

The (re)positioning of the Spanish metropolitan
system within the European urban system
(1986-2006)

Malcolm C. Burns

Tesi Doctoral dirigit per:
Dr. Josep Roca Cladera

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya
Programa de Doctorat d'Arquitectura en Gestió i Valoració Urbana
Barcelona, juny de 2008



Departament de Construccions
Arquitectòniques I



UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Extract from the 1800 Account of Population of Great Britain

A B S T R A C T
OF THE
A N S W E R S A N D R E T U R N S

Made pursuant to an Act, passed in the Forty-first Year of
His Majesty King GEORGE III.

ENTITLED,

*" An Act for taking an Account of the Population
" of GREAT BRITAIN, and the Increase or
" Diminution thereof."*

Enumeration.

PART I.
ENGLAND AND WALES.

Ordered to be printed 1791 December 1791.

Ref: [Research, Policy, Best Practice, Clinical Use Guide](#)

Appendix 2: Extract from the 1910 Census of Population of the United States

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

E. DANA DURAND, DIRECTOR
APPOINTED JUNE 16, 1909; RESIGNED JUNE 30, 1913

WM. J. HARRIS, DIRECTOR
APPOINTED JULY 1, 1913

THIRTEENTH CENSUS OF THE UNITED STATES
TAKEN IN THE YEAR 1910

VOLUME I

POPULATION
1910

GENERAL REPORT AND ANALYSIS

PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF WILLIAM C. HUNT
CHIEF STATISTICIAN FOR POPULATION



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1913

Reprint April, 1915.

Bureau of the Census

CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS.

In its general tables dealing with the population of cities, the Bureau of the Census must necessarily deal with political units, or, in other words, with the population contained within the municipal boundaries of each city. It is a familiar fact that, in some cases, the municipal boundaries give only an inadequate idea of the population grouped about one urban center, and as regards the large cities in very few cases do these boundaries exactly define the urban area. In the case of many cities there are suburban districts with a dense population outside the city limits, which, from many standpoints, are as truly a part of the city as the districts which are under the municipal government. These suburbs are bound to the cities by a network of transportation lines. Many of the residents in the suburbs have their business or employment in the city, and, to a certain extent, persons who reside in the city are employed in the suburbs.

It seems desirable to show the magnitude of each of the principal population centers taken as a whole. Statistics have, therefore, been compiled for each city in the United States with a population of 100,000 inhabitants or more, which, in addition to the population within the city limits, show the population in adjoining communities that may be considered as intimately associated with the urban center. Two sets of computations have been made.

(1) For each city having 100,000 inhabitants or more within its municipal boundaries a computation has been made of the total population in civil divisions within 10 miles of the city boundary. The areas thus mapped out may be briefly defined as "cities and adjacent territory."

(2) In the case of each city having within its own boundaries 200,000 inhabitants or more, the bureau has also mapped out what may be termed a "metropolitan district," which besides the city itself includes only those sections of the adjacent territory which may be considered as urban in character.

Method of defining districts.—In laying out the two classes of districts the population is first determined for all civil divisions (that is, cities, towns, boroughs, precincts, etc.) which are located within 10 miles of the city boundaries. Divisions which lie partly within and partly without the 10-mile limit are included if either one-half of their total population or one-half of their total area comes within that limit. State boundaries are disregarded, so that in some cases the adjacent territory and the metropolitan district lie partly in two states. The area within the 10-mile limit thus defined is the "adjacent territory." It is, of course, very different from the territory included within a circle drawn with a radius of 10 miles from the center of the city; nor is it the territory included within a line drawn parallel to the city boundary at an exact distance of 10 miles, because in making up the "adjacent territory" no civil divisions are subdivided. Hence the outline of the area can

not follow geometrical lines, but must conform to the boundaries of the political divisions which are on the outer edge of the included area. Owing to this fact, the boundary of the adjacent territory thus defined may vary considerably from point to point in its actual distance from the city limits.

The "metropolitan district," which, as previously noted, has, as its nucleus, a city of at least 200,000 inhabitants, includes the population and area of the central city itself and of all minor civil divisions lying within the "adjacent territory" except, as a rule, those which had a density of population of less than 150 per square mile. Where the density was less than that the division was considered as rural rather than urban in character, and as not properly a part of the metropolitan district. This limit of density, however, was not always rigidly applied. In some instances for special reasons divisions having a somewhat higher density, perhaps as high as 200 per square mile, have been omitted, and in a few instances a minor civil division has been included within the metropolitan district, even though it had a lower density than that just stated, because that division was completely or almost surrounded by other civil divisions having a density which would require them to be included. The exception in such cases seems justified in order to avoid undue irregularity in the shape of the districts, or gaps lying wholly within their area.

It is safe to say that these deviations from the rule have had very little effect upon the totals finally arrived at and have yielded on the whole as consistent and satisfactory results as would have been obtained by the application of any rigid rule. In fact, absolute exactness in applying a density limit is out of the question because in most cases the area of the minor civil divisions can only be approximated from the available maps and data.

In general, the city with its "adjacent territory," as here defined, includes the central city, and in addition all cities, towns, villages, or other divisions located within 10 miles of the boundary of the central city; while the metropolitan district includes, besides the central city, only those divisions within the 10-mile limit which had a density of population of not less than 150 persons per square mile.

Two special instances of slight exceptions to the application of the definition of metropolitan districts should be mentioned. Since a strict application of the rules for determining the metropolitan district of Boston would give an area almost identical with the area of the "industrial district" of Boston, as laid out in Census Bulletin 101, Industrial Districts for 1905, the latter area is for convenience of comparison considered as the metropolitan district. The same is true of New York City, except that Nassau County, which was not included in the industrial district, has been added to the metropolitan district. In the case of the other industrial districts shown in

the bulletin mentioned, the areas were so different from the metropolitan districts as determined by the application of the rule here described, that no attempt was made to secure conformity.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS.

Table 50 shows for 1910 and 1900 the population of the 25 metropolitan districts containing individual cities of 200,000 or more inhabitants, distinguishing

the population lying within the city proper from that outside the city. The districts are arranged in the order of their aggregate population. The table also shows the total population of each city with all its "adjacent territory."

It will be noted that two cities of more than 200,000 inhabitants—Newark and Jersey City—do not appear in the table. They are included within the metropolitan district of New York.

AREA AND POPULATION OF CENTRAL CITY, METROPOLITAN DISTRICT, AND ADJACENT TERRITORY, FOR CITIES OF 200,000 INHABITANTS OR MORE: 1910 AND 1900.

DISTRICT.	Area in acres: 1910	POPULATION.		Per cent of increase: 1900-1910	DISTRICT.	Area in acres: 1910	POPULATION.		Per cent of increase: 1900-1910
		1910	1900				1910	1900	
Total for 25 metropolitan districts	4,717,532.2	22,088,331	16,322,800	35.3					
In central cities (28 cities)	1,185,795.8	17,099,904	12,833,201	33.2					
Outside central cities	3,531,736.4	4,988,427	3,489,599	43.0					
Cities and adjacent territory	11,477,658.7	23,018,533	17,100,206	34.6					
Adjacent territory	10,291,862.9	5,918,629	4,267,005	38.7					
NEW YORK.									
Metropolitan district	616,927.6	6,474,568	4,607,804	40.5					
In city proper	183,555.0	4,766,883	3,437,202	38.7					
Outside	433,372.6	1,707,685	1,170,602	45.9					
City and adjacent territory	875,515.2	6,630,599	4,718,255	40.5					
Adjacent territory	691,960.2	1,863,716	1,281,053	45.5					
CHICAGO.									
Metropolitan district	409,086.7	2,446,921	1,837,987	33.1					
In city proper	118,433.1	2,185,283	1,698,575	28.7					
Outside	290,653.6	261,638	139,412	87.7					
City and adjacent territory	535,911.5	2,461,764	1,850,739	33.0					
Adjacent territory	417,478.4	276,481	152,164	81.7					
PHILADELPHIA.									
Metropolitan district	437,732.5	1,972,342	1,623,149	21.5					
In city proper	83,340.0	1,549,008	1,293,697	19.7					
Outside	354,392.5	423,334	329,452	28.5					
City and adjacent territory	715,000.8	2,015,560	1,661,522	21.3					
Adjacent territory	631,660.8	466,552	367,825	26.8					
BOSTON.									
Metropolitan district	335,904.7	1,520,470	1,249,504	21.7					
In city proper	26,289.0	670,585	590,892	19.6					
Outside	309,615.7	849,885	688,612	23.4					
City and adjacent territory	401,568.0	1,543,723	1,269,384	21.6					
Adjacent territory	375,279.0	873,138	708,492	23.2					
PITTSBURGH.									
Metropolitan district	405,880.1	1,042,855	792,968	31.5					
In city proper	26,510.7	533,905	451,512	18.2					
Outside	379,369.4	508,950	341,456	49.1					
City and adjacent territory	543,609.6	1,060,797	806,564	31.5					
Adjacent territory	517,098.9	526,892	355,052	48.4					
ST. LOUIS.									
Metropolitan district	197,993.4	828,733	649,711	27.6					
In city proper	39,276.3	687,029	575,238	19.4					
Outside	158,717.1	141,704	74,473	90.3					
City and adjacent territory	456,593.7	881,927	694,342	27.0					
Adjacent territory	417,317.4	194,898	119,104	63.6					
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND.									
Metropolitan district	289,380.8	686,873	473,073	45.2					
In city proper (San Francisco)	29,760.0	416,912	342,782	21.6					
In city proper (Oakland)	29,248.0	150,174	66,960	124.3					
Outside	230,372.8	119,787	63,331	89.1					
Cities and adjacent territory	384,760.0	692,654	474,453	46.0					
Adjacent territory	325,752.0	125,568	64,711	94.0					
BALTIMORE.									
Metropolitan district	184,659.8	658,715	577,670	14.0					
In city proper	19,290.2	558,485	508,957	9.7					
Outside	165,369.6	100,230	68,713	45.9					
City and adjacent territory	340,352.0	679,644	599,406	13.4					
Adjacent territory	321,061.8	121,159	90,449	34.0					
CLEVELAND.									
Metropolitan district	103,173.6	613,270	420,020	46.0					
In city proper	29,208.8	560,663	381,768	46.9					
Outside	73,964.8	52,607	38,252	37.5					
City and adjacent territory	332,019.2	642,355	443,808	44.7					
Adjacent territory	302,810.4	81,692	62,040	31.7					
CINCINNATI.									
Metropolitan district	111,771.7	563,804	495,979	13.7					
In city proper	31,893.3	363,591	325,902	11.6					
Outside	79,878.4	200,213	170,077	17.7					
City and adjacent territory	512,646.4	594,920	530,563	12.1					
Adjacent territory	480,753.1	231,329	204,661	13.0					
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL.									
Metropolitan district	94,539.0	526,256	372,009	41.5					
In city proper (Minneapolis)	32,069.0	301,408	202,718	48.7					
In city proper (St. Paul)	33,390.0	214,744	163,065	31.7					
Outside	29,080.0	10,104	6,226	62.3					
Cities and adjacent territory	638,859.4	571,469	410,934	39.1					
Adjacent territory	573,400.4	55,317	45,151	22.5					
DETROIT.									
Metropolitan district	96,553.8	500,982	318,967	57.1					
In city proper	26,102.6	465,766	285,704	63.0					
Outside	70,451.2	35,216	33,263	5.9					
City and adjacent territory	271,840.0	521,233	337,163	54.6					
Adjacent territory	245,737.4	55,467	51,459	7.9					
BUFFALO.									
Metropolitan district	132,413.4	488,661	394,031	24.0					
In city proper	24,791.0	423,715	352,387	20.2					
Outside	107,622.4	64,946	41,644	56.0					
City and adjacent territory	306,867.2	508,232	412,731	23.1					
Adjacent territory	282,076.2	84,517	60,344	40.1					
LOS ANGELES.									
Metropolitan district	252,826.8	438,226	123,062	256.1					
In city proper	63,480.0	319,198	102,479	211.5					
Outside	189,346.8	119,028	20,583	478.3					
City and adjacent territory	652,613.4	468,080	152,052	207.8					
Adjacent territory	589,133.4	148,882	49,573	200.3					
MILWAUKEE.									
Metropolitan district	112,339.4	427,175	324,963	31.5					
In city proper	14,585.8	373,857	285,315	31.0					
Outside	97,753.6	53,318	39,648	34.5					
City and adjacent territory	215,396.7	440,206	336,635	30.8					
Adjacent territory	200,810.9	66,349	51,320	29.3					
PROVIDENCE.									
Metropolitan district	126,469.4	395,972	306,110	29.4					
In city proper	11,352.2	224,326	175,597	27.8					
Outside	115,117.2	171,646	130,513	31.5					
City and adjacent territory	271,590.4	489,772	377,249	29.8					
Adjacent territory	260,238.2	265,446	201,652	31.6					
WASHINGTON.									
Metropolitan district	190,389.2	367,869	305,684	20.3					
In city proper	38,408.4	331,069	278,718	18.8					
Outside	151,980.8	36,800	26,966	36.5					
City and adjacent territory	550,169.6	413,458	346,432	19.3					
Adjacent territory	511,761.2	82,389	67,714	21.7					

¹A minus sign (-) denotes decrease.

AREA AND POPULATION OF CENTRAL CITY, METROPOLITAN DISTRICT, AND ADJACENT TERRITORY, FOR CITIES OF 200,000 INHABITANTS OR MORE: 1910 AND 1900—Continued.

Table 50—Contd.		POPULATION.			Per cent of increase: ¹ 1900-1910	Area in acres:		POPULATION.			Per cent of increase: ¹ 1900-1910
DISTRICT.	1910	1910	1900	1910		1910	1900	DISTRICT.	1910	1900	
NEW ORLEANS.					SEATTLE.						
Metropolitan district.....	137,760.0	348,109	294,615	18.2	Metropolitan district.....	41,151.6	239,269	80,885	195.8		
In city proper.....	125,440.0	339,075	287,104	18.1	In city proper.....	35,750.0	237,194	80,671	194.0		
Outside.....	12,320.0	9,034	7,511	20.3	Outside.....	5,401.6	2,075	214	869.6		
City and adjacent territory.....	373,145.6	367,235	310,551	18.3	City and adjacent territory.....	375,449.6	272,189	103,950	161.8		
Adjacent territory.....	247,705.6	28,160	23,447	20.1	Adjacent territory.....	339,699.6	34,995	23,279	50.3		
KANSAS CITY (MO. AND KANS.).					INDIANAPOLIS.						
Metropolitan district.....	62,030.5	340,446	228,235	49.2	Metropolitan district.....	27,850.4	237,783	173,632	36.9		
In city proper (Kansas City, Mo.).....	37,443.0	248,381	163,752	51.7	In city proper.....	21,130.4	233,650	169,164	38.1		
In city proper (Kansas City, Kans.).....	10,940.0	82,331	51,418	60.1	Outside.....	6,720.0	4,133	4,468	-7.5		
Outside.....	13,647.5	9,734	13,065	-25.5	City and adjacent territory.....	465,542.4	283,226	216,537	30.8		
Cities and adjacent territory.....	620,748.8	391,632	276,375	41.7	Adjacent territory.....	444,412.0	49,576	47,373	4.7		
Adjacent territory.....	572,365.8	60,920	61,205	-0.5	DENVER.						
LOUISVILLE.					Metropolitan district.....	46,148.0	219,314	135,809	61.5		
Metropolitan district.....	141,504.9	286,158	259,856	10.1	In city proper.....	37,028.0	213,381	133,859	59.4		
In city proper.....	13,229.7	223,928	204,731	9.4	Outside.....	9,120.0	5,933	1,950	204.3		
Outside.....	128,275.2	62,230	55,125	12.9	City and adjacent territory.....	460,390.4	240,082	155,582	54.3		
City and adjacent territory.....	472,505.6	317,743	288,372	10.2	Adjacent territory.....	423,362.4	26,701	21,723	22.9		
Adjacent territory.....	459,275.9	93,815	83,641	12.2	PORTLAND, OREG.						
ROCHESTER.					Metropolitan district.....	43,538.2	215,048	91,668	134.6		
Metropolitan district.....	119,506.7	248,512	185,409	34.0	In city proper.....	30,975.0	207,214	90,426	129.2		
In city proper.....	12,876.3	218,149	162,608	34.2	Outside.....	12,563.2	7,834	1,242	530.8		
Outside.....	106,630.4	30,363	22,801	33.2	City and adjacent territory.....	389,171.2	259,745	121,200	114.3		
City and adjacent territory.....	315,392.0	270,288	205,407	31.6	Adjacent territory.....	358,196.2	52,531	30,774	70.7		
Adjacent territory.....	302,515.7	52,139	42,799	21.8							

¹ A minus sign (-) denotes decrease.

NOTE.—The following statement gives the name and population of each municipality of 5,000 inhabitants or more falling within each metropolitan district, except the central city itself.

New York district.—New York: Yonkers city, 79,803; Mount Vernon city, 30,919; New Rochelle city, 28,867; Mamaroneck village, 5,699. New Jersey: Newark city, 347,469; Jersey City, 267,779; Paterson city, 125,600; Elizabeth city, 73,409; Hoboken city, 70,324; Bayonne city, 55,545; Passaic city, 54,773; West Hoboken town, 35,403; East Orange city, 34,371; Perth Amboy city, 32,121; Orange city, 29,630; Montclair town, 21,550; Union town, 21,023; Kearny town, 18,659; Bloomfield town, 15,070; Harrison town, 14,498; Hackensack town, 14,050; West New York town, 13,560; Irvington town, 11,877; Englewood city, 9,924; Rahway city, 9,337; Rutherford borough, 7,045; South Orange village, 6,014; Nutley town, 6,009; Roosevelt borough, 5,786; Guttenberg town, 5,647.

Chicago district.—Illinois: Evanston city, 24,978; Oak Park village, 19,444; Cicero town, 14,557; Chicago Heights city, 14,525; Blue Island village, 8,043; Maywood village, 8,033; Harvey city, 7,227; Forest Park village, 6,594; Berwyn city, 5,841; La Grange village, 5,282. Indiana: Hammond city, 20,925; East Chicago city, 19,098; Gary city, 16,802; Whiting city, 6,587.

Philadelphia district.—Pennsylvania: Chester city, 38,537; Norristown borough, 27,875; Bristol borough, 9,256; Conshohocken borough, 7,480; Darby borough, 6,305. New Jersey: Camden city, 94,538; Gloucester city, 9,462; Burlington city, 8,336.

Boston district.—Cambridge city, 104,839; Lynn city, 89,336; Somerville city, 77,236; Malden city, 44,404; Salem city, 43,697; Newton city, 39,806; Everett city, 33,484; Quincy city, 32,642; Chelsea city, 32,452; Waltham city, 27,834; Brookline town, 27,792; Medford city, 23,150; Revere town, 18,219; Peabody town, 15,721; Melrose city, 15,715; Hyde Park town, 15,507; Woburn city, 15,308; Framingham town, 12,948; Weymouth town, 12,895; Watertown town, 12,875; Wakefield town, 11,404; Arlington town, 11,187; Winthrop town, 10,132; Natick town, 9,866; Winchester town, 9,309; Dedham town, 9,284; Braintree town, 8,066; Saugus town, 8,047; Norwood town, 8,014; Milton town, 7,924; Marblehead town, 7,338; Stoneham town, 7,090; Swampscott town, 6,204; Belmont town, 5,542; Wellesley town, 5,413; Needham town, 5,026.

Pittsburgh district.—McKeesport city, 42,694; Braddock borough, 19,357; Wilkensburg borough, 18,924; Homestead borough, 18,713; Duquesne borough, 15,727; McKees Rocks borough, 14,702; North Braddock borough, 11,824; Carnegie borough, 10,009; Sharpsburg borough, 8,153; Jeannette borough, 8,077; Millvale borough, 7,861; New Kensington borough, 7,707; Tarentum borough, 7,414; Swissvale borough, 7,381; Bellevue borough, 6,323; Wilmerding borough, 6,133; Carrick borough, 6,117; Rankin borough, 6,042; Etna borough, 5,830; Knoxville borough, 5,651; St. Clair borough, 5,640; East Pittsburgh borough, 5,615; Glassport borough, 5,540; Coraopolis borough, 5,252; Munhall borough, 5,185.

St. Louis district.—Missouri: Wellston city, 7,312; Webster Groves city, 7,080; Illinois: East St. Louis city, 58,547; Granite city, 9,903; Madison village, 5,046.

San Francisco-Oakland district.—Berkeley city, 40,434; Alameda city, 23,383; Richmond city, 6,802; San Rafael city, 5,934.

Cleveland district.—Lakewood city, 15,181; East Cleveland city, 9,179; Newburgh city, 5,813.

Cincinnati district.—Ohio: Norwood city, 16,185; Madisonville city, 5,193; St. Bernard city, 5,002. Kentucky: Covington city, 53,270; Newport city, 30,309; Dayton city, 6,979; Bellevue city, 6,683.

Detroit district.—Wyandotte city, 8,287.

Buffalo district.—Lackawanna city, 14,549; North Tonawanda city, 11,955; Tonawanda city, 8,290.

Los Angeles district.—Pasadena city, 30,291; Long Beach city, 17,809; Santa Monica city, 7,847; Alhambra city, 5,021.

Milwaukee district.—West Allis city, 6,645; South Milwaukee city, 6,092.

Providence district.—Pawtucket city, 51,622; Warwick town, 26,629; Central Falls city, 22,754; Cranston city, 21,107; East Providence town, 15,808; Cumberland town, 10,107; Lincoln town, 9,825; Johnston town, 5,935; North Providence town, 5,407.

Washington district.—Alexandria city (Va.), 15,329.

Kansas City (Mo. and Kans.) district.—Rosedale city (Kans.), 5,960.

Louisville district.—Indiana: New Albany city, 20,629; Jeffersonville city, 10,412.

The importance of the suburbs of great cities is conspicuously indicated by the combined statistics for the 25 metropolitan districts, which appear at the beginning of the table. The combined population of the metropolitan districts in 1910 was 22,088,331, of which 17,099,904 represents the population of the central cities and 4,988,427 that of the suburban areas, the latter being equal to nearly 30 per cent of the population of the cities proper. The total of 17,099,904 represents the population of 28 "central cities," since there are three metropolitan districts each of which em-

braces two cities of such large population that both together are treated as constituting the urban center of the district. The cities are Minneapolis and St. Paul; Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo.; and San Francisco and Oakland.

The table shows further that the population of the metropolitan districts outside of the central cities increased between 1900 and 1910 more rapidly than that of the central cities, the increase for the suburban districts being 43 per cent and for the central cities 33.2 per cent. In addition to the strictly urban popu-

lation of the 25 metropolitan districts, there were in 1910 nearly 1,000,000 people residing in territory adjacent to the central cities, but not included within the metropolitan districts—that is, in divisions which lie wholly, or in greater part, within 10 miles of the boundaries of the central cities, but in which the density of population was not sufficient to justify calling them strictly urban. The total population of the cities in the 25 metropolitan districts plus that of all their “adjacent territory” was 23,018,533. This, in other words, is the total population which lived in 1910 either in cities of not less than 200,000 inhabitants or within approximately 10 miles of such cities. It constituted 25 per cent of the total population of the United States.

It will be noted from Table 50 that there are great differences among the several metropolitan districts with respect to the proportion which the population outside of the central city represents of the total population of the district. These differences are due to the fact that some of the large cities have made no annexations of territory for many years, while in others extensive annexations have been made, so that most of the densely populated area within the metropolitan district has been added to the city itself. The column in the table giving the area of the various districts shows that there is very little correspondence between the population of the central cities and their area, some cities having several times as many inhabitants per acre as others. The difference in policy with regard to the extension of municipal boundaries makes it the more obviously necessary to exclude thinly settled areas in the neighborhood of the cities in calculating the true metropolitan population; for, in the case of a city which has very extensive boundaries, there is also necessarily a very large area in civil divisions lying within 10 miles of the boundary, and naturally the population of many such divisions is likely to be rural rather than urban in character.

The table emphasizes the well-known fact that most of the large cities of the country have quite a different rank when their suburbs are taken into account from that which they hold when only the population living within their municipal boundaries is considered.

CITIES OF 100,000 TO 200,000 INHABITANTS AND THEIR ADJACENT TERRITORY.

Table 51 shows, for each city having from 100,000 to 200,000 inhabitants, the population within the city proper, the population in other civil divisions all or more than half of which (in area or population) lie within 10 miles of the city boundary, and the combined population of the city and such adjacent territory. In three cases, cities of 100,000 to 200,000 inhabitants do not appear in this list because they are adjacent to other cities. This is true of Paterson, N. J., which forms part of the New York district; of Cambridge, Mass., which forms part of the Boston district; and of Oakland, Cal., which forms a part of the San Francisco-

Oakland district, given in Table 50. It will be further noted that in three cases there are one or more cities within the adjacent territory which approximate in population the central city itself. For this reason the names of such smaller cities are inserted in connection with that of the larger city from whose boundaries the distances are determined.

For reasons already stated, it should not be considered that all of the population included in Table 51 is strictly urban in character or that the figures furnish an accurate comparison of the relative importance of the several cities as centers of urban population. Nevertheless, they do indicate the relative importance approximately. The combined population in 1910 of the 19 central cities covered, together with their adjacent territory, was 4,002,285, of which 2,438,878 represents the population in the 19 principal cities themselves and 1,563,407 the population in adjacent territory. It will be noted that the population of the adjacent territory increased less rapidly during the decade than that of the cities themselves.

The fact that the population of the adjacent territory is larger relatively to that of the central cities in the figures given in Table 51 than it is in the case of the larger cities given in Table 50 should not be misunderstood. It does not imply that the smaller cities have relatively more important suburbs than the larger. It is due to two facts, namely, (1) that in the combined area of the city and its adjacent territory, the smaller the size of the city the greater relatively is the share of the adjacent area in the total; (2) that in Table 51 a number of cities are included, principally in New York state and in New England, in whose “adjacent territory” there are other cities of large size which can not in any true sense be considered suburbs. Troy and Schenectady can not be considered as suburbs of Albany, but these three cities combined, together with other adjacent territory, constitute what may in a sense be considered as a single urban community. For convenience in interpreting the table in this respect there is appended to it a note, giving the name and population of each municipality of 5,000 inhabitants or more falling within the territory adjacent to each of the principal cities listed. To what extent any of these outlying cities are to be considered as depending upon the central city or constituting its suburbs, this report does not attempt to discuss.

Table 52 gives a condensed summary of the statistics in Tables 50 and 51. It thus covers 44 districts and shows the total population within the 47 cities which give their names to these districts, and that in adjacent territory within approximately 10 miles of the municipal boundaries. While a considerable number, perhaps in the neighborhood of 2,000,000, of the population thus included, were living under conditions more or less rural, nevertheless the table gives a comprehensive idea of the importance of the great urban centers of the country.

CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS.

AREA AND POPULATION OF CENTRAL CITY AND OF ADJACENT TERRITORY, FOR CITIES OF 100,000 TO 200,000 INHABITANTS: 1910 AND 1900.

Table 51 DISTRICT.	Area in acres: 1910	POPULATION.		Per cent of in- crease: ¹ 1900- 1910	DISTRICT.	Area in acres: 1910	POPULATION.		Per cent of in- crease ¹ 1900- 1910
		1910	1900				1910	1900	
Total for 19 districts.....	6,815,372.8	4,002,285	3,090,007	29.5	OMAHA.				
Total in central cities.....	268,610.5	2,438,878	1,768,032	37.9	Total in city and outside.....	396,339.2	206,749	175,133	18.1
Total outside central cities.....	6,546,762.3	1,563,407	1,321,975	18.3	In city proper.....	15,400.0	124,096	102,555	21.0
					Outside city proper.....	380,939.2	82,653	72,578	13.9
ALBANY. (Including Troy and Schenectady.)					TOLEDO.				
Total in city and outside.....	378,764.8	349,836	297,094	17.8	Total in city and outside.....	334,297.6	203,748	164,198	24.1
In Albany.....	6,913.7	100,253	94,151	6.5	In city proper.....	16,025.6	168,497	131,822	27.8
Outside Albany.....	371,851.1	249,583	202,943	23.0	Outside city proper.....	318,272.0	35,251	32,376	8.9
SCRANTON.					SYRACUSE.				
Total in city and outside.....	324,096.0	314,538	235,039	33.8	Total in city and outside.....	329,542.4	183,462	150,853	21.6
In city proper.....	12,361.7	129,867	102,026	27.3	In city proper.....	11,083.6	137,249	108,374	26.6
Outside city proper.....	311,734.3	184,671	133,013	38.8	Outside city proper.....	318,458.8	46,213	42,479	8.8
FALL RIVER. (Including New Bedford.)					MEMPHIS.				
Total in city and outside.....	331,340.8	284,938	226,731	25.7	Total in city and outside.....	375,020.8	175,183	137,462	27.4
In Fall River.....	21,722.0	119,295	104,863	13.8	In city proper.....	11,759.9	131,105	102,320	28.1
Outside Fall River.....	309,618.8	165,643	121,868	35.9	Outside city proper.....	363,260.9	44,078	35,142	25.4
LOWELL. (Including Lawrence.)					RICHMOND.				
Total in city and outside.....	411,552.0	283,741	238,246	19.1	Total in city and outside.....	475,942.4	168,854	119,645	41.1
In Lowell.....	8,308.0	106,294	94,969	11.9	In city proper.....	6,388.0	127,628	85,050	50.1
Outside Lowell.....	403,244.0	177,447	143,277	23.8	Outside city proper.....	469,554.4	41,226	34,595	19.2
NEW HAVEN.					BRIDGEPORT.				
Total in city and outside.....	250,816.0	224,901	182,315	23.4	Total in city and outside.....	195,929.6	156,765	116,117	35.0
In city proper.....	11,460.0	133,605	108,027	23.7	In city proper.....	7,906.0	102,054	70,996	43.7
Outside city proper.....	239,356.0	91,296	74,288	22.9	Outside city proper.....	188,023.6	54,711	45,121	21.3
WORCESTER.					DAYTON.				
Total in city and outside.....	398,905.6	222,732	194,653	14.4	Total in city and outside.....	337,158.4	163,646	130,917	25.0
In city proper.....	23,683.0	145,986	118,421	23.3	In city proper.....	10,061.0	116,577	85,333	36.6
Outside city proper.....	375,222.6	76,746	76,232	0.7	Outside city proper.....	327,097.4	47,069	45,584	3.3
COLUMBUS.					NASHVILLE.				
Total in city and outside.....	374,963.2	221,567	164,460	34.7	Total in city and outside.....	373,248.0	150,910	124,642	21.1
In city proper.....	13,017.8	181,511	125,560	44.6	In city proper.....	10,942.0	110,364	80,865	36.5
Outside city proper.....	361,945.4	40,056	38,900	3.0	Outside city proper.....	362,306.0	40,546	43,777	-7.4
BIRMINGHAM.					GRAND RAPIDS.				
Total in city and outside.....	455,334.4	211,961	129,131	64.1	Total in city and outside.....	315,360.0	145,632	114,898	26.7
In city proper.....	30,881.2	132,685	38,415	245.4	In city proper.....	10,730.0	112,571	87,565	28.6
Outside city proper.....	424,453.2	79,276	90,716	-12.6	Outside city proper.....	304,630.0	33,061	27,333	21.0
ATLANTA.					SPOKANE.				
Total in city and outside.....	364,723.2	208,284	141,023	47.7	Total in city and outside.....	392,038.4	124,838	47,450	163.1
In city proper.....	16,428.0	154,839	89,872	72.3	In city proper.....	23,539.0	104,402	36,848	183.3
Outside city proper.....	348,295.2	53,445	51,151	4.5	Outside city proper.....	368,499.4	20,436	10,602	92.8

¹ A minus sign (-) denotes decrease.

NOTE.—The following statement gives the name and population of each municipality of 5,000 inhabitants or more falling within the territory adjacent to each of the above cities:

Albany district.—Troy city, 76,813; Schenectady city, 72,826; Cohoes city, 24,709; Watervliet city, 15,074; Rensselaer city, 10,711.
Scranton district.—Dunmore borough, 17,615; Carbondale city, 17,040; Pittston city, 16,267; Old Forge borough, 11,324; Dickson City borough, 9,331; Taylor borough, 9,060; Olyphant borough, 8,505; Duryea borough, 7,487; Archbald borough, 7,194; West Pittston borough, 6,848; Blakeley borough, 5,345; Winton borough, 5,280; Throop borough, 5,133.
Fall River district.—New Bedford city, 96,652; Taunton city, 34,259; Fairhaven town, 5,122.

Lowell district.—Massachusetts: Lawrence city, 85,892; Methuen town, 11,448; Andover town, 7,301; Concord town, 6,421; North Andover town, 5,529; Chelmsford town, 5,010. New Hampshire: Nashua city, 26,005.
New Haven district.—Ansonia city, 15,152; Naugatuck borough, 12,722; Derby city, 8,901; Wallingford borough, 8,690; West Haven borough, 8,543.
Worcester district.—Clinton town, 13,075; Northbridge town, 8,807; Spencer town, 6,740; Grafton town, 5,705; Westborough town, 5,446.
Birmingham district.—Bessemer city, 10,864.
Omaha district.—Nebraska: South Omaha city, 26,259. Iowa: Council Bluffs city, 29,292.
Syracuse district.—Solvay village, 5,139.
Bridgeport district.—South Norwalk city, 8,908; Norwalk city, 6,954.

Table 52

	Area in acres.	POPULATION.		INCREASE: 1900-1910	
		1910	1900	Number.	Per cent.
Total in 44 districts.....	18,293,031.5	27,020,818	20,190,213	6,830,605	33.8
Total in 47 central cities..	1,454,406.3	19,538,782	14,601,233	4,937,549	33.8
Total in adjacent territory	16,838,625.2	7,482,036	5,588,980	1,893,056	33.9

The total population of these districts in 1910 was 27,020,818, which is equal to 29.4 per cent of the total population of the United States. The population of the districts has increased a trifle over one-third during the decade, 1900-1910, it being noteworthy that the percentage of increase in the cities proper was almost precisely the same as that in the adjacent territory.

Appendix 3: Administrative composition of the Spanish Metropolitan Urban System (2001)

1. Metropolitan area of Madrid (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
5002	Adrada (La)	1960	550	702
5013	Arenal (El)	1059	200	303
5041	Burgohondo	1214	239	350
5054	Casavieja	1548	326	465
5055	Casillas	818	84	228
5057	Cebreros	3156	730	1084
5066	Cuevas del Valle	620	87	187
5075	Fresnedilla	101	38	33
5082	Gavilanes	706	141	215
5089	Guisando	635	70	171
5095	Higuera de las Dueña	326	44	89
5100	Hornillo (El)	391	41	94
5102	Hoyo de Pinares (El)	2345	333	791
5110	Lanzahita	895	210	257
5115	Maello	636	149	206
5127	Mijares	916	144	262
5132	Mombeltrán	1123	256	297
5156	Navahondilla	152	23	42
5157	Navalacruz	274	39	81
5161	Navalperal de Pinare	782	175	266
5163	Navaluenga	2011	503	662
5164	Navaquesera	38	14	18
5167	Navarvisca	361	57	107
5168	Navas del Marqués (Las)	4381	1188	1615
5169	Navatalgordo	297	55	105
5182	Pedro Bernardo	1229	259	362
5184	Peguerinos	287	95	89
5187	Piedralaves	2094	504	701
5201	San Bartolomé de Pinares	720	101	229
5207	San Esteban del Valle	873	162	229
5211	San Juan de la Nava	664	93	180
5221	Santa Cruz del Valle	567	67	154
5227	Santa María del Tiét	407	73	140
5233	Serranillos	389	87	133
5240	Sotillo de la Adrada	3622	1020	1212
5241	Tiemblo (El)	3641	816	1222
5262	Villarejo del Valle	506	111	128
5905	Villanueva de Avila	308	50	74
13028	Campo de Criptana	13184	3048	4605
16002	Acebrón (El)	271	58	76
16011	Alcohujata	61	16	21
16027	Barajas de Melo	701	199	256
16032	Belinchón	359	125	122
16086	Fuente de Pedro Naharro	1213	287	427
16106	Horcajo de Santiago	3440	517	1149
16108	Huelves	57	15	16
16119	Leganiel	253	60	71
16167	Pozorrubio	468	94	137
16169	Pozuelo (El)	100	6	22
16172	Puebla de Almenara	513	69	121
16173	Puebla de Don Francisco	327	64	71
16185	Saceda-Trasierra	91	12	29
16212	Torrubia del Campo	331	73	101
16240	Vellisca	167	28	50
16249	Villamayor de SantiagoG	2673	674	911
16270	Villarrubio	231	157	87
16275	Vindel	20	4	3
16279	Zarza de Tajo	253	56	78
19001	Abánades	114	15	28
19002	Ablanque	152	13	24
19004	Alaminos	84	6	26
19005	Alarilla	129	56	66
19006	Albalate de Zorita	888	206	326
19007	Albares	481	78	166
19008	Albendiego	43	6	14
19009	Alcocer	314	79	80
19010	Alcolea de las Peñas	28	4	6
19011	Alcolea del Pinar	363	143	115

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
19015	Aldeanueva de Guadalajara	108	9	22
19017	Algora	114	21	29
19018	Alhóndiga	238	51	67
19019	Alique	34	4	12
19021	Almoguera	1146	210	353
19022	Almonacid de Zorita	788	379	263
19023	Alocén	162	28	68
19024	Alovera	3170	2081	1536
19031	Angón	40	4	6
19032	Anguita	292	32	63
19033	Anquela del Ducado	86	3	16
19036	Aranzueque	363	81	125
19037	Arbancón	193	45	74
19038	Arbeteta	64	14	15
19039	Argecilla	94	28	29
19040	Armallones	60	11	16
19041	Armuña de Tajuña	111	58	44
19042	Arroyo de las Fragua	40	2	13
19043	Atanzón	91	26	26
19044	Atienza	474	213	174
19045	Auñón	243	45	67
19046	Azuqueca de Henares	20673	8820	9697
19047	Baides	74	14	22
19049	Bañuelos	30	1	8
19050	Barriopedro	31	0	6
19051	Berninches	133	21	45
19052	Bodera (La)	43	2	8
19053	Brihuega	2794	835	1030
19054	Budia	269	71	102
19055	Bujaloro	77	14	29
19057	Bustares	96	14	28
19058	Cabanillas del Campo	4987	1869	2311
19060	Campillo de Ranas	145	27	46
19061	Campisábalos	75	18	22
19064	Canredondo	84	17	23
19065	Cantalojas	152	36	42
19066	Cañizar	98	15	28
19067	Cardoso de la Sierra	80	34	37
19070	Casa de Uceda	101	16	36
19071	Casar (El)	4047	873	1833
19073	Casas de San Galindo	34	6	12
19074	Caspueñas	87	7	34
19075	Castejón de Henares	103	14	26
19078	Castilforte	50	7	23
19080	Cendejas de Enmedio	121	9	32
19081	Cendejas de la Torre	84	12	20
19082	Centenera	68	12	18
19086	Cifuentes	2053	442	759
19087	Cincovillas	37	8	11
19088	Ciruelas	97	21	41
19089	Ciruelos del Pinar	55	5	11
19092	Cogolludo	579	188	222
19095	Condemios de Abajo	28	2	5
19096	Condemios de Arriba	159	42	59
19097	Congostrina	41	8	10
19098	Copernal	31	8	15
19102	Cubillo de Uceda (El)	116	13	43
19104	Chequilla	18	2	6
19105	Chiloeches	1426	407	649
19106	Chillarón del Rey	113	20	37
19107	Driebes	352	53	87
19108	Durón	141	26	43
19110	Escamilla	107	9	22
19111	Escariche	207	46	72
19112	Escopete	45	1	5
19113	Espinosa de Henares	554	134	191
19114	Esplegares	58	8	18
19115	Establés	45	7	11
19116	Estriégana	25	1	4
19117	Fontanar	1055	168	422
19119	Fuencemillán	137	23	50

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
19120	Fuentelahiguera de Albatages	145	27	55
19121	Fuentelencina	204	61	65
19123	Fuentelviejo	57	8	18
19124	Fuenteenovilla	299	47	109
19125	Gajanejos	80	16	26
19126	Galápagos	413	71	170
19127	Galve de Sorbe	142	30	39
19129	Gascueña de Bornova	50	12	16
19130	Guadalajara	68248	27462	28697
19132	Henche	106	10	32
19133	Heras de Ayuso	145	29	45
19135	Hiendelaencina	103	30	33
19136	Hijos	32	4	7
19138	Hita	283	66	92
19142	Hontoba	185	50	68
19143	Horche	1604	375	635
19145	Hortezuela de Océn	79	13	23
19146	Huerce (La)	40	16	12
19147	Huérmedes del Cerro	63	10	17
19148	Huertahernando	73	6	13
19150	Hueva	134	24	42
19151	Humanes	1226	619	419
19152	Illana	697	127	201
19153	Iniestola	26	4	12
19154	Inviernas (Las)	87	14	37
19155	Irueste	67	9	19
19156	Jadraque	1323	486	535
19157	Jirueque	78	16	33
19159	Ledanca	111	40	30
19160	Loranca de Tajuña	350	87	129
19161	Lupiana	244	38	80
19162	Luzaga	99	24	36
19163	Luzón	81	15	22
19165	Majaelrayo	63	17	29
19166	Málaga del Fresno	193	29	50
19167	Malaguilla	138	14	42
19168	Mandayona	425	56	123
19169	Mantiel	94	13	33
19170	Maranchón	208	72	66
19171	Marchamalo	4324	1171	1728
19172	Masegoso de Tajuña	96	20	27
19173	Matarrubia	48	11	12
19174	Matillas	171	55	51
19175	Mazarete	64	4	7
19176	Mazuecos	344	44	79
19177	Medranda	115	17	29
19178	Megina	61	4	9
19179	Membrillera	105	14	19
19181	Miedes de Atienza	102	13	27
19182	Mierla (La)	31	2	11
19184	Millana	125	38	36
19185	Miñosa (La)	60	23	19
19186	Mirabueno	121	30	41
19187	Miralrío	80	19	23
19189	Mohernando	144	39	47
19191	Monasterio	21	6	5
19192	Mondéjar	2223	689	836
19193	Montarrón	51	7	17
19194	Moratilla de los Meleros	100	19	26
19196	Muduex	113	20	37
19197	Navas de Jadraque (Las)	34	7	11
19198	Negredo	17	2	4
19199	Ocentejo	42	11	12
19200	Olivar (El)	98	27	45
19201	Olmeda de Cobeta	75	16	19
19202	Olmeda de Jadraque (La)	21	2	6
19203	Ordial (El)	44	5	12
19208	Pálmaces de Jadraque	66	11	24
19210	Paredes de Sigüenza	52	8	10
19211	Pareja	485	124	161
19212	Pastrana	1056	343	395

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
19214	Peñalén	126	11	40
19215	Peñalver	232	38	70
19217	Peralveche	111	16	35
19218	Pinilla de Jadraque	88	8	29
19219	Pinilla de Molina	29	2	14
19220	Pioz	620	176	282
19224	Pozo de Almoquera	161	27	46
19225	Pozo de Guadalajara	407	131	166
19226	Prádena de Atienza	53	10	16
19228	Puebla de Beleña	41	12	22
19229	Puebla de Valles	76	13	18
19230	Quer	76	52	25
19231	Rebollosa de Jadraque	28	4	8
19232	Recuenco (El)	103	17	21
19233	Revera	53	17	20
19234	Retiendas	56	7	15
19235	Riba de Saelices	160	17	31
19238	Riofrío del Llano	56	3	19
19239	Robledillo de Mohernando	151	15	31
19240	Robledo de Corpes	105	19	32
19241	Romanillos de Atienz	54	11	21
19242	Romanones	118	22	37
19244	Sacedorbo	161	43	62
19245	Sacedón	1541	470	526
19246	Saelices de la Sal	64	11	23
19247	Salmerón	239	44	69
19248	San Andrés del Congo	79	13	21
19249	San Andrés del Rey	50	3	15
19250	Santiuste	21	6	8
19252	Sayatón	129	19	34
19254	Selas	53	10	7
19256	Sienes	73	11	27
19257	Sigüenza	4724	1628	1754
19258	Solanillos del Extre	115	24	27
19259	Somolinos	40	8	14
19260	Sotillo (El)	44	9	17
19261	Sotodosos	59	8	12
19262	Tamajón	210	64	66
19263	Taragudo	31	2	6
19264	Taravilla	67	8	16
19266	Tendilla	308	89	102
19267	Terzaga	30	6	9
19268	Tierzo	58	10	21
19269	Toba (La)	109	15	26
19270	Tordelrábano	10	0	1
19274	Torija	476	239	201
19278	Torre Cuadrada	53	2	13
19279	Torre del Burgo	111	31	39
19280	Torrejón del Rey	1460	376	647
19281	Torremocha de Jadraque	16	2	8
19282	Torremocha del Campo	277	85	92
19283	Torremocha del Pinar	68	5	7
19286	Tórtola de Henares	453	63	172
19288	Tortuero	31	6	12
19290	Trijueque	571	135	227
19291	Trillo	1356	812	451
19293	Uceda	1060	286	497
19294	Ujados	30	6	11
19296	Utande	56	7	20
19297	Valdarachas	28	3	10
19298	Valdearenas	68	12	17
19299	Valdeavellano	103	14	37
19300	Valdeaveruelo	444	28	211
19301	Valdeconcha	71	3	25
19302	Valdegrudas	56	14	30
19304	Valdenúño Fernández	161	26	67
19305	Valdepeñas de la Sierra	212	27	49
19306	Valderrebollo	28	6	5
19307	Valdesotos	35	9	14
19308	Valfermoso de Tajuña	99	7	20
19311	Valverde de los Arroyos	93	24	27

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
19317	Villanueva de Alcorón	243	77	75
19318	Villanueva de Argecilla	39	11	15
19319	Villanueva de la Torre	2960	411	1535
19321	Villares de Jadraque	63	19	25
19322	Villaseca de Henares	62	8	19
19323	Villaseca de Uceda	70	7	30
19325	Viñuelas	116	47	46
19326	Yebes	203	138	20
19327	Yebra	533	125	181
19329	Yélamos de Abajo	96	24	34
19330	Yélamos de Arriba	167	28	55
19331	Yunquera de Henares	2069	408	819
19333	Zaorejas	178	44	48
19334	Zarzuela de Jadraque	41	5	12
19335	Zorita de los Canes	91	72	23
19901	Semillas	50	2	18
28001	Acebeda (La)	51	26	19
28002	Ajalvir	2479	3535	1179
28003	Alameda del Valle	175	49	58
28004	Alamo (El)	4973	1332	2159
28005	Alcalá de Henares	176434	58932	80795
28006	Alcobendas	92090	54787	44677
28007	Alcorcón	153100	37903	71480
28008	Aldea del Fresno	1538	444	611
28009	Algete	15870	6027	7351
28010	Alpedrete	8514	2030	4212
28011	Ambite	310	46	76
28012	Anchuelo	608	94	264
28013	Aranjuez	40797	13311	16502
28014	Arganda del Rey	33432	21486	15881
28015	Arroyomolinos	5541	983	2819
28016	Atazar (El)	98	42	43
28017	Batres	1050	136	520
28018	Becerril de la Sierra	3733	858	1673
28019	Belmonte de Tajo	1152	263	484
28020	Berzosa del Lozoya	144	41	64
28021	Berrueco (El)	410	111	153
28022	Boadilla del Monte	27443	8047	14007
28023	Boalo (El)	3704	887	1823
28024	Braojos	177	33	72
28025	Brea de Tajo	468	54	161
28026	Brunete	6037	1755	2828
28027	Buitrago del Lozoya	1599	549	683
28028	Bustarviejo	1557	386	610
28029	Cabanillas de la Sierra	504	107	247
28030	Cabrera (La)	1837	748	809
28031	Cadalso de los Vidrios	2305	621	807
28032	Camarma de Esteruela	3066	1850	1412
28033	Campo Real	2993	1205	1235
28034	Canencia	446	81	154
28035	Carabaña	1167	250	429
28036	Casarrubuelos	1127	229	538
28037	Cenicientos	1805	319	561
28038	Cercedilla	5535	1953	2562
28039	Cervera de Buitrago	108	23	51
28040	Ciempozuelos	15013	4301	6251
28041	Cobeña	3365	830	1611
28042	Colmenar del Arroyo	1006	289	424
28043	Colmenar de Oreja	6009	1329	2329
28044	Colmenarejo	5385	1201	2561
28045	Colmenar Viejo	35181	11797	16022
28046	Collado Mediano	4695	869	2279
28047	Collado Villalba	47001	13594	21949
28048	Corpa	444	57	164
28049	Coslada	77884	27372	37673
28050	Cubas de la Sagra	2006	624	923
28051	Chapinería	1458	390	575
28052	Chinchón	4362	1535	1864
28053	Daganzo de Arriba	4755	3171	2368
28054	Escorial (El)	10967	3144	4814
28055	Estremera	1050	183	386

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
28056	Fresnedillas de la Oliva	913	141	375
28057	Fresno de Torote	745	249	368
28058	Fuenlabrada	182705	48836	85676
28059	Fuente el Saz de Jarama	4813	1622	2246
28060	Fuentidueña de Tajo	1484	302	530
28061	Galapagar	25559	4738	12758
28062	Garganta de los Montes	320	82	130
28063	Gargantilla del Lozoya	283	60	111
28064	Gascones	115	55	55
28065	Getafe	151479	53052	69613
28066	Griñón	5968	3260	2876
28067	Guadalix de la Sierra	3533	936	1657
28068	Guadarrama	10546	2806	4823
28069	Hiruela (La)	83	27	36
28070	Horcajo de la Sierra	125	24	57
28071	Horcajuelo de la Sierra	105	33	46
28072	Hoyo de Manzanares	6175	1511	2907
28073	Humanes de Madrid	10219	9103	4552
28074	Leganés	173584	42544	80391
28075	Loeches	3295	1995	1426
28076	Lozoya	438	142	182
28078	Madarcos	27	13	14
28079	Madrid	2938723	1562697	1287388
28080	Majadahonda	50683	18463	23760
28082	Manzanares el Real	4547	1055	2200
28083	Meco	8267	2281	3843
28084	Mejorada del Campo	17195	6035	7955
28085	Miraflores de la Sierra	3928	1015	1683
28086	Molar (El)	4152	1143	1841
28087	Molinos (Los)	3752	836	1645
28088	Montejo de la Sierra	305	117	125
28089	Moraleja de Enmedio	3336	2320	1460
28090	Moralzarzal	6739	1510	3259
28091	Morata de Tajuña	5823	1687	2313
28092	Móstoles	196524	41081	90237
28093	Navacerrada	1953	684	964
28094	Navalafuente	581	120	255
28095	Navalagamella	1266	236	563
28096	Navalcarnero	14823	6088	6451
28097	Navarredonda y San Mamés	110	26	47
28099	Navas del Rey	1838	474	730
28100	Nuevo Baztán	4073	727	1904
28101	Olmeda de las Fuente	153	43	62
28102	Orusco de Tajuña	658	130	208
28104	Paracuellos de Jarama	6287	3568	3050
28106	Parla	79213	14168	37356
28107	Patones	354	91	127
28108	Pedrezuela	1670	463	785
28109	Pelayos de la Presa	1581	374	597
28110	Perales de Tajuña	2107	504	828
28111	Pezuela de las Torre	536	122	192
28112	Pinilla del Valle	160	42	63
28113	Pinto	31340	16474	14934
28114	Piñuécar-Gandullas	187	44	76
28115	Pozuelo de Alarcón	68214	26502	30974
28116	Pozuelo del Rey	263	61	107
28117	Prádena del Rincón	98	28	38
28118	Puebla de la Sierra	91	22	46
28119	Quijorna	1321	287	616
28120	Rascafría	1550	542	666
28121	Redueña	184	39	74
28122	Ribatejada	373	82	160
28123	Rivas-Vaciamadrid	35742	9339	18258
28124	Robledillo de la Jarama	93	27	36
28125	Robledo de Chavela	2488	775	1001
28126	Robregordo	81	23	28
28127	Rozas de Madrid (Las)	63385	27150	31510
28128	Rozas de Puerto Real	321	89	95
28129	San Agustín del Guadalix	6521	3668	3080
28130	San Fernando de Henares	36244	15940	17685
28131	San Lorenzo de El Escorial	13039	5029	5843

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
28132	San Martín de la Vega	11635	4895	5688
28133	San Martín de Valdeiglesias	6256	1998	2396
28134	San Sebastián de los Reyes	61884	26920	30269
28135	Santa María de la Alameda	826	149	298
28136	Santorcaz	604	113	233
28137	Santos de la Humosa	1010	176	419
28138	Serna del Monte (La)	114	24	41
28140	Serranillos del Valle	1759	386	746
28141	Sevilla la Nueva	4499	1054	2249
28143	Somosierra	105	54	48
28144	Soto del Real	6166	1786	2900
28145	Talamanca de Jarama	1658	365	689
28146	Tielmes	2165	536	823
28147	Titulcia	936	159	342
28148	Torrejón de Ardoz	97887	38325	46617
28149	Torrejón de la Calzada	4890	1929	2360
28150	Torrejón de Velasco	2334	611	1030
28151	Torrelaguna	2942	1101	1230
28152	Torrelorones	15563	4764	7420
28153	Torremocha de Jarama	430	182	179
28154	Torres de la Alameda	4791	2130	2160
28155	Valdaracete	663	166	257
28156	Valdeavero	702	95	290
28157	Valdelaguna	605	120	248
28158	Valdemanco	533	125	238
28159	Valdemaqueda	611	120	253
28160	Valdemorillo	7091	1876	3439
28161	Valdemoro	33169	16869	16055
28162	Valdeolmos-Alalpardo	1917	599	849
28163	Valdepiélagos	323	41	112
28164	Valdetorres de Jarama	2278	588	969
28165	Valdilecha	2026	516	836
28166	Valverde de Alcalá	320	49	145
28167	Velilla de San Antonio	8202	2534	4006
28168	Vellón (El)	1103	183	430
28169	Venturada	933	232	442
28170	Villaconejos	2945	607	1100
28171	Villa del Prado	4197	1470	1711
28172	Villalbilla	5944	1549	2848
28173	Villamanrique de Tajo	588	130	238
28174	Villamanta	1846	376	731
28175	Villamantilla	372	116	161
28176	Villanueva de la Cañada	11701	3741	5352
28177	Villanueva del Pardillo	6431	1876	3425
28178	Villanueva de Perales	777	120	386
28179	Villar del Olmo	1587	172	687
28180	Villarejo de Salvanés	5778	2191	2353
28181	Villaviciosa de Odón	22564	7709	10569
28182	Villavieja del Lozoy	188	68	69
28183	Zarzalejo	1171	308	509
28901	Lozoyuela-Navas-Sieteiglesias	688	320	258
28902	Puentes Viejas	406	89	154
28903	Tres Cantos	36927	25166	18295
40007	Aldealengua de Pedraza	93	12	30
40019	Arahuetes	52	4	20
40028	Bercial	120	32	55
40034	Caballar	94	21	27
40045	Casla	151	28	51
40049	Castroserna de Abajo	50	10	25
40059	Collado Hermoso	154	37	56
40062	Cubillo	40	10	14
40070	Duruelo	140	28	42
40076	Espinar (El)	6353	2334	2795
40093	Gallegos	97	17	30
40104	Ituero y Lama	90	22	38
40111	Lastras del Pozo	80	38	31
40113	Losa (La)	393	82	182
40122	Marugán	387	93	145
40123	Matabuena	243	60	91
40125	Matilla (La)	110	31	39
40131	Monterrubio	75	24	27

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
40135	Muñopedro	394	67	151
40136	Muñoveros	207	43	59
40146	Navas de San Antonio	295	76	105
40152	Otero de Herreros	838	213	337
40156	Pedraza	458	186	221
40162	Prádena	548	154	207
40163	Puebla de Pedraza	85	12	25
40165	Rebollo	118	11	33
40172	Riofrío de Riaza	59	7	13
40186	Santa Marta del Cerro	53	10	17
40191	Santo Tomé del Puerto	321	93	116
40199	Sotosalbos	131	28	67
40206	Torre Val de San Pedro	189	34	65
40211	Valdeprados	56	12	21
40213	Valdevacas y Guijar	142	38	65
40220	Valleruela de Pedraza	64	10	17
40221	Valleruela de Sepúlveda	71	9	21
40223	Vegas de Matute	243	33	64
40224	Ventosa y Tejadilla	39	11	18
40233	Zarzuela del Monte	547	58	189
40904	Navas de Riofrío	287	64	122
42219	Yelo	54	14	21
45002	Alameda de la Sagra	2889	814	1151
45004	Alcabón	634	111	230
45008	Aldea en Cabo	186	36	50
45011	Almendral de la Caña	398	61	100
45013	Almorox	2166	414	697
45014	Añover de Tajo	4692	1204	1840
45015	Arcicóllar	557	100	212
45018	Barcience	108	53	48
45019	Bargas	7109	1083	3000
45021	Borox	2300	480	843
45022	Buenaventura	541	106	145
45025	Cabañas de la Sagra	1312	338	573
45026	Cabañas de Yepes	253	38	80
45027	Cabezamesada	459	122	148
45031	Camarena	2467	392	981
45035	Cardiel de los Montes	166	37	61
45036	Carmena	814	138	229
45037	Carpio de Tajo (El)	2206	459	787
45038	Carranque	1906	367	833
45039	Carriches	281	63	88
45040	Casar de Escalona (El)	1001	246	313
45041	Casarrubios del Monte	3362	1162	1334
45047	Cedillo del Condado	1783	608	709
45048	Cerralbos (Los)	465	101	150
45050	Ciruelos	374	49	145
45051	Cobeja	1867	527	753
45054	Corral de Almaguer	5549	1488	2091
45056	Chozas de Canales	1167	271	450
45058	Domingo Pérez	470	90	129
45059	Dosbarrios	2100	1038	826
45060	Erustes	196	38	58
45061	Escalona	2180	727	803
45064	Esquivias	3928	1041	1508
45071	Guardia (La)	2379	601	940
45076	Hormigos	390	109	114
45078	Huerta de Valdecarábanos	1711	252	619
45079	Iglesuela (La)	418	133	109
45080	Illán de Vacas	7	5	5
45081	Illescas	11948	5313	5147
45084	Lillo	2922	504	1039
45085	Lominchar	1227	859	490
45086	Lucillos	488	82	137
45088	Magán	1236	293	500
45089	Malpica de Tajo	1892	547	664
45091	Maqueda	468	229	192
45093	Marrupe	150	36	48
45099	Méntrida	2223	672	880
45101	Miguel Esteban	4935	1326	1966
45102	Mocejón	4195	805	1639

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
45105	Montesclaros	414	58	129
45114	Navamorcuende	702	185	221
45115	Noblejas	3012	1103	1189
45117	Nombela	917	183	270
45118	Novés	1597	324	577
45119	Numancia de la Sagra	2967	712	1283
45121	Ocaña	6441	3635	2594
45122	Olías del Rey	4729	1572	2084
45123	Ontigola	1434	397	634
45127	Palomeque	476	150	176
45128	Pantoja	2773	1061	1046
45129	Paredes de Escalona	113	23	27
45134	Portillo de Toledo	2055	583	765
45135	Puebla de Almoradiel (La)	5526	1282	2072
45143	Quismondo	1332	185	472
45145	Recas	2745	764	1053
45149	Romeral (El)	857	236	258
45152	San Martín de Pusa	786	169	238
45157	Santa Cruz del Retamar	1842	480	651
45158	Santa Olalla	2597	638	914
45159	Sartajada	117	59	46
45161	Seseña	5324	4146	2458
45164	Sotillo de las Palomas	220	30	53
45167	Toboso (El)	2069	464	717
45171	Torre de Esteban Hambrán (La)	1506	372	545
45176	Ugena	1945	749	918
45180	Valmojado	2495	904	942
45183	Ventas de Retamosa (La)	936	288	354
45188	Villaluenga de la Sagra	2662	855	1050
45189	Villamiel de Toledo	538	113	207
45191	Villamuelas	739	124	285
45192	Villanueva de Alcardete	3468	908	1213
45193	Villanueva de Bogas	826	148	304
45195	Villarrubia de Santiago	2820	566	976
45196	Villaseca de la Sagra	1565	481	530
45197	Villasequilla	2323	344	966
45198	Villatobas	2187	612	854
45199	Viso de San Juan (El)	1362	415	617
45201	Yeles	1659	1228	708
45202	Yepes	4410	1035	1726
45203	Yuncler	2080	512	751
45204	Yuncillos	664	215	243
45205	Yuncos	4204	1656	1827
45901	Santo Domingo-Caudilla	762	319	253

2. Metropolitan area of Barcelona (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
8001	Abrera	8624	8439	4313
8003	Alella	8470	1957	3832
8005	Ametlla del Vallès (l')	6133	2288	2919
8006	Arenys de Mar	12835	4090	5609
8007	Arenys de Munt	6665	2035	2967
8009	Argentona	9896	3556	4545
8013	Avinyonet del Penedès	1262	441	568
8014	Aiguafreda	2155	899	1013
8015	Badalona	205836	54998	87116
8017	Balenyà	3213	1220	1600
8019	Barcelona	1503884	779296	645419
8020	Begues	4697	980	2375
8021	Bellprat	90	26	49
8023	Bigues i Riells	5914	2092	2748
8025	Bruc (el)	1234	444	553
8026	Brull (el)	186	65	89
8027	Cabanyes (les)	570	99	256
8028	Cabrera d'Igualada	658	148	261
8029	Cabrera de Mar	3763	2712	1836
8030	Cabrils	5219	1400	2527
8032	Caldes d'Estrac	1974	470	894
8033	Caldes de Montbui	13848	5386	6680
8034	Calders	788	218	355
8035	Calella	13694	5475	5330
8039	Campins	294	62	139
8040	Canet de Mar	10778	2884	4644
8041	Canovelles	12912	4622	5876
8042	Cànoves i Samalús	1968	294	902
8043	Canyelles	2158	398	959
8044	Capellades	4881	2112	2243
8046	Cardedeu	12792	4378	5998
8051	Castellar del Vallès	18255	6980	8671
8053	Castellbell i el Vilar	2913	1145	1274
8054	Castellbisbal	9128	9378	4611
8055	Castellcir	406	120	199
8056	Castelldefels	46428	11881	22425
8058	Castellet i la Gornal	1488	1070	604
8061	Castellgalí	966	342	396
8063	Castellolí	430	105	207
8064	Castellterçol	2031	698	867
8065	Castellví de la Marca	1433	505	655
8066	Castellví de Rosanes	1195	725	582
8067	Centelles	5822	2168	2715
8068	Cervelló	6200	1861	2928
8069	Collbató	2429	563	1167
8070	Collsuspina	268	70	152
8072	Corbera de Llobregat	9610	2297	4530
8073	Cornellà de Llobregat	79979	27809	35292
8074	Cubelles	7326	1873	3334
8075	Dosrius	3098	1310	1551
8076	Esparreguera	18290	6054	8381
8077	Esplugues de Llobregat	45127	15377	20673
8079	Estany (l')	403	146	174
8081	Fogars de Montclús	352	127	188
8082	Fogars de la Selva	806	368	361
8085	Font-rubí	1262	303	485
8086	Franqueses del Vallè	13007	5722	6365
8087	Gallifa	186	33	96
8088	Garriga (la)	12037	5429	5392
8089	Gavà	39815	15213	17677
8091	Gelida	4571	1635	2176
8094	Granada (la)	1432	256	651
8095	Granera	67	9	37
8096	Granollers	53105	31776	25406
8097	Gualba	830	242	411
8101	Hospitalet de Llobregat (L')	239019	66668	103195
8104	Llacuna (la)	836	240	376
8105	Llagosta (la)	12042	4618	5609
8106	Llinars del Vallès	7238	3123	3392

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
8107	Lliçà d'Amunt	10629	3285	5248
8108	Lliçà de Vall	5353	5003	2580
8110	Malgrat de Mar	14367	5609	6296
8114	Martorell	23023	24749	10921
8115	Martorelles	4906	4046	2176
8118	Masnou (el)	20678	5600	9751
8119	Masquefa	5500	1395	2496
8120	Matadepera	7190	1390	3270
8121	Mataró	106358	42429	47100
8122	Mediona	1503	559	665
8123	Molins de Rei	20639	9544	9692
8124	Mollet del Vallès	47270	15274	22577
8125	Montcada i Reixac	28295	15828	12306
8126	Montgat	8335	2175	4045
8127	Monistrol de Montserrat	2521	1150	1188
8129	Muntanyola	341	57	178
8134	Figaró-Montmany	873	291	404
8135	Montmeló	8592	3498	4060
8136	Montornès del Vallès	12868	7541	6182
8137	Montseny	286	115	133
8138	Moià	4344	1698	2103
8139	Mura	208	65	101
8145	Olèrdola	2422	2039	1136
8146	Olesa de Bonesvalls	1056	264	520
8147	Olesa de Montserrat	17987	5235	7920
8148	Olivella	1453	253	683
8153	Orius	463	112	206
8154	Pacs del Penedès	704	503	343
8155	Palafolls	5917	2023	2702
8156	Palau-solità i Plegamans	11384	9126	5701
8157	Pallejà	8399	2676	3982
8158	Papiol (el)	3314	2190	1434
8159	Parets del Vallès	14983	10707	7286
8161	Piera	10048	2497	4330
8162	Hostalets de Pierola	1454	376	682
8163	Pineda de Mar	21074	6806	8807
8167	Polinyà	5145	7298	2409
8168	Pontons	414	91	160
8169	Prat de Llobregat (el)	61818	31863	27726
8172	Premià de Mar	26334	5657	12211
8174	Puigdàlber	347	84	159
8179	Rellinars	396	67	161
8180	Ripollet	30235	9272	13880
8181	Roca del Vallès (la)	7748	3434	3785
8184	Rubí	61159	27640	28958
8187	Sabadell	183788	69563	81200
8193	Sant Iscle de Vallalta	944	288	412
8194	Sant Adrià de Besòs	31939	10556	12780
8196	Sant Andreu de la Barca	21933	12211	10867
8197	Sant Andreu de Llavaneres	7833	2004	3779
8198	Sant Antoni de Vilamajor	3829	1092	1821
8200	Sant Boi de Llobregat	78738	23561	34156
8202	Sant Celoni	12700	6124	5396
8203	Sant Cebrià de Vallalta	1951	636	938
8204	Sant Climent de Llobregat	3140	852	1536
8205	Sant Cugat del Vallès	60265	27188	28912
8206	Sant Cugat Sesgarrigues	755	340	341
8207	Sant Esteve de Palautodera	1484	397	626
8208	Sant Esteve Sesrovires	5410	3200	2428
8209	Sant Fost de Campsentelles	6718	2213	3125
8210	Sant Feliu de Codines	4530	1202	2088
8211	Sant Feliu de Llobregat	40042	12908	19511
8214	Vilassar de Dalt	7904	3033	3553
8217	Sant Joan Despí	28772	12726	13489
8219	Vilassar de Mar	17369	5339	8165
8221	Sant Just Desvern	13870	9702	6525
8222	Sant Llorenç d'Horto	1758	489	801
8223	Sant Llorenç Savall	2061	495	755
8224	Sant Martí de Centelles	772	222	352
8227	Sant Martí Sarroca	2448	768	1034
8230	Premià de Dalt	9114	2070	4178

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
8231	Sant Pere de Ribes	23134	5585	10492
8232	Sant Pere de Riudebitlles	2086	625	944
8234	Sant Pere de Vilamajor	2809	867	1313
8235	Sant Pol de Mar	3927	1136	1981
8236	Sant Quintí de Mediona	1791	402	677
8238	Sant Quirze del Vallès	13727	6378	6911
8239	Sant Quirze Safaja	417	115	224
8240	Sant Sadurní d'Anoia	9843	5078	4608
8242	Marganell	233	62	99
8244	Santa Coloma de Cervelló	5557	1609	2882
8245	Santa Coloma de Gramenet	112992	19249	48838
8248	Santa Eulàlia de Ronçana	4950	1159	2459
8249	Santa Fe del Penedès	317	45	143
8252	Barberà del Vallès	26428	17465	12741
8256	Santa Maria de Martorelles	690	108	310
8257	Santa Maria de Miralles	98	72	49
8259	Santa Maria de Palautordera	6442	1847	2931
8260	Santa Perpètua de Mogoda	20479	15397	9623
8261	Santa Susanna	2090	888	998
8262	Sant Vicenç de Castè	7008	2225	2879
8263	Sant Vicenç dels Horts	24694	8129	11415
8264	Sant Vicenç de Montalt	3847	1020	1863
8266	Cerdanyola del Vallès	53343	19156	25004
8267	Sentmenat	5921	3382	2838
8269	Seva	2578	719	1198
8270	Sitges	19893	8085	9077
8273	Subirats	2576	950	1130
8276	Tagamanent	217	134	104
8277	Talamanca	100	65	53
8279	Terrassa	173775	67757	78005
8281	Teià	5450	1084	2550
8282	Tiana	6082	900	2793
8284	Tordera	10116	3759	4359
8286	Torre de Claramunt (La)	2519	741	1207
8287	Torrelavit	1123	584	492
8288	Torrelles de Foix	1713	373	695
8289	Torrelles de Llobregat	3759	655	1806
8290	Ullastrell	1252	267	656
8291	Vacarisses	3173	1638	1542
8292	Vallbona d'Anoia	1027	397	466
8294	Vallgorguina	1430	448	679
8295	Vallirana	9866	2763	4549
8296	Vallromanes	1545	393	768
8300	Viladecavalls	6383	3177	3126
8301	Viladecans	56841	14640	26599
8304	Vilobí del Penedès	917	325	409
8305	Vilafranca del Penedès	31248	14031	14310
8306	Vilalba Sasserra	491	129	286
8307	Vilanova i la Geltrú	54230	19343	23980
8902	Vilanova del Vallès	2540	934	1233
8904	Badia del Vallès	14714	1358	6291
8905	Palma de Cervelló (La)	2696	923	1240
17027	Breda	3381	1166	1514
17083	Hostalric	2912	1550	1418
17101	Massanes	565	636	259
17146	Riells i Viabrea	2264	689	1117
17159	Sant Feliu de Buixalleu	702	356	303
17220	Viladrau	863	369	391
43002	Albinyana	1630	249	689
43012	Altafulla	3293	864	1467
43016	Arboç (l')	3715	1440	1579
43020	Banyeres del Penedès	1736	485	784
43024	Bellvei	1400	639	560
43028	Bisbal del Penedès (La)	2182	430	895
43030	Bonastre	372	80	156
43037	Calafell	13503	4156	5826
43046	Conesa	132	17	48
43050	Creixell	2086	561	794
43051	Cunit	6402	1355	2866
43061	Forès	61	11	20
43074	Llorenç del Penedès	1661	685	748

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
43079	Masllorenç	429	173	174
43090	Montmell (el)	721	69	274
43097	Nou de Gaià (la)	406	50	168
43101	Passanant	194	43	81
43105	Piles (les)	189	27	85
43111	Pobla de Montornès (La)	1522	339	660
43120	Querol	290	54	125
43131	Roda de Barà	3639	1299	1699
43132	Rodonyà	443	154	182
43137	Sant Jaume dels Domenys	1500	361	611
43140	Santa Oliva	2261	1386	858
43143	Savallà del Comtat	62	9	22
43153	Torredembarra	11187	3770	4909
43159	Vallfogona de Riucorb	154	67	47
43163	Vendrell (el)	23744	8711	10693
43164	Vespella de Gaià	210	54	93

3. Metropolitan area of Valencia (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
12002	Aín	155	20	67
12008	Algimia de Almonacid	299	55	93
12010	Almedijar	270	57	83
12012	Altura	3140	635	1215
12022	Bejis	370	91	119
12024	Benafer	150	23	51
12043	Caudiel	704	166	245
12065	Gaibiel	200	43	62
12069	Higueras	47	5	13
12071	Jérica	1561	359	567
12081	Navajas	564	169	243
12097	Sacañet	84	8	37
12107	Sot de Ferrer	407	88	155
12125	Vall de Almonacid	279	30	91
16093	Garaballa	151	43	41
16097	Henarejos	252	37	65
16137	Narboneta	87	11	19
16202	Talayuelas	1159	268	373
16274	Víllora	181	13	11
16276	Yémeda	29	6	4
44002	Abejuela	56	4	17
44231	Torrijas	67	16	20
46005	Alaquàs	27733	8274	11896
46007	Albal	12652	4825	5937
46008	Albalat de la Ribera	3431	674	1356
46009	Albalat dels Sorells	3499	855	1537
46010	Albalat dels Tarongers	717	93	286
46012	Alborache	934	320	386
46013	Alboraya	18201	6034	8869
46014	Albuixech	3076	2658	1284
46015	Alcàsser	7557	3797	3373
46018	Alcublas	812	185	267
46021	Aldaia	24800	12316	10155
46022	Alfafar	18622	3624	7156
46024	Alfara de Algimia	490	142	184
46025	Alfara del Patriarca	2623	708	1133
46026	Alfarp	1353	502	548
46028	Algar de Palancia	424	115	158
46029	Algemesí	24563	8074	10404
46030	Algimia de Alfara	947	228	424
46031	Alginet	11947	3969	5290
46032	Almàssera	5931	1398	2423
46035	Almussafes	7070	12830	3346
46036	Alpuente	911	371	327
46038	Andilla	372	91	156
46041	Aras de los Olmos	383	112	126
46050	Benagéber	181	79	71
46051	Benaguasil	9116	2871	3441
46052	Benavites	645	225	303
46054	Benetússer	13425	2950	5419
46058	Benifairó de les Valls	1898	527	920
46060	Benifaió	12050	4099	5425
46065	Beniparrell	1680	5873	725
46067	Benisanó	1828	637	752
46070	Bétera	15238	4738	6742
46074	Bonrepòs i Mirambell	2231	1000	935
46076	Bugarra	817	166	238
46077	Buñol	9090	3503	3613
46078	Burjassot	35330	9118	14403
46079	Calles	399	82	116
46080	Camporrobles	1361	280	441
46082	Canet d'En Berenguer	3007	744	1394
46089	Casinos	2268	597	809
46093	Catadau	2300	634	934
46094	Catarroja	20990	7991	8877
46098	Corbera	3029	776	1222
46099	Cortes de Pallás	839	263	290
46101	Quart de les Valls	1077	107	489
46102	Quart de Poblet	25305	14074	10194

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
46103	Quartell	1359	418	601
46105	Cullera	20379	6396	7860
46106	Chelva	2046	558	732
46108	Chera	547	106	187
46109	Cheste	7002	3913	3046
46110	Xirivella	26710	7372	11455
46111	Chiva	10577	4065	4773
46112	Chulilla	751	204	256
46114	Domeño	526	111	208
46115	Dos Aguas	448	80	151
46116	Elia (l')	13668	4142	6044
46117	Emperador	205	50	97
46120	Estivella	1148	250	434
46122	Faura	2804	709	1264
46125	Fortaleny	997	151	375
46126	Foios	5540	1857	2539
46133	Gestalgar	624	122	241
46134	Gilet	1631	318	673
46135	Godella	11080	2712	4706
46136	Godolleta	2365	764	1046
46141	Higueruelas	537	191	189
46147	Llíria	17211	6894	7014
46148	Loriguilla	1045	300	437
46149	Losa del Obispo	488	128	166
46152	Lugar Nuevo de la Corina	109	14	39
46155	Llaurí	1402	350	535
46156	Llombai	2327	855	924
46158	Macastre	1063	185	376
46159	Manises	25685	10808	10546
46161	Marines	1396	1356	522
46163	Massalfassar	1412	1235	580
46164	Massamagrell	13131	3225	5638
46165	Massanassa	7370	3136	3069
46166	Meliana	8988	2381	3896
46167	Millares	604	235	234
46169	Mislata	40548	6473	17087
46171	Moncada	18631	5850	7729
46172	Monserrat	3386	1229	1496
46176	Montroy	1628	287	629
46177	Museros	4167	2270	1937
46178	Náquera	3002	1087	1325
46182	Olocau	919	186	413
46186	Païporta	18860	5460	8395
46190	Paterna	46974	23038	19160
46191	Pedralba	2195	700	892
46192	Petrés	822	81	335
46193	Picanya	9024	3507	3966
46194	Picassent	16333	7357	7298
46197	Polinyà de Xúquer	3045	805	1293
46199	Pobla de Farnals (la)	5287	2236	2284
46202	Pobla de Vallbona (la)	12938	4175	5607
46204	Puig	7352	2944	3331
46205	Puçol	14965	4797	6685
46207	Rafelbuñol	5727	3101	2501
46212	Real de Montrou	1855	633	753
46214	Riba-roja de Túria	14209	8810	6064
46215	Riola	1591	207	603
46216	Rocafort	5341	923	2189
46220	Sagunto	56471	20031	22755
46223	Sedaví	8457	2947	3578
46224	Segart	211	19	79
46228	Serra	2004	699	856
46229	Siete Aguas	1126	299	435
46230	Silla	16208	8640	7027
46232	Sinarcas	1188	332	426
46233	Sollana	4471	2990	2104
46234	Sot de Chera	312	51	97
46235	Sueca	25371	7836	10327
46237	Tavernes Blanques	8653	3209	3783
46239	Teresa de Cofrentes	661	85	202
46241	Titaguas	527	193	209

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
46244	Torrent	65417	18047	27212
46245	Torres Torres	443	74	176
46247	Tuéjar	1218	274	402
46248	Turís	4879	1550	1983
46250	Valencia	738441	302770	299349
46256	Vilamarxant	6119	1512	2533
46258	Villar del Arzobispo	3466	1117	1341
46260	Vinalesa	2431	686	1066
46261	Yátova	1949	303	717
46262	Yesa (La)	252	78	96
46902	Gátova	471	72	113
46903	San Antonio de Benagéber	3042	1026	1395

4. Metropolitan area of Sevilla (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
41003	Albaida del Aljarafe	1956	365	615
41004	Alcalá de Guadaira	57426	19996	19965
41005	Alcalá del Río	9042	1944	2780
41006	Alcolea del Río	3338	651	867
41007	Algaba (La)	13005	2001	3987
41009	Almadén de la Plata	1657	393	456
41010	Almensilla	3368	618	1261
41012	Aznalcázar	3473	1020	915
41013	Aznalcóllar	5809	1411	1699
41015	Benacazón	5150	1516	1909
41016	Bollullos de la Mitación	5224	1583	1702
41017	Bormujos	11958	2158	4848
41018	Brenes	10795	3836	4395
41019	Burguillos	3690	756	1046
41021	Camas	24966	5302	8411
41022	Campana (La)	5003	1179	1591
41023	Cantillana	8934	2208	2853
41024	Carmona	25794	6957	8515
41025	Carrión de los Céspedes	2320	386	588
41027	Castilblanco de los Arroyos	4547	712	1053
41028	Castilleja de Guzmán	1870	180	832
41029	Castilleja de la Cuesta	16245	2281	6069
41030	Castilleja del Campo	606	134	178
41031	Castillo de las Guardas (El)	1618	348	347
41034	Coria del Río	24040	4666	7787
41036	Coronil (El)	5076	950	1618
41038	Dos Hermanas	101988	24869	36183
41040	Espartinas	5798	1384	2296
41043	Garrobo (El)	757	90	194
41044	Gelves	6767	911	2753
41045	Gerena	5610	1104	1666
41047	Gines	10918	2148	4159
41049	Guillena	8428	2010	2677
41051	Huévar del Aljarafe	2257	516	645
41055	Lora del Río	18281	4066	5344
41057	Madroño (El)	379	50	97
41058	Mairena del Alcor	16821	3937	6011
41059	Mairena del Aljarafe	35833	7878	14319
41063	Molares (Los)	2688	365	633
41067	Olivares	8105	1486	2594
41069	Palacios y Villafranca (Los)	33045	8318	11152
41070	Palomares del Río	3742	755	1489
41071	Paradas	7040	2005	2766
41079	Puebla del Río (La)	10499	1582	3200
41081	Rinconada (La)	29282	8063	10307
41083	Ronquillo (El)	1351	287	416
41085	Salteras	3344	1092	1267
41086	San Juan de Aznalfar	19340	6041	6569
41087	Sanlúcar la Mayor	10858	2767	3715
41089	Santiponce	7099	1572	2557
41091	Sevilla	684633	281189	238160
41092	Tocina	8828	2544	3141
41093	Tomares	18315	3597	7237
41094	Umbrete	5038	1327	1892
41095	Utrera	45175	10789	13544
41096	Valencina de la Conccepción	6950	1743	2749
41098	Villanueva del Ariscal	4956	807	1583
41099	Villanueva del Río y Miñas	5218	819	1241
41101	Villaverde del Río	6377	1185	1986
41102	Viso del Alcor (El)	16333	3585	5344

5. Metropolitan area of Bilbao (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
1002	Amurrio	9460	4603	3882
1004	Artziniega	1336	484	583
1010	Ayala	2117	951	938
1036	Llodio	18931	6633	7248
1042	Okondo	876	204	356
9410	Valle de Mena	3229	1010	1175
39020	Castro-Urdiales	21081	6675	9370
39030	Guriezo	1765	458	710
39036	Liendo	889	284	404
39038	Limpias	1356	320	549
39101	Villaverde de Trucíos	365	57	126
48002	Abanto y Ciérvana-Abanto Zierbana	9036	3371	3527
48003	Amorebieta-Etxano	16182	6446	6834
48004	Amoroto	376	233	197
48005	Arakaldo	95	80	34
48006	Arantzazu	289	42	121
48007	Munitibar-Arbatzegi Gerraikaitz	390	45	156
48008	Artzentales	655	81	205
48009	Arrankudiaga	775	617	308
48010	Arrieta	521	29	176
48011	Arrigorriaga	11140	3896	4834
48012	Bakio	1727	402	812
48013	Barakaldo	94478	24628	35110
48014	Barrika	1230	238	544
48015	Basauri	45085	14139	18355
48016	Berango	5311	1488	2270
48017	Bermeo	16938	4874	6459
48020	Bilbao	349972	150063	136332
48021	Busturia	1662	209	665
48022	Valle de Carranza	2887	860	1108
48023	Artea	644	117	294
48024	Zeanuri	1143	208	475
48025	Zeberio	995	151	407
48026	Dima	1052	183	425
48028	Ea	810	88	285
48029	Etxebarri Anteiglesia de San Esteban	7043	2957	3162
48031	Elantxobe	443	43	127
48033	Ereño	254	29	103
48035	Fruiz	347	37	151
48036	Galdakao	29544	10590	12762
48037	Galdames	799	209	336
48038	Gamiz-Fika	1227	201	562
48040	Gatika	1295	467	603
48041	Gautegiz Arteaga	843	127	338
48042	Gordexola	1511	243	609
48043	Gorliz	4486	810	1994
48044	Getxo	82285	17800	33026
48045	Güeñes	5831	1415	2031
48046	Gernika-Lumo	15264	5821	6106
48047	Gizaburuaga	144	339	59
48048	Ibarrangelu	542	55	204
48049	Ispaster	613	171	253
48051	Lanestosa	288	34	78
48052	Larrabetzu	1551	445	620
48053	Laukiz	995	143	436
48054	Leioa	28381	11495	12372
48055	Lemoa	2681	1669	1142
48056	Lemoiz	886	116	364
48057	Lekeitio	7357	1606	3026
48061	Maruri-Jatabe	683	105	328
48062	Mendata	339	39	156
48063	Mendexa	341	48	151
48064	Meñaka	515	103	241
48065	Ugao-Miraballes	4104	958	1746
48066	Morga	400	68	174
48067	Muxika	1320	517	551
48068	Mundaka	1853	290	747
48069	Mungia	13807	7555	6202

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
48070	Aulesti	649	100	264
48071	Muskiz	6558	3041	2498
48074	Urduña-Orduña	3982	1079	1550
48075	Orozko	2116	778	825
48076	Sukarrieta	325	168	156
48077	Plentzia	3643	892	1708
48078	Portugalete	51066	8091	18973
48079	Errigoiti	485	35	164
48080	Valle de Trápaga-Trapagaran	12621	6509	4911
48081	Lezama	2113	966	943
48082	Santurtzi	47173	9012	17844
48083	Ortuella	8684	1855	3326
48084	Sestao	31773	8942	10900
48085	Sopelana	10709	2012	4824
48086	Sopuerta	2245	560	878
48087	Trucios-Turtzioz	521	82	175
48089	Urduliz	3142	1169	1333
48090	Balmaseda	7069	1650	2638
48092	Bedia	994	853	380
48093	Areatza	1031	143	368
48094	Igorre	3857	3110	1669
48096	Zalla	7857	2145	3142
48097	Zaratamo	1651	1479	688
48901	Derio	4846	4299	2265
48902	Erandio	22422	8703	8922
48903	Loiu	2199	2796	860
48904	Sondika	3978	3221	1661
48905	Zamudio	3012	10472	1335
48906	Forua	987	156	443
48907	Kortezubi	363	84	146
48908	Murueta	259	155	116
48909	Nabarniz	221	28	99
48911	Ajangiz	434	269	184
48912	Alonsotegi	2662	520	995
48913	Zierbena	1215	523	483
48914	Arratzu	368	57	159

6. Metropolitan area of Zaragoza (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
19016	Algar de Mesa	84	10	19
19109	Embid	64	13	21
19183	Milmarcos	126	10	34
22004	Agüero	171	26	53
22018	Alcubierre	449	97	166
22083	Castejón de Monegros	665	121	233
22119	Gurrea de Gállego	1772	483	686
22137	Lanaja	1531	284	517
42063	Cihuela	90	34	47
44006	Alacón	409	77	105
44008	Albalate del Arzobispo	2185	423	660
44023	Allueva	13	1	2
44024	Anadón	18	4	7
44031	Azaila	171	53	54
44032	Bádenas	25	3	9
44033	Báguena	463	71	129
44039	Bello	369	87	107
44043	Blesa	139	24	54
44047	Burbáguena	303	51	60
44065	Castejón de Tornos	92	13	30
44067	Castelnou	109	24	42
44084	Cortes de Aragón	118	17	26
44085	Cosa	93	23	30
44090	Cucalón	80	16	32
44100	Estercuel	314	108	83
44110	Fuenferrada	48	5	11
44122	Hijar	1928	610	673
44124	Hoz de la Vieja (La)	123	16	32
44125	Huesa del Común	136	27	41
44129	Jatiel	54	4	13
44131	Josa	30	5	12
44132	Lagueruela	64	16	23
44138	Loscós	188	45	54
44142	Maicas	42	0	14
44152	Monforte de Moyuela	77	18	24
44161	Muniesa	684	182	200
44164	Nogueras	19	6	10
44172	Oliete	454	74	102
44184	Plou	53	8	14
44191	Puebla de Hjar (La)	1046	567	377
44205	Samper de Calanda	971	194	309
44207	San Martín del Río	269	42	75
44208	Santa Cruz de Nogueras	29	4	8
44211	Segura de los Baños	40	7	8
44222	Torrecilla del Rebollar	177	32	56
44224	Torre de las Arcas	37	6	9
44227	Torre los Negros	94	17	29
44237	Urrea de Gaén	582	69	186
44256	Villanueva del Rebollar de la Sierra	48	10	13
44265	Vinaceite	283	61	104
44267	Vivel del Río Martín	84	18	22
50001	Abanto	167	31	43
50002	Acered	259	48	79
50003	Agón	186	32	70
50004	Aguarón	751	147	256
50005	Aguilón	287	36	99
50006	Ainzón	1235	270	448
50007	Aladrén	77	4	32
50008	Alagón	5620	2179	2400
50010	Alberite de San Juan	95	20	37
50011	Albeta	120	35	43
50012	Alborge	135	16	50
50013	Alcalá de Ebro	295	32	94
50014	Alcalá de Moncayo	127	17	48
50016	Aldehuela de Liestos	37	8	12
50017	Alfajarín	1548	739	727
50018	Alfamén	1402	475	590
50019	Alforque	82	11	28

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
50021	Almochuel	50	4	13
50022	Almolda (La)	673	138	256
50023	Almonacid de la Cuba	325	47	95
50024	Almonacid de la Sierra	881	207	322
50026	Alpartir	609	102	211
50027	Ambel	339	47	127
50028	Anento	116	21	55
50030	Añón de Moncayo	288	49	81
50031	Aranda de Moncayo	229	46	80
50032	Arándiga	466	71	119
50033	Ardisa	74	13	29
50036	Asín	100	11	32
50037	Atea	206	43	59
50039	Azuara	667	153	239
50040	Badules	112	9	36
50041	Bagüés	39	15	11
50043	Bárboles	315	86	123
50044	Bardallur	284	57	105
50045	Belchite	1612	1056	670
50047	Berdejo	53	2	31
50048	Berrueco	37	9	11
50050	Bijuesca	133	28	42
50051	Biota	1200	226	443
50052	Bisimbre	124	61	47
50053	Boquiñeni	990	194	382
50055	Borja	4295	1697	1787
50056	Botorrita	482	96	193
50060	Bulbuenta	246	79	81
50062	Burgo de Ebro (El)	1628	1090	755
50064	Cabañas de Ebro	544	79	211
50066	Cadrete	1784	1537	873
50068	Calatorao	2852	887	1137
50069	Calcena	99	11	29
50071	Campillo de Aragón	182	37	55
50073	Cariñena	3196	1805	1402
50077	Castejón de Valdejas	324	66	117
50078	Castiliscar	403	68	169
50080	Cerveruela	25	0	9
50082	Cimballa	143	15	39
50083	Cinco Olivas	132	10	40
50085	Codo	259	42	77
50086	Codos	279	55	76
50088	Cosuenda	410	84	158
50089	Cuarte de Huerva	1922	3614	945
50093	Chodes	117	9	26
50096	Embid de Ariza	70	8	18
50098	Encinacorba	300	56	101
50099	Epila	4087	2441	1595
50100	Erla	451	75	166
50101	Escatrón	1111	292	369
50104	Farlete	444	59	184
50107	Figueruelas	1058	8563	474
50108	Fombuena	15	5	5
50109	Frago (El)	132	31	49
50110	Frasno (El)	547	183	176
50111	Fréscano	248	35	82
50113	Fuendejalón	871	251	335
50114	Fuendetodos	176	32	62
50115	Fuentes de Ebro	3887	1348	1693
50116	Fuentes de Jiloca	326	57	97
50117	Gallocanta	157	44	61
50118	Gallur	2900	679	1125
50119	Gelsa	1220	376	449
50122	Grisel	55	7	19
50123	Grisén	470	92	190
50124	Herrera de los Navar	599	128	201
50131	Jaulín	292	61	110
50132	Joyosa (La)	430	116	181
50133	Lagata	157	19	43
50134	Langa del Castillo	177	23	44
50135	Layana	137	29	61

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
50136	Lécera	817	148	268
50137	Leciñena	1292	285	497
50138	Lechón	59	8	18
50139	Letux	463	68	134
50140	Litago	172	13	52
50141	Lituénigo	116	8	37
50142	Lobera de Onsella	54	4	9
50143	Longares	911	242	333
50144	Longás	44	9	20
50146	Lucena de Jalón	235	36	86
50147	Luceni	1034	308	371
50148	Luesia	413	86	136
50149	Luesma	32	3	20
50150	Lumpiaque	917	149	274
50151	Luna	897	188	320
50153	Magallón	1177	228	440
50154	Mainar	170	42	62
50155	Malanquilla	150	25	55
50156	Maleján	294	53	112
50160	Mallén	3109	1019	1269
50161	Manchones	145	17	46
50162	Mara	202	34	74
50163	María de Huerva	1531	889	726
50164	Mediana de Aragón	485	87	163
50166	Mesones de Isuela	350	60	107
50167	Mezalocha	283	73	94
50169	Miedes de Aragón	513	125	161
50170	Monegrillo	524	119	217
50171	Moneva	160	15	54
50173	Monterde	212	23	81
50174	Montón	126	16	41
50175	Morata de Jalón	1471	382	475
50178	Moros	488	103	136
50179	Moyuela	326	55	98
50180	Mozota	114	18	42
50181	Muel	1108	351	427
50182	Muela (La)	1773	691	840
50184	Murero	142	16	43
50185	Murillo de Gállego	150	33	49
50187	Nigüella	98	9	25
50188	Nombrevilla	53	9	22
50191	Novillas	673	138	272
50193	Nuez de Ebro	581	163	273
50195	Orcajo	50	11	19
50197	Orés	112	16	31
50198	Oseja	52	6	23
50199	Osera de Ebro	357	163	161
50202	Paracuellos de la Ribera	255	39	57
50203	Pastriz	1083	137	489
50204	Pedrola	2812	1700	1126
50205	Pedrosas (Las)	103	20	40
50206	Perdiguera	519	110	206
50207	Piedratajada	151	30	66
50208	Pina de Ebro	2233	1172	1055
50209	Pinseque	1819	851	835
50210	Pintanos (Los)	87	13	26
50211	Plasencia de Jalón	370	59	138
50212	Pleitas	61	7	15
50213	Plenas	159	38	63
50214	Pomer	35	2	11
50216	Pozuelo de Aragón	337	67	116
50217	Pradilla de Ebro	628	152	252
50218	Puebla de Albortón	138	41	56
50219	Puebla de Alfindén (La)	2296	3061	1156
50220	Puendeluna	58	7	23
50221	Purujosa	47	0	30
50222	Quinto	2064	678	843
50223	Remolinos	1228	280	467
50224	Retascón	81	18	31
50227	Romanos	133	37	47
50228	Rueda de Jalón	359	57	129

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
50229	Ruesca	86	16	27
50230	Sádaba	1722	559	657
50231	Salillas de Jalón	352	77	123
50233	Samper del Salz	147	14	54
50234	San Martín de la Virgen de Moncayo	296	39	110
50235	San Mateo de Gállego	2212	851	944
50236	Santa Cruz de Grío	212	31	53
50238	Santa Eulalia de Gállego	131	11	48
50239	Santed	72	13	22
50240	Sástago	1389	427	542
50241	Sabiñán	921	181	333
50242	Sediles	102	13	34
50244	Sierra de Luna	243	60	83
50247	Sobradiel	708	549	273
50249	Tabuena	460	97	170
50250	Talamantes	59	8	13
50255	Tobed	251	39	73
50256	Torralba de los Frailes	96	21	31
50258	Torralbilla	78	9	27
50260	Torrelapaja	42	11	17
50262	Torres de Berrellén	1374	273	561
50263	Torrijo de la Cañada	343	52	89
50264	Tosos	192	37	49
50265	Trasmoz	61	11	19
50266	Trasobares	212	32	62
50267	Uncastillo	883	197	322
50268	Undués de Lerda	48	9	15
50269	Urrea de Jalón	325	81	120
50270	Urriés	75	11	18
50271	Used	364	89	122
50272	Utebo	11896	4470	5641
50273	Valdehorna	61	6	18
50274	Val de San Martín	84	12	30
50275	Valmadrid	74	7	30
50276	Valpalmas	176	41	65
50278	Velilla de Ebro	261	45	90
50279	Velilla de Jiloca	118	12	30
50280	Vera de Moncayo	448	98	165
50283	Villadoz	85	18	35
50284	Villafeliche	241	33	65
50285	Villafranca de Ebro	677	155	280
50286	Villalba de Perejil	115	24	40
50287	Villalengua	414	110	149
50288	Villanueva de Gállego	3426	2446	1586
50289	Villanueva de Jiloca	91	9	24
50290	Villanueva de Huerva	588	97	167
50291	Villar de los Navarros	139	37	44
50293	Villarroya de la Sierra	660	172	210
50294	Villarroya del Campo	74	15	24
50295	Vistabella	36	3	14
50296	Zaida (La)	584	373	221
50297	Zaragoza	614905	245681	261857
50298	Zuera	5640	2563	2344
50901	Biel	230	51	91
50902	Marracos	112	22	47

7. Metropolitan area of Málaga (2001)

Code INE	Name of municipality	Population (2001)	LTL (2001)	POR (2001)
29003	Alfarnate	1415	170	259
29004	Alfarnatejo	412	64	109
29007	Alhaurín de la Torre	23369	5079	9007
29009	Almáchar	1928	277	609
29011	Almogía	4201	866	1505
29012	Alora	12363	2354	3686
29025	Benalmádena	34565	13098	13606
29030	Borge (El)	1005	140	177
29036	Carratraca	835	110	185
29038	Cártama	14139	3088	4700
29039	Casabermeja	2935	547	1058
29040	Casarabonela	2475	484	741
29043	Colmenar	3073	909	936
29044	Comares	1336	198	308
29050	Cútar	620	112	210
29066	Macharaviaya	375	51	127
29067	Málaga	524414	190550	188527
29071	Moclinejo	1104	126	292
29080	Pizarra	6874	1431	2347
29082	Rincón de la Victoria	25302	4648	9767
29083	Riogordo	2650	678	999
29092	Totalán	622	87	224
29093	Valle de Abdalajís	2972	353	676
29096	Villanueva del Rosario	3422	415	765
29097	Villanueva del Trabuco	4841	868	1196
29901	Torremolinos	44772	17654	17133

Appendix 4: European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter (1983)

EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS
RESPONSIBLE FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

6th Session
Torremolinos (Spain)
19-20 May 1983

FINAL RESOLUTIONS
adopted by the Conference

Council of Europe
Strasbourg
CEMAT (83) 7

1

RESOLUTION No.2
ON THE EUROPEAN REGIONAL/SPATIAL PLANNING CHARTER

The Ministers,

1. Recalling their proceedings and exchanges of views at the London Conference (1980) concerning the preliminary draft of a Charter prepared by the Committee of Senior Officials at the express wish of the Vienna Conference (1978);
2. Welcoming the work accomplished by the Committee of Senior Officials in accordance with Resolution No. 2 adopted in London (1980) ;
3. Thanking the Parliamentary Assembly for its proposal at the Vienna Conference that a Charter be prepared and the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe for its support and its contributions to this project ;
4. Considering that this Charter will have to serve as a guideline and reference framework for all who bear responsibility for spatial/regional planning in Europe ;
5. Believing that the Charter should initiate a new phase in European co-operation in the spatial/regional planning field and in particular serve as a basis for the work on the preparation of a European Spatial/ Regional Planning Strategy ;
6. ADOPT the appended European Charter on Regional Planning,

AND PRESENT IT to the people and to those who bear political responsibility at local, regional, national and international level ;
7. REQUEST all institutions, administrations and organisations dealing with spatial/regional planning and management to take its substance into account in their work ;
8. UNDERTAKE to recommend to their respective governments that the principles and aims set forth in the Charter be taken into consideration and that international co-operation be promoted with a view to achieving real European planning

9. REQUEST the Committee of Senior Officials and the national and European authorities concerned to do their utmost to arrange the widest possible distribution for it ;

10. DECIDE to discuss at each plenary session the initiatives taken both in their own countries and at European level to promote the principles set forth in the Charter ;

11. INVITE the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to endorse the text of the Charter.

APPENDIX TO RESOLUTION No. 2

EUROPEAN REGIONAL/SPATIAL PLANNING CHARTER

adopted on 20 May 1983

PREAMBLE

The European Ministers responsible for Regional Planning, meeting at their 6th session organised under the auspices of the Council of Europe, considering that :

2. Regional/spatial planning is an important instrument in the evolution of European society and that the intensification of international cooperation in this field represents a substantial contribution towards a stronger European identity ;

3. cooperation in this field calls for an analysis of national, regional and local development concepts with a view to the adoption of common principles designed particularly to reduce regional disparities and to reach a deeper insight into the use and organisation of space, the distribution of activities, the protection of the environment and the improvement of the quality of life ;

4. the profound changes brought about in the economic and social structures of the countries of Europe and their relations with other parts of the world demand a critical review of the principles governing the organisation of space, to avoid their being wholly determined by short-term economic objectives without taking into consideration social, cultural and environmental aspects ;

5. the objectives of regional/spatial planning need new criteria for the orientation and the use of technical progress, in conformity with economic and social requirements ;

6. - all European citizens should be enabled to participate, in a suitable institutional framework, in the introduction and application of regional/spatial planning measures ;

7. and present it to the people as well as to policy decision-makers at local, regional, national and international level.

ADOPT THIS CHARTER

THE CONCEPT OF REGIONAL/SPATIAL PLANNING

8. Regional/spatial planning gives geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society.

9. It is at the same time a scientific discipline, an administrative technique and a policy developed as an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach directed towards a balanced regional development and the physical organisation of space according to an overall strategy.

Its European dimension

10. Regional/spatial planning contributes to a better spatial organisation in Europe and to the finding of solutions for problems which go beyond the national framework and thus aims to create a feeling of common identity, having regard to North-South and East-West relations.

Its characteristics

Man and his well-being as well as his interaction with the environment are the central concern of regional/spatial planning, its aims being to provide each individual with an environment and quality of life conducive to the development of his personality in surroundings planned on a human scale.

12. Regional/spatial planning should be democratic, comprehensive, functional and oriented towards the longer term.

Democratic it should be conducted in such a way as to ensure the participation of the people concerned and their political representatives,

Comprehensive it should ensure the coordination of the various sectoral policies and integrate them in an overall approach,

Functional it needs to take account of the existence of Regional consciousness based on common values, culture and interests sometimes crossing administrative and territorial boundaries, while taking account of institutional arrangements of the different countries,

Long-term it should analyse and take into consideration

Oriented : the long-term trends and developments of economic, social, cultural, ecological and environmental phenomena and interventions.

Its operation

13. Regional/spatial planning must take into consideration the existence of a multitude of individual and institutional decision-makers which influence the organisation of space, the uncertainty of all forecasting studies, the market pressures, the special features of administrative systems and the differing socio-economic and environmental conditions.

It must however strive to reconcile these influences in the most harmonious way possible.

THE FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES

Regional/spatial planning seeks at one and the same time to achieve:

14. - Balanced socio-economic development of the regions

Taking into consideration the economic processes affecting Europe as a whole, the specific regional characteristics and the important role of development axes and communication networks, it should control the growth of regions which are congested or developing too fast, encourage the development of backward regions, and maintain or adapt the infrastructures that are essential to the stimulation of economic recovery in declining regions or those threatened with serious employment problems particularly through manpower migration at European level.

Peripheral areas which have special requirements and structural potential for socio-economic rebalancing should be better linked up to the industrial and economic centres of Europe.

15. - Improvement of the quality of life

It encourages improvement in the quality of everyday life, in respect of housing, work, culture, leisure or relationships within human communities, and the enhancement of the well-being of each individual through the creation of jobs and the provision of economic, social and cultural amenities which meet the aspirations of different sections of the population and which are sited in places where they will be used to the optimum.

16. - Responsible management of natural resources and protection of the environment

By promoting strategies to minimise conflicts between the growing demand for natural resources and the need to conserve them, it seeks to ensure responsible management of the environment, the resources of land, subsoil, air, water, energy resources, fauna and flora, paying special attention to areas of natural beauty and to the cultural and architectural heritage.

17. Rational use of land

In pursuit of the above defined objectives, it is concerned in particular with the location, organisation and development of large urban and industrial complexes, major infrastructures, and the protection of agricultural and forestry land. Every regional/spatial planning policy must be necessarily accompanied by a land-use policy in order to make it possible to achieve objectives which are in the public interest.

PURSUIT OF REGIONAL/SPATIAL PLANNING

18. The achievement of regional/spatial planning objectives is essentially a political matter.

19. Many private and public agencies contribute by their actions to developing and changing the organisation of space.
Regional/spatial planning reflects the desire for interdisciplinary integration and coordination and for cooperation between the authorities involved.

20. It seeks coordination between the various sectors This effort for coordination concerns mainly the distribution of population, economic activities, habitat, public

facilities and power supplies ; transport ; water supply and purification noise prevention and waste disposal ; protection of the environment and of natural, historical, cultural assets and resources.

21. It facilitates coordination and cooperation between the various levels of decision-making and the equalisation of financial resources

The various authorities involved in regional/spatial planning policy need to be given the power to take and carry out decisions, as well as adequate financial means. In order to ensure optimal coordination between local, regional, national and European levels, also as regards transfrontier cooperation, their action must always take into account any measures introduced or planned at the level above or below their own and, consequently, they must keep one another regularly informed.

. At local level : coordination of local authority development

plans, having regard to the essential interests of regional and national planning;

. At regional level : the most appropriate level at which to pursue a regional/spatial planning policy, coordination between the regional authorities themselves and local and national authorities as well as between regions of neighbouring countries

. At national level : coordination of different regional/spatial planning policies and regional aid arrangements as well as harmonisation of the national and regional objectives.

. At European level : coordination of regional/spatial planning policies in order to achieve objectives of European importance and general balanced development.

22. Public participation

Any regional/spatial planning policy, at whatever level, must be based on active citizen participation. It is essential that the citizen be informed clearly and in a comprehensive way at all stages of the planning process and in the framework of institutional structures and procedures.

STRENGTHENING EUROPEAN COOPERATION

23. The European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT) constitutes the ideal political instrument for cooperation and initiative at European level.

- It will intensify relations with the bodies of the Council of Europe and the European Community, as well as with the relevant intergovernmental organisations. It will present regular progress reports on European cooperation in this field to the Parliamentary Assembly and the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe.

- Besides organising and intensifying political cooperation between States, it will promote cooperation in the main technical planning fields such as long-range forecasting, regional statistics, cartography and terminology. It must acquire the scientific, administrative, technical and financial tools essential to the pursuit of its aims, in particular by drawing up a European regional planning concept.

24. The Ministers ask all institutions, administrations and organisations dealing with regional planning problems to have regard in their work to the contents of the Charter.

25. The Charter can be revised with a view to adapting it to the needs of European society.

26. The Ministers undertake to recommend to their respective governments that the principles and aims set forth in the Charter be taken into consideration and that the international cooperation be promoted with a view to achieving real European planning.

A P P E N D I X

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

All principles set down in the present Charter have already been developed in the work of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning on rural, urban, frontier, mountain and coastal areas and on islands.

1. Rural areas with a primarily agricultural function have a fundamental role to play. It is essential to create acceptable living conditions in the countryside, as regards all economic, social, cultural and ecological aspects as well as infrastructures and amenities, while distinguishing between under-developed and peripheral rural regions and those close to large conurbations.

In such areas the development of the urban framework, of social and economic structures and of transport must take account, in all spheres, of their specific functions and in particular of the conservation and management of the natural landscape.

2. Urban areas contribute greatly to the development of Europe and usually present the problem of controlling their growth.

A balanced urban structure requires the systematic implementation of plans for land use and the application of guidelines for the development of economic activities for the benefit of the living conditions of town dwellers.

Special attention should be paid to the improvement of living conditions, the promotion of public transport and to all measures to curb the excessive movement of population away from the town centres to the periphery.

The rehabilitation of the architectural heritage, monuments and sites must be an integral part of an overall town and country planning policy.

3. Frontier areas, more than all others, need a policy of co-ordination between States. The purpose of such a policy is to open up the frontiers and institute transfrontier consultation and co-operation and joint use of infrastructure facilities. States should facilitate direct contacts between the regions and localities concerned in accordance with the European Outline Convention on transfrontier co-operation between territorial authorities in order to promote increasingly close contacts between the populations concerned.

In the frontier areas, no project which could have harmful consequences for the environment of neighbouring countries should be carried out without previous consultation of those States.

4. Mountain areas : In view of the importance of these areas for the ecological,

economic, social, cultural and agricultural functions they fulfil and their value as depositories of natural resources, and of the many constraints from which they suffer in these fields of activity, spatial management policy must give special and suitable consideration to the preservation and development of mountain regions.

5. Regions with structural weaknesses where living and working conditions have made little progress, particularly for historical reasons, or which could be left behind by changes in their economic base, need special assistance related to the disparities which exist between living and working conditions within the various States.

6. Regions in decline : Specific policies should be developed in favour of regions where economic activity has strongly slowed down following industrial restructuring and ageing of their infrastructure and of their industrial equipment, very often monostructured. This situation is accelerated by the worldwide competition resulting from the new international division of labour.

7. Coastal areas and islands : The development of mass tourism and transport in Europe and the industrialisation of coastal areas, islands and the sea, demand specific policies for these regions in order to ensure their balanced development and co-ordinated urbanisation, bearing in mind the requirements of environmental conservation and regional characteristics. Regard must be given to the specific role and functions of coastal areas in the land-sea relationship and of sea-transport possibilities.

Appendix 5: Territorial Agenda of the European Union adopted on 25 May 2007

Territorial Agenda of the European Union

Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions

Agreed on the occasion of the
Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion
in Leipzig on 24 / 25 May 2007

I.

Future Task: Strengthening Territorial Cohesion

(1) The EU looks with confidence at the progress achieved in economic, social and ecological terms. Together the EU Member States operate a combined economy, which is about one third of the world-wide Gross Domestic Product. It is this economic power as well as a territory covering more than 4 million km² and a population of 490 million inhabitants in a variety of regions and cities, which characterises the territorial dimension of the EU.

(2) We, as Ministers responsible for spatial planning and development, present the Territorial Agenda as an action-oriented political framework for our future cooperation, developed together with the European Commission. Through the Territorial Agenda we are contributing to sustainable economic growth and job creation as well as social and ecological development in all EU regions. We are hereby supporting both the Lisbon and the Gothenburg Strategies of the European Council, which are complementary strategies.

(3) Through the Territorial Agenda we would like to promote a polycentric territorial development of the EU, with a view to making better use of available resources in European regions. An important aspect is the territorial integration of places where people live. In this way we will contribute to a Europe which is culturally, socially, environmentally and economically sustainable. It is particularly important to better integrate our newer Member States into this policy of polycentric settlement development. Through the Territorial Agenda we will help – in terms of territorial solidarity – to secure better living conditions and quality of life with equal opportunities, oriented towards regional and local potentials, irrespective of where people live – whether in the European core area or in the periphery.

(4) We see the future task "Territorial Cohesion" as a permanent and cooperative process involving the various actors and stakeholders of territorial development at political, administrative and technical levels. This cooperation is characterised by the history, culture and institutional arrangements in each Member State. EU Cohesion Policy should be able to respond more effectively than it has done so far to the territorial needs and characteristics, specific geographical challenges and opportunities of the regions and cities. That is why we advocate the need for the territorial dimension to play a stronger role in future Cohesion Policy in order to promote economic and social wellbeing.

(5) Territorial Cohesion can only be achieved through an intensive and continuous dialogue between all stakeholders of territorial development. This process of cooperation is what we call territorial governance. The private sector (especially locally and regionally based entrepreneurship), the scientific community, the public sector (especially local and regional authorities), non-governmental organisations and different sectors need to act together in order to make better use of crucial investments in European regions and contribute to tackling climate change.

(6) The Territorial Agenda presents the product of our cooperation. At our Informal Ministerial Meeting held in Rotterdam (2004) we agreed upon a territorial development policy to better assess the perspectives of the EU. And in Luxembourg (2005) we accepted territorial priorities as the basis of our future common activities and the formulation of an expert report on "The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union" which provides the basis for the Territorial Agenda. Our elaboration of the Territorial Agenda is being supported by a

Europe-wide stakeholder dialogue, ongoing since summer 2006. Based on articles 2, 6, 16 and 158 included in the EC Treaty, territorial cohesion has been considered as the third dimension of Cohesion Policy. It has been taken up, for example, in the Third and also the Fourth Cohesion Report as well as in the Strategic Guidelines for Cohesion adopted in 2006. We affirm our commitment to working even more closely together and with the EU institutions in pursuit of this goal – independent of the ongoing discussion about the EU's reform process (EU Constitutional Treaty).

II.

New Challenges: Strengthening Regional Identities, Making Better Use of Territorial Diversity

(7) We are facing major new territorial challenges today. These include:

- regionally diverse impacts of climate change on the EU territory and its neighbours, particularly with regard to sustainable development,
- rising energy prices, energy inefficiency and different territorial opportunities for new forms of energy supply,
- accelerating integration of our regions, including crossborder areas, in global economic competition, and at the same time increasing dependencies of states and regions in the world,
- impacts of EU enlargement on economic, social and territorial cohesion, particularly with regard to the transport and energy infrastructure related integration of Eastern Europe and the new EU Member States as well as their regions,
- overexploitation of the ecological and cultural resources and loss of biodiversity, particularly through increasing development sprawl whilst remote areas are facing depopulation,
- territorial effects of demographic change (especially ageing) as well as in and out migration and internal migration on labour markets, on the supply of public services of general interest as well as the housing market, the development of the settlement structure and how people live together in our cities and regions.

(8) Given these challenges, we firmly believe that territorial cohesion of the EU is prerequisite for achieving sustainable economic growth and implementing social and economic cohesion – a European social model. In this context, we regard it as an essential task and act of solidarity to develop preconditions in all regions to enable equal opportunities for its citizens and development perspectives for entrepreneurship. We agree that regional identities and potentials, needs and diverse characteristics of the regions, cities and villages of Europe gain meaning through a policy of territorial cohesion and through other regional development policies.

(9) Through the Territorial Agenda we are also helping to strengthen the global competitiveness and sustainability of all regions of Europe. This is in accordance with the renewed Lisbon Strategy agreed by Member States in 2005. The diverse territorial potentials of regions for sustainable economic growth and job creation in the EU must be identified and mobilised. Every region and city may, through their engagement, contribute to saving energy and to its decentralized supply and to mitigating climate change, e.g. by supporting the development of low or zero-emissions settlements, developing potential new renewable sources of energy supply and promoting energy efficiency particularly of the building stock. Our cities and regions need to be become more resilient in the context of climate change. They should be firmly bound into governance processes for implementing the Lisbon Strategy as well as into National Reform Programmes.

(10) We wish to highlight the increasing territorial influence of Community policies. This should be taken into consideration as on the one hand EU policy-making should have more regard to local, regional and national potentials and the motives of stakeholders by taking a strategic integrated territorial development approach. On the other hand, individual city and

regional development strategies should explicitly take more account of their national and European contexts. It is important that national, regional and local concerns closely intertwine with EU policies. This applies particularly to rural development policies, environmental and transport policies as well as EU Cohesion Policy.

(11) The Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities complements the concern of the Territorial Agenda as it raises integrated urban development policy as a task with a European dimension. Therefore, integrated urban development policy and territorial cohesion policy each make complementary contributions to implementing the aims of sustainable development.

III.

Territorial Priorities for the Development of the European Union

(12) The Territorial Agenda builds upon the three main aims of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), which remains valid, namely

- development of a balanced and polycentric urban system and a new urban-rural partnership;
- securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge;
- sustainable development, prudent management and protection of nature and cultural heritage.

It also builds on the CEMAT Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent confirmed by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. Based on these principles we also want to intensify the dialogue with neighbouring countries adjoining the EU.

(13) In the context of our policy for territorial cohesion we commit ourselves to the following priorities for territorial development in the EU:

1.

We Aim to Strengthen Polycentric Development and Innovation through Networking of City Regions and Cities

(14) City regions and cities of varying size are best able to build upon their own strengths in the context of a Europe-wide cooperation with entrepreneurs as well as societal and political stakeholders. If they succeed in implementing networks in a polycentric European territory in an innovative manner, they will create conditions to allow them to benefit global competition in terms of their development.

(15) Cities which function as regional centres should cooperate as parts of a polycentric pattern to ensure their added value for other cities in rural and peripheral areas as well as for areas with specific geographic challenges and needs (e.g. structurally weak parts of islands, coastal zones and mountainous areas). To facilitate this process, infrastructure networks within and between regions in Europe need to be extended and updated on a continuous basis. We therefore support European cooperation between city regions as well as with small and medium-sized towns at the internal borders and also beyond the external borders of the EU.

2.

We Need New Forms of Partnership and Territorial Governance between Rural and Urban Areas

(16) A competitive and sustainable Europe comprises in great variety and with different interdependences city regions of varying size and rural areas. City regions are thereby surrounded by urban centres and rurally characterised areas; rural areas beyond the direct commuting distance of city regions are surrounded by regional centres and small and

medium-sized towns. The respective authorities should, as inter-dependent partners, identify their common assets, elaborate joint regional and sub-regional development strategies and in this way jointly lay the foundation for making regions and sub-regions attractive and for enabling investment decisions both by the private and public sector. This is what we call urban-rural partnership.

(17) Regionally oriented investment decisions should be prepared jointly by public and private stakeholders. In this context, it is necessary if, for example, local authorities of varying size form voluntary associations for joint marketing and developing joint strategies to tackle common problems. Against the background of demographic change, authorities facing population loss of young people need to cooperate closely to enable them to maintain attractive services and infrastructure. This cooperation implies a new political dimension. To strengthen this, new forms of territorial governance arrangements may be necessary in European regions. Generally speaking, we would like to create opportunities for innovative economic potential for development, building upon experiences of successful partnership and political cooperation in a functional regional context, also including crossborder areas. We therefore support positive competition between cities and regions.

3.

We Want to Promote Regional Clusters of Competition and Innovation in Europe

(18) Growth zones should be enlarged beyond the economic core area of the EU through a policy of cooperation and networking. One way of combining strengths can be through the creation of suitable and innovative clusters where the business community, the scientific community and administrations work together. This also applies across internal and external borders with our neighbours.

(19) City regions of varying size, small and medium-sized towns as well as rural areas are encouraged, to cooperate with other authorities, even in other countries, in order to strengthen their international identity and specialisation as a way of becoming more attractive for investment. It is reasonable to focus on existing centres of innovation.

4.

We Support the Strengthening and Extension of Trans-European Networks

(20) Mobility and accessibility are key prerequisites for economic development in all regions of the EU. To meet the requirements for mobility in a polycentric European territory, including our neighbouring countries, and to contribute to enhancing the urban environment, it is important to secure integrated and sustainable development of multi-modal transport systems. We need capable networks both for passengers and goods, of rail, road and air (including networks of viable regional airports), efficient maritime, coastal and inland waterways, and secondary networks linking with respective hinterland areas as well as crossborder transport management. We support the removal of barriers to crossborder rail and road transport and particularly support the use of telematic measures to assist the operation of overloaded parts of road networks.

(21) We support an unhampered and socially fair access to information and communication technologies in all regions, to remove territorially induced barriers to accessibility, especially in peripheral and rural areas, and to enable decentralised working and adequate provision of services of general interest, including health care and education. In order to secure the necessary infrastructure, such as achieving general coverage for broadband connections, considering respective demand, we recommend combining infrastructure such as broadband cables in new transport and communication programmes.

(22) Rising energy demand in the face of limited reserves of non-renewable energy sources, and a growing dependence of the EU on imported energy as well the challenge of climate change, means that we should further explore and develop opportunities for decentralized, efficient, safe and environmentally friendly production of renewable energy, which is as yet

underutilised. In order to make better use of regional potentials in this field, which might generate opportunities particularly in rural areas, we recommend further strengthening networks and harmonising conditions for the energy sector.

5.

We Promote Trans-European Risk Management including the Impacts of Climate Change

(23) Joint transregional and integrated approaches and strategies should be further developed in order to face natural hazards, reduce and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change. Further work is required to develop and intensify territorial cohesion policy, particularly with respect to the consequences of territorially differentiated adaptation strategies.

(24) In order to improve the efficiency of risk management activity and to guide development appropriately, integrated trans-European and crossborder strategies (e.g. flood protection, drought and desertification prevention, integrated coastal zone and mountainous areas management, technological hazard management, improved forecasting), should be adopted, in cooperation with our neighbouring countries, and new forms of risk governance arrangements should be developed, especially in multi-hazardous areas like coastal zones, lakesides, maritime and river basins and mountainous areas.

6.

We Require the Strengthening of Ecological Structures and Cultural Resources as the Added Value for Development

(25) The irreplaceable values of European ecological structures and cultural and natural heritage, especially cultural landscapes and the quality of design and process on architecture as well as the built environment, should constitute, against the background of the respective regional circumstances and potentials, the foundation for environmentally and culturally-oriented development which offers development perspectives, whilst safeguarding diverse cultural identities, particularly in regions that are lagging behind or undergoing structural changes. Coordinated transnational interventions and associated management should promote cultural routes and networks as well as other territorial projects of natural and cultural significance.

(26) We advocate further developing networks of valuable nature areas and cultural landscapes in order to create an integrated and sustainable trans-European green structure with adequate corridors and zones linking protected sites and other areas of European and national importance.

(27) Integrated territorial development policies should also be strengthened in ecologically or culturally fragile areas of the EU in order to address the key challenge of reconciling economic development and environmental, social and cultural sustainability.

IV.

Implementing the Territorial Agenda

(28) In order to better incorporate the six territorial priorities in political debates and decision making processes we consider the following actions to be important and recommend them for implementation between 2007 and 2011. We commit ourselves to delivering these actions:

1.

Actions by the European Institutions

(29) We welcome the Communication of the European Commission on "The Contribution of Cities to Growth and Employment in Regions" and ask the European Commission to work on a follow up in view of the Territorial Agenda.

(30) We ask the European Commission to continue to include explicit reference to the territorial dimension of the EU in future Reports on Social and Economic Cohesion to activate cities and regions to bring in their development strategies in the European context. This would help to realise the principle of subsidiarity.

(31) We request the Regional Development Committee of the European Parliament, the Territorial Cohesion Committee of the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee to support and implement the priorities of the Territorial Agenda in their activities, thus giving cities and regions a stronger role in implementing EU Policies.

2.

Actions for Close Cooperation Between the European Commission and EU Member States

(32) We recommend a continuous and in-depth dialogue between EU Member States (including regional and local authorities) and the European Commission on strategic territorial development issues. The opportunities provided by the existing committees (particularly the Expert Committee "Territorial Cohesion and Urban Matters" which was established by the Committee of the Coordination of Funds [COCOF]) should be used efficiently for this purpose.

(33) We ask the European Commission and other European institutions to initiate a dialogue with Member States, based on the principles of subsidiarity, to discuss how the effects of European legislation on sustainable urban and territorial development and planning can be assessed and taken into account and how to improve the coordination of EU policies and initiatives that concern territorial policy areas. This assessment and coordination could take place within the framework of the existing institutions and procedures.

(34) We recommend that the ESPON 2013 Programme, in close cooperation with the European Commission undertake a more in-depth analysis of the effects of EU Policies on territorial cohesion, reveal cause-and-effect relationships and develop operational indicators for a regular reporting on territorial matters. In this context it is important for the ESPON and URBACT programmes and Urban Audit to cooperate closely.

(35) We consider the cooperation, including our neighbouring countries, in the context of EU Programmes for European Territorial Cooperation (Objective 3) to be new and future-oriented funding instruments offering opportunities for strengthening European networks of cities and regions as well as supporting new innovation-oriented European development corridors. We ask the European Commission to support us in developing interregional, crossborder and transnational cooperation as an effective instrument for promoting territorial cohesion.

3.

Actions for Strengthening Territorial Cohesion in EU Member States

(36) We will commit ourselves, within our competences, to integrate the political priorities of the Territorial Agenda as well as the territorial aspects of the Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion Policy 2007-2013 in national, regional and local development policies. In view of the conclusions of the Seminar on Governance of Territorial Strategies, held under the Austrian EU Presidency in June 2006 in Baden, we recommend integration of the territorial dimension in the strategic processes underpinning cohesion policy at EU and national level.

(37) We will ensure that, within the terms of our respective national institutional arrangements, we engage in transparent decision-making processes with public and private stakeholders as well as non-governmental organisations in developing territorially relevant policies, territorial priorities and actions for their implementation.

4.

Joint Activities by Ministers

(38) In order to implement the Territorial Agenda we agree to maintain informal structures for cooperation between our ministries, including the respective EU Presidencies, and with the European Parliament, the European Commission, the Committee of the Regions, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Investment Bank. This requires smooth functioning of the Presidencies Group equipped with adequate secretarial resources and supported by the services of experts, additionally from other Member States.

(39) We agree to act jointly in order to continue and strengthen cooperation among ourselves and with the European Commission through a network of territorial cohesion related contact points. We intend the open Territorial Agenda Working Group, consisting of EU Member States and the European Commission, to continue its work in the current phase of implementing the Agenda.

(40) As a first step in our joint activities and as follow-up to the 2007 spring European Council we commit ourselves, within our competences, to contribute to a sustainable and integrated climate and energy policy in the EU.

(41) Our further joint activities will be focused on facilitating the EU-wide debate on EU key dossiers from a territorial point of view. The most important ones include:

- the debate on the Lisbon process post 2010,
- the 2010 midterm review of Cohesion Policy,
- the 2010 midterm review of the EU Rural Development Policy,
- the 2011 redevelopment of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS),
- the ongoing debate of how to implement the recommendations of the Green Paper on Maritime Policies,
- the ongoing debate on the 7th Environmental Action Programme of the EU,
- the debate on the Transport Policy post 2010,
- the ongoing debate on the Research and Innovation Policy,
- the ongoing debate on the Neighbourhood Policy.

(42) We ask the coming EU Presidencies together with all EU Member States, the European institutions, including the European Commission and the European Investment Bank as well as other stakeholders to implement the actions set out in this Territorial Agenda. We welcome the initiative of the Portuguese EU Presidency to facilitate the implementation of the Territorial Agenda by working out the first Action Programme as well as the will of the Slovene EU Presidency to initiate its implementation through its activities.

(43) We ask the Slovene EU Presidency to take the Territorial Agenda into account in their preparations for the 2008 spring European Council with view to achieving a stronger and more formal political recognition of the territorial conditions for the development of regions and cities and new forms of participation with EU decisions.

(44) We agree that there is a need to encourage public and private stakeholders of territorial development to be engaged in addressing territorial cohesion of the EU. Their specific interests should be recognised. A joint discussion about scenarios for the territorial development of Europe may ease the process of reconciling different interests. We ask the coming EU Presidencies to elaborate this ambition through specific activities in accordance with topical needs for policy development in Europe. We welcome both the initiative of the Portuguese EU Presidency to organize an Informal Ministerial Meeting to be held in

November 2007 and of Germany to organize a Conference on Territory and Economy to be held in spring 2008.

(45) We ask the coming Hungarian EU Presidency to evaluate and review the Territorial Agenda in the first half of 2011.

(46) We consider it our political task to raise awareness for the most important territorial challenges for the EU and we will therefore play an active role in implementing the Territorial Agenda at the European level and within our states. We are convinced that through the Territorial Agenda we are taking a further step towards a competitive and sustainable Europe of diverse regions and active citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abercrombie, P. (1945) *Greater London Plan 1944*, HMSO, London.
- Alkaabi, K.A. and Debbage, K. (2007) Air passenger demand and skilled labor markets by US metropolitan area, *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 13 (3), pp. 121-130.
- Arias, A. and Borja, J. (2007) Metropolitan Cities: Territory and Governability, the Spanish Case, *Built Environment*, 33, 2, pp. 170-183.
- Ascher, F. (1995) *Metápolis ou l'avenir des villes*, Odile Jacob, Paris.
- Baigent, E. (2004) Patrick Geddes, Lewis Mumford and Jean Gottmann: divisions over 'megalopolis', *Progress in Human Geography*, 28 (6), pp. 687-700.
- Beaverstock, J. V. *et. al.*, (1999) A roster of world cities, *Cities*, 16 (6), pp. 445-458.
- Begg, I. (2002) *Urban competitiveness: Policies for dynamic cities*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Berg van den, L. *et al.* (1982) *A Study of Growth and Decline*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Berry, B.J.L. (1995) Capturing evolving realities: Statistical areas for the American future, in D.C. Dahmann and J.D. Fitsimmons (eds.) (1995) *Metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas: new approaches to geographical delimitation*, Population Division US Bureau of the Census, Washington DC.
- Berry, B.J.L. (1976) *Urbanization and Counterurbanization*, Sage, Beverly Hills and London.
- Berry, B.J.L. and Gillard, Q. (1977) *The Changing Shape of Metropolitan America*, Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass., cited in Clark, D. (1996) *Urban World/Global City*, Routledge, London and New York.

Betjeman, J. (1973) *Metro-land*, A script for television, in J. Guest (ed.) 1978) *The Best of Betjeman*, Penguins Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Blumenfield, H. (1965) The modern metropolis, *Scientific American*, 213 (3), pp. 64-74.

Boddy, M. and Parkinson, M. (eds.) (2004) *City Matters, Competitiveness, cohesion and urban governance*, The Policy Press, Bristol.

Brueckner, J.K. (2003) Airline traffic and urban economic development, *Urban Studies*, 40 (8), pp. 1455-1469.

Brunet, R. (1989) *Les villes européennes*, Report for the DATAR, Groupement d'Intérêt Public, Paris.

Bureau of the Budget (1964) *Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas*, Government Printing Office, Washington DC.

Bureau of the Budget (1990) Official Standards for Metropolitan Areas, *Federal Register*, 30th March 1990.

Bureau of the Census (1913) *Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910*, Department of Commerce, Government Printing Office, Washington.

Bureau of the Census (1942) *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC.

Bureau of the Census (1990) Urbanized Areas for the 1990 Census. Final Criteria, *Federal Register*, 55 (204).

Bureau of the Census (1994) *Geographic Areas Reference Manual*, Government Printing Office, Washington.

Burns, M.C. (2003) The search for metropolitan governance in Barcelona. Some comments on what might be learned from London. Paper presented to the *First International Conference on Territory and the City*, June-July, 2003.

Burns, M. C., Roca, J. and Moix, M. (2007) The interaction value and functional distance applied to air passenger flows between European cities: a new European spatial configuration. Paper presented at the *2007 Meeting of the Association of American Geographers*, 17-21 April, San Francisco, United States.

Burns, M. C., Roca, J. and Moix, M. (2008) The spatial implications of the functional proximity deriving from air passenger flows between European metropolitan urban regions, *GeoJournal*, 71 (1), pp. 37-52.

Button, K. and Taylor, S. (2000) International air transportation and economic development, *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 6 (4), pp. 209-222.

Carter, H. (1985) *The Study of Urban Geography*, Arnold, London.

Castells, M. (1989) *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban-Regional Process*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Castells, M. (1993) European cities, the informational society and the global economy, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 84 (4), pp. 247-257.

Castells, M. (1996) *The Information Age: Economy Society and Culture. Volume I: The Rise of the Network Society*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Cattan, N. (1995) Attractivity and Internationalisation of Major European Cities: The Example of Air Traffic, *Urban Studies*, 32 (2), pp. 303-312.

CEC (1991) *Europe 2000 Outlook for the development of the Community's territory*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (1994) *Europe 2000+. Cooperation for European territorial development*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (1995) *Estudios prospectivos de la regions del Mediterráneo oeste*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (1996) *First report from the Commission on economic and social cohesion*, COM(96) 542 final/2, Consolidated Version.

CEC (1997a) *European Spatial Development Perspective. First Official Draft*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (1997b) *Towards an urban agenda in the European Union*, Brussels, COM(97)197 final 6.05.1997.

CEC (1999) *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development in the Territory of the European Union*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (2000) *Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000, Presidency Conclusions*, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm.

CEC (2001a) COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION A sustainable Europe for a better world: a European Union strategy for sustainable development, COM(2001)264 final, 15 May 2001.

CEC (2001b) European Council Göteborg, Conclusions of the Presidency, 15 and 16 June 2001, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/pdf/got1_en.pdf.

CEC (2001c) *Second report on economic and social cohesion, Unity, solidarity, diversity for Europe, its people and its territory*, Office for Official Publications of the European Commission, Luxembourg.

CEC (2004a) *Interim Territorial Cohesion Report, Preliminary results of ESPON and the EU Commission studies*, Office for the Publication of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

CEC (2004b) *Third report on economic and social cohesion, A new partnership for cohesion: convergence, competitiveness, cooperation*, Office for Official Publications of the European Commission, Luxembourg.

CEC (2005) Commission launches ambitious growth and jobs strategy for the EU, Commission Press Release IP/05/130, dated 2 February 2005, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/05/130&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

CEC (2006a) COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND PARLIAMENT Cohesion policy and cities: the urban contribution to growth and jobs in the regions, COM(2006) 385 final, 13.07.2006.

CEC (2006b) *Cohesion Policy and cities: the urban contribution to growth and jobs in the regions*, Annex, SEC(2006) 928, Brussels, 13.07.2006.

CEC (2006c) COUNCIL DECISION of 6 October on Community strategic guidelines on cohesion (2006/702/EC), Official Journal of the European Union, L 291/11-36.

CEC (2006d) COUNCIL DECISION of 18 December concerning the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities (2007-2013) (1982/2006/EC), Official Journal of the European Union, L 412/1-41.

CEC (2007a) *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities*, (http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_998673/Leipzig-Charter-on-Sustainable-Cities-agreed-on-24-May-2007.pdf).

CEC (2007b) *Territorial Agenda of the European Union, Towards a more competitive and sustainable Europe of diverse regions*, http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_1005295/Territorial-Agenda-of-the-European-Union-Agreed-on-25-May-2007-barrier-free.pdf.

CEC (2007c) *The territorial state and perspectives of the European Union, Towards a stronger European territorial cohesion in light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions*, http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_1005296/The-Territorial-State-and-Perspectives-of-the-European-Union.pdf.

CEC (2007d) *Fourth report on economic and social cohesion, Growing regions, growing Europe*, Office of the Publications of the European Commission, Luxembourg.

CEMAT (1983) *European Charter for Regional/Spatial Planning* adopted by the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning, on May 20th 1983 in Torremolinos.
http://www.coe.int/t/e/cultural_cooperation/environment/cemat/list_of_conferences/071_resol1983.asp.

CEMAT (2000) *Guiding principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent*, adopted at the 12th Session of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning on 7-8 September 2000, in Hanover.

Champion, T. (2001) Urbanization, suburbanization, counterurbanisation and reurbanization, in R. Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of urban studies*, Sage, London.

Champion, A.G. (1989) *Counterurbanization. The changing pace and nature of population deconcentration*, Edward Arnold, London.

Champion, A.G. (1989) Counterurbanization in Britain, *The Geographical Journal*, 155 (1), March, pp.52-59.

Champion, T. and Fisher, T. (2004) Migration, residential preference and the changing environment of cities, in M. Boddy and M. Parkinson (eds.) *City Matters, Competitiveness, cohesion and urban governance*, The Policy Press, Bristol.

Chase-Dunn, C. (1985) The system of world cities: AD 800-1975, in M. Timberlake (ed.), *Urbanization in the World Economy*, Academic Press, New York.

Cheshire, P. (1990) Explaining the recent performance of the European Community's major urban regions, *Urban Studies*, 27(3), pp. 311-333.

Cheshire, P. (2006) Resurgent Cities, Urban Myths and Policy Hubris: What We Need to Know. *Urban Studies*, 43 (8), pp. 1231-1246.

Cheshire, P. et. al. (1986) Problems of urban decline and growth in EEC countries, *Urban Studies*, 23 (2), pp. 131-149.

Cheshire, P. and Hay, D.G. (1989) *Urban Problems in Western Europe: an economic analysis*, Unwin Hyman, London.

Chueca Goitia, F. (1987) *Breve Historia del Urbanismo*, Alianza Editorial, Madrid.

Clark, D. (1996) *Urban World/Global City*, Routledge, London and New York.

Coombes, M., Green, A. E. and Openshaw, S. (1986) An efficient algorithm to generate official statistical reporting areas: the case of the 1984 travel-to-work- areas revision in Britain, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 37, pp. 943-953.

CPSV (2001) *La caracterización territorial y funcional de las áreas metropolitanas españolas*, CPSV, UPC, Barcelona.

Davis, K. (1955) The Origin and Growth of Urbanization in the World, *The American Journal of Sociology*, 60, (5), pp. 429-437.

Davis, K. (1965) The Urbanization of the Human Population, *Scientific American*, 213 (3), pp. 41-53.

Debbage, K. (1999) Air transportation and urban-economic restructuring: competitive advantage in the US Carolinas, *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 5 (4), pp. 211-221.

Debbage, K. and Delk, D. (2001) The geography of air passenger volume and local employment patterns by US metropolitan core area: 1973-1996, *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 7 (3), pp. 159-167.

Dematteis, G. (1991) Sistema locali nucleari e sistema a rete. Un contributo geografico all'interpretazioni delle dinamiche urbana, in C. Bertuglia and A. La Bella (eds.) (1991) / *sistema urbani*, Franco Angeli, Milan.

Dematteis, G. (1998) Suburbanización y periurbanización. Ciudades anglosajonas y ciudades latinas, en F. J. Monclús (ed.) (1998) *La ciudad dispersa*, Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Dematteis, G. (1999) in P. Bonaverò, G. Dematteis and F. Sforzi (1999) *The Italian Urban System Towards European Integration*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Derudder, B. and Witlox, F. (2005) An Appraisal of the Use of Airline Data in Assessing the World City Network: A Research Note on Data, *Urban Studies*, 42 (13), 2371-2388.

Dezert, B., Metton, A. and Steinberg, J. (1991) *La periurbanization en France*, Sedes Paris.

Dühr, S. (2003) Illustrating spatial policies in Europe, *European Planning Studies*, 11 (8), pp. 929-948.

ESPON (2004) *Potentials for Polycentric Development in Europe. Final Report of ESPON 1.1.1 Project*. ISBN 91-89332-37-7, ESPON CU/Nordregio: Luxembourg/Stockholm.

ESPON (2007a) *Scenarios on the territorial future of Europe*, ESPON Project 3.2, ISBN 2-9600467-4-9.

ESPON (2007b) *Territorial futures: Spatial scenarios for Europe*, ESPON Project 3.2.

EUROSTAT (1992) *Study of Employment Zones. Regional Statistics and Accounts*, EUROSTAT, Luxembourg.

Faludi, A. (2007) Gathering the evidence for European planning, *Land Lines*, 19 (3), pp. 20-23.

Fawcett, C.B. (1932) Distribution of the urban population of Great Britain, *Geographical Journal*, 79, pp. 100-113.

Ferrão, J. *et. al.* (2002) *as Regioes metropolitanas Portuguesas no contexto ibérico*, Direcção-Geral do Ordenamento do Território e Desenvolvimento Urbano, Lisbon.

Fishman, R. (1990) America's New City, *The Wilson Quarterly*, No. 14.

Font, A. (2004) A polarised and bicephalous urban system, in A. Font (ed.), *The explosion of the city: morphologies, observations and motions*, COAC, Barcelona.

Frey, W.H. and Zimmer, Z. (2001) Defining the city, in R. Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of Urban Studies*, Sage, London.

Friedmann, J. (1986) The world city hypothesis, *Development and Change*, 17 (1), pp. 69-83, reproduced in P. Knox and P.J. Taylor (eds.) (1995) *World cities in a world-system*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Friedmann, J. and Wolff, G. (1982) World city formation: an agenda for research and action, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 6 (3), pp. 309-344.

Garside, P. (1984) West End, east End: London, 1890-1940, in A. Sutcliffe (ed.), *Metropolis 1890-1940*, Mansell, London.

Garton Ash, T. (2007) The silent empire has expanded again. There is so much to celebrate - but why do we see so little celebration? *The Guardian*, 4 January, 2007.

Geddes, P. (1915) *Cities in Evolution*, Williams and Norgate, London.

GEMACA (Group for European Metropolitan Area Comparative Analysis) (1996) *Les Régions Métropoles de l'Europe du Nord-Oest; limites géographiques et structures économiques*, IAURIF-GEMACA, Paris.

Gottmann, J. (1961) *Megalopolis: the Urbanized Northeastern Seaboard of the United States*, Twentieth Century Fund, New York.

Gottmann, J. (1987) *Megalopolis Revisited: 25 Years Later*, The University of Maryland Institute for Urban Studies, College Park, MD.

Gottmann, J. and Harper, R. A. (1990) *Since Megalopolis: The Urban Writings of Jean Gottmann*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Guimerà, R., Mossa, S., Turtchi, A. And Amaral, L. (2005) The worldwide air transportation network: anomalous centrality, community structure and cities' global roles, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102 (22), pp. 7794-7799.

Hall, P. et. al. (1973) *The Containment of Urban England*, George Allen and Unwin, London.

Hall, P. (1966, 1984) *The World Cities*, (3rd ed.), Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

Hall, P. (2002) *Cities of Tomorrow*, (3rd ed.), Blackwell Publishing, Maldon, Oxford and Victoria.

Hall, P. (2005) The World's Urban Systems: A European Perspective. *Global Urban Development*, 1 (1), pp. 1-12, (<http://www.globalurban.org/index.html>).

Hall, P. and Hay, D.G. (1980) *Growth centres in the European urban system*, Heineman Educational Books, London.

Hall, P. and Pain, K. (2006) *The Polycentric Metropolis, Learning from mega-city regions in Europe*, Earthscan, London.

Harvey, D. (1998) Cities or urbanization? in *City 1/2*, pp. 38-61.

Hayward, J. (1846) *The New England Gazetteer*, 48th edition; John Hayward, Boston, cited in Bureau of the Census (1994) *Geographic Areas Reference Manual*, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Hobbs, H. and Stoop, N. (2002) *Demographic trends in the 20th Century, Census 2000 Special Reports*, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington D.C.

Howard, E. (1898) *To-morrow: a peaceful path to real reform*, Swan Sonnenschein, London.

Howard, E. (1902) *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*, (Rep. 1946) Faber and Faber, London.

Indovina, F. (2004) The metropolization of the territory, in A. Font (ed.), *The explosion of the city: morphologies, observations and motions*, COAC, Barcelona.

Indovina, F. et. al. (1990) *La città diffusa*, DAEST, Venezia.

Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (2002) *Delimitação e Caracterização das Regiões Metropolitanas Portuguesas no Contexto Ibérico*, Relatório Final, Março de 2002.

Junta de Andalucía (1996a) *Plan de Ordenación del Territorio, Aglomeración Urbana de Sevilla, Documento de Diagnóstico*, Conserjería de Obras Públicas y Transportes, Sevilla.

Junta de Andalucía (1996b) *Plan de Ordenación del Territorio, Aglomeración Urbana de Málaga, Documento de Diagnóstico*, Conserjería de Obras Públicas y Transportes, Sevilla.

Junta de Andalucía (1999) *Plan de Ordenación del Territorio de Andalucía, Bases y Estrategias*, Conserjería de Obras Públicas y Transportes, Dirección General de Ordenación del Territorio, Sevilla.

Keeling, D. J. (1995) Transport and the world city paradigm, in P. Knox and P.J. Taylor (eds.) (1995) *World cities in a world-system*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kunzmann, K.R. (1996) Euro-megalopolis or themepark Europe? Scenarios for European spatial development, *International Planning Studies*, 1 (2), 143-163.

Kunzmann, K.R. and Wegener, M. (1991), *The pattern of urbanisation in Western Europe 1960-1990*, Institut für Raumplanung, Universität Dortmund.

Lang, R.E. and Dhavale, D. (2005) Beyond Megalopolis: Exploring America's New "Megalopolitan" Geography, *Metropolitan Institute Census Report Series*, Census Report 05:01 (July 2005), Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech, Alexandria, VA.

Lang, R. and Knox, P.E. (2007) The New Metropolis: Rethinking Megalopolis. Paper presented at the *2007 Meeting of the Association of American Geographers*, 17-21 April, San Francisco, United States.

Lee, C. (1973) *Models in planning. An introduction to the use of quantitative models in planning*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Lever, W.F. (2001) The Post-fordist city, in R. Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of urban studies*, Sage, London, pp. 273-283.

Liu, Z.-J., Debbage, K. and Blackburn, B. (2007) Locational determinants of major US air passenger markets by metropolitan areas. Paper presented at the *2007 Meeting of the Association of American Geographers*, 17-21 April, San Francisco, United States.

Lloyd, D.W. (1992) *The making of English towns*, Victor Gollancz Ltd., London.

London Transport Museum (2005) Online resources http://www.ltmuseum.co.uk/learning/online_resources.htm (consulted 28 August 2005).

Lubove, R. (1962) *The Progressives and the Slums: Tenement House Reform in New York City, 1890-1917*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, cited in Hall, P. (2002) *Cities of Tomorrow*, (3rd ed.), Blackwell Publishing, Maldon, Oxford and Victoria.

Maragall, P. (2007) Carta a los amigos, *La Vanguardia*, 30 May 2007.

Meijers, E., Waterhout, B. and Zonneveld, W. (2005) Polycentric Development Policies in European Countries: An Introduction, *Built Environment*, 31 (2), pp. 97-102.

Ministerio de Administraciones Públicas (2001) *Informe de las Grandes Ciudades*, Ministerio de Administraciones Públicas, Madrid.

Ministerio de Fomento (2000) *Atlas Estadístico de la Áreas Urbanas en España*, Centro de Publicaciones, Secretaría General Técnica, Ministerio de Fomento, Madrid.

Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Urbanismo (MOPU) (1987) *Áreas metropolitanas en crisis*, Instituto del Territorio y Urbanismo, MOPU, Centro de Publicaciones, Madrid.

Ministerio de Vivienda (2004) *Atlas Estadístico de la Áreas Urbanas en España 2004*, Secretaría General Técnica Ministerio de Vivienda, Madrid.

Monclús, F. J. (ed.) (1998) *La ciudad dispersa*, Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Monclús, J. and Guàrdia, M. (2006) *Culture, urbanism and planning*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Mumford, L. (1961) *The City in History*, Penguin, London.

Nel-lo, O (1998) Los confines de la ciudad sin confines. Estructura urbana y límites administrativos en la ciudad difusa, in F. Monclús (ed) (1998) *La ciudad Dispersa*. *Barcelona*, Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Nel-lo, O. (2004) ¿Cambio de siglo, cambio de ciclo? Las grandes ciudades españolas en el umbral del S.XXI, *Ciudad y Territorio, Estudios Territoriales*, XXXVII (141-142) (otoño-invierno 2004), pp. 523-542.

Nel-lo, O. and Muñoz, F. (2004) El proceso de urbanización, in J. Romero (coord.) *Geografía Humana*, Ariel, Barcelona.

NUREC (1994) *Atlas of Agglomerations in the European Union*, Network on Urban Research in the European Union, Duisberg.

O'Connell, A. (1999) Book review of 'Modern Multidimensional Scaling: Theory and Practice', by I. Borg and P. Groenen, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997, in *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94 (445), pp.338-339.

OECD (2001) *OECD Territorial Outlook 2001: Making sense of the maze*, OECD, Paris cited in CEC (2007c) *The territorial state and perspectives of the European Union, Towards a stronger European territorial cohesion in light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions*, http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_1005296/The-Territorial-State-and-Perspectives-of-the-European-Union.pdf.

Office of Management and Budget (1999) Recommendations from the Metropolitan Areas Standards Review Committee to the Office of Management and Budget Concerning Changes to the Standards for Defining Metropolitan Areas, *Federal Register*, 20th October 1999.

Office of Management and Budget (2000) Final Report and Recommendations from the Metropolitan Areas Committee to the Office of Management and Budget Concerning Changes to the Standards for Defining Metropolitan Areas, *Federal Register*, 22nd August 2000.

Paddison, R. (ed.) (2001) *Handbook of Urban Studies*, Sage, London.

Pumain, D. et. al. (1992) *The Statistical Concept of the Town in Europe*, NUREC Working Paper No. 1, NUREC, Duisburg.

Reher, D-S. (1994) Ciudades, procesos de urbanización y sistemas urbanos en la Península Ibérica, in M. Guàrdia, F. J. Monclús and J. L. Oyón (eds.) *Atlas histórico de*

ciudades europeas, Península Ibérica, Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Salvat, Barcelona.

Roca Cladera, J. (2003) La delimitación de la ciudad ¿una cuestión posible?, *Ciudad y Territorio. Estudios Territoriales*, XXXV (135), pp. 17-36.

Roca, J., et. al. (1987) *La delimitació de l'àrea metropolitana de Barcelona*, CPSV, UPC, Barcelona.

Roca, J. and Burns, M. C. (2003) *La cooperació interregional i el desenvolupament estratègic, La dimensió europea*, Pla governamental CAT 21, Generalitat de Catalunya, Barcelona.

Roca, J. and Moix, M. (2005) The Interaction Value: Its Scope and Limits as an Instrument for Delimiting Urban Systems, *Regional Studies*, 39 (3), pp.357-373.

Rogers, R. (1999) Londres: la ciutat que ha tornat a néixer després de la supressió del seu Council, in P. Maragall i Mira (ed.) *Europa pròxima, Europa, regions i ciutats*, Edicions UB and Edicions UPC, Barcelona.

Romero, J. (coord.) (2004) *Geografia Humana*, Ariel, Barcelona.

Rozenblat, C. and Cicille, P. (2003) *Les villes européennes, Analyse Comparative*, La Documentation française, Paris.

Sassen, S. (2001a) Cities in the Global Economy, in R. Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of urban studies*, Sage, London, pp. 256-272.

Sassen, S. (2001b, 1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, (Second Edition), Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford.

Schacar, A. (1996) European world cities, in W. Lever and A. Bailly (eds.) *The Spatial Impact of Economic Changes in Europe*, Avebury, Aldershot.

Schürmann, C. and Talaat, A. (2000) *Towards a European Peripherality Index, Final Report*, Institut für Raumplanung, Universität Dortmund.

Serra, J. et. al. (2002) *Gran Aglomeracions Metropolitanas Europees*, Papers 37, Institut d'Estudis Regionals i Metropolitans de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Sforzi, F. (1991) La delimitazioni dei sistemi urbani: definizione, concetti e metodi, in C. Bertaglia and A. La Bella (eds.) *I sistemi urbani*, Franco Angeli, Milan.

Shaw, D.V. (2001) The Post-Industrial City, in R. Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of urban studies*, Sage, London.

Shaw, G. (1989) Industrialization, urban growth and the city economy, in R. Lawton (ed.) *The Rise and Fall of Great Cities*, Belhaven Press, London, cited in Nel-lo, O. and Muñoz, F. (2004) El proceso de urbanización, in J. Romero (coord.) *Geografía Humana*, Ariel, Barcelona.

Smart, M. W. (1974) Labour market areas: uses and definitions, *Progress in Planning*, 2, pp. 238-353.

Smith, D. A. and Timberlake, M. (1995a) Conceptualising and Mapping the Structure of the World System's City System', *Urban Studies*, 32 (2), 287-302.

Smith, D. A. and Timberlake, M. (1995b) Cities in global matrices: toward mapping the world-system's city system, in P. Knox and P.J. Taylor (eds.) (1995) *World cities in a world-system*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Smith, D. A. and Timberlake, M. (2001) World City Networks and Hierarchies, 1977-1997, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44 (10), 165-1678.

Smith, D. A. and Timberlake, M. (2002) Hierarchies of dominance among World Cities: a network approach, in S. Sassen (ed.) *Global Networks, Linked Cities*, Routledge, London.

Spiekermann, K. and Wegener, M. (1994) The Shrinking Continent: New Time Space Maps of Europe, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 21, pp. 653-673.

Sutcliffe, A., Introduction: Urbanization, Planning and the Giant City, in A. Sutcliffe (ed.), *Metropolis 1890-1940*, Mansell, London.

Taylor, P.J. and Hoyler, M. (2000) The Spatial Order of European Cities under Conditions of Contemporary Globalization, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 91 (2), pp. 176-189.

Taylor, P.J. and Lang, R.E. (2004) The shock of the new: 100 concepts describing recent urban change, *Environment and Planning A*, 36 (6), pp. 951-958.

Thompson, W. S. (1947) *The growth of metropolitan districts in the United States: 1900-1940*, Government Printing Office, Washington.

Timberlake, M. (1985) *Urbanisation in the World-Economy*, Academic Press, London

Timberlake, M. and Ma, X. (2007) Shanghai's increasing centrality in airline passenger networks. Paper presented at the *2007 Meeting of the Association of American Geographers*, 17-21 April, San Francisco, United States.

United Nations (1991) *World Urbanization Prospects*, United Nations, New York.

United Nations (2004) *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2003 Revision*, Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, New York.

United Nations (2005) *World Population Prospects: The 2004 Revision*, Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, New York.

Vries, J. De (2002) Grenzen verkend: Internationalisering van de ruimtelijke planning in de Benelux (Exploring borders: the internationalisation of spatial planning in the Benelux), *Stedelijke en Regionale Verkenningen* 27, Delft University Press, Delft, cited in B. Waterhout and W. Zonneveld (2005) Visions on territorial cohesion, *Town Planning Review* 76 (1), pp. 15-27.

Vries, J. De (2004) Venturing into unknown territory: the Making of the Second Benelux Structure Scheme. Paper presented at the AESOP Conference 30 June-4 July, Grenoble, France, cited in B. Waterhout and W. Zonneveld (2005) Visions on territorial cohesion, *Town Planning Review* 76 (1), pp. 15-27.

Warner, S. B. (1978) *Streetcar Suburbs: The process of growth in Boston (1870-1900)*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Weber, A.F. (1899) *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century: A Study in Statistics*, The Macmillan Company, New York, cited in Clark, D. (1996) *Urban World/Global City*, Routledge, London and New York.

Williams, R. H. (1996) *European Union Spatial Policy and Planning*, Paul Chapman Publishing, London.

Wilson, A.G. (1971) *Entropy in urban and regional modelling*, Pion, London.

Wood, E. (1998) The Greater London Authority Bill: A Mayor and Assembly for London, *House of Commons Research Paper*, 98/115, House of Commons Library, London.

Zonneveld, W. and Waterhout, B. (2005) Visions on territorial cohesion, *Town Planning Review*, 76 (1), pp. 15-27.

