

Minutes for Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting – 20th July 2011

The meeting was held in the Board Room at the British Museum on Wednesday 20th July 2011 at 11am. All finds will be available from 10.15am.

Present:

Committee:

Colin Renfrew (Chair)
Trevor Austin
Ian Carradice
John Cherry
Peter Clayton
David Dykes
Tim Pestell

Other:

Caroline Barton (BM)
Roger Bland (BM)
Caroline Lyons (BM)
Janina Parol (BM)
Ian Richardson (BM)
Victoria Wolff (BM - Volunteer)
Helen Loughlin (DCMS)

Item 1: Request from ██████████ and ██████████ (ITV) to film the Committee

Mr ██████████ and Mr ██████████ introduced themselves and explained the manner in which they proposed to film a portion of the Committee's meeting for their television programme, 'Britain's Secret Treasures'.

The Committee noted that the Minister had no objections to the filming taking place should the conditions set forth by the Committee be met. Those conditions, as explained by the Chairman, were:

- a.) that it would not be possible for interested parties viewing the footage to identify that 'their' item, when it appeared on film, was the one under discussion. There should be a clear disassociation of the footage with an audio commentary.
- b.) that prior to being shown in any form, the proposed segment of the programme featuring the Committee be screened by the Chairman, his designated representative and/or other members of the Committee and not to use the footage if objections are raised.

The representative from ITV confirmed that there was no need for them to do retakes of any action and they would simply roll camera while the Committee performed its business. The Committee decided to start from the top of the agenda and work its way through, passing over the complicated cases which might require the naming of individuals.

The Committee made a query as to the destination of unused footage, and expressed concern that was it not destroyed it may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. ITV confirmed that the unused footage could be deleted if necessary.

The filming took place and ITV said they would pass the 'rough cut' format to the Committee and its Secretariat in mid August. ITV confirmed that if the footage were eventually to be used in a broadcast programme, they would seek consent of the Committee again for inclusion of this footage.

Item 2: Minutes of the meeting of Thursday 2nd June 2011

The Committee endorsed the minutes as a true representation of the meeting.

Item 3: Objects

Bronze Age artefacts

1. Bronze Age gold strip from Shrawley, Worcestershire (2010 T604)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £110. The Committee inspected the piece in light of this and noted its rough nature. While the item is but a fragment, the Committee commented on the strip's tactile quality and substance. The Committee agreed with the attribution of £50 above the bullion value of the piece to account for its age and interest, and in agreement with the valuer, recommended £110. Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

2. Middle Bronze Age gold twisted torc fragment from Carhampton area, Hampshire (2010 T822)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee viewed the torc fragment in light of this and concurred with the rationale applied by Mr [REDACTED] in arriving at his suggested figure. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. Winchester Museum Service hopes to acquire.

3. Late Bronze Age hoard from Tisbury, Wiltshire (2010 T647)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee inspected the hoard in light of this and found Mr [REDACTED]'s arguments well supported. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £100. Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum hopes to acquire.

4. Bronze Age hoard from Ayot St Lawrence, Hertfordshire (2011 T86)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £450. The Committee took account of this as it inspected the pieces in the hoard. The Committee felt that most of the value in the hoard was to be found in the two socketed axes. It was noted that the largest piece, for which the valuer allowed £200, possessed a technical appeal, as evidence for the casting sprues was still in place. Unfortunately the axe had suffered some chipping, and when evaluated against similar items seen by a member of the Committee for sale at the London Coin Fair in Bloomsbury, the estimation was high. Most of the other individual items were judged to be of no commercial value individually, but as a whole the hoard was desirable as a museum piece. The Committee recommended £400. Welwyn Hatfield Museum Service hopes to acquire.

5. Bronze Age base metal group (6) from Amport area, Hampshire (2007 T704)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £1,500; comments were supplied by one Finder (Mr [REDACTED]), 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 [REDACTED] (3 axes), Mr [REDACTED] (1 axe) and Mr [REDACTED] (2 axes). Mr [REDACTED] has accepted that his discovery was made in the course of the archaeological work commissioned by Mr [REDACTED] (the Landowner) and does not claim a share of the reward. Mr W [REDACTED] however, has indicated that he wished to claim a share of the reward.

Excerpt from the minutes of the Committee meeting of 5/5/11: *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 Brett'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 ████████ was acting independently of the archaeological investigation which Ms ████████ led and in which Mr ████████ took part.

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

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

The Committee further asked the Secretariat to write again to Mr ████████, 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 ████████ 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 ████████ (that is, are the two axes found by Mr ████████ 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 ████████ 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. (05/05/11)

Responses were received from all interested parties. Hampshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

The Committee reviewed the case again and considered the submissions by the interested parties and experts.

The Committee agreed that:

- a.) The find of the six axeheads constituted a single discovery and are part of the 'same find'.
- b.) Ms ████████ clearly found the first three axeheads on her own, in advance of archaeological work.
- c.) An archaeological investigation was initiated, which should have obviated the need for consideration of paying rewards to anyone but the original finder and the landowner for the subsequent discovery of

more items from the same find, in accordance with paragraph 78 of the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (CoP) (revised).

d.) Mr [REDACTED] was invited on to the land for the purposes of participating in the archaeological investigation, a point he has acknowledged, and the socketed axe found by Mr [REDACTED] is to be considered under the terms of paragraph 78 of the CoP.

d.) The invitation of the landowner for Mr [REDACTED] to 'check over the general area' with a metal detector was separate from the activities of the archaeological team led by [REDACTED]. Mr [REDACTED] was not a part of that team and he was not present with the explicit purpose of assisting the archaeological team. Therefore his participation rescinded the stipulations of paragraph 78 of the CoP and the Committee felt that he should be entitled to the finder's share of the items which he discovered.

The Committee had earlier valued the hoard at £1500 - £200 each for the three socketed axes and £300 each for the three palstave axes. Mr [REDACTED] discovered two palstave axes valued at £300 each. Therefore the breakdown of apportionment of the reward for the entire find is:

Finders: Ms [REDACTED] – 3 socketed axes and 1 palstave axe (£450)
Mr [REDACTED] – 2 palstave axes (£300)

Landowner: Mr [REDACTED] - 3 socketed axes and 3 palstave axes (£750).

The Committee asked the Secretariat to send a copy of this draft recommendation to the [REDACTED] to ask whether they took the view that the requirement of the Treasure Act and CoP had been correctly followed in arriving at it. Specifically they would seek the view of the [REDACTED] as to whether the Committee's draft recommendation appropriately apportioned the reward, or whether the [REDACTED] would consider that the wording of paragraphs 33 and 78 of the CoP override Mr [REDACTED]'s non-participation in the archaeological investigation.

Roman artefacts

6. Roman silver finger-ring from Weston-super-Mare, North Somerset (2010 T42)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £10. The Committee viewed the finger-ring with this in mind and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £10. Weston-super-Mare Museum hopes to acquire.

7. Roman silver finger-ring (incomplete) from South Cambridgeshire (2009 T214)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £15. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and agreed that the ring possessed little commercial value. The Committee recommended £15. Royston Museum hopes to acquire.

8. Roman silver strip from Marbury-cum-Quiosley, Cheshire (2010 T491)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £25. The Committee examined the strip with this in mind. The Committee felt that although the piece possessed little commercial interest, the suggested value was reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £25. The Grosvenor House Museum hopes to acquire.

9. Roman silver brooch from Ulgham, Northumberland (2010 T396)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50; the finder and the acquiring museum submitted comments. The brooch was viewed by the Committee in light of these comments, which were taken into account. It was noted that the museum's response adequately addressed the concerns of the finder with respect to its potential display.

The Committee sought to emphasise that there is no direct correlation between scarcity and financial value, as the finder's letter implied. Nonetheless the Committee remarked that the provisional valuation

was low in relation to examples of comparable brooches sold on the market and previously valued by the Committee. For instance, in 2010 the dealer Den of Antiquity sold a complete Roman silver-gilt crossbow brooch for £350. The Committee had also valued a more complete Roman brooch of similar design from North Ormsby, Lincolnshire (2004 T252; *Treasure Annual Report 2004*, pg. 55) at £120.

On balance, the Committee recommended £80. The Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle, hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval artefacts

10. Early Medieval silver bead from Wickenby, Lincolnshire (2010 T492)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20-25. The Committee examined the bead in light of this and in agreement with the valuer, recommended £25. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

11. Anglo-Saxon silver buckle fragment & brooch fragment from West Wight, Isle of Wight (2010 T286)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £10-£15. The Committee examined the fragments with this in mind and agreed with the conclusions of Ms [REDACTED]. The Committee recommended £10. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

12. Early Medieval silver-gilt object from Shalfleet, Isle of Wight (2011 T22)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20. The Committee inspected the piece with this in mind and in light of the diminutive size the Committee recommended £15. Isle of Wight Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

13. Early Medieval silver brooch from Asgarby area, Lincolnshire (2011 T95)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this. Though the brooch was noted as being incomplete, it was felt to be a substantial piece. The Committee also remarked on the attractive gilding remnant on the brooch. The Committee cited as a comparable case a fragment of an Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt brooch from Snetterton, Norfolk (2008 T14, *Portable Antiquities and Treasure Annual Report 2008*, pg. 107, PAS reference NMS-750C07) valued at £90. In light of the above, the Committee was minded to recommend a value of £90. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

14. Early Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Shorwell, Isle of Wight (2010 T524)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £400-£450. The Committee examined the brooch in light of this, and took account of the damage but commented on the attractive foil-backed garnets, and interesting zoomorphic element. The Committee compared this to a similar brooch from Brighstone, Isle of Wight (2005 T327; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, pg. 74; PAS reference IOW-806E52), which was valued at £360, and felt that the Shorwell example was superior. On balance, the Committee, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £450. Isle of Wight Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

15. Early Medieval silver-gilt pin head from Horncastle area, Lincolnshire (2010 T560)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75. The Committee viewed the pin head with this in mind, commenting on the item's small size yet attractive appearance. The Committee felt that the suggested figure was reasonable, and cited a parallel piece seen offered at the retail rate of £85 at a specialist shop in Bloomsbury. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £75. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

16. Early Medieval gold & garnet mount from Brighstone, Isle of Wight (2010 T658)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250; the finder and museum have submitted comments. The Committee viewed the mount in light of these and took account of both the finder's and the museum's submissions. The Committee felt that the finder's letter did not provide any reasonable

comparisons to other similar objects beyond those suggested by [REDACTED], which had been factored in to the provisional valuation.

However the Committee was sympathetic to the finder's view that the damage to the suspension loop on the mount had been accounted too much weight in the provisional valuation. The mount's garnet was seen as particularly attractive and the Committee was minded to recommend a value of £400. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

17. Early Medieval gold pendant from Wingham, Kent (2010 T101)

The provisional value [REDACTED] suggested £1,200-£1,400. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this. The *comparanda* cited by Ms [REDACTED] were felt to be less relevant to this case than similar pendants valued previously by the Committee. The Committee pointed to two examples; a complete version, without a central cross, from South East Suffolk (2008 T409; *Portable Antiquities and Treasure Annual Report 2008*, pg. 112; PAS reference SF-0646A8), and a damaged circular pendant with central cross from Tolleshunt Major, Essex (2009 T142; PAS reference ESS-7E4F06), both valued at £550. The pendant from Wingham features a cross decoration and is complete, and the Committee agreed that the pendant possesses more attraction than the pieces from South East Suffolk and Tolleshunt Major. Having regard to the above, the Committee recommended £1000. Dover Museum or Canterbury Museum hopes to acquire.

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

The provisional value [REDACTED] had suggested £6,500-£7,500; the finder submitted comments. At its meeting of 5th May 2011, 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.

The pommel had been X-rayed, but unfortunately the results were inconclusive. After receiving consent from the Committee members, the Conservation department undertook to remove a small amount of the encrusted soil to reveal the nature of the decoration on the obscured section of the pommel.

The pommel was cleaned revealing the decoration on the previously obscured side. The Committee examined the pommel again in light of this and considered the valuer's report and the finder's comments.

The cleaned side of the pommel was observed to be undamaged (as the other side had been) but the Committee took account of the considerable wear evident on the decoration. The Committee agreed that the pommel cited by Ms [REDACTED]'s *comparanda*, which sold at Bonham's for £20,000 was superior in that it was complete and undamaged. The Committee also had cause to refer to several of the Anglo-Saxon gold filigree pommels from the Staffordshire that it had valued earlier; K701 (distorted by complete) valued at £7,885 and K393 (damaged at one end) valued at £6,759. It was noted that the presence of the copper-alloy core on the Marston Maisey pommel did little to add to the attraction of the piece but the significant damage to one side was a blow to its appeal.

Taking account of all of the above, the Committee recommended £7000. Wiltshire Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval artefacts

19. Late Medieval silver crucifix fragment from Walton, West Yorkshire (2010 T183)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £10. The Committee viewed the crucifix fragment

in light of this, and concurred with the assessment of Mr [REDACTED]. It recommended £10. Leeds Museum hopes to acquire.

20. Medieval silver brooch from Over Compton, Dorset (2010 T128)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee examined the crucifix with this in mind, citing a similar example seen offered at a retail price of £145. The Committee also pointed to a comparable medieval brooch from Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire (2009 T120, PAS reference PAS-EE74E1) valued at £80. Taking account of the above, the Committee recommended £90. Dorset County Museum hopes to acquire.

21. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Kendal area, Cumbria (2010 T693)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee inspected the ring in light of this, noting that although badly broken, the ring is substantial and its design is attractive. On balance, though, the Committee felt that the extremely poor condition of the ring would hinder its appeal on the market, and recommended £120. Kendal Museum hopes to acquire.

22. Late Medieval silver-gilt fede ring from Undy, Monmouthshire (09.07)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £120. The Committee viewed the ring in light of this and commented that, had the ring been whole, it would have made for an appealing example. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £120. Chepstow Museum hopes to acquire.

23. Medieval silver finger-ring from Hawkesbury, South Gloucestershire (2010 T624)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £200. The Committee viewed the ring with this in mind, finding it to be interesting and attractive, and felt that a modest uplift in price would be a truer reflection of the ring's value on the market. The Committee recommended £250. Bristol Museum hopes to acquire.

24. Medieval gold finger-ring from Llanfrecha, Monmouthshire (09.06)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee took account of this as it inspected the ring. The inscription was found to be worn and the ring had been heavily cleaned overall. The Committee was concerned with the level of cleaning carried out on this item and sought to draw to the finder's attention to paragraph 47 of the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (revised), which says in part 'Inappropriate cleaning can reduce the value (both archaeological and commercial) of finds. Where cleaning occurs, the finder gains nothing by way of an increased commercial value as reflected in the reward and may risk a reduction of the reward by virtue of the cleaning (see paragraph 79 (viii)).' In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £250. Torfaen Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

25. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Dunham-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire (2010 T2) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100; the Committee recommended £70 at the meeting of 5/5/11. The finder has submitted comments – his first letter was received after the original meeting date, so both it and the second letter were seen for the first time by the Committee.

The Committee thanked the finder for his comments and upon viewing the object again agreed that 'distorted' is a more apt description of the state of the ring than 'crushed', the word used by Mr [REDACTED]. As the finder did not provide any comparable evidence which would allow the Committee to reconsider the value it had recommended, the Committee confirmed a recommendation of £70. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval artefacts

26. Post-Medieval silver pendant or dress fitting from Much Hadham, Hertfordshire (2010 T26)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this and found it to be attractive, though diminutive. On balance, the Committee felt the suggested value was slightly high, and recommended £45. Much Hadham Forge Museum hopes to acquire.

27. Post-Medieval silver-gilt ornament from Clitheroe area, Lancashire (2009 T668)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80. The Committee examined the ornament with this in mind and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £80. Clitheroe Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

[Peter Clayton left the room]

28. Post-Medieval silver cufflink element from Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire (2010 T195)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60. The Committee examined this object in light of this, and alongside a similar cufflink element, in better condition, from Wymondley, Hertfordshire (2009 T391, PAS reference BH-060552) valued at £60. On balance the Committee was minded to recommend £40 for the cufflink element from Hemel Hempstead. Dacorum Heritage Trust hopes to acquire.

[Peter Clayton returned to the room]

29. Post-Medieval silver cufflink from Wymondley, Hertfordshire (2009 T391)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee examined this object in light of this, and alongside a similar cufflink element, of lesser condition, from Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire (2010 T195, PAS reference BH-1FFDA3) valued at £40. An example featuring the same design, from East of Colchester, Essex (2007 T638, *Portable Antiquities and Treasure Annual Report 2007*, pg. 249; PAS reference ESS-9A8C94) was also valued at £40. On balance the Committee was minded to recommend £60 for the cufflink element from Wymondley. Stevenage Museum hopes to acquire.

30. Post-Medieval silver button from Much Hadham, Hertfordshire (2010 T446)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30. The Committee inspected the button in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £30. Much Hadham Museum hopes to acquire.

31. Post-Medieval silver thimble from Southwell, Nottinghamshire (2009 T191)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £70. The Committee examined the thimble and agreed with the valuer that the item was attractive and in good condition. The substance of the thimble was also remarked upon as a positive attribute. While the inscription on the thimble was seen to be of only moderate interest, when taken with the other factors in favour of the piece, the Committee recommended £150. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

32. Post-Medieval gold posy ring from Shelton, Nottinghamshire (2010 T489)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,500; the finder submitted comments. The Committee took account of these as it viewed the ring. The Committee thanked the finder for his letter, but as it provided no examples of sales precedents for comparable items on the open market or an expert valuation, the Committee was not able to place much weight on the finder's speculation. The Committee had cause to refer to its own past valuations of posy rings, and pointed to an enamelled and inscribed gold Post-Medieval posy ring from Wixford, Warwickshire (2004 T70; *Treasure Annual Report 2004*, pg. 138; PAS reference PAS-FE21B1) valued at £1,000. On balance, and taking note of the sale for £460 of a similarly enamelled Post-Medieval ring of inferior condition in the TimeLine Auction of 18 March 2011, the Committee found Mr [REDACTED]'s suggestion to be accurate, and in agreement recommended £1,500. Newark and Sherwood Museum Service hopes to acquire.

33. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Frampton, Lincolnshire (2010 T685)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £350; the finder submitted comments. The

Committee took account of these as it viewed the finger-ring. The Committee clarified that Mr [REDACTED] had incorrectly attributed the ring to the Order of the Garter in his valuation report; the ring features a garter belt design but there is no suggestion that it is associated with the Order. Nonetheless, the Committee felt that the ring possessed more attraction than had been accounted for in the valuation report, and recommended £400. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

34. Post-Medieval silver bodkin from Boxted, Suffolk (2010 T599) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40; the Committee recommended £40, (5/5/11). The finder submitted a challenge. The Committee took account of this and examined the bodkin again. The Committee noted that the finder had made reference to two private valuations, but had not provided written evidence of the actual valuations by Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED]. The Committee agreed that the Secretariat should inform Mr [REDACTED] that if he wanted the Committee to take account of the two private valuations to which he had referred, he should supply written evidence of these from the valuers.

The Committee also felt that before confirming its earlier recommendation of £40, it should seek the advice from another expert valuer, and agreed to ask [REDACTED] to provide a further valuation report. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

35. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress hook from Winteringham, North Lincolnshire (2010 T493) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250; the Committee recommended £200, (2/6/11). Extract of the Committee meeting of 2/6/11: *'noting the dress hook's large size and attractive appearance. The Committee mentioned that it had valued many post-medieval dress hooks before. In particular, it pointed out the similarity between the piece under consideration and a past case (2010 T187 from Runton, Norfolk, PAS finds number NMS-B7E374, valued at £120). The Committee also made reference to a similar example being offered for sale by the dealer Timeline Originals for £125. Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee recommended £200'*

The finder submitted a challenge. The Committee examined the piece again in light of this and thanked the finder for his letter. With respect to the finder's reference to the dress hook from Billesley, Warwickshire (2003 T356; *Treasure Annual Report 2003*, pg. 122) as a suitable *comparanda* for the Winteringham piece, the Committee noted that the Billesley dress hook was found in 2003 and since that time the proliferation of dress hooks on the market has led to a decrease in their value.

The Committee reinforced this point by referring to the sale of a larger dress hook at Bonham's jewellery sale of 17 October 2007 (Lot no. 63) for £312, which included the buyer's premium.

For these reasons, the Committee confirmed its recommendation of £200. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

NB – For more information on the increase in reported discoveries of Tudor Dress hooks, see:
Hayward, M.A., Mitchell, D., Parker, K. and Gaimster, D. (2002) Tudor silver-gilt dress-hooks:
a new class of treasure find in England. *The Antiquaries Journal*, 82, 157-196.

36. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress pin from Lopen, Somerset (2010 T76) - 3rd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £300; the Committee recommended £200 (5/5/11). Extract of the Committee meeting of 5/5/11: *'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'*

The finder submitted comments for the meeting of 2/6/11 and the Committee did not alter its

recommendation. Extract of the Committee meeting of 2/6/11: *'The Committee viewed the dress pin from Lopen again and took account of the finder's submission. The Committee noted that the finder's submission contained no alternative valuation or evidence upon which the Committee could base a re-estimate of the pin's worth. In addition to the market evidence suggested by the Committee at its last meeting, the Committee noted that it had valued many similar pins before (for example: 2007 T89 from Durnford, Wiltshire, Portable Antiquities and Treasure Annual Report 2007, pg 145, valued at £80; 2005 T405 from Milborne Port, Somerset, Treasure Annual Report 2005/6, pg. 158, valued at £150) and that the recommended figure for the Lopen pin was in keeping with its relative worth with respect to these. The Committee also cited evidence of similar pin having sold at auction at Bonham's in 2006 for £180. The Committee confirmed its recommendation of £200.*

The Committee suggested that if the finder still disagreed with the recommended value, he could submit his own valuation from a recognized authority or material from his own research showing relevant market comparisons. However, the Committee wished to clarify to the finder that as the pin from Lopen has been declared Treasure by the Coroner, it is the property of the Crown, and so long as a museum wishes to acquire the pin, it cannot be returned to the finder'.

The finder submitted a further challenge. The Committee considered the pin again in light of the finder's letter. The Committee clarified that the motive behind the bending of the pin does not impact upon the market value of the pin; the crucial point is not whether the pin was bent deliberately or not, but that the pin is bent and therefore it suffers in attraction compared to straight examples. The finder's letter supplied no further evidence to support his desire to see an increased valuation; in contrast the Committee noted that it had available to it a good number of *comparanda*, which it had cited previously. The Committee further referred to the recent sale (1 June 2011) of a Tudor filigree pin on the TimeLine Originals website (Item #021404) for £145, whose respective price reinforced the Committee's view that the pin from Lopen was worth £200. The Committee confirmed its recommendation of £200. Somerset County Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 3: Coins

Iron Age coins

37. Iron Age coins (210 & Bronze Age torc fragment from Westerham, Kent (2010 T105)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £8,750 (coins= £8,500; object= £250); the finder made a submission which included a private valuation by [REDACTED] for £19,850. The Committee requested that a second provisional valuation (5/5/11). Extract of the Committee meeting of 5/5/11: *'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 [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED]. It was observed that Mr [REDACTED] based his valuation on auctions from three separate houses in recent years, and that Mr [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED] for these coins, and it deferred making a recommendation in order for that to be commissioned'.

The finder has submitted further comments from [REDACTED] the provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested item at £20,000-£25,000 (coins only). The finder has submitted comments following the second provisional valuation.

The Committee considered the coins again with regards to the submissions, and noted the vast

discrepancy between the first provisional valuation by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]'s valuation, as well as that supplied by [REDACTED]. The Committee noted that Mr [REDACTED] had taken into account other sales (whose results had not been disclosed by Mr [REDACTED]) but felt that the evidence for the sale of similar coins from this same hoard, discovered earlier and sold at auction by Morton and Eden, pointed towards the figure suggested by Mr [REDACTED] and nearer to the range suggested by Mr [REDACTED]. In light of that, and factoring in the value of the torc fragment the Committee, recommended £20,000. Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

Roman coins

38. Roman coins (38) from Standon, Hertfordshire (2010 T533)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50-70. The Committee inspected the coins with this in mind and, noting that several of the fourth century coins were quite attractive, with fully identifiable mint marks, the Committee was inclined to agree with the upper figure suggested by the provisional valuer, and recommended £70. Hertford Museum hopes to acquire.

39. Roman coins (2) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T597 - addenda to 2009 T622)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30-40; the finders submitted comments. The Committee viewed the coins with this in mind and thanked the finders for their letter. With respect to the two coins from this case number, the Committee was minded to recommend the upper figure suggested by Mr [REDACTED] and recommended £40. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

40. Roman coin hoard (14) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T622 - addenda to 2010 T597)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £200-210; the finders have submitted comments. The Committee examined the coins in light of this and agreed that a slight uplift was warranted for the value of the 14 coins from this case number. The Committee recommended £220. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

41. Roman coins (16) & associated material from Hindlip, Worcestershire (2010 T345)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £550-600. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this. It was noted that only one member of the Redditch Historical Detection Society had responded with his views on the proposed division of the finder's share of the reward, and the Committee wished for further confirmation of the agreement of the other members to split the finders' portion of the reward equally between themselves, rather than according to the individual coin or coins found by each member.

In addition, the Committee commented that the provision of a delineated list of the value that had been attributed to each coin in the hoard by the provisional valuer would aide in the calculation of the market value of the hoard by the Committee. The Secretariat was asked to approach Mr [REDACTED] for this information and to liaise with the finders over their wishes as to the allocation of the reward. The decision on a recommended valuation and apportionment was deferred to allow for that information to be collected.

Worcestershire Museums Service hopes to acquire.

42. Roman coin hoard from East Sussex area (2006 T4) - 4th viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £48,060; the Committee recommended £46,010 and the following apportionment (TVC dates 25/2/11 and 5/5/11) - £20,704.50 for the finder, £25,305 for the landowner. At the 5/5/11 meeting both the finder and landowner provided submission regarding the apportionment of which they disagreed with. However 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] portion of the reward was abated by 10%, in favour of Mr [REDACTED]. Extract of the Committee meeting of 5/5/11: *'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 ██████ share of the reward. They were:

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

Mr ██████ 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 ██████' 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 ██████' breach of the conditions imposed upon him by Mr ██████ in his email of 28 December 2005 and his appearance on Mr ██████'s land with a metal detector two years later.

Mr ██████ 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 ██████ had improperly terminated the archaeological investigation. The Committee registered Mr ██████'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 ██████' 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 ██████ had made it clear to Mr ██████ 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'.

The finder made further submissions. Upon further reflection and having taken advice from the DCMS, the Committee considered that, in arriving at its recommendation on 5 May 2011 as to the apportionment of the reward, had improperly taken into account the incident of Mr ██████ crossing Mr ██████'s field two years after the discovery of the subject hoard. The Committee agreed that this was an action which should not factor into its decision as to the apportionment of the reward.

In viewing the material from this case again, including the statements received from the interested parties, the Committee felt that two of the actions performed by Mr ██████ had a material impact on this case. They were:

- a.) Mr ██████ went on Mr ██████ land without permission.
- b.) Mr ██████ made the initial discovery of the two coins by actively searching with a metal detector, without seeking permission, and notifying Mr ██████ of the find only several months later.

Mr ██████ suggested in his email of 8/6/11 that his initial discovery of the first two coins in this hoard may have been some distance from the subsequent discovery of the bulk of the hoard, implying that the first two coins may not belong to the hoard under discussion. The Committee felt this was irrelevant information, as the entire find, including the two coins discovered in the summer of 2005, had been declared treasure together by the coroner, and that they were now all to be considered part of the same find.

On balance, and in light of all the relevant considerations regarding the finder's actions with respect to the discovery of this hoard, the Committee was minded to recommend an abatement of Mr [REDACTED]'s portion of the reward by 10%, in favour of Mr [REDACTED]

The value of the coins was confirmed 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 [REDACTED]

£20,704.50 to Mr [REDACTED]

Brighton Museum hopes to acquire the entire hoard.

The Committee further agreed that the proposed wording of the minutes (which will form the body of the letter sent to the interested parties) should first be sent to the DCMS to ask whether they feel that the revised minutes will now give a clear and appropriate account of the relevant factors behind the Committee's decision.

Early Medieval coins:

43. Early Medieval silver pennies (6) from Wingham, Kent (2009 T313)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] provided two valuations for this find, a) £330 for the hoard as including a chip in one of the coins and b) £335 if there had been no chip in one of the coins. The Committee was asked to provide two recommendations, as one of the coins has sustained a chip at an unknown date.

The Committee examined the pennies in light of this and found the suggested values for the coins to be accurate for both instances (both in their current state and if there had been no chip in one of the coins), and also found the individual prices suggested by Mr [REDACTED] to be correct. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £335 for the coins.

Dover Museum hopes to acquire.

44. Anglo-Saxon silver coins (contemporary forgeries) from Grimsby area, Lincolnshire (2008 T380)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] provided two valuations for this item a) £500 if the forgeries are 8th century in date, b) £30-£40 if a modern-day production. Both the museum and finder submitted comments.

The DCMS representative explained that further consideration was needed as to whether it was possible under the stipulations of the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice for the Committee to recommend a value for a case which was based on assumptions which contradicted the rationale behind the coroner's verdict. Specifically, consideration would need to be given as to whether the Committee could value the coins in this hoard as modern-day imitations, a characteristic which would have exempted them from qualifying as Treasure under the Act, despite the fact that the coroner had found the coins to be Treasure.

The Committee acknowledged the advice but felt that a more definitive view on the age of the coins was necessary for it to be able to make an accurate recommendation. The Committee asked the Secretariat to invite the British Museum to undertake further study into the coins, for instance by ordering a Lead Isotope analysis, perhaps from Oxford University, to determine whether the coins are contemporary forgeries or not. A decision on the recommended value was deferred until more information is forthcoming. The Chairman acknowledged that if further analysis indicated that the coins were modern forgeries, the Committee would need to seek further advice on how to proceed with this case.

The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval coins:

45. Medieval silver pennies (3) from Backwell, North Somerset (2010 T316)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] suggested £275. The Committee examined the pennies with this in mind and found Mr [REDACTED] valuation to be accurate, so in agreement, recommended £275. North Somerset Museum hopes to acquire.

46. Medieval silver coins (12) from Cheriton area, Hampshire (2010 T452)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] suggested £490; one of the finders submitted comments. The Committee was asked to value the coins individually according to their finders (two finders).

The Committee viewed the coins in light of this information. It noticed the provisional valuer's surprise at the unusual spread of the mints, and the condition of the coins, but accepted the finder's testimony as to the circumstances of the find. The valuation for the hoard and its delineation were felt to be accurate, so in agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £490 and apportioned the finders' share of the reward according to the coins found by the respective individuals. Winchester Museums Service hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval coins:

47. Post-Medieval silver pennies (3) from Backwell, North Somerset (2010 T317)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] suggested £45. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £45. North Somerset Museum hopes to acquire.

48. Post-Medieval silver coins (7) from Trellech United, Monmouthshire (10.14)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] suggested £195. The Committee inspected the coins with this in mind and was impressed with Mr [REDACTED]'s valuation, so in agreement, recommended £195. Monmouthshire County Museum Service hopes to acquire.

49. Post-Medieval silver coins (4) from Dundry, North Somerset (2010 T797)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] has valued this tem at £935. The Committee took account of this as it examined the coins and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £935. North Somerset Museum hopes to acquire.

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

50. Bronze Age hoard (191) from Attleborough area, Norfolk (2010 T240)

The provisional [REDACTED] has valued this item at £750. The Committee inspected the hoard in light of this and remarked that the individual values suggested by Mr [REDACTED] which total £365, were accurate. The Committee also accepted the rationale behind the multiplication of this sub-total by a factor to account for the archaeological interest of the entire hoard. However, to double the value was deemed excessive, as the remaining fragmentary pieces not assigned an individual value did little to contribute to the attractiveness of the group. The Committee recommended £650. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

51. Roman gold pendant from Hillington, Norfolk (2011 T78)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £750-£850. The Committee viewed the pendant with this in mind. It made reference to another, larger Roman gold phallic pendant, from Braintree, Essex (*Treasure Annual Report 2000*, pg. 26; PAS reference ESS-0CDDC1) valued at £1,300. The Committee acknowledged that the Hillington pendant would possess a certain appeal for collectors, and felt that Ms [REDACTED]'s assessment was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £800. Lynn Museum hopes to acquire.

52. Anglo-Saxon gold object from East Ruston, Norfolk (2010 T142)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £300. The Committee examined the object with this in mind. It felt that Ms [REDACTED] was correct to note the plainness of the item, and the Committee was inclined to note that it was useful to have regard to the bullion price of the gold in this object. The Committee felt that Ms [REDACTED]'s suggestion that a figure of 2.5 times the bullion price would be a suitable estimate of the object's value was too generous. The Committee recommended £200. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

53. Post-Medieval copper gilded brooch (silver pin lug & catch plate) from Deopham, Norfolk (2010 T682)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £120. The Committee viewed the brooch with this information in mind, and the Committee remarked that it would have once been a very attractive object. In its current state, the suggestion was felt to be slightly high, and the Committee recommended £100. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

[Tim Pestell returned to the room]

Item 5: Any Other Business

Committee vacancy – The vacancy on the Committee has been advertised, with a closing date of 28 July 2011 for applicants. Sifting of the applications will commence after that time with interviews to follow in due course.

Coroner for Treasure – A letter from the Minister for Culture has been sent to the British Museum which explained that in the Minister's view a Coroner for Treasure based at the British Museum could lead to the perception of a conflict of interest in the administration of the Treasure Act 1996, so he is not minded to support the suggestion. Another location for the Coroner for Treasure is needed to be found. The Committee was grateful to the DCMS representative for highlighting this issue, and reiterated that it hoped that progress would be made in the establishment of a Coroner for Treasure.

Museum Payments – The Committee expressed concern at hearing that in some instances, museums that have agreed a recommended valuation go beyond the invoice due date to make payment of the required sum. The Committee wished to discuss this issue further at the next meeting.

Item 6: Date of next meeting - Thursday, 22nd September 2011, the Hartwell Room, British Museum.