

## Re: Space required for an empty varchar field?

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.programming/2004-08/6383.html>

---

**From:** Harag (*haragREMOVETHESECAPITALS\_at\_softhome.net*)

**Date:** 08/29/04

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 2004 11:04:02 +0100

On Sat, 28 Aug 2004 23:17:46 +0200, Hugo Kornelis  
<hugo@pe\_NO\_rFact.in\_SPAM\_fo> wrote:

>On Sat, 28 Aug 2004 10:56:01 +0100, Harag wrote:

>

>>To the other gurus replying.

>>

>>Whats the problem of splitting the table into 2 tables?

>>

>>TABLE 1

>>memID int identify<pk>

>>memName varchar(30)

>>MemDOB smalldatetime

>>... etc

>>

>>

>>TABLE 2

>>MemID int <pk>

>>MemNotes varchar(500)

>>

>>

>>

>>then in the SELECTS left join the 2 tables together on MemID where the

>>notes will be needed? table 2 would only hold the rows where there are

>>actual notes.

>>

>>Al.

>

>Hi Al,

>

>The upside: Less space lost for storing the length of the varchar column

>and the NULL bit. Less problems caused by queries written by programmers

>who don't understand how to deal with NULLS.

>

>The downside: More space lost for storing MemID in another table as well.

>Some queries get more complicated (need to join in one more table – this

>will often have to be an outer join). Correct handling of NULLS in queries

microsoft.public.sqlserver.programming: Re: Space required for an empty varchar field?

>remains a necessity, as they'll be in the result set of an outer join.

>

>Plus, it gets unwieldy fast if you have multiple NULLable columns. I'd

>only consider it if I had multiple columns that are either all NULL or all

>non-NULL, but that's just my personal opinion.

>

>Best, Hugo

Thanks Hugo.

In the above table layout if MemNotes was the only varchar (nullable)  
then would you add it to the original table? and make it one table.

Al.