

Claim: Repeated attempts to frame Mary (Nancy) Williams's Parcel A occupation as permissive

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	Evidence.	2
2.2	Parcel-A segment crosswalk: which events concern which line?	3
2.3	Description	4
2.4	Interpretation	4
2.5	Timing-pattern check: permissive-occupation proposals, land dealings and registration (18 October 2026)	5
2.6	Page version & change log.	6

Page 2612 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 2612 (last modified 2026-10-21 20:02:32 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/claim-repeated-attempts-to-make-mary-williams-occupancy-of-parcel-a-appear-permissive>.

Page ID: 2612 · **Title:** Claim: Repeated attempts to frame Mary (Nancy) Williams's Parcel A occupation as permissive · **Evidence status:** Updated 19 Oct 2026; Parcel-A segment mapping added · **Version:** 1.1.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

Names: the elder woman is **Mary (Nancy) Williams, formerly Buckler**; her youngest daughter is **Mary Buckler (later Godfrey)**. When could two women both be “Mary Buckler”? See [Two Mary Bucklers? Name and identity timeline](#).

[About this page type](#) → [Read the Docs](#)

2.1 Evidence

Date / record	Documentary position	Relevance and limit
1949–1953 — unwritten agricultural tenancy	The Court of Appeal later accepted that Frederick had a periodic agricultural tenancy protected by the Agricultural Holdings Act despite the absence of a written agreement; the last rent is recorded as paid in 1953. The 1939 plan shows Parcel B only [EV-0023]; on that evidence the agricultural tenancy was confined to Parcel B and did not make Parcel-A occupation permissive. 1939 agreement (DBDT123/7): plan shows Parcel B only, highlighted (Media item 88); typed terms visible: monthly let, eight shillings a month, “as meadow or pasture land”, tenant John Williams; landlord Western Ground Rents Ltd (Glamorgan Archives catalogue) [EV-0023]. Page 1 (parcels, acreage): not held — PENDING.	Do not describe the tenancy itself as fictional or failed. Test the land covered and legal scope against the 1939 plan, notice, rent history and original tenancy material. Parcel-A limit: the existence of Frederick’s agricultural tenancy does not by itself establish permissive occupation of A-North, A-Centre or A-South-East.
1954 — GHF-E182	The family chronology identifies a separate further attempt to make Frederick a tenant, treated by the family as an unsuccessful attempt to make Parcel-A occupation permissive [PENDING: EV-0031].	Pending evidence placeholder only; original source not yet attached. Confirm precise terms, proposed parcel, parties, response and why it failed. Until that source is located, do not allocate the attempt to any specific Parcel-A segment.
1955 — GHF-E125 and GHF-E126	Possession order and 4 July execution papers [PENDING: EV-0032 ; PENDING: EV-0034]. The originals and any parcel plan have not been obtained; the events are presently known through later references.	Required to establish the land described in the order and the land actually covered by execution. [SOURCE PENDING] The north woodland and south-east green were taken while Mary remained in the central house-and-garden group; the order, writ/return and any plan must establish whether this was so.
1959 — EV-0039	The Court of Appeal later described a tenancy offer concerning the remaining occupied farmhouse and garden. The original offer and reply have not been located.	Current segment mapping: A-Centre only. The Court of Appeal (1987) recorded that she was offered a tenancy of the farmhouse and garden but “refused to accept it” [EV-0080]; Mary (Nancy) Williams’s c.1974 witness statement (Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony) says she never paid rent to or acknowledged the title of anyone as landlord. The original exchange is still needed. No available plan shows that this offer concerned A-North woodland or A-South-East/VG41.

29 March 1961 — EV-0040	Catalogue entry identifies a deed involving WGR, South Western Brick & Tile and “Cardiff City”; the original deed and plan have not been inspected. The Wiki says the land may lie within the later woodland-title area.	Possible A-North strand only, subject to mapping. Until the deed plan is obtained and overlaid, it is a spatial lead rather than proof of a Parcel-A conveyance. It does not establish that the 1949 or 1959 occupancy events concerned the woodland.
11 December 1962 — EV-0041	Possession order, claim and plan are catalogued as pending; originals have not been obtained.	Likely A-Centre issue, extent still pending. The original claim and plan are required to confirm which land was included. This proceeding must not automatically be extended to the woodland or the lower VG41 ground.
1965 — EV-0039	The Court of Appeal describes a further weekly tenancy offer concerning the farmhouse and garden; it was not signed or returned and no rent was paid. The original offer is not held.	A-Centre only on the present record. It bears on the permissive-occupation dispute at the occupied house-and-garden centre. No available document maps this offer to A-North or A-South-East.
16 June 1970 — EV-0044	The Wiki records VG41’s registration; the original application, registration map and ownership file remain outstanding.	Possible A-South-East strand only, subject to the register map. Village-green registration does not itself prove a council freehold transfer. The house-and-garden tenancy offers should not be used as evidence that the green formed part of those offers without a mapped link.
3 July 1974 — GHF-E135	Catalogue record identifies Mary (Nancy) Williams’s plea of ownership and the pleadings in the county-court action; original pleadings not obtained [PENDING: EV-0049].	Relevant to how ownership, possession and any tenancy/licence case were pleaded by each side.
31 October 1974 — GHF-E136	Two letters are described in the Court of Appeal judgment as licence letters. Original letters or family copies have not been attached.	The Court of Appeal treated the letters as placing Mary in possession under a licence, but their described subject is the occupied house and garden. Do not assume they made the northern woodland or VG41 ground permissive; the original maps and full pleadings must be checked.
31 July 1987 — GHF-E141 and BP Properties Ltd v Buckler	The available report states that the 1974 letters made Mary’s possession permissive, whether or not she accepted them [EV-0080]. The family copy of the judgment is not yet uploaded to GHF-E141.	The appeal directly treated the 1974 letters in the possession/limitation dispute concerning the house and garden. It must not be conflated with proof of root title to A-North or A-South-East; the complete pleadings, judgment and registration maps are needed to establish those separate extents.
3 December 1988 — GHF-E090-N08	The South Wales Echo reported that the family had been fighting for 33 years to prove ownership of the farmhouse.	Contemporary evidence of the family’s publicly reported ownership position, not proof of title or of the wording in earlier court papers.

2.2 Parcel-A segment crosswalk: which events concern which line?

The permissive-occupation theory must be tested against the land actually described in each offer, pleading, order and deed. The fact that an event occurred during Mary (Nancy) Williams’s occupation of the centre does not establish that it applied to the woodland or VG41 ground.

A-North · woodland / Forest of Cardiff route

[SOURCE PENDING] This area was physically taken during the 1955 execution. The 29 March 1961 WGR / South Western Brick & Tile / Cardiff City deed is a possible later dealing on this route, but the original deed and plan have not been inspected. The 1949/1954 tenancy-related events and the 1959/1965 farmhouse-and-garden offers are not proof of permissive occupation of A-North unless a source or plan specifically ties them to it.

Evidence leads: [EV-0034](#) · [EV-0040](#).

A-Centre · farmhouse / buildings / garden

This is the segment to which the available 1959 and 1965 tenancy-offer descriptions, the 1962 farmhouse-and-garden proceedings, and the 31 October 1974 licence letters relate. The Court of Appeal's licence finding concerned the house-and-garden possession/limitation dispute. The separate question whether the middle title registration properly included the historic centre, and how it was combined with Parcel B in 1987, requires the underlying title plans and documents.

Evidence leads: [EV-0039](#) · [EV-0041](#) · [EV-0050](#) · [EV-0078](#).

A-South-East · VG41 / green route

[SOURCE PENDING] This area was also physically taken in 1955. The Wiki records VG41's registration on 16 June 1970, but the original application, map and ownership file remain outstanding. Registration as village green does not itself prove that Llandough Council acquired the freehold. None of the identified house-and-garden tenancy offers or 1974 licence letters is presently mapped to this lower area.

Evidence lead: [EV-0044](#).

Parcel B · eastern agricultural fields

The 1916 agreement is described as a yearly tenancy of the "whole farm", creating a scope question against the reported 1877 A/B split. The 1938 conveyance placed the reversion on the WGR route; the obtained 1939 agreement and plan show the eastern fields (Parcel B) only. The Court of Appeal accepted Frederick's periodic agricultural tenancy in 1949–1953, but the exact land in that tenancy still needs to be kept distinct from the disputed house-and-garden occupancy.

Evidence leads: [EV-0014](#) · [EV-0019](#) · [EV-0023](#).

Working conclusion: the 1959/1965 offers and 1974 licence letters belong on the central-occupation line on the current record. The northern 1961 deed and the south-eastern 1970 VG41 record are separate strands; their maps must be compared before asserting that any permissive-occupation attempt covered those areas.

2.3 Description

The sequence contains tenancy offers in 1959 and 1965, possession proceedings in 1955 and 1962, Mary (Nancy) Williams's ownership plea in 1974, licence letters dated 31 October 1974, and the 1987 appellate ruling on those letters. The originals of GHF-E125, E126, E128, E130, E135 and E136 remain outstanding or unattached.

2.4 Interpretation

The sequence supports examining whether descriptions of Mary (Nancy) Williams's occupation shifted among ownership, tenancy and licence. Keep four matters separate: the 1949–1953 unwritten agricultural tenancy which the Court of Appeal treated as a real protected periodic tenancy; the family's case that its legal extent was Parcel B and not Parcel A; the separate 1954 attempt to make Frederick a tenant, currently tracked by GHF-E182 while the original source remains pending; and the later 1959/1965 offers, 1962 proceedings and 1974 licence letters. The Court of Appeal accepted the 1974 letters' licence effect for the possession/limitation dispute. That decision must not be represented as rejecting all possible root-title evidence without checking the full pleadings, trial judgment and appeal judgment.

The present evidence does not establish a coordinated plan or an intent to mislead. The 1955 order, execution return, offers, pleadings and original licence letters are necessary to test the pattern and its parcel extent.

Related grouping: [Parcel A / Parcel B title sequence](#) · [BP v Buckler: decided and undecided issues](#) · [Missing Records Register](#).

2.5 Timing-pattern check: permissive-occupation proposals, land dealings and

registration (18 October 2026)

Working hypothesis. The chronology raises a question whether repeated efforts to present Mary (Nancy) Williams's occupation as permissive, alongside later dealings affecting the woodland and VG41 ground, helped weaken or obscure the family's claim to the full Parcel A before later registrations. This is worth testing as a potential pattern of information asymmetry or quiet land dealing. It is not yet evidence of a coordinated strategy, concealment or fraud. The precise land covered by each event and the original wording must be established first.

2.5.1 Keep the events separate and date them accurately

- **1949.** The Court of Appeal accepted that Frederick Buckler had a real unwritten periodic agricultural tenancy, though the extent of the tenancy remains a parcel-scope question. Separately, [SOURCE PENDING] Mary refused a contemporaneous offer of a tenancy of the farmhouse; Mary (Nancy) Williams's c.1974 witness statement ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)) says she never paid rent to or acknowledged the title of anyone as landlord; the original offer and reply have not been located. It would be inaccurate to describe Frederick's accepted agricultural tenancy itself as fictional or as proof Mary accepted permission over Parcel A.
- **1959.** The Court of Appeal records that WGR offered Mary a tenancy of the farmhouse and garden and that she refused it, claiming ownership through her grandfather [PENDING: [EV-0039](#)]. The original offer and reply are still unlocated. The account supports a dispute over the occupied house-and-garden centre; it does not establish that the offer concerned the northern forest or the south-eastern VG41 ground.
- **29 March 1961.** The catalogue identifies a WGR / South Western Brick & Tile / Cardiff City deed affecting land said now to be within the woodland title, but the original deed and plan have not been inspected [PENDING: [EV-0040](#)]. The year is 12 years after 1949 by calendar-year subtraction. That is a potentially relevant coincidence; without the deed's precise land and evidence linking the transactions, it does not prove that the 1949 attempt was made to facilitate the 1961 dealing.
- **1965.** The Court of Appeal describes a further offer of a weekly tenancy of the farmhouse and garden, which was not signed or returned and for which no rent was paid [PENDING: [EV-0039](#)]. This is evidence of continued dispute over the occupied centre; it is not, without mapped documents, evidence about the forest or green.
- **16 June 1970.** The wiki records VG41's village-green registration, but its original application, map and ownership file remain outstanding [PENDING: [EV-0044](#)]. This is about 11 years after the 1959 offer, not 12 on the dates currently listed. Do not retrofit an unconfirmed 1958 trigger into the chronology merely to create a matching interval.
- **1969 to 1982–83.** WGR's reported conveyance to BP Pension Trust on 31 December 1969 and the WA231076 /WA240304 first-registration events in 1982–83 are not an exact 12-year interval: they are roughly 12 years 11 months to November 1982 and 13 years 2 months to February 1983 [PENDING: [EV-0043](#)]. HMLR also referred to a 1971 abstract of title, which puts the calendar-year gap to 1983 at roughly 12 years, but its exact date, contents and connection to each title remain to be established. An abstract is not itself an act of possession.

2.5.2 Ownership assertion, non-acceptance and the notice question

The Court of Appeal's 1987 account supports the proposition that Mary refused the 1959 tenancy offer and claimed ownership. The family also reports that she repeatedly rejected being treated as a tenant and asserted that she was the owner. For the 1949 and 1959 events, however, the original correspondence is not currently available on this wiki to verify the exact wording, date, scope and delivery. A rejected offer alone does not prove a concluded tenancy; at the same time, absence of a signature is not always decisive for every possible legal characterisation. The Court of Appeal treated separate 1974 letters as creating a licence despite the absence of express acceptance, so that later ruling must be addressed rather than ignored—but it should not simply be transposed to different documents and dates.

The related “stealth/secretcy” question is whether any later dealing or first-registration applicant knew of Mary's ownership claim, what was said in the deed and application, whether the disputed polygons were included, and whether notice was sent and served. HMLR's 25 May 2026 letter says it was not aware at first registration of the family's interest or an ongoing dispute. That is HMLR's stated position, not proof that no notice was sent, that an applicant concealed information, or that Mary was deliberately kept unaware. Obtain and compare the application forms, declarations, title abstracts, deed plans, occupier enquiries, notices, proofs of service and solicitor/Registry correspondence; reconcile the reported post-death notification separately.

Limitation caveat. A 12-year limitation period can matter to a claim to recover land, but the clock depends on the right-holder, the specific land, adverse possession, permission, acknowledgements, proceedings and the applicable law. It is not a general rule that a party has to wait 12 years before registering title. The date pattern should guide targeted retrieval and cross-examination of the records, not substitute for proof of knowledge, intent or title.

For the spatial and title test, see [Three Parts of Parcel A](#) and the [parcel-map decision rule](#). The original 1961 deed and plan, the VG41 file, the 1955 execution papers, and complete WA231076/WA240304 registration and amalgamation plans remain decisive gaps.

Editorial change history is maintained centrally in the [Master Change Log](#); this page contains the subject analysis, not a separate guest book.

Wider Cedwyn Estate theory cross-reference: The permissive-occupation chronology is a key test of the Cedwyn Estate hypothesis only where the offer, refusal or protest can be tied to a specific parcel and title claim. A rejected offer and an ownership assertion may evidence a live dispute; neither alone proves that a later deed or registration was coordinated with it. Read the [Cedwyn Estate Working Theory](#).

2.6 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.1

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.1	2026-10-18T15:39Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Correction (18 Oct 2026): Item 1: 1939 wording (withdrawn 18 Oct as inference; replaced by facts only). Item 1: same point in the test column.	Corrections log — 18 Oct 2026 (page 3919) / Master Change Log (3923)
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:39Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; earlier log rows carried into this table; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026
	2026-10-18 (rollout date; exact time not separately recorded)	OpenAI-assisted maintenance agent (GPT-6)	Installed the page-local append-only change log and agent instructions. Existing page content was not intentionally rewritten.	User-directed site-wide changelog standard. Saved via WordPress API; public rendering of this page not yet independently checked.

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