

**MINUTES OF THE 23<sup>RD</sup> MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL  
COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 6<sup>TH</sup> AND 7<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY, 2014 AT  
HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The twenty-third meeting of SEAC- Kerala was held on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. On day 1, 6<sup>th</sup> January 2014, 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.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - 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. While going through the status of proposals received by SEIAA as on 31.12.2013, SEAC found that Environmental Clearance has been issued by SEIAA to one proposal without its recommendations. To this end, Secretary SEAC informed the Committee that the said application was processed by SEIAA based on recommendations of Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) of Ministry of Environment and Forests as it has recommended for Environmental Clearance for the project, following KCZMA recommendations. SEAC further noted that EAC is the recommending body of experts at Central level and since the file was duly forwarded by MoEF with EAC recommendations, there is nothing wrong in the procedure.

The Committee discussed on the present status of abandoned quarries in various parts of the state wherein many casualties are reported, as many of them are not at all reclaimed and left as such even without proper fencing. The Committee felt the necessity of a data bank of existing and abandoned quarries for initiating any remedial measures to address the issue. The Committee was of the opinion that the owner of the quarry should be held responsible for such untoward incidents for which some sort of legal action should be initiated against him. The Committee also raised concern on the unscientific method of quarrying going on in Government land and was of the opinion that in order to bring down the quarrying activities being done in patches of Government land thereby causing fragmentation of land and causing adverse impacts on the environment, it would be better to identify specific quarrying zones/probable mineable areas and a zoning policy developed after identifying such areas. Resettlement & rehabilitation of people residing in the fringe area of the quarry zone should also be simultaneously addressed.

The Committee, while going through the agenda items of the meeting, found that one proposal has been referred back to SEAC by SEIAA even though the former has forwarded the same with duly approved appraisal report. On analyzing the reason for referring back to SEAC, the Committee found that the same is returned to SEAC for verification of documents which it sought for filing purpose from the proponent. At this juncture, the Committee decided that, henceforth, it shall forward only those proposals whose clarifications/additional documents are completely received and verified by SEAC, in all respects.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

**Item No. 23.01** Confirmation of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting, held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

**Item No. 23.02** Action taken report on the decisions of the 22<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting

Noted.

**Item No. 23.03** Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 523/1, 523/3/2, 524/1, 524/3/1, 524/3/2, 524/3/3 and 526/1 at Purakkadi Village, Meenangadi Panchayath, Sulthan Batheri Taluk, Wayanad District, Kerala by M/s Krishnagiri Stone Crusher (File No. 159/SEIAA/KL/3488/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the boundary of the proposed quarry site is seen as a fertile land with a top soil thickness of 2 m and which is basically a paddy field. A seasonal stream (an irrigation canal), joining the Karappuzha River is also crossing through the site. The Committee was apprehensive as to whether the proposed activities may hinder the flow of the drain. The major irrigation canal of Karappara Project that is supposed to irrigate the entire contiguous paddy field is located close to the boundary of the quarry site. It was also found that as per sale deed, Sy. Nos. 524/3/3 and 523/1 are recorded as nilam or

paddy land. *Conversion of this wetland for quarry will adversely affect the adjacent plots.* To this end the proponent stated that the area is not suitable for cultivation and at present there are arecanut plantations which are also not flourishing as there is rock beneath the top soil and agriculture was done in that region only at some 30 years back. However, the Committee was of the opinion that being a paddy field having an irrigation canal, the land could be a cultivable land and wanted to ascertain the same during field visit. The Committee also stated that the quarrying operations going on in the area for the past few years is also causing an adverse impact on the land. Even though the proponent claimed it as a non-fertile land, the Committee directed the proponent to verify the present status of land, which is recorded as nilam in the sale deed, with the data bank of wetlands in the concerned village wherein status of wetland which remained uncultivated for the past 30 years would have been changed. The proponent is directed to submit a certificate to that effect or to provide any document granting exemption to the proponent to conduct mining activities in the said nilam.

The Committee was quite unhappy about the present trend followed by many consultants in submitting the environmental quality analysis reports of sample taken from only one location of the project site, which the Committee stated as not sufficient for evaluation of the same with respect to the project site. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site. SEAC also found that even though the proponent has provided the Area Survey Plan approved by Village Officer, the Sy. No. 524/3/2 which is part of the present proposal is not marked in it and hence directed the proponent to provide a fresh area survey plan marking all the Survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. *The Committee also decided that the depth of mining should be restricted and extent of quarrying activities to be specifically demarcated, if mining could be permitted in the area, after assessing the same during field visit.* The Committee also found that the proponent has provided the details of activities towards Corporate Social Responsibility, but the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended is not specifically stated and also, the details of already done activities are included in the proposed activities and under the proposed activities, the amount set aside is calculated inclusive of both proposed and already done activities. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the amount set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the ground realities, especially with respect to the presence of seasonal stream in the project site and to ascertain whether the project site is a fertile paddy field suitable for cultivation. It is further decided to ascertain during site visit as to whether NOC from the irrigation department to conduct quarrying activities in the site is required and as to whether the existing excavated pit should be converted to water body. The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Certificate from concerned Panchayath regarding the present status of land bearing Sy. Nos. 524/3/3 and 523/1, which is recorded as nilam in the sale deed, in the data bank of wetlands or any document granting exemption to the proponent to conduct mining activities in the said nilam..
2. Environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site.

3. Area survey plan marking all the Survey numbers mentioned in the proposal.
4. Revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the amount set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended.

**Item No. 23.04**

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

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent and found that the proponent has provided the yield test report with 100 minutes of pumping instead of 1000 minutes of pumping as directed by SEAC, which is inadequate for an assessment of water availability from the proposed source. It is also found that the proponent has submitted the request for omission of the survey numbers 211/10, 212/13 & 212/17 from the present application for Environmental Clearance without addressing the same to anyone and without providing the details of the project. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a request in writing addressed to Member Secretary, SEIAA incorporating all the details of the project (including the name of the proponent, name of the firm, project location including survey numbers, etc.) duly signed by the proponent. The proponent is also directed to provide provisions for ensuring public access to the canal within the project site and to ensure their access by constructing an over bridge across the canal. *It is also decided to address the concerned local body that the occupancy certificate for the project shall be issued only after ensuring that the proponent has obtained valid Environmental Clearance. The Committee also found that the earlier decision of MoEF on the project is based on a judgment from the Honourable Supreme Court and hence it is decided to consider the directions in the said judgment while recommending the project for Environmental Clearance, if applicable.*

Over and above all, the proponent has submitted a resolution from the Board of Directors of M/s Oceanus Estates India (P) Limited stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated. Considering this, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND FOR INITIATING VIOLATION PROCEEDINGS against the proponent and consider the same after the violation proceedings are taken and action taken received thereon.

The proponent is directed to provide the following before SEAC for reconsideration of the proposal following the violation proceedings initiated by the Government and subject to the receipt of the compliance report of EC conditions from the Ministry of Environment and Forests:

1. Yield test of the well with 1000 minutes of pumping.
2. Request in writing addressed to Member Secretary, SEIAA incorporating all the details of the project (including the name of the proponent, name of the firm, project location including survey numbers, etc.) duly signed by the proponent for

omission of the survey numbers 211/10, 212/13 & 212/17 from the present application for Environmental Clearance.

3. Provisions for ensuring public access to the canal within the project site.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that an over bridge shall be constructed across the canal for access of the proponent without hindering the public access to the same.

**Item No. 23.05**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 615/130, 615/54/3, 615/54/3/22, 615/52/1/27/28, 615/52/1/27/28, 615/54/30, 615/61, 615/54/14, 615/54/5/2, 615/54, 615/54/5, 615/1/154, 615/52/1/28, 615/54/14/2, 615/53/1/9, 615/63/3, 615/54/5, 615/54/7, 615/54/14/2, 615/54/8, 615/54/1/34, 615/54/14/1, 615/52/6, 615/54/1/24, 615/54/7/29, 615/54/6, 615/54/1/36, 615/54/1/219, 615/54/1/219, 615/54/16, 615/54/1/43/1 and 615/54/219 at Konnithazham Village, Konni Panchayath, Kozhencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Malleil Industries Private Limited (File No.161/SEIAA/KL/3491/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the location of the project site lacks clarity in the cadastral map provided by the proponent since the Sy. No. 127/50 which is a large area and is part of Sy. No. 615/54, is excluded in the present proposal. To this end the proponent stated that the resurvey of that area is not yet carried out and hence he is also not able to prove that the land bearing Sy. No. 127/50 is not part of the present project. At this juncture, the Committee directed the proponent to get the survey number boundaries of each plot to be demarcated in the field by concerned authority. Also, the Committee found that the thodu in the north eastern side of the project site is not shown in the map provided and hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised map showing the location of the thodu. The Committee reminded the proponent that the facilities of the quarry should not be marked as settlements and as far as the surface lay out map is concerned, legend is very important. The Committee was not able to distinguish the proposed and existing mine area of the project site from the 500 m radius map provided by the proponent as it is labeled wrongly. The proponent stated that out of the total area of 4.5827 hectares of land, the existing mine is in 2.5 hectares, and agreed to submit a revised map clearly marking the existing and proposed mining areas. The Committee also found many houses in the proximity of the project area and asked whether the proponent has obtained consent from them for conducting quarrying activities. To this end the proponent stated that all those houses are owned by him. However, the Committee wanted to ascertain the same during field visit. The Committee asked the proponent as to how many monitoring stations are fixed for sampling. To this end the proponent stated that they have done the environmental quality analysis of sample taken from only one station. The Committee was quite unhappy about this present trend followed by many consultants in submitting the environmental quality analysis reports of sample taken from only one location of the project site, which is not sufficient for evaluation of the environmental parameters with respect to the project site. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site. The Committee also found that the proponent has provided the details of activities towards Corporate Social Responsibility, but the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended is not

specifically stated and also, the details of already done activities are included in the proposed activities and under the proposed activities, the amount set aside is calculated inclusive of both proposed and already done activities. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the cost set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended. The proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence to prove the amount spent towards CSR. Regarding the proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided the notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation of M/s Mallelil Industries Pvt. Ltd. but the original signatures of the subscribers are not there in the same. Hence the proponent is directed to provide either the original Certificate of Incorporation (for verification and return) or notarized copy of the same.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT, especially to assess the proximity of houses to the project area (stated as owned by the project proponent), which shall be conducted after the survey number boundaries of each plot is demarcated in the field and the same is reported to SEAC by the proponent. Also, the proponent is directed to provide the following before SEAC for further consideration of the proposal following the site visit:

1. Revised map showing the location of thodu in the north eastern side of the project site.
2. Revised 500 m radius map clearly marking the existing and proposed mining areas and with proper legend.
3. Environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site.
4. Revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the amount set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended, and documentary evidence to prove the amount spent towards CSR.
5. Either the original Certificate of Incorporation of M/s Mallelil Industries Pvt. Ltd. (for verification and return) or notarized copy of the same.

**Item No. 23.06**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 78/2A at Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Profile Granite (File No. 130/SEIAA/KL/2437/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. It is found that the proponent has not satisfactorily provided the following clarifications/documents sought earlier:

1. Details of CSR activities are provided without specifically stating the institutions to which the same shall be extended.
2. Copies of land tax receipts dt. 2013 provided shows that the Sy. No. 78/2A is owned by the project proponent, Marakkar, Moosakkutty Haji, Mohammed Aslam, Sadique Ali K.P., K.K. Moideen, Beerankutty and one more person whose name is not clear in the land tax receipt (seen as Thekkumthottathil TT -----). The proponent has provided consent given to him by Thenginthottathil Abdulla to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 78/2A owned by him. Hence clarification is required as to whether these two persons are the same. Valid documentary evidence to prove the same should also be provided.

3. The notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation provided is incomplete as the names of subscribers are not seen in it.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED seeking satisfactory clarifications from the proponent regarding the above items, which were sought earlier. Also, further to the field visit conducted by the subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Dr. N.G.K. Pillai, Chairman, SEAC; Sri, John Mathai, Dr. Harikumar and Dr. E. J. Joseph, Members of SEAC on 22.10.2013, the proponent is directed to provide the following:

- (i) Assurance in the form of affidavit that steep cuttings seen in the old workings shall be reduced by providing benches preferably along the strike of the body.
- (ii) Assurance in the form of affidavit that a distance of 100 m from the HT line and 50 m from the road shall be maintained as No Development Zone and the same may be demarcated with pillars.
- (iii) Assurance in the form of affidavit that green belt shall be provided to the 50 m buffer zone by the side of the road.
- (iv) Since storm water channelization is presently not practiced, the water from the pit area need to be let into desiltation tanks and clarified before it is let out. Provision for a check dam at the lowermost valley section for a next stage of desiltation and clarification to be provided.

**Item No. 23.07**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 1323/1, 1253/4, 1322/7, 1322/2 (539/97/2/2), 1323/7, 1323/9 (539/97/3/9), 1322/4, 1322/7, 1323/11(539/97/3/11), 1324/5 (539/97/5/5), 1323/2, 1256/2, 1256/1, 1323/5, 1323/4 (539/97/3/4), 1325/1(539/97/4/1), 1324/1, 1323/10, 1322/3 (539/97/2/3), 1323/8 (539/97/3/8), 1324/6 (539/97/5/6), 1324/7 (539/97/5/7), 1228/3 and 1322/1 (539/97/2/1), at Kadangode Village and Panchayath, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Verginland Plantations & Farms Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 162/SEIAA/KL/3492/2013)**

The Committee found that in the application submitted by the proponent, one page (the declaration part of Form 1 where the proponent puts signature) is seen as inserted, without being part of spirally bound volume, but the page numbers including the inserted one are seen as continuous numbers. The Committee pointed out that this is a serious lapse from the part of the proponent/consultant and warned that such incidence shall invite rejection of proposal in future, in any case. However, on verification of the soft copy of the proposal submitted, it was found that the proponent has provided the exact copy of the hard copy (including the inserted page) and hence the item was taken for consideration by the Committee.

Subsequently, the project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee asked the proponent regarding the thickness of top soil in the project site. To this end the proponent stated that the average thickness of top soil, after considering three pits, is 1.1 m to 1.5 m. The proponent was also asked regarding the transportation of minerals done at the rate of 67 trips/day, the frequency of which was found to be more, by the Committee. To this end the proponent stated that the frequency of trips is more as they are transporting the material to a crusher unit of Best Industries having a capacity of crushing 3000 tonnes of material per day, located at 600 m within the quarry site. The Committee also found that many working quarries are seen adjacent to this project site and lot of fragments of 1 acre land owned by different persons is seen in the

region. The Committee was apprehensive as to whether it is legally right and as to how the present owners possessed the land which was earlier part of a forest. The Committee found that the region is having large deposits so that it can be declared as a quarrying zone. Considering this case, the Committee reiterated the necessity of identifying the mineable regions in various parts of the state for which a comprehensive EIA study has to be done with respect to concerned areas. The Committee also found that the Sy. No. 1322/7 is seen twice in the proposal submitted by the proponent and sought clarification from the proponent regarding this. To this end the proponent stated that inclusion of the said Sy. No. twice in the application is a mistake and requested the Committee to omit one Sy. No. 1322/7 while issuing Environmental Clearance. The Committee directed the proponent to submit the request in writing. The proponent has not provided the copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No.1323/4 (539/97/3/4) and copy of possession certificate for Sy. No. 1322/7 and is directed to provide the same. The proponent has submitted the minutes of extra ordinary general meeting of the members of Kadangode plantations approving the transfer of landed property in Sy. No. 1323/1 to him and minutes of extra ordinary general meeting of the members of Rainyland plantations and Farms Pvt. Ltd. approving the transfer of landed property in Sy. Nos. 1228/3, 1324/1, 1323/10, 1322/3(539/97/2/3), 1323/8, (539/97/3/8), 1324/6 (539/97/5/6), 1324/7 (539/97/5/7) and 1322/1 to him for starting crusher unit and run related business activities. But the Committee was of the opinion that this consent cannot be considered as consent given to the proponent to conduct mining activities and hence directed the proponent to provide fresh consent. The Committee asked the proponent as to how many monitoring stations are fixed for sampling. To this end the proponent stated that they have done the environmental quality analysis of sample taken from only one station. The Committee was quite unhappy about this present trend followed by many consultants in submitting the environmental quality analysis reports of sample taken from only one location of the project site, which is not sufficient for evaluation of the environmental parameters with respect to the project site. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site. The Committee also found that the proponent has provided the details of activities towards Corporate Social Responsibility, but the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended is not specifically stated and also, the details of already done activities are included in the proposed activities and under the proposed activities, the amount set aside is calculated inclusive of both proposed and already done activities. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the cost set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended. The proponent is also directed to provide documentary evidence to prove the amount spent towards CSR.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the number of working quarries in the proximity of the project site and also directing the proponent to submit the following before SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Clarification in writing as to the inclusion of Sy. No. 1322/7 twice in the proposal and request to omit the repetition.
2. Copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No.1323/4 (539/97/3/4).
3. Copy of possession certificate for Sy. No. 1322/7.
4. Consent given to the proponent by the concerned to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by them.

5. Environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site.
6. Revised proposal on proposed CSR activities linked with the present project along with a detailed split up of the amount set aside for the area/institution to which the same shall be extended, and documentary evidence to prove the amount spent towards CSR.

**Item No. 23.08**      **Application for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the quarry project in Survey No. 78/2A at Kumaranellur Village, Karassery Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Tristar Stone Crusher and Stone Mines (File No. 136/SEIAA/KL/2564/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and it is found that in the consent from the owners of land bearing Sy. No. 78/2A to conduct quarrying activities, the name of one of the owners is given as Vineesh whereas in land tax receipt the name of the person is given as Bineesh. The proponent is directed to provide documentary evidence to clarify the same before 15.01.2014, only on satisfactory receipt of which the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA for further processing. Since all other clarifications/documents provided by the proponent are found to be satisfactory, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions, in addition to the general condition for mining projects:

1. Quarrying should be limited to northern side of the stream.
2. A buffer distance of 10 m on either side of thodu should be left as No Development Zone.
3. Overburden stack should be provided with a protective wall so that the material is not washed down the stream.
4. Old abandoned pits presently seen within the project site must be refilled with overburden and vegetated.
5. At places where overburden thickness exceeds 2 m, quarrying should be done with utmost care in order to avoid dislodging of crestal portion.
6. Check dam should be provided on the minor stream flowing through the mine lease area.

The appraisal report is approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA, subject to the satisfactory receipt of the document sought from the proponent within the stipulated time. It is also decided that the Secretary SEAC shall intimate the proponent to submit additional clarifications before 15.01.2014 by email, for speedy processing of application.

**Item No. 23.09**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 271/1-2, 271/1-3, 271/1-6, 271/1-10, 271/1-11, 271/1-4, 271/8-2, 271/8-1, 271/20 pt., 270/4-1, 270/4, 270/3 and 270/2 at Pallichal Village and Panchayath, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Trivandrum District, Kerala by M/s V.S.C. Hollow Blocks & Crusher Division (File No. 163/SEIAA/KL/3493/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent stated that the mining activity in the present project site has started way back in 2000 and as of now there are no

complaints against the project. But the Committee found that the present project site is located in the Mukkunnimala region and there is lot of complaints about the ongoing quarrying activities in the very sensitive Mukkunnimala region received in the Department of Environment and Climate Change. Hence the Committee requested the Director, Department of Environment and Climate Change, who is also the Secretary of SEAC, to make available the details of those complaints during site visit. The Committee found that, as proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided copies of sale deed for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal except 271/1-10, 271/8-2, 271/8-1, 271/20 pt. and 270/4 and also copies of different sale deeds for Sy. No. 271/1 owned by the project proponent, Sivan, Lekha and Johny but it is without sub division numbers and hence it is not able to trace as to which sub division no. of 271/1 the deed refers to. Hence the proponent is directed to provide copy of possession certificate of all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal. Also, as seen from the sale deed, the proponent owns Sy. No. 270/4-2 which is not part of the present proposal. As seen from the land tax receipts, the proponent owns Sy. Nos. 270/4-1 and 270/4 whereas in area survey plan of the project, instead of Sy. No. 270/4 which is included in the proposal, Sy. No. 270/4-2 which is not part of the proposal is seen marked. Hence the Committee decided to seek clarification from the proponent as to whether EC has to be considered for Sy. No. 270/4 or 270/4-2. The Committee asked the proponent as to how many monitoring stations are fixed for sampling. To this end the proponent stated that they have done the environmental quality analysis of sample taken from only one station. The Committee was quite unhappy about this present trend followed by many consultants in submitting the environmental quality analysis reports of sample taken from only one location of the project site, which is not sufficient for evaluation of the environmental parameters with respect to the project site. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site. 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 evaluating the quarrying activities going on in the very sensitive Mukkunnimala region considering the complaints received in this regard and also directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copies of sale deed for Sy. Nos. 271/1-10, 271/8-2, 271/8-1, 271/20 pt. and 270/4.
2. Copies of possession certificate of all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.
3. Clarification in writing as to whether EC has to be considered for Sy. No. 270/4 or 270/4-2, with reasons for the same.
4. Environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site.
5. 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.
6. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

**Item No. 23.10**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey Nos. 75/2, 75/3 and 75/4, Block No. 16, at Muttom Village and Panchayath, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala of Mr. Denny Joseph (File No. 134/SEIAA/KL/2562/2013)**

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. Any activity including quarrying should not be done in Sy. No. 75/2 and it should be left as a No Development Zone, as the land bearing that Sy. No. is very steep.
2. The present method of quarrying does not provide benches, and steep cliff like section is noticed. This quarried area has been fenced on the top and sides and marked as danger zone.
3. A buffer distance of 20 m may be provided at the base of the cliff as No Development Zone to accommodate loose rock fragments that is likely to fall. A fence may also be provided at 20 m buffer line to ward off people straying into the danger zone. This 20 m wide zone may be provided with vegetative cover.

The appraisal report is approved by the Committee for forwarding to SEIAA with the above recommendations and also recommending for omission of Sy. No. 75/2 from the present application considering the steepness of land bearing the said Sy. No.

**Item No. 23.11**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Kannimangalam Granite Quarry at Kannimangalam in Sy. Nos. 45/1, 45/2, 46, 47 Part, 50/2, 51/1, 51/2, 51/3, 52 & 56/1 at Malayattoor Village, Malayattoor - Neeleswaram Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Vijaya Quarry Works (File No. 115/SEIAA/KL/2181/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily provided all other documents except copies of sale deed for Sy. Nos. 45/1, 51/1, 51/2, 51/3, 52 & 56/1. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the same. The Committee also found that there is a litigation (W.P. (C) 28087 of 2011) pending against the lease area in the Honourable High Court of Kerala since 2011 and no orders or directions have been passed regarding the same till date. Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for want of details on the writ petition before the Honourable High Court and seeking satisfactory receipt of documents sought earlier. The proponent is also directed to provide the details on the current status of the pending litigation with documentary evidence, for taking any further decision in the matter.

**Item No. 23.12**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Illithode Granite Quarry at Potta, Illithode in Sy. No. 301/1 at Malayattoor Village, Malayattoor - Neeleswaram Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Vijaya Quarry Works (File No. 116/SEIAA/KL/2182/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent and found that the proponent has satisfactorily provided all other documents except specific details

on the areas/institutions to which the CSR shall be extended. The Committee also found that there is a litigation (W.P. (C) 28087 of 2011) pending against the lease area in the Honourable High Court of Kerala since 2011 and no orders or directions has been passed regarding the same till date. Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for want of details on the writ petition before the Honourable High Court and seeking satisfactory receipt of details on CSR sought earlier. The proponent is also directed to provide the details on the current status of the pending litigation with documentary evidence, for taking any further decision in the matter.

**Item No. 23.13**      **Application for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 2, 14, 15 and 16/1 at Akathethara Village and Panchayath, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Royal Sand & Gravels Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 160/SEIAA/KL/3490/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proposed project site falls in the foot hills of Malampuzha catchments having an elevation of 424 m – 100 m wherein there is a precedence of accelerated erosion. As stated by the proponent, quarrying is going on in Sy. No. 14 which the Committee found as is near to the forest boundary. The Committee stated that quarrying could be permitted only in Sy. No. 2, part of Sy. No. 15 and Sy. No. 14 considering the above, and decided to confirm the same after the site visit. The Committee found that in the biodiversity listing of fauna in the project site, rabbits were seen recorded and hence stated that rabbits are not seen in wild which should be replaced by black hare. The proponent is directed to provide site specific biodiversity listing of fauna. The proponent has submitted the consent given to the project proponent by Mohammed Faique to conduct quarrying operations in Sy. No. 2 owned by him, but in the possession certificate, the land is in the name of Muhammed Fayiq whereas the consent is given by Mohammed Faique and hence clarification is sought from the proponent to prove that these two persons are one and the same. Also, the Committee found that in one of the copies of sale deed for Sy. No. 2 provided by the proponent, the name of the buyer lacks clarity and the same is also not certified by any authorized person. The proponent provided the original sale deed for verification before the Committee but it was found that in the original also the name of the buyer lacks clarity. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the copy of the sale deed for Sy. No. 2 from the concerned Registrar Office to prove the authenticity of the document submitted before the Committee. The Committee asked the proponent as to how many monitoring stations are fixed for sampling. To this end the proponent stated that they have done the environmental quality analysis of sample taken from only one station. The Committee was quite unhappy about this present trend followed by many consultants in submitting the environmental quality analysis reports of sample taken from only one location of the project site, which is not sufficient for evaluation of the environmental parameters with respect to the project site. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site. The Committee also found that electrical high tension line is at a distance of 700 m of the project site and hence directed the proponent to maintain a safe buffer distance from the same for conducting quarrying activities, as prescribed by KSEB.

Considering all the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess whether the project site is suitable for mining activities considering the precedence of accelerated erosion in the

region and the topography of the land and if suitable, to which all Sy. Nos. quarrying could be permitted and to assess the proximity of forest land to the project site. The proponent is also directed to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

- 1.Site specific biodiversity listing of fauna.
- 2.Documentary evidence to prove that Muhammed Faiyq (in possession certificate) and Mohammed Faique (in the consent given for conducting quarrying operations) is one and the same person.
- 3.Certified copy of the sale deed for Sy. No. 2 at Akathethara Village and Panchayath, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala, from the concerned Registrar Office.
- 4.Environmental quality analysis reports of air, water and noise taken from at least four different locations in the project site.
- 5.Assurance in the form of affidavit that a safe buffer distance, as prescribed by KSEB, shall be left from the electrical high tension line without conducting quarrying activities.

*The meeting concluded at 6 pm on the first day (6<sup>th</sup> January 2014) with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.*

On day 2 (on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014) the meeting commenced at 9.30 am and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala were present:

1. Dr. N.G.K. Pillai - Chairman, SEAC  
ICAR Emeritus Scientist &  
Former Director CMFRI
2. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
3. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
8. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
9. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC  
Director,  
Department of Environment & Climate Change

The Chairman welcomed the members and thereafter, the remaining agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

**Item No. 23.14**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey No. 172, at Kodyathur Village and Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s The Uralungal Labour Contract Co-operative Society Ltd. No. 10957 (File No. 135/SEIAA/KL/2563/2013)**

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. The road leading to the unit should be widened with proper surfacing to facilitate free movement of trucks.
2. Water should be clarified before it is let out of the premises.

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

**Item No. 23.15**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for a 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)**

SEAC reconsidered the proposal which was earlier forwarded to SEIAA with its recommendations and was now returned to SEAC seeking remarks on the following documents submitted by the proponent for filing purposes.

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 cadastry to be provided. The entire land in possession of the proponent to be indicated along with the village boundary.

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. Regarding item no. 1 above, the proponent has provided fresh plan showing fresh haulage lines demarcating danger zone, which is found to be satisfactory. The proponent has provided details regarding items 2 and 3 above, which were found to be satisfactory, on verification. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions (as specified in previous meeting in which the proposal was recommended by SEAC) 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.

**Item No. 23.16**      **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)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. The proponent has provided saakshyapathram from Village Officer, Vadasserikkara, certifying that 13 ares of land in Sy. No. 397/10 has been bought by him and has also provided copy of letter from District Collector, Pathanamthitta reporting the status of land bearing Sy. No. 397/1 and recommending for issuance of NOC for conducting mining in 76.15 ares in the said Sy. No. The Committee verified the same and found that the proponent has provided details on the quarrying lease for Sy. Nos. 397/1 (Govt. land) and 397/10, the area of which coming to a total of 0.892 hectares. Earlier, the proponent has provided copy of letter dt. 07.03.2007 from Thahsildar Ranni, reporting to Dist. Collector, Pathanamthitta regarding present status of land in Sy. No. 397/1 and forwarding the application for NOC to conduct quarrying activities wherein, the area of Sy. No. 397/1 itself comes to a total of 89.15 ar excluding Sy. No. 397/10 whereas as seen from the copy of land tax receipt of Sy. No. 397/10, its area is 13 are. Clarification was sought from the proponent regarding this and the proponent has provided corrected letter from Village Office, Vadasserikkara, clearly specifying that Sy. No. 397/10 has 13 ares of land and Sy. No. 397/1 has 76.15 ares of land. The Committee found that the proponent has satisfactorily addressed all additional clarifications except valid proof regarding the conversion of reserve forest to patta land which was sought earlier, since Sy. Nos. 391/8, 395/1, 7 and 397/1 are not included in the clarification provided. Considering this, the item is DEFERRED seeking satisfactory submission of the above document from the proponent for further consideration of the proposal. If the same is not received within 30 days of communication to be sent by SEAC, the proposal shall be delisted.

**Item No. 23.17**      **Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Vallikunnum Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 649/12-3 by Dr. Manoj Kumar G. (File No. 178/SEIAA/KL/3696/2013)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 1200 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth from 24.28 ares of land for residential purposes from Sy No. 649/12-3 of Vallikunnum Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala. The applicant has not provided any document to prove the utilization of removed excavated earth, present status of land, etc. along with the application. But in the afternoon the proponent submitted a copy of report from Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengannur, reporting the

present status of land and that the excavated earth shall be utilized for the road works of Vallikkunnam and Krishnapuram Grama Panchayaths. In the said report it is stated that there is a possibility of excavating the earth below the road level. Considering the same the proponent is directed that the excavation should not exceed the level of the road. It is also decided that permission may be granted to the applicant for removal of 1200 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth from 24.28 ares of land which should be utilized only for the road works of Vallikkunnam and Krishnapuram Grama Panchayaths.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance for removal of 1200 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares as follows and also on conditions *that removal of ordinary earth (excavation) should not exceed the level of the road and the excavated earth shall be utilized only for the road works of Vallikkunnam and Krishnapuram Grama Panchayaths:*

- (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.

**Item No. 23.18**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the Building stone quarry project in Sy. Nos. 781/1-23-1 & 781/1-23-2 at Athikkayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by Mr. Tomy Abraham (File No. 121/SEIAA/KL/2200/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent and found that the proponent has addressed all the queries raised by SEAC except the following:

- 1.The names of the institutions to which the proposed CSR activities shall be extended is not provided.
- 2.The consent given by Achaamma Tomy, who owns the Sy. No. 781/1-23-1, is not satisfactory as it is nowhere mentioned in the consent that the same is given to the project proponent to conduct quarrying activities in land bearing Sy. No. owned by her.

The Committee also examined and discussed on the complaints received by SEIAA Kerala against the functioning of quarries in Chembanmudi Hills of Athikkayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, including the quarry of the proponent of this project, Mr. Tomy Abraham. Considering the allegations made in the complaints, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND THE PROPOSAL TO BE CONSIDERED AS B1 CATEGORY, to address the proponent to get the public hearing conducted and to report to SEAC based on the General Terms of Reference followed by Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) for non-coal mining. Additionally, the Terms of Reference should address the complaints from public regarding landslide proneness and tribal settlements. The proponent is also directed to address the clarifications sought earlier, as above, complete in all respects, for reconsideration of the proposal following public hearing and EIA report thereon.

**Item No. 23.19**      **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 Committee considered the request from the proponent to withdraw the application for Environmental Clearance stating that the project does not come under the purview of neither the Central nor the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority since as per the BOT agreement entered between them and the Dept. of Tourism, the construction works are to be limited to less than 15,000 m<sup>2</sup> of built up area. The Committee RECOMMENDED TO ALLOW WITHDRAWAL of the application submitted by the proponent on condition that no activity should be undertaken without EC for the case of aerial rope way as it is an activity in the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 that require prior EC. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to make a separate application for that and also to address the LSGI accordingly.

**Item No. 23.20**      **O.M. No. 1-4/2012-RE (Pt.) dt. 20.12.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on High Level Working Group Report on Western Ghats**

The Committee noted the item and decided that till the final notification comes, EC can be considered in proposed ESAs for existing mining projects and not for new ones on condition that it shall be subject to the notification that the MoEF may issue in due course with regard to Western Ghats.

**Item No. 23.21** O.M. No. J-13012/12/2013-IA-II (I) dt. 24.12.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on Guidelines for consideration of proposals for grant of Environmental Clearance EIA Notification 2006 and its amendments regarding categorization of Category 'B' projects/activities into Category 'B1' and Category 'B2'

Noted.

**Item No. 23.22** Any other item approved by Chair

**Item No. 23.22.01** Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Amballur Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala in Sy. No. 1421/1 by E.M. Sunny (File No. 188/SEIAA/KL/3747/2013)

Even though the proponent was intimated about the consideration of his application for EC before SEAC in the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting, the proponent failed to attend the meeting. Hence the item is DEFERRED.

**Item No. 23.22.02** Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Palamel Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 590/1-2 by Smt. Sainaba R. (File No. 189/SEIAA/KL/31/2014)

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The proponent has stated in the application that the removal of ordinary earth is for commercial purposes. When asked about this, the proponent stated that the earth shall be removed to prepare the land for construction of house and the removed earth shall be sold to the concerned person. The Committee directed the proponent to enter the correct details in the application regarding the purpose of removal of earth. Also, it is found that the proponent has either left some columns blank or has incorrectly filled some columns in the application, which the Committee found as not acceptable and directed the applicant to resubmit the application.

The Committee verified the copy of minor mineral license issued to Sri. K.M. Jacob (to whom the applicant propose to sell the removed earth) for stocking and selling of ordinary earth valid up to 31.03.2014 stipulating certain conditions, submitted by the proponent along with the application. The Committee was of the opinion that Sri. K.M. Jacob is authorized to store only up to 2000 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth within a year as per the said license, whereas the proponent has not provided the quantity of earth to be removed from the proposed area, which is very important as far as the application for removal of ordinary earth is concerned. Hence the Committee was of the opinion that only after getting the said data from the proponent, it could be decided as to whether the request from the proponent could be considered. The Committee was also of the opinion that *the excavation should not exceed 1000 m<sup>3</sup> since the purpose is for construction of house*. The proponent is also directed to provide the sketch of the 50 cents of land marking the area where the earth is to be removed and house is proposed to be constructed. Consent from owners of the

adjacent plot stating that they have no objection in removing the earth from the plot of the applicant is also not provided and is hence directed to provide the same.

The Committee found the following discrepancies in the application submitted and hence directed the proponent to resubmit the application entering all details correctly and without leaving no blank columns:

- (i) Column no. 3 of application (extent of area in hectares) is left blank. (*But in the forwarding letter from Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengannur, the extent of area is given as 24.28 Ares, whereas in the affidavit the proponent has stated the extent of area as 20/23 Are.*)
- (ii) Column no. 4.2 of the application (Purpose of removal of earth) is incorrectly filled
- (iii) Column no. 19.4 of the application (Quantity of earth proposed to be removed) is incorrectly filled.

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

1. Revised application form entering all details correctly and without leaving no columns blank. (addressing items (i) to (iii) above)
2. Consent from the owners of adjacent plot.
3. Sketch of the 50 cents of land marking the area where the earth is to be removed and house is proposed to be constructed.

**Item No. 23.22.03      Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Kunnathur Village, Kunnathur Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala in Sy. No. 278/9-2 by Mr. Muraleedharan Pillai (File No. 190/SEIAA/KL/35/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent authorized Mr. Mahesh M. to attend the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting on his behalf to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on the application for removal of ordinary earth. In his authorization, the proponent has stated his inability to attend the meeting due to the pre-fixed health check up for him.

The Committee found that the applicant has submitted application for removal of 900 MT of ordinary earth from 0.24 hectares of land in Sy No. 278/9-2 of Kunnathur Village, Kunnathur Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala, for residential purposes. The Committee found that in the certificate from Village Officer, Amballur dt. 02.03.2013 it is stated that ordinary earth has been removed from Sy. No. 278/9 and as per the certificate from Village Office, Kunnathur, it is stated that high court has issued orders to remove 900 MT of ordinary earth from the said area and that the 300 MT ordinary earth is removed from the site. Hence the Committee decided that permission may be granted to the applicant for removal of 600 MT of ordinary earth in Sy No. 278/9-2 which should be utilized only for leveling the purayidam bearing Sy. No. 267/8 in Block 16 of Kunnathoor Village, Kunnathur Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala. The Committee also found that the Sy. No. in the application belongs to Smt. Soumya and it is stated in the application that she has given consent to the applicant to construct house in the land owned by her but the same is not provided. Mr. Mahesh stated that Smt. Soumya has given the consent which they have not provided with the application and provided the copy of consent given by Smt. Soumya to Mr. Muraleedharan Pillai for removal of ordinary earth from Sy No. 278/9-2 of Kunnathur Village, Kunnathur Taluk, Kollam District. The Committee

also found that in the NOC issued by District Collector, Kollam, certain conditions are stipulated for removal of the ordinary earth and hence the proponent is directed to comply with the same.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares 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.

In addition to the above, the following specific conditions are stipulated:

1. Permission may be granted for removal of 600 MT of ordinary earth in Sy No. 278/9-2 which should be utilized only for leveling the purayidam bearing Sy. No. 267/88 in Block 16 of Kunnathoor Village, Kunnathur Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala.
2. Conditions specified by the District Collector should be followed.
3. The canal in the plot area should be retained.
4. Consent from the owner of the area (Soumya) should be produced before initiating the works.

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

**Item No. 23.22.04 Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Nooranad Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 377/12 by Smt. Sheeja (File No. 191/SEIAA/KL/43/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee

on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee noted the following discrepancies in the application:

1. The removal of ordinary earth is for commercial purposes as stated in col. 4.2 whereas in col. 13.1 it is stated that the same is for construction of house.
2. As per the tax register, the Sy. No. 377/12 is under the possession of Kalyaniammma Lakshmiamma.
3. Copy of relevant abstract of minutes of the meeting of Nooranad Grama Panchayath stating the status of 02.04 Ares of land bearing Sy. No. 377/11-2 provided. It is stated in the minutes that the report is based on the request from the applicant to consider removal of ordinary earth for residential purposes. (But the Sy. No. in the said certificate is different from the Sy. No. of present application).
4. Copy of letter sent to RDO, Chengannur by the Asst. Executive Engineer seeking permission for unloading 1295 m<sup>3</sup> of gravel by Sri. V. Sugathan and, copy of agreement schedule issued by Mavelikkara Block Panchayat for a project of gravel filling in Mannar Grama Panchayath is provided. (But it is not clear as to whom the work order is given and from where the earth shall be taken.).
5. Certificate from Village Officer, Nooranad reporting the names of land owners within 25 m radius of the project site and names and address of residents living within 50 m radius of the project area provided. ID card of all of them and consent from all of them, except Mr. Sidharthan, provided.

The proponent is directed to furnish necessary clarifications/documents regarding items 1 to 5 above, within a week. Only on receipt of the same and further verification, the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA for further necessary action.

The appraisal report is approved and the proposal is **RECOMMENDED** for issuance of Environmental Clearance subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares 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.

**Item No. 23.22.05 Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Nooranad Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 78/4 by Mr. Sadanandan (File No. 192/SEIAA/KL/44/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the total extent of land is given as 12.84 ares in Col. 3 of the application and in the affidavit whereas in Saakshyapathram from Additional Tahsildar, it is given as 18.00 Ares. In the certificate from Village Officer, Nooranad, the extent of area of 18.00 ares is struck off as 12.74 ares. The Committee considering the same was of the opinion that since the proponent has sought EC for removal of earth from a lesser area than that specified by the Additional Tahsildar, the request of the applicant for 12.84 ares may be considered.

1. In the report from Taluk Office, Mavelikkara, it is stated that **red earth** is to be removed for construction of house. (*It is not stated as for Commercial purpose*)
2. The removal of ordinary earth is **for commercial purposes** as stated in col. 4.2 whereas in col. 13.1 it is stated that the same is **for construction of house** and in col. 31.2 it is stated as for own use.
3. As per the tax register, **the Sy. No. 78/4 is under the possession of Krishnan Neelakantan.**
4. Copy of relevant abstract of minutes of the meeting of Nooranad Grama Panchayath deciding to give permission to remove ordinary earth from 15 cents of land bearing Sy. No. 78/4 for construction of house, subject to necessary approval from Revenue and Mining and Geology Department. (**The applicant has sought EC for 12.84 ares which is approximately equal to 31 cents**).
5. Consent from Santhosh and Janatha, stated as the owners of neighbouring plots, provided. But in Col. 5 of the application, the names of owners of neighbouring plots are given as Janatha and Sankara Pillai and **consent from Sankara Pillai is not provided.**
6. In the copy of report forwarded by Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengannur regarding the status of land and proposed utilization of removed earth from the land, it is stated that **2444 m<sup>3</sup> of earth could be removed from 18 ares of land. (But the proponent has sought EC to remove 2444 m<sup>3</sup> of earth from 12.84 ares of land)**

The proponent is directed to furnish necessary clarifications/documents regarding items 1 to 6 above, within a week. Only on receipt of the same and further verification, the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA for further necessary action.

The appraisal report is approved and the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares 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.

**Item No. 23.22.06      Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Nooranad Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 309/4 by Mr. Sunil Kumar S. (File No. 193/SEIAA/KL/45/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth.

The following discrepancies are noted in the application:

1. Column no. 3 (extent of area in hectares) is left blank. (But in the forwarding letter from Additional Thahsildar, Mavelikkara, the extent of area is given as 15.60 Ares).
2. Some columns in application are left blank.
3. The removal of ordinary earth is for commercial purposes as stated in col. 31.2 whereas in the minutes of meeting of Nooranad Grama Panchayath it is stated that the applicant has sought permission for removal of sand for agricultural purposes.
4. As per the tax register, the Sy. No. 309/4 is under the possession of Kesavan Thankappan, which needs clarification.
5. Copy of letter sent to RDO, Chengannur by the Asst. Executive Engineer seeking permission for obtaining gravel provided. (But the identity and relation of the contractor mentioned in the same with the applicant is not clear and it is also not clear as to whether the earth removed from the plot of applicant shall be taken for the said work stated in the work order).

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to resubmit the application and addressing the above, for further consideration of the application.

**Item No. 23.22.07**    **Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Vadakkumbhagam Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala in Sy. No. 17/47 by Mr. Mani P.M. (File No. 194/SEIAA/KL/46/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 160 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth from 0.02.54 hectares of land in Sy No. 17/47 of Vadakkumbhagam Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala, for levelling of land for construction of workshop.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares as follows and also on condition *that ordinary earth should be removed leaving 3 feet distance from the boundary walls of adjacent plot:*

- (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.

**Item No. 23.22.08**    **Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Aaloor Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala in Sy. No. 109/3 by Mr. C.K. Gopalan (File No. 195/SEIAA/KL/47/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent informed his inability to attend the 23<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting being aged and hence authorized another person to attend the meeting on his behalf to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on his application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee verified the authorization from the proponent and is found to be satisfactory.

The Committee found that the applicant has submitted application for removal of 247.5 m<sup>3</sup> of ordinary earth from 0.0678 hectares of land in Sy No. 109/3 of Aaloor Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala, for agricultural purposes.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the person authorized by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance subject to the conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares 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.

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

-----