

---

(Only 25 percent of households declared that they did not have any of the above)

**b) Usefulness**

Including this kind of question in the Census allows information to be obtained that is very interesting for very small geographical areas, which multiplies the possibility of its practical use in the planning of concrete actions aimed at reducing these problems. This would obviously improve living conditions in the most affected areas. There were certain doubts about including this question in some Censuses because of its subjective nature, but in the first pilot test it has been, without a doubt, the question best accepted by households. For this reason, it has been decided to put this question before others within the ensemble of questions relating to the dwelling in order to improve the overall social acceptance of the questionnaire.

**c) Collection method**

In the household questionnaire, treating each *problem* as a dichotomised sub-variable.

In terms of the choice of *concrete* problems to ask, those that allow the most objective versions have been omitted (for example, lack of space, which could be deduced from the comparison between the number of residents and the area) or those that are difficult to solve via action by Administrations (for example, lack of natural light). In particular, one of the most requested in suggestions arising from the draft was public facilities (schools, hospitals), which will be investigated via the *type of building* variable from the itinerary notebooks (because of the greater objectivity and because it will allow each one to be collected separately)

**d) Detailed formulation**

Does your dwelling have any of the following problems?		
	YES	NO
Outside noise	DI	D6
Pollution or bad smells caused by industry, traffic...	r1	D6
Dirty streets	DI	D6
Lack of green areas (parks, gardens).	)1	D6
Bad communications	DI	D6
Delinquency or vandalism in the area	a1	D6
Lack of toilet facilities (toilet and bath or shower) inside the dwelling	D1	D6

---

## E Characteristics relating to the buildings

Substantial new features are also proposed in this section.

The first, and perhaps the most important, is the **deletion of the specific buildings questionnaire**: once all the information for each building has been examined, it seems more practical to integrate it directly into the Itinerary Notebooks printed beforehand.

As well as being a more flexible process and one that substantially reduces printing costs, this option allows for greater use of the preview information available and as a result, better adaptation of the information in terms of quantity and quality in each geographical area.

Another significant new feature is the **simultaneous collection of population, housing and buildings data**. As well as making the previous link between the housing and buildings data unnecessary (as was done quite successfully, but also with a lot of effort in previous Censuses, where buildings data was collected first, six months before the rest of the data) and removing the difficulties of working with two different Census times (registered buildings, buildings not registered, buildings present in both options, but which can't be distinguished between), significant economies of scale are also achieved. This is done both in the processing as well as in the field work by taking advantage of the inevitable contact with respondents to gather their personal data and the housing data in order to also achieve the buildings data, which cannot be directly filled in by the agents.

The third and final new feature is the **simplification of the information requested**. On the one hand this is the result of better coordination with the housing data and on the other hand, a result of adapting to current information needs, which means that some of the 1990 questions can be withdrawn; this is a consequence both of the almost universality of certain facilities, as well as the existence of the aforementioned *1980 Construction and Housing Statistics* in 1990, which provide complete information on all new constructions and complements the *snapshot* of the latest Censuses.

---

### E.1 YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION

#### a) Usefulness

The age of the building is an essential variable when evaluating the property's assets and a very useful socio-economic indicator (especially for the sampling frameworks, given its huge temporal stability).

#### b) Collection method

Through a mixed variable in the Itinerary Notebooks (the exact year for buildings aged more than 10 years old is difficult to define and not particularly useful; for recent buildings however, it is easy and relevant).

#### c) Clarifications regarding the definitions

The year refers to the *last substantial refurbishment* carried out on the building. Refurbishment is considered to be substantial when the changes made are such that a practically new building has been created (part changes are therefore not included, nor are renovations to the front of the building)

#### d) Detailed formulation

---

### Year of construction

- |                      |                            |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Before 1900       | 6. From 1961 to 1970       |
| 2. From 1900 to 1920 | 7. From 1971 to 1980       |
| 3. From 1921 to 1940 | 8. From 1981 to 1990       |
| 4. From 1941 to 1950 | 9. From 1991 to 2001^ YEAR |
| 5. From 1951 to 1960 |                            |

## E.2 NUMBER OF FLOORS, DWELLINGS AND PREMISES

### a) Usefulness

Absolutely basic buildings characteristics.

### b) Collection method

In the case of number of dwellings and premises, the best way of achieving this is by exploiting the content of the itinerary notebooks, where each *space* is identified for each building, distinguishing between dwellings and premises. In terms of the premises, the occupation status is also identified.

In terms of the number of floors (above or below ground), a more specific question in the itinerary notebooks seems to be more practical.

---

## E.3 TYPE OF BUILDING

### a) Usefulness

This is a basic buildings characteristic, both from an analytical point of view as well as an operational one (buildings used exclusively as family or group dwellings are studied in much greater detail than the rest). In combination with question D.1 on the type of premises, this will allow the identification of buildings used for certain public services (hospitals, schools, cultural facilities). The subsequent integration of this information into a Geographical Information System will allow highly useful spatial analysis to be carried out.

### b) Collection method

In the Itinerary Notebooks as a pre-coded variable.

### c) Clarifications regarding the definitions

The problem with this variable centres on the definition of the main *term*. By applying the recent *Construction Type Classification* (final version dated 16/4/97), attention would have to be paid to the total useful area aimed at residential use and non-residential use; this would imply an understanding of the useful area of each of a buildings' *spaces*. Therefore, the same practical criteria as in the 1990 Buildings Census will be applied, where this variable was achieved by the agent carrying out direct observation.

### d) Detailed formulation

Understanding the type of space (family dwelling, group establishment, active premises, inactive premises) and, in turn, the type of premises, allows us to differentiate between two single types of building:

---

### Type of building

1. **Building (or complex) used exclusively or mainly as family dwellings or group dwellings**
2. **Building (or complex) used exclusively or mainly for purposes that are different from a dwelling**

---

The distinction between the buildings used as family dwellings and those used as collective dwellings will be carried out automatically according to the *type of space* contained in the building. And the different types of non-residential building can also be differentiated using the *type of space and premises* (with the advantage that by studying all spaces and all premises, the public services located in the buildings used mainly as dwellings will be found, which might otherwise have been missed).

**The remaining building variables will only be investigated** in keeping with the 1990 Buildings Census and given the demographic nature of these Censuses, **in keeping with buildings used exclusively or mainly as dwellings.**

---

#### E.4 TYPE OF OWNER:

##### a) Usefulness

This allows us to understand, most interestingly, the number of communities of owners in each area and the characteristics of their buildings.

##### b) Collection method

In the Itinerary Notebooks as a pre-coded variable.

##### c) Detailed formulation

---

#### Type of owner

1. Individual
2. Community of owners
3. Private, non-profit Society or Institution
4. Public Body

#### E.5 STATE OF THE BUILDING

##### a) Usefulness

Allows us to evaluate more precisely the property assets in each area and to detect areas that are in a bad state of urban development preservation.

##### b) Collection method

In the Itinerary Notebooks as a pre-coded variable identical to that used in 1990

##### c) Detailed formulation

---

**State of the building**

1. In ruins
2. Poor
3. With some faults
4. Good

To guarantee intercensus comparability (which is particularly important in a subjective question such as this one), the detailed definition in each category will be the same as in 1990.

---

**E.6 BUILDING FACILITIES AND SERVICES****a) Usefulness**

This complements the question on dwelling facilities and contributes therefore to an understanding of the equipment and to detecting areas where there are significant gaps in terms of dwellings. In fact, many of the facilities that were asked about in 1991 at a dwelling level, will be investigated now, as it is more efficient to do this on a building level.

**b) Collection method**

Using an independent pre-coded sub-variable for each facility investigated

**c) Clarifications regarding the definitions**

The same as for the dwelling facilities: below is a detailed analysis of all the building facilities that were considered:

*Running water*

In 1990, almost 10 percent of buildings had running water from a private supply rather than from a public one. Given that it is interesting to understand how this situation has developed, it seems useful to retain this question.

*Disposal of waste water*

Something similar occurs: in 1990 an insignificant percentage of buildings (around 15 percent and almost all single dwelling buildings) did not dispose of waste into sewer system networks, but rather into septic tanks, wells and rivers. As the development of this data is interesting, the question will remain.

*Electrical energy*

In this case, it is virtually universal and therefore it seems preferable to withdraw the question: the 1990-91 *snapshot* and the subsequent data on new buildings are enough to give us an approximate idea of the volume and location of marginal cases (which are often not due to substandard housing problems, but rather that the electricity network does simply not run close to the building).

*Pipe fed gas*

This moves from the dwelling level, as it is more efficient and of similar usefulness

*Telephone line*

The implementation of new technologies (mobile telephone, Internet) brings the importance of each dwelling having a landline into perspective; for this reason, it seems more efficient to restrict ourselves to investigating whether there is a telephone line in each building or not

#### *Lift*

It is actually more interesting to investigate the *accessibility of the building, rather than whether there is a lift or not*. In particular, a building can be considered to be *accessible* when a person in a wheelchair is able to access the building from the street and enter one of the dwellings without the assistance of another person; moreover, this is investigated in relationship with whether there is a lift or not

#### *Porter's office*

There seems to be enough interest in this question to retain it. In particular, it enables us to understand how many buildings have a person in charge of security, among other things.

#### *Solar energy*

Although its usefulness is recognised on a theoretical level (for being a clean and renewable energy source), both its current degree of penetration and the trends monitored are too insignificant to make its inclusion profitable: the 1990 data and the annual exhaustive flows from the *Construction and Housing Statistics* act perfectly well as a starting point, whilst we wait for technological and administrative improvements (in particular those that develop the recent legislative reforms on an operational level) to give a significant boost to this form of energy (much more common in other European countries with less hours of sun than in Spain).

#### *Central hot water*

This continues to be included; in single dwelling buildings, where the availability of hot water can be investigated.

#### *Garage and number of spaces*

In the dilemma over whether to include this question here, as in 1990, or to move it to the dwelling questionnaire, it seems better to leave it here: faced with doubts over which formulation is more useful, the best option is to choose the cheapest solution and the one that allows for greater intercensus comparison

#### *Central air-conditioning*

Not included: due to its marginal situation, because for the new buildings it is covered exclusively and because it will be included at a dwelling level.

#### *Central heating (and type of fuel)*

These are withdrawn, because in the dwellings questionnaire, this is asked of all dwellings with heating, even if it is a collective dwelling.

#### *Garden, swimming pool, sports facilities, satellite dish and other facilities*

Those that are most necessary for small geographic areas should be available as municipal data and the rest are well covered in sample surveys.

#### **d) Detailed formulation**

The keys for the itinerary notebooks could be:

### Facilities and services

Running water	1. From a public supply 2. From a private supply 3. None available
Central hot water	1. Yes, available 6. None available
Disposal of waste water	1. General sewer system network 2. Other system (septic tank, well). 3. None available
Telephone line	1. Available 6. Not available
Pipe fed gas	1. Yes, available 6. None available
Accessibility	1. Yes, with lift 2. Yes, without lift 3. No, with lift 4. No, without lift
Porter's office	1. Only entry phone 2. Only person in charge 3. Mixed system 4. None available
Garage	1. YES    Number of spaces □□□ NO