

Master Scrutiny Issue Register — Public, Court & Institutional Handling

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	1. Media & archival discovery.	2
2.2	2. Land Registry, title extent & registration	3
2.3	3. Court process, judgment scope & legal routes	7
2.4	4. Heritage, planning, archaeology & demolition	10
2.5	Planning-specific additions — 28 September 2026	14
2.6	5. Records, witnesses, family evidence & delayed disclosure	17
2.7	6. Public bodies, institutional relationships & synthesis	19
2.8	Supplementary planning issues — 28 September 2026	20
2.9	9 October correction — issue-register priority	21
2.10	Page version & change log	21

Page 791 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 791 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:14:12 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

This material now lives at <https://fcg.bucklerfamily.estate/case/master-scrutiny-issue-register>.

Page ID: 791 · **Title:** Master Scrutiny Issue Register — Public, Court & Institutional Handling · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

As at 15 October 2026: there are **75 distinct issue entries**. Every issue is recorded once below. An “Open” status means the question remains unresolved on the present record; it is not a finding of wrongdoing. [?]

Evidence discipline: documentary fact, family evidence, inference, allegation and legal possibility remain distinct. A missing record is not treated as proof of concealment. A possible communication between institutions is not treated

as proof of improper coordination. A possible fraud route is not treated as proof that fraud occurred. [?]

Controlling family-case correction — 9 October 2026. On Mary (Nancy) Williams's c.1974 witness statement ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)), the 1877 arrangement took effect in 1928 when quarrying and rent to Thomas ended, transferring the full Parcel A to the Williams family. Parcel A includes the farmhouse/buildings, barn, stable and west-side yard, garden, forest north of the house and the south-east ground later registered as VG41. Parcel B is the separate eastern agricultural fields. The 1939 agreement/plan is already obtained and depicts Parcel B only. [SOURCE PENDING] The 1949 effort to make Mary's Parcel-A occupation permissive failed (no written record of the 2 February 1949 re-grant; GHF-E122). Mary (Nancy) Williams's c.1974 witness statement ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)) records that the title papers disappeared in 1950–52. [SOURCE PENDING] WGR's 4 July 1955 enforcement of Parcel B also seized Parcel-A forest and green under "whole farm" wording (writ and execution record sought: GHF-E126). Later documentary work must corroborate/precisely map that account and trace those areas into later titles; it must not re-open Parcel-A/Parcel-B identity or treat the 1939 plan as unknown. The alternative limitation case (twelve years from 1928 potentially maturing by 1940 if legal conditions were met) is separate from underlying title. Missing originals and register gaps are evidential issues, not by themselves proof of fraud. [?]

2.1 1. Media & archival discovery

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-001	ITV footage — incomplete coverage	A five-second clip of Great House Farm has been obtained from ITV coverage broadcast between a sports programme. The remainder has not yet been located. What was the complete broadcast, and what did the unseen material contain?	Existing five-second clip; ITV archive, transmission records, production files and metadata.	Open
A-002	ITV footage — abrupt editing / omissions	A separate ITV clip contains abrupt transitions and apparent omissions. It does not mention Branwen being pregnant or the children. The issue is whether this is ordinary editorial selection, loss of source material, or something requiring explanation. [?]	Existing clip; original master, rushes, edit decision list, transmission copy and editorial notes if retained.	Open — no inference of redaction yet
A-006	House of Lords records — catalogue / disclosure chronology	The relevant House of Lords Main Papers series was released onto Discovery on 20 May 2026, while earlier searches did not locate it [SOURCE PENDING: search dates not yet recorded]. On 23 September 2026 TNA identified YHL/PO/JO/10/11/2536 containing BP Properties Ltd v Buckler material.	TNA correspondence; Discovery catalogue history; YHL/PO/JO/10/11/2536; related JO/JU/14 and appeal-committee material.	Open — reconstruct search and release history

A-007	TNA earlier searches — title/description limitation	TNA reported an August 2026 keyword search across titles/descriptions rather than the contents of records. The question is whether the earlier search method could have failed to identify the judicial papers that were later found.	TNA 12 Aug 2026 search response; CAS-347296-M0V4Y1 later file handling.	Open
-------	---	---	---	------

2.2 2. Land Registry, title extent & registration

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-008	HMLR first registration — extent of land	The central title question is whether the land registered to BP in 1982 actually included the House Plot / Parcel A or only land supported by the documentary chain.	WA231076; WA240304; FR1/application bundle; deeds; plans; abstract; requisitions; historic registers.	Open — primary file essential
A-009	Potential register mistake as to extent	If the 1982 application included land not comprised in BP's documentary title, the register may have been mistaken as to extent. This is an issue for Schedule 4 alteration /rectification analysis, not a conclusion that the register is wrong.	First-registration file and title plans; LRA 2002 Schedule 4.	Open
A-010	Possible lack of proper care in first registration	If BP or its agent applied to register the House Plot despite an excluding conveyance or without bringing the occupied plot and claimant to the Registrar's attention, did that cause or substantially contribute to any registration mistake?	FR1, conveyances, solicitor correspondence, plans, declarations and requisitions.	Open — depends on file evidence
A-011	Mary (Nancy) Williams, formerly Buckler — notice / actual occupation	Mary (Nancy) Williams was living in the farmhouse during first registration. Did the Registrar make the required enquiry of her, identify her correctly, and record any rights arising from her occupation?	First-registration file; notices/service proofs; address records; occupation evidence; LRA 1925 s.70(1)(g).	Open
A-012	Mary (Nancy) Williams — name mismatch	Documents appear to use both "Mrs Williams" and "Mrs Buckler". The question is whether identification was sufficient for service and whether a name mismatch impeded notice to the actual occupier.	Registration file; notices; service records; marriage certificate; 1974 correspondence.	Open

A-013	1935 marriage certificate — purpose and provenance	The family is investigating why the 1935 marriage certificate was obtained /used and whether it was used to connect “Mrs Williams” with “Mrs Buckler”. There is presently no basis to state that it was obtained to avoid notifying Mary.	Original registration /correspondence file; provenance of certificate; contemporaneous correspondence.	Open — test purpose from primary records
A-023	LRA Schedule 4 — alteration / rectification	If the register included land through mistake, can the register be altered or rectified, and do the proprietor-in-possession safeguards permit it on the facts?	WA231076/WA240304; Schedule 4; HMLR Practice Guide 83.	Open
A-024	LRA Schedule 8 — indemnity if rectification unavailable	If a registered-title mistake is established but rectification is not available, is there a statutory indemnity route for loss? ²	HMLR Practice Guide 39; Schedule 8; valuation and causation evidence.	Open — separate remedy question
A-025	1975 blue plan versus 1982 pink plan	Do the 1975 and 1982 plans show separate parcels, and was a House Plot excluded from the 1975 conveyance but later brought within WA231076?	WA240304 plan; WA231076 plan; conveyances; historic title editions.	Open — decisive parcel test
A-026	WA240304 — later closure / amalgamation	Why was WA240304 created, what land did it comprise, why was it later closed/amalgamated, and precisely what land entered WA231076 as a result?	WA240304 application, plan, register history, amalgamation form and WA231076 item 14.	Open
A-027	Possible synthetic / reconstructed Parcel A	The working hypothesis is that a later document or composite parcel may have been used to reconstruct a “whole farm” description without the genuine documentary chain for the House Plot. This must be proved or disproved document-by-document.	1876–78 instruments; 1916; 1928; 1938–39; 1975; 1982–83; plans and registration applications.	Open hypothesis — no fabrication finding

A-028	Missing 1876–78 instrument?	The title case, resting on Mary (Nancy) Williams’s c.1974 witness statement (Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony), is that the 1877 Bute–Thomas arrangement took effect in 1928 when quarrying and rent to Thomas ended, passing the full Parcel A—including north forest and south-east green ground—to the Williams family. The missing original impairs word-for-word verification of the operative terms and plan; it does not make Mary (Nancy) Williams’s statement a blank hypothesis. Test surviving Bute/Thomas references and compare later title documents to this case.?	D153-related references; Bute estate records; Daniel Thomas business papers.	Open
A-029	1928 event / freehold or registration	The title case, resting on Mary (Nancy) Williams’s c.1974 witness statement (Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony), is that the 1877 arrangement took effect in 1928 and full Parcel A passed to the Williams family when quarrying /rent to Thomas ended. The remaining task is to corroborate the specific completion/receipt evidence, document provenance and succession /standing, and trace how later processes recast the already-distinct Parcel A and Parcel B. Do not reopen whether Parcel A was a distinct part of the family’s title case.	John Williams registration evidence; tree-planting photograph; conveyance /registration index; Bute records.	Open
A-030	1916 tenancy two-parcel	How did the 1916 tenancy’s “whole farm” wording coexist with the separate interests in the full Parcel-A house/quarrying estate and the eastern Parcel-B agricultural fields, and how was that terminology carried into the 1955 possession process and later title descriptions?	Original 1916 agreement and plan; estate register; subsequent 1938–39 documents.	Open
A-031	1938 WGR conveyance	What exact land and estate was conveyed in 1938, and did it include the House Plot?	Complete conveyance, schedule and plan; auction particulars and WGR records.	Open

A-032	1939 WGR / John Williams tenancy	Does DBDT123/7 and its plan concern the eastern agricultural parcel only, or the farmhouse/House Plot as well?	DBDT123/7; associated plan; estate tenancy records.	Open
A-033	Land Registry abstract / 15-year chain issue	The family is investigating the tension between an earlier HMLR statement about the period/chain of title that needed to be seen and a later position that BP satisfied the registration criteria. Which exact documents were accepted and for what acreage?	HMLR correspondence; 1971 abstract; FR1; supporting deeds and plans; requisitions.	Open — reconcile letter against original file
A-071	HMLR inspection / preservation chronology	From the 25 May 2026 stage-2 decision through 25 September 2026, the family repeatedly requested physical inspection and preservation of the historic registration files. The 30 July schedule lists 43 surviving documents but does not list the 31 December 1969 root conveyance or a free-standing 1971 abstract. On 21 September support staff stated that the title was “closed in 2005”, differing from the earlier registration chronology.	Land Registry Titles ; Records Access Chronology ; HMLR stage-2 decision and 30 July schedule.	Open — inspection and preservation requests outstanding
A-072	1969 root deed / 1971 abstract still absent	The 30 July 2026 HMLR schedule lists 43 surviving first-registration documents, but the 31 December 1969 conveyance recited as the root of title and a free-standing 1971 abstract are not listed. The question is what documents actually substantiated BP’s claimed title when registration was made.	HMLR 30 July 2026 schedule; registration history of 23 March 2026; original first-registration file and inspection.	Open — primary file / inspection required

A-073	2005 woodland title split / extent change	On 22 December 2005 the Wiki records land edged green on WA735527 being removed from that woodland title and registered as CYM265133 following a 2 December 2005 transfer from Forest of Cardiff to Goldsworthy Homes. CYM349627 also appears in the recorded plan material. The scrutiny question is what exact area left WA735527, whether it corresponds to historic Parcel A woodland, and how this relates to the later statement that title material was 'closed in 2005'. This is an extent and record-reconciliation issue, not by itself evidence of wrongdoing.	WA735527 register and plan; CYM265133; CYM349627; 2 December 2005 transfer; HMLR 2026 correspondence.	Open — plan comparison required
--------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

2.3 3. Court process, judgment scope & legal routes

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-014	1962 possession order — exact land described	Did the 11 December 1962 possession order concern the same legal parcel later registered to BP, or did it concern the farmhouse /garden as a separately described possession subject?	Order, pleadings, particulars, plan, schedule and enforcement file.	Open
A-015	1955 possession order — “whole farm” versus parcel history	[SOURCE PENDING] The 4 July 1955 enforcement of Parcel B also seized the Parcel-A north forest and south-east green under “whole farm” wording. Compare the order /process documents with the full Parcel-A map to define formal authority, the wording later carried into the title chain, and any mismatch between described and lawfully held land. Do not treat the physical event as an unanswered generic question.	1955 order; plans; 1916 tenancy; 1938–39 documents.	Open

A-016	1974 licence — legal identity and land	The 31 October 1974 letters offered Mrs Buckler / Mrs Williams occupation of the farmhouse. Did the correspondence identify the same land later registered to BP, and what did the letters assume about title?	Letters; 1974 pleadings and notices; property description; 1987 judgment.	Open
A-017	1974 notice / appeal issue	Mary (Nancy) Williams's solicitors reportedly challenged the September 1974 enforcement order on notice grounds. What exactly was argued, what documents were before the court, and what was ultimately decided?	1974 appeal notice, stay application, order, correspondence and court file.	Open
A-018	1987 judgment — scope of what was actually decided	The 1987 judgment is treated as a central primary source. A separate question remains whether the precise documentary root/title extent of a distinct House Plot was necessary to and finally determined by that judgment.	[1987] EWCA Civ 2; 1987 /88 case papers; property descriptions and plans.	Open — legal analysis required
A-074	Earlier limitation completion — 1928 /1940 versus later possession orders	If the relevant Parcel-A right to recover accrued when occupation became adverse by about 1928, the 12-year period already prescribed by the Real Property Limitation Act 1874 could potentially have completed by about 1940. If the period began only in 1940, it would reach about 1952. Did the 1955 order against Frederick or the 1962 order against Frederick and Mary lawfully defeat, bind or preclude the earlier title /limitation case? This is an alternative legal case, not a finding that adverse possession was proved.	1874 Act, s.1; 1928 rent /quarry chronology; parcel plans; 1955 claim/order /return; 1962 pleadings /order/plan; 1986–87 judgments.	Open — legal analysis and primary court records required

A-075	1954 tenancy attempt — source and judicial attribution	The family chronology identifies a separate failed attempt to make Frederick a tenant in 1954. The accessible published 1987 Court of Appeal report does not mention 1954; it records a 10 October 1952 agents' letter declining to proceed with the letting, yet still concludes that a protected periodic agricultural tenancy existed. What primary source supports the separate 1954 event, which parcel was proposed, why did it fail, and was it before either court?	GHF-E182; underlying 1954 letter/offer/correspondence; any trial judgment /transcript; [1987] EWCA Civ 2.	Open — family chronology / original source pending
A-019	1987 judgment — possible new evidence / material non-disclosure	If primary documents now found show that the material facts presented to the court were false, incomplete or materially misleading, could the judgment be challenged on that basis?	House of Lords papers; 1987 bundle; first-registration file; title deeds/plans; newly recovered records.	Open — requires actual new evidence
A-020	Fraud / deliberate concealment — Takhar route	The family is investigating whether any conscious and material dishonesty or concealment of evidence was an operative cause of an earlier judgment. This is a legal gateway to test, not a finding that fraud occurred. ?	New primary evidence; BP /WGR solicitor files; court papers; concealed-document chronology. See Takhar.	Open — primary evidence required
A-021	Limitation — deliberate concealment / mistake	If a relevant fact was deliberately concealed, or the claim concerns relief from a mistake, what effect, if any, does Limitation Act 1980 s.32 have on when time began to run? Deliberate concealment must be distinguished from mere negligence or missing records. ?	Discovery chronology; concealed-document evidence; relevant title /registration records. See s.32 and Canada Square.	Open — counsel required
A-022	CPR 52.30 — reopening the final appeal	What procedural mechanism, if any, could be examined in relation to the final appeal, and what factual material would that examination require?	1987/88 appeal record; any proven process corruption; new evidence.	Open — procedural route under examination

A-034	Police / search / removal of family documents in 1988	[SOURCE PENDING] During the 1988 events, police reportedly searched premises and documents /photos were removed. What exactly occurred, under what legal authority, and does an official inventory or return record survive?	Named family members' testimony; contemporary press; police/court records; inventory; exhibits and correspondence.	Open — SOURCE PENDING until independently verified
A-057	Missing historic court files ?	Could the 1955, 1962 and 1974 court files contain plans, pleadings or admissions capable of resolving the parcel/title question or the notice/service questions?	Cardiff County Court / High Court records; TNA; Glamorgan Archives.	Open

2.4 4. Heritage, planning, archaeology & demolition

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-003	Planning file — missing annexes ?	The 1989–90 planning material appears to be missing annexes referred to by the officer's report. The family's understanding is that some submissions gave reasons against demolition of the historic farmhouse. ?	89/01396/OUT officer's report; Appendices B–E; complete Council file; archive box/listing records.	Open
A-004	Post-demolition planning sequence	After Great House Farm was demolished, BP returned to the planning process. Did the planning authority record, question or reassess the disappearance of the historic building?	89/01396/OUT; 92/00671/RES; site inspection notes; officer reports; conditions and discharge records.	Open
A-005	Planning policy requiring retention	The development-plan material identified in the GGAT review indicates a policy allocation with supporting text saying the buildings on the site should be retained. Why was demolition nevertheless permitted and how was that conflict addressed?	South Glamorgan Structure Plan / Policy H.2; officer report; decision notice; later planning documents.	Open — verify against original policy
A-035	RCAHMMW — lost Johns /Williams correspondence	The Royal Commission archive records correspondence between C. N. Johns and Mrs Buckler as lost since 1986/87. Can its provenance, contents or copies be reconstructed elsewhere?	NMR archive 6048945; Dr Adam Coward's 10 Jun 2026 response; administrative files.	Open

A-036	RCAHMW — partial recording caused by ownership dispute	The Royal Commission's own archive says the house remained partially recorded because of an ownership dispute. What recording opportunities were missed and what records existed before their loss?	NMR 6048945; 1974 measured survey; 1988 additions; correspondence history.	Open
A-037	Cadw — missing spot-listing file ?	Cadw can produce two photographs but not the assessment file, inspector notes, decision record, decision-maker's identity, correspondence, transfer record or destruction record. What happened to the missing record? ?	ATISN 27021; internal review; retention/disposal records; predecessor file indexes.	Open
A-038	Cadw — YYY coding inconsistency	Cadw has given two accounts of the "YYY" marking on its photographs. Which definition applied in July 1988, and what evidence supported the listing decision?	Two Cadw explanations; photographs; survey forms; contemporary listing guidance.	Open
A-039	Cadw — five-month gap	Cadw photographed the building on 29 July 1988 and the public listing consideration did not appear until early December. What happened during the intervening period?	Cadw diary/inspection logs; correspondence; registry; site-notes; communications with other bodies.	Open
A-040	Cadw — evidence considered before refusal	Was the 1974 RCAHMW measured survey, the existing SMR record, GGAT's 1978–80 work, and the 1963 human-remains discovery actually considered before the 5 December 1988 decision?	Cadw decision file; listing assessment; inter-agency correspondence.	Open
A-041	Cadw — no recorded consultation with occupiers	Were Branwen/Mary /family members consulted or given an opportunity to provide information during the spot-listing process?	Cadw file; telephone logs; letters; inspection notes; witness evidence.	Open
A-042	Cadw / GGAT institutional relationship	Cadw funded the regional curatorial function while GGAT also undertook commercial archaeological work. Cadw later described the 1990 assessment as commissioned by BP. What communications, governance arrangements and conflict-management steps existed?	Cadw correspondence; GGAT governance /records; 1990 assessment; grant arrangements.	Open — structural question, not collusion finding

A-043	GGAT — specify, price, bid and execute	In its 1989 consultee document GGAT advised that the application should not be determined without assessment, specified the method, quoted £2,000 /two weeks and recorded prior negotiations with BP; BP then commissioned GGAT. Was that arrangement sufficiently independent and properly managed?	1989 consultee report; 1990 assessment; correspondence with BP /Debenham Tewson.	Open
A-044	GGAT — dual role was disclosed	The 1990 report expressly disclosed GGAT's dual role and offered alternative advice. This fact cuts against a covert-concealment theory, but leaves the independence/governance question open.	1990 assessment.	Open — record both sides
A-045	GGAT — 1990 methodology versus 1994 result	Eight machine-cut trenches left much of the eastern area uninvestigated, yet the plan assigned “non-existent to low” potential; 1994 excavation then found burials, many only centimetres below topsoil, in that wider area. Was the 1990 evaluation materially inadequate by the standards and knowledge then available?	1990 assessment; 1994 preliminary report; 2005 publication; GGAT 1978–80/1982 evidence.	Open — methodology review
A-046	GGAT — own prior knowledge	GGAT had previous excavations south of the same church and a 1982 letter indicating the possibility of occupation north of it. Did the 1990 predictive model properly incorporate that prior evidence?	1978–80 excavation records; 1982 letter; 1990 report.	Open
A-047	GGAT — statutory burial-ground issue	The 1990 report identified the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981 and encountered disarticulated human bone. Did the evaluation and subsequent planning decisions adequately answer the legal/archaeological question posed?	1990 assessment; planning conditions; 1994 excavation; legal advice if any.	Open
A-048	GGAT / planning — missing Appendices B–E ?	The officer's report says further GGAT comments and three further representations/response documents were attached as Appendices B–E. They are absent from the 2026 file.	Manuscript officer's report; missing appendices; Council and Heneb archives. ?	Open — locate originals

A-049	GGAT member / councillor representation	The officer's report records a representation from a local County Councillor described as a member of GGAT. Who was the councillor, what did the letter say, and did GGAT know or act on the connection?	Missing Appendix C/D; council membership records; GGAT governance records. ?	Open
A-050	HER reference / indexing defects	Different bodies and documents have used different HER identifiers, and the current national record does not fully reflect the archaeological significance recorded elsewhere. Could historic indexing errors explain failed searches or incomplete disclosure?	GGAT/Heneb/Cadw /RCAHMW records; HER history; archive catalogue.	Open
A-051	GGAT 1990 report — late archival deposit	The 1990 assessment entered the national archaeological archive by donation in 2019. Why was the report not deposited earlier, and what field /working records survived in the interim?	Archaeology Data Service / national archive metadata; GGAT/Heneb custody records.	Open
A-052	Archaeological artefacts / reported Neath fire	[SOURCE PENDING] Relevant archaeological material or records were reportedly held at a property in Neath that later suffered a fire. What exact objects /records were there, who held them, and what was destroyed or recovered?	Museum accession registers; excavation archive; custody records; fire report; insurance/inventory records.	Open — no inference of deliberate destruction
A-053	Amgueddfa Cymru — incomplete/other finds trail	The Museum has said its searches identified records relating to other archaeological finds from Great House Farm and other discoveries. Which records are these, and do they alter the known provenance of the "ironwork" or other material?	Amgueddfa correspondence 25 Aug 2026; accession catalogue; site records.	Open
A-054	Later document describes house as listed	A later site/planning document reportedly describes Great House Farm as a listed building, while Cadw's record says it was not listed and spot-listing was refused in December 1988. What is the source, date and basis of the later description?	Unidentified later planning/archaeological document; Cadw listing records; Cof Cymru.	Open — identify source first

A-066	Physical destruction as evidence-loss event	The demolition removed the standing building that could have been used to settle disputed architectural and historical questions. The question is what records, measured surveys, photographs and salvage material were created before or after demolition.	RCAHMW survey; Cadw photos; demolition records; rubble observations; press photographs; archaeological records.	Open
A-067	1994 excavation and archaeological significance	The 1994 excavation recorded 858 inhumations in the preliminary report; later publication reported 1,026 burials investigated. Does the later archaeological evidence materially change what should be inferred about the site's significance in 1988–90?	1994 preliminary report; 2005 publication; HER records; 1990 assessment.	Open — significance /counterfactual question
A-068	1990–1994 planning condition compliance	Did the archaeological conditions attached to planning require the later work to follow through the findings of the 1990 assessment, and was the eventual excavation outcome properly fed back into planning and HER records?	Planning conditions 16–18 or equivalent; 1990 report; 1993–94 correspondence; discharge /monitoring documents.	Open
A-069	Heritage record contradictions	Different institutions now hold records which do not align on the building's status, surviving photographs, field record and the description of what was known before demolition. The task is to reconcile the institutional record rather than choose the most favourable account.	Cadw; RCAHMW; Heneb /HER; Amgueddfa Cymru; TNA; Vale planning archive.	Open

2.5 Planning-specific additions — 28 September 2026

Method. These issues were added after a further reading of the 1989 officer's report, the 2026 reconstruction of the 89 /01396/OUT and 92/00671/RES files, and a targeted search for planning-agreement terminology. They are framed as documentary tests, not conclusions of wrongdoing.

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
PL-001	Historic planning agreement search	No section 52 agreement, section 106 agreement, unilateral undertaking, planning covenant or other development agreement has been located in the material reviewed for 89/01396/OUT. Because the permission was granted on 13 March 1990, the historical search should specifically test for a section 52 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1971 rather than assume a modern section 106 label.	Complete 89/01396/OUT file; historic planning /legal-agreement indexes; local-land-charge material; deeds; any modification /discharge record.	Open — absence not evidence of non-existence?
PL-002	Development-plan retention versus demolition	The officer's report records that the supporting information for East Vale Local Plan Policy H.2 said buildings on the site should be retained, while also recording that those buildings had already been demolished. How was that conflict addressed?	East Vale Local Plan; H.2 supporting text; demolition records; Council planning /heritage correspondence; officer report.	Open
PL-003	Demolition changed the planning context	The residential application was determined after the farmhouse had disappeared. Did the Council record whether the earlier retention policy, heritage concerns or the circumstances of demolition affected the planning assessment once the site was cleared?	1988 demolition/planning records; 89/01396/OUT report; site inspection notes; Council/County correspondence.	Open — no inference of unlawfulness
PL-004	Missing Appendix B?	The officer says further GGAT comments were received on 8 February 1990 following discussions with the Trust. The document is missing. Did GGAT change from recommending non-determination to accepting determination subject to conditions, or did it maintain another position?	Appendix B; Council /GGAT correspondence; committee minutes; decision papers.	Open — high-value missing document?

PL-005	Missing Appendices C-E ?	The officer says three other annexes were attached: representations from the Barry Preservation Society and Civic Trust; a local County Councillor described as a GGAT member; and the applicants' agents' response to GGAT. None is in the disclosed file.	Appendices C-E; Council file; Heneb/GGAT records; committee papers.	Open — locate originals
PL-006	GGAT member / councillor representation	The officer disclosed the councillor's GGAT membership, so concealment is not established. The missing letter prevents testing the person's identity, authority, content, and whether any governance or conflict-management step followed. ?	Appendix D; 1989 County Council membership records; GGAT company membership/governance records.	Open
PL-007	Conditions 16–18 and later discharge	The 1990 permission used conditions 16–18 for archaeological access, evaluation and design response. Condition 17 was later recorded as complied with; in 1993–94 GGAT disputed the discharge of condition 18 and the Council ultimately accepted the developer's position. What do the complete discharge records show?	Decision notice; condition-discharge correspondence; 15 Oct 1990 letter; 1993–94 planning file.	Open
PL-008	1992 reserved matters and no additional archaeological condition	In July 1992 GGAT told the Council that significant archaeological deposits and human bone had been confirmed and urged mitigation. Reserved matters were approved on 3 September 1992 without an additional archaeological condition. How did the Council rely on the existing 1990 conditions in reaching that decision?	92/00671/RES officer report; decision notice; GGAT 27 Jul 1992 letter and missing continuation sheet; condition schedule. ?	Open

PL-009	1990 map, prior knowledge and 1994 discoveries	The 1990 evaluation mapped parts of the site as low potential while acknowledging limits to machine trenching; later excavation found extensive burials. The test is whether the 1990 method and interpretation adequately used GGAT's own earlier evidence and the information then available.	GGAT 1978–80 records; 1 Oct 1982 letter; 1990 assessment; 1994 excavation; PPG16-era guidance.	Open — methodological review
PL-010	1983 demolition date error in 1990 assessment	The August 1990 GGAT report dates the destruction correctly in one section but gives 1983 in another. What source produced the 1983 entry and did the error enter any planning or archaeological reasoning?	GGAT 1990 report; source notes; HER record; Council planning file.	Open — documentary error test
PL-011	1972 permission as continuity test	The 1989 officer's report records an earlier conditional housing permission for the same site in 1972 while the family was still living in the farmhouse, with no archaeological condition recorded in that planning history. Did the complete 1972 file contain conditions or representations that explain later treatment?	Application 89/96/3337; 1972 decision notice; committee/officer papers; site plans; later planning-history entries.	Open

2.6 5. Records, witnesses, family evidence & delayed disclosure

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-055	Vale Council FOI search inconsistency	On 7 July 2026 the Council said no additional information had been identified within scope; on 11 September it said service areas had reverted and further historical documentation had been found, which might not itself be Council documentation but was in Council possession. What changed?	FOI 00210772 correspondence; newly found records; search instructions and custodians.	Open

A-056	Heneb record-holder / access route	Heneb stated it was not subject to FOI because it was a limited company, while also holding the successor records / functions. What legal entity holds each historic GGAT record and which access regime applies?	Heneb correspondence; company/charity records; EIR/HE(W)A 2023 analysis.	Open
A-058	Family documents reported lost/stolen	Mary (Nancy) Williams's c.1974 witness statement (Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony) records that the title papers disappeared in 1950–52; David Buckler's 2024 account, reported second-hand by Sion Buckler on 8 Feb 2026 (David Buckler testimony), records that title documents were removed from the family home and reportedly sold. Which items were lost, when, from where, and can the losses be independently corroborated?	Testimony of named family members; library /archive enquiries; probate/estate papers; police reports if any.	Open — testimony; not yet corroborated by a contemporary record
A-059	Witness attrition through death	Key first-hand witnesses have died across the decades, including Mary (Nancy) Williams in 1983 and later generations. The loss of living testimony is relevant to why the family could not reconstruct events earlier and to the present availability of evidence.	Death records; family correspondence; surviving statements and press reports.	Open — chronology / evidence-loss issue
A-060	Multi-generational trauma and delayed disclosure	[SOURCE PENDING] The 1980s events produced prolonged trauma, fear and reluctance among relatives to speak publicly or challenge the account. This is put forward as a reason for delayed disclosure and loss of testimony.	Testimony of named family members; contemporaneous correspondence; diaries; any freely available corroborative records.	Open — SOURCE PENDING

A-061	Claim that challengers “die” because they challenge	Some family members believe that people who challenge the matter die or become unable to pursue it. That belief is recorded here only because it forms part of the family’s explanation for silence. No evidence presently reviewed establishes that any death was caused by challenging Great House Farm issues, and the register will not treat such a causal claim as established. ?	Death chronology; independent evidence would be required for any causal proposition.	Recorded belief — causation unestablished
A-062	Death chronology as possible evidence-access problem	The sequence of deaths may have removed witnesses who knew the parcel history, missing deeds, eviction events or later family decisions. The issue is whether surviving records identify what each person knew or held. ?	Probate files; letters; photographs; notebooks; archive deposits; witness statements.	Open
A-063	Uncle / inherited interest reportedly sold	[SOURCE PENDING] An uncle (“Buckee”) may have sold his interest in a parcel. The exact transaction, parcel, interest and date must be established before it can be used in the title chain or as evidence of witness /interest attrition.	Conveyance or assignment; probate; family papers; Land Registry /estate records.	Open — currently unconfirmed

2.7 6. Public bodies, institutional relationships & synthesis

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
A-064	Government / institutional involvement	The family wants to know whether public bodies exchanged information or coordinated decisions concerning title, enforcement, listing, archaeology and development. Coordination is not itself improper; the issue is whether the documentary record contains undisclosed communications material to the case.	Cadw, Wales Office, Council, GGAT/Heneb, HMLR, police and court correspondence; FOI /EIR responses.	Open — communications test

A-065	BP and public-interest /state connection	Historical BP ownership /government-shareholding facts may be relevant to the family's question about institutional relationships, but shareholding alone does not establish government direction or involvement in the Great House Farm matter. ?	Corporate records; parliamentary records; contemporary government/BP correspondence if any.	Open — contextual only unless direct evidence emerges
A-070	Cross-record convergence test	The final question is whether independently sourced anomalies converge on a common documentary explanation, or whether they resolve into unrelated archive loss, ordinary editorial practice, indexing error, or historical administrative practice.	All entries in this register and the Missing Records Register. ?	Open — final synthesis only after primary records are tested

Connected records: [Master Timeline](#) · [Evidence Library](#) · [Missing Records Register](#) · [Records Access Chronology](#) · [Constructive Criticism & Counterarguments](#). ?

2.8 Supplementary planning issues — 28 September 2026

Added after a further audit of the 1989–1994 planning chronology and the statutory planning framework in force at the time. These are documentary tests, not findings of wrongdoing.

ID	Issue	Question / concern	Evidence lead	Status
PL-012	1992 applicant before 1993 transfer	The Wiki records Ideal Homes Wales as the 1992 reserved-matters applicant and BP's transfer to Ideal Homes on 3 December 1993. What legal or contractual interest, authority or arrangement explains the earlier application?	92/00671/RES; 89/01396/OUT; historic planning register; developer conveyancing/contract papers if held with the planning records.	Open — chronology /formalities test; not a finding of invalidity ?
PL-013	Environmental-assessment screening	The outline site was about 3.4 acres (about 1.38 hectares). The 1988 environmental-assessment regime included urban development projects above a 0.5-hectare threshold as Schedule 2 development. Did the Council make and record the relevant screening determination?	1988 Assessment of Environmental Effects Regulations; 89/01396/OUT; Welsh Office/Council correspondence; planning register.	Open — screening question

PL-014	Historic planning-register completeness	The 1988 General Development Order required the planning register to contain planning applications, reserved-matters applications, plans/drawings and relevant decision information. Does the historic register contain material missing from the surviving 2026 file? ?	Historic planning register /index; 89/01396/OUT; 92/00671/RES; microfilm /scans.	Open — independent records test
PL-015	Archaeological-interest consultation route	The 1988 Order defined a “site of archaeological interest” to include land within a county Sites and Monuments Record. What statutory consultation route was recorded for this application, and are all consultation responses and dates present?	1988 GDO; GGAT consultation; officer report; planning register; consultation log.	Open — statutory-route verification

2.9 9 October correction — issue-register priority

The previous DBDT123/7 and D696 entries must not be allowed to consume execution capacity. DBDT123/7 is closed as already obtained (Parcel B-only). D696 is background corroboration. The active central issue is now **A-122: 1955 Parcel-A physical taking — woodland + VG41 green**, with separate woodland and green downstream ownership chains.

2.10 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:19Z	Sion's Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

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