

The object of this thesis is to establish a process of reflection on certain concepts historically naturalized by urban and environmental science, in such a way that a review of them can be carried out —and, consequently, of the legislation that adopts them philosophically— in the sense of, in the face of the situation of climate change and territorial predation, allowing us to proceed to question a system that establishes development as an element of economic progress in terms of unlimited growth, and to propose the real possibility of establishing development in balance with the territorial environment.

To get this, the evolutionary context of the formation of the *Territorial Planning* concept is defined, reaching the conclusion that the traditionally accepted signifier is more typical of a model based on the generation of capital gains, than on the determination of its own planning, derived from this of its intrinsic determinations, in order to subsequently generate the planning of the uses and activities that must or can be carried out on it.

It is about reflecting on how to consider the territory as a resource already ordered in itself, made up of what we call its *invariants*, which will be used by society —necessarily *disordering it*—, in order to respectfully extract from it the benefits it needs. for social development itself, all of this alternatively to the economic exploitation model —corrected based on "sustainability" criteria— treated as a mere action board, on which to plan uses and activities.

This aforementioned "sustainability" is instrumentalized by the so-called *Sustainable Development*, a term that we describe as oxymoron, since "development" —obviously, in our context, economic development— is a term that is opposed to "limit", an indicator that must be considered inherent to the concept of sustainability.

We will understand, therefore, that *Territorial Planning* linked to *Sustainable Development* criteria implies the inability, in territorial evolution, to consider the necessary balance to be able to recover and maintain those territorial elements, their resources, to consider acceptable levels of well-being. Consequently, any evolution towards the limit, which does not imply recovery of what has been exhausted, with greater or lesser speed —development in "sustainability"— will inevitably imply an approach to definitive depletion.

Review a system based on growth by growth, implementing a system of *Permanent Stability*, which, in the situation of exaltation of expansive policies, will only be achievable through a process of decrease, a path of reversion towards *intra-limit* positions.

This is, therefore, how new territorial figures are proposed prior to urban planning based on what we call *Functional Acceptance Capabilities*, a figure that we link to the intrinsic nature of the territory and its capacity to maintain a certain balance. Capacities that are linked for their activation to the real and verifiable Social Need, without which the transformation of the common heritage is meaningless.

This implies, on the other hand, basic limiting instruments to be implemented in the legislation, so that the criterion turns towards non-expansionist positions: banishing the type of developable land; consider rural land, with its different developable abilities, as an alternative; disclassification, disqualification and even disurbanization, in front of expansionism; determinations such as caring city, mediterranean city, compact, mixed, cohesive, localizability of resources; the right to get urban benefits, with social recovery of real capital gains; renaturalization, revegetation and demobility —non-motorized mobility, proximity— as a project item would be incorporated as a cultural process of degrowth.