

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 22ND MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 7TH DECEMBER, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The twenty-second meeting of SEAC- Kerala was held on 7th December 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. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
3. Dr. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. V. Anitha - 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 found that many building/construction projects have obtained building permits from the concerned local bodies without prior Environmental Clearance (EC) and was apprehensive on the issuance of the same without insisting for prior Environmental Clearance. Hence the Committee felt the urgent need for a press release to be issued in this effect to create awareness among the stakeholders that obtaining Environmental Clearance is a prior requirement as per the EIA Notification 2006 of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.

SEAC was in receipt of a copy of the order issued by District Collector, Malappuram prohibiting sand mining activities from the river beds and coastal areas in Malappuram district without EC following the circular issued by the Department of Environment and Climate Change dt. 27.11.2013 based on the orders of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal dt. 5th and 14th August 2013. The

Committee also found the same situation in many districts of Kerala and hence reiterated that regarding Environmental Clearance, SEAC/SEIAA is authorized to follow only the guidelines issued by MoEF. As SEAC/SEIAA is the competent authority for recommending/issuing EC, the Committee also felt urgent need to assess the concerns of the stakeholders and to issue some clarifications in this regard that not only mining, but also all activities mentioned in the Schedule of the said notification require prior Environmental Clearance. The Committee also decided to follow the directions under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 issued by Ministry of Environment and Forests on 13.11.2013 and also to consider applications for Environmental Clearance in ESAs, received only before 17.04.2013 as per the said directions from MoEF.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 22.01 Confirmation of the minutes of the 21st SEAC meeting, held on 4th November 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

Item No. 22.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 21st SEAC meeting

Noted.

Item No. 22.03 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the Jatayupara Tourism Project in Sy. Nos. 126/6, 126/7, 126/8, 127/1, 129/1, 129/2, 131/1, 131/2, 131/3, 131/4, 132/11, 135/9, 136, 137/3, 139/4 and 139/24 at Chadayamangalam Village and Panchayath, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Guruchandrika Builders and Property Private Limited (File No. 151/SEIAA/KL/3071/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that in the covering letter of application, the name of applicant is given as Rajeev V. whereas in Form 1, the address for correspondence is given in the name of Rajiv Anchal. Also, in the Certificate of Incorporation, the name is given as Rajeev Vidyadharan. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a valid certificate to prove that Rajeev V., Rajiv Anchal and Rajeev Vidyadharan are one and the same person. The proponent has provided a conceptual plan without any legend and without specifying the parking area, green area and location for other proposed facilities like STP, solid waste storage, among others. The Committee found this as a major lapse from the part of the proponent and directed to provide a revised conceptual plan incorporating these details. The proponent has also not provided the landscape plan for the project indicating the location and species of plants (with the number of each species to be planted) proposed for green belt development and hence directed to provide the same. The proponent is also directed to provide the layout and building plan of the project as it is not provided in the application. The proponent has also not provided the cadastral map of the project site duly approved by concerned Village Officer and is hence directed to provide the same in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed. The Committee also found that the 500 metre radius map of the area from periphery of project site provided by the

proponent is not to scale and hence directed to provide a revised vicinity map to scale. The proponent has provided copy of G.O. dt. 16.02.2011 regarding the approval of Detailed Project Report and providing land to the private partner on lease for a period of 30 years regarding Jatayupara tourism project. As per the said order, 60 acres of land transferred to Tourism Department is provided to M/s Guruchandrika Builders and Property Private Limited on lease basis, for a period of 30 years for the completion and making the Jatayupara Tourism Project functional with certain conditions, including that the land shall be utilized only for the project as detailed in the Detailed Project Report. But the Committee found that this DPR is not submitted by the proponent and hence was difficult to ascertain whether the present proposal is in tune with the same. Another condition was that the project will be completed within a period of 12 months of the handing over of the land on lease, whereas the copy of land lease deed provided showed that it was executed on 26th November 2012. When clarification was sought regarding this, the proponent stated that handing over is the third stage in the agreement and the lease deed shall be executed within 12 months after handing over the entire property coming under the project. The proponent also stated that there was delay in handing over the property by Kottarakkara Thahsildar and 3 more regions coming under the agreement are yet to be handed over after which only the time limit of 12 months will commence.

The Committee found that the proponent has already undertaken some construction activities, the details of which are not provided in the application. The proponent stated that the construction for an area of 20,000 m² (including a 6D theatre and geological museum) is now proposed inside the Jadayu sculpture and that the existing capacity of 3096 m² will also be a part of the total built up area of 22,000 m². The proponent stated that three rain water harvesting units are proposed between the rocks. To this end the Committee directed the proponent to submit the technical feasibility study including the capacity, location and purpose of the proposed RWH units in the rock crevices. The Committee found that the rock in the region is being camouflaged by converting it to structures thereby disturbing the natural environment and hence suggested that the proponent should submit the details of the proposed supporting structures to be given to the rocks for its stability. At this juncture, the Committee stated that the proponent has provided only the concept of the project in the proposal without any technical details. **The Committee found that aerial ropeways are also included in the present project and as per EIA Notification 2006 and its subsequent amendments, all aerial ropeways require specific environmental clearance, and are mandatory and comes under Activity 7 (g) of the said notification. Aerial ropeway projects located at altitude of 1000 m and above and also located in notified ESAs, come under Category A projects whereas and all other aerial ropeway projects come under Category B.** Hence SEAC directed the proponent to file an affidavit mentioning the altitude of the proposed aerial rope way and whether the project site is located in notified Eco Sensitive Areas. However, the proponent is directed to provide the entire details of rope way proposed for the project. The Committee was of the opinion that if the present project including the aerial ropeway comes under Category B project, the proponent could submit a single application for both the construction and aerial ropeway together.

The Committee observed that some quantity of hard weathered rocks has to be removed for proceeding with construction activities for which some minor blasting has to be carried out. The proponent is directed to provide details of such processes. When asked about the source of power

for the project, the proponent stated that the power supply at present is ensured by diesel engines. The proponent has also not provided the authentic biodiversity listing of flora and fauna of the project site and is hence directed to provide the same authenticated by concerned experts. The Committee also sought details on the proposed commercial establishments to be set up as part of the project and insisted the proponent that being an archaeologically important place, no major commercial establishment should be set up in the upper regions disturbing the natural serenity and aesthetic beauty of the place. To this end the proponent stated that they have proposed Panchakarma Ayurveda Resort keeping in mind to maintain the serenity of the place. The use of plastics and non-vegetarian eateries will also be banned inside the project area. The proponent stated that the waste generated from the project shall be treated in STP. When asked about the source of water for the project, the proponent stated that a private pond is taken for rent to ensure continuous water supply for the project. But the proponent has not specifically stated the water requirements for the project and details regarding the quantity of water that could be utilized from the pond, depth of the pond, etc. The Committee sought specific details on the waste management and water supply system proposed for the project.

The Committee also found that there are paddy fields on the western side of the project site and asked the proponent as to whether the farm lands mentioned in the proposal is linked with these paddy fields. To this end the proponent stated that organic farming is proposed as a separate project to be implemented in co-operation with the owners of the paddy fields. The Committee sought details on the farm lands mentioned in the proposal. The Committee was of the opinion that since the project invites major tourism prospects along with a large floating population, the anticipated impacts on environment is more which has to be addressed. Hence the proponent is directed to provide details on the same with specific measures to address the impacts. The proponent has mentioned in the proposal that the e-waste would be sold to the approved vendor and that various types of electronic waste including PC if any shall be collected separately and stored in an identified room and will be disposed as per waste (management & handling) rules 2012. The Committee sought clarification from the proponent as to the quantity of e-waste generation expected for a tourism project and to provide the location of storage of e-waste. The Committee also sought specific proposal on traffic management with respect to the anticipated impacts of floating population during execution of the project. The proponent has not provided the GPS readings from four extreme boundaries of the project site and is directed to provide the same.

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

1. Valid certificate to prove that Rajeev V., Rajiv Anchal and Rajeev Vidyadharan are one and the same person.
2. Revised conceptual plan with legend and specifically locating parking area, green area and other proposed facilities like STP, solid waste storage, among others.
3. Landscape plan for the project indicating the location and species of plants (with the number of each species to be planted) proposed for green belt development.
4. Layout and building plan of the project.
5. Cadastral map of the project site duly approved by concerned Village Officer in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed.

6. Revised 500 metre radius map of the area from periphery of project site, to scale.
7. Copy of approved Detailed Project Report of Jadayupara Tourism Project.
8. Technical feasibility study including the capacity, location and purpose of the proposed RWH units in the rock crevices.
9. The details of the proposed supporting structures to be given to the rocks for its stability.
10. Affidavit filed by the proponent mentioning the altitude of the proposed aerial ropeway and whether the project site is located in notified Eco Sensitive Areas.
11. Entire details of rope way proposed for the project.
12. Details of processes including the blasting activities that has to be carried out to remove the hard weathered rocks for proceeding with construction activities.
13. Site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna authenticated by concerned expert.
14. Details on the proposed commercial establishments to be set up as part of the project.
15. Specific details on the waste management and water supply system proposed for the project.
16. Details on the water requirement of the project and the details of private pond (including the quantity of water that could be utilized from the pond, depth of the pond, etc.) taken for rent to ensure continuous water supply for the project.
17. Details on the farm lands mentioned in the proposal.
18. Details on the anticipated impacts of the project on environment and the suggested specific methods to address the same.
19. Clarification in writing as to the quantity of e-waste generation expected from the tourism project and proposed location of storage of e-waste.
20. Specific proposal on traffic management (including parking lay out) with respect to the anticipated impacts of floating population during execution of the project.
21. GPS readings from four extreme boundaries of the project site.

Over and above all, the following factual errors were noticed in the proposal and the proponent is directed to provide the necessary clarifications in writing on each point:

- (i) The water consumption during construction phase is for meeting the domestic requirement of the construction labourers (*10000 litres/day, as given in Form 1 and 1000 litres/day in Form 1A*) and for construction purposes (*5 KLD, as given in Form 1 and 5000 KLD in Form 1A*).
- (ii) The project has made provision for rain water storage tanks of total *25000 KL capacity (as given in Form 1A) and given as 2500 KL capacity (as given in Form 1A)*
- (iii) The domestic sewage of about *500 KL/day (as given in Form 1 and 500 litres/day in Form 1A)* generated will be treated through proposed STP to be developed within the project premises. *After ascertaining the total quantity of sewage generated as to 500 litres/day or 500 KLD only, it could be ensured whether 30 KLD STP is sufficient for treatment of the same.*
- (iv) During operation phase, solid waste generation will be about *50 kg/day (as given in Form 1 and 200 kg/day in Form 1A)*. *To be assessed whether only 4 kg of biogas is generated from a biogas generation plant of capacity 100 kg after ascertaining whether 50kg/day or 200 kg/day waste is generated from the proposed project.*
- (v) In Form 1 it is stated that this is a tourism project and no storage of hazardous chemicals (as per MSIHC Rules) will be done, apart from diesel storage for D.G. sets which will be operated only during emergency and suitable arrangement will be adopted for the same. The used oil from D.G. sets will be sold to the CPCB approved recyclers. In Form 1A it is stated that as per Hazardous Waste (Management and Handling Rules), 2003, the hazardous waste i.e., the used oil

from the D.G. sets, discarded oil filters and discarded batteries will be stored separately and will be disposed to C.P.C.B./ S.P.C.B. authorized vendors only.

Item No. 22.04 **Application for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry project in Sy. Nos. 29/2, 29/3 and 30/4 at Thekkada Village and in Sy. Nos. 470, 472/4-1 & 4-1, 474/1-1, 472/5, 472/6, 474/1 & 474/1-2 at Manikkal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Covenant Stones (P) Ltd. (File No. 132/SEIAA/KL/2440/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 8° 38' 53.3" N to 8° 39' 03. 5" N and 76° 57' 07.00" E to 76° 57' 19.2" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the original cadastre of the project site which is very essential for the evaluation of the project and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also noted that in the biodiversity listing provided by the proponent, white bellied sea eagle, the bird seen in the coastal areas, is also included and hence was of the opinion that considering the location of the project site it is either a wrong identification or the report is not an authentic one. Moreover, in the biodiversity listing of fauna, the vernacular names of some animals were given as Phasianidae, Meropidae, etc. which the Committee found as incorrect. Hence the proponent is directed to provide site specific biodiversity listing duly authenticated by concerned expert. The proponent has provided copy of land tax receipts for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal except Sy. No. 4-1 and is hence directed to provide the same. The Consultant was directed to submit the affidavit undertaking responsibility for the proposal in stamp paper, with details of the project including the Sy. Nos., name of the project proponent with firm, if any and location of the project, hereafter. The Committee also found that the proponent has not provided the detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project and the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended. The detailed split up of spending of Rs. 8 lakhs earmarked for Environmental Protective measures is also not provided by the proponent and is hence directed to provide specific details regarding the same.

The Committee also looked into the complaint received from R. Soman Nair, Treasurer, Thampuram-Thampurattipara & Muthipara Samrakshana Samithi alleging the illegal quarrying activities being conducted by the proponent in the land bearing Sy. Nos. 470, 472/4-1, 472/5-6, 474/1, 474/1-1 and 474/1/2 and the associated environmental issues regarding that and also requesting to initiate necessary action against the proponent to stop quarrying rock and crusher activities immediately. The Committee found that the said survey numbers are included in the present application submitted by the proponent and hence clarification in writing was sought from the proponent regarding two major points raised in the complaint - one stating that the project area is ecologically fragile and the other stating that the project will destroy the progress of proposed tourism project of government, the Thampurampara Ecotourism cum trekking circuit.

Further, from the geological map sections showing the material extraction submitted by the proponent, the Committee was apprehensive of the present proposal to mine the area in patches without extracting the entire reserves in the area. To this end the proponent stated that when the

Department of Mining and Geology made a field reconnaissance for issuing quarrying lease, they have marked leases only where the reserves are located. The Committee was not convinced of the explanation given by the proponent and was of the opinion that considering sustainable development, maximum extraction of resources is permissible with minimum adverse impact on the environment whereas the present proposal involving mining in patches cannot be permitted as there is maximum disturbance to the environment for minimum extraction of resources. Considering this, the Committee directed the proponent to rework the production plan and resubmit the application addressing the shortcomings in the present application and informed the proponent that the present proposal is **REJECTED AND DELISTED**. The proponent is directed to apply afresh provide the following also in the new proposal:

1. Original cadastre of the project site.
2. Site specific biodiversity listing duly authenticated by concerned expert.
3. Clarification in writing as to whether the project site falls in ecologically fragile area and the proximity of project site to the proposed tourism project of government, the Thampuranpara Ecotourism cum trekking circuit. The points raised in the complaint lodged by Thampuran- Thampurattipara & Muthipara Samrakshana Samithi should be specifically addressed.
4. Revised production plan.
5. Copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No. 4-1.
6. Affidavit from the Environmental Consultant undertaking responsibility for the proposal in stamp paper, with details of the project including the Sy. Nos., name of the project proponent with firm, if any, and location of the project.
7. The detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project and the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended and the detailed split up of spending of Rs. 8 lakhs earmarked for Environmental Protective measures.

The Committee also noticed the following discrepancies/contradictions/shortcomings in the proposal submitted by the proponent and hence directed the proponent to avoid such contradictions in future:

- (i) The ultimate depth of mining is given as RL 95 to RL 05 (90 m from hill top level) and is not given in MSL.
- (ii) Copy of Articles of Association and Memorandum of Association of M/s Logistic Distribution System of India Pvt. Ltd. provided wherein it is stated that Noble John & K.J. Samuel are the first Directors of the company. But in the land tax receipt it is given that Richa Sabu Joseph is the Director of the firm. This needs clarification as to who all are the present Directors of the company.
- (iii) GPS reading of longitude shown in Google image dt. 21.01.2012 does not fall within the GPS readings of project site given in pre-feasibility report.
- (iv) The affidavit provided by the proponent regarding the ownership of land bearing Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal is against the facts as it is stated in the affidavit that the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belongs to the company, whereas it is owned by other persons also.
- (v) The consent submitted by the proponent allowing him to conduct quarrying activities in the land owned by other persons lacks clarity as it is not clear as for which all Sy. Nos. consent has been given.

- (vi) It is stated in col. 1.15 of Form 1 that ‘there is no liquid effluent’, while it is stated in checklist that ‘liquid wastes from toilet and office will be treated in septic tank and soak pit’.
- (vii) In the basic information provided by the proponent it is stated that Sekkonathumala reserve forest is about 7.2 km NE from the quarry lease boundary site, which is against the facts.
- (viii) It is also stated by the proponent that the access road width is maintained minimum 7 m for convenient and easy movement. But during final stage and retreating stage it will be kept only 5 m. The proponent is directed to provide the rationale for the same.

Item No. 22.05 **Application for environmental clearance for the Housing project in Sy. Nos. 92/8-3, 92/8-1 and 92/8-2 at Karumalloor Village and Panchayath, N. Paravoor Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s The Federal House Construction Co-operative Society Ltd. No. E-962 (File No. 148/SEIAA/KL/2938/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. Regarding proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has submitted the resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s The Federal House Construction Co-operative Society Ltd. No. E-962 authorizing George P. Mathai, Secretary of the Society. But the proponent has not submitted any valid document to prove that those who have signed the resolution are authorized to do so. Hence the proponent agreed to produce relevant document regarding the elected members of the Board of Directors of the said Society. The Committee found that as per the bore hole data provided, hard layer of rock is seen above the water table located at a depth of 0.5 to 0.75 m and hence while digging the same, the ground water regime may be affected. Considering this, the proponent is directed that the basement level of the lower floor should not be below the local summer water table. Since the maximum height of the proposed building is 53.10 m, the proponent is directed to restrict the height as per the specifications of Airports Authority of India. The proponent is also directed to separately earmark the width of the drive way around the towers with a minimum width of 7 m. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the detailed break up of the amount set aside towards CSR and the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended. But it was found that in the proforma duly signed by the proponent, certain commitments under CSR are made.

Considering the above, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for non-mining projects:

1. Height of the buildings should be restricted as per AAI specifications.
2. Width of the drive way around the towers should be separately earmarked and should have a minimum width of 7 m.
3. The basement level of the lower floor should not be below the local summer water table.

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

Item No. 22.06**Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Dewa Pier20 project in Sy. No. 843 at Ernakulam Village, Cochin Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 149/SEIAA/KL/2940/2013)**

The Committee found that, as proof of authorized signatory the proponent has provided resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. authorizing Mr. Sreedharan Nair of M/s Sagar Electricals to make necessary applications to statutory authorities including SEIAA in respect of the project and to do all other acts, deeds and things that may be necessary in this regard. The Committee stated that it is not acceptable as the authorized signatory of the project as given in Form 1 is Mr. K. Venugopalan Nair. It was also found that the names of Directors who has signed the resolution and in the Certificate of Incorporation of the firm differ. Hence it was decided that the proponent shall not be allowed to make a presentation before the Committee in the absence of the authorized signatory of the project.

It was also found that the land for the proposed project is a reclaimed land and was part of Vembanad backwaters and reclaimed by Cochin Port Trust under Goshree Island Development Authority (GIDA) scheme. The land for the project which was part of 25 hectares of reclaimed land was purchased on 27.03.2006 from GIDA under the Vypeen Bridges scheme project of GIDA by M/s Ansu Enterprises through auction. The proponent has provided possession certificate and land tax receipts in favour of M/s Ansu Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. and notarized copy of sale deed and notarized copy of joint development agreement between M/s Ansu Enterprises and M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. Verifying the same, the Committee was doubtful as to whether one of the parties alone can be the authorized signatory of the project when there exist a joint development agreement between two parties. The Committee was also doubtful whether M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. could develop a land owned by M/s Ansu Enterprises and was apprehensive as to who shall undertake the responsibility of the project. The proponent has stated that though the project is being developed by M/s Ansu Enterprises and M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. jointly, it was decided between them to take all statutory approvals in the name of M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. But the proponent has not provided the notarized copy of the resolution by both the companies regarding the same and the Committee wanted to ascertain whether such an agreement is valid in this case.

The Committee also found from the photographs provided with the application that the proponent had already started construction, which is a clear case of violation of EIA Notification 2006. The proponent stated that construction was started about 18-21 months back after obtaining building permit in 2011 (in the name of Mr. K. Venugopalan Nair for M/s Dewa Projects (Pvt.) Ltd.) and that the structural construction work of three towers was in progress but the construction activities is being stopped at present. The Committee stated that the explanation is not justifiable as the EIA Notification for prior environmental clearance was in effect from September 2006. Hence the Committee decided to issue show cause notice to the proponent as to why violation proceedings should not be initiated against them and directed to file an affidavit stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated. The Committee also found that the longitude readings in the google image dt. 05.10.2012 provided in the application does not fall within the GPS readings provided by the

proponent in checklist and is hence directed to provide the correct GPS readings of the project site in writing.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the extent of violation carried out by the proponent, to assess the legality of the authorized signatory for the project (as to whether M/s Ansu Enterprises or M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd. or both has to submit the application) and to consider the proposal on receipt of the reply from the proponent on the show cause notice. The proponent is also directed to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated.
2. The correct GPS readings of the project site in writing.
3. Cadastral map of the proposed area duly signed by Village Officer.
4. Cadastral map in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed.
5. Notarized copy of building permit issued by Kochi Municipal Corporation on 09.05.2011 for a total plinth area of 1,43,845.14 m² provided but the total built up area of the project is also 1,43,845.14 m². Clarification in writing regarding this.
6. Detailed breakup of the amount set aside towards CSR linked with the present project and the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Item No. 22.07 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 13/2, 13 pt., 11/3-1, 11/3, 11/1, 11/1-1-1-1, 11/1-1-1, 11/1-1, 11/2, 12/2-11, 12/2, 12/1 and 11/1-1-1-2 at Edakunnam Village, Parathodu Panchayath, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala by M/s Excel Granites (File No. 150/SEIAA/KL/2973/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 9⁰ 35' 16.61" N to 9⁰ 35' 29.51" N and 76⁰ 48' 41.08" E to 76⁰ 48' 50.38" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided consent from owners of other Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal other than that owned by him but consent from Shaji K.A, S/o Seythu Mohammed to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 13/2 submitted by the proponent needs clarification since as per possession certificate, the said Sy. No. is owned by Shajimon, S/o Ismail. Hence the proponent is directed to provide valid proof regarding the real owner of Sy. No. 13/2 and his consent given to the proponent to conduct quarrying activities in the said survey number. The Committee also found that regarding the proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided affidavit declaring that he is the sole proprietor of M/s Excel Granites, but the proponent has not provided the Certificate of Incorporation of the firm to prove that he is the sole proprietor of the firm and is hence directed to provide the same. 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. Being an existing quarry, the Committee also wanted to ascertain the present working condition of the quarry.

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

1. Valid proof regarding the real owner of Sy. No. 13/2 and his consent given to the proponent to conduct quarrying activities in the said survey number.
2. Copy of Certificate of Incorporation of M/s Excel Granites.
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.

Item No. 22.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed mining project in Sy. Nos. 229/1, 229/13, 229/9, 229/9-1, 234/10, 234/11, 234/3, 234/4, 234/5, 234/6, 234/8-2, 234/9-1, 238/12, 238/13-2, 238/16-2, 238/17-2, 240/10, 240/11, 240/7, 240/7-1, 240/7-2, 240/8, 240/9, 241/10, 241/1-1, 241/1-2, 241/12-16, 241/12-17, 241/12-2, 241/13-1, 241/18, 241/2, 241/4, 241/5, 241/6, 241/7, 241/8, 241/8-1, 241/9-1, 242/1, 242/2, 242/4-2, 242/4-3, 242/5, 242/6, 242/7, 242/8, 245/4, 245/5, 245/6, 245/6-1, 245/6-2, 245/6-3 and 245/6-4 at Aruvikkara Village and Panchayath, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. (File No. 152/SEIAA/KL/3072/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $8^{\circ} 33' 31.14''$ N to $8^{\circ} 33' 45.66''$ N and $77^{\circ} 01' 06.97''$ E to $77^{\circ} 01' 27.40''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee asked the proponent why they have not included the site of existing quarry in the present application. To this end the proponent stated that the present activities are going on in Government land, the lease of which expires on December 2013 and they do not want to continue mining activities in the said land and is not seeking for the extension of the lease in the said area. Hence SEAC directed the proponent to file an affidavit stating that they shall not mine the rest of the area where mining activities are going on at present any further in future, with reasons for the same. The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided the minutes of extra ordinary general meeting of the members of M/s Winharvest Plantations & Farms Pvt. Ltd., M/s Puredrops Plantations & Farms Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Aruvikkara Plantations & Farms Pvt. Ltd. approving the transfer of landed property in the name of the said respective firms for lease to M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. as proof of ownership of land, it is stated in the minutes that the lease is for starting a crusher unit and run related business activities the Committee stated that it cannot be considered as the consent from the owner to conduct quarrying activities in the Sy. Nos. owned by them. The proponent has not provided consent from M.A. Sakkir Hussain for M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. 240/8, 240/9 and 241/7 and consent from Aneesse K.B. for M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. 229/13, 229/9, 229/9-1, 234/10, 234/11, 234/3, 234/4, 234/5, 234/9-1, 241/5, 241/12-16, 245/4, 245/5, 245/6, 245/6-3 and 245/6-4. Hence the proponent is directed to submit valid consent from owners of concerned survey numbers mentioned in the proposal for conducting quarrying activities in concerned survey numbers owned by them. The proponent is also directed to provide copies of possession certificate of Sy. Nos. 234/8-2 and 241/13-1, as it was not provided with the application. The Committee found that instead of Sy. Nos. 234/8-2 and 241/13-1 (both Sy. Nos. owned by Mr. Anessee as seen from Sale

deed) in the proposal, the possession certificate shows Sy. Nos. 234/8 and 241/13 respectively, and hence sought clarification in writing from the proponent regarding this. It was also found that even though the proponent has provided copy of cadastral map, it is not duly signed by Village Officer and Sy. No. 238 of project site is not marked in it. So the proponent is directed to provide cadastral map duly signed by concerned Village Officer marking all the Survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. Regarding the proposed activities in CSR, the proponent has given details of already done activities. 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 proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR. The Committee pointed out that the employment potential of different projects with different outputs varies, which is not reflected in the data provided by the proponent as it is given as 12 in almost all projects submitted by the same consultant. Both the consultant and proponent are warned to look into it in future.

The Committee observed that some areas of the project site is having thick overburden, and hence directed the proponent to exclude such areas from mining and to file an affidavit to that effect. Moreover, the proponent is directed to make provisions to clarify the storm water and to resubmit the storm water management plan. The proponent is also directed to provide the toposheet 58H/2 to ascertain the cultural and natural features of the project site and adjoining areas.

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

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit stating that mining shall not be done in the rest of the area any further in future where mining activities are going on at present, with reasons for the same.
2. Valid consent given to the project proponent from owners of concerned survey numbers mentioned in the proposal for conducting quarrying activities in concerned survey numbers owned by them.
3. Copies of possession certificate of Sy. Nos. 234/8-2 and 241/13-1.
4. Instead of Sy. Nos. 234/8-2 and 241/13-1 in the proposal, (both Sy. Nos. owned by Mr. Anessee as seen from Sale deed) the possession certificate shows Sy. Nos. 234/8 and 241/13 respectively. Clarification in writing regarding this.
5. Cadastral map duly signed by concerned Village Officer marking all the Survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.
6. 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.
7. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.
8. Assurance in the form of affidavit that mining activities shall be excluded in areas of the project site having thick overburden.
9. Revised storm water management plan incorporating provisions to clarify storm water.
10. Toposheet No. 58H/2

Item No. 22.09

Application for environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690, 691, 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p at Desamangalam Village and Panchayath, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s B.P. Associates (File No. 153/SEIAA/KL/3073/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 10⁰ 44' 58.41" N to 10⁰ 45' 11.89" N and 76⁰ 13' 31.72" E to 76⁰ 13' 45.68" E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee pointed out that the employment potential of different projects with different outputs varies, which is not reflected in the data provided by the proponent as it is given as 12 in almost all projects submitted by the same consultant. Both the consultant and proponent are warned to look into it in future. To this end the proponent stated that in the present application, the data of employment potential given as 12 is true as the distance between the mining area from where the materials are transported and the crusher unit to which the material is transported is less since both the mining area and crusher unit are located within the project site. However, the Committee suggested providing the rationale in such cases in future, if any and to mention at least the names of the mining engineer, blaster and other technical persons related with the project. The Committee noted that some endemic species are present in the project site as per the biodiversity listing provided by the proponent. Hence the proponent is directed to provide an assurance in the form of affidavit that the endemic species in the project site shall be preserved. The Committee observed that mining in a part of Sy. No. 684 is proposed, whereas the same is not mentioned in the proposal and hence directed the proponent to demarcate the proposed mining area coming under Sy. No. 684 in the area survey plan and also to provide in writing the actual survey numbers (indicating 'part' wherever applicable) included in the present proposal where quarrying is proposed. The proponent has provided Area survey plan for Sy. Nos. 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p and not for other Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal and is hence directed to provide the same demarcating the exact boundaries of the project site marking all the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. The proponent is directed to follow the bench system for mining as already unscientific mining is going on without bench formation. The proponent stated that the bench system is proposed for this project and the eco-restoration of 50 hectares is already done. The Committee also found that there is a dam like structure on the southern side of the project site and wanted to ascertain during site visit whether the storm water is directed to drain into this. The proponent has stated in Col. 1.8 of Form 1 that the proposed project activity involves about 89 % of the pit area for exploring building stone whereas in Col. 1.10 of Form 1, it was stated that the proposed project activity involves about 96 % of the pit area. The proponent stated that it was a typographical error on their part and the proposed project activity involves about 96 % of the pit area.

Regarding the proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided copies of possession certificate for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal. But in the same, the Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690 and 691 are stated to be owned by Peter and others, while the names of 'others' are not provided. Moreover, the consent given by Peter is not for conducting quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by him and others but to obtain permission from MoEF and in the consent, all Sy. Nos. are not included. Also, the consent is given only by Peter for Sy. Nos. owned by him and 'others' as seen in possession certificate. As per sale deed, Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690 and 691 are

owned by Baby, Binsu, Peter and Jose. Hence the proponent is directed to submit consent from all the other three owners (excluding the project proponent) of the said Sy. Nos. for conducting quarrying activities. Also, it is not clear as to whether 'Peter' refers to Mr. Peter M. Puravath, the project proponent. Hence the proponent is directed to provide valid proof that Peter, as given in possession certificate and Mr. Peter M. Puravath, the authorized signatory of the project are one and the same person. The proponent has provided consent from V. Jayadas and Vasudevan given to him for conducting quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p owned by them. But as per sale deed provided by the proponent, Sy. Nos. 687 p, 688 p, 689p, 690p and 700p are owned by V. Krishnadas, V. Jayadas and V. Vasudevan. As per another copy of sale deed provided by the proponent, Sy. Nos. 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p are owned solely by Vasudevan whereas in possession certificate those Sy. Nos. are also owned by V. Jayadas. Also consent has been given by these 2 persons. Hence the proponent is directed to provide affidavit regarding the present real owners of Sy. Nos. 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p and, consent from Krishnadas, to conduct quarrying activities if he also owns the said survey numbers. The Committee found that even though the proponent has provided the cadastral map of the project site, the Sy. Nos. of project site was not marked in it and is hence directed to provide a cadastral map marking all the survey numbers included in the present project. Regarding the proposed activities in CSR, the proponent has given details of already done activities. 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 proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for SITE VISIT especially for assessing the provisions made for storm water management of 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 the endemic species in the project site shall be preserved.
2. Demarcate the proposed mining area coming under Sy. No. 684 in the area survey plan and also to provide in writing the actual survey numbers (indicating 'part' wherever applicable) included in the present proposal where quarrying is proposed.
3. Area survey plan demarcating the exact boundaries of the project site marking all the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.
4. Valid proof that Peter, as given in possession certificate and Mr. Peter M. Puravath, the authorized signatory of the project are one and the same person.
5. Consent from all the other three owners (excluding the project proponent) of the Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690 and 691 for conducting quarrying activities.
6. Affidavit regarding the present real owners of Sy. Nos. 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p and, consent from Krishnadas to conduct quarrying activities in the said survey numbers, if he also owns it.
7. Cadastral map marking all the survey numbers included in the present project.
8. 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.
9. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Item No. 22.10

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)

Mr. P.T. Subash and Mr. Abdul Salam attended the meeting representing M/s Al Abeer Educity to provide necessary clarifications to the Committee regarding the project. When asked whether the project falls in ESZ-1, it was stated that the project site does not fall in ESZ-1 and hence the proponent is directed to provide the same in writing. The Committee found that the proponent has not left the sufficient set back between the road and the building block and the same was confirmed with the architect of the project, Mr. P.T. Subash, who attended the meeting. Hence the proponent is directed to file an affidavit stating that sufficient set back distance shall be left between the road and each building block as per rule 77(5) of existing KPBR. The Committee found that the maximum height of building is given as 29.10 m in hard copy of power point presentation and 29.85 m in the redrafted proposal. Hence the proponent is directed to provide clarification in writing regarding the maximum height of the building with respect to the project. The proponent has also stated in hard copy of power point presentation that the total power requirement is 3 MVA whereas it is given in redrafted proposal that the total connected load for the project of 1800 KVA will be sought from KSEB for electricity. In pg. 16 of redrafted proposal, the power requirement is given as 2000 KVA and in page 23 of redrafted proposal, the total connected load for the project is given as 2000 KVA. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to clarify the same in writing. SEAC approved the EIA report submitted by the proponent which was conducted on the basis of TOR prepared following the guidelines approved by MoEF for area development schemes. The Committee found that the proponent has 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. It was suggested to extend the privilege of CSR activities by providing free dialysis to people belonging to BPL categories.

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and found that the following, which were sought earlier, were not submitted by the proponent complete in all respects, and hence was not able to arrive at a final conclusion:

1. Form 1, complete in all respects
2. Clarification in writing regarding the maximum height of the building and total power requirement with respect to the project.
3. Copies of land tax receipt and sale deed for Sy. Nos.145/2B.
4. 500 m vicinity map (to scale) of the site and surroundings clearly marking the nearby facilities specifically indicating distances.

5. GPS readings from the four extreme boundaries of the project site including the northern and eastern boundary.
6. Declaration in writing by the proponent as to whether the project site comes in ESZ-1.
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit (*specifically indicating the name and location of the project with survey numbers*) that the region between the flat topped crestal portion and valley shall be left as green belt without doing any construction activities.
8. Strategies developed to ensure facilitating rapid movement of vehicles along the winding segments including widening of approach road from Melmuri.
9. The mechanism of disposal of different kinds of waste, specifically biomedical waste, denoting specific plans and sites earmarked for the same.
10. Affidavit stating that sufficient set back distance shall be left between the road and each building block as per rule 77(5) of existing KPBR.
11. Detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended.
12. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

All other clarifications, except the above, provided by the proponent were found to be satisfactory.

Considering the above, the Committee agreed in principle to RECOMMEND the proposal after SATISFACTORY RECEIPT OF ABOVE DOCUMENTS and verification by SEAC.

Item No. 22.11 **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 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 conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. A safe buffer distance of 100 m to be provided from the house seen within 100 m from the boundary of site.
2. The steep dangerous cliffs of the abandoned quarries has to be provided with fences and danger warning sign boards.
3. Ultimate depth of quarrying to be limited to the stream bed level near the workers quarters at northern side.
4. Overburden and top soil to be used for reclamation of abandoned pits.

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

No. 22.12

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 91/1-7, 91/1-3, 91/1-4 and 91/1-2 at Enanalloor Village, Ayavana Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 154/SEIAA/KL/3074/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $9^{\circ} 59' 12.22''$ N to $9^{\circ} 59' 21.50''$ N and $76^{\circ} 37' 06.07''$ E to $76^{\circ} 37' 20.43''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The proponent has stated that the nearby settlement is at a distance of 108 m SW of the project site and the nearest quarry is at 25 m, but the Committee decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The existing quarry is in a steep cliff and steep cuttings are made for extracting the building stone. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to follow the bench system. Regarding proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd. authorizing Mr. M.A. Mathai, Managing Director of the firm. But all the 5 signatories of the firm (as seen in the Certificate of Incorporation of M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd.) have not signed the resolution and hence the proponent is directed to address the same. The Committee also found that the proponent has not provided the detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project and the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the same.

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

1. Valid resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd. authorizing Mr. M.A. Mathai, Managing Director of the firm, signed by all the 5 signatories of the firm, as proof of authorized signatory.
2. The detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project and the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended.

Item No. 22.13

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 515/3, 517/1, 532/2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 19, 20, 22 and 30 at Vellarada Village and Panchayath, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Blue Mount Sands & Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 156/SEIAA/KL/3247/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within $8^{\circ} 27' 48.01''$ N to $8^{\circ} 27' 50.33''$ N and $77^{\circ} 12' 32.15''$ E to $77^{\circ} 12' 38.22''$ E and does not fall in ESZ-1. The Committee was doubtful that as per the map given by the proponent, Block 34 falls in Amburi Village and decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The Committee also found that the proponent has stated in the proposal that the width of approach road to the quarry site is 8 m whereas in the application given to the Chief Town Planner the width is given as 5.3 m and hence decided to assess the same during site visit. As per WGEEP classification, the project site is located within protected area and, communication from Divisional Forest Officer, Trivandrum

regarding the same is submitted by the proponent, except for Sy. No. 532/20, stating that the area is not Reserve Forest or EFL boundaries. Hence the proponent is directed to provide certificate from Forest Department as to whether the said Survey no. comes under Reserve Forest and/or EFL areas. The Committee found that the GPS readings of latitude in the google image provided by the proponent does not fall within the co-ordinates given in Form 1 and is hence directed to provide the recent google image marking the exact boundaries of the project site. Regarding proof of ownership of land the proponent has provided copies of land tax receipts and possession certificate for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal in the name of Joy K. Mani, for M/s Blue Mount Sands & Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. But the proponent has not provided consent from Joy K. Mani to conduct quarrying activities stating that he has resigned from the Directorship of the firm. However, the Committee directed the proponent to submit the same. The proponent has also not provided the cadastral map of the project site duly signed by Village Officer with all survey numbers of the project marked in it and the area survey plan of the project site in which the boundary of the project area is specifically marked and is hence directed to provide the same. The proponent has 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 proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR. The Committee also felt that the project site is less than 0.5 km near the Tamilnadu border and the terrain is steeply sloping and unsuitable for quarrying activities as landslide is anticipated in the region. It was decided to ascertain during site visit.

Considering all the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess whether the project site falls in Amburi Village or Vellarada Village, the width of approach road, the proximity of project site to Tamilnadu border and the topography of the land as to whether it is suitable for quarrying activities, and also directing the proponent to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

- 1.Consent from Joy K. Mani to conduct quarrying activities in Survey numbers owned by him.
- 2.Cadastral map of the project site duly signed by Village Officer with all survey numbers of the project marked in it.
- 3.Certificate from Forest Department as to whether Survey no. 532/20 comes under Reserve Forest and/or EFL areas.
- 4.Area survey plan of the project site in which the boundary of the project area is specifically marked.
- 5.Recent google image marking the exact boundaries of the project site.
- 6.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.
- 7.Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Item No. 22.14 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the building stone quarry project in Sy. Nos. 45/1, 45/2, 45/4, 46/1, 46/2, 44/1, 45/3 and 35 at Koodal Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Pyramid Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 155/SEIAA/KL/3075/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proposed project site falls within 9° 9' 32.91" N to 9° 9' 45.36" N and 76° 52' 49.61" E to 76° 53' 01.20" E and does not

fall in ESZ-1. The Committee found that the existing survey numbers of the present proposal and the map provided by the proponent do not tally and hence directed the proponent to provide exact cadastral map of the project site specifically marking the survey numbers included in the present proposal. It is stated in the questionnaire provided by the proponent that there is a forest on either side of the lease at 210 m away from the lease area, but the same is not mentioned in the 'Environmental Sensitivity' section of Form 1. To this end the proponent stated that there is no forest near the lease area but there are teak plantations. As per the map given by the proponent, the eastern boundary is forest which is 210 m away from the lease area. The Committee found that the forest land is separated by junda presently with teak plantations. Even if it is teak plantation, it is a forest area and the proponent has a common forest boundary within the lease area. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to leave a buffer distance from the forest boundary without conducting mining activities. The proponent has stated that the total extent of the quarry lease is 5.1125 hectares in which, part of the area is an existing quarry lease and hence some part of the area is covered by pits. When the Committee asked the proponent as to why they have not initiated any eco-restoration works in the existing pits before going further for mining activities in the area, the proponent stated that quarrying had already been undertaken in Sy. Nos. 35 and 45 that are Government land, before they purchased the land. SEAC sought valid documentary evidence from the proponent to prove that mining activities were conducted by the person who owned the said survey numbers earlier, well before the proponent purchased the land. The proponent has also not provided any proof for inclusion of Sy. Nos. 44/1, 45/3 and 35 in the present proposal which are stated as Government land. Hence the proponent is directed to submit at least their request sent to the concerned Collectorate for applying quarrying lease in those Sy. Nos. owned by the Government. The proponent has also stated that the access road width is maintained minimum 7 m for easy movement. But during and retreating stage it will be kept only 5 m. The Committee directed the proponent to provide rationale for the same. It is stated in Form 1 that the water is met through open well which belongs to the company whereas in questionnaire it is stated that the drinking water for the domestic consumption at the quarry is met by bore well/open well that exist outside the quarry area belongs to the proponent. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the exact details of source of water for the project.

The Committee was apprehensive about a settlement located at a distance of 75 m from the mine lease area. To this end the proponent stated that the said settlement is now under their possession. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to submit an assurance in the form of affidavit declaring the same. The Committee found that the proponent has not submitted the geological sections /drawings perpendicular to the contour and is hence found it difficult for assessment. The proponent is therefore directed to provide longitudinal geological section which is drawn perpendicular to the contour. It was also found that as per the present provision the storm water is drained to the nearby forest without clarification. The Committee stated that it is not permissible and hence the proponent is directed to submit a revised storm water management plan specifically incorporating the details of location of storm water drain. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the detailed break up of the amount set aside towards CSR and the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended and is directed to provide the same, including the details of proposed scholarships as stated by the proponent before the Committee. The

proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

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

1. Exact cadastral map of the project site specifically marking the survey numbers included in the present proposal.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a buffer distance as specified by SEIAA shall be left from the forest boundary without conducting mining activities.
3. Valid documentary evidence to prove that mining activities were conducted by the person who owned the survey numbers 35 and 45 earlier, well before the proponent purchased the land.
4. It is stated that the access road width is maintained minimum 7 m for easy movement. But during and retreating stage it will be kept only 5 m. Rationale for the same has to be provided.
5. The copy of request sent by the proponent to the concerned Collectorate for applying quarrying lease in Sy. Nos. 44/1, 45/3 and 35 stated as Government land in the proposal, as proof for inclusion of Government land in the present project.
6. Exact details of source of water for the project.
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the settlement located at a distance of 75 m from the mine lease area is now under the possession of the project proponent.
8. Longitudinal geological section drawn perpendicular to the contour.
9. Revised storm water management plan specifically incorporating the details of location of storm water drain.
10. The detailed break up of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project, including the details of proposed scholarships as stated by the proponent before the Committee, and the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended.
11. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Item No. 22.15 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 1251/2 pt., 3 pt., 11 pt., 1250/3/2 pt., 3 pt., 1233/3, 1255/1, 2, 3, 4 at Kadangode Village and Panchayath, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s ABA Industries (File No. 117/SEIAA/KL/2183/2013)**

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 conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. Ultimate depth of the quarry should not be lower than the stream bed seen to the west.
2. Storm water to be managed properly by providing drains and siltation tanks before being let out.

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

Item No. 22.16 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 79/1-127, 79/1-128, 79/1-129, 79/1-130, 79/1-131 and 79/1-132 at Manjallor Village and Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s St. Mary's Aggregates (File No. 118/SEIAA/KL/2184/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications except the submission of Field Measurement Plan (FMP) stating that it is not available as the resurvey of the area has not carried out. But the Committee was of the opinion that for further evaluation of the project, the proponent has to either submit the Field Measurement Plan (FMP) or a map marking the exact distance of the project site from the survey boundary pillars precisely defining the proposed mining area. Considering this, the item is DEFERRED seeking satisfactory receipt of the above document from the proponent for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 22.17 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications as directed. From the documents submitted by the proponent it is ascertained that the project site is located in Block 4 of Cherukavu Village and Panchayath, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram district, Kerala. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. Overburden from the upper slopes is heaped on the steep slopes and can lead to slumping. It has to be removed to safer location and used for reclamation of abandoned quarry pits in the lease area.
2. The stream at the gate should not be tampered with.

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

Item No. 22.18 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for proposed building stone quarry in Sy. Nos. 391/3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 393/2, 394/2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 395/1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 396/3, 5, 6, 4, 397/4, 9, 397/1 & 397/10 at Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta district, Kerala by M/s Wimrock Granite Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 104/SEIAA/KL/1689/2013)**

SEAC observed that the proponent failed to circulate the additional clarifications to all at SEAC. Hence the proposal is DEFERRED.

Item No. 22.19 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 275/1-50-3, 275/1-50-4, 275/1-50-5, 275/1-50-2, 270/1A2, 275/1-50-2, 275/1-21-69, 275/1-57, 275/1-49, 275/1-52, 275/1-49, 275/1-52, 275/1-10, 276/1-4, 566/1D and 276/1-11 at Iravon Village, Konni Panchayath, Kozhencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Malleilil Industries Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 92/SEIAA/KL/1052/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The proponent has not provided the Cadastral map duly signed by Village Officer as directed but has stated that the re-survey work of Iravon village, Konni Panchayat is not completed and hence has provided the available cadastral map provided by the Central Survey Office for Sy. Nos. 566, 275 and 276. The Committee also found that during the appraisal of the project, when the proponent was asked to provide copies of sale deed, land tax receipt and possession certificate for Sy. No. 566/10, the proponent has stated that they do not own the land bearing Sy. No. 566/10 and the inclusion of the said Sy. No was a typographical error, which is also recorded in the minutes of 19th SEAC meeting under agenda item no. 19.03. Now, in the clarification submitted by the proponent regarding the exclusion of the said Sy. No. from the proposal, it is stated that they have excluded the said Sy. No. from the present proposal because the depth of the overburden in this area is above 2 m. The Committee found this as contradictory statements and decided to seek clarification from the proponent regarding this. Also, the proponent was earlier directed to provide the original of the Certificate of Incorporation of the firm (the copy of which is submitted along with the application) for verification and return as the Committee found that the proponent has submitted attested copy of Certificate of Incorporation of the firm without the signatures of the parties concerned and without the designation of the partners in it. Moreover it was not notarized. The proponent has now submitted notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation and Articles of Association of the firm but that also does not contain the original signatures of the two directors. Hence the Committee decided to seek clarification from the proponent regarding the same also.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED seeking satisfactory clarifications from the proponent as above, which were sought earlier, for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 22.20 **Simplified procedure and application in Malayalam regarding issuance of EC for mining of brick earth and ordinary earth only for residential purposes (not for commercial purposes) and for areas not greater than 1 hectare**

Noted.

Item No. 22.21 **O.M. No. 1-4/2012-RE (Pt.) dt. 16.11.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests regarding High Level Working Group Report on Western Ghats & Directions under Section 5 of the EP Act, 1986 issued by Ministry of Environment and Forests on 13.11.2013**

Noted.

Item No. 22.22 Any other item approved by Chair

Item No. 22.22.01 EC application for removal of ordinary earth at Palamel Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 226/14 and 226/6 by Sajeena Anwar, Pandalam (File No. 157/SEIAA/KL/3421/2013)

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 22nd SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the applicant has submitted application for removal of 5000 m³ of ordinary earth from an area of 54¾ cents for construction of a residential building in Sy. Nos. 226/14 and 226/6. But as per the land tax receipt, the applicant owns Sy. No. 226/14/2 and 226/6. Hence the Committee decided that EC shall be considered for Sy. Nos. 226/14/2 and 226/6. The Committee asked the proponent whether they have obtained any building permit from the Panchayath for constructing the house in 54¾ cents. To this end the proponent stated that the Panchayath has not so far issued any building permit but they shall provide the location plan as documentary evidence regarding construction of house. The Committee directed the proponent to submit the same. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted a report from Palamel Grama Panchayath rejecting their application for constructing a building in the Sy. Nos. 226/14/2 and 226/6 stating that the land bearing those Sy. Nos. is in one of the highest hills in the Panchayath and any construction on top of the said hill is possible only by leveling the hill which will cause adverse impacts on the environment. The proponent has mentioned in column 32 of the application about a court order granting permission for construction of house in the project site (as Palamel Panchayath has rejected the application for construction of house), the details of which are not clearly provided. Hence the proponent is directed to provide copy of the said court order along with details regarding the same. From the proponent, the Committee came to know that she already owns a house and hence asked why she submitted application for removal of sand from such a large area. The proponent has stated that there is a judgment from the Panchayath Tribunal dt. 09.02.2012 regarding the present proposed project. The proponent is directed to provide the copy of the same. The proponent has provided contradictory statements in col. 19.1 and 19.9 regarding the topography of the site and is hence directed to provide specific details regarding the same. It is also found that the proponent has left out the columns 19.3 and 20 without entering the details and is hence directed to provide the details regarding the same. It is also noted that the proponent has not specifically answered col. 25 regarding the distance (in metre) left in all sides, from the adjacent plot boundaries for removal of the earth. When asked regarding this, the proponent stated that a distance of 2 m shall be left on all the four sides from the adjacent plot boundaries. The Committee directed the proponent to provide the same in writing. The proponent was asked as to where the removed earth is proposed to be dumped. To this end the proponent stated that the removed earth shall be deposited in the Ambalappuzha Government School Ground, Alappuzha. In this regard, the Committee directed the proponent to submit the agreement entered into between the school authorities and the proponent for dumping the removed earth. The Committee further noted that the proponent has not specifically filled in the details in col. 36 of the application asking the list of documents enclosed with the application and is hence directed to provide the same in writing.

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

1. Location plan (sketch) of the project site duly certified by Village Officer.
2. Copy of the judgment from the Panchayath Tribunal dt. 09.02.2012 regarding the present proposed project.
3. Specify the topography of the site as to whether a hill top, leveled land, hill slope, valley, etc.
4. Details sought in column 19.3 and 20 to be provided in writing as those details are not filled in the application submitted.
5. Details sought in column 36 of the application to be specifically provided in writing.
6. Distance (in metre) left in all sides, from the adjacent plot boundaries for removal of the earth, sought in col. 25 of the application.
7. Copy of the court order mentioned in column 32 of the application, along with details regarding the same.
8. The agreement entered into between the Ambalappuzha School, Alappuzha and the proponent for dumping the removed earth.

Item No. 22.22.02 EC application for removal of ordinary earth at Palamel Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 582/8 by Mani Suresh, Nooranad (File No. 158/SEIAA/KL/3427/2013)

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 22nd SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person sought by the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the applicant has submitted application for removal of ordinary earth from an area of 25/30 Are. for construction of a residential building. The Committee asked whether the proponent is constructing house in the entire 25.30 ares (63 cents) of land. To this end the proponent stated that they seek permission to remove 125 m³ of ordinary earth from 6 cents of land only and gave the same in writing also. The proponent is also directed to submit the copy of building permit about which it is mentioned in the application form. They have also provided a certificate from Village Officer which states that the proponent has only 2.48 ares of land, out of the total 25.30 ares. In the Mahassar also it is stated that the area that belongs to the proponent is 2.48 ares, equivalent to 6 cents.

The Committee found that the proponent has not specifically stated the location for disposal of removed earth and sought documentary evidence regarding the same. To this end the proponent stated that the removed earth shall be utilized for the road work of Kayamkulam Municipality and submitted copies of sanction accorded by Assistant Executive Engineer, Kayamkulam Municipality to transport of quarry muck, gravelly earth and ordinary soil for road works. But the Committee found that in that copy it is not stated to whom sanction is given and hence it cannot be ascertained as to whether the sanction given refers to the excavated earth from this plot. Also, the total quantity of excavated earth is not specified. Hence the proponent is directed to provide valid documentary evidence to prove that the excavated earth shall be utilized for the road work of Kayamkulam Municipality specifically mentioning the quantity. The Committee found that in col. 5 of the application form the proponent has stated that there is gravel road in the east of the project site but in col. 6.3 of the application the details of the said road is not mentioned. The proponent gave in

writing on the same day of the meeting that the eastern side of project site has gravel road. The proponent has provided certificate from Palamel Grama Panchayath regarding the status of land bearing Sy. No. 532/8 and certifying that the removal of earth from the plot is for construction of residential building. The Committee found that the NOC provided by the proponent in this regard is not valid as it is given for Sy. No. 532/8 whereas the present proposal is for Sy. No. 582/8. The proponent is directed to provide a fresh certificate from the Palamel Grama Panchayath reporting the status of land bearing Sy. No. 582/8 as to whether the plot shall be utilized for the construction of residential building. The Committee also found that the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengannur has forwarded a letter to the proponent to submit environmental clearance for removal of 125 m³ of ordinary earth from 2.48 ares of land in Re. Sy. No. 582/8 for construction of residential building, whereas the application of the proponent forwarded from Chengannur Revenue Divisional Officer is for 25.30 ares in Sy. No. 532/8. The Committee found that the Sy. No. given in the application is 582/8, which is considered by SEAC and SEIAA which is entirely different from the Sy. No. mentioned in the forwarding letter from Chengannur Revenue Divisional Office and hence sought clarification in writing from the proponent as to whether the Sy. No. of present project is 532/8 or 582/8. Also, it was found that as per land tax receipt submitted by the proponent, the Sy. No. 582/8 is in the name of Narayani Mani and not in the name of Mani Suresh, the applicant. Hence valid documentary evidence is sought to prove that Sy. No. 582/8 is owned by the project proponent. The Committee found that in the Mahassar given by Village Officer, Palamel, the existence of certain trees in the project site is recorded but in the application in col. 19.12 the proponent has stated that no plants exist in the project site proposed for removal of ordinary earth. Hence the Committee sought clarification from the proponent regarding this and the proponent gave in writing that they have cut the trees in the site for utilizing in construction purposes.

The Committee also found that in the affidavit submitted along with the application, it is stated that the application for EC is submitted on 28.05.2013 whereas the same is submitted on 04.12.2013. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh notarized affidavit incorporating the correct details sought regarding the project. The proponent is also directed to provide one and the same certificate to prove that Mani Suresh, the proponent and Mani, as given in ID proof, is the same person.

Considering the information and the documents provided in the application, the proposal is **RECOMMENDED** for issuance of Environmental Clearance on condition that ordinary earth removal to be limited from 6 cents of land as per their requirements and impacts to be addressed as per the guidelines of MoEF in O.M. No. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 for ordinary earth, which is as follows:

- (i) The activity shall not involve blasting.
- (ii) The maximum depth of removal of sand should not go beyond 2 m from the general ground level of the site, which should be prominently marked before initiating the work.
- (iii) Removal of sand should be restricted to 2 m above to the ground water table at the site.
- (iv) The excavation activity shall not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area.
- (v) The borrowed/excavated pit shall be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose(s) as specified in the application.
- (vi) Appropriate fencing all around the borrowed/excavated pit shall be made to prevent any

mishap.

- (vii) Measures shall be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of borrowed/excavated earth during transportation.
- (viii) Safeguards shall be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to borrowing/excavation of earth.
- (ix) Workers / labourers shall be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
- (x) A berm shall be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation.
- (xi) A minimum distance of 15 m from any civil structure shall be kept from the periphery of the excavation area.
- (xii) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

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

It is further recommended that the certificate of Environmental Clearance may be issued only after the satisfactory receipt of the following by the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat:

1. Copy of building permit mentioned in col. 32 of the application.
2. Clarification in writing as to whether the Sy. No. of present project is 532/8 or 582/8.
3. Certificate from the Palamel Grama Panchayath reporting the status of land bearing Sy. No. 582/8 as to whether the plot shall be utilized for the construction of residential building.
4. Clarification in writing as to why Palamel Grama Panchayath has given NOC in the name of Mani Suresh for Sy. No. 532/8 and whether she owns that land.
5. Valid document to prove that Sy. No. 582/8 is owned by Mani Suresh (as at present the land tax receipt shows that the land is in the name of Narayani Mani).
6. Fresh affidavit attested by notary incorporating the correct details sought regarding the project.
7. One and the same certificate of Mani Suresh (applicant) and Mani (in the ID proof submitted along with the application).
8. Valid documentary evidence to prove that the excavated earth shall be utilized for the road work of Kayamkulam Municipality specifically mentioning the quantity.

Item No. 22.22.03 Sand mining without EC prohibited by District Collector, Malappuram

The Committee noted the item.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm with a vote of thanks by Dr. C.N. Mohanan, Member SEAC, who chaired the concluding session. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.
