

PART TWO

ASSESSMENT OF THE NATIONAL POSITION AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE RESOURCE

Unlike some industries there are still working examples of both floor maltings, and small pneumatic malting plants. The rest of the maltings building stock is predominantly converted or re-used, sometimes with relatively few distinguishing features still surviving. It is essential that a number of malthouses survive with their features retained intact so that future generations have some idea of the building type which was once common throughout the country and in which the raw material, malt was produced for our national drink, beer.

1) The Working Survivors

There are just six working floor maltings: Tuckers at Teign Road, Newton Abbot, Devon, (grade 2); Warminster Maltings, Pound Street, Warminster, Wiltshire, (grade 2); Wolverhampton and Dudley's Langley Green Maltings, Oldbury, West Midlands, (grade 2); Wolverhampton and Dudley's Maltings, Birmingham Road, Lichfield, Staffordshire, (grade 2); F. & G. Smith's (Crisps - Anglia Maltings), Great Ryburgh, Norfolk have working floors at a mixed maltings type site where there is also modern plant, not listed; and Fawcett's at Castleford, West Yorkshire, have working floors at a mixed maltings type site where there is also modern plant, not listed.

Small pneumatic drum maltings were to be found at Pontefract and South Milford, both in Yorkshire, but both these have closed in recent years, but one good example is French and Jupps drum maltings at Stanstead Abbots, Hertfordshire. They specialise in coloured malts. Likewise small Saladin box plants are rare since the closure of such examples Pauls maltings at Gainsborough and Louth in Lincolnshire but Saladin boxes probably still survive at the mixed malting plant at Great Ryburgh.

All these are commercial enterprises, although they are often part of a larger or allied enterprise which means that although there may be some cross funding they have to be commercially viable. They have to maintain their buildings, and they have to comply with legislation which has nothing to do with the listed building they occupy, for example Health and Safety.

These maltings share problems common to many historic industrial concerns - at present there is no funding to help these firms meet the extra costs of maintaining the elements of their buildings of particular historic interest or of operating the traditional industrial processes which are carried on in them. If important features are to be retained and floor malting is to continue there needs to be some assistance as otherwise purely commercial factors may result in the loss of important features and ultimately in their closure. It is always easier for the public to understand a process if they can see how it works, and the production of malt by the traditional floor malting process is no exception. Therefore every effort should be made to ensure that these few floor maltings continue to survive, both from a buildings point of view and from a process point of view. With so very few maltings still precariously surviving in use a solution to this funding issue needs to be found and is returned to below.

2) The Protected Maltings

Some 600 buildings are listed and described as being associated with or were or are maltings or malthouses, or malt houses. Many of these are malting sites in name only. The greatest number are of a mainly 19th century date, then 18th century, however of whatever date it is would seem that the main re-use is now as residential accommodation (see below under conversion) which may be why the buildings survive in name only with all other indication of the maltings use having disappeared. A substantially smaller number are in other uses and an even smaller number are disused but retain the majority of their maltings features. As indicated above, just a handful are still working floor maltings. Probably not more than 10 to 15% remain unconverted or converted but with important features such as kilns still surviving. With such low numbers of good quality buildings it is essential that any identified should be adequately monitored.

An analysis of the existing listed stock of malthouses poses some problematic questions. Does, for example, the present listing adequately reflect the date range of malthouses, and perhaps more importantly does it adequately reflect the geographical spread of malthouses across the country? From appendix B it is clear that some counties do not have as many listed malthouses as would be expected, given the evidence from the trade directories. For example the county of Yorkshire as a whole had in the 1830s by far the most maltsters, and even at the end of the 19th century had more than any other county, yet has fewer listed malthouses than counties generally accepted as non-malting counties such as Oxfordshire and Sussex. To a lesser extent the same applies to Staffordshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire all of which had over a hundred directory entries in the 1890s but have an average of only 17 listed examples while Gloucestershire with only 34 directory entries has 53 listed examples. It may be that this is a genuine reflection of the situation and it may be that there are not sufficient malthouses now surviving in those counties that are of listable quality. Even so such a discrepancy in numbers needs to be investigated and if substantiated needs to be rectified. Therefore it may be appropriate for rapid malt house surveys to be carried out in certain counties and in particular Yorkshire.

There are also the questions of protection at the appropriate grade, of protection of unlisted examples worthy of listing and retention of listed status for heavily converted examples.

Thus there are still a number of malthouses which retain many features, sometimes of a late 17th or early 18th century date which are only listed grade 2, when perhaps they should be listed grade 2*. One such example is the malt house attached to the Seymour House Hotel, Chipping Campden which despite conversion retains its steep, evidence of the couch frame, part of the hoist and a complete kiln structure including furnace, perforated tile floor and its stone support structure. There is a need to ensure that these malthouses are listed, or listed at the appropriate grade. In this context it may be appropriate to consider what malt house features should be present in a building to make them worthy of listing as a malt house as opposed to the features which make it listable anyway, for example just because it is a building of 17th century date. Likewise, what features need to be present to make a malt house listable at grade 2*, as opposed to just grade 2? For a malt house to be listed grade 2* it should have some of the following features:

- external: elevations with regularly spaced windows, distinctive external features of a kiln, including a pyramidal roof shape and cowl, hoists and appropriate doors, and hoist housing;
- internal: steep, evidence of couch frame, and kiln furnace with its support structure and perforated tile or wire drying floor, and growing floor evidence, columns, and hatches, and hoist boxing, and cleaning machines - either barley or malt and evidence of how the grain was moved around, for example chutes and hatches, and other hoisting equipment.

For a malthouse to be listed grade 2 it should have some of the following features:

- external: elevations with regularly spaced windows, distinctive external features of a kiln, including a pyramidal roof shape, hoists and appropriate doors;
- internal: steep or kiln furnace, or growing floors (clearly recognisable as such), and columns, and some hatches.

It should, however be remembered that some important malthouses, especially those pre 19th century, do not always have typical features, for example the malthouses at Brockhampton, Gloucestershire and Eastcourt, Wiltshire have completely windowless bottom floor elevations, and the kiln is not obvious either. In fact kilns in early or burgage plot maltings may not be easily visible externally.

Other malthouses which are not listed may well be worthy of listing, not just for the retention of their malting features, but for their historical importance, for example Beeston, Maltings, Nottinghamshire. It does/did have all its malting features as a floor malting at closure in 2000, but it is more important historically because it was the first pneumatic maltings, although not a mechanical maltings in England. Few if any of the pneumatic features survive but parts of the shell are original.

Lastly, it is doubtful whether all the listed maltings should retain their listed status. In particular this will apply to 19th century buildings, and not necessarily those of earlier periods which are listed more for their age than their status as malthouses. With regard to the 19th century maltings, it is questionable whether they should retain their listed status when either only a small part or just the shell with substantially altered fenestration, and no internal features survives. Some of these malthouses however may be important landscape features, but is this sufficient reason for otherwise unworthy maltings buildings to remain listed? For example Free Rodwell's Malthouses Nos 3 and 4 are being converted and will retain few internal features which might seem to make them a candidate for de-listing, but they are of undoubted landscape value. Likewise, The Walls Maltings, also in Mistley, now retain few original features but their position and historical importance may mean they should retain their listed status. A rather more doubtful example is the Whitbread Maltings in East Dereham, Norfolk. These have been particularly unsympathetically converted and it is therefore doubtful if they should retain their listed status, but they do form an important feature of East Dereham and demonstrate the town's former malting importance (also see section 6 below). Another example which has some landscape value but not much else is the maltings in Station Road, Ross-on-Wye which has

been converted to a supermarket. This is a problem which needs consideration if listed maltings are to be valued as a building type. Those not worthy of remaining listed as individual buildings might need to have their status as landscape features confirmed.

3) Maltings not covered by statutory protection

Not surprisingly there is still a substantial body of maltings that are neither listed nor in a Conservation Area, although they may be on a county's sites and monuments record (SMR) or on a local list of buildings considered to be of importance. Even if they come in to the latter two categories they are virtually without protection. Unfortunately some of these will be historically important and may also retain many malting features, for example Beeston Maltings mentioned above is not listed and did retain all its malting features and was the first pneumatic maltings in England. Even maltings which are not worthy of listing may form an important part of the landscape, urban or rural and its history, for example the kilns of Salt and Co's, Walsitch Maltings on Wetmore Road, Burton-on-Trent are an important landscape feature but are not worthy of listing. Likewise maltings in Newark and Retford (if they still survive) in Nottinghamshire, Oulton Broad, Suffolk and in Ware, Hertfordshire are important landscape features even if the buildings are not individually of listable quality. Sometimes these maltings will have noteworthy features that need to be retained or recorded if the buildings come under threat of demolition or substantial alteration on conversion.

In theory these maltings can be demolished without warning. Any proposed development should mean that the SMR is consulted but that will only benefit a maltings if it is on the record in the first place, and many of the later buildings will not be because some SMRs have a pre 19th century or industrial buildings cut off point. Providing the maltings is there, then there will be an opportunity for its value to be considered in the terms of the proposed development and there should be an opportunity for some recording. The SMRs not only include standing buildings, but often concentrate more on below ground sites. Again maltings may now only survive as below ground archaeology as at Saltcote Mill (malting) Heybridge, Essex, but this important aspect should not be ignored. It is however, historical detail which may provide the initial evidence and unfortunately, like many other subjects there has not been sufficient broad-based research (see below).

4) Planning Controls, Conservation and Regeneration.

At present it is only listed building applications which are to result in the demolition of the building which have to be referred to the statutory consultees. Whilst this is certainly essential, it also means that applications which are not for the total demolition of a listed malting may not be referred. Therefore internal features and even important external, or publicly visible features, may be altered or removed completely with little or no outside or knowledgeable input. The local authority having inspected the building, without the benefit of specialist advice (see below), may decide that there are no worthy features and that no detailed recording needs to be undertaken. For example the malting at Barnard Castle, County Durham, has been converted. No important features survived, the original floors having been replaced, and so the only records are the as existing plans. In other examples, not only are features lost but they are frequently not recorded either, although this aspect is slowly improving. Whilst the need for prompt planning decisions is appreciated, it also has to be understood that listed maltings are a

relatively scarce resource and like all archaeological sites once destroyed or their features lost they cannot be replaced. There has to be some means of ensuring that maltings which do retain features are at the very least adequately considered and that recording is undertaken as a matter of course.

Maltings, as with many other historic industrial buildings, highlight skill shortcomings within the planning system. Thus the normal requirement at the beginning of the planning process that there should be the presentation of an impact assessment of the proposed works on the building can, in the case of maltings, be of dubious value if specialised knowledge is not available. An assessment showing what features will be lost or altered and what will be retained in any conversion requires not only an historical knowledge of the site but also a knowledge of the building type, and of the malting process and how this was carried on in the building. Too often when it comes to maltings there is a comment that there is nothing left in the building but open space as all the 'machinery' has gone. This shows a total lack of knowledge of the malting process which does require a lot of open floor space. Usually, the only machinery found in a maltings is grain cleaning machinery used at the beginning and end of the process, and of course the kiln, furnace and floor. An engine might have existed but none are known to survive, although its position may be indicated by oil stains. What may survive is the line shafting and belt drives. Occasionally an electric motor may survive and the capstans for power shovels as at Ditherington, Shrewsbury.

It should also be possible to require a site (building and archaeological) impact assessment on conservation area consents and generally in the planning process when malthouse sites of importance are known. Such sites may only be known however if they are included on the county SMR, therefore initiatives such as the Association for Industrial Archaeology's IRIS (Index Record of Industrial Sites) should be encouraged to deposit such information.

5) Malthouse Recording and Research

Building recording and the recording of below ground features is essential to further research of any subject. In the case of malthouses, buildings recording will eventually provide a more complete understanding of the processes and how they were carried on and how they have changed over time, usually becoming less labour intensive, and more mechanised. Excavation will provide details of earlier periods, for example excavations at Skegby Manor (13th and 14th century) in Nottinghamshire provided early examples of single hole perforated malt kiln tiles from the 18th century. Excavation is more likely to provide details on early kilns than standing malthouses which tend to have been altered to other uses and so have lost their kilns and any important features.

What records of maltings already exist, what is their quality and where are they to be found? The answers to these questions are complex, constantly changing and reveal a very unsatisfactory situation. There is little doubt that listed malthouses have stood a better chance of being recorded than unlisted ones, simply because they are brought to the attention of initially the planning authority, hopefully the statutory consultees including, and until 1999, the former Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England (now English Heritage). The RCMHE normally exercised its right to record them and hence the malthouse records in the NMR

generally reflect the distribution of planning applications rather than the incidence of historic maltings!

With the merger of the RCHME and English Heritage the onus for recording relies mostly on the planning system and developer funding. Whilst in theory the fact that another body, probably an archaeology unit, does the recording, using the appropriate recording guidance and standards, should not be a problem. In practice there is no system established for monitoring the quality of reports, the general standard of recording and the deposition of the record. The lack of quality control may in part be remedied by requesting that those undertaking the work, or their parent organisations, are members of the Institute of Field Archaeologists but this is a less than satisfactory solution when it comes to specialised industrial buildings. Some quality control in the recording of these is also encouraged by existence of the Association for Industrial Archaeology Fieldwork and Recording Award, but, as a voluntary scheme, this only attracts a few reports from enlightened recorders. The Award does nevertheless play some part in standard setting, rewards those who do achieve quality and ensures that entries are deposited in the NMR. Otherwise the lack of a requirement for a copy of the report to be placed in the NMR or other appropriate depository renders reference to its location difficult. As a result anyone doing research who needs to read individual building reports has no overall means of determining how many maltings have been recorded and where the reports are located. It is therefore desirable that some means of monitoring records and a system for quality control are established without delay.

With the onus for setting recording briefs lying with local authority, the extent and quality of building and site recording depends very much upon the personnel at a particular local authority. As regards the recording of maltings, Essex County Council, for example, had a very active industrial archaeology section. Advice from this section resulted in the recording of a substantial number of maltings including: The Granary at Cressing Temple; the seven surviving maltings at The Walls site; Free Rodwell's Maltings Nos 1, 3, 4 and 7 (the latter three are still in progress); Thorley Farm Maltings, Blasford Hill, Little Waltham; Spurriers Farm Maltings, Norton Heath, Epping; Bush Hall Farm Malthouse, Threshers Bush, High Laver, Harlow; Railway Street Maltings, Braintree; Saltcote Mill [Malthouse] Heybridge. Essex has been exceptional, regrettably, other councils are not so fortunate in their staffing and most maltings subject to planning applications have not fared well as regards recording.

What about the study of all the other maltings and especially the unlisted ones? Rarely will there be any recording of these except by voluntary organisations such as local industrial archaeology societies and possibly universities. Archaeology units cannot afford to do the work without funding, nor can other heritage bodies. A university research project may be appropriate but funding such research is unlikely to be a priority. Yet some of these maltings will have important features which need to be recorded if some important details of the industry's past is not to be lost. There does not seem to be any immediate answer to this problem, but it should not be ignored. The result however, is that there are substantial gaps both from a geographical point of view, and in date range, and therefore in our understanding of the development of the building type.

There are two aspects to recording: the broad based survey which captures all the maltings within a given area, usually a county for convenience, and the recording of individual sites. The former will demonstrate the economic development of the industry, the importance of transport in the location of individual maltings and the growth of the industry as a whole, and therefore where maltings are likely to be found. The latter will provide details which will help with the understanding of the changes within the malting process. It is pertinent to point out that when individual sites are being recorded, whether they are below or above ground, the following features may be found and need recording: steeping cisterns, the couch frame, the growing floors, and the kiln, its furnace and the drying floors, and the support structure for the drying floors. In standing buildings it will be particularly important to record the means by which the grain was moved from one floor or area to another, for example by chutes, through doors or by a variety of hoisting machinery: baskets, bucket elevators, etc and their housing. Other features to be recorded include shutters, and louvres, and static equipment such as grain cleaning machines. It may also be appropriate to retain samples of plaster/screed growing floors to enable an analysis of their composition. Likewise grain samples, especially from early sites might enhance our knowledge of early barley varieties and their spread and use. Also, if they survive the perforated kiln tiles should be recorded, that is their size, make and design. Movable items might usefully go to a local museum.

6) Re-use of Maltings

For any maltings to survive whether listed or unlisted, it has to have an economic use. In the case of the majority of maltings, that is those not used to produce floor malt, this will eventually mean conversion or re-use to a greater or lesser extent. Conversion of maltings is often not without problems because of low floor heights and little natural light with windows only in every other bay. As indicated above there are now only a few maltings which survive with all or the majority of their malting features intact. The remainder are either converted already or have been re-used (not necessarily in the recent past), and most have lost the majority of their important internal features. It is therefore essential when they are re-used or converted that not only is the building fabric maintained but that typical features are retained so that there is more than just a name to indicate the building's former use. A list of features to be retained needs to be established, and should include shutters, chutes, columns, whether wood or cast iron, and in some instances whole kilns. None of these are immediately compatible with domestic housing but can become features of the property. There needs to be acceptance of the fact that the majority of maltings will probably end up in residential use so retaining small features is essential and must be an automatic part of the conversion process.

There are some buildings and some sites where there is relatively little left to compromise, but others where it is of prime importance that they are preserved and re-used carefully. Whilst this may seem obvious with regard to all grade 2* buildings, especially those of an earlier date, it is unfortunately not always the case that they have been treated as they should. For example the maltings at Melbourne in Derbyshire is listed grade 2* and, although a medieval building, had as part of it, the remains of a 17th century kiln (exterior) and an 18th century furnace structure inside the 17th century shell. The kiln furnace structure was removed without listed building consent and without recording. In contrast, a much later malting, Weymouth No 4 listed 2* because it

contains the only known example of Last's patent ventilator was carefully converted to residences retaining the ventilators and a kiln furnace.

Two sites in particular demonstrate the problems involved in the re-use of maltings. The first is the massive complex of eight maltings, barley garner and engine house built at Sleaford for Bass and completed in the first decade of the 20th century. In use as a maltings until the 1960s it was subsequently re-used for light industry and in particular for vegetable processing. It suffered a fire which fortunately did not result in the demolition of any part of the buildings. In 1983 it was the subject of a Public Inquiry and fortunately the Inspector did not recommend demolition, but that did not help with the survival of the site. It was to be another twenty years before any positive action was achieved with the launch of a feasibility plan in the autumn of 2003, and with the involvement of the Phoenix Trust the future of the Sleaford Maltings seems more secure. It is to be hoped that the importance of the buildings as maltings is appreciated and their contribution to the development of the industry as a whole is understood and promoted in the development.

By contrast the fate of F & G Smith's Maltings Norwich Road, East Dereham, Norfolk is less secure despite the fact that it is listed grade 2*. In use until December 2000 it had all its maltings features including a belt driven grain screen. The likely re-use is housing but it is essential that the re-use is sympathetic and retains as many maltings features as possible because this building forms an interesting part of the town's historical development as an important malting town in the 19th century when the coming of the railways encouraged the development of maltings far inland and away from the previous centres which were dependent upon water transport. The area of East Dereham in which the maltings stands was dominated by the malting industry. The urban landscape includes not just this and other maltings but also the former railway station area, associated housing with allotments for those working in the various maltings and social centres such as a chapel. Without vision, this important malthouse may be lost completely or poorly converted like other maltings nearby (the Whitbread Maltings). In this case, as with the few other remaining important maltings, it is essential that there is some assistance, preferably but not necessarily financial but in the form of guidance (and encouragement) for sympathetic development.

7) Funding

Support for Building Maintenance and Operation of Processes.

The majority of operating maltings are occupied by their owners who are responsible for the maintenance of the buildings and, as the buildings are old in the case of working floor maltings, this can prove to be a heavy burden. Thus for example, both Tucker's Maltings in Newton Abbott and Beaven's Maltings in Warminster have needed major roof repairs in recent years but listed Grade 2 have not attracted major grants. English Heritage usually will only become involved in the most important sites, for example William Jones's malthouse at Ditherington on Shrewsbury. But in this case, not because it is an important malthouse, but because in its original use as a flax mill it was the first iron framed building. English Heritage did however fund repairs to the Malthouse at the Seymour House Hotel, Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire. The only malthouse which has received funding from a variety of sources is Boyes Croft at Great Dunmow. These included local authorities, English Heritage, the Pilgrims Trust, and the

Heritage Lottery Fund as well as business support: Stanstead Airport Ltd, Tesco Stores Ltd, Guinness UDV, Lambert Chapman Chartered Accountants and Riddleys Brewery. Another example of funding the retention of important malthouses features is at Weymouth No 4 where the retained features, including Last's Patent ventilator were to be maintained by the leasehold sale of the flats with part of the maintenance being used for the retention of specific features.

Much of this type of funding is not suitable for the working floor maltings in their original buildings. So, perhaps there should be something like a Working Industries Building Maintenance Grant from either English Heritage or the Heritage Lottery Fund designed specifically for industries that are working in old buildings which were originally constructed for the purpose of that industry. Such a grant would in fact cover the four floor maltings that are operating in their original buildings and might cover the other two floor maltings if the flooring process is being carried out in buildings designed for that purpose.

Presentation and Education Use.

Those maltings which additionally perform a public educational role could perhaps benefit from assistance with their presentations relating to how they explain what malt is and how it is produced. At present the only working malting open to the public is Tucker's at Newton Abbott, but Beaven's at Warminster hopes to open and Boyes Croft, although not a working malting is open to the public and has already benefit from funding. At least some of the material presented to the public at these malthouses is the result of both broad-based research and detailed study of individual sites. It is essential that such research continues so that when new information comes to light it can be made available to the public.

8) Conclusion

Maltings are a clearly identifiable building type but the building stock which survives in good condition, with characteristic malting features, is surprisingly small (10 to 15%). In consequence it is desirable that the points noted above as to research, planning conditions, recording and funding should be considered as a matter of urgency before any more buildings are lost or poorly converted without an adequate record being made.

Those maltings which do retain important features should be listed and listed at the correct grade. If not there will be inadequate protection for them. Counties where it could be expected more maltings should exist, such as Yorkshire, should be targeted to ensure that if appropriate a better sample of buildings is listed. Also every attempt must be made to ensure that the few working examples do remain in operation. This is far more difficult because their survival depends upon factors other than their listed building status. As PPG 15 states the best use for a building is its original use and in the case of maltings that certainly applies if good quality representative examples are to survive and be understood as a building type. There must be some effort to ensure that malthouses are re-used/converted sympathetically and assistance and advice is available when needed. It is also essential that before conversion takes place that the building is adequately recorded and to a standard that has been adequately monitored. There is a need for more research across the country to emulate that in the counties of Essex, Hertfordshire and Nottinghamshire. This will enable maltings to be better appreciated and valued as a building type.

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact
our Customer Services department:
Telephone: 0870 333 1181
Fax: 01793 414926
Textphone: 01793 414878
E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk