

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 14TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 6TH APRIL, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The Fourteenth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 6th April 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (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. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
10. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
11. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
12. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
13. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
14. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants and made a briefing on the status of proposals appraised by SEAC so far and was happy to note that pending proposals are nil especially with regard to quarry projects.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 14.01 Confirmation of the minutes of the 13th SEAC meeting, held on 2nd March 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

Item No. 14.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 13th SEAC meeting

The Committee noted the item.

Item No. 14.03 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Housing Project in Sy. No. 259/11-1 at Thiruvalla Village & Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Skyline Builders (File No. 82/SEIAA/KL/323/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. In conceptual plan, proposed building is shown in two locations including an additional proposed recreation building block 2 with first aid facility in B1+G+1 which is not stated in the facilities proposed. The proponent was directed to give in writing the entire facilities proposed under the project. The proponent was also asked to provide details of proposed Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities with respect to the present proposal instead of stating the already done activities. To this end the proponent stated that the registration formalities of a separate wing of CSR of the firm is going on and will be soon put in place. The Committee noted from the contour plan submitted by the proponent that the project site is a cut and leveled land with an elevation difference of 5 m. As the cutting of 5 m height in laterite overburden can become unstable, the proponent was told that the cutting on the western side should be provided with a strong retaining wall.

The proponent was asked regarding the yield of the proposed source of water to which it was stated as 36000 L and that the rain water storage is proposed in the first basement level. The Committee was of the opinion that proposed storage of 500 KL of rain water is insufficient to cater the entire water requirements of the project as the anticipated requirement may come to 60 KL/day and hence directed to enhance the storage to at least one month or to 1500 KL, whichever is more. The proponent was also asked to provide the methodology to be adopted to make the rain water potable. To this end the proponent stated that the stored rain water will be filtered using pressure sand filter followed by chlorination. The soil test reports submitted by the proponent showed that the water table was not encountered, but contradictory to this the project site has a 9 m deep well at present. It is also proposed to have two open wells, one having 4 m diameter. The Committee sought clarification regarding this and suggested to have recharge pits having a depth of 6 m below ground level to penetrate the hard laterite layer and to direct the storm water to these pits and let out only the excess quantity for efficient ground water recharge.

The proponent has proposed a 7.5 m cutting from the ground to have two lower basement floors. The Committee raised concern as the removal of overburden to 7 m below ground level will reduce the ground water in the entire area and was doubtful as to which strata will hold water as the well will dry up during summer if such a cutting is made. The Committee found that the project site has an elevation of 15 m and the water level of nearby Manimala River is 5 m AMSL. The Committee was of the opinion that if lower basement floor is constructed, there will be scarcity of water and the ground water regime of the entire area will be altered as it is an elevated land. The Committee also raised concerns of ensuring sustained water source. The proponent was hence directed to avoid the lower basement floor and revise the plan accordingly and submit the same.

The conceptual plan submitted by the proponent did not clearly demarcate the setback lines and hence was directed to show the same in the revised conceptual plan. The Committee was also of the opinion that the bore log data provided by the proponent is wrong and hence directed the proponent to provide a more reliable data on the same.

The Committee also found the basement of building to be close to the adjacent plot boundary and the distance from the main road to be 5 m which was pointed out to be not advisable. Hence the proponent was directed to maintain the required set back distance from the edges. Moreover the nearby school in the project area will be affected due to dust emissions from construction activities. Hence SEAC suggested to address the issue in a constructive way and to extend the CSR activities primarily to the institution.

When asked about the waste disposal facilities proposed, the proponent stated that the biobin systems shall be used during construction phase and biogas plant during operation phase for the same. The Committee pointed out that the proponent has not provided the location for the storage of solid waste in the conceptual plan. The proponent stated that the provision for the same is provided in the STP and biogas plant. But SEAC insisted for separate solid waste storage facility and directed to show it in the revised conceptual plan. The Committee also ascertained that the project site does not come under the CRZ even though Manimala River is adjacent to it.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED directing the proponent to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copy of sale deed
2. Valid proof of Authorized Signatory
3. Cadastral map of the proposed area in which the survey number of the project site is marked.
4. Assurance that lower basement will be avoided and cutting should be limited to 3.5 m below ground level. (Because, or else, it may deplete ground water of adjacent areas, diminish ground water recharge and deplete water availability in their own well).

5. Assurance that the cutting on the western side shall be provided with a strong retaining wall.
6. Assurance that the required set back distance from the edges shall be maintained.
7. Revised conceptual plan avoiding lower basement floor and demarcating the set back distance from the adjacent plot and from the proposed widened road, location of rain water treatment plant, solid waste storage area, among others.
8. Provisions to enhance the rain water storage to at least one month of their consumption or 1500 KL, whichever is more.
9. Detailed proposal for fulfilling the Corporate Social Responsibility with respect to the present proposal.
10. Reworked water consumption chart with alternate source of water.
11. Details of entire facilities proposed for the project.
12. Landscape plan in which index of tree species and index numbers is clearly shown.
13. Detailed storm water management plan with provision for recharge pits.

Item No. 14.04 Application for environmental clearance for the proposed Housing Project in Survey Nos. 699/2, 3, 4, 5, 7 & 8 at Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala by M/s Ayles Properties and Developers Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 38/SEIAA/KL/7082/2012)

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. It was found that the stamp paper in which the notarized assurance was provided by the proponent was bought on 26.02.2008 for clarifications sought on 3.11.2012 which was not acceptable. Moreover, the condition mentioned in the assurance provided regarding the No Development Zone was not confirming with the one suggested by SEAC. The major flaw the Committee found with the project was that the proponent was eligible to construct only up to a total built up area of 24000 m² for an approach road width of 8 m, as per the modified KMBR whereas they are proposing to have a total built-up area of 26,674.02 m² for which the approach road width should be 10 m. After verification of the documents and on its non-satisfactory receipt, the Committee directed the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Fresh notarized affidavit in stamp paper worth `100 stating that sufficient distance shall be left near the project site from the boundary of the thodu as No Development Zone as per the width of the thodu as shown in cadastral map and 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.
2. Landscape plan in which index of tree species and index numbers is clearly shown.

3. Proof as to whether the project site comes under the residential zone.
4. A fresh report on yield test conducted on the source of water.
5. Detailed break-up of FAR and non-FAR area.

The proposal is DEFERRED for reconsideration after satisfactory receipt of above items.

Item No. 14.05 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed I.T. Building Project in Re-Sy. No. 758/2 (Part) at Muringur Thekkumuri Village, Koratty Grama Panchayath, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Infoparks Kerala (File No. 83/SEIAA/KL/324/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proponent has not clearly stated about any proposed/anticipated future development programmes to be taken up in the project area which is very essential when the calculations for water requirements of the project are made. The proponent stated that the present project being in the Special Economic Zone they are at present going ahead only with the Phase 1 development which is the present proposal submitted and that they have made calculations on water requirement based on that. It was also stated that they have already paid ` 3 Crore to Kerala Water Authority to cater the water requirements of the project. But the Committee found that the copy of agreement between M/s KSITIL with KWA regarding the installation of water supply and treatment system for Infopark, Campus Koratty, is not a valid document as it was not signed by any authorized person from KWA. Hence the proponent was directed to provide a valid document regarding the same. The proponent has not indicated the type of Rain Water Harvesting facility proposed for the project and was directed to provide the same. It was also suggested to avoid steep cuttings as it may have negative impact on ground water and suggested to provide recharge pits to augment the recharge of ground water so as to sustain the yield of wells.

Also the soil analysis report submitted by the proponent was not duly signed by any authorized person who has conducted the study and hence the proponent was directed to authenticate the document. The Committee was of the opinion that the conceptual plan submitted by the proponent did not demarcate many significant features like entry-exit points, width of internal and approach roads, etc. among other things and hence directed to provide a revised one. Since this being an I.T. building project, the Committee insisted the proponent to submit specific plans for e-waste management instead of mentioning that it shall be stored in an isolated room and will be sent to the authorized recyclers and will follow C.P.C.B. / MoEF Norms.

The proponent has not clearly provided the provisions for storm water management and hence was directed to provide the same incorporating provision to discharge excess water

outside the plot. The proponent has given the resurvey number in the proposal but has provided the old cadastral map along with the application. It is also found that the Sy. No. 758 is added in the cadastral map submitted by the proponent. Hence it was directed to provide new cadastral map/resurvey map of the proposed project site. The Committee raised concern as the proponent has not given enough space for green area development and was of the opinion that since this is an IT project inviting lot of floating population, in addition to maintaining the aesthetic beauty of the space, the campus could also be made green and environment friendly by providing more space for green area development. To this end the proponent stated that they have taken initiative to avoid cutting of trees to the maximum while preparing the land for construction purposes and assured that they shall provide more space for green area development including avenue plantation. The Committee also observed that the proponent has not clearly addressed the elevation difference of 7 m from NW to SE and hence was directed to ensure that the present topography shall not be disturbed and the cuttings made will not exceed 3 m.

The Committee also found that neither the Re-Sy. No. 758/2 (Part) of the proposed project nor the total land area given to Infopark for the proposed construction is mentioned anywhere in the documents submitted as proof of ownership of land. To this end the proponent stated that they shall provide the copy of the possession certificate for the survey number mentioned in the proposal. Even though an overhead electric line of 65 KV is passing through the proposed project site the proponent stated that no facilities of the project are proposed to construct near it and that they have left sufficient set back as prescribed by KSEB from the tower line.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of their application:

1. Valid agreement with KWA regarding the assurance of water supply for the project.
2. Calculation of population v/s water requirement for the entire master plan of the project.
3. Soil analysis report duly signed by concerned authorized person who has carried out the study.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the present topography will not be disturbed drastically and the cuttings made will not exceed 3 m.
5. Assurance in the form of affidavit that sufficient set back distance of the project site shall be left from the KSEB tower line, as specified by KSEB norms.
6. Revised conceptual plan showing the details of entry-exit points, width of internal and approach roads, etc. among other things.
7. Plans for storm water management incorporating provision to direct it to recharge pits and discharge excess water outside the plot.
8. New cadastral map/resurvey map of the proposed project site highlighting the project area with survey number.

9. Copy of the possession certificate for the survey number mentioned in the proposal and for the extent of area in the G.O. as proof of ownership of land.
10. Specific plans for e-waste management
11. Details of RWH facility proposed
12. Assurance that recharge pits shall be provided to augment recharge of ground water and that deep cuttings shall be avoided.

Item No. 14.06 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 1/1, 278/Pt and 165/2, at Village & Panchayath Oorakam, Morayur and Nediyruppu, Taluk Tirurangadi & Eranad, Malappuram district, Kerala by M/s Hi-Tech Metals (File No. 70/SEIAA/KL/165/2013)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and was found to be satisfactory. Based on the site inspection and on the satisfactory receipt of the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Rain water harvesting units shall be installed on the lower elevation near to the entrance of the project site.
2. The distance criteria from the nearby dwelling units should be a minimum of 100 m or the distance fixed by KSPCB or any other agency whichever is higher.
3. No quarrying shall be allowed at slopes greater than 45°.
4. Quarrying activities should be limited to day time as per KSPCB guidelines.
5. Separate permissions should have been obtained from KSPCB for the crusher units.
6. Retaining walls to be provided adjacent to the road with public access to retain debris from upper slopes.

Item No. 14.07 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Apartment (Silver Linden) Project in Sy. Nos. T.S. No. 208/1A, Panniyankara Village, Kozhikode Taluk and Corporation, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Malabar Highview Builders (P) Ltd. (File No. 84/SEIAA/KL/325/2013)**

The Committee found that the proponent has started construction without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance. The proponent stated that they have secured permit from Corporation, and NOC from Fire and Rescue Services and KSPCB and has started the construction in September 2012 and the consultants were engaged for the assessment and preparation of report of the proposed project in January 2013. But the Committee stated that prior Environmental Clearance is mandatory and hence the proponent was directed to stop the construction work immediately and file an affidavit stating that the violation has occurred and shall not be repeated in future.

As per the directions in O.M. No. J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) dt. 12.12.2012 of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, in violation cases credible action has to be taken and then only further processing of the application should be done. The proposal was DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Dr. N.G.K. Pillai, Chairman, SEAC; Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary SEAC, Dr. P.S. Harikumar, Dr. E.A. Jayson, Dr. V. Anitha, Dr. E.J. Joseph and Dr. Khaleel Chovva, Members of SEAC to assess the extent of violations and report it to SEIAA to decide upon further action to be taken in the matter. It was also decided that the Committee may appraise the proposal at a later stage after the violation proceedings are over.

Item No. 14.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 575/1-3-6-2 and 581/1-5-7, at Konni Thazham Village, Konni Grama Panchayath, Kozhencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Chengalathu Quarry Industries (File No. 77/SEIAA/KL/172/2013)**

After conducting field inspection to the project site the Committee was of the opinion that the proponent is at present doing quarrying activities in a haphazardous manner. The proponent is not following the top to bottom approach of quarrying and hence working has to be initiated from the upper most part where the slope is less. Hence haulage lines and approach has to be made fresh.

Based on the observations made during field inspection, the proponent was directed TO STOP QUARRYING ACTIVITIES IMMEDIATELY till Environmental Clearance is obtained. The proposal is DEFERRED and the proponent is also directed to report to SEAC after stopping quarrying activities and submit the following before SEAC, for further processing of their application for Environmental Clearance:

1. Assurance that top to bottom approach shall be followed for quarrying activities.
2. Benches and haulage roads should be shown in new plan.
3. Assurance that removed overburden shall be stacked and provided with a protective wall to avoid washing down of all fine material depleting the OB stock and polluting the nearby canal and fresh water.
4. The required storm water drainage lines, silt suppression mechanism, rainwater harvesting structures, etc. has to be provided.
5. Assurance that storm water on the hill slopes shall be managed with proper drains.
6. Provision for Rain Water Harvesting to be provided.
7. Assurance that the steep cut slope presently made at the base of the hill shall be abandoned till the working face from the top is lowered sufficiently so as to reduce the overall steepness to less than 45°.

Item No. 14.09

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Information Technology Development Centre Project in Sy. Nos. 84, 86, 90, 91, 93, 98 and 144 at Puthencruz Village and Grama Panchayath, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Cognizant Technology Solutions Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 85/SEIAA/KL/326/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. This is a US based IT unit. The confusion regarding the name of Deepa Baburaaj in the indenture of lease between M/s Cognizant Technology Solutions Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Infoparks Kerala was cleared as it was clarified that she is the wife of Baburaaj Easwar Ramaswamy. Going through the photographs of the project site submitted by the proponent, the Committee raised concern as to whether the proponent has started construction activities. To this end the proponent stated that they have initiated only piling works. The Committee suggested considering the chances of liquefaction of black clay while laying foundation. The Committee also observed that the area is notified SEZ and the entire area surrounding the proposed project site was earlier a marshy land. Hence it was decided to ascertain whether entire wetland reclamation is permitted in SEZ area and whether Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008 is applicable in this case. The proponent has also not provided the master plan of the project with the category of land use to ascertain whether they are permitted to fill up the wetland. SEAC observed that the construction is raised by 1.5 m from the High Flood Level and 10 percent of the total area has to be left undisturbed if it is a wetland. Moreover one arm of Kadamprayar river is passing through the site at present and hence the proponent was directed to leave its width on either side as No Development Zone to avoid alteration of natural drainage system and to ensure free flow of water. The proponent was also directed to provide the revenue records/certificate marking the width of the Kadamprayar river. The Corporate Social Responsibility suggested by the proponent was very vague and the committee raised concerns as to the employment generation potential to the locals both in technical and non technical capabilities. The benefit to the local society that they are envisaging should be categorically specified.

The proponent has provided affidavit in original regarding the conditions mentioned in checklist but it is stated in the affidavit that correspondence office is at Chennai whereas it is given as Brahmapuram, Kochi in Form 1. The Committee also ascertained that the nearby high tension tower line is not passing through the project site. The proponent was directed to maximize rain water harvesting as the present proposed capacity is insufficient to cater the water requirements of the project. Committee suggested to provide the floor level with respect to water level of river during peak flow and to avoid underground floor to prevent inundation.

The proposal is DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Master plan of the project with category of land use.
2. Revised conceptual plan showing the entry-exit points, connectivity and actual width of roads.
3. The width of one arm of Kadamprayar river passing through the site has to be left on its either side as No Development Zone.
4. Cadastral map specifically indicating the Sy. No. and width of the river with the purambokke.
5. Assurance that 10 m buffer setback from the edge of the boundary to the canal on either side shall be left from the edge of purambokke on landward side.
6. Assurance that a minimum of 10 percent of the wetland area shall be left without reclaiming.
7. In place of the supplemental Power of Attorney provided, notarized original Power of Attorney as a registered document or copy of partnership deed as proof regarding the real owners of the firm has to be provided.
8. Landscape plan in which index of tree species and index numbers is clearly shown.
9. Soil analysis report duly signed by concerned authorized person who has carried out the study.
10. Affidavit for conditions mentioned in the checklist mentioning that the correspondence office is at Brahmapuram, Kochi.
11. Source of water for the project incorporating the enhancement of RWH capacity.
12. The revenue records/certificate marking the width of the Kadamprayar river
13. Details on the floor level with respect to the water level of river during peak flow
14. Assurance that underground floor shall be avoided.
15. Detailed specific plans under CSR should also be provided with assurances to the career prospects of locals with technical and non technical capabilities.

The Committee also decided to address the CEO, Infopark to provide the Master Plan of Infopark for proper evaluation of the present proposal under consideration of SEAC.

Item No. 14.10

Application for environmental clearance for the proposed Institute of Medical Sciences and Multi-Speciality Hospital Project in Survey Nos. 225/2, 225/3-1, 225/2/2, 226/5/1/2, 226/5/1/3, 226/5/1/4, 226/5/1/1, 226/5/2, 189/1-2, 189/2, 224/4, 224/5, 397/1-2 and 397/1-3 at Koovappady Village and Panchayath, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Sree Narayana Gurukulam Charitable Trust (File No. 54/SEIAA/KL/7582/2012)

The earlier appraisal report of the proposal submitted before SEIAA was modified by SEAC as per the requirement of SEIAA conveyed in its 16th meeting for re-examining various aspects. It was decided to forward the modified report to SEIAA along with the

recommendations for further processing of the application for approval of Environmental Clearance.

Item No. 14.11 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the construction of Convention and Exhibition centre in Sy. No. 31/4 and 31/20 at Bolgatty Island, Mulavukad Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Lulu Convention and Exhibition Centre Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 86/SEIAA/KL/379/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The primary concern of the Committee was that the proposed project site is a reclaimed kayal – an extension of Vembanad Lake which is a Ramsar site and SEAC was of the opinion to ascertain whether the status of sensitive ecosystem will be lost once the land is reclaimed or it shall continue as the eco-sensitive zone even after reclamation. SEAC felt similar cases of reclamation of paddy lands, where reclamation is done after getting proper approvals from competent authorities and thereafter the application of Paddy & wetland Act becomes null & void to that particular reclaimed area. At this stage, the SEAC observed that KCZMA have recommended the proposal vide letter no 670/A2/12/KCZMA/S&TD dated 29.1.2013. The recommendations of KCZMA reads: “The Authority (refers to KCZMA) decided to constitute a committee of four members. The report of the committee (refers to the four member committee constituted by KCZMA) was placed before the 53rd meeting of KCZMA. The said construction is proposed in the land reclaimed by the port Trust for port activity and subsequently leased out to the proponent. The report of the committee (refers to the four member committee constituted by KCZMA) was discussed in detail and after considering various ecosystem aspects, decided that the area being part of an island, the CRZ extends only up to 50 m and the proposal is for construction of non-port related activity envisaged outside the 50 m, the proposal can be recommended subject to General conditions and that no untreated wastes will be let into the water body and to forward the same to SEIAA”. In view of the recommendations of KCZMA, the proposal was considered for environmental appraisal process which SEIAA/SEAC shall look into.

All the proposed internal roads of the project site are 7.5 m wide. The SEAC was of the opinion that when the expected floating population is 5000, the present proposed parking facility for 1300 cars will be insufficient. The road to the container area also is likely to face heavy traffic congestion and hence SEAC raised concern on how the anticipated traffic congestion that may arise during the execution of the project is planning to be addressed. Hence the proponent was directed to conduct a traffic management study and submit a report of any State level or national level organization of reputation in the field. It was informed by the proponent that such a study is now being undertaken through NATPAC including a proposal for roundabouts and the parking facilities are provided as per the existing KMBR.

The proponent has stated that the source of water for the project is treated surface backwater on non-rainy days for non-flushing requirement. SEAC directed the proponent to submit the technical details of RO technology that is proposed to adopt to purify the water for domestic requirements. SEAC also suggested to make alternate arrangements for water supply, maximize rain water harvesting and storage and clarification of storm water, as rain water could be their major potential source of water. It was also suggested to initiate a drinking water scheme for people residing in Vypeen as part of the Corporate Social Responsibility. Being a CRZ area, the proponent was also directed to treat all kinds of waste in situ and to ensure that no untreated wastes will be let into the water body.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. A valid resolution of Board of Directors with the name and signature of the concerned persons as proof of Authorized Signatory
2. Valid ID proof of Mr. Janardhana Pai, one of the authorized signatory of the project.
3. Valid notarized copy of certificate of incorporation of the firm.
4. Copy of the abstract of minutes of the first annual general meeting of the firm appointing Mr. Nishad M.A. and Mr. Janardhana Pai as Directors of the company provided. But the resolution is passed by 2 persons- Mr. M.A. Yusuff Ali and Mr. M.A. Asharf Ali and only one person has signed the resolution whose name is also not written and hence not identifiable. Moreover proof to the effect that these 2 persons are the directors of the company is also not provided. Valid document addressing these should be provided.
5. Report on traffic management of the proposed project site and access roads.
6. Technical details of RO technology incorporating the disposal of brine solution.
7. Landscape plan in which index of tree species and index numbers is clearly shown.
8. NOC from Southern Naval Command.
9. Soil analysis report duly signed by concerned authorized person who has carried out the study.
10. Assurance that all kinds of waste will be treated in situ and will not be let into the nearby water body.

Item No. 14.12 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Engineering College and School Project in Sy. Nos. 329/7, 329/4, 330/7, 330/13, 330/10, 330/14, 338/17, 334-9-1, 334/8, 326/19, 338/6, 330/8, 326/3, 326/20, 330/16, 330/19, 326/4-2, 328-1-3, 328/1-2, 329/8, 330/1, 330/4, 326/6, 326/4-1, 329/9, 329/11, 328/3, 335/9, 329/1, 330/15, 329/3, 330/11, 330/13-1, 330/9, 330/12, 334/9, 335/7, 326/5, 330/20, 338/16, 326/21, 326/3-2, 326/3-1, 329/5, 326-4-3, 328/1, 328/1-1, 330/3, 330/18, 326/7, 330/5, 329/6, 329/12, 328/2, 335/10, 331/1-6 at Ayirooppara Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk and**

Corporation, Kerala by The Mar Thoma Church Educational Society (File No. 88/SEIAA/KL/703/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proponent has not provided a strong retaining wall for filled up areas. The Committee was of the opinion that the cuttings in laterite greater than 3 m could be unstable and hence should be supported by retaining wall. The Committee also found that a Panchayath pond is located within the project site and hence asked the proponent whether free public access to the pond is maintained. To this end the proponent stated that unhindered access of public to the pond is provided. The proponent also stated that the existing facility to treat sewage will be augmented with the operation of proposed additional facilities. In addition to the Panchayath pond the proponent has got a big pond and two wells of their own in the campus that ensures sufficient water availability for the project. The Committee suggested for recharge pits with a depth greater than 4 m for recharging ground water and to direct the storm water to these pits which shall be clarified especially in the playground and parking area. The Committee suggested fencing the pond all around to avoid any chances of people and animals falling into that. Since the cadastral map provided is darkened and lack clarity, the proponent was directed to provide enlarged cadastral map of the project site showing the plot with survey numbers of the project site.

The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance directing the proponent to submit the following to the SEAC secretariat for filing purposes:

1. Assurance that cuttings in laterite greater than 3 m shall be provided with a strong retaining wall.
2. Assurance that rain water recharging pits shall be provided at the upper reaches and the storm water shall be clarified to make it potable.
3. Assurance that the inflow and outflow of the Panchayath pond shall not be interfered and public access to the pond shall not be disturbed.
4. Enlarged cadastral map of the project site showing the plot with survey numbers of the project site.
5. Assurance that safe vertical and horizontal buffer distance shall be maintained from the KSEB tower line as per the prescribed KSEB norms.
6. Assurance that a sub-surface dyke shall be constructed on the SW side at the lower portion of their own rain water collection pond.
7. Landscape plan in which index of tree species and index numbers is clearly shown.

Item No. 14.13 Discussions on the proposal suggested by SEIAA on the special procedure to be adopted for considering quarry proposals

SEAC discussed the item in detail. The Committee made a retrospective discussion on the status of proposals appraised by it so far to assess whether there are any pending cases as on that date or whether there occurred any delay in appraising any project. It was found that

no such cases have ever occurred so far and the Committee recalled a lot many appreciations received from the project proponents on the speedy processing of applications for EC. Many proponents have informed their appreciations on the present style of functioning of SEAC and SEIAA including the transparency of appraisal of projects, website updating as well as speedy disposal of proposals. Till date nobody has complained on any delay from the part of SEAC. Considering this, SEAC was of general opinion that the present system of conducting meetings is the best one and suggested to think about other options only if some genuine complaints come or a huge volume of proposals are being received continuously. The Committee was also of the opinion that as per the EIA Notification 2006, SEIAA shall base its decision on the recommendations of SEAC wherein any provision for joint meetings to consider the proposals and thereby take decisions is not there. Moreover the Committee stated that a point of difference opined by any member of SEAC in a combined meeting cannot be recorded as it does not stand procedurally as joint meetings become Authority meetings and no appraisal process of SEAC comes in that for being accounted. In such meetings there arises no question of recommendations by SEAC but only decisions of Authority as can be taken. For appraisal processes, maximum number of members is 15 as per EIA notification is concerned. It is learnt that the procedure suggested by SEIAA to consider quarry proposals in a joint meeting has already been sent to Ministry by SEIAA without incorporating the recommendations from SEAC in the matter. Hence the Committee requested the SEAC Secretariat to bring the matter before the State Government to inform the Ministry that there is no need at present to conduct joint meetings of SEAC and SEIAA for considering quarry proposal since there are no long pending cases.

The Committee was apprehensive whether a joint meeting is feasible or has legal validity as per the procedure prescribed in EIA Notification 2006 and its subsequent amendments. The Committee also expressed their difficulty in attending meetings every week since most of the members in research organizations are pre-occupied with their responsibilities at their parent organizations. So the SEAC finally decided to continue their present system of monthly SEAC meetings for appraisal processes of quarry or non-quarry, as is done till date.

Item No. 14.14 Any other item approved by the Chair

The following two items 14.14.1 and 14.14.2 were considered as additional items under this.

Additional Item No. 14.14.1 Appeal No. 29 of 2013 filed by Mr. Sanju George, Managing Partner, M/s Kizhakethalackel Rocks, before the National Green Tribunal at New Delhi (File No. DoECC/E4/2411/2012)

The Committee discussed in detail the appeal filed by Mr. Sanju George, Managing Partner, M/s Kizhakethalackel Rocks, before the National Green Tribunal at New Delhi,

wherein Kerala State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority (Through its Member Secretary), Department of Environment & Climate Change is included as Respondent 1 and State of Kerala (Through the Chief Secretary), Govt. Secretariat as Respondent 2. The Committee held detailed discussion on the draft statement of facts circulated among the members answering the parawise comments to the averments made in the appeal and approved it to forward to SEIAA to take further decision in the matter.

Additional Item No. 14.14.2

Approval of appraisal reports of M/s Vajra Rock Mining Industries and M/s Cochin Blue Metal Industries

The Committee approved the appraisal reports of M/s Vajra Rock Mining Industries and M/s Cochin Blue Metal Industries after confirmation of the minutes of 13th SEAC meeting and decided to forward the same to SEIAA along with recommendations for issuance of Environmental Clearance.

The meeting concluded at 6 pm while the Vice Chairman was in Chair who expressed vote of thanks to the Chairman and members. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.