

**MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 17<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 6<sup>TH</sup> JULY, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The seventeenth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. The meeting commenced at 9.00 am and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala have participated:

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. Dr. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
10. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
11. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
12. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
13. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC  
Director,  
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants and made a briefing on the current status of proposals with SEIAA.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

**Item No. 17.01** Confirmation of the minutes of the 16<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, held on 31<sup>st</sup> May & 1<sup>st</sup> June 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

**Item No. 17.02**      **Action taken report on the decisions of the 16<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting**

The Committee was informed of the request made by M/s Indian Oil Corporation seeking extension of time for furnishing clarifications/documents sought by SEAC in its 16<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> May and 1<sup>st</sup> June 2013. Extension sought was allowed.

All other items were noted.

**Item No. 17.03**      **Application for amendment of Environmental Clearance for the construction of residential apartment complex “Oceanus Maple” at Sy. Nos. 208/6, 208/7, 208/8, 208/9, 208/10, 208/11, 208/12, 208/13, 208/14, 211/10, 212/13 and 212/17 at North Thrikkakara Village, Kalamassery Municipality, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Oceanus Estates India (P) Limited (File No. 68/SEIAA/KL/137/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent was asked to clarify as to why the built up area in the EC issued by MoEF for a height of 60 m and their present request for a height of 72.8 m remained the same. To this end the proponent stated that the Ministry made a restriction only on the height and issued EC retaining other facilities and hence the enhancement of height of the building does not bring any increase in the total built up area of the project. The Committee was of the opinion that for a built up area greater than 24,000 m<sup>2</sup> (the present proposal having a built up area of 32,232.27 sq.m.) the width of approach road should be 10 m, as per existing KMBR. The Committee also held detailed discussions on the ECs issued for high rise buildings (submitted along with the application by the proponent for reference of the Committee in taking a decision in the matter) and was of the opinion that while considering those proposals by MoEF, only the fire fighting facilities has been taken into account and not the width of approach road. Hence SEAC was of the opinion that the proponent should set aside an approach road having minimum width of 10 m as per the existing rules. At this juncture it was also decided that the Committee may develop separate guidelines of its own for appraisal regarding width of the road and height of the building taking into account the environment and disaster management. Over and above, the Committee was of the opinion that since the project proponent has already obtained EC from MoEF, a report from zonal office of MoEF regarding compliance of EC conditions need to be sought for further processing of the application. The Committee also found that the Sy. Nos. 211/10, 212/13 and 212/17 which are part of the present proposal and also in the EC issued by MoEF, is not included in the NOC from Southern Naval Command and Airports Authority of India and hence directed the proponent to provide valid NOC from them.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess how far the proponent has complied with EC conditions stipulated by MoEF and to seek compliance report from MoEF regarding the proposal to proceed further in the matter. The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Valid NOC from Southern Naval Command and Airports Authority of India with all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.
2. Building plan superimposed in the site plan, specifically marking survey numbers.

3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the width of the approach road of the project site shall be maintained as per the existing KMBR.

**Item No. 17.04**

**Application for environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 23/2, 23/2-1, 24, 24/1, 24/2 and 24/3 at Moonilavu Village, Moonilavu Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam district, Kerala by M/s P.V. Granites (File No. 73/SEIAA/KL/168/2013)**

The proponent was asked regarding the present status of litigation pending against them in the Honorable High Court of Kerala. To this end the proponent stated that the petitioner has withdrawn the case. The Committee directed to provide the proof regarding decree from the court in the matter and the proponent provided a copy of the same. Thereafter the project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal.

The proposed project site falls within  $09^{\circ}46'09.3059''$  N to  $09^{\circ}45'59.8612''$  N and  $76^{\circ}48'08.0124''$  E to  $76^{\circ}48'04.6082''$  E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee observed that the proposed quarry is marked only in Sy. Nos. 23/2 and 23/2-1 in the site plan provided and not in other survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. On clarifying the same with the proponent, it is found that the proposed quarry site falls in 24/2 (part), 24/3 (part), 24 (part) and 24/1 (part) in addition to the survey numbers 23/2 and 23/2-1. Hence the Committee decided to consider EC to the project only in those survey numbers given in the survey plan, i.e., 23/2, 23/2-1, 24/2 (part), 24/3 (part), 24 (part) and 24/1 (part). The proponent stated that they are having an open well in the site which is proposed to be used as a source of water. But the Committee was of the opinion that there is no scope for open/bore well in the region and the only dependable source of water could be the storm water pond. However the Committee was of the opinion that the RWH facility provided by the proponent is satisfactory to meet the requirements to a large extent. The Committee also suggested setting aside an amount for CSR towards the restoration of biodiversity loss due to quarrying activities and suggested to contribute 1 percent of the profit to the concerned Panchayath for Biodiversity Management Committee. It was also suggested to contribute 1 percent of the profit to the nearby Vellara UP School for providing toilet and drinking water facility. The proponent readily agreed with the two suggestions and the Committee decided to inform the matter to the Panchayath and the School authorities. SEAC also pointed out that landslips are anticipated in future in the region as it had already occurred in two places in the region, which may adversely affect the people inhabiting the nearby areas and hence informed the proponent that necessary precautions has to be taken to avert the disaster. At this juncture it was suggested to construct a wall all along the periphery of the project site to channelize all the storm water to the already existing pond. The Committee also found that the present provision made by the proponent to clarify the storm water is not sufficient as there is only one desiltation tank provided for the same. The Committee suggested for an additional desiltation tank of 40 KL capacity with two siltation traps and to do periodic cleaning of the tank without fail so that the water coming out of the tank is very much clarified. It was also directed to make provisions to contain dust emissions. To this end the proponent stated that they have efficient dust suppression systems and all the processes are carried out in closed system so as to ensure minimum dust emissions. The Committee also suggested uprooting the invasive species

of plants which are seen sparsely distributed in the project site and suggested to plant rare indigenous species in the area as part of eco-restoration.

The Committee raised concern on the plying of 20 T trucks in a winding road which is very narrow as it may damage the roads and affect the free movement of local people around. Hence the Committee insisted to reduce the size of trucks to 10 T capacity so as to ensure that the maximum capacity of transportation is limited to 10 T. The Committee also directed to reduce the blasting times to twice daily at specified timings when there is least traffic – 11.00-11.30 am and 02-02.30 pm.

Considering the above, the proponent is directed to provide the following to SEIAA for filing purpose:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 1 percent of the profit shall be given to the concerned Panchayath for Biodiversity Management Committee towards eco-restoration and 1 percent to the nearby Vellara UP School for providing toilet and drinking water facility.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a wall shall be constructed all along the periphery of the project site to channelize all the storm water to the existing pond.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that an additional desiltation tank of 40 KL capacity with two siltation traps shall be provided to clarify the storm water.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that trucks of above 10 T capacity shall not be used for transportation of materials.
5. Assurance in the form of affidavit that rare indigenous species of plants shall be planted as part of eco-restoration.

The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Blast timings should be restricted to the times of least traffic as 11- 11.30 am and 2-2.30pm
2. Periodic cleaning of RWH tank must be done.
3. Source of water should be RWH units
4. CSR activity must be made to provide toilet and drinking water facility to the nearby school through the grama panchayath earmarking 1 percent of the profit (Vellara school)
5. Mining should be restricted to the area specified in the survey plan of Village Officer.
6. At the end of mining, the total mined area should not exceed 2.8009 hectares.

**Item No. 17.05**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the residential project “Kent Mahal” in Sy. Nos. 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 and 141/8 at Puthencruz Village, Vadavucode Puthencruz Grama Panchayat, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Kent Constructions (P) Ltd. (File No. 99/SEIAA/KL/1481/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has almost completed 4 towers out of the total 6 towers and has thus violated the

provisions of EIA Notification 2006 without securing a valid prior Environmental Clearance. It is evident from the photographs provided by the proponent that the construction is in progress. The Committee also had apprehensions that the proponent has violated the building rules and hence directed to provide the building permits and approved plans for verification as to whether they have followed the approved plans. It was also directed to file a resolution passed by the Board of Directors that the violation has occurred and shall not be repeated in future. The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided copies of sale deed for all Sy. Nos., the deed for Sy. Nos. 141/3, 141/4 and 141/5 is in the name of M/s Kent Constructions (P) Ltd. represented by its Director, Shameer Marikkar, and deed for Sy. No. 141/8 is solely in the name of Shameer Marikkar, who has resigned from the firm. Also, in the location plan certificate provided by the proponent it is stated that the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belongs to Director of M/s Kent Constructions (P) Ltd., F.M. Shameer Marakkar. Moreover, the revised building permit (*the validity of which is expired*) and NOC from Fire and Rescue Services is in the name of Shameer Marikkar. But as per the resolution of the firm, F.M. Shameer Marakkar has resigned from the Directorship of the company. Hence the proponent is directed to provide consent from Shameer Marikkar for going ahead with the construction activities in the said survey numbers or to prove otherwise of the right of the firm on the said area of land. Since the proponent has not provided copies of land tax receipts, it was also directed to provide the same. In the copy of NOC from Southern Naval Command provided by the proponent valid up to 18<sup>th</sup> December 2013, Sy. No. 1141/3 is given, which needs to be ascertained by the proponent.

The Committee found that the present rain water storage is sufficient for only one day and directed to enhance the storage capacity to at least for a month. The proponent was directed to provide details regarding the same. The proponent has also not provided the sustained yield of bore well in the site. Hence details on the sustained yield of the bore well and well assembly is sought from the proponent. The Committee also found that nearly 118 KL of treated waste water from STP is not used for any other purposes and warned the proponent not to discharge it into the nearby plots or water body. The Committee suggested reusing the same for flushing and non-drinking purposes after properly aerating it. The proponent is directed to provide the water supply plan incorporating these details. The proponent has also not submitted a valid NOC from Airports Authority of India. Hence the proponent is directed to provide copy of valid NOC and copies of all statutory approvals received for the construction project.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the extent of violations and to assess the facilities made for the project and further directed the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. A resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the firm that the violation has occurred and shall not be repeated in future.
2. Copies of the building permits and approved plans of the project.
3. Consent from Shameer Marikkar permitting for construction activities in the survey numbers 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 and 141/8 or to prove ownership of the said land otherwise.
4. Copies of land tax receipts

5. In the copy of NOC from Southern Naval Command provided, Sy. No. 1141/3 is given. This has to be ascertained.
6. Details on the provisions made for enhancing the storage of rain water to a minimum storage for one month.
7. The water supply plan incorporating the details on the sustained yield of the bore well and well assembly and the utilization of excess water from STP.
8. Copy of valid NOC from Airports Authority of India
9. Copies of all statutory approvals received for the construction project.

**Item No. 17.06**      **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. No. 80/1A1 (Part) at Keezhariyur Village, Keezhariyur Panchayath, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode district, Kerala by M/s Payyoli Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 100/SEIAA/KL/1537/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11°31'1.62" to 11°30'50.49" N and 75°41'7.57" to 75°40'55.84 E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The proponent owns about 11.6712 hectares of land and out of this, present proposal is for quarrying in 3.6745 hectares of land. The proponent stated that the remaining land is used for cultivation / plantation and certain portion of land had been excavated for laterite. The Committee found that the shape of the plot does not match with the survey map provided by the proponent. Sy. No. 81, which is not part of the present proposal is shown included in the survey map and the Committee was doubtful as to whether this Sy. No. shall also form part of the present project. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a map marking the exact distance of the proposed project site from the boundary pillars linking the corner stone of Sy. No. 80 to the project site. The project site was found to be near the village boundary and it was directed to leave at least 10 m buffer distance from the same. The proponent is also directed to provide a revised cadastral map clearly marking the village boundary. The copy of possession certificate provided by the proponent shows that the land bearing Sy. No. 80/1A1 coming to a total of 10 acres is under possession of 4 persons including Mr. Issac Jacob, the authorized signatory of the project. The proponent has provided consent from the other three persons on behalf of M/s Payyoli Granites Pvt. Ltd. to conduct quarrying activities but in the consent, the name of one of the partners is given as Shibu Thekkumpuram whereas in possession certificate it is given as Shibu Varghese. The Committee decided to verify the same during field inspection. The Committee also found that as per the present storm water management plan provided, it is proposed to discharge storm water and effluent directly to the irrigation canals located on the south and south west of the project site. The Committee reiterated that this is not permissible and directed the proponent to submit revised storm water management plan addressing the same.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities, especially the provisions made for storm water management and the details on the possession of land and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Map marking the exact distance of the proposed project site from the boundary pillars linking the corner stone of Sy. No. 80 to the project site.

2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a buffer distance of 15 m shall be left from the village boundary to the project site.
3. A revised cadastral map clearly marking the village boundary superimposing project site.
4. Revised storm water management plan.

**Item No. 17.07**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 70/1 at Kolayad Village and Panchayath, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala by M/s Malabar Construction Materials (P) Ltd. (File No. 101/SEIAA/KL/1606/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11°51'42.99" to 11°51'30.31" N and 75°40'33.90" to 75°40'21.74" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee noted that Thodeekkadu Temple, famous for its ancient wall paintings, and Kannavam Reserve Forest is within 5 km radius of the project site. As seen from the photographs provided by the proponent it is found that an unscientific method of mining is going on at present and the thickness of overburden is very high in the area. The Committee stated that the fly rock, storm water and dust may affect nearby areas, if proper measures are not adopted to contain the same. To this end the proponent stated that most of the nearby area is possessed by them and they have taken every step to address these. The proponent has not provided satisfactory measures to manage storm water and hence is directed to provide storm water management plan. In the revenue map provided by the proponent, Sy. No. 71, which is not part of the present proposal is also seen adjacent to the present plot of project proponent and the Committee was doubtful as to whether this Sy. No. shall also form part of the present project. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised map marking the exact distance of the proposed project site from the boundary pillars. Also, since the proponent has not provided copy of authentic sale deed document, the proponent is directed to produce the original sale deed during field inspection by the subcommittee for verification. In the revenue survey map provided by the proponent, the total area marked for present quarry is 4.8200 hectares whereas the present proposal is for 4.8523 hectares. Also, in the area survey plan provided, the region marked as B where lease has been permitted is only for 0.2023 hectares. The proponent is directed to provide valid proof to clarify the same.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities and directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Revised storm water management plan.
2. Revised map marking the exact distance of the proposed project site from the boundary pillars.
3. In the revenue survey map provided, the total area marked for present quarry is 4.8200 hectares whereas the present proposal is for 4.8523 hectares. Also, in the area survey plan provided, the region marked as B where lease has been permitted is only for 0.2023 ha. Valid proof to clarify the same to be provided.

**Item No. 17.08**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 64/1 Pt, 65 Pt, 126/6 Pt at Mankada Village and Panchayath, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram district, Kerala by K. P. Aboobacker (File No. 102/SEIAA/KL/1607/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11°01'13.02" to 11°01'01.86" N and 76°09'45.96" to 76°09'37.65" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that as per the survey map provided by the proponent Sy. No. 48/9, which is not included in the proposal submitted by the proponent, is seen included as part of the present project and the storage of waste water is also seen proposed in this survey number. Hence the proponent is directed to provide proof of ownership of land of that Sy. No. and the consent from the owner of the land to conduct quarrying activities in that Sy. No. It is also directed to provide a revised area survey map clearly marking the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities and directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Proof of ownership of land of Sy. No. 48/9 and the consent from the owner of the land to conduct quarrying activities in that Sy. No.
2. A revised area survey map clearly marking the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.

**Item No. 17.09**      **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 Committee had apprehensions as to whether the project site comes under CRZ-1 as per the approved CRZ maps of Ministry of Environment and Forests since Cochin Port Trust has not taken the approval of MoEF for reclamation. At this stage, SEAC observed that KCZMA have recommended the proposal vide letter no 670/A2/12/KCZMA/S&TD dated 29.1.2013 and in view of the recommendations of KCZMA, the proposal was further considered.

The Committee verified all the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent as directed to them in 14<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting. The Committee 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. On examination, all the documents submitted are found to be satisfactory. The Committee also suggested initiating a drinking water scheme for people residing in Vypeen as part of the Corporate Social Responsibility. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for integrated CRZ cum Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. NOC from Southern Naval Command to be obtained before initiating activity.

2. All kinds of waste must be treated in situ and should not be let into the nearby water body.
3. Traffic management report prepared by NATPAC for the development of the Bolghatty Junction provided by the proponent must be implemented.
4. Landscape plan proposed in which index of tree species and index numbers are provided must be implemented.
5. General conditions of CRZ clearances should be followed.
6. No untreated waste should be let into the water body.

**Item No. 17.10**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for building stone quarry in Sy. Nos. 391/3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 393/2, 394/2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 395/1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 396/3, 5, 6, 4, 397/4, 9, 397/1 & 397/10 at Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta district, Kerala by M/s Wimrock Granite Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 104/SEIAA/KL/1689/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. As given in the proforma, the proposed project site falls within 9° 18' 51.95" to 9° 19' 08.84" N and 76° 50' 20. 14" to 76° 50' 33.96" E whereas in the application submitted, the GPS readings is given as within 9° 18' 51.95" to 9° 19' 08.84" N and 76° 50' 20. 41" to 76° 50' 33.96" E. The proponent is directed to provide the correct GPS readings in writing to SEAC so as to assess whether it falls in any ESZ. In the questionnaire it is stated that there is a forest land adjacent to the lease area which is towards north east of the lease. But no such details are provided in the 'Environmental Sensitivity' part of Form 1. Moreover, the Committee found that as per the topographic map provided by the proponent the project site is given as a reserve forest whereas in the present proposal the same is given as a patta land. The Committee directed the proponent to provide valid proof regarding this conversion. The Committee also suggested setting aside an amount for CSR towards the restoration of biodiversity loss due to quarrying activities and suggested to contribute 1 percent of the amount set aside for CSR to the concerned Panchayath for Biodiversity Management Committee. Regarding proof of ownership of land submitted by the proponent, the following discrepancies are found:

- (i) Copy of sale deed for Sy. Nos. owned by the proponent is not provided.
- (ii) An affidavit stating that all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belongs to the company, is provided by the authorized signatory. But some Sy. Nos. are Government land for which he has obtained only lease for conducting quarrying activities but is not owned.
- (iii) Copies of quarrying lease for a total area of 8.7521 hectares (out of 9.6436 hectares sought for EC at present) issued to Sri. Raju K. Thomas, Managing Director, M/s Wimrock Granite Pvt. Ltd. provided. The quarrying lease for Sy. Nos. 397/1 (Govt. land) and 397/10, the area of which coming to a total of 0.8915 hectares, not provided.
- (iv) Copy of letter dt. 07.03.2007 from Thahsildar Ranni, reporting to Dist. Collector, Pathanamthitta regarding present status of land in Sy. No. 397/1 and forwarding the application for NOC to conduct quarrying activities provided. But in that letter, the area of Sy. No. 397/1 itself comes to a total of 89.15 ar excluding Sy. No. 397/10. And as seen from the copy of land tax receipt of Sy. No. 397/10, its area is 13 are.
- (v) In brief description of project given it is stated that the total quarry area is 9.6436 hectares out of which 0.7615 hectares is Government Purambokke land for which NOC is obtained from the

District Collector which is stated as enclosed as Annexure 5. But in Annexure 5, the District Collector, Pathanamthitta has not given NOC but has directed to submit clearance from MoEF along with their application for NOC for quarrying Government Purambokke land. Moreover, it is not clear from this letter as to which Sy. No. the Govt. land belongs.

- (vi) In brief description of project it is also stated that the proponent has applied for lease on 07.03.2007 in Sy. Nos. 397/1 and 397/10 which is not seen processed yet.
- (vii) The area survey plan provided lacks clarity as all Sy. Nos. are not marked in it and hence difficult to compare the Sy. Nos. and total area given in the proposal.

SEAC directed that the proponent must clarify all the details regarding the proof of ownership of land for further processing of the application.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities, including the proximity to forest land and High Tension tower line of KSEB, and directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Ascertain GPS readings from four extreme boundaries of the project site.
2. Valid proof regarding the conversion of reserve forest to patta land.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 1 percent of the amount set aside for CSR shall be contributed to the concerned Panchayath for Biodiversity Management Committee towards the restoration of biodiversity loss due to quarrying activities.
4. Clarification on all points mentioned above (as (i)-(vii)) regarding the proof of ownership of land.

**Item No. 17.11**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Phase 1 development of Smart City (Kochi) in Survey Nos. 666/10 pt, 640/1, 2 pt, 4 pt, 5, 641/1 pt, 10, 25 pt, 29, 30 at Kakkanad Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Smart City (Kochi) Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 105/SEIAA/KL/1692/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief description of the project. The proponent stated that 27 percent of the total area is set aside for green area development. The Committee found that most of the plant species selected for green area development of the project are exotic species which cannot be permitted and hence the proponent was directed to involve only indigenous plants for the same. The proponent stated that out of the 131 acres of land presently owned by them, the first phase is proposed to be developed in 4.5 hectares and they have provided the conceptual plan of that phase of the project as this phase is a standalone project and has no link with the master plan. Only the permissible activities prior to EC have been made in the site like soil investigation, among others. Approximately 4314 people are expected to be there during occupancy. They also assured that they shall provide the master plan of the other phases altogether when it is finalized and becomes a public document. The Committee reiterated that further application of Smart City shall only be considered with a master plan. For phase I development, the proponent has provided clear cut picture of the facilities proposed. The Committee suggested the proponent to find other alternate sources of water and to develop local water source in addition to their dependency on the water to

be supplied by KINFRA. The Committee also stated that the present capacity of RWH for the present project for one day is not sufficient to cater the requirements and directed the proponent to enhance it to one month storage @ 150 KL/day. The Committee reiterated that filling up of paddy land, as envisaged now, should not be resorted to and reclamation of the project site shall not be permitted. The Committee found that there is a need to store temporarily the excess left over water from STP and suggested to recycle and utilize the same for non-drinking purposes. The Committee found that in checklist it is stated that provision for first aid room will be facilitated in podium ground floor but in the building plan of the same the location for first aid room is not shown and hence the proponent is directed to resubmit the building plan of podium ground floor clearly marking the first aid room. The proponent has provided copy of a letter from CESS declaring that the site coming under the latitudes and longitudes specified in the letter are outside the CRZ but it is not clear from the letter that to which Sy. No. of the project site of Smart City the said latitudes and longitudes refer to. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a declaration in writing clarifying the same.

The proponent is directed to provide the following to SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat for filing purpose:

1. Proposal for development of water source other than KINFRA.
2. Bore well data on sustainable yield.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that only indigenous plants shall be involved for green area development and exotic species shall never be used.
4. First aid room indicated at the podium ground floor to be marked in building plan and submitted.
5. The copy of letter from CESS does not clearly specify as to which Sy. No. of the project site of Smart City said latitudes and longitudes refer to. A declaration in writing clarifying the same to be provided.
6. Notarized copy of communication from NABET addressed to the consultant, extending their validity of accreditation.

The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. RWH has to be ensured for one month storage.
2. Reclamation of paddy fields should not be made.
3. 15.5 percent of energy should be saved by alternate energy sources.
4. Left over sewage water should be used for non drinking purpose and temporary storage.
5. Green area development should involve only indigenous plants.

**Item No. 17.12**      **Application for environmental clearance for the Proposed Group Construction Project of Educuity in Ward No. IX, R.S. No. 395, 397/2 of Pookkottur Panchayath and in Ward No. III, R.S. No. 137/1, 137/2, 137/3, 138, 139/1A, 139/1B, 139/2, 139/3A, 139/3B, 140/1, 140/2, 141/1A, 141/2A, 141/2B, 141/2C, 142/1, 142/2A, 142/2B, 144/1, 144/2A, 144/2B, 144/3A,**

**144/3B, 144/4A1, 144/4A2, 144/4B, 145/1A1, 145/1A2, 145/1B1, 145/1B2, 145/2, 145/2B, 145/3, 145/4, 145/5, 145/6A, 145/6B, 146/2A, 146/2B of Malappuram Municipality, at Melmuri Village & Pookkottur Village, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Al Abeer Educuity (File No. 106/SEIAA/KL/1722/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The project falls under Category 8 (b), Area Development Projects, in the Schedule of Activity of EIA Notification 2006. The Committee found a lot many factual errors in the proposal submitted and discrepancies in many figures in the proforma filled up by the proponent (like maximum height of the building, total water requirement, quantity of solid waste generated, among others.) in comparison with the original application. Hence the Committee suggested redrafting and resubmitting the same avoiding factual errors. Moreover, the conceptual plan provided by the proponent lacks clarity as proposed facilities are not properly indexed and is difficult to make out the proposed location for those facilities. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised conceptual plan. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has not provided copies of land tax receipts for survey numbers 145/2, 145/2B, 145/3, 145/4, 145/5, 145/6A, 145/6B, 146/2A & 146/2B, and copy of sale deed for Sy. No. 145/2B. Also, without a 500 m vicinity map of the site and surroundings clearly marking the nearby facilities the proponent has provided a 10 km radius map which is not readable. The proponent has not provided the GPS readings from the four extreme boundaries of the project site and has not provided in checklist as to whether the project site comes in ESZ-1. Hence the proponent is directed to incorporate these details in the revised proposal. The proponent stated that they have set aside 33 percent of the total land area for green area development. But the Committee found that the landscape plan provided by the proponent is not satisfactory as the index of tree species to be planted is not marked in that. So the proponent is directed to provide a revised landscape plan. The Committee found that the maps including conceptual plan submitted by the proponent is not prepared by the concerned accredited EIA consultant who has prepared the proposal and hence the consultant was directed to submit an affidavit undertaking the responsibility of all documents submitted along with the application. The present storage of rain water proposed for the project is insufficient to cater the entire requirements of the project and hence the proponent is directed to make provisions to collect entire water falling in their plot. The proponent has also not provided the biodiversity listing of flora and fauna of the project site certified by concerned experts and hence was directed to provide the same. The proponent has stated the already done activities towards Corporate Social Responsibility but has not provided any specific proposal regarding the same linked with the present project and was directed to provide the same. The proponent also stated that by the utilization of solar energy they are targeting to save 30 percent in energy. The Committee also raised concern as to whether there is any violation in the width proposed for the approach road as the proponent has stated that the project site is connected by a 10 m wide road and that there is no need to construct any approach road. But as per the existing master plan and the available road width, this cannot be considered now as per the existing rules. Moreover, a portion of that area comes under the green strip.

The proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities, including the proximity of project site to 440 V line, and directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Redraft and resubmit the proposal avoiding factual errors.
2. Revised conceptual plan with due authentication of NABET accredited EIA Co-ordinator.
3. Copies of land tax receipts for survey numbers 145/2, 145/2B, 145/3, 145/4, 145/5, 145/6A, 145/6B, 146/2A & 146/2B.
4. Copy of sale deed for Sy. No.145/2B.
5. 500 m vicinity map of the site and surroundings clearly marking the nearby facilities.
6. GPS readings from the four extreme boundaries of the project site.
7. Declaration in writing as to whether the project site comes in ESZ-1.
8. Revised landscape plan marking the index of tree species to be planted.
9. Affidavit from the consultant undertaking the responsibility of all documents submitted along with the application.
10. Details on provisions proposed to collect entire water falling in the project site.
11. Biodiversity listing of flora and fauna of the project site certified by concerned experts.
12. Specific proposal for Corporate Social Responsibility linked with the present project.

**Item No. 17.13**      **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 item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.14**      **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 item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15**      **Any other item approved by Chair**

**Item No. 17.15.1**      **Proposal for introducing two-stage clearances**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15.2**      **Remarks of SEAC on the proposal of Chairman SEIAA duly forwarded on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2013**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15.3      New template for appraisal report**

The Committee wholeheartedly appreciated and accepted the new template suggested by the Member Secretary SEIAA for appraisal report vide EIA Notification and decided to follow it in all future appraisals to be forwarded to SEIAA.

**Item No. 17.15.4      Govt. letter no. 2575/B1/2013/Env. dt. 26.06.2013 forwarding copy of news regarding fire safety norms for high rise buildings (File No. SEIAA/E4/1772/2013)**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15.5      O. M. F.NO. 21-270/2008-IA.III dt. 06.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests regarding modification in guidelines for high rise buildings**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15.6      O. M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II (M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests regarding categorization of proposals for grant of EC for mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 ha.**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

**Item No. 17.15.7      O. M. No. 21-270/2008-IA.III dt. 19.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests regarding EC for buildings and real estate projects**

Due to time constraints, the item is DEFERRED for consideration in the next SEAC meeting.

*The meeting concluded at 5.15 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.*