

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 18TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 3RD AUGUST, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The eighteenth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 3rd August 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. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - 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. The Chairman informed the Committee of his meeting with the members of CREDAI, Ernakulam, at their own request, and pointed out their appreciations and apprehensions. The Committee was of the opinion that encouraging recharge pits in place of RWH structures is also not advisable as it may only lead to creation of unused pits without serving the purpose of storage and utilization of rain water in a place like Kerala where it receives a good amount of annual rainfall.

The Committee also found that in many cases, the project proponents are cutting trees in the project site, as part of preparation of land for the project, but later the replanting / afforestation

compensating for the loss is not done by them. To this end the Committee decided to add in the General Conditions for EC that the proponent should plant trees at least 5 times of the loss that has been occurred while clearing the land for the project. As far as the mining projects are concerned, the Committee also considered adding the following in the General Conditions of EC of all mining projects:

1. The drains are to be directed to the filtration pond, suitably designed and located to clarify water that is let out.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 18.01 Confirmation of the minutes of the 17th SEAC meeting, held on 6th July 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

Item No. 18.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 17th SEAC meeting

Noted.

Item No. 18.03 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 Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. On verifying the agreement between M/s KSITIL and KWA regarding the installation of water supply and treatment system for Infopark, Campus at Koratty, the Committee was of the opinion to promote Rain Water Harvesting with respect to this project as the KWA is providing raw water which has to be treated properly before use which in turn is rather an expensive process compared to the enhancement of RWH capacity. The Committee also raised concern as to whether the provision to discharge storm water to the nearby 3.6 m wide road, as shown in storm water management plan, is acceptable as it was doubtful as to whether the narrow road shall withstand the discharge. Hence the proponent is directed to manage the storm water drainage by constructing a culvert in the public road to the east side of the project site to prevent inundation of the road disrupting the traffic and affecting the local people. The Committee also found that the affidavit provided by the proponent regarding the conditions suggested by SEAC in its 14th meeting is provided in stamp paper purchased on 27.09.2012 whereas SEAC's direction to provide the same was on 06.04.2013. Also, the "part" of Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal is not given in the affidavit. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh affidavit regarding the same for filing purpose.

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

1. A fresh affidavit in stamp paper purchased after 03.08.2013 regarding the conditions suggested by SEAC in its 14th meeting, with the inclusion of Sy. Nos. as given in Form 1 of the proposal.

2. Assurance that planting of trees to a tune of at least 5 times of the loss that may occur while clearing the land for the project shall be done.

All other additional clarifications provided by the proponent were found to be satisfactory on verification of the same by the Committee. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Recharge pits shall be provided to augment recharge of ground water so as to sustain the yield of wells.
2. Present topography should not be disturbed drastically and cuttings exceeding 3 m should not be made.
3. Sufficient set back distance of the project site shall be left from the KSEB tower line as specified by KSEB norms.
4. Storm water drainage to be managed without causing inundation / traffic disruption on the public road to the east of the project site.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.04 **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 verified the additional documents submitted by the proponent and found that in the bore well sample analysis report submitted, the date of issue of sampling reports is given as 08.02.2016 and hence directed to provide a fresh analysis report on the same. The Committee found that the common entry /exit should have a minimum width of 8 m and hence the drive way proposed all around the building should have sufficient width for the free movement of fire and rescue vehicles. Hence the proponent is directed to provide an assurance regarding the same. Further to the discussion on the site inspection conducted by the subcommittee of SEAC on 17th May 2013 especially to assess the extent of violations, it was found that the proponent has initiated the construction work with structure of two floors completed, and has thus violated the provisions of EIA Notification 2006. Hence it was decided to direct the proponent to submit a resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the firm stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated. Thereafter, further processing of their application shall be considered.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED and the proponent is directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. A Resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the firm stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated.
2. Details on the maximum permissible height of the building.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the width of common entry / exit point of the project site shall be increased to at least a minimum width of 8 m.
4. Narrow linear land on the western side is proposed to be used for row housing. This does not form part of the present project and a clarification to be submitted.

5. Details on how storm water is to be channelized from the plot and its let out from the plot should be given in the plan.
6. The yield of open well and bore well with authentic reports.

Item No. 18.05 **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)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and were found satisfactory. Further to the site inspection conducted on 19.03.2013 by the subcommittee of SEAC, the proponent was directed that the steep cut slope presently made at the base of the hill has to be abandoned till the working face from the top is lowered sufficiently so as to reduce the overall steepness to less than 45° and to declare the area as a dangerous zone isolated by fencing. Considering the dangerous way of conducting quarrying activities at present by the proponent it was directed to stop quarrying activities till Environmental Clearance is obtained, for which the proponent has provided an affidavit stating that the mining activities are suspended in the project site and will restart only after obtaining EC.

Considering the above, and on the satisfactory submission of additional clarifications, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Mining should be limited to Pit-1.
2. 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.
3. 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°. This area should be declared as a dangerous zone isolating it by fencing.
4. The work has to be initiated from the uppermost part where the slope is less. Haulage lines and approach has to be made fresh.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.06 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee verified the cadastral map provided by the proponent in which the Sy. Nos. 93, 98 and 144, which are part of the present proposal, are seen marked

outside the boundary of project site and ascertained that part of these Sy. Nos. are applicable to the present project. Earlier it was decided to address CEO, Infopark to provide the master plan of Infopark for proper evaluation of the project. But the Committee found that the project proponent has now provided the master plan of the project with category of land use and hence the proposal was appraised without insisting on the master plan of Infopark. The Committee insisted that the strip of land between the road and the boundary of the project site at its south and also at SW corner should only be used for landscaping including planting of trees. The Committee found that the proponent has provided a supplemental power of attorney in place of notarized original Power of Attorney as a registered document or copy of partnership deed as proof regarding the real owners of the firm and directed the proponent to provide the same for filing purpose. The Committee ascertained that the copy of soil analysis report done for M/s Larsen and Toubro provided is meant for M/s Cognizant Technology Solutions Pvt. Ltd. and hence is satisfactory. SEAC also observed that in place of cutting of 282 trees for the present project, the proponent has proposed planting of only 172 trees which is a matter of concern and hence directed the proponent to plant trees at least 5 times of the loss that is likely to occur while clearing the land for the project. SEAC also suggested facilitating public transportation to the employees to discourage the usage of private vehicles.

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

1. Notarized original Power of Attorney as a registered document
2. Copy of partnership deed as proof regarding the real owners of the firm.
3. Assurance that planting of trees to a tune of at least 5 times of the loss that is likely to occur while clearing the land for the project shall be done.

All other additional clarifications provided by the proponent were found to be satisfactory on verification of the same by the Committee. Further to the site inspection conducted on 16.05.2013 and on verification of additional clarifications submitted by the proponent, the proposal is **RECOMMENDED** for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. The original width of Kadamprayar river as per cadastral map should be restored and maintained for free flow of flood water.
2. 10 m buffer set back from the edge of the kadambayyar river on either side should be left as a buffer zone and planted with native species.
3. Underground floor should be avoided to prevent inundation.
4. CSR should be specifically for improving the career prospects of locals with skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled capabilities.
5. The strip of land between the road and the boundary of the project site at its south and also at SW corner should only be used for landscaping including planting of trees.
6. The level of structures, approach road and open parking must be above the maximum flood level.
7. The company should provide energy efficient public transport system.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.07 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 213 pt., 214 pt. and 215 pt. at Kavanoor Village and Panchayath, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram district, Kerala by M/s Areacode Granites Private Limited (File No. 107/SEIAA/KL/1805/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11°12'56.96" N to 11°13'3.91"N and 76°05'03.01" E to 76°05'10.60" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee noted that the crusher unit linked with the present project is in operation for a long time but is not following the EMP and the dust suppression systems are not put in place properly. The proponent assured that they shall maintain the crusher unit in a scientific way. The Committee found that the distance of the project site from the nearest river is 102 m and hence directed the proponent to leave more than 100 m from the river edge without conducting quarrying activities if it has some amount of flood plain. The Committee also directed the proponent to take new haulage roads from the upper areas as top to bottom approach has to be followed for mining. The Committee found that the proponent has provided copies of possession certificate, sale deed and land tax receipts for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal, owned by Abdul Salam (who is not the authorized signatory of the project) but has not provided the consent from him to conduct quarrying activities and hence directed to provide the same. It was also found that the area survey plan provided by the proponent shows currently mining area and rocked area but Sy. Nos. of currently mining area is not marked in it and hence not traceable. The proponent is directed to submit the area survey plan marking survey numbers of currently mining area. The proponent has provided affidavit for conditions mentioned in the checklist in a post-dated stamp paper (written as purchased on 12.12.2013) which is not valid, and hence is directed to submit a fresh affidavit in stamp paper purchased after 03.08.2013. The Committee also found that the break up of CSR activities provided by the proponent does not tally with the total figure of Rs. 5 lakhs set aside for the same and hence directed to submit a revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project. 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.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities especially regarding the present status of operation of the crusher unit and allied activities, and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance that environment management plan shall be implemented and the crusher unit shall be maintained in a scientific way.
2. Assurance that 100 m from the river edge shall be left without conducting quarrying activities.
3. Assurance that new haulage roads from the upper areas shall be taken and top to bottom approach shall be followed for mining.
4. Consent issued to Mr. Niyas Vattakandi Soopy by Mr. Abdul Salam to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by him to be provided.
5. Area survey plan clearly marking Sy. Nos. of currently mining area.

6. Affidavit for conditions mentioned in the checklist in stamp paper purchased after 03.08.2013.
7. Revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project.
8. 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.

Item No. 18.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 178/1, 178/3 and 178/6 at Maneed Village and Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam district, Kerala by Mr. C.P. Prathapan (File No. 108/SEIAA/KL/1806/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $09^{\circ} 55' 2.84''$ N to $09^{\circ} 54' 57.86''$ N and $76^{\circ} 27' 23.48''$ E to $76^{\circ} 27' 16.63''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that there is a pond in existence in the site at present which is not provided with any fencing around it and hence the proponent is directed to provide assurance that proper fencing shall be provided around the same. When asked about the nearby habitation of the project site, the proponent stated that there are no houses nearby the project site. But SEAC found that there are houses at a distance of 75 m from the project site and decided to assess the same during site visit. The Committee also directed the proponent to assess the feasibility for quarrying as the estimated reserves are expected to be exhausted within a year as per the current calculated estimates. The Committee also raised concern on the deep cuttings proposed by the proponent which may affect the water table and stated that cutting height of more than 5 m cannot be allowed. The Committee also found that in the copy of possession certificate provided, (in the name of Mr. Prathapan and Mr. Ajay Ghosh for all Sy. Nos.) the Sy. No. 178/3 is given as wetland whereas in the copy of sale deed it is given as Jenmam Purayidam, which the Committee decided to clarify during field visit. The Committee also found that the break up of CSR activities provided by the proponent does not tally with the total figure of Rs. 5 lakhs set aside for the same and hence directed to submit a revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities especially with respect to the proximity of habitation to the project site, clarification as to the status of land belonging to Sy. No. 178/3 whether a wetland / purayidam and, also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that proper fencing shall be provided around the pond in existence at the site.
2. Recalculated estimate of geological reserves and the expected life of mine with a feasibility study.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that cuttings shall be limited to 5 m or bench height, whichever is less, and the depth of quarrying will not exceed the depth to local water table.
4. Revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project.

Item No. 18.09

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 525/2, 523/2, 523/2-1, 523/2-2, 523/3, 523/3-1, 523/4, 523/5-1, 523/6, 524/1, 524/1-2, 524/1-3 and 524/1-4 at Perumkadavila Village and Panchayath, Neyyatinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram district, Kerala by M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 109/SEIAA/KL/1807/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 08°26'36.66" N to 08°26'48.34"N and 77°07'17.77" E to 77°07'29.94" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that the protected area is located at a distance of 7 km E of the project site. The land use classification of the project site is partially revenue land and partially private land. The Committee found a strip of land in the middle of the land owned by them which is not included as part of the present project and hence asked the proponent as to why they have left a strip of land in between without combining these two parts as a single unit. To this end the proponent stated that they are using that strip of land as a passage for transportation. The Committee had serious apprehensions on the proximity of irrigation canals of Neyyar to the project site and directed the proponent to leave 100 m on either side of the canal as No Development Zone. To this end the proponent stated that at present there is 150 m distance from the boundary of the revenue land. However the Committee wanted to ascertain the same during field visit. The Committee also found discrepancy in the ultimate depth of mining stated in the proposal and in the proforma submitted by the proponent as in the former it was given as 80 m MSL whereas in the latter it was given as 145 m MSL. To this end the proponent stated that it was a mistake from their part and confirmed that the ultimate depth of mining is 80 m MSL. The Committee also suggested the proponent to direct the storm water to the pond in existence in the plot as there is a level difference of 100 m and to submit a revised storm water management plan incorporating the same. The Committee also found that the crusher unit linked with the present quarry is contributing to environmental pollution and even though it does not require Environmental Clearance, Environment Management Plan as applicable to the project is equally applicable to the crusher unit also as crusher and quarrying is considered as interlinked projects. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details on the crusher unit including drawings as to its location, specifications, methods of crushing adopted, quantification and source of material, water requirement and source with its interlinkage to quarrying, power requirement and source, Dust suppression methods, Noise management, Waste water management, etc. including the conditions stipulated by KSPCB and its compliance, present status of crusher unit with photographs having digitalized dates from four sides/directions, a map (to scale) clearly denoting the location of crusher, accessories, quarry unit; continuous monitoring data of environmental parameters related to crusher, if any, maintained by the firm, among other things. Regarding the proof of Authorized Signatory, the proponent has submitted a Resolution passed at the meeting of Board of Directors of M/s Delta Aggregates and Sand Pvt. Ltd. authorizing Mr. Thomas Philip which the Committee found as not acceptable as the proponent has applied on behalf of M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. and has provided copy of certificate of incorporation of M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to submit either a new resolution on behalf of M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. or valid proof to prove that these two firms are the same with the same Board of Directors. The Committee also found that the Area Survey Plan provided by the proponent does not have Sy. No. 523/5-, which is part of present project, marked in it. The proponent was directed

to provide an area survey plan incorporating all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. The Committee also found that the proponent has provided the details of already done CSR activities and has not provided the breakup of CSR activities linked with the present project. The Committee also found that since the project site is located between two village boundaries, a buffer distance of 15 m should be left from the same.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities especially with respect to the proximity of irrigation canal to the project site and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a 100 m No Development Zone shall be left on either side of the nearby irrigation canal.
2. A revised storm water management plan incorporating provisions to direct the storm water to the pond in existence in the plot.
3. Details on the crusher unit including drawings as to its location, specifications, methods of crushing adopted, quantification and source of material, water requirement and source with its interlinkage to quarrying, Power consumption and source, Dust suppression methods, Noise management, Waste water management, etc. including the conditions stipulated by KSPCB and its compliance, present status of crusher unit with photographs having digitalized dates from four sides/directions, a map (to scale) clearly denoting the location of crusher, accessories, quarry unit; continuous monitoring data of environmental parameters related to crusher, if any, maintained by the firm, among other things.
4. Submit either a new resolution on behalf of M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. as proof of Authorized Signatory or a valid proof to prove that the two firms, M/s Delta Msand Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Delta Aggregates and Sand Pvt. Ltd. are the same with the same Board of Directors.
5. An area survey plan incorporating all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.
6. Details on CSR activities along with its budget allocation linked with the present project.
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a buffer distance of 15 m shall be left from the village boundaries to the project site.

Item No. 18.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. No. 266/2 at Cherukavu Village and Panchayath, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram district, Kerala by M/s Malabar Granites (File No. 110/SEIAA/KL/1808/2013)**

The authorized signatory of the project, Mr. T.S. Jaleel, has given a request to consider Mr. T.S. Yahiya as his representative to attend the meeting, as he is sick and hospitalized. He has also forwarded a letter authorizing Mr. T.S. Yahiya, the other partner of the company, to represent the company in the appraisal meeting enclosing the attested copy of ID proof of Mr. T.S. Yahiya and the notarized copy of the partnership deed of the firm in which he is a partner. Considering the request and after verification of the documents confirming to the ID proof of the representative, the Committee allowed Mr. T.S. Yahiya to attend the meeting as a representative of authorized signatory of the project.

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11° 11' 33.02"N to 11° 11' 42.28" N and 75° 55' 12.94" E to 75° 55' 25.77" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. Verifying the cadastral map submitted by the proponent the Committee was of the opinion that if the site is in Block 5 then the map submitted before the Committee by the proponent is wrong. To this end the proponent stated that the project site is in Block 4 and agreed to submit a new map correcting the same. The Committee found that there is a GT (Geological Triangular Station) within the project site which has to be preserved and sought assurance from the proponent regarding the same. The Committee also found that since the project site is located near the village boundary, a buffer distance of 15 m should be left from the same without conducting quarrying activities. The Committee was also quite apprehensive on the plying of 20 T trucks on the approach road as it was doubtful whether such a road will withstand transportation of materials with huge tonnage and decided to assess the same during site visit. The Committee also found that the break up of CSR activities provided by the proponent does not tally with the total figure of Rs. 5 lakhs set aside for the same and hence directed to submit a revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities especially the location of GT station within the project site, the condition of approach road as to whether it shall withstand 20 T trucks, and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Cadastral map pertaining to the project site duly certified by Village Officer.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the GT station within the project site shall be preserved without causing any disturbance due to quarrying activities.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a buffer distance of 15 m shall be left from the village boundary to the project site without conducting quarrying activities.
4. Revised proposal for CSR activities linked with the present project along with the budget allocation for the same.

Item No. 18.11 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed IBS SEZ Campus at Info Park, Kochi project in Sy. Nos. 616, 623 and 636 / Ward 7 at Kakkanad Village, Thrikkakara Grama Panchayath, Kanayanoor Taluk, Ernakulam district, Kerala by M/s IBS Software Services Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 111/SEIAA/KL/1809/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief description of the project. The Committee found that the proposed project site has been filled with laterite to a depth of 2 m (i.e. nearly 40000 m³ of laterite) by Infopark and now a 4.5 m deep cutting is proposed for the present project which is demanding for the removal of this 40000 m³ of laterite. SEAC raised concern whether proposed parking below the existing water table in this loose soil is advisable as it may deplete the ground water, affect the free movement of ground water and may raise safety concerns in future. The Committee also reiterated that heavy expenditure may be incurred for waterproofing the basement considering the nature of soil prevalent in the area and reminded the proponent that the structures may not be able to withstand even minor tremors. Also the disposal of black clay may become a problem without any

prospective buyers for it. Hence, considering the stability aspect in tune with the strata, the Committee directed the proponent to limit the construction with one basement floor without going beyond the water table or 2 m, whichever is less. The Committee was not satisfied with the extent of green area proposed for the present project and suggested that the two courtyards / open space inside the buildings could be efficiently utilized for green area development with indigenous species. The proponent is directed to submit a revised landscape plan extending the area for the same. SEAC also suggested facilitating public transportation to the employees to discourage the usage of private vehicles. The Committee was not satisfied with the provisions made at present for harvesting and storage of rain water and directed the proponent to enhance the same and submit details regarding the source of water and provisions made for RWH and storage taking into account the requirements for the project.

SEAC was not satisfied with the CSR activities suggested by the proponent as it does not specifically state the proposed activities towards the same. To this end the proponent stated that 3-4 institutions are beneficiated every month by the firm and they usually do not usually publicize the activities done towards charity. However the Committee directed the proponent to provide details on the amount spent and proposed to spend towards CSR linked with the present project. The Committee also found that the proponent has submitted Specific power of attorney given to him by V.K. Mathews, Managing Director, M/s IBS Software Services Pvt. Ltd., and the extracts of minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s IBS Software Services Pvt. Ltd. held on 27.09.1999 authorizing Mr. V.K. Mathews (signed by the Company Secretary) as proof of Authorized Signatory. But in the notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation of M/s IBS Software Services Pvt. Ltd. provided by the proponent it is not clear who are the directors of the firm and whether Mr. V. K. Mathews can authorize other persons on behalf of the firm. SEAC directed the proponent to clarify the same with supporting documents. The proponent was also directed to provide the cadastral map of the proposed area duly signed by Village Officer as they have not submitted the same along with the proposal.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED and the proponent is directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the construction shall be limited with one basement floor and will not go beyond the water table or 2 m, whichever is less.
2. Revised landscape plan extending the area for green area development involving indigenous species.
3. Details regarding the source of water and revised provisions made for RWH and storage considering the water requirements of the project.
4. Assurance that the company should provide energy efficient public transport system to the employees.
5. Details on the amount spent and proposed to spend towards CSR linked with the present project.
6. Valid proof of authorized signatory with supporting documents regarding the directors of the firm and that Mr. V.K. Mathews can authorize other persons as authorized signatory on behalf of the firm.
7. Cadastral map of the proposed area duly signed by Village Officer.

Item No. 18.12 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 200/1, 202/1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Block 27 at Oorgattiri Village and Panchayath, Eranadu Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s PMR Granites India Private Limited (File No. 112/SEIAA/KL/1930/2013)**

The project proponent has given a request for consideration of change in ID proof of the authorized signatory. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted copy of passport along with the application as ID proof of authorized signatory and now since the original passport is submitted for visa stamping he is not able to submit the original of the passport (for verification) for attending the meeting and hence has requested to consider an alternative ID as proof of authorized signatory and has submitted the attested copy of Voter's ID card as the alternate ID proof. Considering the request and after verification of the authenticity of the alternate ID proof, the authorized signatory was allowed to attend the meeting and make presentation of the project proposal.

Thereafter, the project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $11^{\circ} 14' 39.79''$ N to $11^{\circ} 14' 47.66''$ N and $76^{\circ} 06' 22.62''$ E to $76^{\circ} 06' 30.73''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee asked clarification from the proponent regarding the actual cost of the project as to whether the infrastructural facilities required for the project were taken into account while deriving the total cost of the project. To this end the proponent stated that the present estimate includes the cost of infrastructure also. However the Committee noted that nothing is specifically mentioned about the measures proposed to mitigate expected environmental impacts of quarrying as well as crusher linked with the quarrying unit. The Committee was of the opinion that the crusher unit linked with the quarry contributes to environmental pollution and even though it does not require Environmental Clearance, Environment Management Plan as applicable to the project is equally applicable to the crusher unit also as crusher and quarrying are considered as interlinked projects. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details on the crusher unit including drawings as to its location, specifications, methods of crushing adopted, quantification and source of material, water requirement and source with its interlinkage to quarrying, power consumption and source, Dust suppression methods, Noise management, Waste water management, etc. including the conditions stipulated by KSPCB and its compliance, present status of crusher unit with photographs having digitalized dates from four sides/directions, a map (to scale) clearly denoting the location of crusher, accessories, quarry unit; continuous monitoring data of environmental parameters related to crusher, if any, maintained by the firm, among other things. SEAC also observed that the provisions made for rain water harvesting is not sufficient to cater the requirements and hence directed to provide specific plans for the same.

The Committee found that the Resolution passed at the Board meeting of PMR Granites India Private Limited provided by the proponent (as proof of authorized signatory) authorizing Mr. P.M. Abdul Shukkoor to do all such acts, deeds and things as may be necessary to carry out all the day to day activities of the company is not acceptable as it does not clearly mention that the authorized signatory can make necessary applications / provide clarifications / documents / pay

prescribed fee, etc. to statutory authorities including SEIAA seeking necessary no objections, permissions, consents, etc. in respect of the said project and to do all such acts, deeds and things that may be necessary in this regard. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a new resolution from the Board of Directors of the firm incorporating the above details with respect to the present project. The Committee also noticed that the proponent has provided copies of kraya certificates (along with sale deed) for Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal in the names of persons other than the authorized signatory. The Committee was of the opinion that Kraya certificate is issued by the government in the name of a person evidencing title to the extent of property assigned after a land is assigned to him by the government pursuant to land assignment laws. A schedule of the assigned land will also be attached to the Kraya certificate. For that reason, it is a document showing ownership over the property. The Committee was doubtful whether such a land could be transferred/sold to another person and hence decided to verify its authenticity during field visit.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities especially with respect to current method of operation of crusher unit and also to verify the ownership of land with respect to the kraya certificates submitted by the proponent, and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Details on the crusher unit including drawings as to its location, specifications, methods of crushing adopted, quantification and source of material, water requirement and source with its interlinkage to quarrying, Power consumption and source, Dust suppression methods, Noise management, Waste water management, etc. including the conditions stipulated by KSPCB and its compliance, present status of crusher unit with photographs having digitalized dates from four sides/directions, a map (to scale) clearly denoting the location of crusher, accessories, quarry unit; continuous monitoring data of environmental parameters related to crusher, if any, maintained by the firm, among other things.
2. Details on provisions made for rain water harvesting.
3. A valid resolution from the Board of Directors of the firm stating that the authorized signatory can make necessary applications / provide clarifications / documents / pay prescribed fee, etc. to statutory authorities including SEIAA seeking necessary no objections, permissions, consents, etc. in respect of the said project and to do all such acts, deeds and things that may be necessary in this regard.

Item No. 18.13 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 161/1, 163/3, 4, 177/1, 2, 7 at Alakodu Village and Panchayath, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by M/s St. Martin Granites (File No. 90/SEIAA/KL/1050/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee found that the proponent has provided copy of possession certificate for Sy. No. 177/2-1 instead of Sy. No. 177/2 and hence it was recommended that EC may be issued for the area in Sy. Nos. 161/1, 163/3, 163/4, 177/1, 177/2-1 and 177/7. The Committee also suggested that welfare measure in the vicinity as part of Corporate Social Responsibility must largely cater to

health, education and social welfare and insurance for inhabitants of nearby Harijan colony. The Committee also found that the copy of land tax receipts provided by the proponent as proof of ownership of land lacked clarity and hence directed to submit the original of land tax receipts of all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal, for verification.

All other additional clarifications provided by the proponent were found to be satisfactory on verification of the same by the Committee. Further to the site inspection conducted on 16.05.2013 by the subcommittee of SEAC and subject to the satisfactory receipt of proof of ownership of land after verification of the original land tax receipts, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Quarrying should be limited to Survey numbers 161/1, 163/3, 163/4, 177/1, 177/2-1 and 177/7 and the extent of area of 3.1662 ha in the proposal, and should not be extended to any other part in the area later.
2. Rs. 5 lakh to be earmarked under CSR per year for welfare and insurance of the inhabitants of the nearby Harijan colony.
3. Sufficient set back distance as per KSEB guidelines to be maintained from the KSEB tower line.
4. Siltation tanks located on the slopes are to be supported with strong retaining walls.
5. Overburden stock should be supported to prevent down slope movement and vegetative cover of indigenous species to prevent erosion should be provided.
6. Fencing and retaining wall should be provided as safety measures to avoid any adverse impacts associated with overburden removal.
7. A buffer distance of 100 m from the boundary of the site is to be kept from the nearest settlement.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.14 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. No. 1/1, at Valambur Village, Angadippuram Panchayath, and Sy. Nos. 13/1 and 13/2 at Kariavattam Village, Vettathur Panchayath, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram district, Kerala by M/s Nalakath Granites (File No. 74/SEIAA/KL/169/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent as it was directed to provide copies of all statutory approvals obtained so far confirming to the irregular shape of the proposed mine area with a portion of exposed rock. On verification of the documents submitted the Committee found that the proponent has not submitted certain documents satisfactorily. Hence the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the ground realities and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. 'Consent to Operate' issued by KSPCB and quarrying permit, for Sy. No. 13/2.
2. Consent from Fire and Rescue Services, Malappuram for conducting quarrying in Sy. Nos. 1/1 and 13/2.
3. License issued by concerned Grama Panchayath to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. 13/1 and 13/2.

Item No. 18.15 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee found that the proponent has proposed a 7.5 m cutting from the ground to have two lower basement floors. The removal of overburden to 7 m below ground level will reduce the ground water in the entire area and it 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 and hence 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. Hence the proponent is directed that the excavation shall not go beyond 3 m from the level of M.C. Road.

All other additional clarifications provided by the proponent were found to be satisfactory on verification of the same by the Committee. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. The excavation shall not be beyond 3 m from the level of M.C. Road.
2. Cutting on the western side shall be provided with a strong retaining wall.
3. Provisions to be made to enhance the rain water storage to at least one month of their consumption or 1500 KL, whichever is more.
4. Provisions to be made for 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.
5. CSR activities primarily to be extended to the nearby school.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.16 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 160/4, 160/5, 161/7, 161/8-1, 161/8-2, 161/8-5, 160/1, 160/1-1, 160/1-2, 160/1-3, 160/1-4, 160/2, 160/6, 160/3 and 160/7 at Thottappuzhessery Village, Thottappuzhessery Panchayath, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta district, Kerala by M/s Shanio Metal Crushing Unit (File No. 75/SEIAA/KL/170/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. As directed by SEAC the proponent has provided the layout plan avoiding all factual errors wherein a structure (an incomplete and un-used structure of a temple) located at 61.6 m from the plot boundary which was missing in the layout plan provided earlier, along with the status of the said structure as reported by the Village officer is provided, which on verification was found to be satisfactory. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. 100 m buffer distance to be maintained from the boundary of the nearby temple for quarrying.

The appraisal report is prepared and approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 18.17.1 - Proposal for introducing two-stage clearances

SEAC observed that as per EIA Notification 2006 and its subsequent amendments, there is no provision for two stage clearances.

Item No. 18.17.2 - Remarks of SEAC on the proposal of Chairman SEIAA duly forwarded on 3rd July 2013

Noted.

Item No. 18.17.3 - 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)

Noted.

Item No. 18.17.4 - 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

The Committee decided to formulate separate guidelines considering the directions contained in the O.M. preferably in tune with the National Building Code.

Item No. 18.17.5 - 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.

The Committee decided to formulate separate guidelines considering the directions contained in the O.M. and directed Secretary SEAC to inform the details of O.M. to all the District Collectors.

Item No. 18.17.6 - 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

The Committee decided to formulate separate guidelines considering the directions contained in the O.M. preferably in tune with the National Building Code.

Item No. 18.17.7 – Email from Chairman SEIAA

As directed by Chairman SEIAA, the Committee verified the agenda notes of 11th and 15th SEIAA meeting forwarded to SEIAA along with appraisal reports from SEAC and also the concerned minutes of SEAC and SEIAA wherein the proposal of M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd. was considered. On careful verification of the said documents, it is found that the conditions to enhance the RWH capacity to 10 lakh litres and to maintain the width of internal road to at least 6 m, were not the conditions suggested by SEAC while recommending the proposal for EC and hence the Committee was of the unanimous opinion that SEAC is not in a position to offer any remarks in the matter since the rationale for it can only be provided by SEIAA in view of the fact that these two conditions were stipulated by SEIAA. SEAC also reiterated that it is not bound to follow KMBR in all cases, as the Committee while considering adverse environmental impacts of a project may suggest specific conditions which may deviate from the guidelines specified in KMBR, which is site and project specific.

The Committee also stated that it is not able to provide any remarks regarding the matter indicated in the e-mail of Chairman SEIAA with respect to the writ petition filed in the Hon. High Court of Kerala by M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd. as the matter is still under consideration of the Hon. High Court of Kerala. SEAC also noticed that the violators do not have any right to claim for deemed EC.

The meeting concluded at 4.30 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.