

The Two Parcels

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	Definitions.	2
2.2	The parcels step by step	3
2.3	Related analysis and change record / guest book — 18 October 2026	5
2.4	Page version & change log.	5

Page 11 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 11 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:04:21 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: 11 · **Title:** The Two Parcels · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the [Editing Protocol](#) · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [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](#).

The family’s case about Great House Farm is... .. read more

The family’s case about [Great House Farm](#) is that the [1877 Bute–Thomas agreement \(GHF-E115\)](#) and related records describe two historically distinct parcels: Parcel A, the house/quarrying holding, and Parcel B, the eastern agricultural fields. The family argues that later use of “whole farm” language blurred that distinction. This is a working title reconstruction, not a final judicial finding. The exact legal extent must be tested against the original agreements, filed plans, tenancy records and registration files. See the linked [Parcel A/B title claim](#) for the source-by-source dependencies, the [BP v Buckler scope analysis](#) for what the litigation did and did not decide, and the [evidence-dependency tree](#).

Method and evidence key: [Main Page](#)

2.1 Definitions

Parcel A — the full house/quarrying parcel, not merely the retained house and garden

Parcel A Parcel A means the full 1877 house/quarrying parcel: the farmhouse and associated house group; barns, stable and yard west of the house; garden; the forest/woodland north of the house; and the ground south-east of the house and garden that later became village green VG41. The house-and-garden description used in later proceedings referred to the occupied centre that Mary defended; it was not the geographical limit of Parcel A. [Mary \(Nancy\) Williams](#) described the farmhouse/buildings and about 10 acres as the Thomas/Williams side of the 1877 division. The family's established title case is that when the quarrying arrangement ended in 1928, the Parcel-A freehold included the northern woodland and the south-eastern green ground as well as the house/buildings land (1928).

"The freehold of the greater part of the farm consisting of the farmhouse and buildings and about 10 acres which I still occupy was sold by the [Bute Estate](#) to [Daniel Thomas](#) and another portion consisting of about 9 acres up on the top was retained by the Bute Estate."

Evidence: [Mary \(Nancy\) Williams's statement, c. 1974 \(extract\)](#) (cat. GHF-E011-02) · [Bute-Thomas conveyance and Thomas tenancy, 1877](#) (missing; cat. GHF-E011-01)

Parcel B — the eastern fields

Parcel B The separate fields to the east: on the family's reading, the "about 9 acres up on the top" that the Bute Estate retained in 1877 [PENDING: [EV-0006](#)]. Mary says this portion "was given up later, and does not concern this action". It was later let under the [1916 tenancy](#) and the [1939 revised tenancy](#). The family does not dispute its subsequent passage to WGR and BP.

"Whole farm" — wording that blurred distinct parcels A and B

⌵A + B described as one⌹ The phrase appears in the 1916 tenancy, 1955 order, later conveyances, 1982 registration and 1987 judgment [PENDING: [EV-0014](#)]. It is evidence of how the property was described in those records, not proof that Parcel A and Parcel B were the same legal holding or that WGR had an entitlement to both. The family's case is that WGR's rights concerned Parcel B, while the 1928 operation of the 1877 arrangement had already transferred Parcel A to the Williams family. The 1955 wording then made it possible to treat Parcel A land as part of the fields possession.

Nomenclature

Selected wording: the farm

- [the farm](#)
- [whole farm](#)
- [Great House Farm](#)
- [Parcels A and B](#)

[Proceed to evidence](#) → [Close](#)

Nomenclature

Selected wording: whole farm

- [the farm](#)
- [whole farm](#)
- [Great House Farm](#)
- [Parcels A and B](#)

[Proceed to evidence](#) → [Close](#)

Nomenclature

Selected wording: Great House Farm

- [the farm](#)
- [whole farm](#)
- [Great House Farm](#)
- [Parcels A and B](#)

[Proceed to evidence](#) → [Close](#)

Nomenclature

Selected wording: Parcels A and B

- the farm
- whole farm
- Great House Farm
- Parcels A and B

[Proceed to evidence](#) → [Close](#)

Research note. The [1916 tenancy](#) is the first record identified here to describe both parcels as one. The family's case is that this nomenclature did not undo the 1877/1928 division: by then Parcel A was the Thomas/Williams house-and-quarrying parcel and Parcel B the eastern fields retained by Bute and later let to WGR. Subsequent use of "whole farm"—especially in 1955—blurred rather than resolved that distinction.

The title test

The central question is not whether later records call the property the "whole farm", but whether each later instrument actually carried Parcel A. The research therefore tests the 1877 split, the 1924/1928 material, the 1938 conveyance, the 1939 fields-only plan and the 1969–83 registration chain against one another. The table below applies the test step by step. See [Anticipated Objections and the Family's Answers](#) and the [Legal Review \(land\)](#).

Research note — the chronology of conflation. Mary (Nancy) Williams's witness statement c.1974 ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)) records the freehold passing when quarrying ceased and the last rent paid in 1928; on that basis the 1877 arrangement took effect in 1928, when quarrying and rent to Thomas ended, and Parcel A—including the northern forest and the later VG41 green—became family freehold. The 1949 step that sought to characterise occupation as permissive came before Mary (Nancy) Williams recorded the title papers' disappearance in 1950–52 (witness statement c.1974); that the attempt failed is SOURCE PENDING. In 1955, wording that described the "whole farm" blurred Parcel A and [Frederick's](#) Parcel-B tenancy, and execution seized the north forest and south-east green while Mary defended the still-occupied house/buildings/garden group. Her practical defence of that central area, under extreme physical and family constraints, should not be misread as a claim limited to that area. On the family's limitation case, twelve years from the 1928 change would have matured by 1940 if the relevant conditions were met; the later 1955 recharacterisation made the clock appear to start later. At first registration, the 1969 root/1971 abstract discrepancy must be investigated, but is not by itself Parcel-A-specific proof. The precise 1982–83 filings and title plans remain the test of how the conflated description entered the register.

Same-name records — check which farm before assigning a parcel

Records that say "Great House", "Ty Mawr" or "Llandough" are not automatically about this farm. There are three traps: **Llandough Farm**, a separate farmstead in the same village south of the church (Roman villa site, built over for housing 1978–79); **Llandough-juxta-Cowbridge**, a different parish about 20 km west with its own Great House Farm and the Llandough Castle estate; and **Great House, Llandow**, near Cowbridge. A record is only assigned to Parcel A or Parcel B once its parish, plan, acreage or tenant ties it to Llandough-juxta-Penarth.

Currently unassigned: Amgueddfa Cymru **MS 3360/3**, the 1924 "Particulars ... of the Sale of Nine Well-Known Farms in the Vale of Glamorgan forming part of the Llandough Estate", which has a page headed Great House Farm, and Museum **Ref 13.2**, a waterwheel "from Llandough Farm" (1979). Neither is yet shown to concern either parcel; reasons at [R33 location check](#). The 1924 sale particulars are not the 1877 split Mary (Nancy) Williams, formerly Buckler, describes, and not the 15 May 1924 agreement on the WA231076 file.

2.2 The parcels step by step

Date	Instrument or event	Parcel	Told in full at
1877	Bute–Thomas conveyance and Thomas tenancy	Parcel Athe farmhouse, buildings and about 10 acres	1877 sale
1877	Bute retains the eastern fields	Parcel Bthe ~9 acres Bute kept	1877 sale
1916	Bute tenancy to John Williams	⌊A + B as one⌋described as the whole farm	1916 tenancy (Court of Appeal card formerly here: cat. GHF-E011-03, -04)

1924 / 1928	Agreement of 15 May 1924 on the WA231076 file (contents not yet known); last rent of about £4 to Alfred Thomas, 1928 [PENDING: EV-0016]	Parcel A1928 is the strongest current evidence-based date for the Williams freehold; 1924 is kept as an earlier candidate until read. <i>Not to be confused with the 1924 “Llandough Estate” sale particulars (MS 3360/3), which are unassigned: see same-name records.</i>	1928 · 1924 record · Legal Review
1938	Conveyance of Bute’s reversion to WGR	Parcel Bon the family’s reading, only what Bute still held (deed held by the family; cat. GHF-E011-06) [PENDING: EV-0019]	1938
1939	WGR revised tenancy to John Williams, with plan	Parcel Bthe fields east of the house only; the last written tenancy on record (cat. GHF-E011-07, -08)	1939 · plan
1949	Frederick’s unwritten yearly tenancy	Parcel Bthe fields (cat. GHF-E011-09) [PENDING: EV-0025]	1949 tenancy
1955	High Court possession order and enforcement on 4 July [PENDING: EV-0032; PENDING: EV-0034]	‘A + B as one’ as worded; on the family’s case, possession of Parcel B was also used to seize the northern forest and south-eastern green ground belonging to Parcel A. The farmhouse/buildings /garden group remained occupied by Mary (cat. GHF-E011-10).	order · enforcement
1959, 1965	Tenancy offers to Mary, refused or not signed [PENDING: EV-0039]	Parcel Athe occupied farmhouse/buildings/garden group only—not the whole Parcel-A extent, including its northern forest and south-eastern green	1959 · 1965
1962	Cardiff County Court order, 11 December 1962, never enforced [PENDING: EV-0041]	Parcel Athe remaining occupied farmhouse/buildings /garden group sought separately; this phrasing does not define the entire Parcel-A estate (cat. GHF-E011-11, -12)	1962 order
1969 – 1975	WGR to BP Pension Trust; BP Pension Trust to BP Properties [PENDING: EV-0043; PENDING: EV-0052]	‘A + B described together’ The 1969 root deed and 1971 abstract are absent from the 30 July 2026 HMLR schedule but are recited in the later chain; the gap is not Parcel-A-specific. Their actual parcels clause and plans—not the recital or the missing schedule entries alone—must decide what land was conveyed (cat. GHF-E011-13).	Conveyances
1982 – 1983	First registration, WA231076	‘A + B as one’ both parcels registered as one (HMLR letter of 23 March 2026 and register, cat. GHF-E011-14, -15)	First registration

Acreage trail

Acreage control — do not add these figures as separate parcels. Mary (Nancy) Williams’s “about 45 acres” describes the earlier holding, including land across Leckwith Road; her account of 1877 describes about 10 acres with the farm-house/buildings and about 9 acres retained by Bute. The separate “about 33 acres” limeworks figure comes from an uninspected D153 lead whose item description, extent and relationship to the later parcel model are not verified. It could describe a working area, overlap other areas or refer to a different tract. Do not subtract or add it to the 45, 10 and 9 acres, or assign it to Parcel A/B, until the D153 record and any plan are checked. See [Llandough Limeworks](#) and SC-21.

2.3 Related analysis and change record / guest book — 18 October 2026

Added a cross-reference to the proposed three-component subdivision of Parcel A and the separate Parcel B control area. The model is provisional until original plans are reconciled. See the [Three-part Parcel A: chronology, order scope and later title transfers](#) assessment for the cross-parcel chronology, competing explanations and prioritized document list.

Change record: Added this cross-reference and a dated guest-book entry to connect this page to the new three-part Parcel A analysis. This is an editorial synthesis of existing leads, not a newly discovered primary record or a finding of fraud.

Cedwyn Estate theory cross-reference: The two-parcel model is now examined as part of the wider Cedwyn Estate hypothesis: the family proposes an older estate underlying later Parcel A/Parcel B descriptions. Every link must be grounded in the original instrument and mapped land; a tenancy plan or later title number is not itself proof of free-hold ownership or a forty-parcel estate.

2.4 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:14Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

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