

Q&A — Legal & Ownership

Version 1.0.0 · 2026-10-23

Editors of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki

Table of Contents

1	Release notes	1
1.1	This release (version 1.0.0).	1
1.2	Older versions	1
2	Record	1
2.1	Q&A — Legal & Ownership	1

Page 512 of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki, carried over from the version last modified on 2026-10-21. The same page is published at research.bucklerfamily.estate, and this version is also a [PDF](#) in the wayback archive.

1 Release notes

1.1 This release (version 1.0.0)

- **2026-Oct-23** - Carried over to the docs library from Legal Wiki page 512 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:09:28 UTC). The page text, dates and references are as on the wiki. Links to wiki pages lead to the same page on research.bucklerfamily.estate; images are links to their files on the wiki.

1.2 Older versions

None yet.

2 Record

Page ID: 512 · **Title:** Q&A — Legal & Ownership · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

2.1 Q&A — Legal & Ownership

Controlling scope correction — 9 October... .. read more

Controlling scope correction — 9 October 2026. The established title case is that the 1877 arrangement took effect in 1928 and transferred the full Parcel A to the Williams family. Parcel A includes the farmhouse/buildings, barn, stable and west-side yard, garden, north forest, and south-east ground later registered as VG41. Parcel B is the separate eastern agricultural fields. The record shows the failed 1949 permissive-occupancy attempt preceded the report of missing title papers in 1950–52; the 1955 “whole farm” wording then blurred A and B while WGR’s enforcement of Parcel B also seized Parcel-A north forest and south-east green on 4 July 1955. Mary’s defence of the remaining occupied house group does not narrow the full title claim. This site distinguishes the underlying 1928 title case from the alternative limitation argument (twelve years from 1928 potentially maturing by 1940 if legal requirements were met), and from the later 1986–87 possession/permission findings.

Does this website say the Williams / Buckler family still owns Parcel A?

No. It records the contention that [Parcel A](#) never passed into BP’s title, but no court or public body has found for

the family on title ([Where things stand](#)).

What does ‘BP got possession only’ mean on this site?

It is shorthand for the distinction the research is testing between possession and title; it does not overwrite the legal record. Each record is read for what it actually decided or recorded: the [Court of Appeal](#), the [1974 letters](#) and the [first registration](#).

Did BP Properties Ltd v Buckler settle every ownership question?

It decided BP’s possession claim against the family, and HM Land Registry relied on it in 2026. The site treats the historic conveyance extent of Parcel A as a separate documentary question ([Court of Appeal](#); [what the judgments omit](#); [HMLR 2026](#)).

What is the legal importance of Parcel A and Parcel B being separate?

If the two parcels had different roots of title, each later instrument has to be checked for whether it actually carried Parcel A, rather than assuming that a “[whole farm](#)” description did ([title test](#)).

What is adverse possession’s role here?

The primary case is title under the 1877 arrangement taking effect in 1928. Separately, the alternative limitation case is that twelve years from 1928 would have matured by 1940 if the relevant statutory conditions were met. In the later possession litigation, the courts held that time had not run in the way argued, relying on the 1962 action and the 1974 letters’ effect on permission. Those later findings must be read in their exact pleadings/property scope; “house and garden” identifies the occupied centre, not the full physical extent of Parcel A ([High Court](#); [Court of Appeal](#)).

Could a Land Registry correction or rectification route exist?

Alteration of the register for mistake and indemnity under the Land Registration Act 2002 is being examined ([legal routes](#)). HM Land Registry decided in May 2026 that the title was registered correctly, and every route faces the binding 1987 judgment ([HMLR 2026](#)).

Why are the 1955 and 1962 possession orders important?

The 1955 order used “whole farm” wording. The 4 July 1955 enforcement took Parcel B and also seized the Parcel-A north forest and south-east green, while Mary remained in the occupied farmhouse/buildings/garden group. The 1962 order concerned that remaining house-and-garden group; it does not define the full extent of Parcel A. The Court of Appeal relied on the 1962 action in its limitation analysis, but the later “house and garden” descriptions must not be treated as meaning that all of Parcel A remained with Mary ([1955](#); [1962](#); [Court of Appeal](#)).

Why do the 1974 licence letters matter?

The Court of Appeal held that BP’s 1974 letters made Mary (Nancy) Williams’s possession permissive whether or not she accepted them. The reading is that she refused them as owner; the wording itself is evidence still requiring interpretation ([1974 letters](#); [what the judgments omit](#)).

Open legal questions: Legal, human-rights... .. read more

Open legal questions: [Legal, human-rights and public-law questions](#) · [Land and title](#)

2.1.1 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.1

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.1	2026-10-19T02:05Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Purged the old attribution label; replaced with evidence citations (1955 order, 1987 ruling)	Editing Protocol, 19 Oct 2026
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:17Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

Agents and editors: follow the [Editing Protocol](#).