# Industry Report based on a Survey of UK member companies 2009



Prepared by Mintel Research Consultancy with and for

# The UK Self Storage Association

December 2009

www.ssauk.com

# Contents

| Executive Summary   | . 1 |
|---|-----|
| Methodology   | . 3 |
| Part One: Company Survey  | . 5 |
| Most operators keeping facility numbers static                      | 6   |
| Future Growth Intentions  |     |
| Head Office Employment  | 7   |
| Insurance sales   |     |
| Storage turnover – growing revenues                                 |     |
| Non-storage revenue   |     |
| Domestic business still dominates the market                        |     |
| Average length of stay by customers                                 |     |
| Evaluation of marketing vehicles used to communicate with customers | 10  |
| Part Two: Facility Survey   | 11  |
| Facility Opening Date   |     |
| Number of facilities growing more rapidly outside London            | 11  |
| A new wave of independent operators?                                |     |
| Type of Facility  |     |
| Older facilities more likely to be conversions                      |     |
| Purpose Built focus is in the South                                 | 13  |
| Multi site operators building more purpose built facilities         |     |
| Ownership   | 15  |
| Facilities likely to be freeholds/long lease                        | 15  |
| The majority of facilities are freehold/long leasehold              | 15  |
| Ownership, by size of company                                       |     |
| Current Net Lettable Area   | 17  |
|   |     |
| Recently opened facilities tend to be smaller                       |     |
| London best-served by large facilities                              |     |
| Smaller company – smaller facilities                                | 19  |
| Number of Rooms   |     |
| Shrinking number of rooms   |     |
| Average London facility has 677 rooms                               |     |
| Multiples have more than twice as many rooms as smaller companies   | 21  |
| Staffing Levels   |     |
| London tops staffing charts   |     |
| Longest established facilities have higher staffing levels          |     |
| The two man band?   | 24  |
| Average Billed Room Rate  | 26  |
| Trend for lower prices among newer openings                         |     |
| London leads the way in terms of pricing                            |     |
| Multiple pricing reflects southern heartland                        |     |
| Changes in Empty Room Rates   | 28  |
| Newer facilities feeling the strain?                                |     |
| London companies increase rates most rapidly                        |     |
| Multiples see largest increases in empty room rates                 |     |
|   |     |
| Additional Information  | 30  |



## **Executive Summary**

The Self Storage Association (SSA UK) is the trade association for the self storage industry in the UK. As a membership organisation, the SSA UK is currently made up from more than 250 professional companies who either operate self storage facilities or who are suppliers to the industry.

This annual report, prepared by Mintel, outlines the developments and growth within the self storage industry during 2009. Questionnaire results are submitted by the Association's members and can be readily compared to previous years' results.

Some of the 2009 report's key findings include:

- Despite the tough economic climate, the industry has grown by around 4% over the past year in terms of available rentable space a slow down from the 8-15% seen over the previous five years
- There are now about 800 primary facilities (not including container self storage facilities) and around 28 million rentable square feet an increase of more than one million square feet (4%) of space in the last year.
- There is now 0.5 sq ft of rentable space for each person in the UK.
- A typical self storage facility has an average size of approximately 40,300 rentable square feet; and has circa 500 rooms. Multiple store operators tend to have more rooms per facility than Independent operators (578 compared to 311).
- The internet is proving to be the most important form of marketing for self storage operators now accounting for more than 35% of new business leads (an increase of more than 20% on last year), while directories (such as Yellow Pages) as a source of new business dropped by 27%.
- The average length of stay for customers using self storage facilities is now 225 days (an increase of more than 26%), with only a quarter of customers staying less than 100 days.

However, as evidenced from many other service industries in the last 12 months, revenue has come under considerable pressure:

- The average billed room rate is £20.49, down 2.8% on last year Multiples are down 2.7% (£22.34 average) and Independents are down 9.8% (£15.71 average)
- The industry generated revenues of about £345m, down by 4% on last year, and employment for 2,800.

The diversity of customers using self storage has helped protect the industry during the recent economic downturn. The industry's customer base did however shift slightly with business customers now accounting for approximately 34% of self storage users and private individuals accounting for the remaining 66% – an increase of 10% amongst business users.

The economic outlook for the year ahead remains unsettled; however the self storage industry remains cautiously optimistic. The UK has 0.5 sq ft per person. When compared to penetration levels in more mature markets, (the US has more than 7.4 sq ft per person and Australasia with 1.1 sq ft) it is clear that the UK industry has further potential to grow.



Although the industry's outlook was not as positive as a year ago, 21% of operators are still aiming to open new facilities in the coming year. The longer term outlook remains robust with nearly half the operators (49%) stating that they plan to expand in the next five years, of which 6% of operators plan an aggressive expansion of 10 or more sites.

Other emerging areas of growth highlighted in the report include insurance sales and packaging solutions. Currently nearly 15% of income is generated through these means; however Multiples are well ahead of Independent operators whose non storage revenues remain at less than 9%. This income stream becomes increasingly valuable as the pressure on margins increase in line with the growth in available space.

The full report offers further detail and additional insight into some of the key points raised. SSA UK will in the meantime continue to represent its members and seek to help the industry achieve its goals in the years ahead.

SSA UK Limited, Priestley House, The Gullet, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 5SZ.

Tel: +44 (0)1270 623 150 www.ssauk.com.

### Leading UK operators include:

- Safestore Self Storage listed on the London Stock Exchange in 2007 and currently operates 114 self storage facilities (UK 92; France 22).
- Big Yellow Self Storage listed on the London Stock Exchange in 2002 and currently operates 60 facilities and manages a further 10 facilities for Armadillo Self Storage (see below). Big Yellow became the first UK self storage REIT in 2007.
- Access Self Storage currently operates 49 facilities.
- Lok'nStore Self Storage currently operates 21 facilities. (Lok'nStore is listed on AIM in London).
- Shurgard Self Storage currently operates 21 facilities (Shurgard Europe has a further 167 facilities on the Continent of Europe).
- Storage King (a franchise and management organisation) was operating 24 branded facilities. However, as this report goes to print the Storage King portfolio and organisation is undergoing change.
- Space Maker Self Storage currently operates 12 facilities.
- Armadillo Self Storage currently owns 10 facilities, which are managed by Big Yellow Self Storage.

Note: Comparisons are made in the document with some of the results of the previous surveys (dated 1 June 2006, 1 October 2007 and 31 December 2008). Each year our knowledge on member and non-member facilities is improving. This may well influence the year-on-year statistics both upwards and downwards and exact comparison is not always possible as there is also variation in the participants between the three surveys.

### Methodology

For a fourth consecutive year Mintel Research Consultancy has been commissioned by the SSA UK to analyse a survey sent out to members of the Association. In total, surveys relating to 444 facilities, owned by 92 separate companies have been analysed by Mintel in this, the 2009 edition of the UK Self Storage Industry annual report prepared exclusively for the SSA UK.

When examining the results of the survey, a number of classifications have been used to gain a more detailed understanding of the self storage industry.

As with any survey of this size, some care must be taken in interpreting the results given the possibility that a handful of abnormal responses can significantly skew results. The smaller the sub-sample, the higher is the risk of abnormal responses leading to unrepresentative findings.

Given the need to maintain workable sub-samples, therefore, the level of cross-analysis possible is limited. However, the groups used are large enough to provide some relatively robust sub-samples, while also offering considerable insight into how different sectors of the market are faring.

The groups used in the main body of the report and their definitions are explained below:

**Opening date:** Throughout the analysis, facilities have been broken down into four groups – those opened in 1999 or before (*pre-2000*), those opened in 2000, 2001 or 2002 (*2000-2002*), those opened in 2003, 2004 or 2005 (*2003-2005*) and those opened in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (*2006-2009*).

**Location:** Facilities were divided into four regional groups, South (including South East and South West but excluding London), London (inside M25), Midlands & Wales and North (including Northern England and Scotland).

**Size of company:** Facilities have been split into Independents (including companies with five or less facilities) and Multiples.

The report is in two parts:

**Part One** – the analysis of the company survey

Part Two – analysis of the individual facility survey



The following table compares the 2009 sample (collected in 2009) to the 2008 sample (collected in 2008) to the 2007 sample (collected in 2007) and the 2006 sample (collected in late 2005) by key segmentation.

|           | Comparison of the survey | ·                 | 2000 2007 and 200/  |
|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| FIGURE A: | Comparison of the survey | v sample in ZUUA. | 2008. 2007 and 2006 |
|           |                          |                   | 2000/200/ und 2000  |

|  | Count |      |     |      |      |      |
|--|-------|------|-----|------|------|------|
|  | 20    | 009  | 20  | 800  | 2007 | 2006 |
| Number of companies                    | 92    | -16% | 109 | 40%  | 78   | 87   |
| Companies in both 2008 and 2009 survey | 65    | 3%   | 63  | 31%  | 48   | N/A  |
| Number of facilities                   | 444   | 3%   | 429 | 25%  | 342  | 315  |
|  |       |      |     |      |      |      |
| Pre 2000 facilities                    | 90    | -25% | 120 | 7%   | 112  | 125  |
| 2000-2002 facilities                   | 114   | 15%  | 99  | 3%   | 96   | 111  |
| 2003-2005 facilities                   | 79    | -8%  | 86  | 3%   | 83   | 79   |
| 2006-2009 facilities                   | 161   | 30%  | 124 | 143% | 51   | -    |
|  |       |      |     |      |      |      |
| London facilities                      | 131   | 8%   | 121 | -2%  | 124  | 118  |
| South East facilities                  | 73    | 4%   | 70  | 37%  | 51   | 57   |
| South/South West facilities            | 81    | 3%   | 79  | 75%  | 45   | 42   |
| N. England/Scotland facilities         | 101   | 2%   | 99  | 34%  | 74   | 52   |
| Midlands/Wales facilities              | 58    | -3%  | 60  | 25%  | 48   | 46   |
|  |       |      |     |      |      |      |
| Independent facilities                 | 133   | -20% | 166 | 54%  | 108  | 112  |
| Multiple facilities                    | 311   | 18%  | 263 | 12%  | 234  | 203  |

Source: SSA/Mintel



# Part One: Company Survey

This section of the report covers the aspects of the questionnaire relating to the companies active in the self storage market, giving an overall picture of size, turnover and strategy.

The chart below details the number of facilities owned by each company.

|                          | 2009 | 2008     | 2007   | 2006 |
|--------------------------|------|----------|--------|------|
| Number of Facilities     |      | % of com | panies | •    |
| 1                        | 58   | 60       | 60     | 65   |
| 2                        | 14   | 16       | 13     | 15   |
| 3                        | 9    | 7        | 10     | 6    |
| 4                        | 4    | 4        | 4      | 3    |
| 5                        | 3    | 5        | 3      | 1    |
| 6                        | 1    | 1        | 0      | 2    |
| 7                        | 2    | 1        | 1      | 0    |
| 8                        | 0    | 0        | 0      | 1    |
| 9                        | 0    | 0        | 1      | 0    |
| 10                       | 1    | 0        | 0      | 1    |
| Over 10                  | 8    | 6        | 8      | 6    |
| Avg Number of Facilities | 4.8  | 3.9      | 4.4    | 3.6  |

### Figure 1: Proportion of companies by number of facilities open

- The market remains polarised, with a handful of dominant companies, and a large number of much smaller operators. 58% of the companies surveyed operate a single facility, and 72% have two facilities or fewer.
- The increase in the average number of facilities per company has been caused by the reduction in numbers of independent operators responding to the survey this year, compared to 2008.



### Most operators keeping facility numbers static

- The 2008 survey showed that the expansion in facility numbers had slowed down. The latest survey shows that the rate of expansion has continued to decline.
- In 2009 20% of companies opened at least one more facility.
- That said, there was clearly some confidence in the market, with two large companies having opened at least six sites each and one having expanded strongly, bringing nine new sites on stream in the year.

# Figure 2: Proportion of companies that have opened new facilities in the past 12 months

| Number of new facilities in the past 12 months: | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| None  | 79   | 74   | 55   | 64   |
| One   | 15   | 18   | 35   | 29   |
| Тwo   | 1    | 2    | 6    | 3    |
| Three   | 0    | 2    | 0    | 4    |
| Over three                                      | 5    | 4    | 4    | 0    |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

#### **Future Growth Intentions**

#### Short-term growth

- When it comes to intentions over the next year, responses suggested that the market should continue to expand, but at a very much slower rate than in 2006/7.
- A fifth say that they will open new facilities about the same as those who opened new facilities in the past year.

# Figure 3: Proportion of companies intending to open new facilities in the next 12 months

| Likelihood of opening new<br>facilities in the next 12<br>months: | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| Yes   | 21   | 33   | 44   | 55   |
| No  | 75   | 49   | 35   | 45   |
| Possibly  | 4    | 18   | 21   | 0    |



### Long-term

- In a sign of confidence in the future health of the market, 49% of companies plan to open one or more facilities in the next five years, with 6% planning aggressive expansion of ten or more facilities.
- However, half do not intend to open any new facilities in the next five years. This significant change in future growth intentions is almost certainly down to the current financial climate, which has caused uncertainty and, coupled with a lack of bank finance, has caused retrenchment in any planned investments. It may well be that as the recession starts to recede, many companies will revisit their intentions.

| Figure 4: | Proportion of Companies expecting to open new facilities in the next |
|-----------|--|
|           | 5 years  |

| Number of new facilities | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|
| 0/Possibly/Unsure        | 50   | 25   | 35   |
| 1 – 3                    | 35   | 60   | 35   |
| 4 - 9                    | 9    | 6    | 21   |
| 10 +                     | 6    | 9    | 9    |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Head Office Employment

- Reflecting the large number of smaller companies operating in the market, 74% employed three or fewer staff members at their head office, with an average staffing level of 4.1.
- When it comes to facility numbers, though, it is a polarised market, and one company employs 54 head office staff members accounting for almost 15% of recorded head office staff.

Head office staffing levels

| Number of staff in head office:           | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| 0-1                                       | 32   | 20   | 20   | 20   |
| 1-3                                       | 42   | 52   | 46   | 36   |
| 3 -6                                      | 16   | 18   | 24   | 26   |
| 6+  | 10   | 10   | 10   | 18   |
| Average number of staff in<br>head office | 4.1  | 4.5  | 4.2  | 5.0  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

Figure 5:



### **Insurance** sales

- Companies were asked how they have chosen to ensure that all their customers have insurance cover on their stored goods.
- Since the last report the Government has de-regulated the provision of insurance for the self storage industry. 30% of respondees have already converted to the formal de-regulated selling option, which is a positive response by the industry to the Government's de-regulation initiative. 57% have continued to provide extended cover and the remaining 13% are either still FSA-authorised or have customers that are using other options for their insurance cover.

### Storage turnover – growing revenues

- The chart below illustrates the level of turnover generated from core self storage business.
- 53% of companies generate £201k or more (55% of companies in 2008).
- At the top end of the market, some 19% earned at least £1 million from self storage business, with the spread of incomes highlighting the huge diversity seen within the industry.
- Among the companies turning over less than £1 million, the average figure was £270,000, a slight decrease year-on-year from 2008.

|  | 2009           | 2008     | 2007     | 2006     |  |  |
|--|----------------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| Turnover bands   | % of companies |          |          |          |  |  |
| Up £100  | 20             | 16       | 21       | 31       |  |  |
| £101k to 200k  | 28             | 29       | 34       | 23       |  |  |
| £201k to £1M   | 34             | 41       | 26       | 29       |  |  |
| Over £1M   | 19             | 14       | 19       | 17       |  |  |
| Average self storage<br>turnover less than<br>£1 million | £270,000       | £285,000 | £226,000 | £214,000 |  |  |

#### Figure 6: Turnover (£) from self storage



### Non-storage revenue

- The chart below illustrates the turnover generated from non-storage business, such as merchandise, insurance and other self storage related services. It makes a comparison with the core self storage turnover.
- The difference between Multiples and Independents is again confirmed this year. The slight improvement for Independents is probably caused by the fact that fewer of them responded to the survey.

### Figure 7: Turnover from other business

| % of other turnover to self storage turnover | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| Independents                                 | 8.7  | 6.0  | 8.8  | 14.0 |
| Multiples                                    | 15.9 | 15.5 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| Total  | 14.8 | 12.8 | 15.9 | 16.5 |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Domestic business still dominates the market

- When it comes to the split between domestic and business users, the customer base remains largely driven by individuals who, on average, accounted for just over 66% of customers in a facility. This, though, masked significant differences. For seven companies domestic customers accounted for over 85% of the business, while at the other extreme, three companies said that only 60% of their customers were domestic.
- There is also an indication from this year's survey that the proportion of business customers has increased. This is likely to be a combination of a reduction in private individuals (and therefore the business customer proportion automatically increases) and a concentration by companies on increasing their business customer base. Business customers will take a larger percentage of space as they typically occupy larger rooms than domestic customers.

### Average length of stay by customers

- Around 24% of customers stay for 100 days or fewer, highlighting the fact that many people (mainly domestic customers) use storage facilities to cover relatively short-term space requirements.
- Many of these customers will be using storage as an interim measure, between moving houses, for example. The dramatic decline in the volume of property transactions in 2009 has impacted this sector of the market.
- However, there is also a significant and growing number of longer stayers in the industry, with eighteen of the companies surveyed saying that their average customer stayed at least a year. Figure 8 shows how significant the change has been over the last 2 years.
- This market from domestic customers has grown in the last 2 years, with customers being forced to downsize or to move into rented accommodation in the current environment, and hence the need for prolonged self storage services.



- The average length of stay for Multiples was 49 weeks (9 weeks longer than last year) and for Independents, 29 weeks (6 weeks longer than last year).
- This confirms that companies with a more mature portfolio of facilities (typically the multiple facility operators), tend to have longer average lengths of stay.

| Length of Stay          | 2009             | 2008                | 2007                |  |  |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
|                         | % of companies   |                     |                     |  |  |
| 0 to 100 days           | 24               | 34                  | 35                  |  |  |
| 101 to 200 days         | 29               | 31                  | 43                  |  |  |
| 201 to 300 days         | 47               | 35                  | 22                  |  |  |
| Average length of stay: | 225 (7 months +) | 178 days (6 months) | 154 days (5 months) |  |  |

#### Figure 8: Average customer length of stay

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Evaluation of marketing vehicles used to communicate with customers

- The importance of the Internet in generating business is further highlighted by this years survey. Website and facility signage accounted for six in ten new enquiries.
- An online presence has become crucial, while links with the ever-more popular housing sites such as Rightmove can help capture business from those moving house and looking for temporary storage space.

### Figure 9: Key drivers of customer enquiries

| Key Driver: |                         | 2009                | 2008 | 2007 |  |
|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------|------|--|
|             | % Change<br>2008 - 2009 | Average % enquiries |      |      |  |
| Website     | +21%                    | 35                  | 29   | 18   |  |
| Signage     | -7%                     | 25                  | 27   | 32   |  |
| Referral    | -23%                    | 17                  | 22   | 18   |  |
| Directories | -27%                    | 16                  | 22   | 32   |  |
| Other       | -                       | 7                   |      |      |  |



# Part Two: Facility Survey

This section of the report presents a detailed analysis of the questionnaire concerned with individual facilities, covering such areas as facility age, ownership, average rental charges, and location.

### Facility Opening Date

- The rapid expansion of the market over the past six years is confirmed by the table below, which shows that 36% of facilities covered by the survey had been opened since 2006, and a further 18% since 2003.
- This was, skewed by five of the major operators in the market, who between them have accounted for 62% of all new openings since 2006.
- The current recession has slowed down the rapid growth seen in the market between 2006 and 2009. 2010 may well be crucial in determining the sustainability of a number of companies with recently opened facilities we may see some consolidation amongst the operators as a result of their acquisition financing.

| Figure 10:    | Facility opening date, by geographical location |
|---------------|---|
| i igui o i o. | r donity opening date, by geographical location |

| Column %    | All | South | London | Midlands /<br>Wales | Northern<br>England /<br>Scotland |  |  |
|-------------|-----|-------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|             | %   |       |        |                     |                                   |  |  |
| Pre 2000    | 20  | 17    | 33     | 10                  | 14                                |  |  |
| 2000 - 2002 | 26  | 30    | 25     | 31                  | 17                                |  |  |
| 2003 - 2005 | 18  | 16    | 18     | 10                  | 25                                |  |  |
| 2006 - 2009 | 36  | 38    | 24     | 48                  | 45                                |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Number of facilities growing more rapidly outside London

- London and the South traditionally led the way in developing the self storage market, but they are now being caught up by companies operating in the Midlands and the North.
- Expansion in the London area has been slower because of the higher London property prices and it is really only Multiples who are managing to achieve expansion here.

### Figure 11: Proportion of facilities opened by geographical location

| Location                    | 2009 | 2008    | 2007      | 2006 |
|-----------------------------|------|---------|-----------|------|
|                             |      | % of fa | acilities |      |
| South*                      | 35   | 35      | 28        | 31   |
| London                      | 23   | 28      | 36        | 37   |
| Northern England / Scotland | 29   | 23      | 21        | 17   |
| Midlands / Wales            | 13   | 14      | 15        | 15   |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

\*Note: South includes South, South East and South West



### A new wave of independent operators?

• Independently run facilities and the smaller chains appear to have become a little more aggressive in terms of new openings since 2003.

| Column %    | All     | Multiple | Independent |  |  |
|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|--|--|
| Base        | 444 311 |          | 133         |  |  |
|             | %       |          |             |  |  |
| Pre 2000    | 20      | 20       | 20          |  |  |
| 2000 - 2002 | 26      | 29       | 19          |  |  |
| 2003 - 2005 | 18      | 15       | 24          |  |  |
| 2006 - 2009 | 36      | 36       | 37          |  |  |

### Figure 12: Facility opening date, by size of company

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### **Type of Facility**

- For each facility, respondents were asked to state whether it was a converted warehouse, purpose built facility, or based around containers. The chart below illustrates the proportion of the market accounted for by each of these types of facility.
- The chart shows an increase in purpose built facilities for the third year running and a growth of new builds from 15% to 29% over the last four years!
- Converted warehouses remain the most common type of facility, accounting for 68% of facilities with 29% being purpose built.

| rigule is: Type of facility | Figure | 13: | Type of facility |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|------------------|
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|------------------|

| Type of Facility    | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |  |  |  |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|
|                     | %    |      |      |      |  |  |  |
| Converted Warehouse | 68   | 73   | 79   | 79   |  |  |  |
| Purpose Built       | 29   | 23   | 17   | 15   |  |  |  |
| Containers          | 3    | 4    | 4    | 6    |  |  |  |



### Older facilities more likely to be conversions

• Since 2006, 43% of new facilities have been designed specifically for the task. That is a big change in specification since 2000.

| Column %                   | All | 2006 -<br>2009 | 2003 -<br>2005 | 2000 -<br>2002 | Pre 2000 |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
|                            |     |                | %              |                |          |
| Converted Warehouse        | 61  | 45             | 58             | 72             | 80       |
| Converted & Containers     | 7   | 8              | 6              | 3              | 11       |
| Purpose Built              | 28  | 43             | 30             | 23             | 3        |
| Purpose Built & Containers | 1   | 1              | 1              | 1              | 2        |
| Containers                 | 3   | 4              | 4              | 2              | 3        |

### Figure 14: Type of facility, by opening date

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Purpose Built focus is in the South

- Looking at 2009 survey data and confirming last years statistics, many more facilities have been purpose built in London and the South than is the case in the North.
- In Northern England and Scotland, converted warehouses were more common than across the country as a whole. Partly this will reflect the regions' industrial heritage, with former warehouses more readily available, and partly this will reflect the lack of investment in this region by the multiple operators, who have principally focused their investment in London and the South to date.

| Column %                      | All | South | London | Midlands /<br>Wales | Northern<br>England /<br>Scotland |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                               |     |       | %      |                     |                                   |
| Converted Warehouse           | 61  | 50    | 66     | 66                  | 70                                |
| Converted & Containers        | 7   | 11    | 2      | 5                   | 8                                 |
| Purpose Built                 | 28  | 33    | 31     | 21                  | 18                                |
| Purpose Built &<br>Containers | 1   | 3     | 0      | 0                   | 1                                 |
| Containers                    | 3   | 3     | 1      | 9                   | 3                                 |



### Multi site operators building more purpose built facilities

• Multi site operators are opening more purpose built facilities. This is no surprise as it is a result of their better access to funding, their preferred brand positioning, and the more complicated process involved with obtaining planning and constructing new facilities.

### Figure 16: Type of facility, by size of company

| Column %                   | All | Multiple | Independent |
|----------------------------|-----|----------|-------------|
|                            |     | %        |             |
| Converted Warehouse        | 61  | 64       | 56          |
| Converted & Containers     | 7   | 3        | 15          |
| Purpose Built              | 28  | 33       | 16          |
| Purpose Built & Containers | 1   | 0        | 4           |
| Containers                 | 3   | 0        | 9           |



## Ownership

• Respondents were asked on what basis their facilities were owned, with the results being illustrated below. The freehold/short leasehold split has remained comparable for the last 4 years.

### Figure 17: Ownership of self storage sites

| Ownership of site       | 2009 2008 2007 2006 |    |    |    |  |  |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----|----|----|--|--|
|                         | %                   |    |    |    |  |  |
| Freehold/long leasehold | 79                  | 77 | 78 | 79 |  |  |
| Short leasehold         | 21                  | 23 | 22 | 21 |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Facilities likely to be freeholds/long lease

• These statistics indicate the continued focus on the freehold/long leasehold ownership model.

### Figure 18: Ownership, by date opened

| Column %                 | All | 2006 -<br>2009 | 2003 -<br>2005 | 2000 -<br>2002 | Pre 2000 |  |
|--------------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|--|
|                          | %   |                |                |                |          |  |
| Freehold/ long leasehold | 79  | 81             | 77             | 77             | 81       |  |
| Short leasehold          | 21  | 19             | 23             | 24             | 19       |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### The majority of facilities are freehold/long leasehold

- These statistics are in line with last year's findings. Across all regions, the majority of facilities are freehold/long leasehold.
- Facilities in the South are more likely to be on a short lease when compared to facilities elsewhere. This is mainly because freehold/long leasehold properties are more expensive in the South.

### Figure 19: Ownership, by location

| Column %                    | All | South | London | Midlands /<br>Wales | Northern<br>England /<br>Scotland |  |
|-----------------------------|-----|-------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
|                             | %   |       |        |                     |                                   |  |
| Freehold/ long<br>leasehold | 79  | 74    | 82     | 79                  | 84                                |  |
| Short leasehold             | 21  | 26    | 18     | 21                  | 16                                |  |



## Ownership, by size of company

Figure 20:

Ownership, by size of company

| Column %                     | All | Independent | Multiple |
|------------------------------|-----|-------------|----------|
|                              |     | %           |          |
| Freehold long /<br>leasehold | 79  | 73          | 82       |
| Short leasehold              | 21  | 27          | 18       |



# Current Net Lettable Area

- In order to assess the trends in the size of individual facilities, respondents were asked to give the current net lettable area of each facility being operated. The current net lettable area has been grouped into four bands and is shown below:
- The overall pattern is consistent with last year's findings.

| Figure 21: Net lettable area per | <sup>·</sup> facility |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|

| Net lettable area     | 2009   | 2008   | 2007   | 2006   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
|                       | %      |        |        |        |  |  |  |
| 20,000 sq ft or less  | 23     | 25     | 24     | 28     |  |  |  |
| 20,001 - 40,000 sq ft | 29     | 36     | 34     | 34     |  |  |  |
| 40,001 - 60,000 sq ft | 32     | 26     | 28     | 25     |  |  |  |
| 60,001 + sq ft        | 16     | 13     | 14     | 13     |  |  |  |
|                       |        |        |        |        |  |  |  |
| Average (sq ft)       | 40,300 | 38,300 | 37,500 | 36,900 |  |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

• The average net lettable area is 40,300 sq ft. This figure, however, is skewed by a small number of fairly large facilities. This is slightly higher than the average for last year, which was 38,300 sq ft, although this is not directly comparable as fewer companies provided this information last year.

### Recently opened facilities tend to be smaller

• There has been a clear move towards smaller facilities over the last 10 years, which is mainly due to the continuing arrival of new operators, some of whom are providing self storage as an adjunct to other services and operations.

| Column %              | All    | 2006 -<br>2009 | 2003 -<br>2005 | 2000 -<br>2002 | Pre 2000 |
|-----------------------|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
|                       |        |                | %              |                |          |
| 20,000 sq ft or less  | 23     | 34             | 28             | 11             | 17       |
| 20,001 - 40,000 sq ft | 29     | 19             | 29             | 32             | 40       |
| 40,001 - 60,000 sq ft | 32     | 34             | 29             | 39             | 22       |
| 60,001 + sq ft        | 16     | 13             | 14             | 18             | 21       |
| Average Sq ft*        | 40,300 | 33,081         | 35,305         | 44,068         | 41,346   |

Figure 22: Net lettable area, by date of opening



### London best-served by large facilities

- When it comes to the largest facilities, London dominates, with almost a quarter of all facilities in the capital being at least 60,000 sq ft a simple reflection of the greater population density, and therefore the ability to support large self storage sites.
- Facilities in the South, too, tend to be larger than average, with over 40% measuring at least 40,000 sq ft.

| Figure 23: | Segmentation of net lettable area by location |
|------------|---|
|            |   |

| Column %              | All    | South  | London | Midlands<br>/ Wales | Northern England /<br>Scotland |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
|                       | %      |        |        |                     |                                |  |  |
| 20,000 sq ft or less  | 25     | 23     | 10     | 38                  | 32                             |  |  |
| 20,001 - 40,000 sq ft | 36     | 33     | 26     | 29                  | 26                             |  |  |
| 40,001 - 60,000 sq ft | 26     | 29     | 40     | 21                  | 32                             |  |  |
| 60,001 + sq ft        | 13     | 15     | 24     | 12                  | 10                             |  |  |
| Average Sq ft         | 40,300 | 39,734 | 48,962 | 34,726              | 34,175                         |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

• There have been no significant changes to facility sizes in the different regions over the last 3 years.

#### Figure 24: Average net lettable area by location

|                             | 2009          | 2008   | 2007   | 2006   |  |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--|
|                             | Average Sq ft |        |        |        |  |
| London                      | 48,962        | 46,783 | 44,505 | 43,131 |  |
| South                       | 39,734        | 37,073 | 38,100 | 36,500 |  |
| Midlands / Wales            | 34,726        | 35,472 | 33,834 | 32,169 |  |
| Northern England / Scotland | 34,175        | 30,962 | 32,878 | 27,922 |  |
| All                         | 40,300        | 38,277 | 37,481 | 36,887 |  |



### Smaller company – smaller facilities

- There is a strong correlation between the size of the operating company and the size of the storage facility.
- 50% of all sites owned by Multiples measured at least 40,000 sq ft, as compared to just 22% of those owned by Independents and smaller chains.
- Simple financial muscle will be one reason behind this the larger companies can betterafford the initial investment needed to open sizeable facilities.
- There is also the trend for many Independent facilities to be run as a sideline to an existing business, making use of existing company premises to offer storage facilities.
- These statistics are in line with last year's findings.

#### Figure 25: Segmentation of net lettable area, by size of company

| Column %              | All    | Independent | Multiple |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------|----------|--|--|
|                       | %      |             |          |  |  |
| 20,000 sq ft or less  | 23     | 47          | 13       |  |  |
| 20,001 - 40,000 sq ft | 29     | 32          | 27       |  |  |
| 40,001 - 60,000 sq ft | 32     | 17          | 38       |  |  |
| 60,001 + sq ft        | 16     | 4           | 22       |  |  |
| Average Sq ft         | 39,290 | 25,978      | 46,011   |  |  |



## Number of Rooms

- Closely connected to the overall lettable area of the facility, respondents were also asked how many rooms they had in each facility.
- 18% of facilities have 200 or fewer rooms balanced by the 32% who have at least 600.
- At the upper extreme, some 7% of sites have at least 1,000 rooms, rising to 3,000 rooms in the largest site.

### Figure 26: Proportion of facilities by the number of rooms per facility





### Shrinking number of rooms

- As with square footage, there is a general trend towards smaller facilities, with those opening since 2006 having an average of 434 rooms.
- However, the average number of rooms across the industry has remained consistent.

| Figure 27: | Average number of rooms, by date of opening |  |
|------------|---|--|
| J          |   |  |

|             | 2009 | 2008                    | 2007 | 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|------|-------------------------|------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
|             |      | Average number of rooms |      |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pre 2000    | 519  | 489                     | 525  | 573  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 - 2002 | 598  | 633                     | 626  | 528  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 - 2005 | 483  | 452                     | 445  | 399  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 - 2009 | 434  | 421                     | 384  | N/A  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All         | 501  | 495                     | 510  | 513  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Average London facility has 677 rooms

- Again reflecting trends in the square footage of facilities, London has by far the largest average number of rooms, topping 677.
- Outside the capital, distribution is more even.

|                           | 2009 | 2008                    | 2007 | 2006 |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|------|--|--|--|
|                           |      | Average number of rooms |      |      |  |  |  |
| London                    | 677  | 662                     | 623  | 654  |  |  |  |
| Midlands/Wales            | 393  | 457                     | 420  | 390  |  |  |  |
| South                     | 467  | 444                     | 514  | 449  |  |  |  |
| Northern England/Scotland | 388  | 407                     | 400  | 380  |  |  |  |
| All                       | 501  | 495                     | 510  | 513  |  |  |  |

#### Figure 28: Average number of rooms, by location

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Multiples have more than twice as many rooms as smaller companies

- On average, Multiples have more than twice as many rooms as Independents, offering scope for considerable economies of scale.
- These economies may see them better able to survive any ill-effects caused by a possible recession although larger facilities could also lead to excess capacity if the market is particularly badly hit.
- Multiple operators tend to have more of a focus on the domestic market than smaller independent operators. To service this demand, Multiples will therefore create more small rooms.



### Figure 29: Average number of rooms, by size of company

|             | 2009 | 2008        | 2007         | 2006 |
|-------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|
|             |      | Average num | ber of rooms |      |
| Multiple    | 578  | 612         | 616          | 640  |
| Independent | 311  | 307         | 288          | 266  |
| All         | 501  | 495         | 510          | 513  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

- Average room size being created has not varied significantly in the last year.
- However, Multiples continue to create facilities with smaller average room sizes compared to Independents. This is as a result of a greater focus on domestic customers and therefore their ability to charge a higher rent per square foot occupied.

| Figure 30: | Average room sizes |
|------------|--------------------|
|            |                    |

|                                | 2009   | 2008      | 2007      | 2006   |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|                                |        | Average r | oom sizes |        |
| Average facility size          | 40,290 | 38,277    | 37,481    | 36,887 |
| Average number of rooms        | 501    | 495       | 510       | 513    |
| Average room size              | 80.4   | 77.3      | 73.5      | 71.9   |
|                                |        |           |           |        |
| Multiples Average Room size    | 79.6   | 74.9      | 73.2      | 69.7   |
| Independents Average Room size | 83.5   | 82.1      | 81        | 86     |



# Staffing Levels

- Facilities tend to be fairly lean in terms of staffing levels, with two thirds employing three or fewer people, and just one in twenty facilities having more than four staff.
- The average facility has almost three full time staff (or part- time equivalent).

### Figure 31: Overall staffing levels

| Staffing level | 2009 | 2008            | 2007 | 2006 |  |  |  |
|----------------|------|-----------------|------|------|--|--|--|
|                |      | % of facilities |      |      |  |  |  |
| 1              | 13   | 8               | 7    | 9    |  |  |  |
| 2              | 21   | 27              | 24   | 17   |  |  |  |
| 3              | 36   | 36              | 39   | 51   |  |  |  |
| 4              | 25   | 24              | 23   | 16   |  |  |  |
| 4+             | 5    | 5               | 7    | 7    |  |  |  |
| Average        | 2.8  | 2.8             | 3.2  | 2.9  |  |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### London tops staffing charts

• Given the size of London's facilities, both in terms of square footage and room numbers, it's unsurprising to see that staffing levels were considerably higher in the capital, with half of facilities employing more than three full-time employees (or equivalent part-time staff).

#### Figure 32: Staffing levels, by location

| Column % | All | South | London | Midlands /<br>Wales | Northern<br>England /<br>Scotland |
|----------|-----|-------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1        | 13  | 14    | 3      | 17                  | 24                                |
| 2        | 21  | 29    | 11     | 22                  | 17                                |
| 3        | 36  | 31    | 35     | 40                  | 45                                |
| 4        | 25  | 24    | 39     | 17                  | 11                                |
| 4+       | 5   | 2     | 12     | 4                   | 4                                 |
| Average  | 2.8 | 2.7   | 3.5    | 2.7                 | 2.6                               |



### Longest established facilities have higher staffing levels

• Reflecting the smaller average facility size, more recently-opened facilities tend to have fewer staff, with just 2% of facilities opened since 2006 having more than four full-time employees.

| Column % | All | 2006 -<br>2009 | 2003 -<br>2005 | 2000 -<br>2002 | Pre 2000 |
|----------|-----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
|          |     |                | %              |                |          |
| 1        | 13  | 22             | 15             | 3              | 9        |
| 2        | 21  | 19             | 32             | 19             | 12       |
| 3        | 36  | 42             | 28             | 33             | 38       |
| 4        | 25  | 15             | 22             | 37             | 29       |
| 4+       | 5   | 2              | 4              | 8              | 11       |
| Average  | 2.8 | 2.7            | 2.7            | 3.3            | 3.2      |

### Figure 33: Staffing levels, by opening date

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### The two man band?

- Independents and smaller chains have considerably smaller facilities, with fewer rooms. As such, it's little surprise to see that most employ two or fewer staff.
- Larger Multiples still have fairly lean staffing ratios, but 37% of their facilities employ more than three people, as compared to just 14% of the smaller operations.
- Clearly, many Independents are effectively family businesses, with one or two staff supervising a single facility and possibly not opening on Sundays.

| Column % | All | Independent | Multiple |
|----------|-----|-------------|----------|
|          |     | %           |          |
| 1        | 13  | 26          | 8        |
| 2        | 20  | 37          | 13       |
| 3        | 36  | 23          | 42       |
| 4        | 25  | 9           | 31       |
| 4+       | 5   | 5           | 6        |
| Average  | 2.8 | 2.3         | 3.1      |



### Figure 35: Staffing levels, annual comparison by size of company

|             |      | Average number of Staff |      |      |  |  |
|-------------|------|-------------------------|------|------|--|--|
|             | 2009 | 2008                    | 2007 | 2006 |  |  |
| Multiple    | 3.1  | 3.0                     | 3.1  | 3.1  |  |  |
| Independent | 2.3  | 2.4                     | 3.3  | 2.6  |  |  |
| All         | 2.8  | 2.8                     | 3.2  | 2.9  |  |  |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Figure 36: Staff/serviced area ratio

|  | 2009   | 2008   | 2007   | 2006   |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Average facility size                        | 40,290 | 38,277 | 37,481 | 36,887 |
| Average staffing level                       | 2.8    | 2.8    | 3.2    | 2.9    |
| Square foot per member of staff              | 14,389 | 13,670 | 11,712 | 12,720 |
|  |        |        |        |        |
| Square foot per member of staff Multiples    | 14,842 | 15,280 | 14,618 | 14,379 |
| Square foot per member of staff Independents | 11,294 | 10,505 | 7,746  | 8,748  |

- Staff in Multiples are being asked to manage more square foot of storage producing greater cost efficiency for these facilities.
- Staff per square foot for Multiples has been fairly consistent over the last four years.



# Average Billed Room Rate

• In 2009, the average billed room rate across the sample as a whole was £20.49 per sq ft. This is compared to £21.08 per sq ft. in 2008, a fall of 2.8%.





Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Trend for lower prices among newer openings

• As seen in the previous year's survey, newer facilities tend to charge lower average room rates, with facilities opened since 2006 charging £18.19, compared to the £23.50 seen among those opened pre-2000. This is to be expected as recently opened facilities are more likely to offer introductory discounts.

|             | Average billed room rate |
|-------------|--------------------------|
|             | £                        |
| Pre 2000    | 23.50                    |
| 2000 - 2002 | 21.43                    |
| 2003 - 2005 | 20.03                    |
| 2006 - 2009 | 18.19                    |
| All         | 20.49                    |

| Figure 38: | Average billed room rate, by year of opening |
|------------|--|
| Figure So. | Average billed room rate, by year or opening |



### London leads the way in terms of pricing

- Reflecting higher living costs, room rates in the South tend to be higher than those in the North or Midlands.
- While this will, to a degree, reflect higher living costs, it also hints at considerably higher levels of demand, and potential for continued expansion as long as suitable sites can be secured at a reasonable cost.
- Billed room rates have held up better in the last year in London (-2.6%) and the South (-1.0%) compared to the Midlands/Wales (-5.5%) and the North (-11.0%).

| Figure 39: | Average billed room rate, by location |
|------------|---------------------------------------|
|            |                                       |

|                           | 2009           | 2008           | 2007           | 2006  |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
|                           |                | Average billed | room rate £    |       |
| London                    | 27.78 (-2.6%)  | 28.52 (+12.5%) | 25.36 (+5.3%)  | 24.08 |
| South                     | 18.82 (-1%)    | 19.01 (+0.1%)  | 18.83 (+10.7%) | 17.00 |
| Northern England/Scotland | 15.61 (-11.0%) | 17.55 (+7.4%)  | 16.34 (+7.5%)  | 15.20 |
| Midlands/Wales            | 15.81(-5.5%)   | 16.74 (-3.3%)  | 17.31 (+8.3%)  | 15.98 |
| All                       | 20.49 (-2.8%)  | 21.08 (+2.2%)  | 20.63 (+5.0%)  | 19.63 |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Multiple pricing reflects southern heartland

- With a large base in London and the South, average rates tend to be higher for those facilities operated by Multiples rather than Independents.
- At the same time Multiple operators have done a better job of controlling billed room rates in the difficult market over the last year, rates only declining 2.7% compared to 9.8% at Independents.

| Figure 40. | Average billed seems note by size of company |
|------------|--|
| Figure 40: | Average billed room rate, by size of company |

|             | 2009          | 2008          | 2007          | 2006  |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
|             |               | Average bille | d room rate £ |       |
| Multiple    | 22.34 (-2.7%) | 22.97 (+3.4%) | 22.21 (+3.4%) | 21.48 |
| Independent | 15.71 (-9.8%) | 17.42 (+4.2%) | 16.71 (+12%)  | 14.91 |
|             |               |               |               |       |
| All         | 20.49 (-2.8%) | 21.08 (+2.2%) | 20.63 (+5.0%) | 19.63 |



# Changes in Empty Room Rates

- 2006 and 2007 saw above inflation price increases by 75% of the facilities surveyed, whilst more than 60% of the facilities managed to push through an above-inflation increase in both 2008 and 2009. The downwards trend has been caused by concerns about affordability, which has been further emphasised in 2009.
- Not withstanding the current environment, the majority of operators are still pushing on empty room rates at the rate of inflation of above.

| Figure 41: | Change in empty room rates |
|------------|----------------------------|
|            | onange in empty room rates |

| Change in empty room rate         | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
|                                   |      | 9    | 6    |      |
| Decrease                          | 7    | 2    | 2    | 0    |
| No change                         | 27   | 22   | 19   | 18   |
| Increase - less than inflation    | 3    | 10   | 3    | 8    |
| Increase - greater than inflation | 63   | 66   | 76   | 74   |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Newer facilities feeling the strain?

• It is interesting to note that almost 60% of the most recently opened facilities have seen an above-inflation increase in 2009. However, 39% have not changed their prices this year. This may well be due to the fact that many of the newer entrants are run by Independents, who must compete with the branding power of Multiples – as seen in later analysis.

### Figure 42: Change in empty room rates, by opening date

| Column %                             | All | 2006 –<br>2009 | 2003 -<br>2005 | 2000 -<br>2002 | Pre 2000 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
|                                      |     |                | %              |                |          |
| Decrease                             | 7   | 3              | 6              | 9              | 14       |
| No change                            | 27  | 39             | 28             | 16             | 20       |
| Increase –<br>less than inflation    | 3   | 1              | 5              | 4              | 2        |
| Increase –<br>greater than inflation | 63  | 58             | 61             | 72             | 64       |



### London companies increase rates most rapidly

- Already charging high room rates, those companies based in London were far more likely than most to have seen an above-inflation increase in empty room rates.
- The pattern is similar to last year's findings, but with a slight slowing down in increases across the country.

| Column %                             | All | South | London | Midlands /<br>Wales | Northern<br>England /<br>Scotland |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                                      |     |       | %      |                     |                                   |
| Decrease                             | 7   | 11    | 4      | 9                   | 4                                 |
| No change                            | 27  | 30    | 5      | 37                  | 44                                |
| Increase –<br>less than inflation    | 3   | 4     | 3      | 0                   | 2                                 |
| Increase –<br>greater than inflation | 63  | 52    | 88     | 54                  | 50                                |

#### Figure 43: Change in empty room rates, by location

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

### Multiples see largest increases in empty room rates

• Independents and smaller chains suffer by comparison to Multiples when it comes to empty room rates. 82% (a reduction from 89% last year) of the latter group had managed to increase rates by above the rate of inflation, compared to just a fifth of the smaller operators. The pattern is the same as last year. This indicates that Multiples continue to be more active with Price Management than Independents.

#### Figure 44: Change in empty room rates, by size of company

| Column %                          | All | Multiple | Independent |
|-----------------------------------|-----|----------|-------------|
|                                   |     | %        |             |
| Decrease                          | 7   | 4        | 14          |
| No change                         | 27  | 12       | 63          |
| Increase - less than inflation    | 3   | 2        | 5           |
| Increase - greater than inflation | 63  | 82       | 18          |



# Additional Information

In the 2009 survey respondents were asked to answer several additional questions in regard to their facilities.

• A large majority of facilities are open for the whole week, with just 24% only opening six days, and 2% open for five days a week.

### Figure 45: Number of days open per week

| Number of days open per week | %    |
|------------------------------|------|
|                              | 2009 |
| 5 days per week              | 2    |
| 6 days per week              | 24   |
| 7 days per week              | 74   |

Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy

• This emphasis on convenient access times is confirmed by the fact that over half offer 24 hour access to facilities.





Source: SSA/Mintel Research Consultancy



• Of those firms that offer 24 hour access, 60% say that the entire site is open 24 hours, while at the other end of the scale, a quarter offer 24 hour access to a 40% or less of the site.

| % of company's stores | % of | % of stores |  |  |
|-----------------------|------|-------------|--|--|
|                       | 2009 | 2008        |  |  |
| 0-20%                 | 13   | 13          |  |  |
| 21-40%                | 15   | 13          |  |  |
| 41-60%                | 4    | 11          |  |  |
| 61-80%                | 2    | 4           |  |  |
| 81-100%               | 65   | 59          |  |  |

### Figure 47: Proportion of facilities that offer 24hr access