

Minutes for Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting – 22nd September 2011

The meeting was held in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum on 22nd September 2011 at 11am..

Present:

Committee:

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

Other:

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

Item 1: Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday 20th July 2011

The Chairman reminded the Committee of the usefulness of rapid responses (within one week) to the circulation of the draft minutes of meetings, which are annotated and sent to interested parties prior to the official adoption of the minutes at the subsequent meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved and adopted as a true record.

Item 2: Objects

Bronze Age artefacts

1. Bronze Age copper alloy hoard (31) from Ramsgate, Kent (2010 T117)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100; The Committee viewed the hoard in light of this recommendation, and felt that the provisional valuer's estimation was accurate. The Committee further agreed there have been increasing numbers of similar groups offered for sale, but that the chief interest of such a hoard would be from a museum rather than a private collector. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £100. Dover Museum hopes to acquire.

Roman artefacts

2. Roman gold necklace link from Breewood, Staffordshire (2010 T527)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £35. The Committee inspected the necklace link with this in mind and found the item to be an attractive piece, and recommended £40. The Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent, hopes to acquire.

3. Roman gold bracelet fragment from Marton, Lincolnshire (2011 T67)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £45; the landowner, finder and museum submitted comments. Committee member Trevor Austin announced by way of disclaimer that he had been shown the piece shortly after it was found, and Mr Austin declined to discuss valuation with the finder on the grounds that this would prejudice any future involvement in the valuation process.

The Committee took account of this information as it inspected the fragment. It took note of the concerns of the finder and landowner. The Committee reminded the parties that the recommended valuation is intended to reflect the worth of the item(s) at the time of discovery. By its calculations, the Committee attributed a bullion value of roughly £60 to the piece at the time it was discovered in November 2010. The Committee was minded to add a modest uplift to this figure to reflect the historic element of the item, and recommended £75. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval artefacts

4. Early Medieval silver mount from Bury St Edmunds area, Suffolk (2011 T176)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80-£90; the finder submitted comments and a valuation of £400-£600 from [REDACTED] of Timeline Originals. The Committee examined the mount in light of this and agreed that this mount is less interesting than the *comparanda* quoted in the provisional valuation.

Owing to the disparity in suggested value between Ms [REDACTED]'s valuation and that of Mr [REDACTED] the Committee felt it wise to obtain a second valuation of its own. The Committee instructed the Secretariat to request this valuation from [REDACTED]. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

5. Early Medieval gold & garnet sword button from Cotgrave, Nottinghamshire (2010 T738)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £6,000-£6,500; the finder submitted comments. The Committee inspected the mount in light of the information received, and compared it with a similar sword button in the Staffordshire Hoard (item K675) which had been valued at £4,280. The Committee noted that the garnets of the Cotgrave example were more finely cut, and that overall it was a more complex item than the Staffordshire piece. The Committee also cited as a *comparandum* the Griston scabbard boss (*Portable Antiquities & Treasure Annual Report 2008*, item 178; Treasure case 2008 T634; PAS database number NMS-Z32B24) which had been valued at £8,000. This item was slightly damaged and not as fine as the Cotgrave piece, but was larger in size.

Having regard to the above, the Committee, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £6,500. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

6. Anglo-Saxon gold finger-ring from Uttlesford District, Essex (2008 T548) - 6th viewing

The finder has made a representation to the Secretary of State, contesting the valuation of £7,000. The Committee was asked by the Secretary of State to review the case. The finder has submitted further comments and a private valuation, dated 24 June 2011 and 22 July 2011, that the Secretary of State asked the Committee to view and to provide clarification on two further points:

- a) Why the second private valuation of £15,000 by Mr [REDACTED] is not considered to be a guide to valuation;
- b) The merits of a comparison of 2008 T548 with the 'Alfred Jewel' which Mr [REDACTED] makes reference to in his representations.

The Committee examined the case again. It noted the most recent valuation submitted by Mr [REDACTED] was from a source unknown to the Committee - [REDACTED] of Coins & Antiquities UK. The Committee did not believe it could adequately consider the merits of this valuation without being provided with more information about the valuer's full identity, credentials, and the rationale behind the figure given. As stated in the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (paragraph 67.) 'The Committee reserves the right to adopt safeguards to ensure the reliability of the parties' valuation evidence; for example, greater weight will be given to that from a valuer who belongs to a relevant recognised trade association with its own professional code.' The Committee also noted that this valuation, and indeed those supplied by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] appeared to have been based on photographs of the items. The Committee felt it would be appropriate to advise the finder to invite those valuers to view the ring in person at the British Museum, and to forward any further comments on the valuation as might arise.

The Committee requested that the information regarding [REDACTED] and his valuation, as well as further comments by him or the other private valuers engaged by Mr [REDACTED] reach the Committee in time for the circulation of the papers in advance of the January 2012 meeting. The Committee resolved to table the discussion of the above points a) and b) until that meeting.

Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval artefacts

7. Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Appleby, North Lincolnshire (2009 T200)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80. The Committee viewed the brooch, taking this into account, and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £80.

8. Medieval silver brooch from Blandford Forum, Dorset (2010 T390)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and commented on the interesting punch decoration, and took account also of the absence of a pin. The Committee was concerned that the suggested value was too high, and cited *comparanda* including a small brooch (complete) offered on the Timeline originals website for a retail price of £95. The Committee recommended £40 for the brooch from Blandford Forum. Dorset County Museum hopes to acquire.

9. Medieval silver mount from Barnby in the Willow, Nottinghamshire (2010 T484)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20-£30. This case was removed from discussion as both parties generously agreed to waive their right to reward, in order that the mount is acquired free of charge by Newark & Sherwood Museum.

10. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring fragment from High Burnham area, North Lincolnshire (2010 T634)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and found the suggested value to be reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended, £30. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

11. Medieval silver finger-ring (incomplete) from Kelvedon, Essex (2010 T150)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £30. Braintree Museum hopes to acquire.

12. Medieval gold finger-ring from Bekesbourne, Kent (2009 T678)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £320. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and felt that the suggested figure deviated only slightly from the true value of the item. Owing to the ring's distorted state and the number of scratches it has suffered, the Committee recommended a value of £300. Canterbury Museum hopes to acquire.

13. Medieval gold finger-ring from Lakeneath, Suffolk (2011 T177)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £350. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this, commenting that the ring is slightly worn but not difficult to read, and that in fact the Committee found it to be quite clear. The Committee felt that it is clear that the iconography of the ring represents the Annunciation and observed that this attribute was not fully appreciated in the provisional valuation. It was noted that Mr [REDACTED]'s suggested value did not appear to accord with values recommended by the Committee for previous iconographic rings. Though lighter than many of these, the Committee was of the general opinion that the finger-ring from Lakeneath would command a figure other than £350 if offered at auction. For these reasons, the Committee deferred making a recommendation and asked the Secretariat to seek a second provisional valuation. Moyses Hall Museum hopes to acquire.

14. Medieval gold finger-ring from Baddiley, Cheshire (2010 T708)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £600. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and found the ruby was nicely cut, but observed the setting was crude and took note of the distorted state of the band. On balance, the Committee recommended £500. Grosvenor Museum hopes to acquire.

15. Medieval silver-gilt finial from Offenham, Worcestershire (2009 T689)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £120; the finder submitted comments. Trevor Austin admitted by way of disclosure that he had been phoned by a member of the trade and was invited to comment on the provisional valuation, and Mr Austin declined on the grounds that this would prejudice any future involvement in the valuation process.

The Committee took account of this information as it viewed the item and agreed that the valuation provided by Mr [REDACTED] did not appear to reflect the true value of the piece. The Committee viewed the *comparanda* from Timeline Originals provided by the finder, noting that the first item (Medieval 'Beast Head' Mount) paralleled the piece under discussion, not least because it is from the same (Medieval) period. The other two illustrations provided by the finder, being Anglo-Saxon in culture, were not felt to be fitting *comparanda*. On balance, the Committee felt that it required more information in order to allow it to recommend a value, and the Secretariat was asked to engage the services of another valuer to provide a second provisional valuation. Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

16. Medieval silver-gilt mount from Headon cum Upton, Nottinghamshire (2010 T680)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £25; the finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the mount with this in mind and observed the degree of wear and distortion suffered by the piece. Nonetheless the figures are visible and the Committee agreed with the provisional valuer that the romantic subject allowed the mount to demand greater interest. The Committee believed the value to be in excess of the Mr [REDACTED]'s estimation and recommended £50. Bassetlaw Museum hopes to acquire.

17. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Dunham on Trent, Nottinghamshire (2010 T2) - 3rd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100; the Committee recommended £70 (5 May 2011). The finder submitted comments; the Committee did not change the recommendation of £70 (20 July 2011). The finder submitted further comments. The Committee thanked the finder for his letter, and viewed the ring again in light of this submission. As no new evidence was provided which would cause the Committee to reconsider and amend its recommendation, it confirmed a figure of £70. Newark & Sherwood Museum hopes to acquire.

18. Medieval gold reliquary pendant from Hockley area, Essex (2009 T256) - 3rd viewing

[REDACTED] valued this item at £180,000; [REDACTED] valued this item at £25,000; [REDACTED] valued this item at £4,000-£5,000. 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. The Committee had also considered the finder's submission dated 4 May 2011. Upon making further inquiries, the Committee was provided with revised valuations by [REDACTED] (£15,000-£18,000) and [REDACTED] (£18,000). The finder submitted further comments, dated 1 June 2011. At its meeting of 2 June 2011, the Committee recommended £20,000. The finder submitted a challenge and a private valuation by [REDACTED] of £100,000 - £150,000 (17 August 2011). The British Museum's Department of Conservation and Scientific Research provided a formal report on the examination of the contents of the pendant.

The Committee considered the case again and discussed the issue raised by Mr [REDACTED] in his valuation with reference to the possible extensive restoration of the pendant sold by Timeline Auctions on 18th March 2011 for £14,000, a figure perhaps reflecting that extensive restoration. After examining the evidence before it, the Committee decided that there existed considerable doubt as to the suitability of using the Timeline pendant for a guide to the valuation of the pendant from Hockley. The Committee subsequently disregarded the valuations that based their formulation on the sale of the Timeline piece (i.e. the valuations of [REDACTED] and the revised valuations of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]). This resulted in the Committee drawing upon the original valuations of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and the recent valuation of [REDACTED].

The Committee acknowledged again the difficulty in citing a precise sale precedent for the Hockley pendant, but discussed the item with reference to several other pieces of the period:

- An engraved gold mount from the Dacorum area, Hertfordshire, Treasure case 2007 T224. This had been valued by the Committee at £7,000 in 2009 but subsequently returned to the finder. It was the subject of an auction in 2009, but, although bidding reached £35,000, it remained unsold, and so its market value remains speculative. As a comparison with the Hockley pendant, the Committee observed that the Dacorum piece is smaller, uniface and belongs to another class of object.
- The Phyllis Phillips triptych pendant cited by [REDACTED] this item was listed in a Christie's auction of December 1989 (Lot 480) and the bidding reached £68,000 but the item remained unsold. Exact comparison with this piece was impossible for the Committee, however, as a photograph of the item was unavailable at the time.
- An engraved gold Tau cross acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art for £60,000 by Sotheby's in July 1990. (see - <http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/70009931>).

It was pointed out again that comparison of the Hockley pendant to the Middleham Jewel is inappropriate in terms of determining the former's value, despite the appearance of the two items together in the British Museum's catalogue for the *Treasures of Heaven* exhibition. The Middleham jewel is larger, heavier, set with an impressive sapphire, and in terms of quality of the engraving, goldsmiths' work and iconography, far outweighs the interest and value of the Hockley pendant. The Committee maintained that [REDACTED] s original suggestion relied too heavily on similarities in shape between the two pieces. [REDACTED] valuation offered no other positive *comparanda* than the Middleham Jewel and so it was difficult for the Committee to attribute much weight to his suggested figure.

On balance, the Committee was minded to recommend £70,000 for the reliquary pendant from Hockley.

Southend Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval artefacts

19. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress-hook from Little Cranfield, Essex (2010 T268)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-120. The Committee viewed the item in light of this and commented on the large number of similar dress hooks it had valued in the past. The suggested value was felt to be slightly high, and the Committee recommended £80. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

20. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress-hook from Winterton, North Lincolnshire (2011 T108)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80. The Committee examined the item in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £80. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

21. Post-Medieval silver bead from Crosthwaite area, Cumbria (2010 T228)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £35. The Committee inspected the bead in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £35. Kendal Museum hopes to acquire.

22. Post-Medieval silver-gilt pin head from Chiddingstone, Kent (2010 T284)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80. The Committee viewed the pin head in light of this and in agreement with the valuer, suggested £80. Sevenoaks Museum hopes to acquire.

23. Post-Medieval silver mount from Roxby, North Lincolnshire (2010 T539)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30. The Committee inspected the mount with this in mind and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £30. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

24. Post-Medieval silver fitting from Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire (2011 T64)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £135. The Committee viewed the fitting and took this into account, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £135. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

25. Post-Medieval silver clasp from Scawby, North Lincolnshire (2010 T686)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £125. The Committee viewed the clasp in light of this and commented on the attraction of the piece. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £125. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

26. Post-Medieval silver-gilt button from Ashington, West Sussex (2010 T370)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £275. The Committee examined the button in light of this and felt that although an intricate piece, the suggested figure was slightly high. The Committee recommended £250. Horsham Museum hopes to acquire.

27. Post-Medieval silver cufflink from Orpington, Greater London (2009 T424)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40. The Committee viewed the cufflink with this in mind, and had cause to refer to many other similar items that it had valued before. In accordance with the values of those items, and judging by the relative condition of the Orpington piece, the Committee recommended £45. Bromley Museum hopes to acquire.

28. Post-Medieval silver cufflink from Buckingham, Buckinghamshire (2010 T420)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50-£60. The Committee took this into account as it viewed the cufflink, commenting that it was larger and featured a less common design than another cufflink seen at the same meeting from Orpington, Greater London (Treasure case 2009 T424, PAS database number LON-53D2C4) valued at £45. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £60. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

29. Post-Medieval silver seal matrix from Barlby, North Yorkshire (2010 T615)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee viewed the matrix in light of this, commenting on the small size of the piece but noting that it was complete and not damaged. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. York Museums Trust hopes to acquire.

30. Post-Medieval silver bodkin fragment from Normanton on Trent, Nottinghamshire (2010 T754)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20. The Committee viewed the bodkin fragment with this in mind and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £20. Newark & Sherwood Museum hopes to acquire.

31. Post-Medieval silver apostle spoon finial from Bawtry, Nottinghamshire (2011 T151)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee viewed the finial in light of this and found the item to possess an appeal in its own right (and not merely as a component of a spoon). The Committee had in the past valued two similar silver spoon finials (2005 T63 from Merton, Devon; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6* p.162 and 2005 T210 from Bishops Tawton, Devon; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6* p.162) at £150. For that reason the Committee recommended a value of £150. Bassetlaw Museum hopes to acquire.

32. Post-Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Malmesbury, Wiltshire (2010 T791)

The provisional [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £250. Athelstan Museum hopes to acquire.

33. Post-Medieval gold posy ring from Dorking, Surrey (2010 T517)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £200. The Committee viewed the ring in light of this and observed that it is a reasonable weight and features an inscription, but also took account of the ring's unfortunate, crushed state. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £200. Guildford Museum hopes to acquire.

34. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Lea and Claverton, Wiltshire (2010 T718)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £220. The finder submitted comments including valuations by [REDACTED] (Bonhams) at £1,500-£2,000 and [REDACTED] (Timeline Originals) at £800 - £1,200 and a *comparandum* sold by the dealer Sanda Lipton.

The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this. The Committee commented on the delicate nature of the ring and took account of its worn state. It felt the inscription was quite legible. Owing to the large discrepancy between the valuation of Mr [REDACTED] and those submitted by the finder, the Committee deferred making a recommendation, and asked the Secretariat to seek a second provisional valuation from [REDACTED]. The Committee also advised the finder that he may wish to invite the valuers he consulted to view the ring in person at the British Museum, and to forward any further comments on the valuation they may have. Athelstan Museum hopes to acquire.

35. Post-Medieval silver bodkin from Boxted, Suffolk (2010 T599) - 3rd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £40; the Committee recommended £40 (5 May 2011). The finder submitted comments; the Committee requested a second valuation (20 July 2011). The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60.

The Committee took account of these facts as it viewed the bodkin again. It was noted that despite being asked, the finder had not supplied written evidence of the valuations cited in his submission of 17 June 2011. The valuation of Mr [REDACTED] provided specific auction precedents and that of Mr [REDACTED] on the number of bodkins he had seen in the market, and the Committee placed more weight on their suggestions. In agreement with [REDACTED] the Committee recommended £60. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 3: Coins

Roman coins

36. Roman coin (catalogue item 13 only) from York area, North Yorkshire (2008 T622)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20. The Committee had previously valued the entire hoard and associated material at £2,500 (5 May 2011). The Committee viewed the coin in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £20. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

37. Roman coins (16) and associated material from Hindlip, Worcestershire (2010 T345) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £550-£600; the Committee did not make a recommendation (20 July 2011). Mr [REDACTED] subsequently supplied a valuation breaking down the value

assigned to each coin in the group and one of the finders has submitted comments. The Committee examined the coins in light of this, thanking the finder for her letter. Addressing the finder's concern, the Committee explained that it was tasked with valuing the find in the condition in which it was discovered, and that the figure recommended would reflect the value of any coin that had the same attributes. That the coin in question (No. 2) is only 'possibly' Elagabalus is a factor in its value. The Committee made the general comment that the fragments in the group had been overvalued by Mr [REDACTED] and that two of the complete coins deserved an increase from Mr [REDACTED]'s suggestion. The lumps of metal, unattractive in their own right, were attributed a value by the Committee to reflect the archaeological interest of their association with the hoard of coins.

The recommended breakdown was as follows:

1. Denarius of Geta	£25
2. Denarius of possibly Elagabalus	£5
3. Denarius of Elagabalus	£5
4. Denarius of Elagabalus	£5
5. Denarius of Elagabalus	£8
6. Denarius of Severus Alexander	£5
7. Radiate of Gordian III	£30
8. Radiate of Herennia Etruscilla	£40
9. Radiate of Trajan Decius	£15
10. Radiate of Hostilian	£5
11. Radiate of Volusian	£10
12. Radiate of Trebonianus Gallus	£20
13. Radiate of Aemilian	£15
14. Radiate of Valerian	£5
15. Commemorative Radiate of Valerian II	£5
16. Radiate of Gallienus	£2

The non-coin items:

17. Molten gold lump	£300.
18. Molten silver lump	£25
Total:	£525

Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

38. Roman coin hoard from East Sussex area (2006 T4)- 5th viewing

[REDACTED] valued this item at £48,060.

At its meetings of 25 February, 5 May, and 22 July 2011, the Committee had recommended £46,010 for the value of the hoard, apportioned as follows:

£20,704.50 for Mr [REDACTED] the finder,
£25,305.50 for Mr [REDACTED] the landowner.

This amounted to an abatement of 10% of Mr [REDACTED]'s reward, in favour of Mr [REDACTED]

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport advised the Committee to re-examine the case again in view of the fact that it appeared there were differences recorded in the minutes of 5 May 2011 and 22 July 2011 for the Committee's reasons given for the abatement. It is therefore advisable to clarify and review the relevant factors in the Committee's recommendation for the apportionment of the reward. Mr [REDACTED] made several additional submissions.

- A. The Committee considered a point raised by Mr [REDACTED] in his submission of 16 September 2011. In that email, Mr [REDACTED] withdrew his previous suggestion that an abatement of his share be applied only to the value of the first two coins that he discovered, and did so on the grounds that those coins did not themselves constitute treasure. The Committee clarified that in its view the two coins, as well as the remainder of the hoard, were confirmed by the coroner to constitute a single find of 'Treasure' and so were subject to the same procedures of valuation and reward payment.
- B. The Committee resolved to look at the case afresh, considering all of the submissions by the interested parties, and all relevant evidence to determine a recommended apportionment of the reward of £46,010. It also resolved to ensure that this was correctly recorded in the minutes.
- C. It was noted that the minutes of the meeting of 5 May 2011 reflected that the Committee had considered as relevant to the discussion the fact that two years after the discovery of the hoard, Mr [REDACTED] was again seen on the land with a detector, despite being told unequivocally not to return. The Committee was advised that this is not a relevant circumstance that should factor into the decision of reward apportionment or abatement, and the Committee agreed, confirming that this event was not a relevant factor in the current analysis.
- D. The Committee considered carefully all the documents and the evidence submitted by Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] and recommended an abatement of 10% of Mr [REDACTED]'s reward, in favour of Mr [REDACTED]

Having considered this case in the round it is confirmed that the reasons for this decision are as follows:

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.

This fact is not disputed, and Mr [REDACTED] admits to the above in his submission of 16 February 2011.

b.) The Committee was not satisfied that Mr [REDACTED] had unconditional permission to return to the land and excavate further on 28 December 2005 and if he had conditional permission as evidenced by the email of Mr [REDACTED] of 28 December 2005, he had not in any event complied with the condition imposed by the landowner.

The Committee felt that a significant piece of evidence in this matter was the email of Mr [REDACTED] to Mr [REDACTED] dated 28 December 2005 which read:

'...Thanks for the message – how exciting – please e-mail me when you/Sussex Uni would like to have another look around and we will come with you. We own the fields...'

This e-mail was quoted by both parties (Mr [REDACTED] in his submission of 23 February 2011; Mr [REDACTED] via FLO Stephanie Smith on 21 February 2011). The Committee noted that this email highlighted a discrepancy in Mr [REDACTED]'s submission of 16 February 2011, in which he said:

'As I remark elsewhere in this statement, at no time did [Mr [REDACTED]] ever say he

wanted to come with me or that he wanted me to ‘check in’ during the few subsequent days until the bulk of the coins had been excavated’

The Committee considered that Mr [REDACTED]’s e-mail of 28 December 2005 clearly constituted a conditional permission for Mr [REDACTED] to search Mr [REDACTED]’s property. However, as stated above, the Committee was not satisfied that unconditional permission had been granted prior to Mr [REDACTED] returning to the land and finding further coins on 28 December 2005 and the conditional permission given by Mr [REDACTED] on 28 December 2005, as evidenced by his email, had not been complied with anyway.

In conclusion, having reconsidered the matter afresh, the Committee confirmed a recommended value of the hoard as: £46,010.

For the reasons cited above, the Committee recommended a 10% abatement of the reward for Mr [REDACTED], and recommended the following apportionment:

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

Brighton Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval coins

39. Medieval silver coins (6) from Preston Capes, Northamptonshire (2010 T792)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £166. The finder submitted comments, which the Committee thanked him for. Upon viewing the coins, the Committee felt that Mr [REDACTED]’s suggestions were accurate and had properly appreciated the condition of the coins in arriving at a value for them. Mr [REDACTED] had also provided valuable, recent auction parallels. For those reasons, the Committee agreed with Mr [REDACTED]’s suggestion, and recommended £166. Daventry Town Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval coins

40. Post-Medieval silver coins (3) from Chester area, Cheshire (2011 T271)

The provisional valuer Peter [REDACTED] suggested £140. The finder submitted comments, and the Committee took account of these as it viewed the case. The Committee explained that the values listed in Spink’s Standard Catalogue and on the AMR Coins website provided by the finder constitute retail prices of these items and market values, which are usually expressed in terms of auction hammer price. The Committee agreed with the values suggested by [REDACTED] and recommended £140. Grosvenor Museum hopes to acquire.

41. Post-Medieval coin hoard (6) and silver-gilt medal from Oswestry, Shropshire (2010 T418) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] valued this item at £203; the Committee recommended £203 (2 June 2011). The finder and landowner have submitted comments regarding the valuation of the medal. The Committee thanked the parties for their letters, and examined the medal again. On balance, the Committee considered that Mr [REDACTED] had adequately accounted for the condition of the medal in his report, and that his suggested figure had been properly justified by the provisional of auction *comparanda*. The Committee confirmed its previous recommendation of £203 for the group. Powysland Museum hopes to acquire.

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

42. Bronze Age hoard (191) from Attleborough, Norfolk (2010 T240) - 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £750; the Committee recommended £650 (20 July 2011). The finder submitted a challenge. The Committee read the finder's letter and supplementary material and viewed the hoard again. The Committee noted that the first parallel supplied by the finder contained a number of complete and recognisable items, whereas the hoard in question is very much more fragmentary. In addition, the parallels from Ancient Relics.co.uk and Timeline Originals represent retail prices, rather than true market values, which are usually equated to auction hammer prices. Not finding anything in the submission which would cause it to change its recommendation, the Committee confirmed a recommendation of £650. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire

43. Medieval silver brooch from Potwick with Whitton, Norfolk (2010 T781)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£150. The finder submitted comments. The Committee read the finder's letters and viewed the object, noting that the finder himself acknowledged he could provide no evidence to support his view. The Committee commented on the interesting design around the circumference of the piece, and found itself in agreement with the suggestion of [REDACTED]. It recommended £150. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

44. Post-Medieval silver plate fragment from Cranworth, Norfolk (2011 T111)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50. The Committee viewed the plate fragment in light of this and pointed to the interesting pattern on the surface of the piece. Though not especially attractive, the Committee felt the plate would demand some attention on the market, and recommended £70. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

[Tim Pestell returned to the room]

Item 5: Any Other Business

2008 T585 – Anglo-Saxon Grave goods from the Lewes Area, East Sussex – *Currently this case is awaiting coroner's inquest, as the Barbican House Museum wishes to acquire the items. The archaeologists who excavated the grave are concerned at the fragility of the material and have requested that it is not moved, but valued by photographs. Please review the photographs of the objects and inform the Secretariat which of the items are needed to be transported to the British Museum.*

The Committee was unable to view the photographs however it asked for the robust items to be brought to the British Museum for valuation, and acknowledged that the more fragile pieces would have to be valued from photographs.

Delays in acquiring museums paying invoices and museums withdrawing interest – *At the meeting of 20 July 2011, the Committee expressed concern upon learning that in some cases museums which have agreed a recommended valuation have exceeded the expected time of four months to pay the agreed amount of money to the British Museum. The Committee wished for further information about the procedures employed by the Secretariat when invoicing and taking payment from a museum.*

The procedures of the Secretariat are framed by the requirements of the Treasure Act and the Code of Practice, and are also intended to ensure that all of the interested parties in cases of Treasure are treated fairly and openly. The valuation and reward process is intended to see fair market value rewards paid to finders and landowners as quickly as possible, and to give museums a reasonable amount of time to raise the money to pay these rewards. This principle works both ways – there is no limit on the amount of time a case can take whilst going through the valuation process, and as the Committee is aware there are many cases that take more than a year for the interested parties (usually the finders or landowners) to accept a recommended value. The Committee has urged the Secretariat to adopt a strategy of 'active case management' to ensure that parties making the same arguments in multiple submissions do not delay the acceptance of a valuation unduly.

To persuade museums to make payments for items of treasure within the target time of 3 months (4 if pursuing outside funding) the Secretariat maintains active correspondence with the museums in questions throughout the invoice period, sending reminders when the deadline of 3 months has been breached and chasing payment at 4 months from the invoice date. The majority of museums make their payments within this time; and for those that do not, the reasons for delay are usually down to unfamiliarity with the system, poor judgement at the length of time required for funding applications to be approved, or

withdrawal of funding or lack of funding at the particular time of invoicing (the date of which can vary tremendously from the date of initial expression of acquisition interest, owing to variations in the length of inquests and valuation period). The delay in coroner inquests has had a particularly negative effect on the ability of some museums to afford items of treasure: some coroners adopt a practice of storing up cases of treasure for some time and holding inquests in large 'batches' resulting in a hoard of cases falling in the same museum's catchment area coming due all at once. This can make acquisition of them all difficult for the curator to afford.

In addition to the standard letters (above) the British Museum Secretariat also has published advice on its website (finds.org.uk/treasure) for museums on fundraising options, and maintains a close relationship with representatives from the major funding bodies - in particular the staff at the V&A Purchase Grant Fund - in order to be able to provide accurate information to the appropriate curators. The Secretariat also assists acquiring museums by arranging for funding bodies to view the items concerned at their meetings. The British Museum Secretariat has also worked with colleagues at the DCMS to enable the movement of items of treasure to acquiring museums in advance of payment, to assist them in local fundraising efforts.

If, despite a museum's best efforts to pay the invoice on time, payment is delayed, the British Museum Secretariat instructs the relevant curator to keep the other parties informed of progress in raising the funds.

If an acquiring museum was not willing to undertake the provision of this information, or if the museum did not respond within a given time to queries from the Secretariat as to a time frame for payment of an invoice, the Secretariat would eventually be in the position of being forced to return the find to the finder or landowner (provided no other museums wished to acquire it).

A rough analysis of the over 800 finds which have been invoiced for, paid and acquired since the British Museum assumed the TVC Secretariat function in 2007 shows that the average time for payment of an invoice is 67 days.

We feel that of greater concern than the small number of incidents of delinquent payment of invoices are the cases where museums that had expressed an interest in acquiring an item of treasure withdraw from the process without following through with the acquisition. A list of the cases where this has occurred is included in this pack; in the calendar year from August 2010 to August 2011 a total of 97 cases were dropped by a museum that had initially expressed an interest in them. This is from a total of 261 cases that were concluded in that period. It is the Secretariat's experience the withdrawal of museum interest during the valuation process is particularly harmful to the experience of the other interested parties - this is because if no museum had initially expressed an interest, an inquest would not have been necessary and the find could have been returned much earlier.

To combat this the British Museum Secretariat proposes to put together a simple, straightforward advice sheet for curators of acquiring museums to inform them of the steps of the treasure process and make them aware of the time delay caused by subsequent withdrawal of interest. It has been our approach to advise museums expressing an initial interest in acquiring treasure that they should a.) have a realistic expectation of the market value of the item(s) in question and b.) expect that money will be available or can be raised when the time for the invoice arrives.

Any advice that the Committee may have in this matter would be most appreciated.

The Committee acknowledged the negative effect of museums withdrawing inquest from a Treasure case on the future cooperation of finders and landowners in the process. The Committee felt that it may be worthwhile to highlight this issue with the Secretary of State, and make him aware of the factors contributing to the withdrawal of acquisition interest by museums. It was put forth that it may be useful to address the issue in relevant publications such as the Museums Journal and the newsletters of the NCMD.

Dates of Meetings in 2012 – The Secretariat will circulate potential dates for meetings via e-mail.

Item 6: Date of next meeting: Friday, 28 October 2011, at the British Museum.

