

**MINUTES OF THE 3<sup>RD</sup> MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL  
COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 5<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2012 AT MELODY  
HALL, MASCOT HOTEL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The third meeting of SEAC – Kerala was held on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2012 at Melody Hall, Mascot Hotel, Thiruvananthapuram. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. The agenda included the evaluation of four new projects and reconsideration of one old proposal. The meeting started at 9.30 am and the following members of SEAC Kerala were present in the meeting:

1. Dr. N.G.K. Pillai - Chairman, SEAC
2. Dr. Oommen V. Oommen - Vice-Chairman, SEAC
3. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. Harikrishnan K - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
11. Shri. Eapen Varghese - Member, SEAC
12. Shri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC & Director, Department of Environment and Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants. Before taking up the regular agenda items the Chairman delivered retrospections regarding the functioning of SEAC and the total number of projects evaluated so far.

Evaluating the format of proposals that was placed before the committee earlier, it was found necessary to convey some general suggestions to the project proponent/consultant so that they could be genuine without factual errors for the proposals that are being submitted.

The following suggestions were put forward by the committee for the project proponents/consultants to be taken care of while submitting their proposal for prior environmental clearance under EIA Notification 2006.

1. Biodiversity listing regarding flora and fauna specific to the project site may be got certified by the Biodiversity Monitoring Committees/Bhoomitrasena Clubs of the locality or by any subject expert from the nearby R&D organizations/Government/Aided colleges.
2. Proper environmental quality analysis should have been done by accredited laboratories and the reports should contain date(s) of sampling, analysis and reporting, etc.
3. Water samples for water quality analysis should have been taken from minimum four different locations (preferably four corners) within the site.
4. Answering questions in Form 1 and Form 1A should be site and project specific and generalized statements should be avoided.
5. An affidavit to the effect that a compliance certificate from the project proponent by way of affidavit shall be submitted to the concerned LSG before applying for occupancy certificate stating that whatever commitments made before the committee and recommendations made by the committee/ SEIAA have been fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible. A copy of the same should also be provided to the Department of Environment and Climate Change.
6. The proponent must provide more specific information on Corporate Social Responsibility and also on how the project is going to influence the society at large.
7. Photographs of the site taken recently from the four sides should have the dates embedded on it.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

**Item No. 03.01** Confirmation of the **Minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala, held on 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2012 at Dalbergia Hall, Kerala Forest Research Institute (KFRI), Peechi, Thrissur**

Confirmed.

**Item No. 03.02**      **Action taken report on the decisions of the 2<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting**

Noted.

**Item No. 03.03**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Commercial Complex at Edapally South Village, Corporation of Kochi, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 127/5 & 128/3-1 by M/s Narmada Builders and Traders Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 16/SEIAA/KL/629/2012)**

SEAC observed that the proposal submitted by the proponent was not having cadastral map. The building plan submitted lacked clarity on entry and exit points. In both conceptual plan and landscape plan, connection between the road and plot was not shown. In report on water quality submitted, date(s) of sampling and analysis were not provided. The report also stated that the water is not potable. Therefore it was suggested that the proponent, in consultation with experts shall provide specific plans to make the ground water potable. The proponent did not conduct pump test and has failed to provide data on the capacity (dependable flow or yield) of the proposed source of ground water. Committee also raised their concern on the proximity of the project site with the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary. Considering all the above, the SEAC directed the proponent to submit the following:

1. Provide a cadastral map with building plan superimposed on it.
2. Resubmit a site plan showing separate entry and exit to service road/NH, drainage, etc. indicating the width of the roads.
3. Provide a fresh water quality report done by an accredited lab. The water samples should be taken from four different locations (preferably from four corners) within the site.
4. Conduct ground water yield study of the proposed abstraction well by an approved agency and submit specific plans to make the ground water potable, if the quality of the water is not satisfactory.
5. Examine the viability of utilizing solar energy and report the possibility of providing more solar cells/photovoltaic cells.
6. A Certificate from the Forests and Wildlife Department regarding the distance of the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary from the project site.
7. Give assurance in the form of affidavit regarding the quantity of earth that shall be removed specifically mentioning how they are going to be disposed off.

8. An affidavit to the effect that a compliance certificate from the project proponent by way of affidavit shall be submitted to the concerned LSG before applying for occupancy certificate stating that whatever commitments made before the committee and recommendations made by the committee/SEIAA have been fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible.
9. Seismic codes – IS 1893 (2002), IS 13920 (1993) and IS 456 (2000) as applicable shall be incorporated.

DEFERRED the proposal for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

**Item No. 03.04 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Residential Project at Village Attipra, District Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 526/7, 526/16, 526/1-1, 526/1, 526/20, 526/21, 526/19, 526/6, 525/15, 525/14, 525/14-1, 544/1-1, 525/2-1-1, 544/1, 526/27 and 526/28 by M/s Muthoot Estate Investments (File No. 17/SEIAA/KL/630/2012)**

The proposed project site is at a distance of 100 m from Akkulam Lake but the plot comes outside the CRZ map. Information given in Form 1 and Form 1 A is having factual errors which need to be rectified. The project is likely to affect the ground water regime causing ground water depletion and hence deep cutting as suggested by the proponent should be avoided. The proponent has to ensure as a social responsibility commitment that drinking water is available for people in the neighbouring areas. The committee also suggested proper measures for recharge of ground water. The committee also noted that the proposed project site is near to the Southern Air Command Headquarters. The committee made the above observations and directed the proponent to submit the following:

1. Significant changes in the land use should be clearly specified.
2. Yield/dependable flow of water should be provided appropriately after detailed studies.
3. Specific details on disposal of heap of soil or huge quantity of soil that may be removed from the site.
4. Have water quality test reports from more bore holes, of minimum four points in the site at different locations.

5. Storm water from the plot must be directed to percolation ponds of suitable dimension after clarification. More number of such ponds to be provided at suitable locations so as to maximize conservation of rain water.
6. RWH storage capacity should be a minimum of 1000 KL.
7. Provide suitable strategies to address the possible depletion of ground water table of the area.
8. Provide a certificate from competent persons either from Government Engineering Colleges/NIT for the structural stability of the proposed design for construction of retaining wall.
9. Silt fencing should be given during construction phase so as to avoid possible down slope movement of mud and other material during the rains and siltation of nearby lake.
10. For flora selection, consult with experts and give details.
11. Should get clearance from Air force Authority, since site is located near to the Southern Air Command Headquarters.
12. An affidavit to the effect that a compliance certificate from the project proponent by way of affidavit shall be submitted to the concerned LSG before applying for occupancy certificate stating that whatever commitments made before the committee and recommendations made by the committee/SEIAA have been fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible.
13. Seismic codes – IS 1893 (2002), IS 13920 (1993) and IS 456 (2000) as applicable shall be incorporated.

DEFERRED the proposal for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

**Item No. 03.05**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the construction of Residential Project ‘Purva Grand Bay’ at Ernakulam Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Corporation of Cochin, District Ernakulam, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 843, 2535 & 2536 by M/s Puravankara Projects Limited (File No.19/SEIAA/KL/717/2012)**

This proposal is a clear case of violation as they have started development and construction of the building in December 2005 and continued the construction activities even after the EIA Notification in 2006. As per the recommendations of the Kerala Coastal Zone

Management Authority, construction of the apartments should be subject to the local and country planning regulation that existed as on 19-02-1991. At present the building is constructed with an FSI of 3.99 (while the prescribed limit as on 19-02-1991 is 1.5). The project site is at a distance of 12 m from Cochin Backwaters. Since there is a road between the plot and the water body, this distance can be neglected. A swimming pool provided in 5<sup>th</sup> floor may likely to cause structural instability. The site is very near to the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary.

SEAC directed the proponent to submit the following:

1. Assurance in writing that the FAR will be limited as per KCZMA recommendation.
2. A copy of the subcommittee report of KCZMA.
3. Laboratory reports of environmental quality of air and water from 2005 onwards.
4. An efficient plan to dispose the ferric iron and other toxic waste coming from RO plant.
5. Structural stability certificate since 5<sup>th</sup> floor is having swimming pool and the construction is on the banks of backwater.
6. Provision for concurrent use of rain water
7. Certificate from Kerala Forest and Wildlife Department regarding the distance from the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary.
8. Seismic codes – IS 1893 (2002), IS 13920 (1993) and IS 456 (2000) as applicable shall be incorporated.

The committee further decided to have a SITE INSPECTION by a subcommittee to examine the present status of the project site. DEFERRED the proposal for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

**Item No. 03.06**

**Application for environmental clearance for the proposed construction of a Hospital Complex Project, at Puthiyangadi Village, Edakkad Desam, Kozhikode Corporation, Kozhikode Taluk & District, Kerala, in Sy.Nos. 54/3A, 54/3B1, 54/1, 53/1, 54/12, 54/3C1 B2, 54/2, 58/2B, 54/3C1 A & 54/3B2 by M/s Perfect Health Care Services (File No. 9/SEIAA/KL/394/2012) (Former Item No. 02.06)**

RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific condition:

The proponent shall provide the details of the technology adopted to prevent the chances of saline intrusion from Connolly canal.

## **Additional Agenda Items:**

**Item No. 03.07** Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Mall of Travancore at Pettah Village, Fort Zone, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala State, in Sy. Nos. 508/1-1, 508, 508/1, 507/1, 506/2, 506/1, 511/2, 511/1, 511/3, 511/4, 511, 507/2-3, 507/2-1, 507/2-3-1, 507/2-4, 507/2, 510/1, 509/1, 510/2, 510/3, 510/4, 512/2-1, 512/2-2, 512/1-2, 507/2-2 by M/s Malabar Commercial Plaza (P) Ltd (File No. 22/SEIAA/KL/956/2012)

The proposal submitted was found to be with factual errors and was not site specific. The proponent has made provision of rain water storage, only for one day, which needs to be enhanced for at least one month. Since the project site has water bodies within it, they should be retained without being reclaimed as they act as recharging zone and thus serve the purpose. The committee suggested that the entire 12 m No Development Zone in the western side of the proposed project site can be used for conservation of water. The committee also raised concern on the possible discharge of waste water and disposal of solid waste to the nearby Parvathi Puthanar r. The proposal requires CRZ recommendations as to the extent of No Development Zone. Based on the above observations, SEAC directed the proponent to submit the following:

1. Redraft and submit a dedicated site specific proposal avoiding factual errors.
2. Water quality report done by an accredited laboratory should be provided. The water samples should be taken from four different locations (preferably four corners) within the site.
3. Selection of species for greenbelt development should be justified after consultation with experts and details provided therein.
4. For RWH, minimum one month storage facility need be provided.
5. Have percolation pits in the site, as far as possible so as to direct all the storm water into these.
6. CRZ recommendations as to the width and extent of No Development Zone on the western side, if any, shall be provided.
7. An affidavit that the waste water generated will not be discharged to the nearby Parvathi Puthanar r.
8. Conduct yield study of the well in pre-monsoon period by an approved agency and submit the expected/dependable yield from well water.

DEFERRED the proposal for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

**Item No. 03.08**      **Request from M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd.**  
**(File No. 8/SEIAA/KL/393/2012)**

Considering the request of M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd. for allowing bore wells in the site, the committee was of the opinion that since the plot is very near to sea, the construction of bore wells will invite salt water ingress to the ground water and it will affect the drinking water quality of the nearby areas. So the committee DEFERRED it for reconsideration if the proponent produces a certificate from Central Ground Water Board or State Ground Water Department to the effect that the construction of bore wells in the said site is not likely to cause saline water intrusion in the area.

**Item No. 03.09**      **Request from M/s Emmay Logistics (India) Private Limited**  
**(File No. 7/SEIAA/KL/378/2012)**

Considering the request from M/s Emmay Logistics (India) Private Limited for reducing the width of internal roads from 7.5 m, the committee decided that the road should have width for the free circulation of heavy vehicles intended for rescue and relief operations towards both sides and as per KMBR and accordingly RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance.

**Additional items:**

**Item No. 03.10**      **Conducting an induction workshop for Secretaries of LSGIs**

An induction workshop for the Secretaries of Local Self Government Institutions through KILA was proposed to create awareness among the general public and various government sectors regarding the functioning of SEAC and SEIAA Kerala and the necessity of having prior environmental clearance before issuing building permit to the project proponents of all projects coming under the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

**Item No. 03.11**      **Addressing Local Self Government regarding issuance of occupancy certificate**

SEAC is keen to ensure that the commitments made by the project proponent during the submission of the project proposal as well as the conditions put forward in environmental clearance are fully complied with the proponents. So it was decided to bring the matter before the LSGIs, that occupancy certificate shall be issued only after the submission of a compliance certificate in the form of an affidavit stating that whatever commitments made



before the SEAC by the proponent and recommendations made by the committee/SEIAA are fully complied with and also shall be complied in future during the entire operation phase of the project.

The meeting concluded at 4.45 pm with vote of thanks by the chair.

Chairman SEAC

Secretary SEAC