BRITISH CROWN GREEN BOWLING ASSOCIATION

Executive Committee

22nd October 2026

To: Steve Cochrane

Copied to Mr Dan Newton and to all BCGBA Member Associations

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Response to the Notice of Special General Meeting, 14 November 2026

Dear Mr. Cochrane,

You are named as the person who issued the Notice convening the Special General Meeting on 14 November 2026, "by order of the Board" and "for and on behalf of the Board of the British Crown Green Bowling Association (Unincorporated Association)." This response is addressed to you for that reason, and is copied to all Member Associations, because the questions it raises go to the heart of who currently has authority to speak and act for this Association.

Before County Associations turn to the substance of 14 November, they are entitled to clear answers to a more basic question: on what authority, and in what capacity, has this meeting been called?

1. The Notice claims the authority of a Board from which you told the membership you were stepping down

Bye Law 6(e) provides that it is the Chief Executive, not the Board, who convenes a Special General Meeting on proper requisition. There is no Chief Executive in post: Mr Newton's resignation was confirmed in your own letter of 4 September 2026, and he remains, at most, on his contractual notice period.

In that same letter you told County Secretaries and Members that BCGBA had "reached a genuine transition point," that the other Regional Board members and the Independent Directors had already resigned, that you intended to "step away" from your Board role, and that you would remain "as Interim Chair only for as long as necessary to help facilitate that transition." Four weeks later, on 2 October, a formal Notice was issued over your signature purporting to act "by order of the Board." We ask you to state plainly which Board issued that order, who its members are, when and how they were appointed, and on what basis that Board is said to be constituted under Bye Law 3. If an interim Board is now said to exist, the membership has never been told who sits on it, and Bye Law 3 makes no provision for one.

Bye Law 6(e) also requires the contents of the requisition to be circulated to all Member Associations at least 28 days before the meeting — that is, by 17 October 2026. As far as the Executive Committee is aware, they have not been. If they have, please confirm when, and to whom.

2. The Bowls Development Alliance has no role under the Bye Laws, and its involvement is unexplained

The Notice states that Lisa Graham, Managing Director of the Bowls Development Alliance, "will support the running and facilitation" of the meeting. Nothing in the Bye Laws provides for the BDA, or any outside organisation, to run, chair or facilitate a General Meeting of this Association. Bye Law 6(a) provides only for the chairing of the Annual General Meeting; the Bye Laws are silent on the chairing of a Special General Meeting, which makes it all the more important that the question is not settled unilaterally. Bye Law 5, which sets out who may attend and speak at the National Advisory Council, names only British Parks and the Federation of Crown Green Bowls as external bodies. The BDA appears in neither. The BDA is a neutral outside party. The Notice itself describes it as "a partnership organisation established by the sport's National Governing Bodies." BCGBA is itself a member of the BDA: the minutes of the 2022 AGM record that the Association re-joined it that year, and that membership carries a cost to the Association. It also works closely with it in practice: Bye Law 8(c) directs members to the BDA for BCGBA safeguarding policies, and the Board's own webinar records the BDA as providing interim safeguarding support under the Board's arrangements. Your letter of 17 July 2026 offered County Associations "independent facilitation." A partner of the very Board whose conduct is in dispute is not that.

We therefore ask: who decided to invite the BDA to run and facilitate this meeting, and on what authority; what the financial and other terms of BCGBA's membership of the BDA currently are, and what relationship exists between the BDA and any individual connected with either organisation; and why the BDA is considered a neutral facilitator of a meeting about the legitimacy of the Board it has been working alongside. Our position is that the BDA, if present at all, should attend as a silent observer only, with no part in running, chairing or facilitating the meeting, and no material input into its business.

3. Which document governs: the Bye Laws, or the Articles of Association?

In his letter of 18 June 2026 to Martin Goddard of Greater Manchester, Mr Newton stated that "the Articles of Association now govern the operation of the BCGBA," directed that matters be raised under Article 55 of the Articles, and described Bye Law 6(e) as applying "historically." The Board's webinar, referred to in your letter of 17 July and still available to view, told the membership that the Company, registered in 2013, was now being activated, that the Articles provide the legal framework, and that the Bye Laws continue to govern only the playing rules and day-to-day administration of the sport. To this day, the Association's own website publishes the Articles under Policies & Procedures as "the formal governing document."

Those Articles make the five Regions the only members of the Company (Article 5). County Associations are not members of the Company and have no vote. Article 55, to which Counties were directed, allows only the Regions to bring forward business. Nothing in the Articles provides for the Company to take over the Unincorporated Association, its members, its assets or its functions. The Articles that the website calls the formal governing document would, if they governed, leave the County Associations with no say at all.

Yet the Notice of 14 November is issued expressly for the Unincorporated Association, convened "in accordance with the Bye Laws," and relies on the very Bye Law 6(e) that Counties were told applied only historically. The Articles when County control was to be set aside; the Bye Laws when a meeting must be called and a vote won. The Executive Committee's position has been the same throughout: the Association is governed by its Bye Laws, and no lawful transfer of its governance or assets to the Company has taken place. We ask you to confirm, without qualification, whether you now agree — and if you do, to remove the Articles from the website as the Association's governing document, and to withdraw or correct the webinar, before 14 November.

4. Questions asked in August remain unanswered

- On 13 August 2026, three County Associations requested all documentation relied on to support any claim by the Company to the Association's assets, funds, records or authority, including any UA resolution authorising a transfer, within 14 days. A further request on 19 August sought evidence of who assented to the resolutions adopting the Articles, and on whose behalf. Neither has been substantively answered.
- The public register at Companies House shows two separate resolutions adopting Articles of Association within a month — filed on 27 May and 20 June 2026, the second replacing the first. The register does not show which members assented to them.
- The explanation given publicly, including in the Board's webinar, is that the current structure was approved at the 2022 AGM. The minutes of that meeting, held on 5 March 2022, record a single governance resolution: "To approve, and allow the CEO to proceed with, the implementation of the Governance Review," carried 81 For, 1 Against, 0 Abstentions. They record nothing about incorporating the Association, activating the Company, adopting Articles of Association, or transferring the Association's governance or assets to a company.
- Mr Newton has acted as Chief Executive of both the Unincorporated Association and the Company, and is a registered director of the Company, without his correspondence separating the two capacities — a position which, in our view, cannot be reconciled with a director's statutory duty to avoid conflicts of interest under s.175 Companies Act 2006.
- The Company has not been shown to hold a bank account of its own, yet its running costs have been met from Association funds, without the documentation requested in August being produced to justify this.

County Associations are entitled to these answers before being asked to vote on the Association's governance, staffing, finances and future on 14 November.

5. What has been delivered since 22 August

Since the vote of no confidence was carried 32 For, 0 Against, 4 Abstentions, and Resolution 2 was carried 31 For, 5 Abstentions, the following has been achieved:

- All members of the previous Board, including the Chief Executive, have resigned other than the Financial Officer and Mr Cochrane, who has said he intends to step down;
- A governance review is under way to restore lawful and transparent operation (Resolution 3);
- Financial separation between the Unincorporated Association and the Company has been implemented (Resolution 5); no legal transfer of the Association's assets to the Company has taken place;
- The Board of Trustees is being restored to full strength with the appointment of a fifth qualified Trustee;
- A Safeguarding Officer is being actively sought to fill a post vacant since Easter (Resolution 6);
- The purported redundancies of the Financial Officer and the National Administrator have been reversed; and
- Disciplinary proceedings left in abeyance have been recommenced.

All of this while the remainder of the 2026 season's competitions has continued to be run. County Associations weighing the competing accounts of this year are entitled to measure them against what has actually been done, and by whom.

6. What we ask before 14 November

- That the requisition and all motions and business to be put to the meeting be circulated to all Member Associations at least two weeks beforehand, so that representatives can take instructions from their Counties rather than decide on the day;
- That representation and voting follow Bye Law 6(d), under which BCGBA Board members do not count as County or Association representatives;
- That decisions be taken by a simple majority of those present and voting, as at Owley Wood, this being a Special General Meeting and not a Rules Revision Meeting; Bye Law 10(e) requires two-thirds only to alter the Bye Laws, and since no proposed alteration accompanied the Notice, as Bye Law 10(c) would require, none can properly be considered;
- That the meeting be chaired by someone who is not a party to the dispute and has not declared a position on its outcome; our President, Steve Davies, chaired the National Advisory Council on 10 October, and we propose him;
- That the BDA attend, if at all, as a silent observer only, and that the questions in Section 2 be answered in writing;
- That the choice of venue be explained, including who was consulted and what arrangements, including remote participation, have been made for Member Associations finding it difficult to attend;
- That the Articles be removed from the website as the Association's governing document, and the webinar withdrawn or corrected; and
- That you confirm whether you hold any office or role within Yorkshire Crown Green Bowling Association, one of the Associations whose request led to this meeting, so that Member Associations can judge for themselves whether any interest beyond your role as Interim Chair bears on its outcome.

Conclusion

Crown Green Bowls needs clarity, not competing claims of authority. The Executive Committee's position has not changed: the Association is governed by its Bye Laws, its assets belong to its members, and its future belongs to the County Associations — not to whichever body finds it convenient, at any given moment, to speak for them. We will attend on 14 November in that spirit, and ask that the questions above be answered in writing in good time beforehand.

Yours sincerely,

The BCGBA Executive Committee

admin@bcgba.org.uk