

## Minutes for Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting – 19<sup>th</sup> January 2012

### Attendance:

#### **Committee:**

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

#### **British Museum:**

Caroline Barton  
Roger Bland  
Caroline Lyons  
Ian Richardson

#### **DCMS:**

Kathryn Barrett  
Paul Blaker

The meeting was held in the Board Room at the British Museum on Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at 11 am.

*Note:* The agenda contained a series of 30 cases all discovered at a site from the Woodbridge area, Suffolk. They were however separate, discrete cases. There were four private finders variously associated with 28 of these finds, and two finds were made by Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service. All finds were from land owned by a single landowner. Colchester and Ipswich Museums Service hope to acquire these finds, and the interested parties have agreed that for administrative ease they should all be processed at the same time. To that end, several of the parties submitted paperwork which touched on the effect of provenance on value, with respect to the entire group of finds. Representations were also made with respect to specific items. The paperwork was included under each of these specific cases, and in the first case of the group (agenda item 2). The finder/landowner divisions of reward have been agreed by all parties for each individual case. The cases from the Woodbridge area, Suffolk are marked with a †.

Owing to the unusual circumstances whereby the finds from the Woodbridge area were made, the Committee asked the Secretariat to obtain further information about the arrangements in place for the searching conducted in this location, and to supply in advance of the next meeting a short factual paper on the situation in the Woodbridge area and potential difficulties which may arise for the Committee when considering the allocation of rewards for finds made under such circumstances. This paper will be circulated with the Committee members in advance of the next meeting, for comment.

### Item 1: Welcome

Hetty Gleave was welcomed to the Committee as its newest member.  
Paul Blaker was welcomed as the Head of Cultural Property at the DCMS.

**Item 2: Minutes of the meeting of Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> October 2011** – The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

### Item 3: Objects

#### **Bronze Age artefacts**

##### **1. Bronze Age gold penannular ring from Reigate, Surrey (2011 T332)**

The provisional valuer suggested £300. The Committee examined the ring in light of this and agreed that it was of an artefact type that had been valued before on several occasions. The penannular ring from Reigate was felt to be a pleasant example and the rationale in the provisional valuation was seen to be sound. In agreement with the valuer, the Committee recommended £300. Guildford Museum hopes to acquire.

##### **2. †Prehistoric gold bucket-shaped object (a), Anglo Saxon silver bar (b), silver object (c) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T163)**

The provisional valuer suggested £700-£900. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the

context of this site. As one of those finds (though discovered in the course of archaeological investigation), the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the items and formed the view that most of the value in this group was to be found in the bucket-shaped object, the questionable dating of which the Committee noted. The Anglo-Saxon parallels suggested from Timelines Auction and Timeline Originals were believed to be not as attractive as the gold bucket-shaped item, which however did not contain the garnet decoration that complimented the other pieces. On balance, the Committee was in agreement with the lower figure suggested by the provisional valuer, recommending, £680 for the bucket-shaped item, and £10 for each of the silver items, for a total of £700. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

### **Iron Age artefacts**

#### **3. Iron Age (possibly) gold twisted wire fragment from Gwithian, Cornwall (2010 T748)**

The provisional valuer suggested £550, and the Committee viewed the wire fragment in light of this. It was thought that although the piece has form and shape and at least bears a resemblance to an Iron Age artefact, most of its value would be in its gold composition. For largely undiagnostic objects the Committee had in the past taken the view that it was appropriate to recommend a value equal to one and a half times the bullion value of the precious metal contained therein. In this case, as it was felt that there was some additional attraction to this tactile piece, the Committee was inclined to recommend a figure above one and a half times the bullion value of the item. The Committee recommended £520. Royal Institute of Cornwall hopes to acquire.

### **Roman artefacts**

#### **4. Roman silver finger-ring from Penkrige, Staffordshire (2011 T282)**

The provisional valuer suggested £300. The Committee examined the ring in light of this and found it to be a pleasant example. The Committee had cause to refer to a similar finger-ring from Fulbourn, Cambridgeshire (2002 T235; *Treasure Annual Report 2002*, p23; valued at £500) which was, at 9.9 grams, much larger and heavier than the Penkrige ring (2.4 grams). Taking this into account, the Committee recommended £250. The Potteries Museum and Art Gallery, Stoke-on-Trent, hopes to acquire.

#### **5. Roman gold lamella from North Yorkshire (2009 T325)**

The provisional valuer suggested £500. The Committee examined the lamella with this in mind and took note of the lack of a legible text on the surface of the item, and its incomplete state. Other *lamellae* which have come before the Committee have contained inscriptions that have been at least partially deciphered and the objects have been in better, complete condition (see: 2007 T1 from South Oxfordshire; *Portable Antiquities & Treasure Annual Report 2007*, p86; valued at £6,500, and 2003 T93 from Billingford, Norfolk, *Treasure Annual Report 2003*, p56; valued at £10,000). The Committee therefore found itself in agreement with the provisional valuer, and recommended £500. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Early Medieval artefacts**

#### **6. †Anglo-Saxon gold mount from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T384)**

The provisional valuer suggested £40. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the mount and found the provisional value to be reasonable, so in agreement with the valuer, recommended £40. Colchester &

Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**7. †Anglo-Saxon (or later) silver-gilt mount from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T386)**

The provisional valuer suggested £15. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the mount and agreed with the provisional valuer's assessment that the piece had a little commercial value. Nonetheless, the suggested figure seemed appropriate for a gilded silver piece of metal, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**8. †Early-Medieval silver mount from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T723)**

The provisional valuer suggested £15. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the silver mount and felt that it possessed little commercial appeal but acknowledged that it possessed some substance, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**9. †Anglo-Saxon gold bead from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T354)**

The provisional valuer suggested £300-£350. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the bead and found it to be of reasonable weight and condition, and a nicely executed artefact. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £350. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**10. Anglo-Saxon gold & garnet setting from Warmington, Warwickshire (2009 T662)**

The provisional valuer suggested £300-£400. The Committee inspected the setting in light of this and commented that although there was a garnet present in the artefact, which contributed to its appeal, the suggested range was slightly high. Owing to the small size of the item, the Committee recommended £250. Warwickshire Museum hopes to acquire.

**11. †Early Medieval silver ingot from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T353)**

The provisional valuer suggested £5-£10. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee inspected the ingot, and stated that it had in the past valued many similar artefacts, whose valuations have reflected the size, weight and precious metal content of the artefacts. In relation to these items, the Committee remarked that an appropriate figure for the item in question would be slightly higher. It recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**12. †Early Medieval (possibly) silver ingot from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T722)**

The provisional valuer suggested £10. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the ingot, and stated that it had in the past valued many similar artefacts, whose valuations have reflected the size, weight and precious metal content of the artefacts. In relation to these items, the Committee remarked that an appropriate figure for the item in question would be slightly higher. It recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**13. †Early Medieval silver ingot from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T650)**

The provisional valuer suggested £10. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the ingot, and stated that it had in the past valued many similar artefacts, whose valuations have reflected the size, weight and precious metal content of the artefacts. In relation to these items, the Committee remarked that the provisional valuation was accurate, and in agreement, recommended £10. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**14. †Early Medieval (possibly) gold ingot droplet from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T648)**

The provisional valuer suggested £50. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the ingot, and stated that it had in the past valued many similar artefacts, whose valuations have reflected the size, weight and precious metal content of the artefacts. In relation to these items, the Committee remarked that an appropriate figure for the item in question would be slightly lower. The Committee recommended £45. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**15. †Early Medieval (possibly) gold globule from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T651)**

The provisional valuer suggested £40. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the globule and noted that its tiny size, especially in comparison to another gold item from the Woodbridge area (2010 T648, valued at £45) justified a lower value. The Committee recommended £25. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**16. †Early Medieval gold disc from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T649)**

The provisional valuer suggested £250. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the object and

commented on the likelihood of it representing a coin blank, as posited in the report for the coroner. It was noted that a gold coin blank of Iron Age date, weighing 6.05 grams, compared to 1.23 grams for the Woodbridge area example, had been valued at £145. It was suggested that the provisional valuation was therefore high in this case, and the Committee recommended £150. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**17. †Anglo-Saxon silver wrist clasp (possibly) fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T366)**

The provisional valuer suggested £10-£15. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee scrutinised the fragment and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**18.\* †Anglo-Saxon silver mount or? wrist clasp fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T385)**

The provisional valuer suggested £30. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the item in light of this and compared it to another possible wrist clasp fragment from the Woodbridge area (2011 T366; valued at £15). Feeling that this piece was superior to 2011 T366, the Committee recommended £40. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**19. †Early Medieval silver-gilt? mount fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T247)**

The provisional valuer suggested £100. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee inspected the mount, noting its fragmentary nature. At the same meeting the Committee viewed another Early Medieval silver-gilt mount, from Bury St Edmunds area, Suffolk (2011 T176; valued at £100), which was a complete item and felt to be more attractive. On balance, the Committee recommended £80 for the mount fragment from the Woodbridge area, Suffolk. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**20. †Viking silver finger-ring (four fragments) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T333)**

The provisional valuer suggested £10-£15. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds (though discovered in the course of archaeological investigation), the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the ring, and owing to its poor state, agreed with the provisional valuer and recommended £10. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**21. †Early Medieval silver-gilt brooch fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T34)**

The provisional valuer suggested £35. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there

were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the brooch fragment and noted that it was small but decorative, and felt that this justified the suggested value. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £35. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**22. †Early Medieval copper alloy pendant with gold setting from Woodbridge area Suffolk (2010 T412)**

The provisional valuer suggested £50. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the pendant and complimented the decoration present. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £50. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**23. †Anglo-Saxon gold? jewellery fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T75)**

The provisional valuer suggested £80-£100. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee inspected the fragment and commenting on the attractive filigree work. As the piece was so small and its precise nature was not known, the Committee remarked that the provisional valuation was slightly high, and recommended £70. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**24. †Anglo-Saxon gold? jewellery / mount fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2009 T383)**

The provisional valuer suggested £150-£180. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the fragment, having cause to refer to another gold possible jewellery fragment from the Woodbridge area, Suffolk seen at the same meeting (2010 T75; valued at £70). The object in question was more substantial than 2010 T75 but lacked the filigree work, and on balance, the Committee felt that the attraction of both items was equal. Therefore the Committee recommended £70 for 2009 T383. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**25. †Early Medieval silver? brooch fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T197)**

The provisional valuer suggested £10. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the fragment and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £10. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**26. †Early Medieval silver-gilt fragments (two) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T198)**

The provisional valuer suggested £20. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided

a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed these two fragments and felt that their diminutive nature pointed to a slightly lower value, and recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**27. †Early Medieval silver-gilt fragment from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T196)**

The provisional valuer suggested £15. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the fragment and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £15. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**28. †Early Medieval silver hooked tag from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T652)**

The provisional valuer suggested £60. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee inspected the hooked tag, noting that while it was broken at the top, it was largely complete and retained the traces of niello inlay. Having regard for similar hooked tags offered for sale on the website Timeline Originals, the Committee recommended £50. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**29. Early Medieval silver strap end from Glemsford, Suffolk (2010 T755)**

The provisional valuer suggested £450-£500. The Committee viewed the strap end in light of this, commenting on the pleasing substance of the item. It was noted that a similar example had been offered by the dealer A.A. Gillis at a retail price of £450 – the Committee commented that the market value of the item would therefore have been lower than this. The Glemsford piece was felt to be superior to the A.A. Gillis example. The Committee also pointed to a Carolingian mount from Great Dunham, Norfolk (2006 T522; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, p89; valued at £500) of similar size and composition. Taking account of all of the above, the Committee recommended £450. Moyses' Hall Museum hopes to acquire.

**30. †Anglo-Saxon silver mount (two fragments) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T653)**

The provisional valuer suggested £850-950. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The finders also requested, with regard to this specific case, that the Committee have regard for the high status appearance of the mount and its uniqueness. The Committee viewed the mount in light of this, taking into account the finders' views. The Committee noticed that the break in the mount was clean and the interior appeared solid, and wished the finders luck in locating the missing components of the mount. The Committee admired the pieces, pointing out that every artefact of this nature from the Anglo-Saxon period is intricately varied and so each is unique. It further commented that it was impossible to assert that this piece was of very high status. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Committee felt that on balance the suggested range was slightly high, and recommended £800. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

### **31. †Anglo-Saxon gold pin from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T654)**

The provisional valuer suggested £1,200. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. With respect to this particular piece, the finders also drew attention to two comparable Anglo-Saxon silver pins offered on the Timeline Originals website for £1,950 and £1,750. The Committee viewed the gold pin in light of this and acknowledged the rarity of the item. It was noted that the figures on the Timeline Original's site were retail prices, rather than market values, but nonetheless the Committee felt it prudent to seek a second provisional valuation on this item before making a recommendation, and asked the Secretariat to commission a second provisional valuation. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

### **32. Early Medieval silver-gilt sword pommel from Lowick, Northamptonshire (2010 T702)**

The provisional valuer suggested £2,500-£3,000 and the finder submitted comments. The Committee took account of the finder's points as it viewed the item. The Committee acknowledged a resemblance to the pommel found in Chiswick Eyot and subsequently acquired by the Museum of London; however at the time of the meeting no information was available as to the details of this acquisition so it was not possible to compare the market value of the two items. [NB – Subsequent to the meeting it was revealed that the pommel from Chiswick Eyot was acquired by the Museum of London for £900 in 1981].

It was commented that the Lowick pommel was a substantial item which could likely withstand a degree of conservation treatment to enhance its appeal, which might have a bearing on its market value, and this possibility was taken into account. The Committee made the point to the finder that such work would only be carried out after the acquisition of the piece, as according to the Treasure Act 1996 *Code of Practice*, paragraphs 47 and 66, the pommel would be valued in the condition in which it was found.

The Committee further noted that the finder referred to two offers from dealers for the Lowick pommel, and it advised the finder that if he wished the Committee to take account of these he should arrange for the full details of these offers, including the names of the dealers/valuers, their credentials and the reasoning for their suggested figures, should be provided to the Committee in advance of the next meeting.

The eighth-century date of the pommel was felt to contribute to its appeal, as it represented a rarer find than seventh-century examples valued previously by the Committee. On balance, the Committee felt that it was necessary before making a recommendation, for it to request a second provisional valuation. It asked the Secretariat to commission a second provisional valuation for this item and deferred making a recommendation until the report is received. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

### **33. Early Medieval silver mount from Bury St Edmunds area, Suffolk (2011 T176) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £80-£90; the finder submitted comments and a valuation from [REDACTED] of Timeline Originals. The Committee requested a second valuation (22 September 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £80; the finder and museum submitted comments. The Committee viewed the item again, commenting once more on the disparity between the valuation figures provided by the experts it had consulted, and the suggestion made by [REDACTED]. The Committee was inclined to give greater weight to the valuations from those experts who had seen the item in person, noting that Mr [REDACTED] had provided his suggestion based on photographs. The Committee noticed the *comparanda* provided in the first valuation were for gilt copper-alloy items, but that these were heavier objects than the piece in question and their prices were retail values rather than auction precedents. At the same meeting the Committee viewed another Early Medieval mount, of silver-gilt, from the Woodbridge area of Suffolk (2010 T247) and valued it at £80. Having regard to all of the factors above, the Committee recommended £100. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

### **34. Anglo-Saxon gold finger-ring from Uttlesford District, Essex (2008 T548) - 8<sup>th</sup> viewing**

The finder 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 and to provide clarification on two further

points:

The Committee reaffirmed that it always considers all of the information available when discussing a case again, and it did so in this instance. The Committee reconsidered the matter at some length taking into account all of the submissions and valuations received. In discussing the matter, the Committee also clarified the two issues raised by the Secretary of State, namely:

a. Why the second private valuation of £15,000 by Mr [REDACTED] is not considered to be a guide to valuation?

The Committee clarified that it took the view that Mr [REDACTED] is not known as a specialist in this field, and felt that the value suggested by him was a retail figure, not a true market value. It therefore gave less weight to Mr [REDACTED]'s suggested value than to others supplied.

b. The merits of a comparison of this with the Alfred Jewel.

The Committee explained that the Alfred Jewel is a supreme example of its type, a device to assist in reading which is a portrait set in a highly polished piece of clear quartz 'rock crystal'. It is of a completely different nature to the ring in question and could not be considered as a *comparandum* in terms of arriving at a valuation for the ring.

Noticing that several of the valuers whose suggestions were provided by the finder had made their judgements based on photographs, the Committee made clear that it was inclined to give greater weight to those valuations provided by individuals who had seen the ring in person. This was an important point, for the Committee commented that while several valuers compared the ring from Uttlesford to the Warwick Ring (2001 T11; *Treasure Annual Report 2001*, p34), it was felt that viewing the Uttlesford Ring in person allowed for the proper appreciation of its relative worth. It was also noted that the finder did not respond to the invitation to supply further information on the credentials of "[REDACTED]" of Coins & Antiquities UK and that as a result the valuation carried little weight.

The Committee gave careful consideration to all the representations of the finder **including the valuations** provided by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of £8,000 - £12,000 and £8,000 - £10,000 respectively and balanced these two valuations with those from the first provisional valuer (£5,000), the second provisional valuer (valuation of £7,000, from an estimate of £6,000-£8,000) and [REDACTED] (£8,000). The Committee recommended £8,000.

Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Medieval artefacts**

#### **35. Medieval silver-gilt seal matrix from Ripon, North Yorkshire (2010 T327)**

The provisional valuer suggested £1,200. The Committee viewed the matrix in light of this and commented that the intaglio was impressive, but noticed the loss of gilding around the edge and the loss of the ring on the reverse of the item. The matrix was compared to several similar examples valued earlier by the Committee (2005 T319 from Manston, Dorset; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, p128; PAS ID: SOMDOR-A23EB6 valued at £500; and 2008 T233 from Tendring District, Essex; PAS ID: ESS-A3AA61; valued at £700) and thought to be slightly superior. Taking account of all of the above, the Committee recommended £1,000. Harrogate Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **36. Medieval silver seal matrix from Crantock, Cornwall (2011 T125)**

The provisional valuer suggested £2,000. The finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the matrix in light of this and found it to be a handsome object of substance, in good condition. The Committee took account of the finder's points regarding provenance and importance to the locale, and felt that the seal might draw particular attention from a collector with an interest in Cornish finds. The Committee believed the valuer's suggested figure accurately incorporated those factors and in agreement with the provisional

valuer, recommended £2,000. The Royal Institution of Cornwall hopes to acquire.

### **37. Medieval silver ring from Stourport area, Worcestershire (2010 T707) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £380; the Committee recommended £380 (28 October 2011). The landowner agreed with the valuation and waived his share of the reward to the finders. The finders submitted comments. The Committee examined the ring again and took account of the finders' comments, having particular regard to the comparison provided by the finders from Timeline Auctions of 23/24 June 2011 (Lot 801). The Timelines's ring was slightly more attractive and in better condition than the Stourport ring, but was considerably lighter (1/8 of the weight). The Committee confirmed a recommendation of £380.

It was noted that the landowner had waived his right to a reward in favour of the finders, and the Committee was satisfied with the arrangement proposed by the finders, by which they would share the reward with the occupier of the land. Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

### **38. Medieval gold iconographic finger-ring from Lakenheath, Suffolk (2011 T177) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £350; the Committee requested a second valuation (22 September 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £4,000-£6,000 and the finder submitted a private valuation from Timeline Originals of £3,000-£3,500.

The Committee viewed the finger-ring from Lakenheath again and took account of the two new valuations. Owing to the large discrepancy between the first valuation, which the Committee had at the time regarded as low, and the subsequent two, the Committee chose to disregard the first valuation. The Committee noted that there was substance to the ring and that it was wearable, two factors which contributed to its appeal. The Committee had previously valued a similar, though perhaps slightly more worn iconographic ring from Ilam, Staffordshire (2005 T519; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, p120; valued at £3,000). The Committee remarked that both the second provisional valuation and the private valuation cited the same comparison, a ring previously auctioned by Timeline Auctions in their sale of 18 March 2011 (Lot 772). The greater weight was given to the second provisional valuation because the valuer had seen the ring in person, however, the Committee felt that the valuer did not fully account for the wear to the ring. For that reason, and having regard to the range suggested by the private valuer, the Committee recommended £3,500. Moyses Hall Museum hopes to acquire.

### **39. Medieval silver-gilt finial from Offenham, Worcestershire (2009 T689) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £120; the finder submitted comments. The Committee requested a second valuation (22 September 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £90. The Committee viewed the piece again and commented that the item was an appealing piece, and was more desirable than both valuers appeared to appreciate. The Committee clarified for the finder that 'coin fairs' (as referred to by the first valuer) always feature the stall of at least six artefact dealers and that there are opportunities to see material similar to this item at such fairs.

The *comparandum* provided by the finder in his letter of 20 August 2011 (discussed at the 22 September 2011 meeting) although similar to the piece in question was regarded as much more grandiose. Having regard to all of the above, the Committee recommended £175, noting that this was substantially above both professional estimates received. Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

### **40. Medieval silver badge from Preston area, Lancashire (2011 T344) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £350; the finder submitted comments. The Committee requested a second valuation (28 October 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £500. The Committee viewed the badge again in light of the evidence before it. It was felt that the second valuation accorded with the views of the Committee and that it was well supported. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £500. The Museum of Lancashire hopes to acquire.

### **41. Medieval gold reliquary pendant from Hockley area, Essex (2009 T256) – 4<sup>th</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer valued this item at £180,000; the second provisional valuer valued this item at £25,000; the third provisional valuer 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 the second provisional valuer (£15,000-£18,000) and the first provisional valuer (£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. At the 22 September 2011 meeting the Committee recommended £70,000.

The finder submitted further comments; the second provisional valuer provided a copy of the Christie's auction catalogue featuring the Phyllis Phillips triptych pendant.

The Committee viewed the pendant again and considered all of the evidence before it. It was noted that the finder supplied no new evidence which would allow the Committee to reform its recommendation, but it addressed several of the finder's concerns. In particular, it was explained that the Tau Cross acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art was felt to be the closest and most relevant *comparandum* in terms of attractiveness, desirability, composition and date, and was still regarded as a significant indicator of the relative value of the Hockley Pendant. The Committee took the view that it is not correct to imply that the demand in the market for such items has increased steadily since the sale of this piece and that it would necessarily fetch more at auction today. It was also explained that the appearance of the Hockley Pendant in the *Treasure of Heaven* exhibition catalogue was not translatable into a market value.

The second provisional valuer had supplied a photograph of the Phyllis Phillips triptych pendant which the Committee viewed; noting the lack of similarity between this and Hockley pendant the Committee reconfirmed its view from the meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011 that exact comparison of the two pieces in terms of value was impossible.

The Committee maintained its original view of the relative value of the Hockley Pendant to the gold mount from the Dacorum area, Hertfordshire. The Committee's last recommendation for the pendant was ten times the value that it had earlier recommended for the mount. The finder drew attention to the fact that when initially offered at auction, bidding on the mount reached £35,000 but remained unsold; the Committee noted that when offered for auction again recently, the mount was estimated at £10,000 - £15,000, but failed to sell. While this result was not a direct factor in calculating a value for the Hockley Pendant, it did add credence to the Committee's original valuation of the mount.

The Committee reiterated its view from the meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011 that the Middleham Jewel could not be considered a useful guide for determining the value of the Hockley Pendant, for the reasons expressed at that time. The Committee also pointed out that the juxtaposition of the two objects in the *Treasures of Heaven* exhibition catalogue did not imply a similarity in market value of the two pieces.

Finally, the Committee explained again that [REDACTED]'s valuation was acknowledged, but it was also noted that Mr [REDACTED] had not supplied any rationale to explain the figure arrived at. The Committee also explained, in respect of an earlier query from the finder, that the provisional valuers' reports had not in fact been shared amongst the valuers, and as far as the Committee is concerned they remain ignorant of one another's recommendations.

The Committee confirmed a recommendation of £70,000 for this case. Southend Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Post-Medieval artefacts**

#### **42. Post-Medieval silver locket pendant from Whittingham, Northumberland (2011 T298)**

The provisional valuer suggested £250. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this and commented that it was not an Agnus Dei (as speculated in the report for the coroner) but that it was Catholic and possibly Jesuit, and that it remained an attractive piece. The Committee recommended £300. The Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle, hopes to acquire.

**43. Post-Medieval silver-gilt dress fitting from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T368)**

The provisional valuer suggested £75. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee inspected the fitting in light of this and noticed that the pin was broken, but that nonetheless the piece would generate interest from a collector. The Committee recommended £85. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

**44. Post-Medieval gold object from Southwark, Greater London (2008 T742)**

The provisional valuer suggested £70. The Committee inspected the find and noted that its original function remained undetermined. It was felt that this factor would inhibit the item's appeal on the open market, and so had a bearing on its market value. The Committee recommended £50. The Museum of London hopes to acquire.

**45. †Post-Medieval silver button/ cufflink from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T412)**

The provisional valuer suggested £30. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the button and agreed that its small size and fragmentary condition were detrimental to its market value. Having valued whole buttons of this type in the range of £40-£50, (see for instance 2008 T514 from Little Hempdon, Buckinghamshire; PAS ID: BUC-679C67; valued at £45), the Committee recommended £20. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

**46. †Post-Medieval silver dress pin of bodkin type from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2011 T367)**

The provisional valuer suggested £18. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the item and felt that the valuation was well supported. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £18. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

**47. Post-Medieval gold seal matrix from Allerton Bywater, West Yorkshire (2010 T144)**

The provisional valuer suggested £750. The Committee inspected the matrix with this in mind. The Committee commented that the piece was very light but detailed and pleasant, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £750. Leeds Museum hopes to acquire.

**48. Late Medieval/ Post-Medieval silver mount from Dilwyn, Herefordshire (2010 T494) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £20; the Committee recommended £20 (28 October 2011). The landowner submitted a challenge. The Committee viewed the mount again in light of these. It was noted that the landowner had not provided any new information that would give the Committee grounds for revising its position. It therefore confirmed a recommendation of £20. Hereford Museum hopes to acquire.

**49. Post-Medieval silver bodkin from Boxted, Suffolk (2010 T599) – 4<sup>th</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £40; the Committee recommended £40 (5 May 2011). The finder submitted a challenge including references to two private valuations, the Committee asked for a second provisional valuation (20 July 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £60; the Committee recommended £60 (22 September 2011). The finder submitted another challenge and another private

valuation.

The Committee viewed the bodkin again in light of this and agreed that the presence of an inscription was beneficial to the piece, but commented that most inscriptions are unique in their own way and that the singular quality of uniqueness does not in itself contribute to the market value of such a piece. The Committee noted that the evidence provided by the finder consisted of text embedded in his email, and felt that this represented information received second-hand, suggesting that if the finder wished for the information from Dei Gratia Coins and Antiques to be taken into account it should be provided in a standalone document from the valuer and should cite the references to auction precedents which it includes, in order to allow for the Committee to judge the validity of the comparison. The same principle was applied to the two earlier valuations to which the finder referred. Further, the Committee reinforced its position that it was inclined to attach greater weight to valuations suggested by parties who had seen the item in person. The Committee confirmed a recommendation of £60 for this item. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **50. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Brimington, Derbyshire (2009 T752) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £180; the Committee recommended £190 (28 October 2011). The finder/landowner submitted a challenge. The Committee viewed the ring again and paid regard to the finder's letter. The Committee noticed that the Secretariat had asked the finder to provide written evidence for the valuation of £250 to which he refers, but that no evidence was forthcoming. Therefore the Committee felt that it could not factor this figure into its decision. If the finder wished the Committee to give consideration to the valuation referred to, he should provide the valuation on a separate document with the identity of the valuer and his or her credentials. The Committee confirmed a recommendation of £190. Chesterfield Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **51. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Lea and Claverton, Wiltshire (2010 T718) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer 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 requested a second valuation and the finder was invited to ask the valuers he submitted information from to come and view the item in person (22 September 2011). The second provisional valuer suggested £800-£1,200. The Committee viewed the item again, commenting once more on the delicate nature of the ring, noting that whilst it was wearable, it would be susceptible to damage if worn. The Committee clarified its standing policy of giving greater weight to those valuers who had seen the item in person, and noted that of the valuation reports before it, it was the first provisional valuer (£220) and the second provisional valuer (£800-£1,200) who had viewed the item first-hand. This, it was felt, allows a valuer to properly account for factors such as wear. Nonetheless, as the private valuations received were from individuals known from the trade, their suggestions carried some weight. Having regard to all of the evidence submitted, the Committee recommended £800. Athelstan Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Item 4: Coins**

#### **Iron Age coins**

#### **52. Iron Age gold staters (4) from Stafford area, Staffordshire (2010 T458)**

The provisional valuer suggested £2,550-£3,050. One of the finders submitted comments. The Committee took account of the finder's submission as it viewed the coins. It provided comments on and recommended the following figures for the following coins:

1. The Committee paid particular regard to this coin and felt that the valuer had over optimistically classified it as EF, when it was more appropriately in VF condition. Therefore the Committee felt that the proper figure was £1,000.
2. The suggested range was felt to be accurate, and the Committee recommended £250.
3. This coin was viewed as almost in better condition than the first, barring the small nibble missing from the edge. It recommended £850.
4. The suggested range was felt to be accurate and the Committee recommended £650.

In total, the Committee recommended £2,750. Potteries Museum and Art Gallery, Stoke on Trent, hopes to acquire.

**53. Iron Age gold staters (67) & gold quarter stater from East Cambridgeshire (2010 T681)**

The provisional valuer suggested £21,000-£25,000; the finder submitted comments. The Committee read the finder's letter and viewed the coins. It noted that the coins were attractive but not individually outstanding and that the suggested range for the hoard was correct. The Committee naturally understood that the finder would prefer a recommendation at the higher end of this range, but felt that a value in the lower half would be more appropriate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £22,000. St Neots Museum hopes to acquire.

**Early Medieval coins**

**54. †Anglo-Saxon silver sceattas (3 & fused) from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T249)**

The provisional valuer suggested £20. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee viewed the sceattas and found them to possess some interest, and recommended £30. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

**55. †Early Medieval gold coin pendant from Woodbridge area, Suffolk (2010 T90)**

The provisional valuer suggested £200. The finders of the group of finds from the Woodbridge area provided a submission which asked the Committee to consider, for all of the finds, the effect on value of the context of this site. As one of those finds, the Committee considered that factor in this case. It was noted that there were a large number of small individual discoveries from this site that were being viewed in one session by the Committee. However, this did not mean that any individual piece was enhanced in market value above that which it might possess had it come from another location, as many sites may produce a number of cases that over the years come before the Committee. The Committee examined the coin pendant and felt that the valuation was well-argued and accorded with figures recommended for similar pendants seen before by the Committee. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £200. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

**56. Viking hoard (79 coins & 13 silver fragments) from Furness area, Cumbria (2011 T283) – 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £48,300 in its current condition. The landowner (via their agent) submitted comments; the finder also submitted comments and provided a copy of his statement to the Coroner. The Committee recommended £49,500 (28 October 2011). The landowner submitted a challenge as to the apportionment of the reward, and included letters from the Historic Environment Record officer for Cumbria County Council and an amateur archaeologist; the museum also questioned the apportionment. One of the finders responded to these comments. The tenant's wife also supplied comments, and one of the finders replied to these.

The Committee noted that none of the parties had questioned the valuation figure; thus it reconfirmed a recommendation of £49,500.

The Committee considered the submissions of the interested parties carefully, and formed the view that nothing had been submitted to convince the Committee that the circumstances surrounding the find were substantially different from those examined at the last meeting. In particular, the statement from the tenant's wife confirmed that permission had been granted for the detectorists to search the land. The museum made the point that the finders had spoken to the wife of the tenant, rather than the tenant himself, but the Committee expressed the view that any reasonable person would assume that the partner of a tenant would have the authority to represent that person, a conclusion reinforced by the definition of 'Tenant' in the Short Fixed-Term Farm Business Tenancy between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (supplied by the

landowner). It was noted that the tenant and his wife may not have been in a legal position to grant permission to detect on the land, but that this could not be held against the finders (see the reference in the minutes of the last meeting to paragraph 74 of the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice). The Committee made the point that evidence suggested that the finders felt that proper permission had been granted to them to detect, which was the material point in determining whether there was any wrongdoing on their behalf.

The statement by the Senior Historic Environment Officer was felt to be unhelpful on several points. The Committee makes recommendations to the Secretary of State on abatements of rewards according to the rules set out in the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice, not the Code of Practice for Responsible Metal Detecting. Therefore the suggestion that the finders had violated principles of the latter Code were deemed irrelevant insofar as the finders' actions were understood not to be in breach of any of the procedures of the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice. The further suggestion that an abatement to the finders' share of the reward might facilitate an easier acquisition of the hoard by the museum was also, the Committee pointed out, not a factor which it could consider in recommending the apportionment of the reward.

The Committee renewed its view from the previous meeting that the finders had taken reasonable steps to seek permission to search the area prior to detecting, and that they had reported the find promptly as required by the Treasure Act 1996. Therefore the Committee found no reason to abate the finders' share of the reward, and recommended again that the value of £49,500 be split evenly, with the finders receiving 25% each (£12,375) and the landowner receiving 50% (£24,750). Dock Museum hopes to acquire.

### Medieval coins

#### **57. Medieval silver coin hoard (519) & associated pottery from Corringham area, Essex (2009 T432)**

The provisional valuer suggested £13,007; the finder submitted comments and a private valuation from [REDACTED] of DNW valuing the hoard at £25,000 - £35,000. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this, noting that most of the coins were relatively common. It was felt that the figures provided by the provisional valuer were precise and reasonable, and the Committee commented that in comparison it was difficult to see the rationale behind the private valuation from DNW in view of its range and lack of detail. It was suggested that if DNW were able to supply a more detailed reasoning for their figures, and if it was clear that the valuer had viewed the coins in person, it might enable the Committee to take more account of this valuation. At the moment however the Committee was inclined to agree with most of the comments in the valuation provided by the provisional valuer. It felt that the values suggested for the silver coins were accurate, but that the values for the gold nobles and quarter nobles were slightly low. In addition to the suggested value for these coins (nos. 143-147 in the report), the Committee recommended a value of £15,000 for the entire hoard, including the pottery fragments. Thurrock Museum hopes to acquire.

### Post-Medieval coins

#### **58. Post-Medieval silver coins (fused) from Mepal, Cambridgeshire (2010 T273)**

The provisional valuer suggested £45. The Committee viewed the coins from this group and found the suggested figure to be accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £45. Fitzwilliam Museum hopes to acquire.

### Item 5: Norfolk Cases [Tim Pestell left the room]

#### **59. Iron Age copper alloy hoard from Shipdham area, Norfolk (2011 T340)**

The provisional valuer suggested £600. The Committee took account of this as it viewed the items. It felt that the larger terret ring was particularly impressive. For that reason, despite noting that the valuer had used as his guide retail prices (which are usually higher than auction parallels, the figures seen as true indicators of market value), the Committee agreed with the suggestion and recommended £600. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

## **60. Post-Medieval silver coins (11) from Spixworth, Norfolk (2010 T161)**

The provisional valuer suggested £319. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and was broadly in agreement with the valuer. However it noticed that the groat of Elizabeth I (no. 3 on the valuation report) had a particularly fine portrait, and so increased the value of that coin and recommended a total of £400. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

**[Tim Pestell re-entered the room]**

## **Item 6: Any Other Business**

### **Triennial Review of the Treasure Valuation Committee**

As part of the consultation, the invitation for interested parties to submit views relevant to the review of the Committee has been published on the DCMS website here:

<http://www.dcms.gov.uk/consultations/8756.aspx>. Paul Blaker was available to discuss in more detail.

### **Freedom of Information Request: Publication of Minutes**

The British Museum received a Freedom of Information (FOI) request for copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Treasure Valuation Committee from 2008-2011.

The Committee acknowledged that it had several years ago given its full support to the publication of the minutes of its meetings in electronic format on the Internet. The Committee reconfirmed that endorsement, and agreed that the best location for those minutes was on the website of the Portable Antiquities Scheme. The Committee asked the Secretariat to take the necessary steps to publish historic minutes from 2007 - 2011 by the summer of 2012.

The Committee's view was that:

- The Secretariat should redact any information in the minutes, the release of which would contravene the Data Protection Act 1998. This includes but is not limited to the names of finders, landowners, land occupiers or other interested private parties in a case.
- The Committee will take advice [REDACTED] as to whether it is appropriate to redact the names of specific expert valuers:
  - o Is it appropriate to redact the names of private valuers?
  - o Is it appropriate to redact the names of provisional valuers in the minutes?
  - o Is it appropriate not to release the names of provisional valuers on the list of approved valuers at all?
- The Committee will take advice [REDACTED] as to whether it is appropriate to redact references in the minutes to the Committee having sought [REDACTED] advice, and what that advice may have been (see e-mail of 9 August 2011 from [REDACTED]), and how such a redaction should be carried out. If the advice is to redact this information, the Committee would appreciate a clarification of the reasoning for this decision.
- The Secretariat should take steps to ensure that no information in the minutes would lead to the precise identification of a findspot of Treasure beyond that which is indicated in the information released at the Coroner's inquest. Any such information should be redacted.
- The Committee said that publication of the minutes should only take place after all of the subject cases considered therein have been closed but noted that this might not be until after the period

that parties have to appeal to the Secretary of State. The Secretariat would like advice [REDACTED] as follows:

- Is it appropriate not to release the minutes until all the cases considered at that meeting have been closed?
- If so, at exactly what point should a case be considered “closed”?

It was proposed that the minutes be made available as .pdf documents at this URL:

<http://finds.org.uk/treasure>. A link to this page should be embedded on the following DCMS web page:  
[http://www.culture.gov.uk/what\\_we\\_do/cultural\\_property/4135.aspx#treasure](http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/cultural_property/4135.aspx#treasure)

For efficiencies sake, it was suggested that, after the initial publication of historic minutes, the Secretariat conduct a bi-annual exercise to review unpublished minutes for state of completeness and to publish those whose subject cases have all been closed.

**Item 7: Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will take place on Friday, 9 March 2012 at 11.00am in the Hartwell Room of the British Museum.

## **Index to valuers:**

1. James Ede
2. Judith Nugee
3. James Ede
4. James Ede
5. James Ede
6. David Miller
7. David Miller
8. Richard Falkiner
9. Judith Nugee
10. Judith Nugee
11. Judith Nugee
12. David Miller
13. Richard Falkiner
14. David Miller
15. Judith Nugee
16. Peter Spencer
17. Judith Nugee
18. David Miller
19. Richard Falkiner
20. Judith Nugee
21. David Miller
22. Richard Falkiner
23. Judith Nugee
24. Judith Nugee
25. Richard Falkiner
26. David Miller
27. David Miller
28. Richard Falkiner
29. Judith Nugee
30. Judith Nugee
31. Richard Falkiner
32. Judith Nugee
33. 1<sup>st</sup> – Judith Nugee. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Peter Spencer
34. 1<sup>st</sup> – Judith Nugee. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Peter Spencer
35. Richard Linenthal
36. Richard Linenthal
37. Peter Spencer
38. 1<sup>st</sup> - Richard Falkiner. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Mark Bowis
39. 1<sup>st</sup> - Richard Falkiner, 2<sup>nd</sup> - Peter Spencer.
40. 1<sup>st</sup> - Richard Falkiner, 2<sup>nd</sup> – Peter Spencer
41. Peter Spencer, Richard Falkiner, Mark Bowis.
42. Peter Spencer
43. Richard Falkiner
44. Peter Spencer
45. Richard Falkiner
46. Peter Spencer
47. Richard Linenthal
48. Richard Falkiner

49. 1<sup>st</sup> - Peter Spencer. 2<sup>nd</sup> - Richard Falkiner
50. Peter Spencer
51. 1<sup>st</sup> – Richard Falkiner. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Mark Bowis
52. Tom Eden
53. Tom Eden
54. David Miller
55. Peter Spencer
56. Peter Spencer
57. Peter Spencer
58. Peter Spencer
59. James Ede
60. Peter Spencer