

**MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 6TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT
APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 4TH AUGUST, 2012 AT
VIEW POINT, BOLGHATTY PALACE, ERNAKULAM**

The sixth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 4th August 2012 at View Point, Bolghatty Palace, Ernakulam. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. The agenda included the evaluation of three new projects and reconsideration of five old proposals. 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
ICAR Emeritus Scientist &
Former Director CMFRI
2. Dr. Oommen V. Oommen - Vice-Chairman, SEAC
Chairman, Kerala State Biodiversity Board &
CSIR Emeritus Scientist
3. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. E.J. Joseph - 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. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
12. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants. He congratulated Dr. Oommen V. Oommen on assuming charge as the Chairman, Kerala State Biodiversity Board. Chairman also congratulated Dr. Khaleel Chovva who has participated in an International Conference on Wetland Ecosystem conducted by IUCN, in Romania.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 06.01 **Confirmation of the Minutes of the 5th meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala, held on 7th July, 2012 at Melody Hall, Mascot Hotel, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

Item No. 06.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 4th & 5th SEAC meetings**

The Secretary presented action taken report on the decisions of the 4th and 5th SEAC meetings and the committee noted.

Item No. 06.03 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Mobility Hub Project at Poonithura Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 678 to 694 (except 680), 721 to 727 & 731 to 735 by Vyttila Mobility Hub Society (File No.28/SEIAA/KL/2793/2012)**

The Vyttila Mobility Hub Society is a registered society under the Local Self Government Department of Government of Kerala. The Chairman of the Society is the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Kerala. The main objective of the Society is to establish and manage a Mobility Hub in Vyttila, Ernakulam district which will be the first mobility hub in India having integration of various modes of transport viz. bus, boat and metro rail and is an ambitious pioneering project of this type in Kerala. The mobility hub is coming up in the sprawling 26 acres of land at the busy Vyttila junction, which is envisioned as a long-term solution to Kochi's transportation problems, by providing connectivity with the western and eastern parts of the city, West Kochi, and also regional hubs like Vypeen, Palarivattom, Kakkanad, Tripunithura and Aroor. By basing operations in Vyttila bus terminal, the KSRTC and private buses would be able to save huge amounts of fuel, apart from the time saved by not entering the busy city. The first phase of the mobility hub which has already commenced its operation is only on a temporary arrangement.

After the presentation of the proposal by the project proponent, the major point that raised concern among all the members was the system of traffic management – both inside and outside the proposed project area. The proponent was asked to explain the traffic movement plan from all the roads reaching Vyttila Junction and then to the mobility hub. Traffic congestion needed to be addressed effectively as many vehicles will be stranded, which in turn may create environmental pollution, wastage of fuel and loss of valuable time. The Committee expressed their concern and stressed that there arises no scope for further expansion of the hub unless and until adequate measures are taken for effective traffic

management. The Committee further stressed that the proposed project can be coupled with a flyover at Vytila Junction and only then can the mobility hub become a technically viable and feasible project. 2800 trips are handled by the mobility hub at present and trips are going to be enhanced to 3500 (700 more trips) with the implementation of the proposed expansion which further emphasizes the necessity for a flyover. The proponent said that a proposal is under consideration before the National Highway Authority of India (NHAI) for the construction of a flyover and a roundabout below it, which could be considered as a simultaneous development related to the proposed mobility hub. The proponent also said that some facilities in and around the project area shall be utilized to make adequate provisions for parking in addition to the proposed ones. The proponent was also asked whether the proposed metro rail station would come inside the mobility hub area and also whether there would be any overlapping of suggested flyover and the metro rail track. The proponent clarified here that the metro rail project is not coming inside the proposed project site.

The site is located near Kaniyampuzha River which was another matter of concern. The proponent clarified that the river is abutting the proposed project area. Moreover, they shall provide proper oil trap system which will ensure that the river is not getting polluted with oil or grease or any washing from the proposed bus clinic. The Committee suggested adopting latest German technology as done by Indian Oil Corporation to dispose the oil and diesel washings. It was also suggested to provide a high barricade around the project site to prevent disposal of solid waste materials into the river. Oil and fuel storage in ground near river should be addressed properly. The proponent was also advised to consider shifting the location of both the oil and fuel storage facility and bus clinic away from the river frontage. The proponent said that the bus clinic deals with minor repairs only.

The drainage provided and the storm water management plan of the project was found to be somewhat agreeable. The storm water drain was directed towards Kaniyampuzha River which may create pollution problems as well as flood during peak monsoon season with heavy rains. Present width of the tarred road leading to the hub is only 15 m and the proponent informed that a proposal is under consideration to enhance the width by 30 m which would be in existence when the project becomes fully functional by 2016-2017.

The proponent was asked whether they have a fool proof STP, for which they said that at present they have only septic tanks and soak pits without having a proper STP and an STP of 1184 KL/day is proposed for the present project. Out of this, 50 percent will be biodegradable and sludge from STP will be fed to a biogas plant. In Form 1 A of the proposal

submitted it was said that the roof rain water storage tank of 300 KL x 2 numbers will be used as source of water during rainy days. Clarification was sought in this regard to which the proponent stated that 2 numbers of rain water storage tank of 3000 KL storage capacity is provided amounting to a total 6000 KL capacity.

There are 2 basement floors mentioned in the proposal. The nature of soil up to 4.5 m is sandy and below that it is sticky expansive organic clay. The proposed construction of lower basement floor supposed to go beyond 8 m below the ground level is found to be not technically feasible considering the nature of strata below 4m depth. So the committee was of the opinion that it is better to avoid the construction of one lower basement floor which extends to such a depth and thus limit the basement floor to one.

It was pointed out that the pavement with marbonite tiles provided in the present bus shelter is creating heat islands and is also causing inconvenience to the public. The major drawback noted is that passengers cannot use the bus shelter during both sunny and rainy days as far as the type of roofing and flooring presently provided is considered. It was suggested to take care of this issue in future and to use non-reflective tiles in the proposed expansion to avoid such problems. To ease the pedestrian movements a dedicated walkway and provision for subway is to be provided.

The inclusion of *Acacia spp.* for the green area development was objected by the committee and the proponent was reminded of the Government Order (G.O.(Rt) No. 2244/10/LSGD dt. 07.07.2010) from the Local Self Government Department regarding the Mobility Hub wherein it is stated that no trees standing on the land shall be cut and removed without prior sanction from the Assigning Authority.

The proponent was asked about the source of water to meet the requirements of the proposed project. It was stated here that their sources of water are rain water, KWA and treated water from STP. The Committee advised the proponent not to depend largely on the water provided by KWA and advised to go for 15 m diameter open wells in addition to the proposed RWH structure.

Considering all the above, the proposal is **RECOMMENDED** for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance should be submitted in the form of affidavit that used oil, diesel and grease will not be disposed into the nearby Kaniyampuzha River.

2. Fresh embankment of suitable material along the riverside should be provided to prevent bank erosion and other hazards like men and material falling into water and disposal of solid wastes into the river.
3. Appropriate modern technologies shall be adopted for diesel storage.
4. A full fledged functional STP with provision for complete recycling of wastes shall be provided avoiding the use of septic tanks and soak pits.
5. The sand removed up to 4 m should be utilized in situ.
6. Use of reflective tiles and reflective glass may be reduced and replaced with non-reflective ones.
7. The possibility of linking the project with commissioning of a flyover and roundabout beneath it at Vyttila Junction may preferably be explored.

Item No. 06.04 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Residential Project at Village Vijayapuram, Panchayath Vijayapuram, Taluk Kottayam, District Kottayam, Kerala in Re-Survey No. 72/3, 72/5, Block No. 23 by Mr. Sam Mathew Kalarickal (File No.29/SEIAA/KL/2794/2012)**

The project proponent gave a brief description of their proposed project. The proposed site is 5 km away from Kottayam town. The most important thing which raised concern among the members was that the proposed project site is recorded as nilam and chira in the land documents registered in 2007. Since nilam cannot be reclaimed or taken for any construction purposes, the committee sought clarification from the proponent regarding the same. The nilam has already been reclaimed as evident from the google maps and soil investigation report provided. The proponent informed that they have got documents as it is classified as land. Moreover, it was found that the survey number provided in the proposal is not the region shown in the cadastral map. Considering all the above, the SEAC directed the proponent to submit the following:

1. Registered Power of Attorney to be provided.
2. Proof of exclusive ownership of the 10 m wide access road to the proposed construction site, in the name of Mr. Sam Mathew Kalarickal.
3. Proof of evidence that the proposed area is a land as per revenue records and not nilam.

4. An assurance in the form of affidavit that, before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent shall submit an affidavit to the LSG Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible, should be submitted by the proponent.

The committee DEFERRED the proposal for reconsideration on receipt of the above items.

Item No. 06.05 **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)**

The project proponent has not submitted some documents as directed by the 3rd SEAC and so DEFERRED the proposal. The project proponent was directed to submit the following documents on or before 16th August 2012 or else the proposal shall be recommended for rejection of EC with directions to apply afresh, if necessary.

1. Yield study report of well, done by an approved agency
2. Cadastral map with building plan superimposed on it.
3. Site plan showing separate entry and exit to service road/NH, drainage, etc. indicating the width of the roads.
4. 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.

Item No. 06.06 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed expansion of Residential Township 'Sahara Grace' Project at Village Kakkanad, Seaport Airport Road, Thrikkakara, Ernakulam District, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 536/5, 536/6, 535/1, 535/3, 535/4, 540/3, 533/6, 533/7, 533/8, 534/3, 540/1, 533/1, 533/9, 533/10, 533/11, 533/12, 533/13, 533/14 & 533/15 by M/s Sahara India Commercial Corporation Limited (File No.12/SEIAA/KL/397/2012)**

A brief description of the project was given by the project proponent. The proponent has got EC from MoEF vide letter no. 21-762/2007-IA.III dated 05.02.2008 for constructing four blocks of A,B,C and D. Now the EC is sought for additions of 4 floors in C block and one floor in D block. It was said that new units are proposed in the existing land in an

interspersed area which includes the area in which EC has already been obtained from MoEF. Since the proposal comes under Kochi Structure Plan the proponent was asked about the FAR of the proposed project as the permissible FAR is 2.5. The proponent said that the proposed project has an FAR of 2.61. So the proponent was asked to produce the copies of all statutory clearances already obtained. There is a *thodu* within the site. The Committee was doubtful regarding as to whether the land is a paddy field and so decided to have a site inspection to ensure the same. Clarification was sought on the decrease in total water requirement even after the proposed expansion. The proponent said that now they have adopted effective water conservation measures which has brought down the water requirement. Considering the above, the proponent was directed to provide the following documents:

1. Registered Power of Attorney
2. Building permits, site plan, building plan, proposed plan, sanctioned plan and NOC given by Thrikkakkara Municipality/Grama Panchayath for all the blocks.
3. Certificate from Fire and Rescue Services
4. NOC from Airports Authority of India.
5. Revenue permission for constructing two bridges.
6. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the purambokku land will be left as such and no construction will be done there.
7. An assurance in the form of affidavit that, before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent shall submit an affidavit to the LSG Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible, should be submitted by the proponent.

The proposal has been DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and shall be reconsidered after site inspection and also on the satisfactory receipt of the above items.

Item No. 06.07 **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)**

On scrutiny of additional documents submitted by the project proponent based on 3rd SEAC decisions, the committee found that the certificate from Airports Authority of India

produced by the proponent is in the name of Mr. Krishnakumar from whom the proponent has bought the land.

The Committee suggested to include native fruit bearing trees like tamarind, njaaval, among others for green area development as it may attract birds. Considering the above, the proponent was directed to produce the following documents on or before 16th August 2012:

1. Certificate from Airports Authority of India that the permission pertaining to the survey numbers of the proposed project in the name of Mr. Krishnakumar is transferable OR, the project proponent should get a new certificate in the name of the present owner of the land.
2. Structural stability certificate

The proposal has been DEFERRED for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

Item No. 06.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the construction of a Residential Project ‘CHOICE PARADISE’ at Village Nadama, Taluk Kanayannur, Thripunithura Municipality, District Ernakulam, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 1307/2, 1309/2,3, 1302/5, 1304/2 and 1303/2 by M/s Choice Constructions (File No. 18/SEIAA/KL/671/2012)**

The proposal which was deferred in the 4th SEAC meeting for site inspection was reconsidered based on the field inspection report. The main concern of the Committee was regarding the fire and safety measures adopted by the proponent for such a tall building of height 121.83 m. As per the decisions of the 4th meeting of the SEAC, a site inspection was held on 21.07.2012 by a subcommittee. The subcommittee consisted of Dr. N.G. K. Pillai, Chairman, SEAC Kerala; Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary, SEAC Kerala; Sri. Eapen Varughese, Member, SEAC Kerala and Prof. (Dr.) G. Madhu, Co-opted Member from Cochin University of Science and Technology, SEAC. The subcommittee, in its report, made the following conclusions and recommendations.

1. The fire fighting facilities provided in the residential complex is satisfactory and they meet most of the requirements stipulated by National Building Code of India and the Kerala Municipality Building Rules, 1999.
2. The regular inspection and maintenance of the fire fighting facilities is essential to ensure their proper functioning in case of an emergency. The project proponent should make necessary arrangements for the smooth operation and regular maintenance of the fire

protection system. This task should be entrusted to experienced and skilled operators and fire crew. The Fire and Rescue Department may be addressed to ensure regular quarterly inspections of the fire fighting facilities and its proper functioning.

3. Fire drills and mock evacuation drills shall be conducted at least once in three months. Participation of maximum number of inhabitants shall be ensured in the mock evacuation drills. The students of the nearby school may also be made aware of the fire fighting mechanisms provided in the building.
4. The fire fighting measures in our country is usually capacitated to manage at a maximum height of 60 m. The fire fighting and safety measures adopted in this building is recommended to be considered as a model to see how fire fighting facilities can be efficiently managed even at a height of more than 60 m.

On the basis of the subcommittee report, the proposal was RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

- (i) Fire drills and mock evacuation drills shall be conducted at least once in three months. Participation of maximum number of inhabitants shall be ensured in the mock evacuation drills. The students of the nearby school may also be made aware of the fire fighting mechanisms provided in the building.
- (ii) The builder/authorized signatory should take the responsibility for ensuring proper functioning of fire fighting facilities as well as waste management for a minimum period of 10 years by levying maintenance charges for the flat owners.

Item No. 06.09 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed construction of a Resort cum Villa Project at Paruthippara of Ramanattukara Village, Kozhikode District, Kerala, in Sy. Nos.2/1, 2/2A, 3/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9/4, 5, 10, 11/1, 2& 12/1 by M/s Waterline Hotels Pvt. Ltd. (File No: 15/SEIAA/KL/628/2012)**

The Committee found that some documents submitted by the proponent as directed by SEAC in its 4th meeting, are not satisfactory. The proposal was DEFERRED and the project proponent was directed to submit the following on or before 16th August 2012.

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that some region in the proposed project site shall be left as mudflats for birds.

2. Assurance that RWH structure shall be sufficiently elevated so as to address any flood water condition.

Item No. 06.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Construction project of Mall of Travancore, Chackai, Pettah Village, Fort Zone, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala State in Sy. Nos. 506/1, 506/2, 507/1, 507/2, 507/2-1, 507/2-2, 507/2-3, 507/2-3-1, 507/2-4, 508, 508/1, 508/1-1, 509/1, 510/1, 510/2, 510/3, 510/4, 511, 511/1, 511/2, 511/3, 511/4, 512/1-2, 512/2-1, 512/2-2, 515/1, 515/2-2, 515/3, 515/4, 515/5-1 by M/s Malabar Commercial Plaza (P) Ltd. (File No. 22/SEIAA/KL/956/2012 (II))**

The proponent was initially informed that mere consideration of the proposal by SEAC does not imply that their application is being processed in view of the fact that it is not still having KCZMA recommendation. The project proponent was allowed to present their proposal as they have submitted an office letter No. 976/A3/12/KCZMA/S&TD dated 03.08.2012 from KCZMA stating that they have received the report regarding the project of M/s Malabar Commercial Plaza (P) Ltd. and the same shall be placed before the next KCZMA meeting scheduled for 21st August 2012 wherein they shall take a final decision on the CRZ clearance and forward the same for consideration of the Environment Impact Assessment Committee.

The Committee reminded the project proponent that their proposal shall be actually considered for application of Environmental Clearance only after the receipt of KCZMA recommendations. The Committee also found that certain material documents provided to SEAC members were not submitted to the office of SEIAA along with original application wherein the proponent was directed to forward the proposal as identical to that of the original application. SEAC observed it as a great fault from the proponent and decided to seek clarification on this aspect. The proponent has not mentioned anything about Corporate Social Responsibility. They said that they have set aside 0.1 percent of the whole turn over for telemedicine, charity, housing, education and scholarship. Furthermore the existing social infrastructure around the proposed project has not been given. The committee was of the opinion that much larger area shall be provided for recharge of ground water and provision shall be made to collect water from the plot and store it. It was also found that the yield study report of the well submitted was not satisfactory. As per the report, tube wells and bore wells are not permissible in the area as it may affect the quality of ground water. Larger diameter open well has to be provided so as to conserve water in the plot. The size of the recharge well provided at present is 3 m. The committee suggested to avoid planting the *Bambusa bambos* (Green bamboo) for green area development as this particular species is thorny. Considering the above, the proponent was directed to produce the following:

1. Conceptual plan
2. Building plan
3. Proof of authorized signatory
4. Cadastral map of the proposed area duly certified by Village Officer
5. Affidavit in original regarding the constitution of environmental monitoring cell, providing fire fighting system, providing systems to minimize dust emissions, to provide adequate safety measures for the construction workers during the construction phase and to upload the following in the website of the project:
 - a) EC order
 - b) Status of compliance of the stipulated EC conditions
 - c) Results of monitoring data and update the same periodically AND
 - d) Send the copy of the EC to the LSG concerned
6. Details of social infrastructure in and around the project site to be provided.
7. KCZMA recommendations as to the width and extent of No Development Zone.
8. Specific action plan for Corporate Social Responsibility.
9. Biodiversity listing regarding flora, especially mangrove species 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.
10. NOC from Airports Authority of India.
11. Assurance that use of glass for decorative / aesthetic purposes shall be avoided.
12. Assurance that large diameter open well shall be provided for conservation of water.
13. Report of yield test conducted by an approved agency shall be submitted.
14. Fresh water quality report incorporating microbiological quality of water to be provided.
15. Assurance that at least a portion of the water logged area in the project site shall be retained so as to facilitate ground water recharge.

16. An assurance in the form of affidavit that, before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent shall submit an affidavit to the LSG Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible, should be submitted by the proponent.

The proposal has been DEFERRED for reconsideration on receipt of all the above.

The meeting concluded at 5.00 pm with vote of thanks by the chair.