ABSTRACT
Methodological challenges in the research on second homes: lessons learned from the Alpine region, Slovenia and the Municipality of Kranjska Gora

The article examines selected methodological challenges in research on second homes, putting into perspective the transnational, national and local levels, with the cases of the Alpine region, Slovenia and the Municipality of Kranjska Gora. The heterogeneity of residential patterns, the dynamic of housing development and the disparities in the terminology limit comparisons at international level. National data on second homes in Slovenia are put in focus of a critical evaluation, as they surprisingly show a decreasing trend in the last two decades, and were recently abolished as a statistical category. The article also discusses the differences of official databases of second homes in the Municipality of Kranjska Gora and addresses potential suggestions for improvement of their quality.
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IZVLEČEK
Metodološki izzivi pri preučevanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč: izkušnje iz alpske regije, Slovenije in Občine Kranjska Gora
V članku smo preučili izbrane metodološke izzive pri preučevanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, pri čemer smo se na primerih alpskega prostora, Slovenije in Občine Kranjska Gora osredinili na problematiko z mednarodne, državne in lokalne ravni. Raznoterost bivalnih vzorcev, dinamika stanovanjskega razvoja in razlike v terminologiji omejujejo natančne primerjave pojava na mednarodni ravni. Kritično so ovrednoteni državni podatki o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih v Sloveniji, saj v zadnjih dveh desetletjih presenetljivo izkazujejo trend zmanjševanja, pred kratkim pa so bili ukinjeni kot statistična kategorija. Članek obravnava tudi razlike med uradnima zbirkama podatkov o počitniških bivališčih na območju Občine Kranjska Gora in razpravlja o možnih predlogih za izboljšanje njihove kakovosti.
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1 Introduction

Second homes are attracting research interest in a wide variety of disciplines, such as tourism and leisure mobility studies (Hall and Müller 2004), anthropology, urban and regional planning, land use policy (Gallent and Tewdwr-Jones 2000), housing studies (Paris 2009), rural geography (Pacione 1984), demography and migration (Casado-Diaz 1999), economy, and environmental studies. Research can have various objectives, including a better understanding of the spatial distribution of their development (Sonderegger and Bätzing 2013) and origins, the motives and the changing practices of their owners or residents (Sarman and Czarnecki 2020), the role of second homes in tourism (Machiavelli 2011; Blondy, Vacher and Vye 2016), their perception and interest for local stakeholders (Gerber and Tanner 2018), and also their diverse effects on the territories in economic, environmental, and social terms (Coppock 1977; Gosar 1989; Roca 2013; Cretton, Boscoboinik and Friedli 2020). Controversies surrounding second homes about the pressure they exert on the environment (Koderman 2017), public service providers (Larsson and Müller 2019) and on the real estate available for permanent purposes prompts renewed research to report their consequences over time (Paris 2009; Müller and Hoogendoorn 2013; Carrosio, Magnani and Osti 2019). However, while the nature of the effects can be listed, they are often difficult to measure in any tangible way as well as to assess the exact number of second homes in a given area. One of the main reasons for this is the deficiency to define what a second home is in all its dimensions and features of users.

Despite the abundance of research works on the phenomenon of second homes, there is still no scientific consensus on the definition of a second home (Hall and Müller 2004; Stock 2006; Elmi and Perlik 2014; Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez and Such-Devesa 2018). The diversity of morphological, legal, and residential uses of second homes puts researchers at an impasse on the possibilities of establishing a universal definition. The heterogeneity of administrative and tax definitions around the world also reflects the complexity of this residential dwelling (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin and Daneshpour 2023). The terminological disparities for second homes in the statistical institutes of different countries are evident and require in-depth focus prior to any further analysis.

In view of these issues, we present a discussion of methodological challenges and possibilities for observing the phenomenon in question, with the benefit of hindsight from the research carried out and the data available for transnational, national and local area cases. What are the methodological challenges when observing second homes? Are we in a position to monitor the development of second homes more accurately at local level than at national or international level?

We have identified three particularly interesting contextual facts that have led us to focus our research on the Alpine region, Slovenia and the Municipality of Kranjska Gora to discuss methodological challenges from the transnational to national and local level in this paper. The first part of the paper puts into perspective the qualitative limitations of available data on second homes at the international level of the Alpine Region. The second part presents several methodological challenges of the research on the second homes in Slovenia, while the third part focuses on the Municipality of Kranjska Gora and analyses the contradictory estimates based on different data sources at the local level. Lessons learned from the studied cases led to consider possible methodological changes in the process of registration of second homes, which would contribute to reducing the possibility of inadequate monitoring of this phenomenon.

2 Methodology

The method of analysis of relevant literature and sources, as well as administrative regulations in the field of second homes were used in the article. By obtaining information from data providers on the used definitions of second home and the methods of data collection, we assessed their quality by
focusing on second home categories, as well as temporal and spatial uncertainties in their registration (Visser et al. 2006; Brennen et al. 2017). We have performed a spatial analysis of the statistical data by using a geographic information system (software QGIS 3.16). Some of the analysed databases on second homes were obtained on request from the Statistical office of the Republic of Slovenia (statistical data on second homes on the settlement level and explanations about the methodology of registration of second homes) and the Municipality of Kranjska Gora (database of second home owners and co-owners).

3 Selected challenges in the research on second homes

We have encountered several challenges regarding the research on second homes in the Alpine areas; they are discussed on transnational, national and local level.

3.1 Definition of a second home in the light of the transnational comparative analysis in the area of the Alpine region

The term second home covers a wide range of meanings (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin and Daneshpour 2023). In different academic fields, second home is commonly used to refer to leisure residences, recreational homes, holidays homes, family properties, summer homes, seasonal homes (Coppock 1977; Roca 2013; Sonderegger and Bätzing 2013), as well as weekend homes or multilocal residences (Stock 2006; Duchêne-Lacroix, Hilti and Schad 2013). Consequently, second home can be characterized by at least three aspects:

• by a diversity of morphology: a flat in a tourist condominium complex, a luxurious chalet, a family house, a subdivision house, a cottage, an apartment in holiday village club (Norris and Winston 2010);
• by different legal status: a freehold, a joint property, a usufruct in property, a real estate investment shareholding, a time-sharing property, a long-term lease (Paris 2011);
• by various types of dwelling uses: for personal leisure time, for family reunion, for rental of tourist furnished accommodation, for rental to seasonal workers, for friends and relatives visiting tourism, as an unoccupied or abandoned home. This dwelling use can be changing in the life course of the owners, for example, people can retire and would then mainly stay at their previous vacation residence (»second home«) and only use their previous main residence in the city for visits by their adult children (Müller and Hoogendoorn 2013; Roca 2013; Elmi and Perlik 2014).

Several researchers have identified a fragmentation of research currents on the debated topic, which can be divided into two concepts: second homes and residential tourism, which are nevertheless attributed to a partially or totally overlapping phenomenon (Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez and Such-Devesa 2018; Müller and Hall 2018). Some results of empirical studies on the emerging mobile society even argue that it is difficult to dissociate the main residence from the second home (Müller 2020). A systematic review of the research suggests that a more flexible concept of the definition of a second home is worth considering, where categories or sub-categories of these homes should be defined and overbroad definitions should be avoided (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin and Daneshpour 2023). Researchers of second homes have noted that when a person lives in multiple areas, multiple living spaces are formed, thereby establishing what is known as a multilocal lifestyle (Stock 2006; Duchêne-Lacroix, Hilti and Schad 2013; Weichhart and Rumpolt 2015). In practice, an individual’s multilocal living consists of living in several dwelling locations, which are perceived as a cumulative living space. The second home can be perceived as one form of multilocal dwelling (Borsdorf 2014). However, multilocal dwelling is not necessarily related with multiple ownership of several residential units since it describes the cyclic residential lifestyle more than ownership (Duchêne-Lacroix, Hilti and Schad 2013). Owner that puts his secondary residential property under long-term rental is not a multilocal dweller. This phenomenon
may concern the owners of second homes as well as the inhabitants. Such multilocal lifestyle is expected in the future to strengthen among residents as the clear separation between the workplace and leisure in terms of housing location can be blurred, and the two functions can also be merged nowadays with remote working possibilities (Perlik 2011; Duchêne-Lacroix, Hilti and Schad 2013; Müller and Hoogendoorn 2013; Roca 2013; Weichhart and Rumpolt 2015).

Due to the complexity of forms, legal statuses and uses of second homes, researchers often face a lack of harmonized and accurate statistical data. Several studies also expose the limitations of census and tax data on second homes (Sonderegger and Bätzing 2013; Borsdorf 2014; Blondy, Vacher and Vye 2016; Carrosio Magnani and Osti 2019; Back 2020). The discrepancy between declarative statistical categories and actual use of second homes is difficult to determine by statistical data collection, and even less likely to be regularized by statistical adjustment methods. Variations in individual residential choices, practices, lifestyles from the time a building permit is issued and to building’s subsequent use can affect the reliability of information provided by homeowners to the relevant institutions, as administrative residential declarations might also be driven in view of tax benefits (Sonderegger and Bätzing 2013; Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez and Such-Devesa 2018).

If we look at the definitions of second homes used by statistical offices and administrative bodies in the area of the Alps, whether for property taxation or land-use planning purposes, we can observe several differences (Czarnecki and Frenkel 2015). In some cases, second homes are defined indirectly by public authorities, focusing on any dwelling that is not an individual’s principal residence, while such differences in definitions significantly affect the way data is collected. The list of the existing definitions of a second home in the Alpine region is presented in the Table 1.

These discrepancies do not enable a harmonised quantitative comparative analysis across the Alpine region. Even within one Alpine country, different definitions co-exist depending on regional state authorities (for example in Austria) or between tax administration and statistic national offices (for example in France, Germany, and Slovenia).

Sonderegger and Bätzing (2013) attempted to quantify second homes in the Alpine region and have developed a comprehensive overview of the phenomenon. In their research, they estimated that a total of 1,850,000 second homes were officially recorded in 2012 (26% of the total housing stock). The published figures are estimated by own calculations (for Italy), by rounding up past dwelling stock (for Germany and Austria), or by applying the percentage growth of macro-regional trends for second homes between 2000 and 2011 (for France and Slovenia). The updated estimates in the Table 3 below were calculated by compiling the number of second homes registered per municipality within the Alpine Convention perimeter on the basis of available national censuses between 2011 and 2022 (except Liechtenstein, Monaco and Germany, where the data are not available for the debated period). The data for Italy remains an estimate based on the subtraction of unoccupied conventional housing from the total number of dwellings. The German and Slovenian censuses identify vacation homes, but do not include private tourist rentals, which are not operated by professional companies. The compilation of census data per municipalities available from 2011 to 2017 provides an estimate of 2.6 million second homes (excluding Lichtenstein), compared with 1.8 million in 2012, according to estimates by Sonderegger and Bätzing (2013) for the same area covered by the Alpine Convention.

Table 1: Various definitions of a second home according to statistical offices or public administrations in the Alpine countries (except Liechtenstein and Monaco) (sources: Federal Office... 2010; Statistisches... 2011; Federal Department... 2012; German... 2013; Swiss... 2015; Landesrecht... 2016; Zakon... 2018; Statistik... 2021; Institut... 2021; Istituto... 2021; Žnidarič and Miklič 2022; Code... 2023; Agenzia... 2023; Federal Statistical... 2023; Statistični... 2023b). ► pages 38–39
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Definition of a second home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Austria     | **Statistical definition:** A residence that is not a main residence domicile. A person may establish any number of additional residences establish.  
**Regional definition (example of the Tyrolean Planning Act):** Recreational residences are buildings, flats or other parts of buildings which are not used to satisfy a living need related to the centre of living relations throughout the year, but which are used to stay during holidays, weekends or otherwise temporarily for rest purposes. |
| France      | **Statistical definition:** A second home is a dwelling used for short stays (weekends, leisure or holidays). Furnished accommodation rented for tourist stays is also classified as a second home.  
**Definition for the purpose of taxation:** A secondary residence is a furnished premise used for accommodation and not permanently occupied. |
| Germany     | **Statistical definition:** Holiday and leisure accommodation in which people spend their free time (e.g., at weekends, on a holiday). It can be used by a private owner himself or be permanently rented to a third party for leisure use (or made available to him free of charge). Holiday dwellings that are permanently rented on a commercial basis are excluded.  
**Definition for the purpose of residency registration and second home tax (the so called: Zweitwohnungsteuer):** If a resident has multiple residences in Germany, one of these residences shall be his or her principal residence. The principal residence shall be the residence used most by the resident. All other residences of the resident shall be considered as secondary residences. |
| Italy       | **No statistical definition.**  
**No definition for the purpose of taxation.** |
| Slovenia    | **Statistical definition:** An apartment that is used occasionally or for several months of the year for rest and recreation or is used only occasionally.  
**For the purposes of the Act on promoting the development of tourism of Slovenia, which enables municipality to adopt tourist tax:** A holiday home or holiday apartment is a residential building or apartment used for seasonal or occasional residence and not occupied by registered permanent residents or rented out, where such rental is properly reported to the competent tax authority. |
| Switzerland | **No statistical definition.**  
**Definition for the purpose of Federal law on secondary residences (in force since 1 January 2016):** Any property that is not considered as a principal residence is de facto a second home. |
Additional information

This definition refers to the Building and Housing Census of Austria. However, the terms *Zweitwohnsitz* or *Nebenwohnsitz* are commonly used.

Federal states of Austria can legislate and specify the definition of a second home, to which they then apply their spatial planning regulatory policies.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between occasional accommodation and second homes, which is why the two categories are often grouped together by the French statistical office.

Second homes are identified on the basis of their liability to council tax. Furnished tourist accommodation is not taken into account for council tax if it is registered as a business holding.

The German Statistical Office defines holiday or leisure homes, but not second homes.

Municipalities may levy a second home tax. In accordance with the case law of the Federal Constitutional Court, second homes of married couples who do not live permanently separately are exempted from the second home tax under certain conditions.

The Population and Housing Census does not survey second homes but only occupied and unoccupied conventional dwellings.

The tax administration defines the main residence which benefit of tax advantages to additional homes. Principal dwelling is defined as the real estate unit in which the taxpayer and members of his or her household habitually reside. Additional accommodations can be entitled to Real Estate Tax exemption if it is the registered main residence of one of the spouses.

Instead of second homes, the statistical office uses the following terminology: vacation, seasonal or secondary accommodation.

Furnished accommodation rentals are not included in this definition.

The term *second home* is not used in the official Swiss statistics. In the 2000 population census, the Swiss Federal Statistical Office distinguished between permanently occupied, temporarily inhabited and empty dwellings.

The second homes includes:
- short-term rental accommodation, with or without hotel services;
- accommodation temporarily occupied by the owner or tenant;
- unoccupied holiday homes;
- habitable accommodation that has not been permanently occupied for more than two years.
An observation over relative similar data sources (the censuses of each country of the Alpine Convention) on a more recent period highlights a significant increase in the total number of second homes over than 3.7 million if we assume that the number in next censuses of Germany and Monaco will not decrease. This rise in the total number of second homes in the Alpine region is fuelled by growths in every Alpine country, except for Slovenia (the reasons for the decline in the number of these dwellings in Slovenia are explained in the following section of the paper). Austria is facing the biggest increase in the number of second homes, followed by Italy when France and Switzerland have more modest increase. If we would consider the estimate numbers per countries previously published by Sonderegger and Bätzing (2013) for 2012, we could interpret a drastic two-fold increase in approximately a decade. A doubling in the number of second homes in the last decade seems unlikely, given the spikes in second-home construction periods reported in the literature in different Alpine Area (Gosar 1989; Macchiavelli 2011; Delorme 2014; Koderman 2017; Gerber and Tanner 2018). This discrepancy in assessment between two estimations methods is nonetheless very significant, and calls into question our ability to accurately estimate the number of second homes, based on the availability of data and given definitions.

Another dilemma in comparisons of data on second homes is the time lag in data collection and publication between statistical offices of the Alpine nation, as shown in the Table 2. This fact does not allow a simultaneous comparative approach in the same year.

Finally, we can highlight another methodological challenge that prevents a comprehensive comparison of second home data at international level. Although second homes may be subject to strict regulation and their development is closely monitored by public institutions, the possibilities of control remain insufficient due to private use (Borsdorf 2014). The existing public statistical data on second homes do not provide information on their use as it’s difficult to detect usage on private property. Several

Table 2: Number of second homes in the Alpine Convention countries from 2011 to the most recent census available (* excluding the data from Lichtenstein; ** excluding the data from Germany, Lichtenstein and Monaco) (sources: Censimento... 2011; 2021; Registri... 2011; Wohnungen... 2011; Nebenwohnsitzfälle... 2013; 2022; Recensement... 2015; 2018; 2022; Inventaire... 2017; 2023; Statistični... 2023b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities within the Alpine Convention perimeter</th>
<th>Number of second homes Data</th>
<th>The year of the census</th>
<th>Number of second homes Data</th>
<th>The year of the census</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>410,409</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>966,842</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>235.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>566,332</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>612,222</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>108.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>22,605</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>To be published in 2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,226,289</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,708,203</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>139.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8,862</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8,043</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>375,763</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>387,060</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>103.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>To be published in 2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL for the Alpine Convention</td>
<td>2,611,048*</td>
<td>3,682,370**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
researchers have therefore made their own estimated calculations and conclude that qualitative empirical research remains crucial to better understand second homes as a multilocal lifestyle (Sonderegger and Bätzing 2013; Borsdorf 2014). Researchers can also estimate second home numbers by deducting the known permanent dwelling from the dataset (Carrosio, Magnani and Osti 2019).

The Figure 1 shows trends in the changes of second homes by municipality in the Alpine Convention perimeter. As the observed periods vary between countries, the percentage of change has been annualized based on census data collected between 2011 and 2023. A green gradient indicates growing annual number of second homes while red shows their stagnation or decline.

From Figure 1 we can see that there are some differences between the Alpine Convention’s countries, with a general decline in the number of second homes in Slovenian municipalities, and an increase in Austria and Italy, which seems to be most pronounced in the southern Tyrol. The spatial distribution of increases in France is much more contrasted. Increases tend to be concentrated in the heart of the mountain ranges and decreases in the western plains.

A comparative approach to the changes in the number of second homes in the Alpine region has proven to be a difficult task as we had to ignore some differences in the data. However, a similar comparison of their shares in the total housing stock of municipalities would not be feasible since they do not incorporate the same types of real estate, while multiplication of data sources could increase the bias and unreliability of results. However, shares can be observed on a country-wide scale, based on a common methodological framework for collecting statistical data, as also shown below for Slovenia.

### 3.2 Changes in the registration methods of second homes in Slovenia

According to Jeršič (1968, 54), second homes first appeared in the alpine region of Slovenia, particularly in the picturesque mountainous areas of Bled and Bohinj, while in other parts of the country such objects were virtually unknown before the Second World War. They have become more common since the 1950s, when this phenomenon started spreading to many other holiday, health and tourist resorts, such as Jezersko, Trška Gora, Piran, Rakitna, Gorenja vas, Kamniška Bistrica (Gosar 1987, 184). Second homes were for the first time officially registered in the data collecting category in the Census of 1971, when there was a total of 4,281 second homes recorded on the territory of Slovenia, what represented a modest 0.9% of the total housing stock of the country (Opačić and Koderman 2016). The second home phenomenon slowly gained momentum during the 1960s, when the construction of such dwellings spread from the popular resorts to other areas of the Slovene countryside, while the distance between the first and second home typically remained small enough to allow daily migration. The 1970s were characterized by an increasing number of individuals who wanted to spend their free time in their second homes and used them to cultivate gardens, vineyards and orchards in their surroundings. During the 1970s and 1980s, second homes have become an integral part of the Slovene cultural landscape as they represented 3.2% of the total housing stock in 1981 (a total of 18,965 such dwelling were recorded this year) (Opačić and Koderman 2016) and could be found also in the wine-producing regions in the Pannonian and Dinaric regions (Gosar 1987, 188).

After the disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1991, the newly formed independent state of the Republic of Slovenia entered a period of transition from a centrally planned to a free market economy (Bole 2008; Nared et al. 2020). During the 1990s, the beginning of the process of privatization and increased foreign investment started and tourism became one of the main pillars of the national economy (Opačić and Koderman 2018). In 1991, the number of second homes in Slovenia reached 26,374 units and represented 3.9% of the total housing stock.

*Figure 1: Average annual percentage in changes of second homes in the municipalities within the Alpine Convention perimeter based on the available census periods from 2011 to 2023 (as the observed periods vary between countries (Table 2), the change was calculated on a yearly average basis).*
A decade later in 2002, there were a total of 31,681 second homes in Slovenia, which accounted 4.1% of the total housing stock. This was the last terrain census of buildings, dwellings and population; in 2011 the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia conducted a register-based census by using the Register of Real Estate, maintained by the Surveying and Mapping Authority of the Republic of Slovenia, as well as the Central Register of Population and the Register of Households, which are both maintained by the Ministry of Interior Affairs. In the 2011 census, the share of second homes dropped to only 2.5% (only 20,740 dwellings were registered as second homes). This decline can mostly be attributed to the different methodology used by the Statistical Office, according to which almost 4,000 buildings that were categorized as second homes in the Register of Real Estate, were later declared as permanent residences of at least one person. Consequently, these dwellings have been categorized as primary residences, not as second homes. Moreover, the analysis by the Statistical Office also shows that many of the objects that were categorized as second homes in 2002, have had their categorization changed to vineyard cottages (especially in the regions of Pomurje and Southeastern Slovenia) (Koderman 2017). Similar census of buildings and dwellings was also conducted in the years 2015 and 2018, were a decreasing trend of the number of second homes and the share of them in the total housing stock is visible: in 2018, only 2.3% of the housing stock was officially registered for second home use on the national level. This fact may come as a surprise, especially if we have a closer look at the growing trend of population and number of dwellings in general (Table 3), not to mention the growth of Slovenia's Gross Domestic Product, which has almost doubled in the debated period from 2002 and 2018 (Statistični ... 2023a).

As Figure 2 shows, the municipalities with the highest share of second homes in their housing stock in 2018 where partly located in the Triglav National Park in northwestern Alpine region of Slovenia (Kranjska Gora, Bohinj and Bovec). Second homes were, however, also present in the housing stock of some of the municipalities in eastern and southeastern Slovenia, which are known for their health (Podčetrtek, Zreče) or seaside resorts (Piran and Ankaran). Other, smaller municipalities (Kostel, Jezersko, Ribnica na Pohorju) also show a significant proportion of holiday units, however, it should be noted that these municipalities have a low number of residential units (less than 1000) in general.

Table 3: Number of dwellings and second homes and share of second homes in the total housing stock in Slovenia between 1971 and 2018 (sources: Popis stanovništva ... 1972; 1984; Popis prebivalstva ... 1993; 2003; Registrski ... 2011; Statistični ... 2023b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Base index</th>
<th>Number of dwellings</th>
<th>Base index</th>
<th>Number of second homes</th>
<th>Base index</th>
<th>Share (%) of second homes in total housing stock</th>
<th>Base index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,727,137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>471,076</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,891,864</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>585,780</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>18,965</td>
<td>443.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>356.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,913,355</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>683,137</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>26,374</td>
<td>616.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>424.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,964,036</td>
<td>113.7</td>
<td>777,772</td>
<td>165.1</td>
<td>31,681</td>
<td>740.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>448.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,050,186</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>844,656</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td>20,740</td>
<td>484.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>270.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,066,880</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>852,181</td>
<td>180.9</td>
<td>19,896</td>
<td>464.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>255.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Municipalities in Slovenia with the highest share of second homes in the total housing stock in 2018. ➤ page 44
When analysing data on the number of second homes, presented in Table 3, the year 2018 represents an important turning point, as this is the last year, when the data on the second home phenomenon were still available to potential researchers. In 2021, when the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia conducted the register *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings* again, data on second homes were no longer recorded. The main reason for this decision of the Statistical Office was the abolition of the second home category in the Real Estate Register, in which this data had been poorly maintained for several years (Žnidaršič and Miklič 2022). The term *poor maintenance* refers to non-existence of concrete mechanism or regulation on national level to persuade the owners of the second homes to formally register their dwelling for holiday purposes. The owners of second homes could have done such registration voluntarily, thus many of them avoided to do the registration for speculative motives, especially after the announcement of the real estate tax in 2008 (which otherwise did not materialize) (Pahor 2008). After a decade of observation, the official manager of the register, the Surveying and Mapping Authority of the Republic of Slovenia, decided not to keep the record of this data any longer, and as a result, the Statistical Office also cancelled the registration of this data (Miklič 2023).

Until 2018, the Statistical Office extracted data on the potential second home use of the dwellings from the Real Estate Register and analysed it together with data from the Central Population Register, since according to the methodology for the *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings*, inhabited dwellings (for at least one year) are considered as ordinary inhabited apartments and not second homes. However, as already mentioned, in the 2021 census, these data, which are otherwise optional for the census, are no longer collected due to the abolition of this category in the Real Estate Register (Miklič 2023). Slovenia thus became one of the countries in the European Union where data on the number, size and distribution of second homes are no longer recorded.

### 3.3 Discrepancies between municipal and national data on second homes – the case of Municipality of Kranjska Gora

In Slovenia, the municipal tourist tax system is divided into two categories between owner-occupiers and owner-renters of tourist rentals. Apart from the data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, this municipal tax system provides another important data source, which is based only on owner-occupiers, who are subject to annual taxation. However, there are some exceptions from the tourist tax for those owners of vacation homes, who have their permanent residence in the Municipality of Kranjska Gora, as well as for vacation apartments, which are unfit for habitation, and also for owners with disabilities (Zakon ... 2018). Therefore, the figures in a municipal database cannot be considered for observation directly, as some second home owners are not affected by the tax and are consequently excluded from the database. One dwelling can also be the subject of several independent tax payers, if the property is shared among multiple owners or when the owner is changing during a year. The use of municipal database therefore requires reprocessing to eliminate duplicates, but it still represents a reliable and updated data source, which was used in several studies on second home phenomena (for example: Koderman and Salmič 2013; Salmič and Koderman 2013; Koderman 2014). For the purpose of this study, the process of pre-screening of the data valid as of December 31, 2022 was done to avoid double counting of dwellings, when transactions occurred during the year and when one dwelling is shared by several owners. The processed data of the municipal database are presented together with the data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia in the Table 4.

According to public data from the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, the Municipality of Kranjska Gora experienced a slight decrease in the number of second homes in 2018 with 961 dwellings, compared to 983 registered in 2011. From 2002 to 2018, most settlements in the municipality recorded a moderate increase in the number of second homes, with the exception of Belca, Srednji vrh and Zgornja Radovna, where there was a slight increase in the number of dwellings, while their number was generally low (Table 4).
Table 4: Changes in number of second home per settlement in the Municipality of Kranjska Gora (sources: Popis prebivalstva... 2003; Registriški... 2011; Občinski... 2023; Statistični... 2023c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Number of second homes</th>
<th>Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia</th>
<th>Database of second home owners of the Municipality of Kranjska Gora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belca</td>
<td>2 100.0 2 100.00 1 50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovje</td>
<td>8 100.0 13 162.50 8 61.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozd Martuljek</td>
<td>93 100.0 120 129.03 113 94.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranjska Gora</td>
<td>581 100.0 694 119.45 688 99.14 1,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log</td>
<td>7 100.0 15 214.29 12 80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojstrana</td>
<td>23 100.0 29 126.09 25 86.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podkoren</td>
<td>26 100.0 64 246.15 72 112.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rateče</td>
<td>15 100.0 14 93.33 17 121.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srednji Vrh</td>
<td>9 100.0 8 88.89 6 75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zgornja Radovna</td>
<td>24 100.0 24 100.00 19 79.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of second homes in the Municipality of Kranjska Gora</td>
<td>788 100.0 983 124.75 961 97.76 1,426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>5,247 100.0 5,302 101.04 5,212 98.30</td>
<td>Unsuitable comparison due to different data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of dwellings in the Municipality of Kranjska Gora</td>
<td>3,023 100.0 3,764 124.51 3,912 103.93</td>
<td>Unsuitable comparison due to different data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of second homes (%)</td>
<td>26.07 100.0 26.10 100.12 24.60 94.25</td>
<td>Unsuitable comparison due to different data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we compare the number of second homes in 2018 (961), provided by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, with the database of the tourist taxpayers (owners and co-owners of second homes) of the Municipality of Kranjska Gora in 2022 (1416) (Table 4), we can observe a difference of 455 second homes. Although the number cannot be directly compared due to the different year of registration, it can be assumed that the number of second homes in the database of Statistical Office from 2018 is underestimated. Reasons for this anomaly can be found in the same facts that were described in the previous chapter from the national level. The consideration of this paradox can be reinforced by the growing number of dwellings for permanent users (their number has increased for almost 4% in the same period), while the population slightly decreased over the same period.

This comparison of figures from two different databases puts into perspective the methodological approaches of registration of second homes in the same area. Both databases present official and representative estimate, collected with a valid methodology. Each database has its limitations, which do not appear to be marginal, since the observed results are significantly different.

4 Discussion

Several methodological challenges have been identified in this research on second homes depending on the geographical level of case studies. These challenges do not only concern research, since public statistics provides several baseline indicators to support decision-making for administrative management of second homes, particularly for town planning, tax policy and tourism (Roca 2013; Czarnecki and Frenkel 2015). However, the reliability of the existing data for potential transnational, national or even local management is questionable from several aspects. Definitions frame the method of data collection and can create various estimations of the number of second homes for a same study area, depending on the adopted research approach and related data sources, as shown by the cases observed in this paper. Moreover, the complex and heterogeneous residential behaviour of second home owners and users revealed by empirical studies has proven that one needs to be cautious when observing quantitative statistical data (Coppock 1977; Hall and Müller 2004; Paris 2009; Blondy, Vacher and Vye 2016; Bausch 2017; Cretton, Boscoboinik and Friedli 2020). The term second home is not suitable to address potential owner of three or more »homes« and indicates the ranking of different homes when they might have all specific functions or ties from the owner’s perspective. The term multiple homes was already claimed by Chris Paris (2011) to make up for the linguistic shortcomings of the notion of secondary residence.

Multi-property ownership does not presume residential use to be distributed among all properties as a multilocal dwelling. Some of the properties may be used rarely or even be vacant, and their order (first, second, third, etc.) makes it impossible to know the owners’ locations for permanent or secondary use.

The versatility of the choice of multilocal dwellers in their declarations and practices is also to be perceived as possible bias of interpretations, and enhances the need of renewed empirical approach (Stock 2006; Duchênes-Lacroix, Hilti and Schad 2013). Finally, a case study on the mountainous areas of Friuli-Venezia Giulia tempers the assessment of second homes owners who may be considered as equal seasonal residents (Jelen et al. 2022). The second home may also represent a temporary residential status in the residential migration process of new highlanders (Norris and Winston 2010). In addition to the previous findings, Müller and Hall (2018) have warned about the limitations of the projected second homes development, when important societal change occurs (such as the rise of teleworking, climate change and increased mobility).

It therefore seems essential to discuss the prospects for approaching second homes in the research field but also public management, starting by matching definitions with the corresponding methods and observation capacities. In 2005, Guizzardi (2005) explored the accuracy of a new methodology to monitor second homes occupancy. He analysed the electricity consumption of second homes in a case
study of the region of Emilia Romagna (Italy). By calculations based on the data of electricity consumption, he obtained a number of second home visitors close to the official statistics from municipal assessments. In 2022, the Municipality of les Deux Alpes in the French Alps designed a similar method for identification of second homes by scanning the water consumption data.

These data sourcing protocols state the real estate occupancy but they do not inform on the user’s motives and types of use of second homes comprehensively. Motives and type of use might be connected with a diverse range of activities, such as leisure, remote work, seasonal work, family gathering, renting, a financial investment, seasonal dwelling or no use at all. The French national statistical office observed temporary population gains in the French Alpine areas with a high rate of second homes, based on estimates linked to mobile phone data during the first lockdown of the COVID-19 crisis in 2020 (INSEE 2020). This data source provided an insight of occupancy of these dwellings, but retains a large margin of error due to numerous variables, such as the mobility of the permanent population and differences in personal phone use, which can modify the volume of overall phone activity (Ziliang et al. 2016). Steinicke, Čede and Löffer (2012) used diversified techniques for data acquisition to observe migration and demographic change in the Italian Alps through aerial photographs, remote-sensing images, land use mapping and empirical studies to verify the results of statistical interpretation. Methods with monitoring of electricity consumption, drinking water, mobile phone activity, remote sensing images, and land use mapping have certain potential for estimation of overall occupancy of users in their second homes. However, real time knowledge of the occupancy rate does not allow us to confirm if the real estate is second home.

![Figure 3: Theoretical approach to residential ownership monitoring in different municipalities.](image-url)
or not. Moreover, the quality of data sourcing differs from one municipality to another depending on the capacities and reliability of public service organization.

Based on the lessons learned from the discussed cases in this paper and the state of the art of new approaches, we designed a theoretical approach, which incorporates the identified patterns in the ownership of second homes from the municipal, national, and even transnational level (Figure 3). This approach assumes that some individuals own multiple dwellings, which they use as first, second or even third home, and might practice commuting between several dwellings. For this reason, the municipality cannot have an overall view of the individual’s potential multi-property ownership situation. If a second home owner declares that his main residence is in the municipality A, the municipal authorities cannot identify if this owner has a second home outside of this municipality. The diagram in the Figure 3 shows the need for coordination at national level, where spatial distribution of individual’s housing stock would be more efficiently visible. Such monitoring of individual’s property on a national level already exists in several countries including Slovenia, however, it is only used to keep a record of person’s tax records. Distinguishing between one’s single and multiple dwellings or properties on a local level would give municipalities a better understanding of the presence of second home users throughout the year and enable them more adequate estimation of public services in relation to the population’s presence or absence. Improvement of these estimations would be very beneficial especially for municipalities in popular tourist destinations with high share of second homes.

We propose to identify the extent of family’s or individual’s properties through a bottom-up approach, based on cross-referencing of the data at national level. Such database could be established by compiling of the data collected by the municipalities, when they gather information to collect local tourist taxes, and combining and connecting them with national Real Estate Register. This proposed approach could then serve as a monitoring tool for the public authorities.

Concerning the transnational level of second homes, temporal, categorical, and spatial methodological limitations of the data could be reduced with coordinated approaches and methods of the data providers. Data quality in this field could be drastically improved through harmonization of the metadata frame among the Alpine countries (or the European Union) and their statistical offices.

5 Conclusion

In the article, we identified three methodological challenges at the international, national and local level that have an impact on the study of the phenomenon of second homes:

• Inconsistent definitions of second homes between national authorities and statistical offices in the case of countries in the Alpine region: Sonderegger and Bätzing (2013) study identified the characteristics and trends of the development of second homes in the Alpine area, and when carrying out a comparative analysis ten years later, we were confronted with problems arising from various inconsistencies in data collection.

• Changes in the methods for monitoring data on second homes: in contrast to other countries in the Alpine region, Slovenia has been experiencing a decline in the number of second homes for almost two decades, even though the number of inhabitants, the number of dwellings and the value of GDP per capita have been increasing over the same period. Changes in methodology and poor data maintenance in the category of second homes have led the Surveying and Mapping Authority of the Republic of Slovenia to abolish this category in the Real Estate Register in 2018, and consequently the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia has also abandoned the recording of this data.

• Discrepancies between municipal and national data on second homes: the example of the Municipality of Kranjska Gora showed discrepancies in the data on the number of second homes, which are derived from two public data registers.
Based on the findings of previous research and the methodological challenges presented, the paper formulates a theoretical approach that would allow obtaining more accurate estimates of the number of secondary dwellings. Combining the datasets from the tax and property registers at municipal and national level could help to distinguish between single and multiple property ownership. At the same time, it was proposed to harmonise definitions and synchronise the data framework at international level, which would improve the possibilities for further research in the field of second homes.
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METODOLOŠKI IZZIVI PRI PREUČEVANJU SEKUNDARNIH POČITNIŠKIH BIVALIŠČ: IZKUŠNJE IZ ALPSKE REGIJE, SLOVENIJE IN OBČINE KRANJSKA GORA

1 Uvod


Kljub številnim raziskavam o pojavu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč še vedno ni znanstvenega soglasja o njihovi definiciji (Hall in Müller 2004; Stock 2006; Elmi in Perlik 2014; Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez in Such-Devesa 2018). Zaradi morfoloških raznolikosti, različnih zakonskih opredelitev in stanovanjskih oblik uporabe sekundarnih počitniških bivališč so raziskovalci neenotni pri oblikovanju univerzalne definicije, kompleksnost pojavu pa se zrcali tudi v heterogenosti upravnih in davčnih definicij (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin in Daneshpour 2023). Terminološka razhajanja za opredelitve sekundarne počitniškega bivališča v statističnih uradih različnih držav so nedvomno izrazita in zahtevajo poglajenje preučitev pred nadaljnjim analizo.

Glede na navedena dejstva v nadaljevanju predstavljamo razpravo o metodoloških izzivih in možnosti opazovanja obravnavanega pojava, pri čemer izhajamo iz preteklih raziskav in razpoložljivih podatkov na mednarodni, državni in lokalni ravni. Kakšni so torej metodološki izzivi pri spremljanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč? Ali lahko na lokalni ravni natančneje opazujemo razvoj sekundarnih počitniških bivališč kot na državni ali mednarodni ravni?

Da bi osvetlili metodološke izzive od mednarodne do državne in lokalne ravni smo se v prispevku osredotočili na tri posebej zanimiva vsebinska izhodišča in raziskavo usmerili na območje Alp, Slovenijo in Občino Kranjska Gora. V prvem delu prispevka so predstavljene kvalitativne omejitve sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, tretji del pa se osredotoča na Občino Kranjska Gora in na lokalni ravni analizira nasprotjujoče si ocene teh bivališč na podlagi različnih virov podatkov. Pridobljena spoznanja so nas vodila k razmisljevanju o morebitnih metodoloških spremembah v postopku evidentiranja sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, ki bi prispeval k zmanjšanju možnosti za pomanjkljivo spremljanje tega pojava.
2 Metode

V prispevku je bila uporabljena metoda analize relevantne literature in virov ter predpisov s področja sekundarnih počitniških bivališč. S pridobivanjem informacij od upravljavcev podatkov, pregledom uporabljenih definicij sekundarnega počitniškega bivališča, metodah zbiranja podatkov o tem pojavu in ocenjevanjem njihove kakovosti smo opredelili več nedoslednosti v klasifikaciji sekundarnih počitniških bivališč ter časovnih in prostorskih vidikih njihovega evidentiranja (Visser s sodelavci 2006; Brennen s sodelavci 2017). Prostorsko analizo statističnih podatkov smo izvedli z uporabo geografskega informacijskega sistema (programska oprema QGIS 3.16). Nekatere analizirane zbirke podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih smo pridobili od Statističnega urada Republike Slovenije (statistični podatki o sekundarnih počitniških stanovanjih na ravni naselij in pojasnila o metodologiji evidentiranja sekundarnih počitniških bivališč) in Občine Kranjska Gora (zbirka podatkov o lastnikih in solastnikih počitniških bivališč).

3 Izbrani izzivi pri preučevanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč

Pri preučevanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč na območju Alp smo naleteli na več izzivov, ki jih obravnavamo na mednarodni, državni in lokalni ravni.

3.1 Opredelitev sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v sklopu mednarodne primerjalne analize na območju Alp

Izraz sekundarno počitniško bivališče zajema širok razpon pomenov (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin in Daneshpour 2023). Na različnih znanstvenih področjih se izraz počitniško bivališče običajno uporablja za prebivališče za prosti čas oziroma rekreacijo, počitniško prebivališče, družinsko posest, poletno ali stanovanje na več lokacijah (Stock 2006; Duchêne-Lacroix, Hilti in Schad 2013). Posledično lahko sekundarna počitniška bivališča razlikujemo na najmanj treh ravneh:
• po morfološki raznolikosti: počitniška bivališča v obliki stanovanja v turističnih apartmajskih kompleksih, razkošne brunarice, družinske hiše, stanovanjske podenote, koče za letovanje, apartmaji v podeželskem počitniškem centru (Norris in Winston 2010);
• po različnem pravnem statusu: počitniško bivališče kot etažna oziroma skupna lastnina, posest z lastniško pravico oziroma pravico do uporabe ali uživanja, nepremičinski investicijski sklad, bivališče s časovno souporabo nepremičnine, bivališče v dolgoročnem najemu (Paris 2011);
• po različnih vrstah uporabe stanovanj: za osebno preživljanje prostega časa, za družinska srečanja, za turistični najem oziroma nastanitev, za obiske prijateljev in sorodnikov, kot nenaseljeno ali zapuščeno stanovanje. Raba stanovanja se lahko v življenjskem obdobju lastnikov spreminja, ko se denimo ljudje upokojijo in potem večinoma prebivajo v svojem sekundarnem počitniškem bivališču, svoja nekdanja stalna bivališča v mestu pa uporabljajo na primer ob obiskih otrok (Müller in Hoogendoorn 2013; Roca 2013; Elmi in Perlík 2014).

Več raziskovalcev je v povezavi z obravnavo tematiko izpostavilo delitev raziskovalnih usmeritev na dva sklopa, in sicer na koncept sekundarnih počitniških bivališč in koncept tako imenovanega bivanjskega turizma, ki pa se delno ali v celoti prekrivata (Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez in Such-Devesa 2018; Müller in Hall 2018). Nekateri rezultati empiričnih študij o nastajajoči mobilni družbi kažejo, da je težko ločiti glavno prebivališče od sekundarnega (Müller 2020). Ob sistematičnem pregledu raziskav lahko ugotovimo, da je na mestu razmislek o prožnejšem konceptu definicije sekundarnega počitniškega bivališča, v katerem bi bilo treba opredeliti kategorije ali podkategorije teh bivališč in se izogniti preširu opredelitvi (Ghorbanpour, Kheyroddin in Daneshpour 2023). Raziskovalci sekundarnih počitniških

Zaradi zapletenosti oblik, pravnih statusov in načinov uporabe sekundarnih počitniških bivališč se raziskovalci pogosto srečujejo s pomanjkanjem usklajenih in natančnih statističnih podatkov. Številne študije izpostavljajo tudi kakovost in omejitve popisnih in davčnih podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih (Sonderegger in Bätzing 2013; Borsdorf 2014; Blondy, Vacher in Vye 2016; Carrosio Magnani in Osti 2019; Back 2020). Neskladja med formalnimi statističnimi kategorijami in dejansko uporabo teh bivališč je z zbiranjem statističnih podatkov težko opredeliti, še težje pa jih je odpraviti z metodami statističnega preračunavanja. Razlike v posameznikovih stanovanjskih možnostih, praksah in življenjskih slogih o odobrjenih dovoljenjih za uporabo teh bivališč lahko vplivajo na pridobitev podatkov o življenjskih prostorih, ki jih lastniki bivališč posredujejo pristojnim ustanovam. S tem so administrativne prijave prebivališča lahko izvajale tudi zaradi davčnih ugodnosti (Sonderegger in Bätzing 2013; Perles-Ribes, Ramon-Rodriguez in Such-Devesa 2018).

Če si ogledamo opredelitve izraza sekundarno počitniško bivališče, ki jih uporabljajo statistični uradi in administrativne ustanove na območju Alp za namene obdavčitve nepremičnin ali prostorskega načrtovanja, lahko opazimo številne razlike (Czarnecki in Frenkel 2015). V nekaterih primerih ustanove sekundarna počitniška bivališča opredelijo tudi posredno, pri čemer se osredotočijo na vsako enoto, ki ni posameznikovo primarno bivališče, razlike v definicij pa pomembno vplivajo na način zbiranja podatkov. Pregled obstoječih definicij sekundarnega počitniškega bivališča na območju Alp je predstavljen v preglednici 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>država</th>
<th>definicija sekundarnega počitniškega bivališča</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Avstrija | Statistična definicija: Bivališče, ki ni posameznikovo primarno prebivališče. Posameznik ima lahko v lasti poljubno število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč.  
 setback  
 Regionalna opredelitev (primer Zakona o prostorskem načrtovanju na Tirolskem): Bivališča za namen rekreacije so stavbe, stanovanja ali drugi deli stavb, ki se ne uporabljajo za celoletno zadovoljevanje življenjskih bivalnih potreb, temveč so namenjena bivanju med obdobji počitnic, praznikov, koncev tedna ali drugim začasnim namenom počitka. |
| Francija | Statistična definicija: Sekundarno bivališče je stanovanje, ki se uporablja za kratkotrajno prebivanje (ob koncu tedna, v prostem času ali med počitnicami). Opremljena stanovanja, ki se oddajajo za turistično bivanje, se prav tako uvrščajo med sekundarna bivališča.  
 setback  
 Definicija za namen obdavčitve: Sekundarno bivališče je opremljeno stanovanje, ki se uporablja za bivanje in ni stalno naseljeno. |
| Nemčija | Statistična definicija: Počitniške in rekreativne bivalne enote, v katerih ljudje preživljujo prosti čas (na primer ob koncih tedna, na počitnicah). Lastnik ga lahko uporablja sam ali pa ga odda v trajni najem tretji osebi za uporabo v prostem času (lahko mu je na voljo tudi brezplačno). Počitniška stanovanja, ki se trajno oddajajo v najem na tržni osnovi, so izključena.  
 setback  
| Italija | Statistična definicija ne obstaja.  
 setback  
 Definicija za namen obdavčevanja ne obstaja. |
| Slovenija | Statistična definicija: Stanovanje za sezonsko ali sekundarno rabo je po definiciji stanovanje, ki se občasno ali več mesecov v letu uporablja za počitek in rekreacijo ali se uporablja samo občasno.  
 setback  
 Definicija iz Zakona o spodbujanju razvoja turizma: Počitniška hiša ali počitniško stanovanje je stanovanjska stavba ali stanovanje, ki se uporablja za sezonsko ali občasno prebivanje in v njem ni prijavljenih oseb s stalnim prebivališčem ali se ne daje v najem, kjer je tak najem ustrezen prijavljen pristojnemu davčnemu organu |
| Švica | Statistična definicija ne obstaja.  
 setback  
 Opredelitev za namene zveznega zakona o sekundarnih prebivališčih (velja od 1. januarja 2016): Vsaka nepremičnina, ki se ne šteje za primarno bivališče, se pojmuje kot sekundarno bivališče. |
Ta definicija se nanaša na popis stavb in stanovanj v Avstriji, pogosto se uporablja tudi izraza Zweitwohnsitz ali Nebenwohnsitz. Avstrijske zvezne dežele lahko zakonsko opredelijo definicijo sekundarnega bivališča, za katero nato uporabljajo svoje regulativne politike prostorskega načrtovanja.

Pogosto je težko razlikovati med občasnim bivališčem in sekundarnim bivališčem, zato francoski statistični urad obe kategoriji občasno združuje.

Sekundarna bivališča so opredeljena na podlagi zavezanosti k plačilu občinskega davka. Opremljeno bivališče, ki se oddaja v tržni najem turistom, se ne upošteva pri plačilu občinskih dajatev, če je registrirano kot poslovni objekt.

Občine lahko obračunajo davek na sekundarno bivališče. V skladu s sodno prakso zveznega ustavnega sodišča so bivališča zakoncev, ki občasno živijo ločeno, pod določenimi pogoji oproščena plačila davka na sekundarno bivališče.

Pri popisu prebivalstva in stanovanj se počitniška bivališča ne beležijo, evidentirajo se le zasedena in nezasedena stanovanja.

Davčna uprava opredeljuje primarno prebivališče, ki je deležno davčnih ugodnosti v primerjavi z drugimi bivališči istega lastnika. Primarno bivališče je opredeljeno kot nepremičninska enota, v kateri davčni zavezanec in člani njegovega gospodinjstva običajno prebivajo. Drugo bivališče je lahko upravičeno do oprostitve davka na nepremičnine, če je v njem prijavljeno primarno prebivališče enega od zakoncev.

Statistični urad namesto izraza sekundarno bivališče uporablja izraz stanovanje za sezonsko ali sekundarno rabo.

V definicijo niso vključeni dolgoročni najemi opremljenih nepremičnin.

Izraz sekundarno bivališče se v švicarski statistiki ne uporablja. Švicarski zvezni statistični urad je pri popisu prebivalstva leta 2000 razlikoval med stalno naseljenimi, začasno naseljenimi in praznimi stanovanji.

Sekundarna bivališča zajemajo:
• stanovanja, oddana v kratkotrajni najem, s hotelskimi storitvami ali brez njih;
• stanovanja, ki jih začasno zaseda lastnik ali najemnik;
• nezasedena počitniška bivališča;
• bivalne enote, ki niso stalno naseljene več kot dve leti.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>občine na območju Alpske konvencije</th>
<th>število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč podatki</th>
<th>leto izvedbe popisa</th>
<th>število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč podatki</th>
<th>leto izvedbe popisa</th>
<th>indeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avstrija</td>
<td>410.409</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>966.842</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>235,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francija</td>
<td>566.332</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>612.222</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>108,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemčija</td>
<td>22.605</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>ni razpoložljivih podatkov</td>
<td>bo objavljeno leta 2024</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italija</td>
<td>1.226.289</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.708.203</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>139,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenija</td>
<td>8.862</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8.043</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>90,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Švica</td>
<td>375.763</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>387.060</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>103,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monako</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ni razpoložljivih podatkov</td>
<td>bo objavljeno leta 2026</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKUPAJ za območje Alpske konvencije</td>
<td>2.611.048*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.682.370**</td>
<td></td>
<td>141,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
o možnostih natančnega ocenjevanja števila tovrstnih bivališč, ki izhaja iz dostopnosti podatkov in uporabljenih definicij.

Drugo težavo pri primerjavah podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih predstavlja časovni razkorak pri zbiranju in objavljanju podatkov med posameznimi ustanovami držav na območju Alp, kot je prikazano v preglednici 2. To dejstvo onemogoča primerjavo števila sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v istem časovnem obdobju.

Na koncu lahko izpostavimo še en metodološki izziv, ki onemogoča celostno primerjavo podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih na mednarodni ravni. Čeprav za sekundarna počitniška bivališča veljajo strogi predpisi, javne ustanove pa budno spremljajo njihov razvoj, so možnosti nadzora na področju zasebne uporabe še vedno nezadostne (Borsdorf 2014). Obstojči javni statistični podatki o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih ne zagotavljajo informacij o njihovi uporabi, saj je slednjo na zasebnem premoženju težko opredeliti. Več raziskovalcev je zato v svojih študijah ugotovilo, da so kvalitativne empirične raziskave še vedno ključnega pomena za boljše razumevanje sekundarnih počitniških bivališč kot »večlokalnega« življenjska sloga (Sonderegger in Bätzing 2013; Borsdorf 2014). Raziskovalci lahko za oceno števila teh bivališč uporabijo sklepanje na podlagi poznanega nabora podatkov o stanovanjih za stalno prebivanje (Carrosio, Magnani in Osti 2019).

Slika 1: Povprečni letni delež sprememb sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v občinah znotraj območja Alpske konvencije, na podlagi razpoložljivih podatkov popisov prebivalstva, zbranih med letoma 2011 in 2023 (zaradi razlik v opazovanih obdobjih po posameznih državah (preglednica 2), so bile spremembe izračunane na podlagi letnega povprečja).

Glej angleški del prispevka.

S slike 1 je razvidno, da obstajajo precejšnje razlike med državami Alpske konvencije: v slovenskih občinah, ki so del omenjenega območja, se je število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč na splošno zmanjšalo, v Avstriji in Italiji pa povečalo, kar je najbolj izrazito na Južnem Tirolskem. V Franciji je prostorska porazdelitev sprememb precej bolj izrazita. Povečanje je večinoma osredotočeno na osrednje delegorških območij, zmanjšanje pa se kaže na območji zahodnih ravninskih predelov.

Primerjalna analiza sprememb v številu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč na območju Alp se je izkazala za relativno težavno nalogo, saj smo morali zanemariti nekatere razlike v podatkih, medtem ko bi bila primerjava gibanja njihovih deležev v celotnem stavbnem fondu občin zaradi omejene kakovosti podatkov neizvedljiva. Ti deleži pa so bile razreditev precej precej bolj izrazit. Povečanje je večinoma osredotočeno na osrednje dele gorških območij, zmanjšanje pa se kaže na območju zahodnih ravninskih predelov.

3.2 Spreminjanje metod za spremljanje podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih v Sloveniji

Jeršič (1968, 54) navaja, da so se sekundarna počitniška bivališča v Sloveniji najprej pojavila v alpskem svetu, zlasti na območjih Bleda in Bohinja, v drugih delih države pa jih pred drugo svetovno vojno skoraj ni bilo zaslediti. Pogosteno je se začela graditi od petdesetih let 20. stoletja, ko so se pojavila v številnih počitniških, zdraviliških in turističnih krajih, kot so Jezersko, Trška Gora, Piran, Rakitna, Gorenja vas in Kamniška Bistrica (Gosar 1987, 184). Sekundarna počitniška bivališča so bila med kategorijami...
zbiranja podatkov v popisu prebivalstva prvič vključena leta 1971, ko je bilo na ozemlju Slovenije skupno evidentiranih 4281 sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, kar je takrat predstavljalo skromnih 0,9% celotnega stanovanjskega fonda (Opačić in Koderman 2016). Gradnja tovrstnih bivališč se je intenzivneje razvila v šestdesetih letih 20. stoletja, ko so se sekundarna počitniška bivališča razširila tudi na druga območja slovenskega podeželja, pri tem pa je oddaljenost med posameznim primarnim in sekundarnim bivališčem običajno ostala dovolj majhna, da je omogočala dnevno migracijo. Za sedemdeseta leta 20. stoletja je bilo značilno vse večje število posameznikov, ki so želeli prosti čas preživljati v sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih in so si v njihovi okolici uredili vrtove, vinograde in sadovnake. V sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih 20. stoletja so ta bivališča postala sestavni del slovenske kulturne pokrajine, saj so leta 1981 predstavljala 3,2% celotnega stanovanjskega fonda (v tem letu je bilo skupno evidentiranih 18.965 takšnih stanovanj) (Opačić in Koderman 2016), najti pa jih je bilo mogoče tudi v vinorodnih deželah v panonski in dinarski regiji (Gosar 1987, 188).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>leto popisa</th>
<th>število prebivalcev</th>
<th>indeks izhodiščni stanovanj</th>
<th>število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč</th>
<th>indeks izhodiščni</th>
<th>delež (%) sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v stavbnem fondu</th>
<th>indeks izhodiščni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1.727.137</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>471.076</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1.891.864</td>
<td>109,5</td>
<td>585.780</td>
<td>124,3</td>
<td>18.965</td>
<td>443,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1.913.355</td>
<td>110,8</td>
<td>683.137</td>
<td>145,0</td>
<td>26.374</td>
<td>616,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.964.036</td>
<td>113,7</td>
<td>777.772</td>
<td>165,1</td>
<td>31.681</td>
<td>740,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.050.186</td>
<td>118,7</td>
<td>844.656</td>
<td>179,3</td>
<td>20.740</td>
<td>484,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2.066.880</td>
<td>119,7</td>
<td>852.181</td>
<td>180,9</td>
<td>19.896</td>
<td>464,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jugovzhodni Sloveniji) (Koderman 2017). Podobna popisa stavb in stanovanj sta bila izvedena tudi v letih 2015 in 2018, ko je bil zabeležen nadaljnji upad števila in deleža sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v celotnem stanovanjskem fondu – leta 2018 so omenjena bivališča na državni ravni uradno predstavljala le 2,3 % stanovanjskega fonda. To dejstvo je nekoliko presenetljivo, zlasti če si podrobneje ogledamo splošno gibanje rasti števila prebivalcev in števila stanovanj v državi (preglednica 3), pa tudi rast slovenskega bruto domačega proizvoda, ki se je v obravnavanem obdobju 2002–2018 skoraj podvojil (Statistični… 2023a).

Kot je razvidno iz slike 2, so se v letu 2018 občine z najvišjim deležem sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v stanovanjskem fondu nahajale pretežno v severozahodnem goratem delu Slovenije, ki zajema tudi območje Triglavskega narodnega parka (Kranjska Gora, Bohinj in Bovec). Ta bivališča so bila intenzivneje prisotna tudi v stavbnem fondu nekaterih občin v vzhodni in jugovzhodni Sloveniji, ki so poznane kot zdraviliške (Podčetrtek, Zreče), ter obmorske občine (Piran in Ankaran). Tudi nekatere druge občine (Kostel, Jezersko, Ribnica na Pohorju) izkazujejo velik delež sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, vendar je treba poudariti, da imajo te občine na splošno majhno število stanovanjskih enot (manj kot 1000).

Pri podatkih o števili sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, predstavljenih v preglednici 3, predstavlja leto 2018 pomembno prelomnico, saj je to zadnje leto, ko so bili podatki o teh bivališčih še na voljo zainteresiranim raziskovalcem. Leta 2021, ko je Statistični urad Republike Slovenije ponovno izvedel registrski popis prebivalstva, gospodinjstev in stanovanj, podatki o tovrstnih objektih niso bili več predmet popisnih kategorij. Glavni razlog je bila ukinitev kategorije o počitniški rabi stanovanj v Registru nepremičnin, v katerem je bil ta podatek več let slabzo vzdrževan (Žnidaršič in Miklič 2022). Izraz slabzo vzdrževanje se nanaša na neobstoj konkretnega mehanizma ali predpisa na državni ravni, ki bi prisilil lastnike sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, da svoja prebivališča formalno registrirajo. Lastniki tovrstnih bivališč so lahko omenjeno registracijo opravili na prostovoljni osnovi, vendar pa so se mnogi med njimi registracij ali izogibali zaradi špekulativnih razlogov, zlasti po napovedi davka na nepremičnine leta 2008 (ki se kasneje sicer ni uvedel) (Pahor 2008). Po desetletju spremjanja je Geodetska uprava Republike Slovenije, ki je uradni upravljavec registra, sprejela odločitev, da se omenjeni podatki ne bodo več vodili v evidenci registra, posledično pa je beleženje teh podatkov ukinil tudi Statistični urad (Miklič 2023).

Do leta 2018 je Statistični urad podatke o potencialni uporabi stanovanj v počitniške namene torej pridobival iz Registra nepremičnin in jih skladno z metodologijo popisa prebivalstva analiziral skupaj s podatki iz Centralnega registra prebivalstva. Kot že omenjeno, pa se v zadnjem popisu iz leta 2021 ti podatki, ki so sicer neobvezna popisna enota, ne beležijo več zaradi ukinitve te kategorije v Registru nepremičnin (2023). Slovenija je tako postala ena od držav v Evropski uniji, kjer se podatki o številu, velikosti in razporeditvi sekundarnih počitniških bivališč ne spremljajo več.

Slika 2: Občine z najvišjim deležem sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v celotnem stanovanjskem fondu v letu 2018.
Glej angleški del prispevka.

3.3 Neskladja med občinskimi in državnimi podatki o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih – primer Občine Kranjska Gora

V Sloveniji je občinski sistem turistične takse razdeljen na dve kategoriji, in sicer na lastnike in najemnike stanovanj, ki se uporablja v turistične namene. Poleg podatkov Statističnega urada Republike Slovenije tako občinski sistem plačnikov turistične takse zagotavlja drugi pomembni vir podatkov, ki temelji na lastnikih, ki so sicer neobvezna popisna enota, ne beležijo več zaradi ukinitve te kategorije v Registru nepremičnin (Zakon … 2018). Omenjene skupine posameznikov so izključene iz evidence plačnikov turistične takse, zato je treba podatke iz občinske evidence obravnavati z zadržkom. Poleg tega je posamezno bivališče
lahko tudi predmet več ločenih davčnih plačnikov, če si nepremičnino deli več lastnikov ali če se lastnik slednje med letom zamenja. Pri uporabi občinske podatkovne evidence plačnikov turistične takse je torej potrebna dodatna pozornost za odpravo podvajanj, kljub temu pa tovrstna podatkovna zbirka predstavlja zanesljiv in ažuren vir podatkov, ki je bil uporabljen že v več raziskavah o pojavu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč (na primer Koderman in Salmič 2013; Salmič in Koderman 2013; Koderman 2014). Za namen te raziskave je bil opravljen predhodni pregled podatkov, ki so bili aktualni na dan 31. decembra 2022, z namenom preprečitve podvajanja števila bivališč, ki bi se pojavila v primerih, ko so obravnavane nepremičnine tekom leta spremenile lastništvo ali v primeru, da si lastništvo posamezne enote deli več solastnikov. Analizirani podatki občinske evidence plačnikov turistične takse so skupaj s podatki Statističnega urada Republike Slovenije predstavljeni v preglednici 4.


Če primerjamo podatek o številu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč leta 2018 (961), ki ga je podal Statistični urad Republike Slovenije, s podatkom iz zbirke plačnikov turistične takse (lastniki in solastniki počitniških bivališč) Občine Kranjska Gora leta 2022 (1416), lahko ugotovimo razliko v višini 455 bivalnih enot (preglednica 4). Čeprav podatkov zaradi različnega leta registracije ni mogoče neposredno primerjati, lahko domnevamo, da je število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v podatkovni zbirki Statističnega urada iz leta 2018 relativno podcenjeno. Razloge za odstopanja je mogoče najti v istih dejstvih, ki so bila opisana že v prejšnjem poglavju, ki se nanaša na državno raven. Razmislke o tem neskladju je mogoče podkrepiti tudi z naraščajočim številom vseh stanovanj v občini (njihovo število se je v enakem obdobju povečalo za skoraj 4%), medtem ko se je število stalnih prebivalcev v enakem obdobju nekoliko zmanjšalo.

Ta primerjava podatkov iz dveh različnih podatkovnih zbirk postavlja v ospredje razmislke o zanesljivosti metodoloških pristopov pri registraciji sekundarnih počitniških bivališč znotraj istega območja. Obe podatkovni zbirki predstavljata uradne in reprezentativne ocene, zbrane po uveljavljeni metodologiji, vsaka zbirka pa ima tudi svoje omejitve, ki niso zanesljive, saj se opazovani rezultati bistveno razlikujejo.

4 Razprava

Pri preučevanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč se soočamo z več metodološkimi izzivi, ki izhajajo iz administrativne ravni študije primerov. Ti izzivi se ne nanašajo le na raziskovalno delo, saj zbiranje in obdelava podatkov o teh bivališčih zagotavlja več osnovnih kazalnikov za podporo pri odločanju in administrativnem upravljanju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, zlasti za potrebe prostorskega načrtovanja, davčne politike in turizma (Roca 2013; Czarnecki in Frenkel 2015). Vendar pa je zanesljivost podatkov za morebitno mednarodno, državno ali lokalno upravljanje vprašljiva z več vidikov. Metode zbiranja podatkov izhajajo iz opredelitve izrazov, ki lahko ob različnih raziskovalnih pristopih in virih podatkov pripeljejo do različnih ocen števila sekundarnih počitniških bivališč na istem preučevanem območju, kar prikazujemo tudi v primerih, predstavljenih v prispevku. Poleg tega so številne empirične študije, ki so preučevali kompleksno in heterogeno vedenje lastnikov in uporabnikov sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, razkrile, da moramo biti pri opoznavanju kvantitativnih statističnih podatkov previdni (Coppock 1977; Hall in Müller 2004; Paris 2009; Blondy, Vacher in Vye 2016; Bausch 2017; Cretton, Boscoboinik in Friedli 2020). Izraz sekundarno počitniško bivališče ni primeren v primeru lastništva treh ali več prebivalcev in kaže na neustrezno razvrščanje, pri čemer imajo za lastnika lahko vsa bivališča posebno funkcijo ali pomen brez kakršnekoli razvrstitve. Izraz večkratna bivališča je opredelil že
Preglednica 4: Razlike v številu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v naseljih v Občini Kranjska Gora (vir: Popis prebivalstva…2003; Registrski…2011; Občinski…2023; Statistični…2023c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>naselje</th>
<th>število sekundarnih počitniških bivališč</th>
<th>podatki Statističnega urada Republike Slovenije</th>
<th>podatki evidence plačnikov turistične takse v Občini Kranjska Gora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belca</td>
<td>2 100,00</td>
<td>2 100,00</td>
<td>1 50,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovje</td>
<td>8 100,00</td>
<td>13 162,50</td>
<td>8 61,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozd Martuljek</td>
<td>93 100,00</td>
<td>120 129,03</td>
<td>113 94,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranjska Gora</td>
<td>581 100,00</td>
<td>694 119,45</td>
<td>688 99,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log</td>
<td>7 100,00</td>
<td>15 214,29</td>
<td>12 80,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojstrana</td>
<td>23 100,00</td>
<td>29 126,09</td>
<td>25 86,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podkoren</td>
<td>26 100,00</td>
<td>64 246,15</td>
<td>72 112,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rateče</td>
<td>15 100,00</td>
<td>14 93,33</td>
<td>17 121,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srednji Vrh</td>
<td>9 100,00</td>
<td>8 88,89</td>
<td>6 75,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zgornja Radovna</td>
<td>24 100,00</td>
<td>24 100,00</td>
<td>19 79,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skupno število počitniških bivališč v občini</td>
<td>788 100,00</td>
<td>983 124,75</td>
<td>961 97,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>število prebivalcev</td>
<td>5247 100,00</td>
<td>5302 101,04</td>
<td>5212 98,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skupno število stanovanj v občini</td>
<td>3023 100,00</td>
<td>3764 124,51</td>
<td>3912 103,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delež (%) sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v stavbnem fondu občine</td>
<td>26,07 100,00</td>
<td>26,10 100,12</td>
<td>24,60 94,25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lastništvo več nepremičnin ne predpostavlja, da je posameznikova bivanjska raba porazdeljena med te nepremičnine kot »večlokno« bivanje. Nekatera bivališča se lahko uporabljajo redko ali so celo nezasedena, njihov vrstni red (prvo, drugo, tretjo in tako naprej) pa nam ne pove, katero prebivališče lastniki uporabljajo za primarno ali sekundarno bivališče. Raznolikost posameznikov, ki imajo »večlokno« življenjski slog pri svojih bivalnih navadah in prijavi bivališč, je prav tako razlog za delno izkrivljenost podatkov in prispeva k potrebi po vzpostavitvi novega empiričnega pristopa (Stock 2006; Duchênes-Lacroix, Hilti in Schad 2013). Raziskava, izvedena v gorskih območjih Furlanije - Julijske krajine kaže, da se lahko lastnike sekundarnih počitniških bivališč smatra za enakovredne sezonske prebivalce (Jelen s sodelavci 2022). Sekundarno počitniško bivališče lahko predstavlja tudi začasni bivanjski status v procesu stanovanjske migracije novih prebivalcev (Norris in Winston 2010). Poleg navedenih ugotovitev sta Müller in Hall (2018) opozorila tudi na omejitve kvantitativnih raziskav o razvoju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v času pomembnih družbenih sprememb, kot so razširitev dela na daljavo, podnebne spremembe in povečana mobilnost.


Na podlagi spoznanj, pridobljenih iz obravnavanih primerov v tem prispevku, in pregleda literature smo oblikovali teoretični prístop, ki upošteva vzorce lastništva sekundarnih počitniških bivališč na občinski, državni in celo mednarodni ravni (slika 3). Ta pristop predpostavlja, da imajo nekateri posamezniki v lasti več nepremičnin, ki jih uporabljajo kot prvo, drugo ali celo tretje bivališče in lahko med njimi potujejo. Zaradi tega občine ne morejo imeti celovitega vpogleda v posameznikovo lastništvo. V kolikor oseba izjavi, da je njegovo glavno prebivališče v občini A, občinski organi ne morejo ugotoviti, ali ima lastnik dodatno bivališče zunaj te občine. Shema na sliki 3 prikazuje potrebo po spremljanju
na državni ravni, z namenom učinkovitejšega pregleda nad prostorsko porazdelitvijo stanovanjskega fonda posameznika. Takšno spremljanje posameznikovega lastništva na državni ravni se že izvaja v več državah, vključno s Slovenijo, vendar se uporablja zgolj za evidentiranje posameznikovih davčnih obveznosti. Razlikovanje med osebami z eno ali več nepremičninami na lokalni ravni bi občinam omogočilo boljše razumevanje prisotnosti uporabnikov sekundarnih počitniških bivališč skozi vse leto in ustreznejšo oceno javnih storitev glede na posameznikovo prisotnost oziroma odsotnost. Izboljšanje tovrstnih ocen bi bilo še posebej pomembno za občine v priljubljenih turističnih destinacijah z visokim deležem sekundarnih počitniških bivališč.

Slika 3: Teoretični pristop k spremljanju lastništva bivališč v različnih občinah.
Glej angleški del prispevka.

Ugotavljanje obsega premoženja družine ali posameznika zahteva pristop od spodaj navzgor, ki temelji na navzkriženem primerjanju podatkov na državni ravni. Takšno podatkovno zbirko bi bilo mogoče vzpostaviti s pomočjo podatkov, ki jih zbirajo občine za opredelitev lokalne turistične takse, ter jih združiti in povezati z državnim registrom nepremičnin. Ta predlagani pristop bi lahko služil tudi kot orodje političnim odločevalcem.

Metodološke omejitve in nedoslednosti v časovnih in prostorskih podatkih sekundarnih počitniških bivališč ter njihovi klasifikaciji bi na mednarodni ravni lahko zmanjšali z usklajenimi pristopi in metodami upravljavcev podatkov. Kakovost podatkov na tem področju bi se lahko bistveno izboljšala z uskladitvijo metapodatkovnega okvira med državami na območju Alp (ali na ravni Evropske unije) in njihovimi statističnimi uradi.

5 Sklepa

V pričujočem članku smo na mednarodni, državni in lokalni ravni opredelili tri metodološke izzive, ki vplivajo na preučevanje pojava sekundarnih počitniških bivališč:

• Neusklajene definicije sekundarnega počitniškega bivališča med državnimi organi in statističnimi uradi v primeru držav na območju Alp: Sonderegger in Bätzing (2013) sta opredelila značilnosti in trende razvoja sekundarnih počitniških bivališč v alpskem prostoru, pri izvedbi primerjalne analize deset let pozneje pa smo bili soočeni s težavami, ki izhajajo iz različnih neskladij pri pripravi podatkov.

• Spremembe metod za spremljanje podatkov o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih: v nasprotju z drugimi državami na območju Alp se v Sloveniji že skoraj dve desetletji soočamo z zmanjševanjem števila sekundarnih potniških bivališč, čeprav se število prebivalcev, stanovanj in vrednost BDP na prebivalca v istem obdobju povečujejo. Spremembe metodologije ter slabo vzdrževanje podatkov v kategoriji sekundarnih počitniških bivališč so povzročile, da je Geodetska uprava Republike Slovenije leta 2018 to kategorijo v Registru nepremičnin ukinila, posledično pa je tudi Statistični urad Republike Slovenije opustil evidentiranje omenjenih podatkov.

• Neklasična med občinskimi in državnimi podatki o sekundarnih počitniških bivališčih: na primer Občine Kranjska Gora so bila prikazana neskladja v podatkih o številu sekundarnih počitniških bivališč, ki izhajajo iz dveh javnih evidenc podatkov.

Na podlagi spoznanj prejšnjih raziskav in predstavljenih metodoloških izizvov smo v članku oblikovali teoretični pristop, ki bi omogočil pridobitev natančnejših ocen števila sekundarnih počitniških bivališč. Združevanje nabora podatkov iz davčnega in nepremičninskega registra na občinski in državni ravni bi lahko pomagalo razlikovati med lastništvom ene in več nepremičnin. Hkrati je bila predlagana uskladitev definicij in sinhronizacija podatkovnega okvira na mednarodni ravni, kar bi izboljšalo možnosti nadaljnjih raziskav na področju sekundarnih počitniških bivališč.
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