

**MINUTES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE  
ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)  
KERALA, HELD ON 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021 THROUGH VIDEO  
CONFERENCING.**

**Present:**

- 1. Dr.H.Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA, Kerala**
- 2. Dr.Usha Titus I.A.S, Principal Secretary, Higher Education & Member Secretary, SEIAA**
- 3. Dr.Jayachandran.K, Member, SEIAA**

The 106<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA was held online on 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021 observing all the COVID protocols stipulated by the Government for video conferencing. Chairman participated from his home office at Bangalore, Member Secretary participated from her office in the Government Secretariat Thiruvananthapuram and the Member from his home office at Kottayam. The meeting started at 11.00 AM on 19<sup>th</sup> and agenda items were taken up for discussion.

**Physical Files**

<b><u>Item No.106.01</u></b>	<b>Minutes of the 105<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 22<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020 for information</b>
------------------------------	--

Noted

<b><u>Item No.106.02</u></b>	<b>Action taken report of 105<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA</b>
------------------------------	---

Authority appreciated the follow up actions taken by SEIAA team under difficult circumstances of COVID Pandemic in the state.

**Item No. 106.03**

**Environmental clearance for the Development of Govt. Medical College cum Hospital in Sy.No.643 at Iravan Village, Kodencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by The Principal in charge, Konni Medical College.(File No. 810.A/SEIAA/EC4/2373/2015)**

The Principal-in-charge, Konni Medical College, Office of the Director of Medical Education, Medical College, P.O., Thiruvananthapuram, vide his application received on 23/06/2015, has sought Environmental Clearance (EC) under EIA Notification, 2006 for the Development of Govt. Medical College cum Hospital at Sy. No. 643 at Iravan Village, Kodencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala. It is interalia, noted that the project comes under the Category B, 8(a) of Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

The project is for construction & development of Govt. Medical College cum Hospital with 500 bed facilities by Director of Medical Education, Health & Family Welfare Department, Govt. of Kerala. The land for the same was allotted by Govt. of Kerala. The total Plot Area is 20.5985 ha and the total Built-up Area is 99,165.6 sqm (Phase-1, 47,586sqm+ Phase-2, 51,579.6sqm).

Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 50<sup>th</sup>, 53<sup>rd</sup>, 73<sup>rd</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, 76<sup>th</sup> and 77<sup>th</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup>, meetings held on different dates since 2015. Field inspections were also carried out at different points of time and documents required for Appraisal were also collected at different stages of Appraisal.

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>& 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2019. The Committee heard the detailed presentation made by the Consultant and submissions by the Project Proponent. SEAC noted that it is a case of violation of EIA notification 2006 as noted in the previous SEAC meetings also and the violation proceedings have to be initiated as per MoEF& CC Notification No. S.O. 1030 (E) dated 8.3.2018 for prior EC.

SEAC with certain recommendation forwarded the proposal to SEIAA for necessary further action, mentioning that it is a GOK project of utmost importance to the common public of a larger region and the project was under the consideration of the SEIAA since 2015.

The proposal was placed in the 99<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup>& 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2019. Authority noted the observations made by SEAC from 2015 onwards. Authority requested SEAC to inform the satisfactoriness of compliance of Panchayat Rules, arrangements for disposal of Medical waste and Biodegradable non-medical waste in the campus including

management of waste water. In the Form I, it is stated that Periyar Tiger Reserve is abutting the North East & Southern sides of site. SEAC may clarify whether the project is located within Ecologically Sensitive Zone of Periyar Tiger Reserve if so, follow up actions to be taken as per OM No.F.No.22-43/2018-IA-III dt.08.08.2019 of MoEF for wild life clearance. The proposal was posted back to SEAC with a request make definite recommendations for EC and follow up actions to be taken if there is violation of EIA Notification 2006.

The proposal was placed in the 107<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> December, 2019. The Committee decided to seek clarifications from the proponent as to whether the project is located within the Ecologically Sensitive Zone of Periyar Tiger Reserve and if so, the follow up action has to be taken as per OM No.F.No.22-43/2018-IA-III dt.08.08.2019 of MoEF&CC for wild life clearance.. The proponent vide letter dated 09.01.2020, submitted the certificate issued from the Office of the Divisional Forest Officer(DFO), Konni Forest Division stating that there is no Ecologically Sensitive Zone of Periyar Tiger Reserve located within 10 km of the project site.

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020. A field inspection was also conducted on 13.02.2020 by a team led by Chairman SEAC and certain field observations were made. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting. The Committee discussed and accepted the Field Inspection Report. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting. The Committee heard the proponent and the consultants. In the detailed deliberations, it was confirmed that the construction has taken place in violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and violation proceedings have to be initiated if the EC has to be issued. Therefore, the proponent was directed to submit the EIA Report and EMP as per the relevant rules and guidelines and considering the specific TOR given vide the decision of the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 2- 4, June, 2020. The proponent was also directed to include the assessment of ecological damage, remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan specifically addressing the highland terrain ecosystem characteristics and wildlife conflicts, if any.

In response to the above, the proponent submitted the remediation plan and other documents on 24.08.2020. Then the proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> -8<sup>th</sup> October and the Committee decided to direct the proponent to revise their proposal as per the decision of the 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC. The proponent had submitted the EIA report

including the EMP, Ecological damage assessment, remediation plan and natural community resources augmentation plan on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The proponent and the consultants were present. The consultant presented the EIA report including the ecological damage assessment and remediation plan, and the natural and community resource augmentation plan as part of the violation proceedings as directed by the SEAC in its 111<sup>th</sup> and 112<sup>th</sup> meetings. The Committee accepted the proposals presented in the report and decided to direct the proponent to follow the due procedures for violation proceedings as stipulated in the EIA guidelines. The Committee also decided to recommend the issuance of the EC for the built up area of 99,165.6 sq. m. of the project, subject to the conditions stipulated in S.O.1030 (E) dated 8.3.2018 and with certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Authority noted that in its 115<sup>th</sup> meeting SEAC has recommended for issue of EC subject to the conditions stipulated in S.O.1030 (E) dated 8.3.2018 which deals with violation proceedings. As per this OM cited the following steps have to be followed for issue of EC in violation cases.

- i) In case of violation action will be taken against the Project Proponent by the respective State or State Pollution Control Board under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and further no consent to operate or occupancy certificate will be issued till the project is granted Environmental Clearance. (S.O.804(E) of MoEF&CC dated 14<sup>th</sup> March 2017)
- ii) State level expert appraisal committee (SEAC) should visit the site and decide whether the project can run sustainably under compliance of environmental norms with adequate safeguards, if so SEAC should prescribe appropriate Terms of Reference for carrying out an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Study and for the preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP). The SEAC shall stipulate implementation of EMP comprising remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan corresponding to the ecological damage assessed and economic benefit derived due to violation as a condition of Environmental Clearance. (S.O.1030 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018)

- iii) The Project Proponent will be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan with State Pollution Control Board and the quantification will be recommended by SEAC and finalized by Regulatory Authority. The bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of EC and will be released after successful implementation of the remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan and after the recommendation by the regional office of MoEF&CC, SEAC and Regulatory Authority. .(S.O.1030 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018)

**Authority noticed that SEAC has taken action under point no (ii) above and the action has to be taken under point no (i) and (iii) above. Authority decided to inform the SPCB for taking action under point no (i) above and inform SEAC and Project Proponent for necessary follow up action under point no (i) and (iii) above, so that prior EC can be issued after completing the above procedures.**

**Item No.106.04      Application for Environmental Clearance for the granite building stone quarry of M/s A-one Sands Pvt. Ltd in Muthalamada –I Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District(File No. 747/EC1/180/2015/SEIAA)**

Sri.K.P.Joy, Managing Director, M/s A-One Sands Pvt. Ltd, Kooran Kalloorkaram House, Peechanikkad, Puliyanam.P.O., Angamaly, Ernakulam applied for Environmental Clearance on 09.01.2015, for the extraction of granite building stone from Re-Sy Nos.435 part, 441/1 part & 442 part in Block 23, of Muthalamada –I Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District. The proposal was delisted as per the decision of the 49<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 05.02.2016. 12 such similar cases were delisted in that Authority meeting and the Authority decided that the proposal would be revived with seniority, in case MoEF exempts the area involving the sites from the ESAs of the state.

The proponent vide letter dated 03.12.2020 informed that at present their mining area is exempted from the ESAs and requested to consider his application with seniority of File No. 747/EC1/180/2015/SEIAA with EC fees, duly paid on 23.04.2015.He has enclosed the copy of judgment in WP( C) No. 22589 of 2015 dated 08.09.2015 and as per the judgment, the application for Environmental Clearance shall be considered as expeditiously as possible, at

any rate, within two months from the date of production of the mining plan. Mining plan is not enclosed.

Simultaneously the proponent had applied online via PARIVESH on 11.12.2020 (proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/187395/2020) for Environmental Clearance for the granite building stone from Re-SyNos.435, 441/1, 452, 441/2, 440/1, 440/2 &436 in Block 23, of Muthalamada –I Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District.

**The Authority noticed that the proposal has not been appraised by SEAC and Authority decided to send the proposal to SEAC for appraisal under intimation to Project Proponent. Authority decided to inform SEAC to speed up the appraisal process in view of the of judgment in WP(C) No. 22589 of 2015 dated 08.09.2015.**

**Item No.106.05      Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Residential Project Construction-“VKL Garden”in Sy.No.415/21 at Chellanmangalam Uliyazhathura, Kariyam villages, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala of Mr. Shaji.K.Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 1190/A2/2018/ SEIAA)**

Mr. Shaji.K.Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Anjana Complex Vytila- Aroor Bypass Road, Maradu.P.O., Cochin-682304, vide hardcopy of application received dated 24.01.2019 (online submitted dated 14.10.2018), has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the Proposed Residential Project Construction in Sy.No.415/21 at Chellanmangalam Uliyazhathura, Kariyam villages, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala. The project comes under the Category B2 of EIA Notification 2006.

Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 97<sup>th</sup>, 98<sup>th</sup>, 101<sup>st</sup>, 105<sup>th</sup>, 108<sup>th</sup> meetings held on different dates and also actions taken by SEIAA in its 99<sup>th</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup> meetings held on different dates. The proposal is before SEIAA for initiating violation proceedings under EIA notification 2006..

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020. Authority heard the proponent/consultant and also the Assistant Executive Engineer,

Town Planning wing, Thiruvananthapuram Corporation. The Proponent stated that there is no violation of EIA notification 2006 quoting certain reasons. The proponent was given one week time to submit all the documentary evidences in support of his claims for necessary further action.

The proponent has submitted the Title deed and copy of S.O.3999(E) dated 9<sup>th</sup> December 2016 of MoEF, Govt. of India in support of his claim that the construction has taken place when EC was not mandatory (9<sup>th</sup> December 2016 – 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017) for projects up to 150000 sq. m as per the S.O. cited. A verification of satellite imageries shows that the construction was almost completed well before 09th December 2016. Satellite images dated 27th December 2015, 28th October 2016, 16th January 2017, 04th March, 2018 shows that there is no considerable change in the building structure from December 2015 to March 2018 indicating that a large portion of the construction has taken place much before the issue O.S. cited, violating EIA notification 2006.

Moreover, the benefit of the exemption under the S.O cited, is admissible in the states where building Bye laws have been modified integrating the environmental conditions prescribed by MoEF&CC for construction of buildings and an Environment Cell has to be constituted in LSGs for issuing integrated building permission and environmental clearance. It is learnt that GOK have not modified building Bye Laws and Environment Cells has not been constituted in LSGs as envisaged in the O.S. cited.

Further , as per S.O 3999 dated 09<sup>th</sup> December 2016, the Project Proponent shall submit online application in Form 1A along with specified fee for Environmental appraisal and additional fee for building permission. The Environmental Cell shall appraise the project and stipulate the environmental conditions to be integrated in the building permission. Hence the Project Proponent may submit the integrated building permission and environmental clearance if any obtained as per above S.O.

**Under the circumstances narrated above, Authority decided to forward the documents submitted by the Project Proponent to the Town Planning Officer Thiruvananthapuram along with the observations made by SEIAA for verification of the documents submitted by the proponent as above and report. The Project Proponent may be informed of the observations made by SEIAA and decision taken for necessary follow up action.**

**Item No.106.06**

**Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Expansion of Residential cum Commercial unit- “VKL Towers” in Re-survey No.181/14, 181/14-1, 181/14-2, 181/14-3, 181/14-4, 181/14-5, 181/10, 181/10-1, 181/10-2, 181/18, of Attipra village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by Mr. Shaji.K.Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 1228/EC2/2019/ SEIAA)**

Shri.Shaji.K.Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor , Anjana Complex Vyttila- Aroor Bypass Road, Maradu.P.O., Cochin – 682304, vide his application received dated 28.01.2019, has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the Proposed Expansion of Residential cum Commercial unit- “VKL Towers” in Re-survey No.181/14, 181/14-1, 181/14-2, 181/14-3, 181/14-4, 181/14-5, 181/10, 181/10-1, 181/10-2, 181/18, of Attipra village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala. The project comes under the Category B, 8(a) of Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

The total plot area of the proposed project is 6,460 Sq.m. The existing built up area is 18, 244.64 Sqm. & the proposed built up area is 2,224.597 Sq.m. Hence, the total built up area is 20,469.237 Sqm( 1B+1G+21UF) which requires prior EC under EIA notification 2006. The height of the building is 85.189 m above MSL. The total project cost mentioned in Form-1 was 13.6 crores whereas it was 94.80 crores in the basic information. The proponent on 4.05.2019 informed that the project cost mentioned in Form -1 is due to typographical error and the actual project cost is 94.80 crores.

Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 97<sup>th</sup>, 98<sup>th</sup>, 101<sup>st</sup>, 103<sup>rd</sup>, 105<sup>th</sup>, 106<sup>th</sup>, 107<sup>th</sup> and 110<sup>th</sup> meetings of SEAC held on different dates and action taken by SEIAA in its 103<sup>rd</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup> meetings held on different dates. This is a case of violation under EIA notification 2006.

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020. Authority heard the proponent/consultant and also the Assistant Executive Engineer, Town Planning wing, Thiruvananthapuram Corporation. The Proponent stated that there is no violation of EIA notification 2006 quoting certain reasons. The proponent was given one week time to submit all the documentary evidences in support of his claims for necessary further action. The Project Proponent has submitted some of the documentary evidences. The



proponent vide his letter dated 12.11.2020 has stated that there is minor error to the tune of only 554.18 square meters hence beyond threshold limit of 20000 square meters and waive the violation proceedings. He has also expressed his willingness to demolish the excess area though at a huge cost.

**Authority decided to inform the proponent that as per EIA Notification 2006, Authority does not have such waiving powers under violation proceedings and hence his request cannot be considered. About the demolition of excess area he may decide as per his choice and keep the Authority informed of his action.**

**Item No. 106.07      Seeking alternate name for the existing Environmental Clearance Holders, M/s Crescent Granite Products in Lakkidi Perur-1 Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District (File No. 1649/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

Mr.Shoukkathali.P. vide letter dated 04.08.2020 requested to change the name in Environmental Clearance Order of M/s Crescent Granite Products in Lakkidi Perur-1 Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District due to the death of Mr.Said Muhammed, Managing Partner & Authorised Signatory of the project. The Environmental Clearance was sought on 01.02.2018 (EC NO.DIA/KL/PL/22/2017) from District Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Palakkad for 5 years. DEIAA issued Environmental Clearance for the quarry project in Re.Sy Nos.437/4, 3, 434/1, 2 at Lakkidi Perur-1 Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District for lease area of 0.7097 hectares.

In the request letter Mr.Shoukkathali.P mentioned that the proposed quarry is with lease area 0.7097 Ha at old Sy.No.437/4, 437/3, 434/1, 434/2, Re.Sy.Nos 437/5, 437/6, 434/5, 434/4 & 434/2 respectively .He has also enclosed the copies of EC issued, death certificate of Mr.Said Muhammed, partnership deed dated 03.10.2004, reconstitution deed of partnership dated 24.07.2020 and resolution letter dated 04.08.2020.

**Authority noted that there are differences in the survey numbers mentioned in both the cases and decided to seek clarification from the Proponent in this regard. Proponent may produce a certificate from the village officer to clarify the same. After**

getting a satisfactory clarification, the request of Mr.Shoukkathali.P., vide letter dated 04.08.2020 to change the name in Environmental Clearance may be considered.

**Item No.106.08**      **Joint Committee inspection for the quarry project in Survey No 179& 129 at Ayyankunu Village, Iratty Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala by M/s Reena metals (File No. 210/EC4/221/2014/SEIAA)**

**Noted**

**Item No.106.09**      **Application for Environmental Clearance for mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey No 292/1 A of Vellad Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala by Mr. Mathew, M/s Alacode Granites (File No. 1277(A)/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Mr. Mathew, M/s Alacode Granite, Managing Partner, Building No-AP VIII 388, Alakode P.O, Thaliparamba, Kannur District, Kerala-670571 vide his application received online and the hard copy of the project received on 30.07.2019 has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the building stone quarry project in Survey 292/1 A of Vellad Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala for an area of 1.6923 hectares. The project comes under Category B2, Activity 1(a) as per the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

The proposed project site falls within Latitude 12°12'3.62"N to 12°12'12.39"N, Longitude 75° 28'57.14"N to 75° 29'0.71"N E. The proposed project is for quarrying of 69,000 MTA. The expected cost of the project is 70 Lakhs

The proposal was considered in the 103<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup>& 18<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents. The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>& 29<sup>th</sup> October 2019 and the committee decided to defer the proposal to the next meeting.

The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>& 30<sup>th</sup> November

2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation.

The proposal was placed in the 109<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January & 01<sup>st</sup> February 2020. The proponent was present. The RQP made the presentation. The Committee directed the proponent to submit the certain other details which were submitted on 26.02.2020

The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup> -04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 29.9.20 by a Sub Committee of expert members SEAC consisting of Dr.R.Ajayakumar Varma & Dr.N.Anil Kumar and certain field observations were made. The proposal was placed in 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> – 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee discussed and accepted the field inspection report of Sub Committee and decided not to recommend the proposal for EC considering the high hazard potential of the site among other reasons.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to Project Proponent with reasons quoted by SEAC for rejection.**

**Item No.106.10**      **Environmental clearance for the Proposed Mining of heavy mineral sand in Re survey Nos. 81/3 to 81/4, 81/7 to 81/13, 82, 83, 84/1 to 84/14, 85 to 93, 122 to 126, 127/1 to 127/4, 127/7 to 127/13, 128, 129/1, 129/4 to 129/16, 139/1 to 139/5, 139/9, 139/10, 140 to 142, 143/1 to 143/3, 143/6 to 143/10, 151/1, 151/2, 152, 153, 168 at Alappad Village and 1, 2/1, 2/8 to 2/18, 5/1 to 5/4 at Panmana village, Karunagappally Taluk, Kollam District by M/s Indian Rare Earth Ltd. (File No. 610/SEIAA/KL/4639/2014)**

**Authority perused the letter received from CGM & Head, IREL addressed to Member Secretary SEIAA, in which he has requested for the grant of EC till the life of mine without mentioning validity period. The Authority noted that the composite EC as recommended by SEIAA in its 105<sup>th</sup> meeting has already been issued after carefully considering all relevant aspects.**

**Authority once again decided to inform the Project Proponent that the EC period shall be till 2023-24 i.e the period of validity of mining plan approved by Department of Atomic Energy Govt. of India vide its letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The project**

**Proponent is advised to take steps well in advance for the preparation and approval of new Mining plan.**

**Item No.106.11      Application for environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy.No.270/6 & 270/3 at Kulakkada Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District by Sri.Thambu.S [File No.916/A1/EC1/ 2019/ SEIAA]**

**Authority noted that the Project Proponent has submitted the clarifications for the issues raised by SEIAA in its letter dated 02/12/2020 but he could not satisfactorily explain the clarifications sought. Authority decided inform the Project Proponent to come over to the office of SEIAA on a prior appointment and explain the issues raised with relevant documents and proofs. Followed by this, the proposal may be placed in the next SEIAA meeting for necessary further action.**

**Item No.106.12      Application for environmental clearance for mining of brick clay in Sy.No. 111/1 & 111/2 in Puthoor Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District by Sri.P.Sundaran,[File No.929/A1/2019/SEIAA]**

**Authority noted that the Project Proponent has submitted the clarifications for the issues raised by SEIAA in its letter dated 02/12/2020 but he could not satisfactorily explain the clarifications sought. Authority decided inform the Project Proponent to come over to the office of SEIAA on a prior appointment and explain the issues raised with relevant documents and proofs. Followed by this, the proposal may be placed in the next SEIAA meeting for necessary further action.**

**In the meantime the Project Proponent may be asked to extend the validity of bank guarantee for one more year.**

**Item.106.13      Judgment in WP(C) No. 18226/2020 dated 09.09.2020 filed by Saseendran Nair, Kavilayil House, Chunakara North, Mavelikara (Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/160049/2020( File No. 2390/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Application for the Extension of validity of Environmental Clearance for mining of laterite stone submitted on 10/09/2020 (Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/160049/2020). Shri.Saseendran Nair.K at Sy No.137/4/2-137/5/2/2 Chunakkara Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District submitted before the SEIAA application for extension of Environmental Clearance No.22/L/2020 dated 17.02.2020 valid upto 16.08.2020.

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2020. Authority noted that an application for the Extension of validity of Environmental Clearance for mining of laterite stone was submitted by the Project Proponent Shri. Saseendran Nair. K on 10/09/2020. Environmental Clearance issued on 17.02.2020 is valid upto 16.08.2020. The present status of the file in “PARIVESH is under examination of SEIAA”. In the meantime the project proponent has filed a WP(C) No. 18226/2020 seeking intervention of Honourable High Court for extension of EC.

The Hon’ble High court in its judgement in above WP(C) No.18226/2020 dated 09.09.2020, has directed SEIAA to consider the application preferred by the petitioner for extension of the validity of Environmental Clearance in accordance with law after affording opportunity of hearing within three weeks. The Project Proponent was heard through video conferencing on 22nd October. Authority decided to seek extension for three months to complete the process explaining the process involved and steps taken so far including the personal hearing held already on 22nd October.

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. SEAC has recommended for the extension of EC SEIAA as he is eligible for extension as per SO No.4254 dated 27/11/2020.

**Authority decided to extend the validity period of EC for a period of one year from the date of issuance of permit from the Department of Mining & Geology subject to terms and conditions in the original EC.**

**Item No. 106.14**      **Application for environmental clearance for removal of Ordinary earth in Sy.No.121/10 at Vazhakkulam Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam District by Shri.James Jacob [File No.2205/EC2/2019/SEIAA]**

Authority decided to inform SEAC that irrespective of the depth and area of mining prior Environmental Clearance is mandatory for mining minor minerals as per S.O.141 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016. Further as per Appendix XI of EIA notification 2006 approved mining plan is a must for mining minor minerals from 0-5 Ha. As SEIAA is governed by EIA notification 2006, if a Project Proponent approaches SEIAA for EC to mine the minor minerals, the application should be invariably accompanied by an approved mining plan.

Authority decided to post the case back to SEAC with the above observations for resubmission of the proposal with an approved mining plan if the Project Proponent is interested in EC under EIA notification 2006.

**Item No. 106.15**      **Application for Environmental Clearance for Granite building stone Quarry in Block No.03, Re Sy.No. 191/1,191/1-1,191/2 in Edakkunnam village, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam District (File: No. 2433/EC2/ 2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> October 2019 & 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/clarification and the proponent submitted the same on 30.12.2019 & 22.02.2020 respectively. The proposal was placed in 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 2 - 4 June, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in 112<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> - 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 31.10.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 - 5, November 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal quoting the following reasons,

*1) The hazard potential of the site is very high as the proposed site is in medium hazard zone, which is in continuation with the high hazard zone. The distance to high hazard zone on North West direction is 2.48 km and to North East direction is 1.95 km.*

2) *There is a thickly vegetated overhung portion on the North side of the site which may cause possibility of land slide once the lower area is disturbed by due to induced seismic activities waves.*

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

**Item No. 106.16      Application for environmental clearance for mining of Ordinary Earth Shri. Thomas N.P.    [FileNo.2453/EC2/2019/SEIAA]**

As per the decision of 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting Authority decided to issue EC for 6 months from the date of issue of permit from the Department of Mining & Geology, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan. As per the mining plan the extractable quantity is 36088MT but the proponent requested for mining of 12000 m<sup>3</sup> that is 24000MT only. Thus Environmental Clearance was issued to Shri. N.P. Thomas dated 23-11-2020 (EC No. 97/OE/2020), limiting the extractable quantity to the requested quantity *ie.*, 12000m<sup>3</sup>.

**Authority ratified the action taken in issuing EC limiting the extractable quantity to the requested quantity of 12000 m<sup>3</sup>**

**Item No. 106.17    Environmental Clearance for the Proposed expansion of Caritas Hospital, Thellakom, Kottayam with the addition of a Hospital building, Geriatric Centre (Nursing Home ) & Doctor's quarter's block, Block for Nuclear Medicine and an Amenity Centre in Phase I and a Staff Quarters block and multilevel mechanical car parking system in Phase 2 in Survey Nos. 188/10, 200/1, 200/2, 200/3, 200/4, 201/8, 201/8-1, 201/9, 201/9-1, 201/10, 201/15, 201/15-1, 201/24, 201/26, 201/26-1, 201/26-2, 202/3, 202/4-2 at Peroor village, KottayamTaluk, Kottayam District, Kerala by Fr. Thomas Animoottil, Director, M/s Caritas Hospital (File No.1184/A2/2018/SEIAA)**

Director, Caritas Hospital, Fr. Thomas Animoottil, Thellakom P.O., Kottayam-686630, vide his application received online has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006, for the proposed project in Survey Nos.188/10, 200/1, 200/2, 200/3,200/4,

201/8, 201/8-1, 201/9, 201/9-1, 201/10, 201/15, 201/15-1, 201/24, 201/26, 201/26-1, 201/26-2, 202/3, 202/4-2 at Peroor village, Kottayam Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala. It is interalia, noted that the project comes under the Category B (B2) of Schedule 8 (a) of Environment Impact Assessment Notification 2006. The proposed expansion will increase the bed strength from 660 to 950 by the addition of 290 beds. The proposed built up area for expansion was 62422.59 sqm and the total built up area after expansion was 93165.56 sqm. As per SEAC report EIA Notification 2006 was violated in the year 2011.

The proposal was placed in the 88<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 and the Committee directed the proponent to submit certain additional documents. The proponent has submitted the same. The proposal was placed in the 94<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2019. The Committee after detailed deliberation decided to approve the standard ToR subject to general conditions.

The proposal was placed in the 97<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2019. The Committee directed the proponent to present the EIA Report as per the TOR issued on 20-3-2019. The proponent submitted the EIA report prepared based on the ToR approved on 20.03.2019. The proposal was considered in the 99<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 27-28<sup>th</sup> June, 2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. A field inspection was also carried out on 23.07.2019 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in 101<sup>st</sup> SEAC Meeting and the Committee decided to recommend for EC subject to certain specific conditions and general conditions.

The proposal was placed in 97<sup>th</sup> SEIAA held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2019. Authority noticed that in the SEAC, Sub Committee report, there is a mention of violation of EIA Notification in 2011. It is seen that after deducting other exemptions, total existing built up area coming under the purview of EIA notification 2006 is 30742.9 m<sup>2</sup>. Probably this area seems to be involved in above referred violation. The total built up area proposed for expansion is 62422.59 sq.m whereas EC required is for 93165.56 sq.m. Authority decided to seek a clarification from SEAC on the above aspects, with specific recommendations whether we should proceed with violation proceedings or not.

The proposal was placed in the 104<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The Committee stood by the EC recommendation and entrusted Shri.K. Krishna



Panicker and Dr.A.V.Raghu, expert members, to peruse the files and suggest steps for initiating the violation proceedings.

The proponent has submitted a letter dated 12.11.19 requesting to give him an opportunity for personal hearing in the next SEAC meeting. The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The proponent requested for personal hearing regarding details of remediation plan. The Committee decided to call the proponent for personal hearing on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

The Committee heard the proponent and the consultant on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019 and directed to submit a suitable damage assessment and remediation plan for the violation of EIA notification 2006 as per guidelines and Court orders on the subject. The proponent has submitted a letter dated 06.02.2020 requesting to give them an opportunity for personal hearing in the next SEAC meeting. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 2 - 4 June, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for hearing and informed the proponent accordingly.

The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 12th - 14th August 2020. The proponent and the consultant were heard. The proponent submitted to reconsider the cost involved for remediation of damage and violation proceedings. The proponent also requested to consider the revised proposal for expansion. The Committee directed the proponent to revise and submit the proposals in this regard. The proponent submitted the revised application for Environmental Clearance on 24-09-2020. The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

Committee considered the revised proposal including the remediation plan in detail and decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details:

1) Documentary evidence to prove that construction of 7221.46 m<sup>2</sup> area was completed before 2006 and reason for obtaining building permit in 2016 only.

2) A detailed chart showing differences between old and revised proposals. The proponent submitted the documents on 02-11-2020.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The Committee discussed the revised remediation plan and natural resource augmentation plan submitted by the proponent. Total construction under violation category is 30742 sq. m (constructed after 2006). Total cost of construction is Rs 53.63 Crore. Total damage assessed

under various environmental parameters plus economic benefit accrued is Rs 106.79 lakhs. Total budget for remediation plan and natural resource augmentation plan is Rs 160.05 lakhs to be implemented within three years. As reported by SEAC the estimated area as per the revised plan under different categories requiring EC are as follows;

New construction 10212.33 sq. m

Under violation category 30742.97 sq. m

Total construction for which EC required 40955.3 sq.m

**SEAC has reported that the proponent has submitted all relevant documents as per 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting and copy of Bank Guarantee remitted for an amount of Rs. 1,60,05,000/- (Rupees one crore sixty lakhs and five thousand only) towards remediation & community and natural resources augmentation plan. Kerala State Pollution Control Board has also forwarded a copy of Bank Guarantee remitted by the project proponent for an amount of Rs. 1,60,05,000/- (Rupees one crore sixty lakhs and five thousand only)**

**Authority noted that SEAC has recommended to issue EC in its 101<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> & 02<sup>nd</sup> August 2019. Followed by this in response to the observations made by SEIAA in its 97<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24.9.2020 SEAC has taken steps for the completion of Violation proceedings. Authority decided to inform both SEAC and the Project Proponent that the following steps are to be followed in violation cases before issue of EC**

- i) In case of violation action will be taken against the Project Proponent by the respective State or State Pollution Control Board under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and further no consent to operate or occupancy certificate will be issued till the project is granted Environmental Clearance. (S.O.804(E) of MoEF&CC dated 14<sup>th</sup> March 2017)
- ii) State level expert appraisal committee (SEAC) should visit the site and decide whether the project can run sustainably under compliance of environmental norms with adequate safeguards, if so SEAC should prescribe appropriate Terms of Reference for carrying out an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Study and for the preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP). The SEAC shall stipulate implementation of EMP comprising remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan corresponding to the ecological damage assessed and

economic benefit derived due to violation as a condition of Environmental Clearance.(S.O.1030 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018)

- iii) The Project Proponent will be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan with State Pollution Control Board and the quantification will be recommended by SEAC and finalized by Regulatory Authority. The bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of EC and will be released after successful implementation of the remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan and after the recommendation by the regional office of MoEF&CC, SEAC and Regulatory Authority. .(S.O.1030 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018)

**Authority noticed that though SEAC has taken action under item no (ii) above, the EIA report as well as EMP should have been prepared by an accredited consultant rather than by a monitoring committee suggested by SEAC. However proponent has already remitted an amount of Rs 1,60,05,000 towards Remediation and community and natural resources Augmentation plan. It is presumed that this remittance has been made as per the Remediation and community and natural resources Augmentation plan approved by SEAC consisting expert members in the field.**

**Thus action under point no (ii) and (iii) have been completed and action is pending under item (i) above. Authority decided to inform the SPCB for taking action under point no (i) above and inform this position to SEAC and Project Proponent for necessary follow up action under point no (i) above, so that prior EC can be issued.**

**Item No. 106.18      Application for Environmental Clearance of Granite Building Stone quarry in Survey No-176/2,176/7,176/8,176/9,176/10 of Edakkunnam Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala for an area of 0.9708 hectares. File No.2437/EC2/2019/SEIAA**

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on October 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> 2019 and the Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents and the proponent has submitted the documents. The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for a

presentation. The proposal was placed in the 109<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2020 and 1<sup>st</sup> February 2020. RQP made a presentation and the Committee directed the proponent to submit certain additional documents/details. The proponent submitted the same on 28.02.2020. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2 - 4 June, 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 04.09.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 & 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit few more documents/details. The proponent submitted the document on 27-10-2020 & 24-11-2020 respectively. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions:

Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form I, Pre-feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent during Appraisal, Mining Plan and the filed inspection report and SEAC had recommend to issue EC subject to certain conditions.

**Authority decided to issue EC for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.**

- 1. Provide adequate filtration traps.*
- 2. Widen the road leading to the project site for smooth vehicle movement.*
- 3. Carry out green belt development as suggested in EMP in the first year of functioning.*
- 4. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of*

*activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*

- 5. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 6. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 7. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

**Item No.106.19**

**Application for extension of environmental clearance for mining of Laterite Stone by Shri.Vibin Sivadas [File No.2558/EC2/2019/SEIAA]**

**Authority decided to extend the validity period of EC for a period of one year from the date of issuance of permit from the Department of Mining & Geology subject to terms and conditions in the original EC.**

**ItemNo.106.20**

**Application for environmental clearance for mining of Ordinary earth by Sri.Saidhu Muhammed M.K.,Mundeth Thekkeveedu Ernakulam-683556 [File No.2680/EC4/2019/SEIAA]**

The proposal was placed in the 104<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The proponent submitted the additional documents asked for on 23-09-2020. The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation along with ground water level details in the nearby open wells with specific geo-coordinates.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28-30 December 2020. The consultant made the presentation. The Committee decided to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) The nearest building is only 10.1 m away from the proposed mining site.*
- 2) Purchase order is for 10000 MT only whereas the proposal is for removal of about 56000 MT ordinary earth from the project area.*
- 3) The proposed mining plan envisage mining up to 10 m depth at central part of the project area and it will affect the open wells down the slope.*
- 4) Large scale removal of ordinary earth may cause land slide and drying up or lowering water level of open wells in the area.*

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

**Item No.106.21      Application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry project in Survey No-392/1A/3/2 pt, 392/1A/2pt 393/2pt of Kottappady Village and Sy Nos. 467/1A/60pt of Pindimana Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Mr. Jose Mathew (File No-1394 (A)/EC2/2019/SEIAA) Court direction – Time limit. (WP(C) 7728/2019 filed by Sri.Biju Jose (File No. 4506/A1/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. Jose Mathew, Proprietor, Aranjanayil House, Chelad P.O Kothamangalam, Ernakulam District, Kerala vide his application received online and the hard copy of the project received on 17/06/2019 has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification,

2006 for the building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 392/1A/3/2 pt, 392/1A/2pt 393/2pt of Kottappady Village, and Sy Nos. 467/1A/60pt of Pindimana Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala for an area of 1.8757 Ha. The project comes under Category B2, Activity 1(a) as per the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006. The proposed project is for quarrying of 1,00,000MTA

The proposal was considered in the 103<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proponent submitted the documents on 25.09.2019, except Certificate from Dam Safety Authority with respect to Bhoothathankettu Dam,. The proposal was placed in the 104<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for a presentation.

The proposal was placed in 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> October 2019 and the proponent made presentation. A field inspection was also carried out on 3-10-2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team. Meanwhile a WP(C) 7728/2019 was filed by Sri Biju Jose against the Project Proponent.

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020 and as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in the above WP (C), the Committee decided to invite the proponent and the petitioner for personal hearing. The proposal was placed in the 109<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January & 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2020. The Committee heard the Petitioner and his representative Advocate Shivsankar and the Proponent and his Advocate Sebastian Philip. The Committee after hearing both parties sought a clarification from the petitioner regarding his statement in the affidavit that his residential house is located at a distance within 25m from the proposed quarry. The Petitioner agreed to submit the document in proof of his claim.. Committee decided that on receipt of such a document, the Sub Committee entrusted with field inspection shall take into consideration this aspect also at the time of field inspection. It was also decided to bring this aspect to the notice of SEIAA. .

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The Committee discussed and decided to accept the Field Inspection Report (FIR) in this regard. The petitioner Shri. Biju Jose was directed to submit the permit and the building number received from the Grama Panchayat for his building near the proposed quarry of the proponent. The proponent was directed to submit the survey sketch showing the details of houses within

200metres distance certified by the Village Officer concerned. The Committee also decided to inform the SEIAA of the above and to seek extension of time for the compliance of the directions of the Hon“ble High Court of Kerala in this regard.

The petitioner Shri.Biju Jose submitted certificate of building permit dated 15-11-2018 and the certificate issued by the Kottappady gramapanchayath evidencing the building number on 15-12-2020.

**Authority also noticed that in his letter Letter No. G3-2227/19 dated 15-12-2020, the Chief Conservator of Forests, Central Circle, Thrissur has raised following objections on the proposed project.**

1. The proposed area is situated at a distance of 200mts from Kottappara Reserve Forest. The area is rich in flora and fauna.
2. The proposed area is at a distance of 4.3 km from nearest protected area, Thattekad Bird Sanctuary. If mining is carried out in this area, it may adversely affect the flora and fauna of this area.
3. The population of wild elephants is high in this area and human-animal conflict is very frequent. Crop damage by wild animals is very frequent and farmers suffer huge crop loss and property damage due to this.
4. Mining in this area at a distance of 200mts from forest boundary will further increase the tress pass of wild elephants to human settlements which may increase in human-animal conflicts. Casualty of wild animals also may happen due to mining operations.

CCF has requested to consider his objections on behalf of Forest Department, before issuing No Objection Certificate.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee discussed and accepted the additional details submitted by the proponent. SEAC noted the objections raised by the Chief Conservator of Forests, Central Circle, Thrissurin his Letter No. G3-2227/19 dated 15-12-2020 regarding the proposed project area and decided to reject the proposal as it is only 200 mts from the forest boundary.

**Authority noted that, though in general the distance to be maintained from Forest**



areas is 50 meters, SEAC has a freedom to increase the minimum distance considering the local factors specific to the project. Further as per the affidavit submitted by the Proponent the house of Mr Biju is located at a distance of 25m from the quarry. In this case considering all the local factors and the objections raised by Chief Conservator of Forests, Central Circle, Thrissur SEAC has decided to reject the proposal. Authority decided to reject the proposal as per the recommendations of SEAC and inform the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.

**Item No: 106.22**      **Environmental clearance issued to the granite building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 253/2, 253/4-1, 253/4-2, 253/4-3, 253/4-4, 254/2, 255/7, 252/5, 252/6 and 252/7 at Rayamangalam Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Pavan Quarry and Aggregates Pvt. Ltd.(File No. 470/SEIAA/KL/3214/2014) Judgment in WP(C) No. 7894 of 2020 (J) dated 16-03-2020.**

As per the decision of 52<sup>nd</sup> meeting of SEIAA Environmental clearance was issued to the granite building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 253/2, 253/4-1, 253/4-2, 253/4-3, 253/4-4, 254/2, 255/7, 252/5, 252/6 and 252/7 at Rayamangalam Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala owned by M/s Pavan Quarry and Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. The validity for the EC expires on 31-05-2021.

A complaint was received from Smt. Anjali Vijayan, Methala, Ernakulam on 10-03-2020 alleging irregularities in the functioning of quarry . Smt. Anjali S.O filed WP(C) No. 7894/2020 before the Hon'ble High court of Kerala. The Hon'ble High court in its judgment dated 16-03-2020 directed the Authority to consider the petitioners complaint referred as Ext P 9 in the judgment, after affording hearing opportunity to the parties concerned and pass appropriate orders within a period of two months. Also the Hon'ble High court in its judgment suggested that each of the respondent authorities may ensure appropriate inspection with due prior notice to the petitioner and respondents.

Meanwhile the petitioner, Smt.Anjali Vijayanin the above writ petition has submitted a representation dated.06.07.2020 before the Authority stating that the allegations and all other disputes raised against the respondents have been amicably settled between the parties through conciliation and now she intends to withdraw the petition submitted against the respondent M/s Pavan Quarry and Aggregates Pvt. Ltd.

Now the respondent in the petition M/s Pavan Quarry and Aggregates Pvt. Ltd has submitted an application for extension of EC on PARIVESH Portal and the same is under consideration as on 09-11-2020.

Authority opined that in the light of the order of Hon'ble High court it is not appropriate to dispose of the petition on the basis of a representation received from petitioner Smt. Anjali Vijayan. Hence an opportunity of being heard through video conferencing was fixed on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021

**An opportunity of being heard was given to the petitioner, Smt. Anjali Vijayan on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021. But the Petitioner was unable to attend the hearing as she was hospitalised and she has authorised her brother Sri. Arun O.V to attend the hearing through video conferencing. In the video conference Arun stated that they have no objections in the functioning of the quarry and they propose to withdraw the petition. Authority informed Shri Arun, the representative of the petitioner that, she should file a withdrawal petition before the Honorable High court of Kerala within two weeks and inform the outcome to the Authority for necessary further action.**

**Item No.106.23      **Petition against the High Grip Granites – Judgment in WP(C) No.19734 of 2020 (File No.552/SEIAA/KL/ 4086/2014)****

Sri. Abdul Azeez.P.P, Chairman, Save Vazhayoor, a people's collective for protecting the environment filed a petition before the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority against High Grip Granites, East Vazhayoor.P.O, Ramanattukara Via, Malappuram, Proprietor of the said quarry is M.E. Mohanan, S/o. Kadungon, Moonnamthodi, Edakkattu Vishnu Nivas, Karadu Parambu, Faroke College, Malappuram District.

The State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority has given Environmental Clearance vide No.552/SEIAA/KL/4806/2014 dated 15.07.2017 to M/s High Grip Granites for quarrying granite stone in Survey No. 147/1(P) 155/2 (P), 154/16(P) and 154/17(P) at Vazhayoor Village, Kondotty Taluk Malappuram District. The petitioner alleges that the proponent has obtained Environment Clearance by deliberate concealment of facts which is material to appraisal and decision on the application for EC.

The petitioner also challenged the Environmental Clearance before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in a public Interest litigation vide WP(C) No.6770 of 2019 and as per the Judgment dated 07.03.2019 the Court dismissed the said W P (C) as withdrawn since the Petitioner prays for permission to withdraw the writ Petition.

Petitioner, Sri.AbdulAzeez.P.P.filed a WP(C) No.19734 of 2020 before the Hon'ble High Court and the Judgment copy was received in SEIAA office on 13.10.2020. The Hon'ble High Court in its Judgment directed the first respondent SEIAA to take a decision on Ext.P6 (Petition submitted by Sri.AbdulAzeez P.P) with notice to the Petitioner and the second respondent (M/s High Grip Granites) within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the Judgment.

SEIAA had filed an extension petition for four months for complying the direction of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No.19734 of 2020.In the meantime SEIAA has taken required follow up actions.

Sri.AbdulAzeez P.P has filed Contempt of Court Case (Civil) 2013/2020 (S) in WP(C) No.19734/2020. Authority noted that the Standing Counsel has filed an exemption petition against the Contempt of Court and the Court has allowed exemption of the parties from personal appearance and directed SEIAA to file an affidavit in this regard. All three respondents (Chairman, Member Secretary and Member of SEIAA) have filed the affidavits as advised by the standing council. The Standing Counsel was also requested to file an extension of four months for complying the Court direction and the same is under consideration of the Hon'ble Court.

**Authority noted that, all follow up actions sufficient enough to answer the Exhibit (P6) have been taken and hence urgent steps should be taken by SEIAA to dispose of the Exhibit (P6) within 15 days narrating the entire range of events, follow up actions taken by SEIAA and SEAC, field observations of SEAC, squarely answering all the allegations raised by the petitioner in Exhibit (P6), in WP(C) No.19734 of 2020 and in Contempt of Court Case (Civil) 2013/2020 (S).**

**Item No.106.24**

**Application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry project in Sy.No. 73/27 of Pullippadam**

**Village, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram District , Kerala for an area of 1.5209 Ha by Sri. Noushad (File No. 1357/EC2/ 2019/SEIAA)**

Sri.Noushad, Proprietor, Palappatta House, Pannipara P.O, Malappuram District, Kerala – 676541 vide his application received online and the hard copy of the project received on 24.07.2019 has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the building stone quarry project in Re. Survey. No. 73/27 of Pullippadam Village, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram District , Kerala over an area of 1.5209 Ha. The project comes under Category B2, Activity 1(a) as per the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

The proposed project site falls within Latitude 11°15' 18.24" N to 11°15' 22.80" N to Longitude 76°09' 55.13" E to 76°10' 02.24" E. The proposed project is for quarrying of 41,003 MT. The estimated cost of the project as per From IM is 2 crore. The proponent remitted an amount of Rs.1 lakh as processing fee.

The proposal was considered in the 102<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> & 27<sup>th</sup> August 2019. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents. The proponent submitted the documents on 29.10.2019. On verification of online portal of PARIVESH, it is noted that the application is still for TOR and not for EC.

The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 109<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 31<sup>st</sup> January & 1<sup>st</sup> February 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The Proponent submitted the documents on 07.03.2020. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup> to 04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to revise the application from ToR to EC. The Project Proponent has complied with this direction. A field inspection was also carried out on 01.09.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 113<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020 & 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The Proponent submitted the documents on 08.10.2020 & 23.11.2020 respectively. The proposal was placed in the

116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee noted that since the nearest house is 202 m from the project boundary and the project life is ten years, the Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC for ten years with review after five years subject to certain specific conditions.

**Authority noticed that the Committee appraised the proposal based on Form I, Pre-feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent as the part of the appraisal, Mining Plan and the filed inspection report and the Committee decided to recommend EC subject to certain conditions.**

**Authority decided to issue EC initially for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions**

- 1. Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules insists that mining has to be carried out as per Mining Plan and lessee has to submit a scheme of mining for every 5 years. On production of approved scheme of mining for the next five years, the period of this EC will be extended by this Authority, till the expiry of the new mining scheme period, provided the Project Proponent does not violate the EC conditions, which will be certified by SEAC after a field inspection.*
- 2. The seasonal stream originating from BP8 should be properly drained to the nearest stream.*
- 3. The rocky buffer areas between BP7 and BP8 should be planted with suitable species of Ficus using appropriate techniques by consulting experts.*
- 4. The OB dumping site need to be protected with retaining wall.*
- 5. The access road shall be widened to at least 7 m*
- 6. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of CER activities. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*

7. *The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
8. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
9. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

**Item No. 106.25**      **Request from Mr.V.Govindankutty to reduce the distance from the forest boundary from 100m to 50 mts (File No.1062/SEIAA/1639/2016)**

Environmental Clearance has been granted for the quarry project in Survey No.39/1 & 39/2 of Venganallur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr.V.Govindankutty, Managing Partner, M/s.Divya Metal Industries vide Proceedings No.1062/SEIAA/EC1/1639/16 dated 10.10.2017. The EC was granted with some specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for mining. The specific condition no.3 is that 100 m distance should be left from the reserve forest boundary for mining operations. The proponent as per his letter dt.20.06.2018 requested to reduce the distance from the nearest forest boundary from 100m to 50 mts on the grounds that

- i) The proposal for quarry is only 1.3079 ha and is a very small quarry and setting aside 100 mts from the nearest forest boundary will lessen further area for quarrying.

- ii) The DEIAA is granting EC for mining operations after setting aside 50 mts from the nearest forest boundary which was based on a decision arrived on a video conference meeting with Chairpersons of DEIAA on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2017 in which the Chairman of SEIAA was also present.

The above request was placed before the 83<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 22.10.2018 and SEIAA decided to constitute an expert committee for an evaluation study on the environmental impact caused by quarrying adjacent to the forest area with the following members.

- 1) Dr.H.NageshPrabhu IFS (Rtd), Chairman, SEIAA
- 2) Dr.P.S.Easa, Member, SEAC
- 3) Prof.A.P.Thomas, Professor, M.G.University

In the 87<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA the evaluation report was discussed and SEIAA decided to impose a minimum distance of 50 m from the forest boundary to the quarry. However, SEAC while assessing any application for quarry may recommend higher distance from forest boundary based on scientific reasons to be mentioned.

Mr.V.Govindankutty, filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court requesting to stay the operation of the condition no.3 i.e. 100m distance to be left from the reserve forest boundary in the decision taken at the 71<sup>st</sup> meeting of SEIAA. An affidavit was filed by SEIAA before the Hon,ble High Court. At the time of filing counter affidavit in WP(C) No.36112/2018 the minimum distance from quarry to the forest boundary fixed by the Authority was 100 mts.

The proposal was placed in the 95<sup>th</sup> SEIAA Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Authority decided to verify the present status of the WP(C) No.36112/2018, in the meantime decided to call for a joint field inspection report involving SEAC and Kerala Forest Department.

The proposal was placed in the 103<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 17<sup>th</sup>& 18<sup>th</sup> September 2020.A field inspection involving Divisional Forest Officer, Thrissur Mr. Jayasankar and SEAC Member, Dr. P. S. Easa. During the field inspection it is noticed that from the nearest boundary pillar the distance is only 45.3 leave alone 50 meters. This is in violation of KMMC rules and EC condition In the meantime a letter No.A9/10353/19 dated.20.11.2019 was received from the Secretary, Chelakkara GramaPanchayat, stating that complaints have been

received from the nearby residents alleging Environmental pollution due to quarrying by Divya Metals. They requested to reexamine the matter after conducting a site visit.

The Proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup>, & 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee discussed the report of the special team comprising of Dr.P.S.Easa& DFO, Thrissur and the Committee decided to reject the request of the proponent, since it is in violation of the minimum distance criteria with reference to forest area.

**Authority noticed that the Proponent had violated the distance criteria and Secretary, Chelakkara GramaPanchayat, has reported that he has received complaints from local residents alleging Environmental pollution due to quarrying by Divya Metals. Authority decided to inform the Proponent that as per the recommendation of SEAC after the field inspection, his request to reduce the distance from forest boundary from 100 meters to 50 meters cannot be considered and he should maintain a distance of 100m from the forest boundary as per the original EC conditions. The Director, Mining & Geology shall be informed to take action against the Proponent for violation of distance criteria as he has not maintained the distance criteria of even 50 meters.**

**Item No.106.26      Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry project in Re Survey No. 397/4 in Elamkur Village, ErnadTaluk, Malappuram District Kerala by Sri MujeebRahman (File No. 1319/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 101<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 1-2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2019 & 103<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 17<sup>th</sup>& 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The Committee decided to obtain certain documents/details from the proponent. The proponent submitted the documents on 22.08.2019 & 15.11.2019 respectively. The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for a presentation.

The proposal was placed in the 109<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 31<sup>st</sup> January & 01<sup>st</sup> February 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain additional documents/details and the proponent submitted the documents on 02.07.2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 20.09.2019 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field



observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee directed the Proponent to submit certain additional documents/details and the Proponent submitted the same.

The proposal was again placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee decided to recommend for the issuance of EC subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Authority noticed that the Committee appraised the proposal based on Form I, Pre-feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent as the part of the appraisal, Mining Plan and the filed inspection report and the Committee decided to recommend EC subject to certain conditions.

**Authority decided to issue EC for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.**

- 1. The drainage plan should be modified avoiding the area south east of the hollow space.*
- 2. The seasonal stream flowing through the middle of the project area must be protected.*
- 3. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed.. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 4. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 5. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to*

*use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*

6. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

**Item No: 106.27**      **Proposals for Environmental Clearance in which application for withdrawal is received from proponent. (File No. 96/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

**Authority accorded sanction for the withdrawal of the proposals from the PARIVESH as requested by the Project Proponents.**

**Item No. 106.28**      **Complaint against quarrying in Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk by residence of Kannakara colony – received from Chief Minister Office Portal. (File No. 1388/A1/2020/SEIAA)**

**Authority decided to forward a copy of the complaint to District Collector, Pathanamthitta, the Chairman District Disaster management Authority, with a request to obtain a report within 10 days from the Director, Mining & Geology, on the irregularities alleged to have been committed by the Project Proponents and issue Stop Memo depending upon the gravity of the situation in the project region.**

**Authority also decided to request the District collector to send definite proposals for the cancellation of ECs if the quarries in question are functioning dangerous to life and properties of local residents as alleged.**

**Item No. 106.29**

**Judgment dated 2.11.2020 in WP (C) 17533/2020 and 23 other cases- regarding the validity of EC (File No.1858/A1/2020/SEIAA)**

**Authority noted the observations made by the SEAC and resolved to seek extension from the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at least up to 31-05-2021 in view of the large number of proposals to be appraised by the SEAC adhering to the COVID-19 protocols.**

**In view of the time limit, Authority decided to request SEAC to expedite follow up action on the direction of Honorable High court.**

**Authority decided inform SEAC to follow the direction of Honourable High court in WP (C) 15962/2020 and connected cases in disposing the fresh proposals.**

**Item No.106.30**

**General Decision in 97<sup>th</sup> SEIAA Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2019 to invite Member Secretary, State Disaster Management Authority to future meetings to help to clarify the hazard zonation of the area on which Environmental Clearance is being sought. (File No.1881/A1/2018/SEIAA)**

Authority took note of the observations made by Member Secretary, Kerala State Disaster Management Authority and thank him for the information provided.

Authority decided to inform SEAC and all concerned sections in SEIAA to refer Section 3.21 (1 to 3) and Section 5.11 of the Kerala State Disaster Management Plan 2016 (<https://sdma.kerala.gov.in/sdmp/>) laid under Disaster Management Act, 2005 before giving approval to projects.

SEAC and all concerned sections in SEIAA to note that, Section 3.21 mentions about disaster prevention and Section 5.11 mentions about role of State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA). As per section 5.11 of Kerala State Disaster Management Plan 2016, SEIAA to ensure that disaster management plans and hazard susceptibility maps are consulted and adequate risk reduction measures are incorporated into project proposals, prior to issuing environmental clearance.

**Item No.106.31**      **Hazard Occurrence Certificate from Soil Conservation Department – Clarification sought for – reg. (File No.2241/A1/2020/SEIAA)**

Authority decided seek no objection certificate from DDMA for the projects located in high hazard zone. Alternatively SEIAA and SEAC may verify the position as per the guidelines provided by Member Secretary State Disaster management authority in his letter No.OM SEOC/242/2020/SDMA-KSDMA dated.28.10.2020.We may also notify this requirement in our website for the benefit of Project Proponents.

**Item No 106.32**      **Judgment dated 2.12.2020 in WP (C ) 22491/2019 filed by Sri.S.Sundaresan ( File No.2578/A1/2019/SEIAA)**

Authority decided to call the file from DEIAA Kollam and place it in the next SEIAA meeting after scrutinizing the file thoroughly. Any detail/document required from the Project Proponent may be collected well in advance before placing the file in the SEIAA meeting. Authority decided to inform this decision of SEIAA to the project proponent for information and necessary follow up action.

**Item No. 106.33**      **General decision 1 of 97<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting - To Review the list of general conditions prescribed while issuing Environmental Clearance (File No. 3583/A1/2019/SEIAA)**

Authority approved the updated versions of the General conditions which includes the suggestions made by SEAC, Senior Geologist Dept. of Mining and Geology, Office staff of SEIAA and Environment Scientist. Authority suggested to upload the upgraded versions of General conditions for the benefit of Project Proponents.

Authority acknowledged with thanks the efforts put in by all concerned.

**Item No106.34**      **Constitution of another SEAC to cover northern region of the state (File No.3779/A1/2019/SEIAA)**

**Noted**

**Item No.106.35**      **Draft Procedure for River Sand Mining considering the latest NGT Order dated.14.10.2020 (File No.4001/A1/2018/SEIAA)**

The draft procedure for issuing Environmental Clearance for river sand mining projects, prepared by a team of Expert members of SEAC, considering the latest NGT Order dated.14.10.2020, was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020 for perusal and approval. The Committee approved the draft procedure and forwarded the same to SEIAA for approval.

Authority perused the draft procedure and decided to study it further in relation to existing procedure so that the relevant existing procedure can be dovetailed into the draft procedure for an efficient and effective operation of the proposed procedure in the field.

Looking into their experience in the field, Authority decided to entrust this assignment to Dr Jayachandran Member SEIAA and Dr.Jude Immanuel, Environmental Scientist. They may provide their inputs within 3 weeks. They may peruse the note given to Member Secretary on river sand mining in relation to one of the Agenda items of 104<sup>th</sup> SEIAA Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> & 24<sup>th</sup> June 2020. Authority also decided to forward a copy of the same to Institute of land Development and Management (ILDm) which has done extensive research on river sand mining for their inputs.

**Item No106. 36**      **Disposal of files in PARIVESH Portal which have been processed by SEIAA physically (File No.116/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

Authority accorded sanction for Delisting of files in PARIVESH Portal which have been processed by SEIAA physically /offline mode and Delisting of proposals where noaction is pending.

**Item No.106.37**      **Application for Extension of Environmental Clearance for Ordinary Earth Mining Project of Manikandan P.V, over an extent of 2.4027 Ha in Re Sy No-1/2A1, 1/2A3 of Pattithara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad District, and Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIN/173083/2020, 951/A2/2019/SEIAA)**

Authority decided to extend the validity period of EC for a period of six months from the date of issuance of permit from the Department of Mining & Geology subject to terms and conditions in the original EC.

**Item No: 106.38**      **ToR application for the prior Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Phase I Development of Azhikkal Port at Azhikkal, Kannur District, Kerala (amending the Minutes), SIA/KL/MIS/53915/2020 , 1753/EC4/SEIAA/2020**

In response to the Letter of Managing director & CEO, Azhikkal Port, Authority perused the procedure to be followed under EIA notification 2006 and CRZ notification for issuing TOR and Environmental Clearance for such projects.

As per Section 4(b) of CRZ notification, KCZMA should recommend the proposal to SEIAA for EC under EIA notification 2006. As per section 4.2 (i), the Project Proponent shall submit certain documents for clearance from KCZMA which includes Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) report and Environment Management plan (EMP) for which ToR has to be approved.

Authority noted that SEAC has already approved the TOR with some additional areas to be covered. Authority decided to forward the TOR approved by SEAC with additional areas to be covered, to KCZMA for their comments. Looking into the emergency of the situation, KCZMA is requested forward their comments directly to Project Proponent within 7 days and thereafter the Project Proponent may proceed ahead with EIA study and preparation of EMP as

per the ToR approved by SEAC with additional areas to be covered and the comments offered by KCZMA.

Authority also agreed to the request of Managing Director & CEO, Azhikkal Port to make necessary amendments in related records including the ToR letter to be issued.

**Item No. 106.39 Environmental Clearance – Ordinary Earth project at Kakkanad Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala for an Area of 0.2857 Ha. Of Mr.Sreekumar Chenketh, Joint General Manager, South Indian Bank (Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/156220/2020, File No: 1762/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 114 SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The proponent and consultant were present. The consultant made the presentation. The Committee decided to inform the SEIAA that as per the EIA Notification, removal of ordinary earth for buildings with plinth area of a structure below 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> needs no prior EC.

The proponent submitted (Dated 10-12-2020) a request letter to issue a letter stating that the EC is not required for their project as the built up area is less than 20,000 Sqm. In continuation to this they have to take up the matter with Department of Mining and Geology, Ernakulam for issuance of Movable permit.

**Authority decided to inform the Project Proponent that only digging foundation for buildings not requiring prior Environmental clearance is exempted from EC under EIA notification 2006. In all other cases if he requires EC for mining ordinary earth, he should apply for the same with an approved mining plan.**

## **PARIVESH FILES**

### **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE**

- 1) **Application for Environmental Clearance for Ordinary Earth Quarry of Shri.K. H. Shajahan Rawather' over an extent of 2.4517 Ha. Block No. 2, Sy. Nos. 394/1, 1-2, 1-3, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15-2, 397/1, 3, 4, 14, , 15, 16, 19, 20, 398/5 & 398/9 in Kidangannur Village, Kozhenchery Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala(SIA/KL/MIN/125574/2019, 1584/EC4/2019/SEIAA)**

Authority noticed that Project Proponent had earlier obtained an EC in 2016 for mining 50000 m3 of ordinary earth from the same locality. It may be ascertained from the proponent whether he has carried out mine closure activities as per the approved mining plan if not the reasons thereby. He should also produce a certificate from the District Geologist to the effect that proponent has not violated EC condition and mined earth has been used for the purposes for which EC was issued.

Project Proponent may be asked to produce a letter from the user agency mentioning the quantity of ordinary earth required for their purpose and the project Proponent shall file an affidavit to the effect that he would not use the excavated earth for the purposes other than what is mentioned in the letter issued by user agency.

- 2) **Application for Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Laterite (Building Stone) Quarry in Re-Survey Nos. 56/5-4, 3 of Sreekrishnapuram - II Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala for an extent of 0.0972 Ha by Shri. Sreenath K (SIA/KL/MIN/132613/2019, 1683/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 7th December, 2020. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of the EC subject to the general conditions.

**The Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to issue EC for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan for a period of one year from the**



date of issue of permit from Department of Mining and Geology with following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

- 1. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
  - 2. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honorable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
  - 3. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal , covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 3) Application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey No 326/2-9 in Eramalloor Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala for an extent of 0.5522 Ha of land by Sri. P.M. Moitheen (Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/145890/2020, File No: 1430/EC3/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to revise and resubmit the application for EC with all necessary documents. The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation along certain

documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 29th and 30th December, 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal since area is part of an almost mined out old quarry and the entire material is mined out.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 4) Application for Environmental Clearance for mining of Ordinary Earth in Re Sy No 294/1 of Elankur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala for an area of 0.3844 Ha by Sri.Abdul Samad. (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/146392/2020, File No.1594/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation along with certain documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee deferred the proposal. The proposal was again placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1. The purpose of excavation of soil is not satisfactory.*
- 2. There is a potential threat to the students and school which is situated very adjacent to the proposed mine area.*

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 5) Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Laterite (Building Stone) Quarry in Re-Survey Nos. 550/10-3, 550/10-2 of Ezhukone Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala for an extent of 0.0809Ha of Shri. Sudarshanan (Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/148210/ 2020, File No.1694/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEAC, Kerala, held on 6-8 October, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was

placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEAC, held on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) Nearest house is 4 m west of the proposed quarry as per survey map certified by the Village Officer, Neduvathoor Village. There is another house 6 m south of project boundary*
- 2) Quarrying activity within close proximity to houses will cause lot of difficulties to the residents.*

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 6) Application for Environmental Clearance for the quarry project in Re-Survey Nos. 898, 899/1, 899/2, 896/1, 896/2, 897/1 at Kodassery Village, Chalakudy Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Sri.Arun Baby, M/s Mattthil Mines and Developers (P) Ltd. (Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/41465/2019, File No.1464/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details and the proponent submitted the same. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup> to 04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The Committee invited the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 07<sup>th</sup> to 09<sup>th</sup> July 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 11.10.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee discussed the field inspection report and decided to reject the proposal because there is house at 48m from the proposed quarry.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 7) **Application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s. K L Granites”, over an extent of 1.2537 Ha. Re-Survey Block. No:35, Re-Survey. Nos. 368/3, 368/4, 374/3 (Patta Land) & 369/1 (Government land), Pulimath Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/43756/2019 , 1454/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020 and 109<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January & 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2020 for Appraisal..The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details and the Proponent submitted the same.

The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2 - 4, June, 2020. The proponent was invited for a presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit the certain additional documents/details and the Proponent submitted the same. A field inspection was also carried out on 22.11.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 7th December, 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal since there is no proper access road to the proposed site and found that the narrow access road is passing through residential areas and having curves making it difficult for material conveyance through the road.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 8) **Environment Clearance for mining lease of "Granite Building Stone Quarry of Shri. P.S. Sebastian’ over an extent of 3.3580 Ha. (8.2976 Acres) at Re-Survey Block No. 65, Re-Survey Nos. 170/3, 175/1, 175/1-1, 175/1-2, 175/1-3, 175/2, 173/1, 170/1, 170/2, & 170/4, Teekoy Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala State (Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/44633/2019 File No. 1530/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108th Meeting of SEAC, held on 13th & 14th January, 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details and the proponent submitted the same. The proposal was placed in the 111th meeting of SEAC, held on 2 - 4, June, 2020. The proponent was invited for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112th meeting of SEAC, held on 12th to 14th August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 15.10.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in the 115th meeting of SEAC, held on 3 – 5, November 2020. The Committee decided to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- i) Entire project area is in medium hazard zone and only 226 m away from high hazard zone
- ii) The area is susceptible for land slides
- iii) The mining activity will adversely affect natural drainage system of the area

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 9) **Application for Environmental Clearance for Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Mr. Narayanan, over an extent of 0.4532 Ha in Survey No-1/PT2, in Chiranellur Village, Kunnankulam Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/45742/2019, File No.1510/EC4 /2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108th meeting of SEAC held on 13th to 14th January 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation with all documents including photographs of the proposed site. The proposal was placed in the 110th meeting of SEAC held on 11th & 12th February 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to submit consent letter from the house owner adjacent to the proposed quarry. The proposal was placed in the 111th meeting of SEAC held on 02nd to 04th June 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 24.09.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain additional documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee deferred the proposal. The proposal was again placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee scrutinized the additional documents/details submitted by the proponent. The Committee decided to reject the proposal for the reason that the nearest house is situated within 48.8m. from the quarrying site.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

- 10) Environmental Clearance for the proposed expansion of Government General Hospital, Kozhikode in survey Nos. TS 4-4127/2, 127/3,131, 133, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146/2, 147/1, 148, 142, Ward-IV, Kasaba Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District (File No: 1623 /EC4/2019/SEIAA) (SIA/KL/MIN/137528/2020)**

Dr. V. Ummer Farook, Superintendent, Govt. General Hospital, Red Cross Road, Vellayil, Kozhikode vide application dated 14/1/2020 has sought environmental clearance for the proposed expansion of Government General Hospital Kozhikode in survey Nos. TS 4-4127/2, 127/3,131, 133, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146/2, 147/1, 148, 142, Ward-IV, Kasaba Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District. The proposed expansion includes the construction of 7 buildings in the existing campus of Government General Hospital, Kozhikode with total additional built-up area of 26735.13 m<sup>2</sup>. Total project cost is 177.45 crores and expected duration of the project is 36 months.

The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup> & 04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 27.9.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup>, 04<sup>th</sup> & 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proponent submitted the documents online on 21.12.2020. The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020 and the Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to certain specific conditions in addition to general conditions.

**Authority decided to issue EC for 5 years for the proposed expansion which includes the construction of 7 buildings in the existing campus of Government General Hospital, Kozhikode with total additional built-up area of 26735.13 m<sup>2</sup> subject to following specific conditions and general conditions.**

- 1. The Environmental Management Plan and cost required for its implementation during the operation phase shall be revised to the satisfaction of SEAC by re-addressing the following aspects. The progress of implementation of EMP shall be mentioned in the half yearly report.***
  - i. Adequate space allocated for storage of biodegradable and non-biodegradable Waste and the number of composting bins during the operation phase***
  - ii Adequate space allocated for the safe storage of biomedical waste***
  - iii Sequential plan for managing the demolition waste and excavated soil and its utilization.***
  - iv Substantiated plan for the use of the excess excavated soil of about 6430 m<sup>3</sup> for internal road laying, backfilling and landscaping and handing over of the excess quantity for the nearest public works.***
  - v Explore the possibilities of tree planting preferably with suitable medicinal plant tree species like Saracaasoca etc***
  - vi Substantiated plan for the parking arrangement without compromising the required open spaces near the hospital buildings.***
  - vii Ensure that the depth of the percolation pit (proposed as 3.6 m) is such way that it allows adequate infiltration..***
  - viii Design the storm water drain considering the carrying capacity as the quantity of flow increases gradually.***

- ix      *Adopt Climate responsive design as per Green Building Guidelines in practice .*
  - x       *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having high solar reflective index.*
2.    *Building design should cater to the differently-abled citizens*
  3.    *Water efficient plumbing should be adopted*
  4.    *Design of the building should be in compliance to Energy Building Code as applicable.*
  5.    *Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER): As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of the activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
  6.    *The proponent shall make all the arrangement for the proper segregation and treatment of biomedical waste by installing suitable on site biomedical waste treatment plants.*
  7.    *Provision shall be made for the housing of construction labour within the site with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF dt.22.09.2008 and Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996)*



## **CONSIDERATION OF TOR PROPOSALS**

- 1) Terms of Reference for Granite (Building Stone) Quarry with permit of existing quarry extent of 0.8939Ha at survey No. 1065 at Melmuri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District., Kerala by Mr.Kunhi Muhammed [SIA/KL/MIN/48913/ 2019, 1820/EC6/2020/SEIAA ]**

**Authority noted the ToR approval by SEAC as a part of its appraisal.**

- 2) Application for Environmental Clearance for Granite building stone quarry project situated in Re. Survey. No.181/1, 181/2, 180/3, 287/1 of Morayur Village Kondotty Taluk Malappuram District, Kerala over an area of 0.9539 Ha by Sri. E.K. Abdurahiman, Managing partner, E.K sands & Granites (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/35093/2019, File No. 1344/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 13<sup>th</sup>& 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to furnish certain documents/details.

The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup> to 04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The proponent is invited for presentation. The proponent was directed to apply for a fresh EC along with all the documents submitted earlier (for TOR) including the additional documents sought by SEAC. Accordingly the Proponent applied for EC in PARIVESH vide Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/158630/2020 on 19.06.2020.

The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 26.09.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain additional documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup>& 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee deferred the proposal. The proposal was again placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> December

2020. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to the General Conditions.

Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form I, Pre-feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent as the part of the appraisal, Mining Plan and the filed inspection report and SEAC had recommend to issue EC subject to certain conditions.

Authority decided to issue EC for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

- 1. Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER): As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be not less than 1-2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed under CER. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 2. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 3. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 4. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of*

*the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

**3) Application for ToR for the Proposed Hospital Project, ‘Ahalia Hospital’ at Vadakarapathy Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala SIA/KL/NCP/57523/2020, 1827/EC1/2020/SEIAA**

M. R. Dinil, Trustee, Ahalia International Foundation Elippara, Kozhippara P.O Palakkad- 678557, submitted an application for ToR via PARIVESH on 16.10.2020 for the Proposed Hospital Project, ‘Ahalia Hospital’ in Re-Sy.Nos. 108/1, 110/1, 110/2, 111/1 in Vadakarapathy Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala.

The proposed project site falls within Latitude 10° 47' 49.23" N to Longitude 76° 49' 41.42" E. Total plot area is 52900.507 m<sup>2</sup> (13.072 Acres) and the total construction built-up area is 31722.40 m<sup>2</sup>. Height of the building is 16.875 m. No. of Floors is B+G+3. The cost of the Project is INR 6514.43 Lakhs.

The construction activities of the hospital started in 2009 and were completed and commissioned in 2018. The EIA Notification 2006 was violated in the year 2017 when the threshold of 20000 m<sup>2</sup> was crossed. The built up area constructed in excess of 20000 m<sup>2</sup> is 11722.4 m<sup>2</sup>.

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 7th December, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for hearing. The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The proponent and consultant were present. The Committee heard the proponent. The Committee expressed the inability to take up the proposal since the date of application is after the window period and hence proposals involving violation cases cannot be considered at the State level.

**Authority decided to reject the proposal as recommended by SEAC and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reason given by SEAC for rejection and Notifications relevant for Violation proceedings.**

- 4) Building Stone Mine (Quarry, Minor Mineral Mining) project of M/s Sri Krishnagiri Rock Products Pvt. Ltd. situated at Block No. 39, Re Survey Nos. 283/8, 283/9, 283/10 at Kizhakkenchery 2 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala for area of 15.9522 hectares. [SIA/KL/MIN/42344/2019 1437/EC1/2019/SEIAA ]**

**Authority noted the ToR approval by SEAC as a part of its appraisal.**

- 5) Application for fresh quarrying permit for operating Granite Building Stone over an extent of 0.9460Ha at Re Sy No 202/2 in Elankur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala. By Sri.Sainudheen C. K(Designated Partner) YESCO GRANITES LLP [SIA/KL/MIN/46586/2019, 1573/EC3/2019/SEIAA ]**

**Authority noted the ToR approval by SEAC as a part of its appraisal.**

- 6) Proposed Expansion of Hospital Project, “Al-Azhar Medical College and Super Speciality Hospital” at Kumaramangalam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala (Proposal No: SIA/KL/NCP/55155/2020, File No: 1780/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

Al-Azhar Medical College, CEO has submitted an application for expansion of Al-Azhar Medical College and Super Specialty Hospital. The project involves increasing bed strength from 650 to 1200 and includes the vertical expansion of 5 existing buildings, construction of a new building for Nurses Hostel and an MLCP and other amenities. Vertical expansion is proposed for Hospital Block, College Block, Boys Hostel, Girls Hostel and Staff Quarters. The amenity proposed includes Mortuary, Canteen, STP, Sump and Pump Room. Total built up area requiring EC for the proposed expansion 85090.77 m<sup>2</sup>

. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for hearing. The proposal was placed in

the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee heard the proponent. The Committee expressed the inability to take up the proposal since the date of application is after the window period and hence proposals involving violation cases cannot be considered at the State level.

**Authority decided to reject the proposal as recommended by SEAC and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reason given by SEAC for rejection and Notifications relevant for Violation proceedings.**

- 7) **Quarry in Survey No. 1019/3, 1019/4 1019/5, 1019/6, 1019/7, 1021/6, 1021/8, 1021/9, 1027P , 1028P, 1029P & 1030P of Panimkulam Village, Thalappily Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala State and extends over an area of 7.8000 Ha Mr. Prince Abraham is the authorized signatory, Southern Rock and Aggregate Mining Company[SIA/KL/MIN/52608/2020, 1764/EC6/2020/SEIAA ]**

Authority noted the ToR approval by SEAC as a part of its appraisal.

- 8) **The proposed building stone quarry project situated at Survey No. 91/1-7, 91/1-7-5, 91/1-7-3, 91/1-2-5, 91/1-4-4, 91/1-3, 91/1-2-2 and 91/1-3-3 of EnanallorvillagMuvattupuzha Taluk, Eranakulam Dist. Kerala with an extent area of 6.4496 hectares. M/s Mudakkalil Granites (P) Ltd (SIA/KL/MIN/44943/2019, 1485/EC3/2019/SEIAA ]**

Authority noted the ToR approval by SEAC as a part of its appraisal.

- 9) **Application for ToR for the Proposed Building Stone Quarry of Mr.Nizamudheen.S, ReSurvey No:- 83/12,96/1,96/12-1,96/13-1, in Nellanad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/45589/2019, 1497/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020. The Committee directed the proponent to furnish certain documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2 - 4, June, 2020. The proponent was invited for

presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 18.10.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 7th December, 2020. The Committee discussed the Field Inspection Report. The area is prone to rock falls and the side slopes are very steep in nature. There are big boulders located in different sy. no. owned by different individuals. It will be very difficult to safely manage the boulders in this area. Hence, the Committee decided to reject the proposal.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

#### **EXTENSION/AMENDMENT/CORRIGENDUM FOR TOR PROPOSALS**

- 1) **Application for extension of validity of ToR for the Proposed EIA study for Outer Area Growth Corridor highway project through villages Mangalapuram, Andorrkonam, Pothencode, Karakulam, Aruvikkara, Poovachal, Vilappil, Kattakada, Maranallur, Malayinkezhu, Pallichal, Balaramapuram, Venganur SIA/KL/NCP/ 185952/ 2020, 1143/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017**

Govt. of Kerala through the Capital Region Development Project-II (CRDP) proposes to develop an Outer Area Growth Corridor around Thiruvananthapuram city. Accordingly, the ToR for carrying out the EIA study was issued vide letter no. 1143/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017, dated 04.01.20148.

Now Sr.T.Balakrishnan, Convenor, Capital Region Development Project-II (CRDP) had applied for the extension of validity of ToR for the Proposed EIA study for Outer Area Growth Corridor highway project vide PARIVESH on 07/12/2020.

During course of the EIA study assessments and various stakeholder consultations the need to slightly amend the alignment was identified to meet stakeholder concerns as well as to address certain engineering issues/constraints. Accordingly the analysis for a modified

alignment was carried out and went through several stages of confirmation at the state government level. Unfortunately by the time the alignment was finalized, the Covid-19 pandemic broke out. Due to this, further necessary site assessments/stakeholder consultations, etc. could not be carried out. Although the pandemic is still prevailing, they were in the process of carrying out the studies needed for completion of the EIA study. However, the current ToR validity is only until January 2021 by which time they are not in a position to complete the EIA study. Hence they seek extension of ToR validity.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2020. The Committee decided to recommend the extension of validity of the ToR for one more year.

**Authority decided to extend the validity of ToR for one more year as recommended by SEAC.**

### **General Items**

Authority decided to upgrade/redesign the website of SEIAA with the assistance of NIC regional office at Thiruvananthapuram having a mandate of designing and hosting of government websites. The website shall have the regular features of a model government website dovetailed with special features of functioning of SEIAA. Dr. Junaid Hassan.S, Project Assistant, who has good knowledge of computers, PARIVESH, and functioning of SEIAA etc. is nominated as counterpart officer from SEIAA to coordinate with NIC office under the guidance of Joint Secretary & Administrator, SEIAA. The progress achieved in this assignment shall be regularly placed in SEIAA meetings for review.

**Sd/-**

**Dr.H.NageshPrabhu IFS (Retd)  
Chairman, SEIAA**

**Sd/-**

**Dr.Usha Titus I.A.S.  
Principal Secretary,  
Higher Education Dept.  
& Member Secretary, SEIAA**

**Sd/-**

**Dr.Jayachandran.K  
Member, SEIAA**