

Q&A — Open Questions & Research Priorities

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 — Open Questions & Research Priorities	1

Page 521 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 521 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:10:56 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: 521 · **Title:** Q&A — Open Questions & Research Priorities · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

2.1 Q&A — Open Questions & Research Priorities

This is the single register of open research... .. [read more](#)

This is the single register of open research questions. The topic Q&A pages link here rather than repeating their own lists. Method and evidence key: [Main Page](#) · [title test](#).

2.1.1 Land and title

Closed control — 9 October 2026. The... .. [read more](#)

Closed control — 9 October 2026. The family's established title case is that the 1877 arrangement took effect in 1928 when quarrying and rent to Thomas ended, passing the full Parcel A to the Williams family. Parcel A includes the farmhouse/buildings, barns, stable and yard west of the house, garden, forest north of the house, and ground south-east of the house/garden later registered as VG41. Parcel B is the separate eastern agricultural fields. The already-obtained 1939 agreement/plan depicts Parcel B only. The questions below concern corroborating

the existing case and tracing later instruments; they must not re-open Parcel A/B identity or the 1939 plan conclusion.

- What surviving Bute, Thomas or Williams records corroborate the 1877 arrangement and its effect in 1928, including Mary (Nancy) Williams's c.1974 statement ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)) that the freehold of the house/quarrying parcel would pass when quarrying ceased?
- Which surviving instruments, maps, rent records and estate papers most precisely document the boundaries of the full Parcel A, especially the north forest and south-east green ground?
- What does the 1916 "whole farm" terminology say, and how did that broad wording later obscure the distinct Parcel-A and Parcel-B interests?
- **Closed:** the 1939 WGR–John Williams plan depicts Parcel B only. No further retrieval or generic "does it include Parcel A?" task is required. [?]
- What precise land do the 1905 conveyance, 15 May 1924 agreement and 29 March 1961 deed describe, and how do their operative clauses and plans affect the downstream title chain? These are parallel instrument checks, not a reason to restart the established 1928 family case.
- Where is the 31 December 1969 root conveyance and the 1971 abstract referred to in later registration history, and what do they say about the parcels? Their absence from the July 2026 schedule affects both later chain descriptions and is not Parcel-A-specific proof.
- What did the 1975 and 1982–83 title plans and first-registration files include, and how do they map against the full Parcel-A extent, the 1955-seized north forest and the south-east VG41 ground?
- What do the 1982–84 registration applications, title class, plans, occupation answers, requisitions, notices and applicant responses show about the precise land registered and the disclosure of Mary's ownership claim?
- What did the February 1987 amalgamation application and plan change, and how did the relevant registered extents develop into present woodland and green titles?

2.1.2 Heritage and archaeology

- What was the full wording and scope of H. J. Thomas's 1974 measured survey?
- Why do later descriptions refer to access issues, an anomaly or a partial survey?
- What material was considered in the 1988 listing assessment beyond the two surviving photographs?
- Is there an independent record of the destruction or disposal of the 1988 listing file, or a duplicate in another archival series?
- What were the complete archaeological planning conditions, especially conditions 16 and 18, and how were they discharged?
- What did the 1990 assessment conclude about the farmhouse and the wider site, and what sources did it rely upon?
- What was the documentary basis for describing archaeological material as unrelated to the site?
- How did the 1994 excavation findings alter or confirm the earlier picture, and how did they feed back into the planning and heritage record?

2.1.3 Planning and demolition

- What complete set of documents was before the planning authority for 89/01396/OUT in 1989?
- Where are the missing planning appendices, and can they be recovered from council, archive or developer records? [?]
- What archaeological and heritage material was before the planning authority at the 1992 reserved-matters stage?
- Which surviving plans best show the former farmhouse / House Plot before and after redevelopment?
- What planning and heritage records were created in 1988–1992, and which are no longer held?

2.1.4 Records and administration

- Which family-held documents still need to be scanned and uploaded with clear provenance?
- Which original deeds, plans and archive references can be obtained or inspected without a paid staff search?

- Are any records for the site indexed under another [Great House Farm](#), Llandough, Cowbridge or parcel name?
- What further planning, heritage or archaeological records survive outside the institutions already searched?

2.1.5 Legal, human-rights and public-law questions

- What exactly did [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler](#) determine about possession, title and the relevant land?
- What is the legal significance of ECHR application 14464/88 being declared inadmissible? (The Commission's stated grounds are summarised at [ECHR 1989](#).)
- What rights and remedies were argued in the domestic and Strasbourg proceedings?
- What legal effect, if any, follows from the 1982/83 registration if the underlying extent was wrong?
- Could any present-day legal or public-law route address a historic registration or title-extent issue, or revisit an historic record or decision?
- What evidence would a court, tribunal, registry or public body require for alteration, rectification, a declaration or any other remedy?
- What evidence exists about the original administrative decision-making surrounding heritage and demolition?
- Which current complaints, public-law, information-rights or archival mechanisms remain available for unresolved records questions? [?]

2.1.6 Remedy

- What remedies, if any, would follow if Parcel A were shown to have been omitted from or wrongly included in a later title?
- Which public records could be amended or supplemented to correct the historical record?
- What heritage or archival recognition could appropriately preserve the lost farmhouse's history?
- Are any surviving parties, successors or institutions legally relevant to a remedy claim?

2.1.7 Family history

- Which family memories can be independently corroborated by deeds, registers, photographs or newspapers?
- Can the exact dates and identities of all relevant Williams / Thomas / Buckler family members be reconciled across the available records?
- What additional photographs, letters or household records survive?

2.1.8 How an open question becomes an answer

A question moves out of this register only... .. read more

A question moves out of this register only when the underlying evidence actually answers it.

Priority sequence: recover the 1877... .. read more

Priority sequence: recover the 1877 instrument and plan; establish the effect of the 1924/1928 material; compare the 1938 conveyance and 1939 plan; reconstruct the 1969/1975 chain; obtain the complete 1982–83 registration file; then compare the documentary title position with the 1974 and 1987 possession narrative. These steps are the core proof sequence for the Parcel A theory.

Topic pages: Q&A · Legal & Ownership · read more

Topic pages: [Q&A](#) · [Legal & Ownership](#) · [History & the Two Parcels](#) · [Land Registry & Title](#) · [Heritage & Archaeology](#) · [Demolition & Redevelopment](#) · [Evidence, Records & Method](#) · [Reparations & Remedy](#) · [Human Rights & Public Law](#) · [Family & Personal History](#)

2.1.9 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

2 Record

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
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](#).