported report the Committee recommended £220. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **54. Anglo-Saxon gold bracteate from Holt area, Norfolk (2009 T657)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £5,500; [REDACTED] also valued two pieces of 'edging' at £20 but these were declared 'not Treasure' by the coroner and these were not considered as part of the case. The Finder submitted comments.

The Committee inspected the bracteate in light of this, factoring into its discussion the rarity of the piece and its large size as well as the distortion and incomplete edging. The Committee took account of the Finder's suggested comparison of this piece with a bracteate found in the same area of Norfolk in 2004 (2004 T297; *Treasure Annual Report 2004*, item 109, valued at £6000) which it noted was smaller in size and weight but which was better preserved around the edges. On balance, and in accordance with the Committee's own views regarding the demand in the market for this class of item, the Committee recommended £6,250. Norwich Castle Museum hope to acquire.

### **55. Roman copper alloy coin hoard (28) from Swanton Morley, Norfolk (2008 T707)**

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £70. The Committee inspected this case with that in mind and taking into account the condition of the coins, recommended £55. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

[Tim Pestell re-entered the room]

### **Item 5: Any Other Business**

#### **Anglo-Saxon coins from Harswell, East Riding of Yorkshire (2007 T311) - 3<sup>rd</sup> viewing**

The Committee recommended £500 for these coins (1/10/10) but abated the share of the Finder [REDACTED] by 100%. The identity of the Landowner remains unknown. [REDACTED] has not responded to any letters from the Committee's Secretariat. At its meeting of 13 January 2011, the Committee's advice on the proper course of action for the DCMS or its agent to take was to agree a placement of the coins in the East Riding Museums Service under the terms of a long-term 'loan', which would allow for a reward to be paid in the future to the Landowner if information about his or her identity ever emerged.

The local museum interested in acquiring these coins, the East Riding Museums Service, is not willing to accept the coins under these conditions and is minded to withdraw its interest. As it is not in the public interest for the coins to be returned to Mr [REDACTED] nor for them to remain in 'limbo' in the British Museum, could the Committee please consider whether it could recommend an alternative course of action where the coins would be placed with the East Riding Museums Service?

The Committee suggested the possibility of finding a person or body to covenant with the Crown to provide the landowner's reward for this find, in the event that the Landowner's identity were to come to light in the future. This would allow the East Riding Museums Service to acquire the coins immediately without fear of having to earmark and commit existing funds indefinitely or raise funds at some uncertain point in the future. [REDACTED] agreed to speak to the DCMS legal advisors with regards to this proposal

**Iron Age Grave goods from 'Near Portesham' Dorset (2010 T415) -** This case is due to come before the Committee at the conclusion of the coroner's inquest. The local museum has expressed concern over the fragile nature of some of the material, which is currently in Bournemouth, and fears damage if it is transported. If the robust items are brought to the British Museum for valuation, would you be content for the provisional valuer and for the Committee to value the fragile items by photograph?

The Committee agreed that the stable objects should be brought to the British Museum and that the fragile objects, including the fragmentary mirror, could be valued both provisionally and by the Committee itself, from photographs. The Committee further agreed to ask the provisional valuer to make their suggestion from the evidence of the photographs of the unconserved mirror.

**Good-bye to Thomas Curtis** – The provisional valuer and ex-member of the Treasure Valuation Committee Thomas Curtis formally gave notice of his retirement from the business of valuing Treasure finds. The Committee expressed its appreciation and gratitude for Mr Curtis's diligent work over the years in both capacities, and wished him the best of luck for the future.

**Best wishes to Trevor Austin** – The Committee wished Trevor Austin good health and a speedy recovery.

**Departure of Vice-Chairman Dr Jack Ogden** - The Committee resolved to record its deep regret at Jack's decision not to pursue an extension of either his vice-chairmanship of the Committee or membership therein. The Committee extended its heartfelt thanks for Jack's many years of service in both roles and wished him the best of luck in his future endeavours.

The Committee was grateful for and agreed with [REDACTED]'s suggestion that the issue of appointing a replacement for Dr Ogden, both as a member and as Vice-Chairman to the Committee, should wait until the next Chairman has been appointed.

**Coroner for Treasure, revisions to the Treasure Act Code of Practice** – At its meeting of the 26<sup>th</sup> of November, the Committee had given its endorsement to a proposal whereby the instalment and operation of a single Coroner for Treasure (as detailed in the Coroner's and Justice Act 2009) could be effected at minimal cost through cooperation with the British Museum's Department of Portable Antiquities & Treasure.

The Chairman inquired whether any further progress had been made towards the establishment of a Coroner for Treasure.

██████████ confirmed that after discussion with the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), that office confirmed that it is content for the DCMS to take the lead in consultation regarding the proposed operation of a coroner for Treasure. The DCMS is in the final stages of drafting a consultation document on said operations, which is to be circulated amongst a selection of coroners for their comments.

It is hoped that mutual acceptance of the proposals will allow for the post of Coroner for Treasure to be appointed and that this will in turn trigger a review of the Treasure Act Code of Practice.

The Committee expressed its concern that little progress had been made in this regard and reaffirmed its view that the appointment of a single Coroner for Treasure and the implementation of the other changes spelled out in the Coroner's and Justice Act 2009 with regard to Treasure would (a) significantly discourage wrongful dealings in treasure, (b) assist the proper reception of treasure into the public domain, (c) reduce the risk of costly and damaging legal challenges to deliberations by coroners and other parties to the treasure process, and (d) promote the general efficiency of the Treasure Act.

**Item 6: Date of next meeting** - Thursday, 5 May 2011, Hartwell Room, British Museum.