

MINUTES OF 29TH MEETING OF SEAC KERALA HELD ON 2ND & 3RD MAY 2014, AT HARITHASREE HALL, DoECC

The twenty-ninth meeting of SEAC-Kerala was held on 2nd and 3rd May 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. On day 1, 2nd May 2014, the meeting commenced at 9.30 am. The list of participants is attached at the end.

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the members. The Committee discussed on the cases of Environmental Clearance wherein the employee of the firm applies for EC. The Committee was of the opinion that in such cases, there is every possibility that the commitments made by such authorized person/authorized signatory need not be binding on the real promoters of the firm. Hence it is decided that the applications from the real proponent (like Directors) only shall be accepted henceforth and the proponent himself has to attend the SEAC meeting for making presentation before the Committee hereafter. The Committee discussed on the informal information on the tendency of builders to split up the built up area to less than 20,000 m² for evading the processing of Environmental Clearance on the plea that the procedure for the same is stringent. The Committee wanted to inform the general public that it has not so far delineated from its primary and prominent role in protecting the environment with respect to whatever projects which has been appraised so far and reminded that every measure shall be taken to ensure that EC is sought for all projects coming under the purview of EIA Notification 2006 and opined that local bodies should take stringent measures to curb this tendency.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations.

Item No. 29.01 Confirmation of the minutes of the 28th SEAC meeting, held on 25th & 26th April 2014, at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed

Item No. 29.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 28th SEAC meeting

Noted

Item No. 29.03 Environmental Clearance for Group Housing project, 'Nikunjam Palm Grove', in Sy. Nos. 1888/2-4, 1888/2-2 and 1888/2-3 at Kadakampally Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 252/SEIAA/KL/1090/2014)

The project proponent expressed his inability to make a brief presentation before the Committee. With due request from the proponent, Mr. Ravindran, General Manager (Technical)

of M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd., who was neither an accredited consultant nor an approved Sectoral Area Expert, was allowed to make a technical presentation of the proposal before the Committee. *The Committee was also apprehensive on the acceptability of EMP submitted by the proponent, since the same was not prepared by an accredited agency and further needed to examine whether such an Environment Management Plan (EMP) which is not prepared by a competent agency can be made acceptable or not.* During the presentation, the Committee found that the presentation made by the proponent gives only a rosy picture and neither clearly concentrate on the conceptual plan of the project nor the specific requirements for the project with specifications for each facility. The Committee informed the proponent that as far as a construction project is concerned, proper appraisal could be based only on the specific details provided in Form 1, Form 1A and the Conceptual Plan. Considering the same, the proponent is directed to ***reorient the presentation incorporating facts and specific details contained in Form 1, Form 1 A and Conceptual plan and to make a fresh presentation before the Committee for further appraisal.*** The proponent stated that the power/energy requirement for the project shall be as per the MoEF norms and the biobin system shall be as suggested by CREDAI. The Committee observed that the proponent failed to clearly specify the power and energy requirement for the project and also the specifications of the biobin system/RWH units (stated to be as per KMBR, which is not specific) proposed and is directed to provide specific details on the same. The Committee was quite apprehensive as to the proximity of the project site to the T.S. canal and was of the opinion that the canal being tidally active, any construction in its proximity requires CRZ clearance, as tidally active creeks are governed by CRZ norms. Considering the same, the proponent is directed to provide clearance from KCZMA demarcating the No Development Zone specific to the project site as CRZ is not under the ambit of SEAC. To this end the proponent stated that construction is permissible 10 m away from the canal as per the amendment of Trivandrum Town Planning Scheme, 2007. Hence the proponent is directed to provide relevant document to prove that the area is exempted from the coastal zone since the CRZ limits are not prescribed by town planning schemes but as per the CRZ Notification of Government of India. The Committee also found that Sy. No. 1888 is a vast area and hence the position of the project site in the said Sy. No. is to be clearly demarcated. It was also found that in the soil analysis report provided by the proponent, the profile of the soil is not mentioned and is hence directed to provide the same. Also, as per the soil analysis report provided by the proponent, organic clay is found which shows that the wells are not yielding. But as stated by the proponent, the wells in and around the site are high yielding and hence the proponent is directed to provided document to prove the high yielding of wells as stated by the proponent. Also the proponent is directed to provide the yield test report of well in the site. The Committee found that the proponent has not clearly shown the set back distance of the project site from the highway and is directed to provide the same in the revised conceptual plan to be submitted. The proponent has also not provided specific details on the CSR activities linked with the present project. To this end the proponent stated that construction of foot overbridge is proposed by all builders in front of the Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Cotton Hill, Vazhuthacaud and Holy Angel's Convent School, both at Thiruvananthapuram. The Committee stated that the same is not sufficient as part of CSR since it is not specific and the proponent is directed either to provide the details of contribution from his part for the project or to provide specific details on

the CSR activities linked with the present project with details of areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended. The Committee also found that the proponent has not provided in the application NOC from Airports Authority of India (AAI). The proponent presented before the Committee the NOC issued by AAI. But on verification of the same, claimed to be issued for the project, it was found that it was issued in 2009 and in the said NOC neither the name of the proponent nor the Sy. Nos. of the project site are mentioned which was hence difficult to identify whether the said document was issued for the present project. Hence the proponent is directed to provide NOC from AAI in the name of the proponent clearly specifying the Sy. Nos. of the project site. The proponent has also stated that he has not provided the cadastral map since the same is not available as the resurvey of the block is not completed. ***However, the Committee decided to seek clarification from Revenue Authorities as to whether resurvey map is available for Kadakampally Village.***

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent and directed the proponent to address the factual errors in the application:

- (i) *In col. 23 of application regarding whether forest land is involved, it is stated as 'Not Applicable'.*
- (ii) The maximum number of floors of the building is stated as Basement + Ground floor + 13 floors (in *c.f. pg. no. 133*) and, Basement + Ground floor + 14 (in *c.f. pg. no. 69*) of the application.
- (iii) The total plot area of the proposed project is 0.6070 hectares (in *c.f. pg. no. 69*) (60 Ares 700 m²/ 150 cents) and 0.6075 hectares (in *c.f. pg. no. 133*) of the application.
- (iv) The maximum height of building is 44.55 m (as given in *c.f. pg. no. 69*) and 45.55 m (as given in *c.f. pg. no. 133*) of the application.
- (v) Capacity of STP is 125 KLD (as given in *c.f. pg. no. 69*) & 120 KLD (as given in *schematic diagram of STP provided at c.f. pg. no. 139*)
- (vi) It is stated in the checklist at *c.f. pg. no. 9* that the nearest water body is T.S. canal which is located at a distance of 20 m from the project site. But the details of the same are not mentioned in the 'Environmental Sensitivity' part of Form 1.
- (vii) Conceptual Plan is provided *but the Sy. Nos. of the project site are not shown in it.*
- (viii) Notarized copy of Resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors of M/s Nikunjam Constructions Pvt. Ltd. authorizing Mr. S. Krishnakumar, Managing Director of the firm provided. But in the same, only the proponent has put his signature, whereas the current list of directors of the firm shows one more director (Smt. Sindhu Krishnakumar) who has not signed the resolution).
- (ix) Details of Rain Water Harvesting and Water recharge pits are not provided.
- (x) In none of the maps provided in the application Sy. Nos. of the project site are mentioned to ensure that the said map refers to this project.
- (xi) Location of open wells is not provided.
- (xii) Google image of the project site without date and co-ordinates provided.
- (xiii) Details on CSR activities are not provided but stated that as per the mandatory norms under Companies Act, which lacks clarity. (*Details of contribution from the part of the proponent for the construction of foot over bridge in front of the Government Girls*

Higher Secondary School, Cotton Hill, Vazhuthacaud and Holy Angel's Convent School, both at Thiruvananthapuram, or specific details on the CSR activities linked with the present project with details of areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, to be provided).

- (xiv) Built up area is 30,688.7 m² as given in the application and 30,668.70 m² as stated by the proponent during presentation.

Considering the lapses found in the application submitted and the presentation done by the proponent before the Committee, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide KCZMA recommendations duly forwarding copy of the proposal, reorient the presentation incorporating the facts and specific details contained in Form 1, Form 1 A (like soil profile, water balance chart, among others) and Conceptual plan & to make a fresh presentation before the Committee for further appraisal and also seeking the following additional clarifications:

1. Specific details on the power/energy requirement and the proposed biobin system.
2. Quantification of energy saved.
3. Revised conceptual plan showing set back distance from the highway and also incorporating other specific details/facilities of the project.
4. Document to prove that the project area is exempted from the coastal zone regulations.
5. Cadastral map in which the proposed outlay plan of the project site is superimposed.
6. Soil profile of the project site.
7. Document to prove the high yielding of wells in the area as stated by the proponent.
8. Yield test report of well in the site.
9. NOC from AAI in the name of the proponent clearly specifying the Sy. Nos. of the project site.
10. Clarifications (with supporting documents) on items (i) to (xiv) above.

Item No. 29.04 **Environmental Clearance for Commercial Complex project in Sy. Nos. 4/18-3, 6/19-2, 6/9-3, 5/3 pt., 6/1-2, 4/14, 6/6-2, 6/1-2-3, 6/7-2-2, 6/5-2, 6/5, 6/12-2, 4/18-2, 6/19-2, 6/9-2, 4/17, 4/20, 7/1-3, 6/10, 6/11, 6/8, 7/1-4, 4/16, 4/19-2 and 4/15 at Aluva West Village, Choornikkara Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by P.C. Thahir (File No. 270/SEIAA/KL/1223/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The proponent was directed to explain the conceptual plan of the project. The proponent stated that GAIL pipeline and 66 KV electric line are passing on one side of the project site and hence a setback of 5.5 m is left from the project site on that side. The Committee found that the set back left from the highway, as shown in the landscape plan lacks clarity. The distance of the project site from the highway is not reflected in the conceptual plan also. To this end the proponent stated that a setback of 8 m is left from highway. However the Committee decided to ascertain the same during site visit and directed the proponent to submit the revised conceptual plan demarcating the setback left from highway. The proponent is also directed to provide clearance from the NHAI regarding the setback to be left from the highway. The Committee raised apprehension regarding the present road width of 5 m left by the proponent,

which was not sufficient for the free movement of Fire and Rescue Services. It was also found that the construction is proposed for one level below the existing ground level. The Committee stated that the same is not permissible and directed the proponent to provide assurance that the depth of excavation should not exceed at least the water level of the Muttar river. The proponent is also directed to set aside a land bank for the excavated earth. At this juncture, SEAC suggested that Government may be addressed to consider for a land bank for each district for storing excavated so that the same may be utilized for government works. It was further suggested that the removed earth which is in excess other than that is used within the project area should be given free of cost for state or central government purpose only. The Committee appreciated the CSR activities proposed by the proponent on need based assessment of the stakeholders. The Committee asked the proponent as to why clearance from Airports Authority of India has not been taken for the project. To this end the proponent stated that AAI clearance is not required for a height up to 30 m. Hence the Committee directed the proponent that the height of the building should not exceed 30 m and if it exceeds that limit, permission from Airports Authority of India may be sought.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Notarized copy of saakshyapathram from Village Officer certifying that the land marked as nilam as per BTR with respect to all sy. nos. of the project site except 4/19-2 and 4/15, is notified as converted land in the draft data bank of Choornikkara Krishi Bhavan limits, provided. *But some Sy. Nos. marked as purayidam in the land tax receipts is stated as nilam in the saakshyapathram.*

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the setback left by the proponent from the highway and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Revised conceptual plan demarcating the setback left from highway.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the depth of excavation should not exceed at least the water level of the Muttar river.
3. Clearance from the NHAI regarding the setback to be left from the highway.
4. Clarification on item (i) above.

Item No. 29.05 **Request for condoning of delay in submitting additional clarifications regarding environmental clearance for proposed Apartment (Silver Linden) Project in Sy. Nos. T.S. No.208/1A, Panniyankara Village, Kozhikode Taluk and Corporation, Kozhikode District, Kerala from M/s Malabar Highview Builders (P) Ltd. (File No. 253/SEIAA/KL/1091/2014)**

The Committee decided that the proponent has to apply afresh, since the earlier application is delisted as the proponent failed to submit the additional clarifications within the stipulated time.

Item No. 29.06 **Request from M/s Kizhakethalackel Rocks to accord Environmental Clearance for the quarry project at Kumily Village, Peermade Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala (File No. 236/SEIAA/KL/880/2014)**

As per NGT orders, SEAC reconsidered the application for Environmental Clearance of M/s Kizhakethalackel Rocks. The Committee found that the proponent has not submitted the application as per the present guidelines and following the general instructions stipulated for all applications for Environmental Clearance as given in SEIAA website. Hence the proponent is requested to apply afresh based on the changed conditions and following SEIAA guidelines.

Item No. 29.07 **Environmental clearance for River sand mining in Kasargod District, Kerala submitted by District Collector, Kasargod (File No. 308/SEIAA/KL/1642/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting. Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance which shall be valid only up to 30th September 2014 for mining 50000 m³ of sand from the 41 Kadavus as per the CWRDM Report of 2011-2012 and with the following conditions:

1. The depth of sand mining should not exceed the water level at summer.
2. The quantity of sand removed from each Kadavu during the period(s) of EC validity, should not exceed the quantity removed during the corresponding period in 2013.
3. Mining of sand in the Coastal Regulation Zone shall be as per the guidelines stipulated by the KCZMA.
4. Summer water level must be fixed with reference to a permanent point (bench mark) by levelling and should be recorded for future reference. At least two such points must exist in each Panchayath.
5. The conditions under Para 1 (iii) (a) to (e) stipulated in the O.M. dt. 24th December 2013 of MoEF for river sand mining should be complied with. Items mentioned under Chapter 3 of the Kerala Protection of River Bank and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act 2001 should be followed, unless repugnant with the conditions in the O.M. dt. 24th December 2013.
6. Online e-management system should only be resorted for sand distribution.
7. All the other statutory clearances as is required should be obtained.

Item No. 29.08 **Environmental clearance for the proposed expansion of existing super speciality hospital project in Re-Sy. Nos. 18/29, 18/25, 18/23, 18/24, 18/29pt. and 18/26-2 at Chorode Village and Panchayath and Re. Sy. Nos. 16/2 and 16/1A1 at Vadakara Village & Municipality, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Parco Institute of Medical Sciences Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 271/SEIAA/KL/1224/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The Committee found that clearance from National Highway Authority of India is

required for the project and is hence directed to provide the same. It was found from the photographs dt. 01.01.2014 provided in the application that the construction has started. Hence the Committee decided to ascertain the status of construction during site visit. The Committee found that the hospital being 400-bedded requires at least parking space for 400 cars as against the proposed parking facility for 220 cars. Hence the proponent is directed to verify the parking requirements for the hospital and to submit the details on the same. Moreover, the proponent has not provided the facilities proposed for the project especially, the various departments proposed to be included as part of the hospital project and is hence directed to provide details on the same.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Regarding proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation consequent upon change of name of M/s Avicenna Medicare Institute Pvt. Ltd. to M/s Parco Institute of Medical Sciences Pvt. Ltd. provided. ***But as per the certificate, the name of the earlier firm is given as Avicenna Medicare Institute Pvt. Ltd. whereas in the land tax receipt the name is given as Avicenna Medicine Institute Pvt. Ltd. Clarification is required as to whether these two are separate firms.***
- (ii) In the Location sketch (in original) for Sy. Nos. in the name of M/s Parco Institute of Medical Sciences Pvt. Ltd., Sy.No.18/29 is not seen marked. Also, in the copy of location sketch of Sy. Nos. 16/2 and 16/1A1, the Sy. Nos. are stated to be owned by Puthiyapurayil Abdurahiman and not in the name of M/s Avicenna Medical Institute Pvt. Ltd.
- (iii) Copy of building permit (valid up to 04.02.2014) issued in the name of P.P. Abdul Rehman for construction of hospital building in some Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal and some Sy. Nos. not part of the present proposal provided.
- (iv) Copy of NOC from Fire & Rescue Services provided. But in the same, some Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal and some Sy. Nos. not part of the present proposal is included.
- (v) Attested true copy of NABET accreditation certificate not provided.
- (vi) Details of CSR do not clearly specify the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended and the amount set aside for the same.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the status of construction and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Clearance from the NHAI regarding the setback to be left from the highway.
2. Cadastral map in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed.
3. Details on parking requirements for the hospital project.
4. Details on the facilities proposed for the project especially, the various departments proposed to be included as part of the hospital project. Nuclear medicine waste management plan may also be included which is planned about 5 km away from the project site.
5. Clarification on items (i) to (vi) above.

Item No. 29.09 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 1019/3, 1019/4, 1019/5, 1019/6, 1019/7, 1021/6, 1021/8, 1021/9, 1027P, 1028P, 1029P and 1030P at Painkulam Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Southern Rock & Aggregate Mining Company (File No. 285/SEIAA/KL/1362/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The Committee found that the proponent has provided copies of land tax receipt for Sy. Nos. 1019/3, 1019/4, 1027 and 1028 and possession certificate for Sy. Nos. 1019/3, 1019/4, 1019/5, 1021/8, 1021/9, 1027, 1028 in the name of the proponent and copy of land tax receipt and possession certificate for Sy. Nos. 1030, 1019/6 and 1019/7 in the name of Prince Abraham, but in the application, EC is sought for 'part' of Sy. No. 1027, 1028 and 1030. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a map marking the exact distance of the project site from the survey boundary pillars precisely marking the proposed mining area in the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Basic information of the project not provided.
- (ii) Affidavit from the proponent undertaking that he is owning the firm M/s Southern Rock & Aggregate Mining Company and that he is the sole proprietor of the firm provided. But Certificate of incorporation of the firm not provided so as to ascertain the directors of the firm, if any.
- (iii) In the area survey plan provided, 'part' of Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal is not shown so, but the total area is the same as that mentioned in the proposal (7.8000 hectares).
- (iv) Details on CSR provided but the areas/institutions for which the same shall be extended is not specifically provided. Committee suggested the inclusion of organ transplant also under CSR.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Map marking the exact distance of the project site from the survey boundary pillars precisely marking the proposed mining area in the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.
2. Clarification on items (i) to (iv) above.

Item No. 29.10 **Environmental clearance for the residential project ("Marine View at Marine Drive") at Plot No. D4 & D5 in Sy. No. 843 pt. at Ernakulam Village, Kochi Municipal Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Puravankara Projects Limited (File No. 275/SEIAA/KL/1278/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

Google image dt. 16.01.2013 provided. But the co-ordinates in the image does not fall within the co-ordinates provided in the checklist (Latitude: 10⁰00' 01.38" N to 10⁰59' 51.06" N

(i) Longitude: 76⁰16' 22.73" E to 76⁰16' 31.22" E).

(ii) Copy of NOC from Southern Naval Command for a height of 102 m AMSL (for Block T), 98 m AMSL (for Block J) and 95.75 AMSL (for Block G) including water tank, aerals, lift-well, etc. provided. But the certificate is valid only up to 2012. Also, it could not be ascertained whether the present application pertains to the construction of 3 blocks T, J and G as it is mentioned in the application about 3 residential buildings in blocks for 1141 apartments without referring to the names of blocks.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the above additional clarifications from the proponent for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 29.11 **Environmental clearance for the Apartment Housing project in Sy. Nos. 128/4, 128/19-2, 128/8-1, 128/19-4, 128/19-1, 128/18-4, 128/19-6, 128/2-1, 128/20, 128/19, 128/18, 128/120-2, 128/19-5, 128/18-3, 128/19-3, 128/3, 128/19-3-1 and 128/2 at Cheruvaikal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk and District, Kerala by Army Welfare Housing Organisation (File No. 295/SEIAA/KL/1494/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation of the project before the Committee. Regarding proof of authorized signatory, letter from Brig. S. Kemparaj, Dy MD (Adm) of Army Welfare Housing Organisation (AWHO) authorizing Col. M.D. Nair to sign all documents to be submitted to authorities has been provided by the proponent. In the copy of building permit issued to Army Welfare Housing Organisation (AWHO), some Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal are not included (Sy. Nos. 128/8-1, 128/3, 128/120-2 and 128/19-3-1) and some Sy. Nos. not included in the proposal (Sy. No. 128/2-2 and 128/18-1) are seen included. In the NOC from Airports Authority of India for a height of 53.03 m AMSL for Blocks 1 to 6 in Sy. No. 128/4 and for a height of 48.515 m AMSL in Sy. No. 128/2, other Sy. Nos. mentioned in the application is not provided. But it was found that the EC is sought for the whole area of the site in which construction is proposed.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance on usual conditions stipulated for non-mining projects.

Item No. 29.12 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 8/2(p) at Vettilappara Village, Kondotty/Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Vettilappara Bricks & Metals (File No. 286/SEIAA/KL/1363/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The proponent stated that quarrying is going on in the area for the past 15 years.

The Committee directed the proponent to provide desiltation tank on the lower slopes as part of the storm water management plan.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) The total project cost is given as ` 2 in c.f. pg. no. 51.
- (ii) Google image dt. 02.01.2012 provided but the co-ordinates of the image does not fall within the co-ordinates given in the application.
- (iii) Notarized affidavit in original for the conditions mentioned in the checklist provided but the village and taluk with respect to the project stated in the affidavit differs from the application.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain whether quarrying could be permitted in the area taking into account of the slope, and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that desiltation tank shall be provided on the lower slopes of the project site.
2. Revised biodiversity listing of flora and fauna.
3. CSR activities specifically linked with the present project mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.
4. Clarification on items (i) to (iii) above.

Item No. 29.13 **Environmental clearance for the proposed expansion of existing Retail Shopping Complex project in Sy. Nos. 43, 44, 29, 55, 54, 45, 51/1, 14, 13, 47, 47/1, 46, 11, 7, 10, 9/1, 9/2, 3 and 4 at Muttambalam Village, Kottayam Municipality, Kottayam Taluk and District, Kerala by Mr. V. Thiruvekitam (File No. 296/SEIAA/KL/1495/2014)**

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance.

Item No. 29.14 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 1/1 (P) at Elamkulam Village, Perinthalamanna Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Madeena Granite (File No. 305/SEIAA/KL/1572/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The Committee noticed that there is thick overburden in some places of the project site and asked the proponent whether they could set aside those areas without quarrying. To this end the proponent stated that those areas are not fertile and hence is not suitable for any other land use. The proponent is directed to provide a sketch showing the entire lease area in which the proposed mining area is marked.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Consent given to the proponent by the owners of land bearing Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal is provided, but the consent is given to apply for EC for quarrying activity.
- (ii) Google image dt. 18.04.2013 provided but the co-ordinates of the image does not fall within the co-ordinates given in the application.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Sketch showing the entire lease area in which the proposed mining area is marked.
2. Clarification on items (i) to (ii) above.

Item No. 29.15 Environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 261/1, 264/1, 2-1, 2-2, 5, 5-2, 6, 7, 265/1, 1-2 and 1-3 at Elamadu Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Aiswarya Granites (File No. 127/SEIAA/KL/2368/2013))

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. It was found that clarification in writing was sought as to whether Sy. No. 261/1 or 262/1 is part of present proposal. The proponent has clarified that Sy. No. 262/1 only is part of the present proposal. Considering the same, the Committee decided that **Sy. No. 261/1 given in the present application to be replaced as 262/1.**

The item is DEFERRED seeking report from the proponent on the following issues stated in the site inspection report with detailed master plan, maps, etc.

1. There is no clear demarcation in the quarry area between the land in possession of the proponent, land in possession of other quarry owners and government land. It was explained that they are all interspersed. Hence it is difficult to evaluate area in the absence of clear cut revenue records. It is better that the proponent provide the cadastral map of all fields in his possession, the fields for which clearance is asked for now (all three proposals), government land where quarrying is completed/in progress, government land for which lease is sought and the adjacent fields of others where quarrying is completed or in progress.
2. The present method of quarrying is not by benches. Steep cuttings and pits with stagnant water are seen. They are potentially dangerous zones if not properly fenced.
3. Areas with rubber plantations and with deep overburden are included in the proposal.
4. Over burden is not stacked in clear cut places.
5. Cases of fly rock falling on dwelling units with damaged roofs have been reported. One such case is seen by the committee. The presence of relatively dense settlement on the eastern side is to be pointed out and adequate measures be taken to prevent hazards from fly rock.
6. Storm water management has not been thought off in a planned manner.
7. The status of land in the quarry zone may also be ascertained from revenue records.

It was further decided that the proponent shall also be informed that the three proposals (File Nos. 127, 128 and 129) are considered together by SEAC as a single proposal so as to avoid fragmentation of contiguous area.

Item No. 29.16 **Environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 126/2-1, 2-2, 3-3, 127/5-2, 5-3, 8 and 129/4 at Elamadu Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Aiswarya Granites (File No. 128/SEIAA/KL/2369/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. It was found that clarification in writing was sought as to whether Sy. No. 261/1 or 262/1 is part of present proposal. The proponent has clarified that Sy. No. 262/1 only is part of the present proposal. Considering the same, the Committee decided that **Sy. No. 261/1 given in the present application to be replaced as 262/1.**

The item is DEFERRED seeking report from the proponent on the following issues stated in the site inspection report with detailed master plan, maps, etc.

1. There is no clear demarcation in the quarry area between the land in possession of the proponent, land in possession of other quarry owners and government land. It was explained that they are all interspersed. Hence it is difficult to evaluate area in the absence of clear cut revenue records. It is better that the proponent provide the cadastral map of all fields in his possession, the fields for which clearance is asked for now (all three proposals), government land where quarrying is completed/in progress, government land for which lease is sought and the adjacent fields of others where quarrying is completed or in progress.
2. The present method of quarrying is not by benches. Steep cuttings and pits with stagnant water are seen. They are potentially dangerous zones if not properly fenced.
3. Areas with rubber plantations and with deep overburden are included in the proposal.
4. Over burden is not stacked in clear cut places.
5. Cases of fly rock falling on dwelling units with damaged roofs have been reported. One such case is seen by the committee. The presence of relatively dense settlement on the eastern side is to be pointed out and adequate measures be taken to prevent hazards from fly rock.
6. Storm water management has not been thought off in a planned manner.
7. The status of land in the quarry zone may also be ascertained from revenue records.

It was further decided that the proponent shall also be informed that the three proposals (File Nos. 127, 128 and 129) are considered together by SEAC as a single proposal so as to avoid fragmentation of contiguous area.

Item No. 29.17 **Environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 127/6, 127/7 and 119/1 at Elamadu Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Aiswarya Granites (File No. 129/SEIAA/KL/2370/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. It was found that clarification in writing was sought as to whether Sy. No. 261/1 or 262/1 is part of present proposal. The proponent has clarified that Sy. No. 262/1 only is part of the present proposal. Considering the same, the Committee decided that **Sy. No. 261/1 given in the present application to be replaced as 262/1.**

The item is DEFERRED seeking report from the proponent on the following issues stated in the site inspection report with detailed master plan, maps, etc.

1. There is no clear demarcation in the quarry area between the land in possession of the proponent, land in possession of other quarry owners and government land. It was explained that they are all interspersed. Hence it is difficult to evaluate area in the absence of clear cut revenue records. It is better that the proponent provide the cadastral map of all fields in his possession, the fields for which clearance is asked for now (all three proposals), government land where quarrying is completed/in progress, government land for which lease is sought and the adjacent fields of others where quarrying is completed or in progress.
2. The present method of quarrying is not by benches. Steep cuttings and pits with stagnant water are seen. They are potentially dangerous zones if not properly fenced.
3. Areas with rubber plantations and with deep overburden are included in the proposal.
4. Over burden is not stacked in clear cut places.
5. Cases of fly rock falling on dwelling units with damaged roofs have been reported. One such case is seen by the committee. The presence of relatively dense settlement on the eastern side is to be pointed out and adequate measures be taken to prevent hazards from fly rock.
6. Storm water management has not been thought off in a planned manner.
7. The status of land in the quarry zone may also be ascertained from revenue records.

It was further decided that the proponent shall also be informed that the three proposals (File Nos. 127, 128 and 129) are considered together by SEAC as a single proposal so as to avoid fragmentation of contiguous area.

Item No. 29.18 **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 verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. The following shortcomings were found in item (2), (3) and (4) of additional clarifications sought by 23rd SEAC meeting:

1. Copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No.1323/4 (539/97/3/4). - *Stated as provided in Annexure 2 but Annexure 2 is not land tax receipt, but saakshyapathram from Village Officer wherein the Sy. No. mentioned in the same does not match with the Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal.*
2. Copy of possession certificate for Sy. No. 1322/7.- *Provided but as per the possession certificate the Sy. No. is owned by Shine whereas as per the land tax receipt, that Sy. No. is owned by Mr. P.K. Jaleel, the project proponent.*
3. Consent given to the proponent by the concerned to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. Nos. owned by them. – *Consent from Sheby, Shamsudeen and Rejula not provided.*

Hence the item is DEFERRED seeking the proponent to clarify the above discrepancies.

Item No. 29.19 **Environmental clearance for the Residential Apartment project in Sy. Nos. 193/24A and 24B at Edappally South Village, Kochi Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Elko Properties & Developers Pvt. Ltd. & ABZ Skyline Properties Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 299/SEIAA/KL/1499/2014)**

The authorized signatory of the project attended the meeting. During presentation, it was stated that 350 KL rain water storage capacity is proposed for the project, 6 percent of total FSI to be set aside as recreational area out of which 35 percent would be left as open area. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided copy of sale deed for Sy. No.193/24 B. But on verification of the land tax receipt and possession certificate, it was found that the land bearing Sy. No. 193/24 is purayidam. The proponent has also stated that they have applied for NOC from Naval Command and CIAL. The proponent has not provided the biodiversity listing of flora and fauna in the application but has provided the same before the Committee at the time of presentation.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Cadastral map provided lacks clarity. (*Cadastral map in which proposed outlay plan is superimposed to be provided*).
- (ii) *The traffic management of internal road is not satisfactory (Hence, it is to be revised - Width of road from the entry point of the building to the entry point to the ramp should have a minimum width of 7 m.)*

The Committee, at the end of the presentation found that the authorized signatory is only an employee of the company who is not entitled to implement the commitments made before the Committee. **Hence SEAC directed the actual Managing Director to be present before the next SEAC to file affidavit towards fulfilment of commitments made by the applicant before SEAC.** Considering the same, the item is DEFERRED seeking the presence of the Managing Director of the firm before SEAC for filing affidavit towards assurance of commitments made by the Authorized signatory and seeking clarifications on item (i) and (ii) above. On receipt of this, proposal can be recommended on the following conditions:

1. Width of road from the entry point of the building to the entry point to the ramp should have a minimum width of 7 m.
2. NOC from Southern Naval Command and CIAL should be obtained.

Further it was decided that the matter shall be vetted by CTP for final decision on the matter.

Item No. 29.20 **Environmental clearance for the Apartment project in Sy. Nos. 51/1 and 52/1 at Kottooli Village and Taluk, Kozhikode Municipality,**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The proponent stated that a high school (private) was operating in the site since 1995 which was wound up in 2007. It was operated from a 3 storey building. Due to the change in policy of the Government (high school should have minimum campus of 3.50 acres), the high school did not meet the requirement with regard to the land size and hence the operation of the school discontinued. As stated by the proponent, the following litigations are pending against the project and /or land in which the project is proposed to be set up in the Honourable High Court of Kerala regarding the construction work (piling work) started at site before obtaining EC and the Honourable High Court stayed the work for 2 months:

1. WP (Civil) 5542 of 2014
2. WA No. 497/14
3. WP (C) No. 4701/14

Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details of petition at Honourable National Green Tribunal as mentioned in the above High Court orders.

In the copies of sale deed provided by the proponent, Sy. No. 51/1 is marked as nilam. The proponent has produced copy of High Court order granting permission for going ahead with the construction. On verification of the said order, the Committee observed that the High Court order only states that the land could not be considered as a wetland since there was a school. But the Committee was of the opinion that the certificate regarding conversion of wetland is necessary in this regard, considering the Wetland Act. Hence the proponent is directed to provide certificate from data bank stating that the said land is not coming under wetland. As stated by the proponent, the project site is declared as residential zone as per the regional master plan. The proponent is also directed to provide the document regarding the same and the original cadastral map of the site. It was also found in the cadastral map submitted by the proponent that the project comes only in 'part' of the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal and hence the proponent is directed to provide cadastral map in which proposed outlay plan of the project is superimposed, clearly demarcating the Sy. Nos. coming under the project. The proponent stated that RWH unit with a capacity of 6000 KL (90 days storage) is proposed for the project since the wells in the region could not be considered as a dependable source. It was also stated that the waste water shall be treated before discharging.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) The total power requirement is 800 kVA as given in c.f. pg. no. 26 and 1646.33 kVA as given in c.f. pg. no. 35 of the application. (Even though the proponent has confirmed it as 800 kVA at the time of presentation, clarification in writing on the same is required).
- (ii) Copy of land tax receipt for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal in the names of the proponent, Arangil Karuvadath Pradeep, Malieckal Aboobacker Koya and 'Wafa & others' provided. But the names of 'others' are not provided so as to verify as to whether the consent and authorization provided is sufficient.

- (iii) Possession certificate for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal in the name of the proponent & others provided. But the names of 'others' are not provided so as to verify as to whether the consent and authorization provided is sufficient.
- (iv) Details on Corporate Social Responsibility provided but the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended is not specifically mentioned.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Details of petition at Honourable National Green Tribunal as mentioned in the High Court orders.
2. Certificate from data bank stating that the land bearing Sy. No. 51/1 (marked as 'nilam' in land document) is not coming under wetland.
3. Cadastral map in which proposed outlay plan of the project is superimposed, clearly demarcating the Sy. Nos. coming under the project (*in order to ascertain as to whether only 'part' of Sy. Nos. only has to be considered for EC*).
4. Original cadastral map of the project site
5. Document to prove that the project site is declared as residential zone as per the regional master plan.
6. Clarification on items (i) to (iv) above.

Item No. 29.21 **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 Mallelil Industries Private Limited (File No.161/SEIAA/KL/3491/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent. It was found that the map provided by the proponent showing the location of thodu in the north eastern side of the project site is not authentic. It was also found that the proposed CSR activities are not as stipulated in Companies (Amendment) Act 2003. Considering the same, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following:

1. Revised map (cadastral) showing the location of thodu in the north eastern side of the project site
2. CSR activities proposed to be implemented for the present project following Companies (Amendment) Act 2003. Details on the same to be provided.

The Committee further observed that the proponent has not yet reported to SEAC demarcating survey number boundaries of each plot consequent to which only the SITE VISIT pending with respect to the project could be conducted. Hence the proponent is directed to

report the same along with the submission of the above additional clarifications, for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 29.22 **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 Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent, which were found to be satisfactory. The proponent was directed to provide copy of request sent by him 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, but the proponent has not submitted the document for Sy. No. 44/1 and hence it was decided to exclude that Sy. No. while recommending for EC. 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 distance of 100 m should be left in the present form from the ground level water tank of Community Drinking Water Scheme.
2. Mining should not be undertaken in Sy. No. 44/1.

Item No. 29.23 **Environmental clearance for River sand mining in Idukki district, submitted by District Collector, Idukki (File No. 268/SEIAA/KL/1221/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The proponent has provided the copy of the ID as proof of authorized signatory of the project. The proponent stated that the last sand audit of the district was done way back in 2004 and there were 228 kadavus existing by then. But soon after sand auditing and thereafter, there are only 90 legally approved kadavus out of which EC has been sought for 9 kadavus, consistently having available sand and economically sustainable, at present. It was further stated by the proponent that the quantity of sand available in the stretches for which EC is sought now is less as there are many dams in between. Three kadavus – Mallappilly, Njaloor and Karimbanakkal kadavus are not included in 2004 report, but the proponent stated that those are considered in the forthcoming report. The proponent has provided the details of sand allotted (in terms of number of loads) for the past three years from the 9 kadavus. The proponent has also ensured that the interim report on sand mining shall be received from CESS within a month. The proponent, who is also the District Collector, brought to the attention of the Honourable Committee the hardships faced by common man due to non-availability of sand in the district as the sand mining is prohibited from August 2013. It was stated that the housing projects at lowest level are the worst affected because of the situation and that there is huge pressure from the labourers to take immediate steps to ensure the availability of sand. The proponent requested to consider EC and issue interim EC at least for 6 months for the present proposal based on CESS report of 2004 considering the sustainable way of mining done in the past and the present

scenario prevailing in the district. It was further stated that there is a fully functional working e-sand software and vibrant e-governance society for sand distribution in the district.

Considering the above, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance which shall be valid only up to 30th September 2014 from the nine Kadavus in the application, for mining of 16000 m³ of sand altogether and with the following conditions:

1. The depth of sand mining should not exceed the water level at summer.
2. The quantity of sand removed from each Kadavu during the period(s) of EC validity, should not exceed the quantity removed during the corresponding period in 2013.
3. Mining of sand in the Coastal Regulation Zone shall be as per the guidelines stipulated by the KCZMA.
4. Summer water level must be fixed with reference to a permanent point (bench mark) by levelling and should be recorded for future reference. At least two such points must exist in each Panchayath.
5. The conditions under Para 1 (iii) (a) to (e) stipulated in the O.M. dt. 24th December 2013 of MoEF for river sand mining should be complied with. Items mentioned under Chapter 3 of the Kerala Protection of River Bank and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act 2001 should be followed, unless repugnant with the conditions in the O.M. dt. 24th December 2013.
6. Online e-management system should only be resorted for sand distribution.
7. All the other statutory clearances as is required should be obtained.

Item No. 29.24 **Environmental clearance for the Residential Apartment project in Sy. Nos. 505/1, 506/11 and 506/15 at Cheranalloor Village and Panchayath, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Skyline Builders & Developers (India) Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 300/SEIAA/KL/1500/2014)**

Mr. Shajith, authorized signatory of the project attended the meeting. During presentation, it was stated that 350 KL rain water storage capacity is proposed for the project. The proponent has not provided consent from Abdul Azeez for going ahead with the project in land bearing Sy. Nos. owned by him. But the Committee observed that the said consent is not required since Mr. Abdul Azeez has given authorization to Mr. Shajith. The proponent has also stated that they have applied for NOC from Naval Command and CIAL. The proponent has not provided the biodiversity listing of flora and fauna in the application but has provided the same before the Committee at the time of presentation.

The Committee noticed the following shortcomings/discrepancies in the application submitted by the proponent:

- (i) Only the recurring cost of introducing biobins is provided (Capital cost to be incurred on the same to be provided).
- (ii) 500 m radius map not provided.

The Committee, at the end of the presentation found that the authorized signatory is only an employee of the company who is not entitled to implement the commitments made before the Committee. ***Hence SEAC directed the actual Managing Director to be present before the next SEAC to file affidavit towards fulfilment of commitments made by the applicant before SEAC.***

Considering the same, the item is DEFERRED seeking the presence of the Managing Director of the firm before SEAC for filing affidavit towards assurance of commitments made by the Authorized signatory and seeking clarifications on item (i) and (ii) above. On receipt of this, proposal can be recommended on the following condition:

1. NOC from Southern Naval Command and CIAL should be obtained.

Further it was decided that the matter shall be vetted by CTP for final decision on the matter.

Item No. 29.25 **Environmental clearance for the Residential cum Commercial project in Sy. Nos. 786/2, 786/15, Re Sy. Block No. 11, Re Sy. No. 33/1 at Kazhakuttam Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk and Corporation, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Asset Homes Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 298/SEIAA/KL/1498/2014)**

The project proponent attended the meeting and made a brief presentation before the Committee. The Committee found that the proponent has stated that provisions are made for rain water harvesting without mentioning the capacity of storage. To this end the proponent stated that the capacity of RWH unit proposed is 2500 KL. The proponent has provided copy of land tax receipt and possession certificate for Sy. No. 33/1 in the name of Laila Beegum and has provided an affidavit stating that M/s Asset Homes Pvt. Ltd. have entered into a joint venture agreement with the land owner for the development of the project which could not be executed due to the change in the policy by Govt. of Kerala. The Committee stated that the same is not sufficient and consent from the owner of the land is required for initiating the project. The proponent produced before the Committee the notarized consent from Laila Beegum given to the proponent to conduct construction activities in the land owned by her. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided copies of land tax receipt/possession certificate for Sy. Nos. 786/2 and 786/15. Also, in the cadastral map, only Sy. No. 33/1 is marked whereas Sy. Nos. 786/2 and 786/15 are not seen marked. To this end the proponent stated that Sy. No. 786 is old Sy. No. which has been assigned new number 33/1 for which the proponent has provided copies of land tax receipt and possession certificate.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance on usual conditions stipulated for non-mining projects along with the following specific conditions:

1. Excavated earth should be utilized within the site and the excess should only be given for Government purposes free of cost preferably through land bank.
2. Since ground water is exploited considerably, neighbouring community should be provided with drinking water facility.
3. Set back distance to be left from the Highway as stipulated by CTP, Vigilance.
4. Consent from Airport Authority to be provided.

Item No. 29.26 **Request for condoning of delay in submitting additional clarifications regarding environmental clearance for the proposed IBS SEZ Campus at Info Park, Kochi project in Sy. Nos. 616, 623 and 636 /**

Ward 7 at Kakkanad Village, Thrikkakara Grama Panchayath, Kanayanoor Taluk, Ernakulam district, Kerala by M/s IBS Software Services Pvt. Ltd. (File No. SEIAA/E4/1460/2014)

The Committee decided that the proponent has to apply afresh, since the earlier application is delisted as the proponent failed to submit the additional clarifications within the stipulated time.

Item No. 29.27 Complaint lodged by Mr. Banerji K.K.S. against construction of Naattika-Kothakkulam bypass (File No. SEIAA/E4/444/2014)

Noted for further action.

Item No. 29.28 Complaint lodged by Sri. K. Prabhakaran, Secretary, Swasraya Mattancherry, Kochi against Kalpatharu Co-operative Society (File No. SEIAA/E4/2348/2013)

Noted for further action.

Item No. 29.29 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 Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent including the map showing a buffer distance of 50 m from the forest land on the north. The documents submitted were found to be satisfactory.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance on usual general conditions stipulated for mining projects, with a validity period of 15 years subject to renewal in every five years.

Item No. 29.30 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 1687/1 at Kodakara Village, Chalakkudy Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. James Jacob K. (File No. 311/SEIAA/KL/1782/2014)

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. 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 ordinary earth from 15 cents of land stipulating other usual conditions.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.31 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 71/1, 71/3 and 73/1 at Parappookkara Village & Panchayath, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. Gireeshkumar K.P. (File No. 312/SEIAA/KL/1786/2014)**

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. 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 under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests, for removal of brick earth on condition that the land should be retained as paddy land.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.32 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 759/4 at Kalloor Village, Thrissur Panchayath, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. Gireeshkumar K.P. (File No. 313/SEIAA/KL/1787/2014)**

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. 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 under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.33 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 37/2A at Irimbiliyam Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr. Kunhimarakkar Haji (File No. 314/SEIAA/KL/1824/2014)**

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided any proof of the company owned by the proponent for which the removed earth shall be utilised. To this end the proponent submitted the lease agreement entered into between C.P. Chandran and the project proponent wherein the former has given the tile factory owned by him for rent to the latter.

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 under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.34 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 86/pt. at Pullipadam Village, Mampad Panchayath, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr. Krishnakumar K.V. (File No. 315/SEIAA/KL/1832/2014)**

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. 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 under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests, with a specific condition that the quantity of earth should not exceed 2000 m³.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.35 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 342/7 and 341/4 at Pirayiri Village and Grama Panchayath, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by Mr. C. G. Unnikannan (File No. 316/SEIAA/KL/1836/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant was absent for the meeting. Hence the item is DEFERRED and the project proponent is directed to attend the next SEAC meeting, failing which the application shall be delisted.

Item No. 29.36 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 69/2 and 70/2 at Vattamkulam Village and Panchayath, Ponnani Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr. Bhavadas K. (File No. 317/SEIAA/KL/1838/2014)**

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. 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 under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests, for removal of 800 m³ of ordinary earth on usual conditions.

The appraisal report is approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 29.37 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 273/1 at Irimbiliyam Village and Panchayath, Tirur Taluk,**

Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr. K. Aboobakkar (File No. 318/SEIAA/KL/1839/2014)

Further to intimation from the SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat, the applicant attended the meeting to provide necessary clarifications before the Committee. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the quantity of earth proposed to be removed and any valid document to prove that the removed earth shall be used for the road works of NH 66, as stated in the application. Hence the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the quantity of earth proposed to be removed and the document to prove the utilization of removed earth.

Item No. 29.38 Any other item approved by Chair

Item No. KLA/29.38.01 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)

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent, which were found to be satisfactory and hence RECOMMENDED for EC under the usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ordinary earth stipulated in O.M. dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests, on condition that the quantity of earth removed should not exceed 1000 m³ since the purpose is for construction of house.

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

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:

Dr. N. G. K. Pillai (Chairman SEAC); Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair (Secretary SEAC); Sri. John Mathai (Member, SEAC); Dr. C.N. Mohanan (Member, SEAC); Dr. Harikrishnan K. (Member, SEAC); Dr. V. Anitha, (Member, SEAC); Dr. K.M. Khaleel Chovva, (Member, SEAC); Dr. E.J. Joseph, (Member, SEAC); Dr. George Chackacherry, (Member, SEAC); Dr. P.S. Harikumar, (Member, SEAC); Prof. Dr. Kurian Sajan, (Member, SEAC); Dr. Jayson E.A., (Member, SEAC); Smt. Chanchu V.T (Assistant Environmental Officer, SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat); Smt. Silvi T. (LDC, SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat); Smt. Beena L.; Sri. P.Z. Thomas; Sri. P.C. Thahir; Sri. Ajmal Ahammed. T.T.; Sri. Santhosh M.N.; Sri. S. Krishnakumar; Sri. T. Ravindran; Sri. Haneefa T.K.; Sri. Sunil P.T.; Dr. Nasir Ali; Sri. T. Mathew Abraham; Sri. Prince Abraham; Smt. Kusha K.M.; Dr. Shanth Thimmaiah; Sri. Eshwar; Sri. Avinash C.P; Smt.

Sangeetha Chachadi; Sri. Ranjit Thomas; Sri. Koshy Mathew; Col. M. D. Nair; Sri. V. Thiruvankitam; Sri. V. Gomathi Vinayagam; Sri. Surendran K.S.; Sri. P.M. Mohammad; Sri. Veeran Kutty; Sri. V. Ibrahim; Sri. Aboobacker K.; Sri. K.B. Abdul Rahman; Sri. Prasanth K.P.; Sri. Shajith K.; Sri. A. K. Pradeep; Sri. Assankoya P.S.; Sri. Shijith Lal P.M.; Smt. Hema Seetharam; Sri. P.Z. Thomas; Sri. Sandeep Rajendran; Sri. Patil Ajith Bhagwatrao; Sri. Chandran Pillai V.R.; Sri. K. Anil Varma; Ar. Veena Dathan; Sri. Saru Aravind; Sri. James Jacob K.; Sri. K.V. Girishkumar; Sri. N. Kunjimarakkal; Sri. Najeeb Hassan N.; Sri. K.V. Krishnakumar; Sri. K. Bhavadas; Sri. K. Aboobacker; Sri. P.S. Mohammed Sagir; Sri. Gireendrakumar V.; Sri. Narayana G. and Sri. Mohammad Badrul Huda