

Minutes for Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting – 5th May 2011

The meeting was held in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum on Thursday 5th May 2011 at 11am.

Present

Committee:

Norman Palmer (Chair)
Trevor Austin
Ian Carradice
John Cherry
Peter Clayton
David Dykes
Tim Pestell

Other:

Caroline Barton (BM)
Roger Bland (BM)
Caroline Lyons (BM)
Ian Richardson (BM)
Kathryn Barrett (DCMS)
Nicki Fox (DCMS)
Colin Renfrew (incumbent Chair)

Item 1: Chairman Professor Palmer welcomed Lord Renfrew as the Chair designate of the Committee

Item 2: Minutes of the meeting of Friday 25th February 2011 – The chairman submitted corrections and the minutes were passed as a true record.

Item 3: Objects

Bronze Age artefacts

1. Bronze Age hoard from Stannington, Northumberland (2010 T442)

██████████ suggested £1,500-£1,800. The Committee viewed the hoard in light of this. It felt that the valuer's formula for arriving at a figure, which placed heavy emphasis on the value of the complete axes, was accurate, and in agreement with the valuer it recommended £1500. Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle, hopes to acquire.

2. Bronze Age base metal group from Amport area, Hampshire (2007 T704) – 3rd viewing

██████████ valued this item at £1,500; comments were supplied by one Finder (Mr ██████████), the Landowner and an Archaeologist involved in the case. The Committee felt that the provisional valuation for the axes was accurate, and noted that it agreed with both the global figure suggested (£1,500) and the figures for the individual axes (£200 for the socketed axes, £300 for the palstaves) (14/04/10).

The coroner named three finders in this case – Ms ██████████ (3 axes), Mr ██████████ (1 axe) and Mr ██████████ (2 axes). Mr ██████████ has accepted that his discovery was made in the course of the archaeological work commissioned by Mr ██████████ (the Landowner) and does not claim a share of the reward. Mr ██████████ however, has indicated that he wished to claim a share of the reward.

At its meeting of 13/01/11, the Committee had asked the Secretariat to write to Mr ██████████ and Mr ██████████ with the following question:

As you may know the question has been raised as to whether Mr ██████████ was, at the time of his discovery of two axeheads, engaged in the investigation led by Ms ██████████ The Committee would be interested to hear your views on this matter.

An answer from Mr ██████████ has been received.

The Committee considered the evidence before it, noting Mr ██████████'s lack of response to the inquiry mentioned above and taking account of the e-mail from Mr ██████████. The Committee felt that Mr ██████████'s e-mail did not fully answer the question that the Committee had raised as to whether Mr ██████████ had been engaged in the investigation of the area led by Ms ██████████.

In determining who, as between Ms [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] should receive the finder's share of the reward for the three axes found subsequent to Ms [REDACTED]'s initial discovery, the Committee felt that it still required further information from the relevant parties as to:

- Whether Mr [REDACTED] was participating in an archaeological investigation or excavation;
- If Mr [REDACTED] was participating in an archaeological investigation or excavation, whether any part of the material uncovered by Mr [REDACTED] in that capacity should be considered part of the hoard to be accredited to Ms [REDACTED] for the purposes of reward or should be attributed to a separate hoard in respect of which Ms [REDACTED] should receive no reward.
- Whether Mr [REDACTED] was acting independently of the archaeological investigation which Ms [REDACTED] led and in which Mr [REDACTED] took part.

The Committee noted that Ms [REDACTED]'s e-mails of 9 December 2010 made it clear that she considered Mr [REDACTED] to have taken part in the investigation. It also noted that both [REDACTED] (e-mail of 6 May 2010) and Mr [REDACTED] (email of 4 February 2011) made clear that they felt Ms [REDACTED] should receive the entirety of the finder's share for all six axes discovered. However, neither submission stated clearly whether the authors felt Mr [REDACTED] had participated in the archaeological investigation.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to write to Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] asking for them to state specifically whether they felt Mr [REDACTED] was knowingly engaged in an archaeological investigation.

The Committee further asked the Secretariat to write again to Mr [REDACTED] asking him again to answer the same question.

The Committee also observed that on a literal interpretation paragraph 78 of the *Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (revised)*, which provides for an original finder who does not remove the whole find from the ground to receive the entire finder's portion of a reward for items of Treasure that are later uncovered by archaeologists, seems to apply only in instances where a find is partially removed by a finder, whose subsequent reporting allows for archaeologists (or those engaged in an archaeological investigation) to remove the remainder of the find. In this instance, Ms [REDACTED] removed all of the items that she had found (three axe heads) and reported them, but seems to have been unaware at that time of the existence of the other three axe heads, located some distance from the original findspot. This potential ambiguity led the Committee to debate whether the practice of rewarding a finder for later discoveries on the same general site should apply in this instance. To aid its deliberations, the Committee asked the Secretariat to ask Dr Ben Roberts, the British Museum Bronze Age curator who authored the report for the coroner, whether he could state with any more conviction whether the three latest axes should be considered to have been deposited together with those discovered by Ms [REDACTED] (that is, are the two axes found by Mr [REDACTED] perfectly consistent in type and surface condition as those found earlier). The Committee also asked the Secretariat to liaise with the Finds Liaison Officer and/or archaeologist (as appropriate) to learn exactly how far apart the axes were found and whether this distribution is consistent with ploughing in the field.

The Committee also asked the Secretariat to write to Ms [REDACTED] and ask her for a more detailed summary of the circumstances of her original discovery, particularly as to whether she felt that she had uncovered only part of the hoard before contacting the archaeologists, and whether that reporting led to the recovery of other items in the same original hoard or merely to the chance discover of other 'unconnected' items on the same general site.

Hampshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

Iron Age artefacts

3. Iron Age gold alloy bracelet from Towton area, North Yorkshire (2010 T350) - 2nd viewing

[REDACTED] suggested £25,000-£30,000; [REDACTED] suggested £20,000. The finder's solicitor submitted comments. The Committee requested further information from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and a third provisional valuation from [REDACTED] (25/2/11).

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided further information; [REDACTED] valued this item at £15,000. The

finders' solicitor provided a submission including a private valuation from Mr [REDACTED] of Spink's for £25,000 - £30,000.

The Committee considered the bracelet in light of this evidence. The Committee felt that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had answered the questions put to them adequately and thus the Committee had more cause to accept their valuation reports.

The Committee regarded it as significant that the *comparandum* used by all three valuers, the Iron Age gold torc (the Diss torc), sold at Spink's in Autumn 2010 for a sum considerably in excess of its pre-auction estimate. The Committee observed that items of this nature come on the open market only infrequently and that there is appeal for them amongst the wider public, and took the view that these considerations were particularly material in valuing the Towton bracelet. Attractive in appearance, size and weight, the bracelet was adjudged by the Committee to possess the characteristics of a popular artefact for acquisition. The bracelet's precise provenance and good condition were felt to reinforce its attraction. The Committee recommended £25,000. York Museums Trust hopes to acquire.

Roman artefacts

4. Roman silver wire ear-ring from Stanstead Abbots, Hertfordshire (2010 T400)

[REDACTED] suggested £20-25. The Committee viewed the ear-ring in light of this and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £20. Ware Museum hopes to acquire.

5. Roman silver finger-ring fragment from Chesterton, Cambridgeshire (2009 T527)

[REDACTED] suggested £8-£12. The Committee viewed the finger-ring fragment in light of this and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £10. Peterborough Museum hopes to acquire.

~~6. *Roman silver finger-ring from Barnby in the Willow, Nottinghamshire (2010 T482)~~

~~[REDACTED] suggested £180-£220; Newark Museum hopes to acquire.~~

~~This case was withdrawn from the agenda as the finder and landowner had generously waived their rights to a reward in order that the finger-ring could be placed in Newark Museum~~

7. Roman gold finger-ring fragment from Gosberton, Lincolnshire (2011 T13)

[REDACTED] suggested £130-£150. This case was deferred at the request of the Finder to enable him time to respond to the provisional valuation. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

8. Roman silver spoon fragment from South Cambridgeshire area (2010 T72)

[REDACTED] suggested £40; the finder submitted comments. The Committee examined the spoon fragment with this in mind. The Committee thanked the finder for his letter but noted that the submission did little to controvert the valuation. The Committee noted that there are many complete examples of spoons from this period, in much better condition, and felt that on the open market this spoon fragment would not demand considerable attention. In agreement with the provisional valuation the Committee recommended £40.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to liaise with the curators of St Neots Museum and Royston Museum to determine whether a waiver of their shares of any reward by the finder and landowner (as has been intimated in the finder's submission) would allow for the fragment to be placed in Royston Museum.

9. Roman gold finger-ring & jet pendant from Sherriff Hutton, North Yorkshire (2010 T193)

[REDACTED] suggested £650-£700; the finder submitted comments. The Committee considered the items in light of this and took account of the finder's submission, noting that he feels that local importance and provenance of these finds should carry more weight than issues of wearability. The Committee felt that the factors cited by the finder's letter did not materially contribute to the market value of the items.

On balance, the Committee felt that the suggested range was accurate, but that Ms [REDACTED] had overestimated the attraction of the jet pendant, for which she had allowed £100. Taking all this into consideration, the Committee recommended £650 for both the finger-ring and the pendant. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval artefacts

10. Viking silver ingot from Andreas, Isle of Man (2010-2)

██████████ suggested £120. The Committee viewed the ingot in light of this. There have been numerous Early Medieval cigar-shaped ingots to come before the Committee in recent years, and given that they all possess roughly the same degree of archaeological interest and attraction, the Committee attempts to be consistent in its recommendations according to the weight and precious-metal content of the ingots.

The Committee found that the provisional valuation for this item was very close to its own past recommendations, and for an ingot of this size it recommended £130. Manx National Heritage hopes to acquire.

11. Viking silver ingot from Ballamodha, Isle of Man (2010-3)

██████████ suggested £80. The Committee viewed the ingot in light of this. There have been numerous Early Medieval cigar-shaped ingots to come before the Committee in recent years, and given that they all possess roughly the same degree of archaeological interest and attraction, the Committee attempts to be consistent in its recommendations according to the weight and precious-metal content of the ingots.

The Committee found that the provisional valuation for this item was lower than its own past recommendations. For an ingot of this size, and bearing as it does scratches from antiquity which added to its appeal, the Committee recommended £200. Manx National Heritage hopes to acquire.

12. Anglo-Saxon gold & garnet pendant from Halesworth area, Suffolk (2010 T348)

██████████ suggested £1,300-£1,500. The Committee took this under advice as it viewed the pendant, which the Committee found to be lovely and complete. The Committee noted that it had recently considered a similar pendant from Hawton, Nottinghamshire (Treasure case: 2009 T542; PAS ID: DENO-494555) which was marginally smaller and valued at £1000. The Committee also pointed to a parallel in the commercial market. A smaller early medieval pendant, with a distinctive mount but no attachment, was offered by Timeline Originals for £950.

Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £1300. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

13. Early Medieval gold & copper alloy pommel cap from Marston Maisey, Wiltshire (2010 T564)

██████████ suggested £6,500-£7,500; the finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the pommel in light of the valuation and took account of the finder's points.

The Committee pointed to a very similar example of a sword pommel from the 2009 Staffordshire Hoard (K701, valued at £7500) as a parallel. The Committee felt that the interlace pattern on the pommel's exposed surfaces suffered no detractor in its appeal if it were not to be classified as zoomorphic. However the Committee did agree that it would be useful to have sight of the side of the pommel obscured by soil, in order to determine whether the interlace design continued or whether any other decorative device was employed.

Paragraph 66 of the *Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (revised)*, requires the Committee to value items of Treasure 'as at the time of finding of the object and in the condition in which it was found'; the Committee needed to balance that instruction with the need to have proper knowledge of the item to be valued. In arguing whether to recommend the removal of the soil from this piece, the Committee pointed to examples where it had requested conservation work on past items that were deemed to possess features that might have a material bearing on their market value, such as hoards of corroded coins. In this instance, the Committee decided that it was important for the obscured portion of the pommel to be investigated, but felt this could be done to a satisfactory degree using X-radiography, which would not affect the items condition. The Committee therefore asked the Secretariat to request that the British Museum's Conservation and Scientific Research department undertake an X-ray of the pommel. The results of this procedure will be used by the Committee in its consideration of the value of the pommel at a subsequent meeting.

Wiltshire Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval artefacts

14. Medieval silver brooch from Besthorpe, Nottinghamshire (2010 T704)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and found it an accurate assessment. In agreement with the valuer, the Committee recommended £75. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

15. Medieval silver annular brooch from Westbury, Wiltshire (2010 T544)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £125. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the brooch, pointing out the existence of a close parallel sold by 'Valued History' in August 2004 for £120. Accounting for inflation over time and for the fact that the earlier sale represented a retail value rather than auction hammer price, the suggested value was felt to be accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £125. Wiltshire Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

16. Medieval silver fitting from Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire (2010 T241)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60. The Committee kept this in mind as it viewed the fitting. The fitting was thought to possess more appeal than accounted for by Mr [REDACTED] and the Committee recommended £75. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

17. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Newton Poppleford, Devon (2008 T666)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this, commenting that silver rings with stones are unusual and that this piece would command attention in the market place. Whilst possessing little superficial attraction, the ring was felt to be unusual and not insubstantial in size and quality. The Committee recommended £125. Fairlynch Museum hopes to acquire.

18. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Dunham-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire (2010 T2)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and felt that the valuer overestimated its attraction. Owing to the damage evident in this piece the Committee recommended £70. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

19. Medieval silver finger-ring from North Nottinghamshire area (2010 T159)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £400. The Committee examined the finger-ring with this in mind, and felt that, while the ring may attract a specialist in amuletic inscriptions, its obscure if not impenetrable inscription and plain appearance would have limited appeal to the general collector. The Committee recommended £350. Bassetlaw Museum hopes to acquire.

20. Medieval silver-gilt mount from Ryther, North Yorkshire (2008 T754)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £600. The Committee inspected the mount in light of this and, agreeing with Mr [REDACTED]'s suggestion that the piece dates to the later 10th or 11th Century, also felt that the suggested value was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £600. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

21. Medieval gold reliquary pendant from Hockley area, Essex (2009 T256)

[REDACTED] suggested £180,000; [REDACTED] suggested £25,000; [REDACTED] suggested £4,000-£5,000. The Committee also considered the finder's submission dated 4 May 2011.

Subsequent to the composition of the curatorial report, the contents of the pendant were examined with the consent of the curator, finder and landowner and were found to consist of mud and root fibres.

In examining the artefact the Committee took note of the various parallels mentioned by the valuers and by the finder in his submission. The Committee felt that the reasoning of [REDACTED] gave too much weight to a remote and potential controversial association of the Hockley pendant (via a gold mount from Dacorum, Treasure case 2007 T224) with the Middleham Jewel with, and that the overall figure was thus inflated. Nonetheless the Committee appreciated the view that the Hockley example was a complete reliquary and that this contributed to its appeal.

Of particular relevance was felt to be the gold medieval reliquary pendant sold by Timeline Auctions on 18

March 2011 for £14,000. Whilst the Timeline pendant featured a more elaborate engraving and a small sapphire, making it artistically superior to the reliquary pendant from Hockley, the Timeline Auction piece was incomplete. The Committee noted that the Timeline Auction example had been offered in auction at Sotheby's in 2005 for £20,000-£30,000 but that it had failed to sell.

As two of the provisional valuers did not mention this parallel in their report, the Committee considered it important to hear their opinions and that of [REDACTED] (whose report had been provided before the auction was held) on the insight that this auction may have provided into the relative demand on the market for the reliquary pendant from Hockley.

The Committee therefore deferred making a recommendation and asked the Secretariat to inquire of the three valuers: *'Does the hammer price of £14,000 for Lot 760 (Medieval nativity reliquary pendant) in Timeline Auctions' sale of 18 March 2011 affect your estimation of the value that the gold medieval reliquary pendant from Hockley, Essex (2009 T256) would have had at the time it was discovered in May 2009?'*

The Committee emphasised that in posing this question it was seeking to determine the market value for the Hockley pendant at the time of its discovery, and not its value in 2011.

Southend Museum hopes to acquire.

[REDACTED]

22. Medieval silver-gilt iconographic finger-ring from Ashington, West Sussex (2008 T629) – 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £60; the finder submitted comments. The Committee recommended £300 (25/2/11). Horsham Museum submitted a challenge. The Committee thanked the museum for its letter and reminded the museum that the Committee's identification of value for the purposes of reward could not pay regard to the maximum amount that the museum was willing to pay, but must focus exclusively on the market value of the piece. The *comparanda* cited in the museum's letter were not felt to be relevant to this discussion, as they were either made of bronze or were of an entirely different nature from the silver-gilt finger-ring. The Committee therefore confirmed its recommendation of £300. Horsham Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval artefacts

23. Post-Medieval silver bodkin from Boxted, Suffolk (2010 T599)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40. The Committee inspected the bodkin in light of this and in agreement, recommended £40. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

24. Post-Medieval silver button from Misterton, Nottinghamshire (2010 T196)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £70; the Committee viewed the button with this in mind and in agreement, recommended £70. Bassetlaw Museum hopes to acquire.

~~25. *Post-Medieval gold mourning ring from Sidecup, Greater London (2010 T192)-~~

[REDACTED] suggested £200; Bexley Heritage Trust hopes to acquire.

This case was withdrawn from the agenda as the museum had withdrawn interest in acquiring.

26. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress pin from Lopen, Somerset (2010 T76)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £300. The Committee viewed the pin with this in mind, commenting on the proliferation of finds of this nature and their availability on the market. The Committee cited several similar examples that it had seen, such as a pin with straightened shaft offered for £170 (retail) in Bath in October 2009. With this in mind, and owing to the fact that the shaft of this pin is misshapen, the Committee felt that the suggested figure was high, and recommended £200. Somerset County Museum hopes to acquire.

27. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress pin-head from Tiverton, Devon (2008 T18)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £45. The Committee viewed the pin-head in light of this and compared it to a pin head it had valued earlier (2007 T169 from Colyton, Devon, valued at £60; *Portable*

Antiquities & Treasure Annual Report 2007, pg 248). On balance, the Committee felt that this pin-head warranted less and recommended £35.

At the inquest the Coroner had been unable to identify of the landowner/occupier at the time of discovery. While noting that neither the Coroner nor the Finds Liaison Officer was able to ascertain the identity of the landowner as at the time of discovery, the Committee observed that a Chinese takeaway restaurant was currently occupying the site, and thought that it might be possible to trace the original owner of the land from the current occupiers.

As it is not possible to identify the landowner at this time, but the possibility remains that the owner may emerge, the Committee observed that the Secretary of State may require the acquiring museum to provide the entire recommended sum for the reward to the Secretariat, to hold until the landowner is identified. Alternatively, the Secretary of State may wish for the acquiring museum to pay only the finder's share of the reward at this time, but to covenant (or put forward a well-wisher willing to covenant) that it will pay the landowner's share of the reward should that party be identified at any point in the future. That said, the Committee did not consider this to be a matter on which it has either the obligation or the entitlement to make any formal recommendation, and took the view that this was a matter for the Secretary of State and the acquiring museum to settle among themselves. The Royal Albert Memorial Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 4: Coins

Iron Age coins

28. Iron Age coins (21) & Bronze Age gold torc fragment from Westerham, Kent (2010 T105) – 5th addenda

██████████ suggested £8,750 (coins= £8,500; object= £250). The finder made a submission which included a private valuation by ██████████ for £19,850.

The Committee viewed the coins and torc fragment in light of this, and took account of both valuations. The Committee noted as well that this is the fifth addenda to this hoard, and had cause to refer to its notes regarding the valuation of 2009 T192, an earlier addendum that had been valued in November 2010.

The Committee was concerned at the large discrepancy between the suggested figures of Mr ██████████ and Mr ██████████. It was observed that Mr ██████████ based his valuation on auctions from three separate houses in recent years, and that Mr ██████████ appeared to have relied on sales from his own company (which appeared to the Committee to be retail in nature) as the primary factor for his calculations. Given the historic connection of coins from this hoard with auction sales from Morton and Eden, the Committee felt that it would be appropriate to request a further valuation from ██████████ for these coins, and it deferred making a recommendation in order for that to be commissioned. Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

Roman coins

29. Roman coins (36) and copper alloy metalwork from Horncastle, Lincolnshire (2010 T95)

The provisional valuer ██████████ suggested £160. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and found Mr ██████████'s assessment of the items to be accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £160, which included the copper-alloy lump. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

30. Roman coin hoard (24) from Hucknall, Nottinghamshire (2009 T669)

The provisional valuer ██████████ suggested £400. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the coins, commenting that the formula employed by Mr ██████████ was accurate, given the condition of the coins. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £400. Nottingham Museum Service hopes to acquire.

31. Roman coin hoard (308) and associated material from North West Cumbria area (2010 T236)

The provisional valuer ██████████ suggested £2,550; the landowner and museum submitted comments.

The Committee viewed the coins in light of this, thanking the landowner and museum for their letters. In addressing the museum's concern that the valuer had favoured dealer list prices in arriving at a suggested figure, the Committee pointed out that the valuer had sufficiently shown that his suggestion was in fact a market value, and that it had been based on, but was not equivalent to, the dealer list prices cited in his report.

The Committee further acknowledged that in their current, unconserved state the coins possessed little attraction, but, in line with the guidance in the Treasure Act Code of Practice paragraph 66, it felt that the valuer had given correct weight to the potential of the coins in this hoard to achieve higher values once cleaned and conserved. The Committee argued that on the open market, any potential buyer would balance the expected costs of conservation against the potential to enhance the value of the coins, and arrive at a fair figure for the collection. In this case, many of the coins featured clear, legible inscriptions in their current state and the Committee felt in consequence that those examples would command attention on the market. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £2,550. Senhouse Museum hopes to acquire.

32. Roman coins hoards & associated material from York area, North Yorkshire

The following four case numbers pertain to associated deposits and involve the same interested parties. Both finder and landowner submitted comments regarding these cases. York Museums Trust hopes to acquire.

The Committee considered the coins in light of this information, thanking the parties for their letters. It commented that many of the coins possessed appeal, and felt that the valuers' suggestions were well formulated. The Committee also agreed with the amount suggested for the ceramic pot.

With regard to the concerns raised about the attribution of 'no commercial value' to 250 of the fragmentary and illegible coins and the ceramic potsherds from treasure case 2008 T622, the Committee felt that nonetheless a nominal value for these items had been incorporated into the global figure suggested for this group and saw no reason to depart from the figure of £2500.

The Committee considered the landowner's comment that, because an auction house will impose both seller's and buyer's premium, a valuation based on hammer price alone would not reflect the sum that a buyer would have to pay at auction. The Committee observed that the purpose and policy of the reward system is to neutralise the temptation to which finders or landowners might otherwise be exposed to avoid reporting finds and to seek instead to dispose of them illegally. If the payable reward broadly reflects the sum that a vendor would otherwise receive at auction that policy is maintained.

In this instance the Committee also observed that it did not deliberate from the standpoint of York Museums Trust acting in the role of buyer, with the finder and landowner in the position of sellers; nevertheless the Committee did consider it important for the valuation to reflect a figure that the finder and landowner would be confident of receiving had they had the option of selling the items privately.

Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee, in agreement with the suggestions of the provisional valuer, recommended:

A. Roman coin hoard (1443) & associated material from York area, North Yorkshire (2008 T622)
£2,500

B. Roman coin hoard (546) from York area, North Yorkshire (2008 T672)
£2,140

C. Roman coin hoard (1050) & associated material from York area, North Yorkshire (2008 T723)
£5,500 (coins= £5,440; object= £60)

D. Roman coins (12) from York area, North Yorkshire ('Addenda')
£5

Total value = £10,145.

NB - The Committee further noted that in the above discussion, with regards to the definition of the 'value', it was important to examine whether the relevant phrasing in the Code of Practice (paragraph 65) required revision in the upcoming review.

33. Roman coin hoard from East Sussex area (2006 T4) - 3rd 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. Prior to making a recommendation, the Committee resolved to ask the finder, Mr [REDACTED] several direct questions in relation to the statements received (13/1/11). The finder responded to the Secretariat's letter and made several further submissions. The landowner, Mr [REDACTED] supplied comments on the finder's response. The Finds Liaison Officer for Sussex provided further information. The TVC recommended a valuation and apportionment (25/2/11) as follows:

For the small selection, the recommended apportionment, 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 (including the pot) was:

£25,305.50 to Mr [REDACTED] and

£20,704.50 to Mr [REDACTED]

The landowner accepted the valuation of the coins. However, the finder and landowner both disagreed with the recommended apportionment of the reward and submitted further comments to that effect.

The Committee felt that the Mr [REDACTED]'s submissions touched on three material points of misconduct on Mr [REDACTED] part by reference to which the Committee might consider a further abatement of Mr [REDACTED] share of the reward. They were:

- a. Mr [REDACTED] went on the land and made the initial discovery of the two coins without permission, notifying Mr [REDACTED] only several months later.
- b. On 28 December 2005 Mr [REDACTED] was given permission to search again only if he informed Mr [REDACTED] of when he intended to search, and allowed Mr [REDACTED] to accompany him if he wished, and Mr [REDACTED] failed to do that.
- c. Two years later Mr [REDACTED] was again seen on the land with a detector, despite being told unequivocally not to return.

Mr [REDACTED] for his part, did not deny that he had failed to secure permission prior to his searching with a metal detector. The Committee noted Mr [REDACTED]'s account of the circumstances of discovery – in particular his action of walking across a field with a detector and only approaching the landowner *after* an important item had been discovered – demonstrated an approach contrary to best-practice. However, the Committee had appreciated that fact when it made its recommendation of the previous meeting, and it had also taken account of Mr [REDACTED]'s breach of the conditions imposed upon him by Mr [REDACTED] in his email of 28 December 2005 and his appearance on Mr [REDACTED]'s land with a metal detector two years later.

Mr [REDACTED] argued that it is he who should receive a greater portion of the reward, feeling that his actions in uncovering and reporting the coins played an important role in ensuring the find was properly recovered, and that Mr [REDACTED] had improperly terminated the archaeological investigation. The Committee registered Mr [REDACTED]'s concern that, should this line of enquiry be considered pertinent, the Committee should take a statement from the Sussex FLO at the time. However the Committee felt that there was nothing in Mr [REDACTED] submission on this point which would cause it to depart from its original recommendation.

The Committee also observed that there was disagreement between the two parties as to whether Mr [REDACTED] had made it clear to Mr [REDACTED] that a metal detector had been employed in the discovery of the first two coins and would continue to be employed in subsequent searches. The Committee did not

feel that it would be possible to establish the truth in this matter and did not therefore accord weight to this matter in reaching its recommendation.

Having taken all of this information into consideration, and noting that it had duly examined much of this evidence at the meeting of 25 February 2011, the Committee reconfirmed its recommendation of the last meeting, whereby Mr [REDACTED]'s portion of the reward was abated by 10%, in favour of Mr [REDACTED].

The value of the coins was also reconfirmed as that previously recommended, and therefore the Committee adopted the following breakdown in the value of the whole hoard:

£25,305.50 to Mr [REDACTED] and
£20,704.50 to Mr [REDACTED]

Brighton Museum hopes to acquire the entire hoard.

Medieval coins:

34. Medieval silver coin brooch from Thorney, Nottinghamshire (2010 T405)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £35. The Committee reviewed the brooch in light of this and commented that the report should read that 'the obverse has been gilded' and that the remains of an attachment are on the reverse. The Committee felt that the brooch had no independent numismatic value and that whatever interest it possessed lay in its character as a piece of jewellery. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £35. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval coins:

35. Post-Medieval bronze coins (10) from Bridgnorth, Shropshire (2010 T457)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £32. The Committee inspected the coins in light of this and noted that they were of a common variety, many having been struck and remained in circulation for a long period. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £32. Northgate Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 5: Norfolk Cases

36. *Medieval silver annular brooch from Hunstanton, Norfolk (2011 T21)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this. The Committee commented that it had valued a similar brooch, with more appeal but lacking a pin, from Sledmere, North Yorkshire (2003 T408; *Treasure Annual Report 2003*, p.99; valued at £110). The Committee found the brooch from Hunstanton to be pleasant, but the suggested figure high, and recommended £130. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire

37. *Post-Medieval silver mount from Oxborough, Norfolk (2010 T450)

[REDACTED] has valued this item at £35; Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

This case was withdrawn from agenda as both the finder and landowner generously waived their right to a reward for the finger-ring, in order that it may be placed in the Norwich Castle Museum

38. Roman copper alloy coins (18) from Broadlands area, Norfolk (2010 T678)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £175. The Committee viewed the coins with this in mind and commented that, while a majority were worth very little, owing to the agreeable portraits on examples like the coin of Domitian, the overall figure of £175 was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £175. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

39. Medieval silver coins (5) from Walsoken, Norfolk (2009 T660)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £320. The Committee considered the coins in light of this and found the valuation well argued. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £320. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 6: Any Other Business

Update on acquisition of South Leicestershire Coin Hoard (2008 T473) – After being unable to afford the purchase of this item, valued at £10,690, the finder and landowner, rather than allowing the coin hoard to be broken up and sold in piece, have accepted the offer of £6,000 from the Leicestershire County Council Heritage Services.

Launch of Portable Antiquities & Treasure Annual Report 2008 - The latest (and last of its type) PA&T Annual report will be launched on Wednesday, 25th May 2011 at 10:30am in Gallery 41 of the British Museum. All members are invited.

Consultation on proposal for Coroner for Treasure - ██████████ confirmed that the DCMS is awaiting advice on the draft consultation document to be sent to coroners.

Goodbye from Norman Palmer – Norman Palmer thanked the Committee for its excellent work throughout the past decade and reiterated his view that the Committee plays a unique and vital part in the history and heritage of this nation. He could not have wished for a better group of colleagues. The Committee had given loyal and selfless support during the ten years of his Chairmanship and had shown exceptional standards of competence, sometimes in challenging conditions. The spirit of dedication and team-work among its members had made attendance at meetings a lasting pleasure. He noted that during his time there had been no decision that was not unanimous and no recommendation that had provoked legal challenge or censure. He remarked that it was probably a sign of the success of the Committee that its work had passed without extensive public attention. He had great confidence in the abilities of his successor, Lord Renfrew, to lead the Committee into the next era of its operations, and he wished both the Committee and its new Chairman well.

Item 6: Date of next meeting - Thursday, 2nd June 2011, Hartwell Room, British Museum.