

Three Parts of Parcel A — Divergent Chronologies before 1987 Amalgamation

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. Evidence labels: what can safely be said	2
2.2	2. The three physical components and why they must not be collapsed	2
2.3	3. Parallel chronology	3
2.4	3A. Reverse-engineered chronology: perimeter capture, the 1961 deed and VG41	5
2.5	Repeated pattern of occupancy characterisation → challenge → later registration (family reconstruction, 18 October 2026).	7
2.6	4. What is the strongest argument for the family?	8
2.7	5. What works against the family?	8
2.8	6. What works in BP's favour—and what remains to be tested?	8
2.9	7. What works in the council's favour—and what questions remain?	9
2.10	8. What the 1987 judgment decided—and what it should not be made to decide	9
2.11	9. Smoking-gun test: what would change the assessment?	9
2.12	10. Priority evidence list	10
2.13	11. Overall assessment	10
2.14	Related pages and authorities	11
2.15	Land Registry correspondence cross-check — three-part Parcel A theory (18 October 2026)	11
2.16	Parcel mapping and 12-year timing hypothesis — 18 October 2026.	13

Page 3356 of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki, carried over from the version last modified on 2026-10-20. 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 3356 (last modified 2026-10-20 22:45:37 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/three-parts-of-parcel-a-divergent-chronologies>.

Page ID: 3356 · **Title:** Three Parts of Parcel A — Divergent Chronologies before 1987 Amalgamation · **Evidence status:** Corrected 18 Oct 2026; evidence labels on the edited lines · **Version:** 1.0.1 · [Editing Protocol](#)

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

Provenance of the plan of the Williams parcel (corrected 20 Oct 2026): date and origin unknown; from a family heirloom collection, disclosed 2026. Our case, prospective, links it to the 1877 Daniel Thomas & Son agreement, which is not yet in hand [SOURCE PENDING]. It is the only known source for the three-way split of Parcel A, much as Parcel B is known from the 1939 tenancy plan. [See the plan](#).

Assessment status (18 October 2026): working forensic reconstruction based on the presently accessible wiki pages and the published Court of Appeal judgment. It is a family-side title hypothesis under active test, not a judicial finding that the family owned all three areas, that the 1955 enforcement was unlawful, or that any party acted fraudulently.

Controlling question. Did three physically distinct parts of the land later called “Parcel A” follow different practical and legal paths from the 1955 execution of a possession order to the title-registration amalgamation recorded in 1987—and, if so, did later proceedings and registration treat them as one coherent estate without proving that the same root of title covered all three? The question is potentially important because it separates physical possession, legal title, registered title, and village-green status. Those are not interchangeable.

Provisional conclusion. This is a high-value evidential lead, but the three-part distinction alone is not a smoking gun. The strongest presently established point is narrower: the Court of Appeal’s 1987 account says possession was taken on 4 July 1955 of all parts of the farm except the farmhouse and garden, while the appeal before it was confined to the farmhouse and garden. The judgment also says the possessory-title claim for the rest of the farm had failed on factual findings and was not challenged on appeal. That combination supports a differentiated chronology, but it does not establish that the woodland and later VG41 land were within a separately owned Parcel A, or that WGR/BP lacked title to them. The missing link is a parcel-by-parcel comparison of operative deeds, contemporaneous plans, the 1955 enforcement record, VG41’s original file, and the Land Registry application files.

2.1 1. Evidence labels: what can safely be said

- **Judicial account:** the published Court of Appeal judgment records WGR’s possession proceedings against Frederick Buckler, the 4 July 1955 execution excepting the farmhouse and garden, the 1962 possession order for the farmhouse and garden, the 1969 transfer, BP’s registration from November 1982, and the narrow scope of the 1987 appeal. See [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler, 31 July 1987](#), especially paragraphs 2 and 4–10.
- **Recorded in the wiki but requiring primary-file confirmation:** the exact boundaries and title identity of the “northern forest” and the south-east ground later recorded as VG41; the legal effect and completion date of the 1987 amalgamation; and the precise contents of the original VG41 file.
- **Family case / reconstruction:** the 1877 separation between a house/quarrying parcel conveyed to Daniel Thomas and land retained by Bute; the family’s claimed acquisition of the whole of Parcel A following the end of quarrying around 1928; and the contention that the 1955 execution took land which was outside Frederick Buckler’s agricultural tenancy and outside WGR’s rightful title.
- **Not established by this argument alone:** fraud, concealment, bad faith, the council’s ownership of all or any of VG41, the validity or invalidity of every registered title, or a present right to recover possession. Those conclusions require additional evidence and, where relevant, specialist legal assessment.

2.2 2. The three physical components and why they must not be collapsed

2.2.1 A. Northern forest / woodland

The family case identifies the wooded ground north of the house as part of Parcel A: the former house/quarrying parcel, not the eastern agricultural fields said to have remained with Bute as Parcel B. The wiki’s [Woodland page](#) treats the 1939 WGR–John Williams tenancy plan (DBDT123/7) as Parcel B only [EV-0023]. If the 1877/1928 Parcel A title did extend across the woodland, a later taking of physical possession in 1955 would not, by itself, prove that WGR had acquired the woodland’s freehold. It would prove a change of possession, subject to the exact execution record and boundaries.

Strongest support for the family: the Court of Appeal’s account fixes 4 July 1955 as the date WGR took possession of all parts of the farm other than the farmhouse and garden. That is useful evidence of the physical division at

the moment of execution. It may allow the woodland's later chain to be tested against the same event rather than being treated as an unrelated later loss.

Strongest difficulty: the judgment says the possessory-title claim for the rest of the farm failed on factual findings because the acts of possession relied on were too tenuous and equivocal, and that part of the order was not challenged on appeal. This is adverse to an adverse-possession theory for the woodland. It is not automatically dispositive of a separate documentary title claim through the reported 1877 conveyance, but the distinction must be supported from the pleadings and trial record, not assumed.

Critical spatial test: overlay the 1877 Bute–Thomas plan or parcel description, the 1924/1928 material, the 1938 conveyance plan, the 1939 tenancy plan, the 1955 warrant/return and execution plan, and the current/1982–83 title plans. “Woodland north of the house” is a useful location description, not yet a sufficient legal description of the land at issue.

2.2.2 B. Farmhouse, buildings and garden

This is the component that remained physically occupied after 4 July 1955 and became the centre of the 1962 possession order, the 1974 proceedings and letters, and the adverse-possession appeal decided in 1987. The 1962 order is described in the wiki as concerning the farmhouse and garden, with mesne profits from 1955. The 1974 case included Mary (Nancy) Williams's defence asserting ownership and limitation. BP's letters of 31 October 1974 offered continued rent-free occupation of the house and garden; the Court of Appeal held that, absent repudiation, the letters placed her in possession under a licence, even though she had not expressly accepted them [EV-0080].

What this proves: the house/garden had a distinct and sustained occupancy history, and the licence issue was material to the result of the 1987 appeal. It also explains why the litigation record is richer for this middle component than for the woodland or green.

What it does not prove: the 1974 letters were about remaining in the farmhouse and garden. They should not be extended, without the actual wording and mapped land, to establish permission over the northern woodland or south-east ground. Conversely, the family cannot rely on the prominence of the house/garden litigation as proof that the court accepted a family freehold in the rest of Parcel A. The appeal concerned adverse possession, and BP's registered paper title was treated as the starting position in that dispute.

2.2.3 C. South-east ground, later associated with VG41

The family reconstruction places a third component south-east of the house/garden within the wider Parcel A and says it was physically taken on 4 July 1955, then later followed a different administrative and conveyancing history. The wiki's [Redevelopment and Church View Close](#) page records VG41 as registered on 16 June 1970 and says the full registration file and map remain high-value evidence to obtain. It also correctly warns that administration of a village-green register does not, by itself, establish that the council owns the underlying freehold.

Strongest support for scrutiny: VG41 creates an independent documentary trail, potentially with a mapped polygon, applicant, landowner assertions, notices, objections and supporting evidence. It may enable the present green area to be plotted backward against the 1955 execution footprint and the reported 1877 Parcel A boundary. If the council acquired one part and a charity received another, the separate conveyances and their plan attachments may also reveal how the land was described and from whom it was said to derive.

Important limits: registration as a village green is not the same thing as a conveyance of ownership. It does not automatically prove that a council acquired the freehold, that the area belonged to the family, or that any later transfer was invalid. Any reported division between a council-held south half and a charitable gift of a north half must be checked against the original VG41 map, transfer deeds, registered title entries and current title. This page does not treat that division as established until those records are produced.

2.3 3. Parallel chronology

2.3.1 1877 — asserted division of the estate

Mary (Nancy) Williams's later account distinguishes the farmhouse, buildings and about 10 acres sold by Bute to Daniel Thomas from approximately 9 acres retained by Bute “up on the top” [PENDING: EV-0006]. On her statement ([Mary \(Nancy\) Williams testimony](#)) this was a real division of ownership, not merely a tenancy boundary; the title case is that Parcel A's later family title encompassed the house, garden, ancillary buildings, woodland and south-east ground. The legal effect depends on the original instrument's words, plan, parties, reservations, conditions and any later conveyances. An approximate acreage statement is not enough to draw an authoritative boundary.

Catalogue/provenance control point: the older Two Parcels page still refers to a missing placeholder, GHF-E011-01, for the Bute–Thomas conveyance, while the later claim page indexes GHF-E115 (1877 Bute–Thomas agreement), E116 and E117 as relevant early documents. Those records and identifiers must be reconciled in the Evidence Library. The file actually inspected, any counterpart, its provenance and whether it contains an operative conveyance or a different kind of agreement must be stated precisely.

2.3.2 1916–1939 — “whole farm” wording against later fields-only evidence

The 1987 judgment says Bute granted John Williams a yearly agricultural tenancy of the “whole” farm in February 1916 and that the reversion was conveyed to WGR in 1938 [PENDING: [EV-0014](#); PENDING: [EV-0019](#)]. The family’s contrary construction is that Bute had already sold Parcel A to Thomas in 1877 and could only let Parcel B in 1916; it further relies on the 1939 WGR–John Williams tenancy and plan (DBDT123/7) as covering the eastern fields only. This is one of the most consequential clashes in the theory, not a detail to gloss over. It needs a line-by-line legal comparison of the 1916 instrument, 1938 conveyance and plan, and 1939 tenancy and plan. A later plan may help define an area but does not automatically vary a prior operative instrument; a broad phrase such as “whole farm” may also be descriptive rather than a precise cadastral boundary. The documents, not either party’s label, must decide.

2.3.3 1924 / 1928 — end of quarrying and claimed family freehold

The family places the transition to its freehold at the end of quarrying and the last rent to Alfred Thomas around 1928, with the 15 May 1924 material as an earlier possible date. That may be consistent with a tenancy or conditional arrangement ending, but the end of a rent stream does not by itself prove that a legal freehold was conveyed or vested. The 1924 drain agreement/plan, 1928 receipt or termination record, 1877 agreement and any later deed must be read together. The resulting boundary must then be tested against the northern woodland and the south-east ground, not merely the farmhouse.

2.3.4 4 July 1955 — one execution event, potentially three different title consequences

The Court of Appeal recorded that on 4 July 1955 the possession order was enforced and possession was taken in respect of “all parts of the farm except the farmhouse and garden.”

Source: [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler](#), paragraph 6. This is the most important judicial wording for the three-part reconstruction. It is direct support for a physical distinction between the occupied centre and the rest of the land. It is not, on its own, a finding that the woodland and VG41 ground were legally owned by the Williams family or that the execution was unlawful. The judgment describes the farm in WGR’s possession proceedings; whether each ground component actually fell within a separate Parcel A freehold must be proved independently.

The primary High Court order, warrant, bailiff/sheriff return, attendance notes, plan, notices and any contemporaneous boundary description are therefore essential. The order is reported as being against Frederick Buckler alone, based on an agricultural tenancy whose status is discussed in the judgment. If the family is right that his tenancy was Parcel B-only, that is a serious scope question: what did the order authorise, what land did the officer enter, and what title did WGR claim over each area? But the answer cannot be inferred merely from the family’s parcel labels or from the fact of physical taking.

2.3.5 1959–1962 — a focused house-and-garden proceeding

The Court of Appeal states that WGR offered Mary a tenancy of the farmhouse and garden and she refused it; in 1962 WGR brought a fresh action against Frederick and Mary for possession of that area and mesne profits from 1955 [PENDING: [EV-0041](#)]. The wiki’s copy and archive references show that the original 1955 and 1962 court files, including the relevant orders, plans and underlying papers, still need to be assembled in the documentary record. This narrower litigation focus is consistent with the fact that the house/garden remained occupied while the other ground had been taken in 1955. It does not itself decide which estate owned the areas outside the house/garden.

2.3.6 1974 — ownership assertion, adverse-possession defence, and licence letters

The wiki records that Mary’s 1974 statement asserted ownership of the farmhouse and about 10 acres through the older Thomas/Williams history and that she said she had never paid rent to or acknowledged the title of anyone as landlord. The 1974 county-court action was part-heard and not finally heard. The separate application to enforce the 1962 possession order led to the two letters of 31 October 1974, addressed to Mary but sent to her solicitor. The 1987 Court of Appeal treated the letters as a licence over the house/garden because she did not repudiate them.

This creates a distinction of real forensic significance. Mary’s broader historical assertion may be evidence of the family’s claimed source of title; the litigation outcome, however, turned on adverse possession of the occupied house/garden and the legal effect of the licence letters. The letters should neither be treated as a conveyance of the whole of

Parcel A to BP nor assumed to have preserved the family's title claim over all three components. Their exact mapped scope and the pleadings in each action must be checked.

2.3.7 1970 — VG41 and the chronology problem

VG41 is recorded on the wiki as registered on 16 June 1970, after the reported 1955 taking but before the 1982–83 registrations [PENDING: [EV-0044](#)]. The sequence is potentially important: the registration file may record what was understood about the land's identity, ownership and public use at that time. It does not follow that registration transferred the freehold. Obtain the full application, original map, notices, statements, evidence, objections, decision record and any correspondence. Determine whether the registered area exactly matches the claimed south-east Parcel A ground, and whether the register or map changed later.

2.3.8 1982–1983 — first registration and notice

The wiki records BP's registration as proprietor from November 1982 and a further title event in February 1983; it tracks titles WA231076 and WA240304. The family's concern includes whether a title description derived from Parcel B or the broad "whole farm" history was used to register land said to belong to Parcel A, and whether Mary or the family had an effective opportunity to object. The 1987 judgment states BP had been registered proprietor since November 1982, so the register is not a mere later allegation; the issue is what land was registered, on what evidence, with what notices and legal effect.

The critical comparison is not simply "BP registered the farm". It is: which title number covered which polygon; what deed or other root was lodged for each polygon; whether woodland and the future VG41 area are shown within the title plan; what the applicant disclosed about the Thomas/Williams history and occupation; which persons were notified and when; what Land Registry asked or was told; and whether the file contains evidence of any objection, requisition or qualification. The register, filed plan, application form, supporting deeds, abstract, survey correspondence and proof of service must be reviewed together.

2.3.9 2 February 1987 — amalgamation while appeal proceedings were live

The dedicated wiki page on [1987 HMLR Amalgamation During Appeal](#) identifies 2 February 1987 as an amalgamation event in the title chronology while the BP v Buckler appeal process was live [PENDING: [EV-0078](#)]. The timing warrants careful inquiry, but it does not establish impropriety by itself. A registry amalgamation is an administrative title-state act; it ordinarily should not be described as creating the underlying ownership or curing a defective root of title merely because two title records were combined.

Verification required: determine whether 2 February 1987 is the date of application, the date an entry was made, or the legally effective completion date. Obtain the application, attached plan, consent/authority, correspondence, decision, pre- and post-amalgamation registers and title plans, and any evidence of notice to the litigants or their solicitors. Until then the precise statement should be "the wiki's title chronology records an amalgamation event/application on 2 February 1987", not an unqualified assertion that the titles were definitively merged that day.

2.4 3A. Reverse-engineered chronology: perimeter capture, the 1961 deed and VG41

Working hypothesis added 18 October 2026: the northern woodland and south-eastern ground later associated with VG41 were not simply incidental areas lost during the 1955 execution. On this hypothesis [SOURCE PENDING], they were the north and south portions of a distinct Parcel-A estate, physically taken while Mary remained in the house-and-garden centre after her leg amputation. Subsequent dealings over the north and south areas may have converted that initial physical separation into a durable legal and planning boundary around the occupied home. This can be tested as a possible strategy of perimeter capture or hostile land acquisition; it is not yet proof that WGR, a council, Brick & Tile, a charity or a later developer coordinated a plan.

4 July 1955 — physical separation under the possession process. The Court of Appeal expressly records that possession was taken of all parts of the farm except the farmhouse and garden, and explains that Mary had recently returned from hospital after a leg amputation and strongly resisted leaving. This supports the spatial core of the family's argument: the house remained occupied while land around it did not. The judgment does not itself identify the northern woodland and VG41 polygon by modern boundaries, so those must be mapped against the 1955 execution record and older conveyance plans.

1959 and 1965 — resistance and knowledge. The Court of Appeal records that by 1959 Mary was asserting a title through her grandfather and refused WGR's offer of a tenancy of the farmhouse and garden [PENDING: [EV-0039](#)]. The Wiki also indexes further 1965 dealings/offers and objections to permissive occupation and trespass [SOURCE

PENDING: no document or named speaker yet]. If the letters and replies confirm those objections, they support an argument that WGR knew Mary rejected the attempt to recast her occupation as permissive and asserted ownership. But the located 1959/1965 material must be plotted to its land: a protest about the house and garden is not automatically proof that the council knew of, or was dispossessing Mary from, the northern woodland or south-eastern green.

29 March 1961 — potentially critical northern strand. The Wiki's catalogue identifies GHF-E129 as a deed with plan involving Western Ground Rents Ltd (WGR), South Western Brick & Tile and a party described as "Cardiff City"; the same entry says the deed and plan have not yet been obtained or transcribed [PENDING: [EV-0040](#)]. If the plan places land transferred, conveyed, leased or otherwise dealt with in the northern woodland claimed as Parcel A, it could show the first post-1955 onward dealing with that area and help identify the body asserting control six years after the execution. That would be significant, especially if the operative 1877/1928 title material excluded the land from WGR's chain. It does not yet prove a transfer of the "north half", its legal nature, the recipient's knowledge of Mary's claim, or a wrongful disposition. The deed, plan, consideration, recitals, title references, authority/consents and successor body must be checked before assigning those conclusions. See [GHF-E129](#).

1962 — an important scope conflict that must be resolved, not papered over. The family's current reconstruction asks whether the 1962 possession process also encompassed a wider Parcel-A area including the forest. However, the published Court of Appeal judgment describes the 11 December 1962 order as one for possession of the farmhouse and garden, with mesne profits, and the Wiki's current GHF-E130 catalogue is titled as a farmhouse-and-garden order. Until the sealed order, claim, plan and any separate order are inspected, this page cannot state as established fact that the 1962 order included the forest. If the primary plan proves broader coverage, that would materially alter the chronology; if it confirms house/garden only, it supports the distinction between the central occupied land and the previously taken north/south areas.

16 June 1970 — VG41 and a statutory ownership route separate from adverse possession. The Wiki records VG41 as registered on this date, and the full application/map/ownership file remains pending under [GHF-E133](#). The Commons Registration Act 1965 did more than record green status: under its then sections 1(3) and 8, where green registration became final and no owner was registered, the case could be referred to a Commons Commissioner; if the Commissioner was not satisfied that anyone owned the land, the prescribed local authority could be registered as owner and the land would vest in it. See the historic Act, [section 1](#) and [section 8](#). This creates a specific and potentially decisive question: was VG41 merely registered as a green, or was a separate owner-entry and statutory vesting sequence actually completed? The owner column, objections, Commissioner referral/decision, notices and resulting register entry must answer that. It is not accurate, on the existing record, to call the 1970 event "the council registering possession by adverse possession". A statutory vesting route, if used, is a different legal mechanism.

12-year adverse-possession clock — do not conflate the actors or polygons. Mary's 1959 and 1965 objections may be relevant evidence of her rejection of WGR's claims and any assertion that her occupation was permissive. Whether they interrupted or defeated a limitation period depends on the exact claimant, exact land, acts of factual possession, intention to possess, title, any acknowledgement or proceedings, and the law then applicable. A challenge to WGR over the occupied house cannot automatically interrupt an unrelated council's asserted possession of the green, and an objection is not always legally equivalent to retaking possession or commencing proceedings. Conversely, the Court of Appeal itself observed that WGR's advisers were mistaken in believing that visits and assertions of title alone stopped time running under section 13 of the Limitation Act 1939. The full correspondence and the VG41 ownership file are therefore essential before any clock can responsibly be calculated.

25 July 1972 — planning context and the "surrounded home" hypothesis. The Master Timeline indexes an earlier housing permission on the site on 25 July 1972, while Mary still occupied the house [PENDING: [EV-0046](#)]. When considered with the 1955 physical taking, the 1961 deed lead and the 1970 VG41 registration, this timing raises a coherent question about whether the intervening development land, the northern woodland and the southern green were dealt with separately before homes were built between the occupied centre and those outer areas. The reverse-engineered hypothesis is that this left Mary's household increasingly isolated within a narrow residual holding while legal and administrative control of the perimeter was established elsewhere. To advance from chronology to motive, the investigation needs the 1961 plan, VG41 map and application, planning application/permission/site plans, land ownership certificates, committee papers, developer correspondence and evidence of what each party knew. Planning permission alone does not prove that the council knew of a competing family title or that development and land registration were coordinated to defeat it.

Does the 1987 ruling protect—or determine the title to—the two outer areas? The family is right to insist that the appeal was limited to the farmhouse and garden and should not be presented as a reasoned appellate determination of every separate documentary-title issue concerning the northern woodland and south-eastern ground. But a broader statement that the outer areas were wholly "outside" the judgment would go too far: paragraph 2 records that the possession order for the rest of the farm was not challenged on appeal because the adverse-possession claim failed on first-instance findings. The unappealed order and findings may have procedural consequences. The exact distinction is between (a) issues the Court of Appeal actually decided, (b) the unchallenged part of the possession order and trial findings, and (c) whether the family's distinct 1877/1928 root-of-title case for the precise north/south poly-

gons was pleaded and necessarily determined. The court file, pleadings, orders and plans must be analysed before asserting either that the ruling legally protects the family's outer parcels or that it extinguished every possible title argument.

2.5 Repeated pattern of occupancy characterisation → challenge → later registration (family reconstruction, 18 October 2026)

Family evidence records the same sequence three times on Parcel A:

- **Northern forest:** 1949 attempt to characterise occupation as permissive; Mary (Nancy) Williams asserted ownership; approximately twelve years later (1961) a registration / synthetic estate was created (lead document: the 29 March 1961 deed).
- **Southern green (later VG41):** 1958/59 attempt to characterise occupation as adverse; Mary (Nancy) Williams, formerly Buckler, again asserted ownership; about 11 years later (16 June 1970) the land was registered as village green.
- **House and garden:** the same method was used by BP — occupation framed as permissive (licence letters, 31 October 1974); first registration of the home/garden about 13 years after the 31 December 1969 WGR-BP conveyance (WA240304 application, 23 February 1983), then amalgamation. The later two intervals are approximately 11 years (1958/59 to 1970) and 13 years (1969 to 1983). The separate 1949–61 sequence is around 12 years by calendar-year subtraction, but the exact 1949 date and the land affected by the 1961 deed still need primary-record confirmation. These are distinct leads, not one repeating twelve-year scheme.

Evidence label: Family evidence / reconstruction. The 1949 and 1958/59 characterisations and Mary's responses remain high-priority primary-record targets. The parallel with the BP method is analytical, not a judicial finding of fraud or racketeering. The 1987 Court of Appeal decision determined possession of the house and garden; it did not adjudicate the northern forest or the southern green against independent title-holders who were not parties. Ownership of those two parcels is still asserted.

2.5.1 How the “hostile perimeter capture / lawfare” hypothesis can be tested

- **Sequence and parcel identity:** prove that the 1961 deed and 1970 VG41 polygon overlap the exact northern and southern Parcel-A ground reportedly taken on 4 July 1955, and that the two areas were part of the same earlier conveyancing estate.
- **Authority and title:** identify what right WGR had to dispose of the northern area, what title/source the green claimant relied upon, whether a Commons Commissioner considered ownership, and exactly how any local authority was entered as proprietor under the 1965 Act.
- **Knowledge:** compare Mary's actual 1959/1965 written protests and any 1970 objection with WGR's deed file, council records, planning submissions and notices. Knowledge that Mary disputed occupation is not necessarily knowledge that her underlying documents established legal title; that second question needs evidence.
- **Coordination versus parallel activity:** look for shared plans, common solicitors/surveyors, cross-referenced deeds, committee minutes, inter-agency correspondence, instructions, consideration and timing. Similar chronology can indicate a coordinated strategy, but could also reflect separate transactions following WGR's asserted title. Corroboration is needed to distinguish them.
- **Practical effect:** map the residual occupied holding after each event and measure access, boundary, services and development constraints. The “surrounded” description should be demonstrated spatially rather than left as rhetoric.
- **Alternative explanations:** test whether the 1961 instrument was a transfer, lease, covenant, easement or other arrangement; whether the green registration concerned community use rather than a title grab; whether the relevant authority was the correct statutory registration authority; and whether development/planning was procedurally independent of the title transactions.

Revised forensic position: a possible sequence of perimeter capture is now an explicit line of inquiry, not a finding. The strongest potentially probative combination would be a deed/plan proving that WGR dealt with the disputed northern parcel in 1961, a VG41 ownership/Commissioner record showing how the southern parcel became vested or was claimed in 1970, and contemporaneous correspondence showing that the responsible actors knew the family's title case applied to those exact areas. Without those links, “hostile takeover”, “lawfare” and “concealment” remain hypotheses rather than established facts.

2.6 4. What is the strongest argument for the family?

- The 1877 documents and 1924/1928 records may establish that Parcel A was a distinct estate, with its own conveyancing path, which did not pass to Bute/WGR merely because later records used “whole farm”. The present evidence must show that the description included the woodland and south-east ground, not just the house and close.
- The 1939 tenancy plan is described as fields-only/Parcel B. If that plan and the 1938 conveyance truly exclude the three disputed Parcel A components, they undermine the assumption that every later WGR/BP document automatically carried those components, although the exact legal effect of earlier instruments remains decisive.
- The 1987 judgment itself distinguishes the house/garden from all other parts when describing the 1955 execution. It therefore supports the proposition that the three components did not have one identical possession history after 1955, and it exposes a gap between the practical focus of the later litigation and the full geographic scope of the family’s historical title theory.
- The 1974 licence letters are described as applying to the farmhouse and garden. If the family can show a separate documentary title in the woodland or green land, the licence ruling should not be casually treated as deciding those other areas.
- VG41 and any separate transfers to the council or a charity may provide independent map-and-deed evidence, potentially allowing the south-east strand to be reconstructed even if the house litigation was focused elsewhere.

2.7 5. What works against the family?

- The Court of Appeal described Bute’s 1916 grant as an agricultural tenancy of the “whole” farm, the 1938 reversion as conveyed to WGR, and BP as registered proprietor from November 1982. These are substantial adverse statements in a published judgment and must be answered from the primary deeds and plans, not dismissed as mere nomenclature.
- The Court recorded that Mary’s claimed documents had not been produced by 1959. The wiki must distinguish historical documents recently indexed, privately held documents, records only described in correspondence, and instruments actually inspected and authenticated. The existence of a catalogue entry is not the same as verification of its legal contents.
- The Court of Appeal noted that the possessory-title claim for the remainder of the farm had failed at first instance on findings that the acts relied on were too tenuous and equivocal, and that part of the possession order was not challenged on appeal. This is a major obstacle to any attempt to revive an adverse-possession case over the woodland or green. The family’s best version of its case must rely on proven earlier documentary title, if that title exists, rather than silently substituting adverse possession for a claim the courts rejected.
- Mary’s 1974 litigation was not finally heard as a fresh claim, but the 1962 possession order and the 1987 appellate outcome have legal significance. The content of the pleadings, orders, issue actually tried and any findings that bind later claims must be examined before saying that ownership was never adjudicated in any relevant respect.
- Long non-challenge to land outside the occupied house can be used against the family: it may suggest lack of possession, an accepted boundary, acquiescence or simply practical inability to contest loss. Silence does not automatically transfer ownership, but nor does it preserve a title claim or prevent other defences. The reason for the lack of contemporaneous challenge must be evidenced, not inferred.

2.8 6. What works in BP’s favour—and what remains to be tested?

BP-favourable case. BP can point to the historic Bute/1916 tenancy narrative, WGR’s 1938 reversion, the 1955 possession order and actual taking outside the house/garden, the 1962 possession order, the 1969 transfer to BP Pension Trust, the later transfer/registration, the express registration of BP as proprietor, and the 1987 appeal’s rejection of the adverse-possession case concerning the rest of the farm. This is not a weak paper position merely because the family’s alternative reconstruction is plausible enough to investigate.

Points still requiring proof. BP’s possession and registration narrative does not eliminate the need to establish

the scope of each operative instrument if there is credible evidence that the 1877 transaction separated Parcel A. The 1955 order against Frederick and its execution can explain physical control without necessarily answering whether the freehold of every ground component lay within WGR's chain. The filed first-registration documents are the decisive test of whether the registered polygon and documentary root cohered. Any allegation that BP knowingly asserted an overbroad title must be tested against what BP possessed, knew, relied on and disclosed at the relevant dates. A discrepancy is not automatically fraud.

2.9 7. What works in the council's favour—and what questions remain?

The council's maintenance or administration of VG41 does not, by itself, make it owner of the freehold or establish that it knew about the family's asserted title. A village-green registration concerns the registered status and rights attaching to land; the proprietary estate and the register's public-use effect are separate questions. The chronology also means the 1970 registration may have a statutory history independent of BP's 1982–83 registration.

The council's exposure, if any, depends on its actual role and records: whether it applied for, administered, acquired, held, maintained, transferred or gifted any of the relevant ground; what conveyance or title was used; whether the council held the VG41 application/map; and whether later development, disposal or correspondence revealed a plausible defect. If a south-half acquisition and north-half charitable gift are asserted, the original deeds, recipient identity, plans and title entries must be established before assigning responsibility. No conclusion of council wrongdoing follows merely from a separate land history.

A particularly useful check is whether the VG41 polygon corresponds exactly to the reportedly seized south-east component or overlaps other land. If it does not match, the three-part theory's spatial premise needs correction. If it does match, the file may show who asserted what about ownership in 1970, years before BP's registration, and whether that assertion is consistent with the title chain later relied on. The file may support, complicate or defeat the family case.

2.10 8. What the 1987 judgment decided—and what it should not be made to decide

The appeal in *BP Properties Ltd v Buckler* was expressly limited to the farmhouse and garden [EV-0080]. The judgment reports that BP had registered paper title, that the remainder of the farm was not in issue on appeal because the adverse-possession claim for it had failed on the facts, and that Mary's possession of the house/garden was treated as licensed after the 1974 letters. These are meaningful holdings and procedural facts. They should not be omitted from a family-favouring analysis.

At the same time, an adverse-possession appeal based on BP's registered title is not automatically the equivalent of a fully pleaded title action testing every 1877 conveyance, reservation, parcel boundary and later conveyance. The current material does not justify the sweeping claim that the 1987 court "decided nothing about title"; it plainly accepted BP's registered paper title as its starting point and decided the adverse-possession appeal. The proper narrower question is whether the independent root-of-title proposition now advanced—especially the claimed 1877 separation and the later inclusion of woodland/green land—was specifically pleaded, evidenced, tried and determined. The court file and judgment must be reviewed before answering that question categorically.

The distinction is especially important for issue estoppel, *res judicata*, limitation, relief against a registered title, and any proposed challenge to historical administration. Those questions turn on the precise claims, parties, issues necessarily decided and statutory regime. This page identifies them for legal review; it does not decide them.

2.11 9. Smoking-gun test: what would change the assessment?

The theory becomes materially stronger if a linked series of primary records shows all of the following:

- An operative 1877 instrument (read with its plan and reservations) really conveyed the disputed woodland and south-east ground with Parcel A, and the 1924/1928 documents establish the route by which the Williams family acquired or became entitled to that estate.
- The 1938 conveyance to WGR and 1939 tenancy plan can be shown not to include the disputed parts of Parcel A, with no later instrument transferring them to WGR/BP before first registration.
- The 1955 order/warrant/return and execution map show exactly which land was taken and on what claimed authority. The same polygons can be aligned with Parcel A, woodland and the present VG41 map—not just

described in approximate words.

- BP's first-registration application files show which title was claimed over each polygon, the root documents and plans relied on, what contrary material or occupiers were disclosed, what notice was served and when, and any material discrepancy between the documentary root and the registered extent.
- The 1987 amalgamation record proves what was applied for and actually registered, on which plan and authority, whether the live litigation was known to the Registry, and whether the consolidation obscured a material distinction or simply combined two correctly held titles.
- The VG41 file and later council/charity deeds establish the exact green boundaries and land transfers and can be reconciled to the proposed Parcel A polygon.

Even that combination would first establish a strong title-and-process discrepancy, not necessarily fraud. A fraud or concealment allegation additionally requires evidence of the relevant person's knowledge, representation or omission, and the applicable legal test. An error, disputed interpretation, incomplete file or flawed conveyance may have different legal consequences from deliberate deception.

2.12 10. Priority evidence list

- **First:** certified 1877 Bute–Thomas instrument, counterpart/lease and plan; reconcile the newer GHF-E115–E117 entries with the older GHF-E011-01 placeholder and record precisely what has actually been inspected.
- **Second:** the 15 May 1924 agreement/drain plan and the 1928 end-of-quarrying/last-rent record, plus any conveyance or vesting instrument that makes the asserted family freehold legally effective.
- **Third:** certified 1938 Bute/WGR conveyance and plan; DBDT123/7 1939 tenancy and plan; 1916 tenancy and plan. Create a marked comparison showing inclusion/exclusion polygon by polygon.
- **Fourth:** the 1955 High Court order and statement of claim, warrant, proof of service, officer's return, attendance notes, plan, inventory/description and any contemporaneous map of the 4 July execution.
- **Fifth:** 1962 Cardiff County Court pleadings, plan, sealed order and enforcement/mesne-profit records; the uncompleted 1974 action file; the 1974 defence and both licence letters with proof of receipt by the solicitor.
- **Sixth:** complete WA231076 and WA240304 first-registration files, title plans, lodged deeds/abstracts, surveyor correspondence, requisitions, notices and proof of service; obtain register snapshots before and after every relevant entry.
- **Seventh:** full 2 February 1987 amalgamation application/decision file, any authority/consent and correspondence, and dated pre-/post-amalgamation title plans. Establish whether 2 February records application or completed entry.
- **Eighth:** complete VG41 application and register file with original map, notices, statements, ownership material, objections and subsequent amendments; then the deeds, plans and title entries for each suspected council or charitable transfer, plus current proprietor records.

2.13 11. Overall assessment

For the family: the three-part model is a useful forensic framework because it prevents the occupied house/garden litigation from being mistaken for a complete account of every physical component. The Court of Appeal's own chronology makes the 1955 separation between house/garden and the rest explicit. The model is strongest where it generates precise map-and-deed tests.

Against the family: the same judgment presents strong obstacles: BP's registered paper title; the historical "whole farm" tenancy/reversion narrative; the absence of produced title documents noted by the court; and the unchallenged adverse-possession failure for the remaining land. The lack of sustained challenge to the woodland or green does not itself preserve the family's position. A separate original-document root of title is indispensable.

For BP: the judgment and register establish a substantial contemporaneous legal position, and the 1987 case cannot be recast as if it accepted family ownership. **Against BP's position:** if primary deeds show Parcel A was conveyed away before WGR's chain began, the physical taking, registration plan and merger still need to be shown to cover only land properly within that chain; registration and amalgamation are not substitutes for investigating the documents that underpin them.

For the council and any charity: VG41 registration and subsequent transfers may have independent lawful explanations and do not by themselves point to wrongdoing. **Open issue:** who owned each parcel, who asserted that ownership, what land was transferred, and what records each body actually held must be established before responsibility can be assessed.

The present conclusion is therefore: **high-value lead, not yet a smoking gun**. The decisive question is not whether three physical areas can be described, but whether the original title, enforcement, registration and later transfer records can be made to fit one another. If they cannot—and if the mismatch was material and knowingly presented—the implications could be serious. Until then, this remains a testable reconstruction that must give equal visibility to evidence favourable to the family and evidence adverse to it.

2.14 Related pages and authorities

- [The Two Parcels](#) — parcel definitions and the title-chain comparison.
- [The 1955 Possession Order](#) — order, execution and missing primary records.
- [The 1962 Possession Order](#) — the occupied house/garden proceeding.
- [The 1974 Licence Letters](#) — title assertion, proceedings and the licence issue.
- [Woodland](#) — the northern component and claimed loss.
- [Redevelopment and Church View Close](#) — VG41 and the green/land-development chronology.
- [1982–83 Registration & Opportunity to Object](#) — notice and first registration.
- [1987 HMLR Amalgamation During Appeal](#) — application/entry chronology.
- [Claim: Parcel A and Parcel B had distinct histories](#) — cross-check the later-indexed early deeds and registration evidence.
- [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler](#), Court of Appeal, 31 July 1987 — published judgment; read especially paragraphs 2 and 4–10 for scope, the 1955 execution, title background and the distinction between the house/garden and the rest of the farm.

Method note: This page distinguishes judicially recorded facts, documentary descriptions reported by the wiki, family contentions, inferences and unresolved questions. Do not cite the working reconstruction as proof of title. Update it only when a primary document, reliable transcript or confirmed title record changes the assessment; record the source, exact wording, date, author/provenance and mapped area.

2.15 Land Registry correspondence cross-check — three-part Parcel A theory (18 October 2026)

Status and scope. This is a specific cross-check of the working three-part reconstruction against the Land Registry correspondence and file schedule catalogued on this wiki. The researcher states that this precise three-part model had not previously been put to HM Land Registry. The letters must therefore not be described as specifically examining and rejecting this mapped theory. Equally, silence on a geographical question is not proof that the theory is correct or that anyone acted improperly.

2.15.1 What the correspondence establishes—and what it does not

- **23 March 2026 — registration history.** HMLR described separate first-registration applications for WA231076 (30 November 1982, relying on a conveyance dated 19 November 1982) and WA240304 (23 February 1983, relying on a conveyance dated 23 May 1975), followed by an amalgamation application in 1987. This establishes a two-title registration history as reported by HMLR; it does not establish that there were only two earlier physical or proprietary parcels, nor does it itself establish three distinct legal estates.
- **19 April 2026 — Stage 1 complaint decision.** HMLR said a 1971 abstract of title had been lodged for WA231076 and that its records indicated it had seen a copy for WA240304. It relied on documentary title and conveyancing recitals when concluding that the registration basis was adequate. The response does not expressly map the 1955 enforcement, 1961 deed, 1962 possession order or VG41 boundary against the three proposed areas.
- **25 May 2026 — Stage 2 complaint decision.** HMLR said it had not been aware at first registration of the family's interest or a possibly ongoing dispute, and declined rectification or indemnity. This records HMLR's stated

knowledge and conclusion; it is not proof that no family interest or dispute existed, and it does not specifically determine the new three-part reconstruction.

- **30 July 2026 — schedule of first-registration documents.** The wiki's catalogue records a deed dated 29 March 1961 in the WA231076 file. Its existence and file location make it a material lead, but its parties, operative wording, plan, land extent and legal effect must be established from the instrument itself. Its date alone does not prove that it created a separate northern estate, removed land from a later order or altered ownership.
- **9 October 2026 — Independent Complaints Reviewer.** The ICR declined to substitute its view for HMLR's registration decision and adopted a broad view of the significance of the 1987 proceedings. That is an adverse position this analysis must confront. The lack of a parcel-by-parcel discussion does not establish that the northern and south-eastern areas fell outside the judgment's legal effect.

2.15.2 Test of the three geographical tracks

1. Northern woodland/forest. [SOURCE PENDING] This area was taken during the 1955 enforcement and later followed a title or estate history distinct from the occupied house group. The 1961 deed on the WA231076 file is a lead, not proof. Compare the original deed and plan with the 1955 order and enforcement records, the 1962 possession order and successive registered title plans.

2. Central occupied farmhouse/buildings/garden. The 1987 Court of Appeal account is an important constraint: it describes possession on 4 July 1955 of all parts of the farm except the farmhouse and garden, and describes the appeal as confined to the farmhouse and garden. This is adverse context for any theory that ignores the "whole farm" order or assumes the later litigation resolved every question about every adjoining area. The order, pleadings, judgment and plans must be read together before concluding the precise legal scope or binding effect.

3. South-eastern ground associated with VG41. The wiki records a village-green registration dated 16 June 1970, while noting that the exact overlap with Parcel A requires confirmation. Village-green registration is not, by itself, proof of a freehold conveyance or creation of a new freehold estate. Obtain and map the VG41 application, register entry, plans, decision and relevant instruments against historical Parcel A boundaries and later title plans.

2.15.3 Possession, registration and ownership are distinct

Physical possession or enforcement does not by itself prove that freehold title transferred. Village-green registration does not by itself establish a freehold conveyance. A registered title plan ordinarily shows general boundaries rather than conclusively deciding every boundary dispute. Nor does the later amalgamation of WA231076 and WA240304, without analysis of the instruments and plans, prove or disprove the proposed three-part historical structure. The theory must be tested against original documents, not inferred from dates alone.

2.15.4 Priority documents and unresolved discrepancy

- Obtain and inspect the complete 29 March 1961 deed and plan; identify the parties, parcels, operative provisions and any registration or later conveyancing consequences.
- Compare the 1955 order, warrant and enforcement/return records with any plan or contemporary description of the land actually taken and the farmhouse/garden left in occupation.
- Compare the 1962 possession order and litigation plans with the three proposed areas, without assuming a physical division automatically creates separate legal estates.
- Obtain the complete VG41 file and map the 1970 boundary against historical and registered title plans.
- Reconcile HMLR's 19 April statement that a 1971 abstract was lodged with the 30 July schedule as catalogued on this wiki, which does not list a 1971 abstract among its 43 documents. This warrants clarification of the schedule's scope and HMLR's file record; it does not by itself prove that the abstract was never lodged or that the title was defective.
- Examine the 1987 appeal bundle and judgment alongside the original orders and plans before asserting that any area was outside the judgment's binding effect.

Current conclusion. The three-part Parcel A reconstruction is a worthwhile, newly formulated and testable hypothesis. The HMLR correspondence reviewed here does not expressly determine its parcel-by-parcel geography and therefore does not specifically reject it in this form. But the correspondence also does not prove the reconstruction, defective registration, concealment or fraud. The 1961 deed, exact scope and execution of the 1955 order, 1962 order and VG41 file are the priority checks. Until instruments and plans are examined, describe separate northern and south-eastern "estates" as proposed tracks or possible interests—not established legal estates.

2.16 Parcel mapping and 12-year timing hypothesis — 18 October 2026

Research hypothesis, not finding of a scheme. The sequence raises a legitimate question whether repeated attempts to characterise Mary (Nancy) Williams's occupation as permissive, followed by dealings affecting the northern woodland and the south-eastern green and later title registrations, contributed to a perimeter of land being treated as if it belonged with the eastern farm title. The timing and possible information asymmetry deserve investigation. The current record does not establish a coordinated plan, deliberate concealment or fraud. The key test is whether each dated document concerns the same mapped land and what its maker knew and disclosed.

2.16.1 First principle: these are three proposed physical components, not three proven legal estates

For this investigation, use consistent working labels: **A-North** (the northern woodland/forest); **A-Centre** (the occupied farmhouse, buildings, garden and associated yard); **A-South-East** (the ground later associated with VG41); and **Parcel B** (the eastern agricultural fields). These labels prevent the three areas being collapsed in the narrative, but they do not prove that the three A components were separately conveyed, registered or legally distinct estates.

The reported HMLR history is two first-registration titles, WA231076 and WA240304, later amalgamated so that registration continued under WA231076. A two-title registration history does not tell us whether the earlier registered polygons covered all of Parcel A, only one or two components, or merely strips within them. Nor does the 1987 amalgamation establish the boundary by itself. We need the filed plans and operative deeds before answering that question.

2.16.2 Date pattern to test—without forcing the arithmetic

Event or proposed link	Timing	What the record currently supports
1949: Frederick's unwritten agricultural tenancy; reported contemporaneous offer to Mary	1949 → 1961 = 12 calendar years	The Court of Appeal accepted that Frederick had a periodic agricultural tenancy, despite no written agreement. The family separately states that Mary refused a tenancy of the farmhouse and asserted ownership at that time, but the contemporaneous offer/reply has not been located. Do not conflate the real agricultural tenancy with the reported rejected offer to Mary.
1959: Mary refuses WGR's offer and asserts a claim through her grandfather	1959 → 16 June 1970 = about 11 years, not 12	The Court of Appeal records an offer concerning the farmhouse and garden and says Mary refused it. The original offer and reply remain unlocated. The present record does not show that this offer concerned A-North or A-South-East. An exact 12-year theory would need a separately evidenced 1958 trigger, which is not presently identified here.
29 March 1961: WGR / South Western Brick & Tile / Cardiff City deed	12 years after 1949 by calendar-year subtraction	The wiki catalogue says the deed affects land now within the woodland title and is listed in HMLR material; the full deed and plan have not been inspected. It is a high-priority spatial lead, not proof the land was Parcel A or that the 1949 event was arranged to enable this dealing.
16 June 1970: VG41 village-green registration	About 11 years after the 1959 offer	The original VG41 file and map remain outstanding. The area and any ownership claim must be plotted; registration as a green is not itself proof of freehold transfer. A 12-year interval from 1958 cannot be assumed without a verified 1958 event.
1969 WGR conveyance to BP Pension Trust → WA231076/WA240304 first registrations in 1982–83	About 12 years 11 months to the November 1982 registration; about 13 years 2 months to the February 1983 application, using 31 December 1969 as the conveyance date	This is not an exact 12-year interval. The exact registration dates and title history must be kept separate from the 1969 conveyance date. Any suggestion of timing around limitation must explain the actual dates and land involved.

1971 abstract of title mentioned in HMLR correspondence → 1982–83 registrations	Roughly 11–12 years, depending on the abstract’s actual date and which application it supported	The 19 April 2026 HMLR letter says a 1971 abstract was lodged/seen; the July schedule catalogued on the wiki does not list it. Its exact date, contents, parcel extent and file destination need reconciliation. An abstract is a title-history document, not an event of possession.
---	---	---

Why the timing could matter. The historical 12-year limitation period for actions to recover land makes the proposed timing pattern worth checking against evidence of possession, permission, acknowledgement, ownership and the accrual of a right to recover each specific parcel. It does not create a general rule that land must be registered only after 12 years, and date alignment alone does not show that a later deed or registration was planned to defeat Mary’s rights. The event, land, actor and legal mechanism must all match.

2.16.3 The secrecy / non-notification question

The family’s concern is that Mary maintained an ownership claim, refused tenancy offers, and yet land may have been dealt with or registered without a meaningful opportunity for her to challenge the claimants’ title. HMLR’s 25 May 2026 letter said the Registry had not been aware at first registration of the family interest or an ongoing dispute. That records HMLR’s stated position; it does not prove that Mary received no notice, that an applicant concealed information, or that anyone knowingly exploited her. The reported late notification after Mary’s death is separately catalogued as a report requiring its original letter and proof of service.

To test a possible stealth or information-asymmetry pattern, compare the actual first-registration forms, statements of truth/declarations, supporting deeds and plans, occupier enquiries, notices and service records, requisitions, solicitor correspondence and any disclosures about Mary’s occupation or ownership claim. Determine who knew what, on what date, for each mapped area. Absence of a document from an HMLR schedule is a discrepancy to resolve, not proof that it was withheld deliberately.

2.16.4 How to determine whether the amalgamated title contained all, some or none of Parcel A

- **Build a parcel-to-instrument overlay.** Plot the 1877 instrument/plan and 1924/1928 material; the 1938 conveyance and 1939 tenancy plan; the 1955 order, warrant and execution/return; the 29 March 1961 deed plan; the 1962 possession-order plan; the 1969 conveyance; the original VG41 map; the 1975 conveyance; the WA231076 and WA240304 first-registration plans; and pre-/post-amalgamation register entries and plans.
- **Test three competing outcomes.** (A) the amalgamated title contained the whole of A-North, A-Centre and A-South-East; (B) it contained only parts of one or more components, with some land already conveyed or registered separately; or (C) the eastern title did not include the reported Parcel-A components except to the extent a specific plan proves overlap. Do not choose among these outcomes from the title numbers or descriptive labels alone.
- **Map successors.** Carry each verified polygon forward into current titles, including the woodland title associated with WA735527 and the mapped VG41 area, and identify any excisions or transfers. A later owner’s title can cover only a portion of one historic component; present-day ownership is not a substitute for the 1877-to-1987 boundary reconstruction.
- **Record both confirmations and falsifiers.** A deed plan excluding a component, an unrelated VG41 polygon, a complete 1969 conveyance covering all three areas, or proof of proper notice may defeat or narrow the hypothesis. Matching plans, disclosure of the family claim to a decision-maker, and a documented absence of notice may strengthen particular parts of it. The inference must follow the comparison.

Current assessment. The pattern is important enough to investigate as a possible sequence of contested occupancy-characterisation, land dealings and registrations around a three-part estate. It should be described as a *timing and information-asymmetry hypothesis*, not as a proven racket. The controlling evidence is the mapped extent and operative effect of each instrument, plus what the parties and Registry were told and what notice was actually given.

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: This three-part Parcel-A analysis forms one case study within the wider Cedwyn Estate hypothesis. The forest deed, green record, permissive-occupation chronology and 1982–87 registrations are possible links only to the extent original documents establish the same mapped land; this page does not prove the wider Llandough–Leckwith theory. Read the [Cedwyn Estate Working Theory](#).

Change history is maintained on the [Master Change Log](#); no separate page-local version footer is maintained.