

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 21ST MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 4TH NOVEMBER, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The twenty-first meeting of SEAC- Kerala was held on 4th November 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. The meeting commenced at 9.30 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. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
11. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
12. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants and briefed upon the current status of proposals with SEIAA Kerala. The Committee congratulated and honoured Dr. Khaleel Chovva, the Honourable member of SEAC for receiving Dr. Radhakrishnan National Award under the title 'Education and Environment'.

The Committee also observed that indiscriminate illegal quarrying activities are going on in most of the Government lands in Kalanjoor area of Pathanamthitta District leaving behind unreclaimed huge pits without any eco-restoration activities. Hence the Committee decided to bring it under the immediate attention of District Collector, Pathanamthitta and request to take urgent steps to address the same.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 21.01 Confirmation of the **minutes of the 20th SEAC meeting, held on 5th October 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

Item No. 21.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 20th SEAC meeting**

Noted.

Item No. 21.03 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey No. 172 (P) at Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Palakkal Granite Products Private Limited (File No. 137/SEIAA/KL/2567/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 11^o17' 46.591" N to 11^o 17' 53. 659" N and 76^o 02' 58.445" E to 76^o 03' 09.979" E. The Committee was quite apprehensive about the land coming under the Eco Sensitive Area (ESA) of Kasturirangan report. So the Committee decided that any final decision in such cases shall be taken only after considering the MoEF decision on Kasturirangan Report. One of the major concerns of the Committee with respect to the project is that the project area falls in the land bearing Sy. No. 172 of Kodyathur village, Kozhikode Taluk wherein the Committee had already appraised two projects for Environmental Clearance having the same survey number, for which Environmental Clearance has not been recommended as yet. The Committee found that the entire land of 30 hectares is not resurveyed. The Committee also found that the appraisal/assessment of the present project is not feasible for, one, it is not possible to trace the real owners of the land bearing Sy. No. 172 and secondly, as to whether there is any Government land within, as the Revenue Department has not yet assigned any sub survey numbers to the land now under the possession of different persons. The Committee was of the opinion that since the said Sy. No. has some patches of forest within it and more than 15 quarries are operating in that Sy. No. bearing a large area (against which lot of complaints are prevailing at present), the appraisal is possible only if Revenue Department demarcates the regions of forest and assigns sub survey numbers coming under the said survey number. Hence, the proponent is directed to submit a village map demarcating his project site (marking the sub survey number) and forest patches within the land bearing Sy. No.172. *It is also decided to send a letter to the District Collector, Kozhikode, urgently requesting to arrange to forward information regarding Sy. No. 172 of Kodyathur village, Kozhikode Taluk and seeking a map demarcating the sub survey numbers and alienated forest patches coming under it.* The Committee found that the proponent has submitted consent to conduct quarrying activities from different owners (claimed to be so as seen from the land tax receipt) of the Sy. No. in the form of lease agreement. Since this is an existing quarry, the proponent is directed to provide the environmental monitoring schedule of the ongoing and proposed activities. The Committee found that the ultimate depth of mining is given as 130 m in Form 1 and 130 m MRL in the check list and the proponent was sought clarification regarding this. To this end the proponent stated that it is a typographical error on their part and the ultimate depth of mining is 80 m AMSL which is the depth of stream bed near the entrance. The Committee observed that there are some settlements in the

eastern side of the project site within 100 m. The proponent stated that those are only office buildings and are not houses. To this end the proponent was asked to provide declaration in writing regarding the status of buildings within 100 m of the project site. The Committee found the water analysis report submitted by the proponent non satisfactory as the permissible limits of various parameters were wrongly provided in the report. Hence, the proponent is directed to provide a fresh water analysis report following actual standards. The proponent is also directed to ensure the quality of drinking water before supplying to the workers. The Committee found that the biodiversity listing provided by the proponent is not authenticated by any one and hence directed the proponent to provide biodiversity listing of flora and fauna authenticated by concerned expert who has prepared the same. The proponent has also not provided details on quantity of sewage generation, total power requirement and total water requirement regarding the proposed project and is directed to provide the same. The Committee also sought rationale from the proponent regarding their statement that the access road width is maintained minimum 7 m for easy movement which will be kept only 5 m during and retreating stage. Even though the proponent has provided an affidavit from the Directors of M/s Palakkal Granite Products Private Limited authorizing Mr. P.M. Aboobacker, Managing Director of the firm to sign all the statutory documents on behalf of the firm, the Committee found it unsatisfactory as the person is not specifically authorized to sign/make applications before SEIAA Kerala and to receive Environmental Clearance certificate on behalf of the company/organization concerned. Hence, the proponent is directed to provide a valid proof of authorized signatory incorporating the above details.

The Committee also noticed that in the undertaking provided by the consultant regarding responsibility of the project prepared by them, the details of the project are not mentioned and hence is directed to provide a fresh undertaking regarding the same. The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided the affidavit for conditions mentioned in the check list, the details of the present project are not indicated in the same which is not acceptable and hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh notarized affidavit incorporating the details of the present project in that.

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. Village map demarcating the project site (marking the sub survey number) and forest patches within the land bearing Sy. No. 172.
2. The environmental monitoring schedule of the ongoing and proposed activities.
3. Declaration in writing regarding the status of buildings within 100 m of the project site.
4. Fresh water analysis report of water samples taken from four different locations of the project site, including the source of drinking water, following recent standards.
5. Biodiversity listing of flora and fauna authenticated by concerned expert.
6. The details on the quantity of sewage generation, total power requirement and total water requirement regarding the proposed project.
7. Rationale regarding the statement that the access road width is maintained at a minimum 7 m for easy movement which will be kept only 5 m during and retreating stage.
8. Valid resolution from the Directors of M/s Palakkal Granite Products Private Limited authorizing Mr. P.M. Aboobacker to sign/make applications before SEIAA Kerala and to receive Environmental Clearance certificate on behalf of the company/organization.

9. Fresh undertaking from the Environmental Consultant regarding the responsibility of project prepared by them, incorporating the details of project including location, survey numbers and details of the proponent.
10. Fresh notarized affidavit regarding the conditions mentioned in the check list incorporating the details of the present project.

Item No. 21.04

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the Believers Church Hospital project in Survey Nos. 96/1, 96/13, 102/6, 102/9, 95/4, 236/1, 236/2, 236/2/1, 236/3, 236/7, 236/8, 235/12, 235/15, 235/4, 235/13, 235/11, 235/14, 235/14, 235/13, 235/11, 237/8, 237/8, 102/7, 102/8, 102/9, 102/1, 102/1, 102/1/2, 102/14, 102/17, 94/5, 94/1, 94/2 and 94/3 at Kuttapuzha Village, Thiruvalla Municipality, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Believers Church (File No. 142/SEIAA/KL/2743/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee noted that the proponent owns 100 acres of land and that the present project is designed in 25 acres. The Committee found that part of the land for the proposed activity is "Purayidam", part of it is reclaimed land and the remaining is "Nilam" and that permission for the reclamation was obtained from the District Collector in 2003. The Committee asked the proponent as to whether the present project in this dimension was envisaged earlier in 2003. To this end the proponent stated that they have sought permission from the District Collector for reclaiming the land during 2003 for constructing a small medical facility then but due to shortage of funds for the same, the project implementation was stalled and construction was later resumed on obtaining building permit. They have hence completed Ground floor + 4 floors on a permission obtained for Ground floor + 6 floors. In the meantime, EIA Notification has come and hence they have applied for seeking Environmental Clearance and they stated that there was no deliberate intention on their part to infringe the law by going ahead with the construction activities as the activities were started after getting building permit and have been stopped from August 2013. But the Committee raised strong objection in this regard as to why the concerned Municipality has given building permit for the project without insisting for prior Environmental Clearance, even after intimating the same way back in 2012. Hence it was decided to *send a letter to the concerned Municipality seeking reasons for issuing a building permit without ensuring environmental clearance from the proponent.*

The Committee also found that a 'thodu' flowing in the east to west direction dividing the property into two portions, which was located within the project area was also reclaimed and the water flow through the 'thodu' was diverted which eventually joined the Kuttapuzha thodu. The Committee expressed concern on this diversion carried out by the proponent as the natural thodu with a width of 6 m is part of the revenue land with specific survey number and is not owned by the proponent. Moreover, the realignment of thodu was also done by the proponent as part of the reclamation, as the flow of thodu towards east was diverted towards west. The Committee enquired whether the proponent has obtained any permission from statutory authorities for the reclamation of thodu. To this end the proponent stated that when the District Collector, Pathanamthitta has given permission for reclamation, it was directed that the drainage of area should be maintained. So the proponent was of the opinion that diversion of the thodu has not altered the drainage of the area in

any way as it was joined to Kuttapuzha thodu maintaining the width of original thodu. The proponent also stated that the thodu is called as naalaka thodu which is not a revenue thodu and as per the Field Measurement Book the thodu does not have any survey number. But SEAC was of the opinion that the thodu was marked as a revenue thodu during resurvey and observed that the sub survey no. 236/4 is only missing in the map wherein other adjoining survey nos. such as 236/1,2,3,5,6 and 7 are marked in the map and hence stated that the missing survey no. could be the survey number of the thodu. Also, as per land revenue records, more than 15 plots are reclaimed and the proponent has not provided 1 m wide thodu adjacent to each plot.

The proponent was asked regarding the provision for stored water for the project. The proponent stated that they have constructed a rain water collection pond in 2001-2002 with 100 ML capacity in an area of 3.5 acres. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the location of RWH facility, water recharge pits and solid waste storage area in the conceptual plan and hence directed the proponent to revise the conceptual plan incorporating the location of these. The Committee also found that there are a lot of endemic species in the area as seen from the biodiversity listing provided by the proponent and asked the proponent as to how they are going to conserve them. The proponent stated that the endemic species can be conserved as their habitats are not coming in the building foot print. However, the Committee sought assurance from the proponent on this.

The Committee sought clarification from the proponent as to why there is a mention about a bhoosthithi vazhi in the proposal. To this end the proponent stated that as per the village map a 2.5 m – 3 m wide small walkway, which was earlier used by the public and which is not part of the Government land, is coming within the project site as bhoosthithi vazhi. But the Committee stated that Sy. Nos. 96/6 and 102/5 are bhoosthithi vazhi coming within the project site which has to be left as such for the free movement of public as it does not belong to the proponent. It was also found that the Sy. No. 96/6 bifurcates the plot and reiterated that the land should be left as such without any construction activities as it may fragment the land into many portions. But the proponent stated that the said survey no. does not come within their land and hence the Committee wanted to ascertain the same during the site visit.

The proponent was asked on the proposed construction of elevated bridge for the connection of the two portions of the property as the thodu is passing through the project site. The proponent was directed that the pillar for the construction of the bridge shall not be erected in the purambokke land and free board should be left under the bridge for the movement of boats. So before construction of bridge the proponent has to comply with these two conditions. The Committee also observed that a 66 KV electric line is passing through the project site and hence directed the proponent that safe horizontal and vertical set back as prescribed by KSEB should be left from it without any construction activities.

The Committee found that the proponent has not specifically mentioned the proposed CSR activities linked with the present project and is directed to provide the same specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended. At this juncture the Committee suggested identifying certain slums located in the Thiruvalla-Changanacherry area and bringing it under the CSR activities. It was also suggested to provide free education to at least 2 economically backward medical students a year as part of CSR.

The Committee noticed that the proponent has provided the same Sy. No. twice or thrice in the proposal submitted and was hence sought clarification regarding that. To this end the proponent stated that two or more pattayams/thandappers are there for the same Sy. No. and hence same survey

no. has been given twice or thrice in the application. The proponent was also sought clarification regarding the present status of land. To this end the proponent stated that 37 percent of the total land is dry land and 43 percent of the land is reclaimed in 2003; some portions are retained as nilam and in that portion they propose for a water recharge pond.

Since land based issues with respect to the thodu, bhoosthithi vazhi, nilam, among others, are there linked with the project site, the Committee decided to DEFER the project proposal until SITE VISIT for assessing the ground realities especially with respect to the location of the bhoosthithi vazhi as mentioned in the proposal, the extent of construction activities done so far, the present status of the reclaimed thodu and ascertaining as to whether any survey number is assigned to the thodu and whether it is a revenue thodu or owned by the proponent. It was also decided to ascertain as to whether the Sy. No. 96/6 comes within the plot and bifurcates it and to verify the land utilization orders during site visit.

The Committee found that the proponent has not provided copies of lease deed for Sy. Nos. 94/1 and 94/2 and is hence directed to provide the same. It was also found that the Sy. Nos. 95/4, 236/2/1, 237/8, 237/8, 236/3, 236/7, 236/8, 94/5, 236/1, 94/3, 236/2 are given as pandaravaka pattom in lease deed whereas in the 'saakshyapathram' it is given as 'nilam'. Hence, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the recent land tax receipts of these Sy. Nos. clearly mentioning the nature of land bearing those Sy. Nos. The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided the notarized affidavit in original undertaking the conditions mentioned in the check list, the Sy. Nos. of the project site are not given in it but is stated to refer the saakshyapathram for the Sy. Nos., which is not acceptable. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh notarized affidavit regarding conditions mentioned in the check list incorporating the specific details of the project including all Survey nos. of the project site.

The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Cadastral map superimposing the proposed outlay plan of the project.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the endemic species within the project site shall be conserved.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the Sy. Nos. 96/6 and 102/5 will be left as such without any construction activities.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the pillar for the construction of the bridge shall not be erected in the purambokke land and free board should be left under the bridge for the movement of boats.
5. Assurance in the form of affidavit that safe horizontal and vertical set back as prescribed by KSEB shall be left from the KSEB tower line without any construction activities.
6. Revised conceptual plan clearly marking the location of RWH facility and solid waste storage area, retaining the existing paddy field (nilam as per document) as water recharge pits.
7. The detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project specifically mentioning the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended. It is also suggested to provide free education to at least two economically backward medical students a year as part of CSR.
8. Copies of lease deed for Sy. Nos. 94/1 and 94/2.
9. Recent land tax receipts of Sy. Nos. 95/4, 236/2/1, 237/8, 237/8, 236/3, 236/7, 236/8, 94/5, 236/1, 94/3, 236/2 clearly mentioning the nature of land.

10. Fresh notarized affidavit regarding conditions mentioned in the check list incorporating specific details of the project including all Survey nos. of the project site.

Item No. 21.05 **Application for environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey Nos. 332/4, 340/5, 340/4pt, 331/4, 331/6p, 340/3, 340/3p and 340/4p at Pananchery Village, Pananchery Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s St. Basil Granites (File No. 61/SEIAA/KL/7682/2012)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee found that the proponent has satisfactorily provided all other additional clarifications except the following, as directed by SEAC.

1. The location of access road and garland drain around, especially on the western side.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a retaining wall shall be provided on the western part of garland drain to arrest the runoff and clarify the water.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that proper green belt shall be put in place.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that fencing and retaining wall shall be provided as safety measures to avoid any untoward incident.
5. Assurance in the form of affidavit that erosion hazards due to bush clearing & soil disturbance from the new quarry activity shall be effectively addressed.

Hence the Committee decided that the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA directing the proponent to provide the affidavit for filing purpose. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. A safe buffer distance of 100 m shall be left from nearby settlements of land and within lease area without conducting quarrying activities.
2. Retaining wall should be provided on the western part of garland drain to arrest the run off and clarify the water.
3. Fencing and retaining wall should be provided as safety measure to avoid any untoward incident.

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

Item No. 21.06 **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 and found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications as directed. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific condition in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. The boundary pillars between two villages as such should be retained.

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

Item No. 21.07 **Application for environmental clearance for the Proposed Group Construction Project of Educity 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 Educity (File No. 106/SEIAA/KL/1722/2013)**

As decided in the 20th SEAC meeting held on 5th October 2013, the proponent was invited for presentation, with direction to orient the same with respect to the changes made in the redrafted proposal and the project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. First and foremost, the Committee found the following discrepancies/shortcomings in the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent:

1. Revised conceptual plan with due authentication of NABET accredited EIA Co-ordinator. – *At pg. 349, conceptual plan is provided. But the legend is not readable. Conceptual plan is not authenticated by NABET accredited EIA coordinator. Hence the proponent is directed to provide revised coloured conceptual plan with properly and legibly marked legend authenticated by NABET accredited EIA coordinator.*
2. 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. – *Informed by the proponent as enclosed in pg. 113 of the proposal but at pg. 113 it is only a copy of trust deed.*
3. Copy of sale deed for Sy. No.145/2B. - *Informed by the proponent as enclosed in pg. 113 of the proposal but at pg. 113 it is only a copy of trust deed.*
4. 500 m vicinity map of the site and surroundings clearly marking the nearby facilities. – *Map is not to scale. Details of nearby facilities are not clearly and specifically indicated with distances, etc.*
5. GPS readings from the four extreme boundaries of the project site. – *GPS co-ordinates of northern and eastern boundary are not provided.*
6. Declaration in writing as to whether the project site comes in ESZ-1. – *Informed by the proponent that it is enclosed as Annexure 1 but, Annexure 1 is Soil Investigation report.*
7. Revised landscape plan marking the index of tree species to be planted. - *Informed by the proponent as enclosed in Annexure 10 at pg. 349 but at pg. 349 it is conceptual plan. At pg. 348, Annexure 10 is given wherein the scribblings of the page are not at all readable.*
8. Details on provisions proposed to collect entire water falling in the project site. – *Details not provided. Instead it is stated that, to prepare a project report for a possible RWH and water conservation measures, it is necessary to conduct detailed field study in the area (pg. 111 – conclusion). This study could be conducted only after the SW monsoon season preferably after*

middle of September. Hence, the proponent is directed to provide specific details on the provisions made to collect the entire water falling in the project site.

9. Biodiversity listing of flora and fauna of the project site certified by concerned experts. – *Provided but not certified by concerned experts. Instead it reads: (pg. 63) it is certified by QCI approved concerned expert but neither the certification nor the details of QCI approved expert is provided.*
10. Specific proposal for Corporate Social Responsibility linked with the present project. - *Provided but CSR split up with budget allocations and the specific areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended are also not given.*

The proponent also failed to address the following items sought in the letter from Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA dt. 24.08.2013:

1. The facilities for nuclear medicine and other related activity in the medical college campus are not built up into the plan with adequate precautionary measures. - *To this end the proponent stated that the proposed project does not require the nuclear medicine facility as no oncology department or radiotherapy department is proposed for the present project. The proponent also reiterated that there is no nuclear medicine waste anticipated in the proposed project. But SEAC sought affidavit from the proponent stating that nuclear medicine facility is not required for the present project (stating the reasons for the same).*
2. No strategy has been detailed to address the unsuitability for normal construction at the steep segment of land with slumped laterite boulders between the flat topped crestal portion and valley. – *The proponent is directed to provide assurance in the form of affidavit that the region between the flat topped crestal portion and valley shall be left as green belt without doing any construction activities.*
3. Nothing has been mentioned on the strategies developed to ensure facilitating rapid movement of vehicles along the winding segments including widening of approach road from Melmuri. – *The proponent stated that the present width of the approach road is 8 m.*
4. The mechanism of waste disposal denoting specific plans and sites earmarked are lacking. Minor details of facilities like canteen, departmental store, etc. are not provided. - *The Committee stated that the location of playground and STP suggested in the present plan should be shifted. The proponent is directed to revise the conceptual plan incorporating the location of other facilities like canteen, departmental store along with new location proposed for playground and STP and specific sites for waste disposal. The proponent is also directed to provide specific plans for disposal of different types of waste generated from the present project.*
5. With regard to the master plan as to a part of the area coming under the green strip, Govt. order approving the development plan for Malappuram town is furnished but the details pertaining to the area of the proposal is not submitted specifically. *The proponent is directed to provide a valid document from the concerned Secretary/ Town Planner depicting the portion of master plan of the revised zoning with respect to the present project (specifically marking the project area) and defining permissible activities in the zone coming under the project.*

The Committee also observed that as per the biodiversity list of flora provided by the proponent, at present there are 54 numbers of sandal wood trees in existence at the site and hence directed the proponent to provide the measures to protect the same, as cutting of sandal wood trees by private parties are not permissible as per the law.

In addition to addressing the above shortcomings, the proponent is directed to provide the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Specific measures to protect the sandal wood trees in existence at the site at present.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED seeking satisfactory clarifications from the proponent as above, which were sought earlier.

Item No. 21.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. No. 611/1A-303-147 at Keerampara Village and Panchayath, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Reji Kuriakose and Jeeva Reji (File No. 144/SEIAA/KL/2745/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $10^{\circ} 5' 30.19''$ N to $10^{\circ} 5' 35.80''$ N and $76^{\circ} 41' 24.14''$ E to $76^{\circ} 41' 36.27''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The proponent has stated that the cost of the project is Rs. 70 lakhs in Form 1 and Rs. 75 lakhs in pre-feasibility report. The Committee asked regarding this and the proponent stated that the total cost of the project is Rs. 70 lakhs. The proponent has not provided cadastral map of the project site duly certified by Village Officer and hence is directed to provide the same. The Committee found that Thattekkad Bird Sanctuary is located at 2.5 km which is in proximity of the project site and was apprehensive about the noise and dust that may be generated during mining activity that may disturb the migratory birds visiting the sanctuary. To this end the proponent stated that a noise study was conducted earlier to study the impact of landing/turning of flight towards the tunnel in the run way wherein the flight takes a turn above the sanctuary and as per the said study, such activities does not have much adverse impact on the sanctuary. Moreover, as per the observation in the said study, the birds could cope up with the change due to adaptation capability, since blasting is done in pre-fixed timings. However, the Committee was of the opinion that as per the S.O. 3067 (E) dt. 1st December 2009, the projects to be located within 10 kms of National Parks, Sanctuaries, Biosphere Reserves, Migratory Corridors of Wild Animals, the project proponent shall submit the map duly authenticated by Chief Wild life Warden showing these features vis-à-vis the project location and the recommendations or comments of the Chief Wildlife Warden (thereon at the stage of EC). Hence, the proponent is directed to provide the same for conducting quarrying activities in the said project site in proximity of the Thattekkad Sanctuary. The Committee also found that as per the WGEEP classification, the project site is located within protected area and the entire land is in the Government Purambokke land. The Committee verified the certificate from the Forest Department submitted by the proponent along with the application stating that the existing quarry operations are in non-forest area. The Committee found that it is not satisfactory as it refers only to the area where activities are going on at present and does not refer to any area where the proponent intends to do quarrying activities later on and it is not clear as to whether the any part of the applied land is in forest area. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a certificate from Forest Department citing the coordinates of the proposal as to whether any forest land is involved in the present project. SEAC was also of the opinion to verify whether quarrying activities are permissible near sanctuary as per Section 34 of the Wild life Protection Act. Moreover, since no activities are permitted within 10 km of the protected area as per the EIA Notification itself, the Committee decided to defer the item to ascertain whether the proposal can be recommended for issuance of Environmental Clearance after verifying the above.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess its proximity to the protected area and the status of the land as to whether it is entirely Government Purambokke land and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Cadastral map of the project site duly certified by Village Officer.
2. Map duly authenticated by Chief Wild life Warden showing the features (National Parks, Sanctuaries, Biosphere Reserves, Migratory Corridors of Wild Animals) vis-à-vis the project location and the recommendations or comments of the Chief Wildlife Warden (thereon at the stage of EC), for conducting quarrying activities in the said project site in proximity of the Thattekkad Sanctuary.
3. Certificate from Forest Department citing the coordinates of the proposal as to whether any forest land is involved in the present project.

Item No. 21.09 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Medical Trust Institute of Medical Sciences project in Sy. Nos. 188/2, 3, 5, 189/1, 2,3,4,5,6,190/1, 2,3,198/4, 199/2, 3,4,5,7, 200/5, 7, 12, 201/1, 2, 12, 202/24 at Thiruvankulam Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Pulikkal Medical Foundation (File No. 143/SEIAA/KL/2744/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee was doubtful as to whether the proposed project site falls in salt water wetland. But the proponent stated that originally the region was a tidal channel which later got converted to fresh water. Mangrove associates are the dominant vegetation seen in the area. Most of the area is reclaimed wetland. The Committee was of the opinion that the land has to be elevated more before initiating construction activities as chances of flooding are anticipated in the region. The Committee also suggested retaining soft landscaping for maintaining the aesthetic beauty and to avert subsequent issues. The Committee found that the site legally does not come under CRZ but half the width of Konathu Puzha (approximately 10 m) should be left on its either side as No Development Zone with no construction activities. The Committee found that regarding the proof of ownership of land the proponent has provided copies of sale deed. But in the same, all Sy. Nos. are given as jenmom land, whereas, in the certificate from Tahsildar, all Sy. Nos. except 202/24 and 200/12 are reported as 'nilam' in village records and as 'reclaimed land' in draft data bank prepared based on the Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008. Hence, to ascertain the nature of the land, the Committee sought copies of land tax receipt (recent) of all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal from the proponent. It was also found that the proponent has not provided the cadastral map of the project site in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed and is hence directed to provide the same.

The Committee asked whether the proponent has made provisions for post EC monitoring being a hospital project dealing with biomedical waste. To this end the proponent stated that a fully functional environmental monitoring cell shall be put in place as already assured. The Committee found that there is no open space or sufficient set back between the proposed building block and the approach road as the blocks are abutting the road which violates Rule 33(5) of existing KMBR as evident from the plan submitted by the proponent. Hence, the proponent is directed to provide the revised plan incorporating necessary modifications considering the above. The proponent was asked

regarding the width of the existing approach road. To this end the proponent stated that the present width of approach road is 9 m. The Committee also directed the proponent to maintain the hierarchy of road width uniformly throughout the project area.

The proponent has proposed to construct an elevated bridge / culvert for the connection of the two portions of the property as the branch of the thodu which is flowing within the site divides the property into different portions and appropriate culverting is required for connecting the parcels of land. The Committee asked whether the proponent has obtained necessary permissions from the concerned authorities for construction of the culverts. To this end the proponent stated that they have already obtained permission for construction of one culvert within the project site and permission shall be taken for constructing two more culverts.

The Committee found that since tidal influence is more in the area, saline intrusion is anticipated in the region during peak summer season. Hence, the proponent is directed to enhance the capacity of rain water harvesting, as their potential source of water is well. Another major concern of the Committee was regarding the location of the proposed disposal area of biomedical waste near the proposed well. The Committee directed the proponent to adopt proper measures to prevent any leaching into the well and nearby canal. The proponent is also directed to relocate the STP and solid waste processing area which is located very close to the nearby water body.

The Committee asked the proponent as to why they have selected the area for the construction of a medical college as the area is a tidal flat flood plain area and industrial area close to Cochin refinery with LPG, diesel plants (high chemical area) in its proximity. To this end the proponent stated that the project site is at a far distance from these areas.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for SITE VISIT for assessing the ground realities especially to ascertain the status of land as to whether it is a wetland and to assess the provisions made for waste management with respect to the project. The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that soft landscaping shall be adopted.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that half the width of Konathu Puzha (approximately 10 m) should be left on its either side as No Development Zone with green area and with no construction activities.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the hierarchy of road width shall be maintained uniformly throughout the project area.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that necessary statutory approvals shall be taken for the construction of culverts over the irrigation canal within the project site.
5. Copies of land tax receipt (recent) of all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.
6. Revised building plan leaving sufficient set back / open space between the proposed building block and the approach road.
7. Provisions to enhance the harvesting of rain water.
8. Provisions to prevent leaching of biomedical waste into the nearby well and canal.
9. Revised conceptual plan relocating the present STP and solid waste processing area located near the adjacent water body at present.
10. Cadastral map of the project site in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed.

Item No. 21.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the building stone quarry project in Survey No. 2442, at Koodaranhi Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by Thankachan M.S. (File No. 138/SEIAA/KL/2568/2013)**

The proponent was not allowed to make a presentation as it was found on prima-facie examination of the application itself that the ownership of the land by the proponent is not proved beyond doubt on the basis of any document. The only supporting document for ownership of land provided by the proponent is an affidavit (proposal page no. 159 and c.f.pg. no. 229) stating that the land bearing Sy. No. 2442, Koodaranhi Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District belongs to me (Thankachan M.S.). This is not acceptable as it is not supported by any land document (title deed or land tax receipt or possession certificate bearing the said survey no.). Further the proposal does not contain any proof of authorized signatory wherein the proponent has deliberately excluded the column of proof of authorized signatory from the checklist. *(In the checklist, serial no. of column no. 5 and 6 & 7 are seen handwritten wherein it can be assumed that the proponent was aware that one column is missing. The same consultant organization who has prepared the proposal for File No. 137 has clearly given all the serial numbers in that checklist. From this it is assumed that the proponent/consultant (File no. 138) has deliberately omitted the column of authorized signatory).*

Considering the above, the Committee decided to REJECT and DELIST the application directing the proponent to submit a fresh application enclosing all requisite documents for the appraisal by SEAC, if required.

Item No. 21.11 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 15/7, 15/15, 16/5, 16/2, 20/1, 19/1, 15/9 part, 21/5, 21/6 part, 16/4-1 and 16/4, at Thottapuzhassery Village, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Panachayil Industries (File No. 145/SEIAA/KL/2746/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $9^{\circ} 22' 26.12''$ N to $9^{\circ} 22' 36.75''$ N and $76^{\circ} 41' 31.71''$ E to $76^{\circ} 41' 41.58''$ E, and does not fall in ESZ-1. The major concern of the Committee with respect to this project was regarding the location of the project as it was found that the project site is encircling the property of another person which blocks his accessibility to the plot if quarrying activities are permitted in the present project site. Considering the same, the Committee was of the opinion that permission could not be granted to 30 per cent of the area for which Environmental Clearance is sought at present which in turn will incur a heavy loss to the proponent. The Committee reiterated that it is not at all feasible and legally standing for permitting quarrying activities in the said area, since if the incumbent approaches the court projecting his difficulty to survive in the midst of quarrying activities hampering his normal life, the proponent may not be able to conduct quarrying activities. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to obtain consent to conduct quarrying activities from the person owning the neighbouring plot of the project site.

The Committee found that the proponent has also not provided consent from P.A. Jacob and Binu K. Mathew to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by them which is included in the present proposal and is directed to provide the same. The proponent has also not provided the copy

of cadastral map duly certified by Village officer with survey numbers of the project specifically marked in it and is hence directed to provide the same.

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

1. Consent to conduct quarrying activities from the person owning the neighbouring plot of the project site.
2. Consent from P.A. Jacob and Binu K. Mathew to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by them which is included in the present proposal.
3. Copy of cadastral map duly certified by Village officer with survey numbers of the project specifically marked in it.

Item No. 21.12 **Application for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 35/2 pt., 35/3 and 41 pt. at Erimayur I Village, Erimayur Panchayath, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Sahara Granites (File No. 146/SEIAA/KL/2747/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 10⁰ 40' 16.59" N to 10⁰ 40' 32.74" N and 76⁰ 32' 59.37" E to 76⁰ 33' 16.22" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that content of declaration given by the proponent in Form 1 is different from that given in EIA Notification 2006 and directed the proponent to resubmit Form 1 in the format prescribed by MoEF and reminded the proponent/consultant that no one is empowered to change the format prescribed by MoEF unless and until any amendment in the same is effected. The proponent has stated that a low tension and high tension electrical line is existing up to the project site, without mentioning the actual distances from the same and hence decided to ascertain the same during field visit. Regarding the proof of ownership of land, the Committee noticed the following discrepancies and hence directed the proponent to address the same for further consideration of the proposal:

- (i) Copies of possession certificate for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal (Sy. No. 35/2 owned by the project proponent, Sy. No. 41 owned by M.S. Anilprasad & Dr. Bindu and Sy. No. 35/3 owned by Dr. Bindu) provided. (As per the Saakshyapathram provided by Village Officer Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal is seen as possessed by Melvin Francis and Jaise also (It is not clear from the saakshyapathram as to which Sy. No. is possessed by them) but the copies of possession certificates in their names for Sy. Nos. possessed by them is not provided).
- (ii) Consent from Melvin Francis given to M/s Sahara Granites to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 35/2 (stated as owned by him) provided.
- (iii) Consent from Jaise George given to M/s Sahara Granites to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 35/2 (stated as owned by him) provided.
- (iv) Consent from project proponent given to M/s Sahara Granites to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 35/2, 35/3 provided. (But as seen from possession certificate, Sy. No. 35/3 is not owned by him).
- (v) Consent from Bindu given to M/s Sahara Granites to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 35/3 provided. But consent to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 41, owned by her, not provided.
- (vi) Copies of sale deed for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal provided. It shows that Sivaprasad and the project proponent (along with Anilprasad) have right over Sy. No. 41

whereas as per possession certificate Sy. No. 41 is owned by M.S. Anilprasad & Dr. Bindu. This needs clarification.

- (vii) As per possession certificate, the project proponent owns only Sy. No. 35/2 whereas the partition deed at c.f. pg. no. 219, shows that he has right over Sy. No. 35/3.
- (viii) In the sale deed it is shown that Sy. No. 35/2 is given to Jaise George by Baby, Sivaprasad, Anil Prasad and project proponent.
- (ix) In the 'dhaanaadhaaram' it is shown that Sy. No. 35/3 and 41 is given to Bindu by the project proponent.
- (x) Copy of sale deed showing that Sy. No. 35/2 is owned by Melvin Francis is provided.

Considering the above, clarification is required regarding the present real owners of each Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal along with consents from the concerned, which has to be provided by the proponent.

The Committee also found that the proponent has provided copy of Cadastral map, but survey no. 41 is not marked in it and is hence directed to provide a cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer with all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal marked in it. The Committee found that the proponent has provided the details on CSR but the break up of CSR activities provided does not tally with the total figure of Rs. 6,25,000 set aside for the same. Hence, the proponent is directed to provide a detailed split up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with the amount earmarked for each activity and the details of the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended. The Committee also observed that the ultimate depth of the mine workings provided by the proponent is 75 m MSL and directed the proponent that the same shall not exceed 70 m MSL. The proponent is directed to provide assurance regarding the same.

Considering all the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the proximity of the site to low tension and high tension lines and also directing the proponent to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of their proposal:

1. Re-submit Form 1 in the format prescribed by MoEF.
2. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer with all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal marked in it.
3. Detailed split up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with the amount earmarked for each activity and the details of the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the ultimate depth of mining shall not exceed 70 m.

Item No. 21.13 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 111/3 pt, 110/8, 112/4, 111/4 pt., 111/5 pt., 113/2, 112/5, 112/1-1, 112/1-2, 112/8-1, 112/8-2, 112/8-3, 112/2 and 112/7 at Koodal Village, Kalanjoor Panchayat, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Aswathy Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 147/SEIAA/KL/2748/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $9^{\circ} 9' 10.23''$ N to $9^{\circ} 9' 26.32''$ N and $76^{\circ} 52' 2.91''$ E to $76^{\circ} 52' 21.86''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that Sy. No. 113/2 was government land now in possession of the proponent. Hence, the Committee asked the proponent whether they have obtained pattayam for

that Sy. No. and proof regarding the same thus need be submitted. The proponent has provided copy of Cadastral map but survey nos. 111/4 pt., 111/5 pt., 113/2, 112/5, 112/1-1, 112/1-2, 112/8-1, 112/8-2, 112/8-3, 112/2 and 112/7 of the project site are not marked in it and is hence directed to provide cadastral map duly signed by Village Officer marking all the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal, especially, 111/4 pt., 111/5 pt., 113/2, 112/5, 112/1-1, 112/1-2, 112/8-1, 112/8-2, 112/8-3, 112/2 and 112/7. The proponent has also not provided the detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also directed the proponent to leave a safe buffer distance of 100 m from the side of the nearby temple without conducting quarrying activities. The Committee also found that the approach road to the project site is not suitable for the transportation of hard rock and machinery and hence the proponent is directed to widen the same. The Committee also insisted the proponent to carry out eco-restoration activities in the already mined pit now in possession of the proponent.

Considering the above, it is stipulated that the proponent has to submit the following document to SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat for filing purposes:

1. Valid document to prove that the proponent has obtained pattayam for Sy. No. 113/2.
2. Cadastral map duly signed by Village Officer marking all the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal, especially, Sy. Nos. 111/4 pt., 111/5 pt., 113/2, 112/5, 112/1-1, 112/1-2, 112/8-1, 112/8-2, 112/8-3, 112/2 and 112/7.
3. Detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended.

The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance under the usual General Conditions for mining projects along with the following specific conditions:

1. A buffer zone of 100 m should be left from the side of the temple.
2. Approach road should be widened and hard surfaced for facilitating transport of hard rock and machinery.
3. Eco-restoration should be made in the already mined pit now in possession of the proponent.

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

Item No. 21.14 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 1457/1, 1461/1, 1462/1, 2, 1463/1,2 and 1465/1 at Madakkathara Village and Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. (File No. 91/SEIAA/KL/1051/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has not provided the following clarifications satisfactorily:

1. Regarding Proof of ownership of M/s Thrissur Granites and M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd., the proponent has provided notarized copy of Memorandum of Association & Articles of Association of M/s Thrissur Sand and Gravel Pvt. Ltd. with Joshua Kuruvilla, Aniyam Mathew, P.M. Yohannan and Jose John as Directors provided. But the names of the subscribers given at the end of the document are Jose John, Jessy George, George P. Mathew, John Varkey and John Jose, which is different from that given in the Articles of Association. Also, as stated by the

- proponent Mr. Jose John is the Managing Director and Mrs. Jessy George and Mr. John Jose are directors of M/s Thrissur Sand and Gravel Pvt. Ltd.. This needs clarification.
2. Original of the Memorandum of Association & Articles of Association of M/s Thrissur Sand and Gravel Pvt. Ltd. with all relevant annexure has to be submitted by the proponent for verification and return.
 3. Notarized copy of Memorandum & Articles of Association of M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. with Jose John, Suja Jose, Saleesh Kottungal Sreedharan and Shiji Saleesh as subscribers provided. But the names of the Directors as mentioned in the document are Saleesh Kottungal Sreedharan and Shiji Saleesh only. Also, as stated by the proponent Mr. Jose John is the Managing Director Suja Jose, Saleesh Kottungal Sreedharan and Shiji Saleesh are directors of M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. . This needs clarification.
 4. Original of the Memorandum of Association & Articles of Association of M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. with all relevant annexure has to be submitted by the proponent for verification and return.
 5. The proponent has provided details of total mineable area under his possession and its present status. *But it is stated that quarrying activity is in progress at M/s Thrissur Sand and Gravel Pvt. Ltd. and hence the proponent has to clarify as to whether Environmental Clearance is obtained for the ongoing activity.*

Hence the item is DEFERRED and it is further decided to issue notice to the proponent to submit the requisite documents, complete in all respects, within 15 days of receipt of the communication regarding the same, failing which the application shall be delisted.

Item No. 21.15 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee found that the proponent has satisfactorily provided all other additional clarifications except the following, as directed by SEAC.

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that fresh haulage lines shall be laid from an alternate side and the quarry shall be developed afresh abandoning the existing working face for the time being. Fresh plan has to be prepared and submitted with all details.
2. Since storm water with the silt from the quarry is let out without clarification, proper arrangement has to be provided for desilting and clarification of water and details regarding the same to be submitted to SEAC.
3. Outline of lease area superimposed on the cadastre to be provided. The entire land in possession of the proponent to be indicated along with the village boundary.

The Committee decided that the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA directing the proponent to provide it for filing purpose. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. Fresh haulage lines should be laid from an alternate side and the quarry should be developed afresh abandoning the existing face.
2. Storm water from the quarry should be let out after desilting and clarification.

3. Fresh steep cutting with 50 m height, in precariously poised condition is seen at the working face. The quarrying activity in this sector should be stopped and entry to this area should be avoided.

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

Item No. 21.16 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications as directed. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific condition in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. New haulage roads should be taken and top to bottom approach to be followed for further mining.
2. 100 m should be left from the Chaliyar river edge without conducting quarrying activities.
3. The existing level of the quarry should not be deepened further.
4. The workers should be provided with reasonable dwelling units and proper sanitation facilities including supply of safe drinking water.
5. The crusher unit should be installed with all the conditions stipulated by KSPCB.

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

Item No. 21.17 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The Committee found that the crusher unit and other facilities are located in Anavoor village. The cadastral map provided by the proponent does not cover Anavoor village. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the segment of Anavoor village map, with survey numbers in his possession.

1. The segment of Anavoor village map, with survey numbers in possession of the project proponent.

The Committee decided that the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA directing the proponent to provide it for filing purpose. The proposal is

RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. A 100 m No Development Zone should be left on either side of the nearby canal. It should be demarcated on the ground with pillars and fenced.
2. Storm water should be directed to the pond in existence before letting out.
3. Stipulations of KSPCB should be fully complied with for the crusher unit.
4. A buffer distance of 15 m should be left from the village boundary to the project site.
5. Retaining wall should be provided to the storage of overburden.
6. The approach road to the quarry is narrow and not hard top. It should be tarred.

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

Item No. 21.18 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for 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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications as directed. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific condition in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. A buffer distance of 10 m to be left by the side of the stream preserving the existing vegetation.
2. Check dams to be provided in the stream at places to arrest the flow and enhance water availability.

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

Item No. 21.19 **Simplified procedure for issuance of EC for mining of brick earth and ordinary earth (File No. SEIAA/E4/2225/2013)**

The Committee suggested some modifications in the format of tentative questionnaire in Malayalam regarding processing of applications for EC regarding mining of brick earth and ordinary earth and approved the same with modifications. It was decided to forward the modified format incorporating the suggestions to SEIAA for further necessary action.

Item No. 21.20 **Letter from Mr. A. S. Narayana Swami on the recommendations of SEAC on the subject 'Quarries to pay for Ecology restoration' (File No. DoECC/E3/2665/2013)**

Noted.

Item No. 21.21 **High Level Working Group Report on Western Ghats – O.M. No. 1-4/2012-RE(Pt.) dt. 19.10.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests**

Noted.

Item No. 21.22 **Any other item approved by Chair**

None.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.
