

**MINUTES OF THE 151th MEETING OF THE STATE
ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 30th & 31st DECEMBER 2024**

Present:

- 1. Dr H. Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA Kerala**
- 2. Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA Kerala**
- 3. Dr Rathan U. Kelkar IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA Kerala**

The 151st meeting of the SEIAA, Kerala was held on 30th and 31st December 2024. The meeting started at 10.30 A.M. Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu, Chairman, SEIAA Kerala chaired the meeting, Dr Rathan U. Kelkar IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA attended the meeting. The Authority considered the agenda for the 151st meeting and took the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No. 151.01 **Minutes of the 150th Meeting of SEIAA held on 27th & 28th November 2024.**

Noted.

Item No. 151.02 **Action Taken Report on 149th SEIAA Kerala held on 28th, 29th & 30th October 2024 Placed for Information.**

Noted

Item No. 151.03 **Status of Proposals Pending for 365 days placed for information and necessary action.**

The follow up action taken is appreciated and the position will be again reviewed physically in the monthly meeting of SEIAA proposed to be held in the last week of January. The statement shall be revised by SEIAA, Secretariat as discussed and put up for review.

Item No. 151.04 **Complaint against quarrying operations owned by Sri. Ashly John Tharakan, Madaparambil House, South Mazhuvannur P.O., Mazhuvannur Village, Ernakulam – Complaint submitted by Sri. K.M. Mathew**

(File No. 290/EC3/2021/SEIAA)

A complaint submitted by Sri. K.M. Mathew was received in this office on 21.01.2021 against Mr. Ashly John Tharakan, Madaparambil House, South Mazhuvannur P.O., Mazhuvannur Village, Ernakulam, Kerala for non-compliance of EC conditions. In the Complaint, the complainant has alleged that the Project Proponent is not complying with the EC conditions and causing impact on the local inhabitants. Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry of Mr. Ashly John Tharakan, Madaparambil House, South Mazhuvannur P.O., Mazhuvannur Village, Ernakulam was issued from DEIAA, Ernakulam vide number DIA/KL/MIN/5514/2014 dated 23-01-2018.

Report from MoEF & CC, Regional Office, Bangalore has been received on 13-07-2021. Site inspection was conducted by MoEF & CC, Regional Office, Bangalore on 26-03-2021 along with Assistant Environmental Engineer (Kerala State Pollution Control Board, District Office-2, Ernakulam), Mr. K.M. Mathew (Complainant), Mr. Ashly John Tharakan (Project Proponent). MoEF & CC, Regional Office, Bangalore directed SEIAA to take necessary action against the Project since there were many non-compliances of EC conditions as per S.O. 637 (E) dated 28-02-2014. An action taken report is to be submitted to MoEF & CC, Regional Office, Bangalore.

The matter was placed before the Authority and SEAC on several occasions for follow up actions.

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decision of 166th SEAC meeting, the proceedings of the Chairperson, KSPCB dated 15.06.2024, the complaint of the Sri. K. M. Mathew dated 05.08.2024. The Authority noticed that the SEAC in its 166th meeting directed the Project Proponent to submit the revised damage assessment report and the same is yet to be received. The Chairperson, KSPCB intimated that an Assistant Engineer was authorized to legal action against the Project Proponent. The Authority also noted that vide his complaint Sri. K. M. Mathew intimated that there are damages in his house due to the quarrying activities. **In these circumstances the Authority decided the following:**

1. Intimate the KSPCB to proceed with the legal action against the Project Proponent by the authorised Assistant Engineer. The SEIAA Secretariat shall provide all the necessary assistance and information available regarding the project to the KSPCB.
2. DO letter of the Member Secretary, SEIAA shall be forwarded to Director, Mining and Geology Department to get action taken report on the illegal mining and the mine closure status as per the decision of the 136th and 140th SEIAA meeting.
3. The Project Proponent shall be directed to submit the revised damage assessment report as per the general framework as directed by the SEAC in its 166th meeting within one month.

Item No. 151.05 **Environmental Clearance for the Group Housing Project, GREEN VISTAS – “PRAKRITI” of Mr. Saurabh Gulechha, Chief Operating Officer, M/s Green Vistas Infrastructure Projects at Re-Sy No. 359/3, of Kakkanad village, Thrikkakara Municipality, Kanayanur Taluk, Ernakulam – Submission of Hearing Note**
(File No. 1189 (A)/EC2/2018/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the letter of the Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality dated 20.11.2024 and the letter of the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB Ernakulam dated 22.11.2024. The Authority noted from the letter of the Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality that the NOC issued to the Green Vistas on 04.02.2006 was regularised on 22.12.2014 for the construction of 5 residential apartment blocks, commercial area, club house, etc. without submitting the mandatory prior environmental clearance. It is also noted that the Hon’ble High Court also insisted to get the mandatory prior environmental clearance for the projects. Therefore, the explanations submitted by the Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality is not agreeable.

The Environmental Engineer, KSPCB vide letter dated 22.11.2024 intimated that that the Board had not issued the consent/renewed consent further, instead refused the consent application and the direction of MoEF&CC is complied. The KSPCB also reported that after the disposal of application by issuing refusal order, the procedure of filing case under section

19 of Environmental protection Act 1986 has been started and it is in final stage. The case is being filed in Hon'ble First Class Judicial Magistrate Court, Kakkanad.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. Direct the Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality to take the necessary action to cancel the NOC and Occupancy Certificate issued for the Residential project 'GREEN VISTAS – 'PRAKARTI', as the project was started after 14-09-2006 and the construction of first two blocks itself was in violation of EIA Notification 2006 since the same was constructed without mandatory prior environmental clearance. Action in this regard may be intimated to the Authority within one month failing which the Authority will be constrained to proceed against the Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality for an appropriate action. The Secretary, Thrikkakara Municipality is advised seriously to study the proceedings/decision of SEIAA/SEAC so far and the Judgement in Review Petition No. 469/2021 dated 20-10-2021 linked to order/Judgment in WP(C) 3870/2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.**
- 2. Obtain the status of the legal proceedings initiated against the project from the KSPCB. The Legal Officer shall monitor the status of the case and provide regular updates.**

Item No. 151.06 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Mayin Haji M.C, Managing Director, M/s Calicut Granites for an area of 9.1058 Ha at Sy Nos: 266/1, 266/2, 253/5, 253/15, 253/16 and 253/17 at Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Ambalakkandi Quarry Union
(File No.1225/EC1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaint forwarded by IRO Bangalore and the HYCR submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority noticed that the IRO Bangalore forwarded a complaint filed by Ambalakkandi Quarry Union, which states that there is illegal mining, absence of demarcation certificate, deficiencies in mining plan and EIA, inaccurate lease application, unresolved issues from DMG communication.

The Authority further noticed that the Project Proponent filed a WP(C) No. 18197/2024 before the Hon'ble High Court seeking a stay on the decision to conduct public hearing. The SEIAA Secretariat provided the Statement of Facts to the Standing Council vide letter dated 27.09.2024. The Authority also noticed that as per KOMPAS, the status of the quarry is marked as "working with concession".

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. The SEAC is directed to conduct a field inspection immediately, verify the compliance status of EC conditions, and submit a report. The SEAC has the liberty to recommend action against the Project Proponent, including the cancellation of the EC.**
- 2. The Legal Officer is directed to consult with the Standing Counsel to obtain the current status of the WP(C) pending before the Hon'ble High Court.**

Item No. 151.07 Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Ulahannan, Edaputhusseriyil Veedu, Thalappuzha, Valad P.O., Wayanad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 4.2689 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 57/16, 57/1270, 57/1069 & 57/1273 in Valad Village, Mananthavady Taluk, Wayanad – Letter from the Secretary, Thavinjal Grama panchayath

(File No. 1247/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaint of Sri. Reji Mathew, Chairman, Anti – Quarrying Action Committee, Valad, Wayanad dated 25.08.2024 and the letter of Secretary, Thavinjal Grama panchayath dated 04.11.2024. The Authority noticed that the complaint was forwarded to the District Collector for report and the same is yet to be received.

The Authority also observed that the letter dated 31.10.2023 received from the Panchayath on the same matter was considered in the 135st SEIAA meeting and decided that *".....the request of the Secretary may not be considered as the distance of the houses are quite far away from the influence zone of the mining activities and beyond the distance as specified in the KMMC Rules which is 50m. However, Panchayat has freedom to carry out a study through a recognised agency and take necessary further action"*. The decision of the Authority has already been intimated to the Secretary, Thavinjal Grama Panchayat.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decision to intimate the Panchayat authorities to carry out a study through a recognised agency and take necessary further action. The SEIAA Secretariat shall expedite necessary action to get the requested report from the District Collector, Wayanad.

Item No. 151.08 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Eldho Kuruvilla for an area of 2.3337 Ha at Block No. 29, Re-Sy Nos: 284/1, 279/2-2pt, 279/2pt, 284/2, 284/2-1pt, 284/2-4pt, 284/1-3pt, 284/2-5pt & 284/1-1pt in Mazhuvannoor Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam – Request from Mazhuvannur Panchayath w.r.t the changes in CER activities.

(SIA/KL/MIN/74360/2019; 1446/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the representation of the Project Proponent Sri. Eldho Kuruvila dated 22.11.2024. The Authority noticed that the Mazhuvannur Panchayath had requested some changes in approved CER activities as stated in the EC such as the installation of solar panel in FHC at Azhuvannur (Rs.10.50 Lakh) and mini solar high mast light (Rs.6 Lakh). It is mentioned in the letter that the Mazhuvannur Panchayath requested to change the approved CER activities as there are sufficient solar lights and hence requested to utilize the fund for other community service projects. The revised CER activities proposed by the Panchayat Committee are as follows:

- a. Revival of Panchayat Stadium – Estimated amount of Rs.15 Lakh
- b. Setting up of CCTV system – Estimated amount Rs.1.5 Lakh

The Authority on deliberation, observed that the earlier CER was proposed by the Project Proponent after stakeholder consultation along with the consent of the panchayat authorities and was approved by the SEAC. The revised activities suggested by the panchayat has no relevance with respect to environmental conservation and can't be accepted.

The Authority decided to return the suggestion of the Panchayat/ Project Proponent to its original form.

Item No. 151.09 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sudheermon P. P. for an area of 0.9569 Ha at Survey No: 217/4 in Pulpatta Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram - Request of Name Change**
(SIA/KL/MIN/169289/2020, 1843/EC6/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the representation of the Project Proponent received on 28.11.2024, letter of RQP, Dr. Sakkir S. Pillai dated 16.12.2024. Vide letter the RQP apologized for his actions and requested SEIAA to not to take any action against him as per the 149th SEIAA decision. The Project Proponent Sri. Sudheermon requested to change the name in the EC issued to Sri. Zubair P. P. The Project Proponent stated that vide Gazette Notification dated 31.08.2018 he has changed his name as Zubair P. P. and has the right to change the name and hence to reconsider the decision of 149th SEIAA meeting.

Upon deliberation, the Authority opined that although the Project Proponent had changed their name on 31.08.2018, this was not brought to the Authority's attention until after the issuance of the EC. Furthermore, as per existing norms, providing a copy of the Gazette Notification along with the EC is sufficient to obtain other statutory licenses.

In light of these circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decision made during the 149th SEIAA meeting.

Item No. 151.10 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. N.A Thomas for an area of 0.9668 Ha at Sy Nos: 372/1A/3/8, 372/1A/4/9 & 372/1A/4/9 in Kottappady Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam – Interim Order dated 30.10.2024 in WP(C) No. 38168/2024 filed by Sri. N.A Thomas – Reply to the Show cause Notice**
(SIA/KL/MIN/131683/2019; 1813/EC3/2020/SEIAA)
(New File No. 2178/EC1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the reply to show cause notice submitted by the Project Proponent dated 04.12.2024. The Authority also noted that as directed in the 150th meeting, the instruction to vacate the stay in WP(C) No. 38168/2024 was forwarded to the Standing Counsel on 19.12.2024.

The Project Proponent in his reply stated that there is no direction in the O.M dated 17.05.2022 or in the order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court to the effect, as claimed in the show cause notice i.e., Mining operations can be commenced only after obtaining clearance from the SCNBWL. The project area is 7.6 km from the boundary of the Thattekkad Wildlife Sanctuary and there is no law, either statute or judge-made, directing the Project Proponent to take prior clearance from SCNBWL before commencing the quarrying operations, if the quarry falls within 10 km, but not within 1 km or within the ESZ identified and draft notified. *The Project Proponent also submitted that the issuance of show cause notice itself is without any valid reason and it is requested to recall the same and drop all action in furtherance of the same.*

The Authority noticed that as per the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 26.04.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022 it is clearly stated that *while granting Environmental and Forest Clearances for project activities in ESZ and other areas outside the Protected Areas, the Union of India as well as various State/Union Territory Governments shall strictly follow the provisions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 17th May 2022 issued by MoEF&CC.* The Office Memorandum of MoEFCC dated May 17, 2022, it is prescribed that *“any development activity in a notified ESZ, or in the case of national parks and sanctuaries for which no ESZ has been finally notified, will require consideration and recommendation of the National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) or its Standing Committee in addition to the Environment Clearance under the 1986 Act”.*

The allegation by the Project Proponent that *“...there is no law, either statute or judge-made, directing the Project Proponent to take prior clearance from SCNBWL before commencing quarrying operations”* is not acceptable, as the specific condition of the EC clearly stated that the Project Proponent must obtain SCNBWL clearance before commencing mining activities.

The Authority viewed the wilful negligence on the part of the Project Proponent seriously, as the explanation provided is ultra vires in light of existing court directions and other applicable norms. The Authority also noted that, as per the interim order of the Hon'ble High Court, a stop memo has not been issued.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. Issue Stop memo by quoting dereliction of the Project Proponent by

commencing quarrying activities without mandatory wildlife clearance from SCNBWL.

- 2. The action taken report shall be sought from the Mining and Geology Department, KSPCB, Secretary, Kottappady Grama Panchayat, etc. on the direction of the 148th SEIAA meeting.**
- 3. The Project Proponent shall be heard in the next meeting of SEIAA as per Clause 8(vi) of EIA Notification 2006. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue intimation regarding the same well in advance.**
- 4. Inform the Standing Counsel about the action taken by the Authority based on the interim order of the Hon'ble High Court.**

Item No. 151.11 Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Ernakulam to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sajeew Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s United Metals for an area of 3.5588 Ha at Sy Nos: 12/1B, 12/1C, 12/1A in Arakuzha Village & 469/8-5,469/8-1 in Palakkuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam - Complaint filed by All Kerala Anti-Corruption & Human Rights Protection Council.

(File No. 2933/EC1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaint of the All Kerala Anti-Corruption & Human Rights Protection Council dated 10.11.2024. The Authority noticed that the Environmental Clearance was issued by DEIAA, Ernakulam to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sajeew Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s United Metals, Karimpana P.O, North Palakkuzha, Muvattupuzha, Ernakulam for an area of 3.5588 Ha at Survey Nos: 12/1B, 12/1C, 12/1A in Arakuzha Village & 469/8-5,469/8-1 in Palakkuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam vide proceedings dated 23.01.20218 for 5 years. The validity of the EC was expired on 22.01.2024 after Covid 19 Relaxation. The Project Proponent is continuing the mining activities with concession from Mining and Geology Department as per the KOMPA's and the Project Proponent submitted the application for reappraisal of EC (SIA/KL/MIN/509191/2024) vide PARIVESH 2.0 only on 28.11.2024.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. The Project Proponent shall submit a clarification for continuing the mining activities after the expiry of the EC without getting fresh EC from SEIAA after re-appraisal by SEAC.
2. During the re-appraisal procedure of the EC proposal, the SEAC shall consider the complaint.

Item No. 151.12 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Eldho Kuruvilla, for an area of 8.7668 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 283, 282/3-1, 282/3- 3pt in Mazhuvannoor Village & Block No. 28 Re-Sy Nos. 284/1-2, 284/1-3, 284/2-2Pt., 284/2- 3pt., 285/4, 283/2-5-2, 283/2-3-2, 282/1-3-1-2 in Arackappady Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam - Request from Mazhuvannur Panchayath w.r.t the changes in CER activities.**

(SIA/KL/MIN/144152/2020; 1392/EC2/2019/SEIAA)
(New File No. 2972/EC1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the matter and noted the letter and email dated 22.11.2024 of the Project Proponent Sri. Eldho Kuruvila. The Authority noticed that the Project Proponent forwarded the request of Mazhuvannur Panchayath to change in CER activity proposed for the project. The Authority noticed that the EC was issued with the revival of Cheenikuzhy Pond (Rs.5 Lakh), Rainwater Harvesting – Well Recharge – 50 wells (Rs.12.5 Lakh) and installation of 20 Nos of solar lights (Rs. 22.5 Lakh) as CER proposals. The Panchayat authorities informed that there has sufficient solar lights in their jurisdiction and the CER amount shall be utilised for other community service projects as following:

- a. Setting up of Ecofriendly Happiness Park – Estimated amount of Rs.10 Lakh
- b. Setting up of bottle booths for collection of plastic and paper waste – Estimated amount Rs.2 Lakh

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. Direct the Project Proponent to submit a detailed proposal for the project with physical and financial details.
2. After getting the proposal the SEAC shall appraise the same and recommend according to its merit.

Item No. 151.13

EC issued for the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Sadanandan at Sy Nos. 143/2, 143/4, 144/1, 144/2, 144/3, 146/1, 146/2, 146/3, 147/1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, 148, 149/4 , 152/4, 152/5, 152/6, 152/7, 152/8, 152/9, 152/10, 152/11, 152/12, 152/13, 152/14, 152/15 in V-Kottayam Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta - Judgement dated 13.10.2023 in Appeal No 48 of 2022 (SZ) filed by Sri. Roy Thomas before the Hon'ble NGT, Judgment dated 21.02.2024 in WP(C) No. 2976/2024 filed by Sri. K. Sadanandan & Interim order dated 28.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 33412 of 2024 filed by Sri. K. Sadanandan.

(File No. 200/SEIAA/EC4/86/2014)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decision of its earlier meetings, the interim order dated 28.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 33412 of 2024, the judgment in W.A No. 1804 Of 2024 and the hearing note submitted by Sri. Roy Thomas dated 12.11.2024. As per the Interim Order of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 33412/2024, dated 29.10.2024, the SEIAA in its 149th meeting decided to revoke the stop memo issued on 17.01.2024. However, the Hon'ble Court vide its judgment in WA No.1804 of 2024 quashed the order of the single bench dated 29.10.2024. The Hon'ble Division Bench with the above judgment disposed of the WA.

After that the Hon'ble High Court in its interim order in WP(C) No. 33412/2024 directed SEIAA to revoke the Ext.P20 decision i.e., the decision taken in the 149th meeting to revoke the Stop memo. The Authority opined that the as per the interim order, the stop memo issued on 17.01.2024 will be continued.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to set aside the decisions taken in its 149th meeting. The Authority also decided to maintain the *status quo* on all other earlier decisions and actions. Further action in this matter shall be considered after getting the joint inspection report as directed in the 148th SEIAA meeting.

Item No. 151.14 **Environmental Clearance issued for Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajas M. M., M/s Ponoorpoyil Granites at Sy No. 83 (P) in Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode**
(File No. 1229/EC2/2024/SEIAA)
(Main File No. 442/SEIAA/EC4/3034/2014)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decision in its 149th meeting and the letter of the Project Proponent dated 19.11.2024. The Project Proponent submitted a copy of the survey map of the area where the EC was issued. The Authority observed that the EC was issued for an area of 4.6658 Ha by considering the mining plan approved by the Mining and Geology Department for the entire area. Hence, the details regarding the land may be available with the Mining and Geology Department, as they issued the LoI and approved the Mining Plan.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to approach the Mining and Geology department with these revenue documents to address the grievance.

Item No. 151.15 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Building stone quarry project of Sri. K.V. Mathew, M/s Kachanathu Minerals and Metals Pvt. Ltd in Sy. Nos. 135/2-3, 135/7, 135/7-1, 135/6, 135/2-2, 135/2, 135/2-1, 167/1, 167/1-1, 167/5, 167/2-2, 167/2-13 of Block 27 at Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta – Complaint Received**
(File No. 765/SEIAA/EC4/505/2015)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the earlier decisions made by various SEIAA / SEAC meetings. It is noted that based on the direction of the Authority, the Sub-Committee, SEAC conducted the field inspection in the presence of the complainant and District Geologist on 09.11.2024. The 174th SEAC discussed the field inspection report and noted that the Project Proponent has not applied for the revalidation of EC though the validity of the EC issued from SEIAA expired on 15.01.2023 (after COVID expansion). But the quarrying activity is being continued at the site as per the order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 03.11.2023 in WP(C) No. 34722 of 2022, which directed the Mining and Geology Department to issue the transit passes.

The 174th SEAC observed that most of the complaints raised by the complainant is found factual. The Project Proponent has mined up to a depth of around 45 without maintaining benches of 5m height and width and without providing 45 degree slope as stipulated in the approved mine plan. The field inference indicated the removal of soil from the portion adjacent to the land owned by the Complainant but whether it is up to 7m or not requires investigation by the Mining & Geology. The Project Proponent failed to provide any proof for actual implementation of the CSR plan. The Mining and Geology Department has imposed fine on the Project Proponent for excess mining indicating that the allegation of the complainant regarding over extraction of building rocks is factual. The field inference and the failure to provide any proof regarding material procurement for NONEL blasting, engagement of supervisor for controlled blasting and usage of safeguards such as blasting mats etc. indicated that the complaint regarding uncontrolled blasting is factual.

The Committee also noted from the field inspection report that none of the 3 specific conditions stipulated while granting are complied with by the Project Proponent. The Project Proponent has also not complied with 31 of the 61 general conditions stipulated while granting EC. It is also inferred that the compliance to the environmental management and safeguard conditions is not satisfactory. There is also over extraction of resource from the buffer zone and from the mine area as per the findings of the Mining & Geology Department. Based on discussion, the Committee recommended the following:

1. A stop memo may be issued to the Project Proponent with immediate effect and EC may be cancelled for non-compliance of EC conditions and over-extraction from within and outside the mine area, after obtaining an explanation from the Project Proponent.
2. The KSPCB may be directed to conduct the environmental damage assessment and impose fines and environmental compensation for damages caused due to illegal mining and violation of EC conditions.
3. Though the EC was issued in the name of Sri. K.V. Mathew, the lease was executed in the name of Sri. K.V. Abraham, Managing Director of M/s. Kachanath Minerals & Metals Pvt. Ltd. During the field inspection, the Manager of the Company informed that the EC holder, Sri. K.V. Mathew expired and Sri. K.V. Abraham is the Managing Director of the company at present. This

information was not provided to the SEIAA and the EC is not found transferred to Sri. K.V. Abraham.

Upon deliberation, the Authority noticed that the Project Proponent had committed grave violation and serious non-compliance of EC conditions in addition to the concealment of fact that the original Project Proponent has changed.

The Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided the following:

- 1. Issue a Stop Memo with immediate effect for the non-compliance with EC conditions and the grave violations committed by the Project Proponent.**
- 2. Issue a show-cause notice to the Project Proponent seeking an explanation as to why the EC should not be cancelled for non-compliance, violations, and concealment of facts.**
- 3. Direct the District Geologist, Pathanamthitta, to submit a detailed report on the illegal mining activities and the quantity of over-extraction to the KSPCB for assessing environmental damage.**
- 4. Instruct the KSPCB to assess the environmental damages caused by the unscientific and unsustainable illegal mining conducted in violation of EC conditions. A Joint Committee, as decided in the 146th SEIAA meeting, shall be constituted to carry out this assessment.**
- 5. Provide a copy of the FIR and other details to the Standing Counsel immediately to defend the Authority if the PP approaches the Hon'ble High Court against the decision of the Authority.**

Item No. 151.16 O.A No. 93 of 2024 (SZ) (Earlier O A No.770/2023(PB)) filed by Sri. Sajimon Joseph against the quarry activities of Sri. Thankachan Mathalikunnel before the Hon'ble NGT
(File No.1068/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the reply dated 26.11.2024 to the show-cause notice issued to the Project Proponent, as well as the interim order dated

12.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 39873 of 2024. The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, via its interim order, stayed the stop order issued by the SEIAA and directed the Project Proponent to provide an explanation in response to the show-cause notice.

The Authority reviewed the explanation dated 26.11.2024 submitted by the Project Proponent and found it unsatisfactory.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. Wait for the final judgment of the NGT, as the case is pending with the tribunal.**
- 2. Direct the Standing Counsel to take steps to vacate the stay on the stop memo, as the explanation submitted by the Project Proponent in response to the show-cause notice is not satisfactory and continued mining will aggravate environmental damages further. The Legal Officer shall expedite the action.**

The Authority noted that the agenda and the file were not updated with the details of the interim order in WP(C) No. 39873 of 2024. The SEIAA Secretariat should take necessary action to update the details at the earliest.

Item No. 151.17 Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Rajeevan Nambiar, Managing Director, M/s Kokkallur Granite Pvt. Ltd at Re-Sy Block No. 1, Re-Sy Nos. 49/1B, 85, 86 in Balussery Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode - Interim order dated 03.12.2024 in WP(C) No. 37162/2024. (File No. 1262/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the letter dated 06.12.2024 from the Project Proponent, as well as the interim order dated 03.12.2024 in WP(C) No. 37162 of 2024. The Authority observed that the EC issued for the project is set to expire on 12.01.2025, and the Project Proponent was instructed to submit an application for the modification of the EC in the PARIVESH Portal, along with all required documents, to avail the benefits of S.O. 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022.

However, it was noted that instead of submitting the application, the Project Proponent filed WP(C) No. 37162 of 2024 in the Hon'ble High Court. Through an interim order dated 03.12.2024, the Hon'ble High Court directed the Mining and Geology

Department to issue the transit pass, as was directed in a similar case, WP(C) No. 19945 of 2022. The Authority expressed concern that such interim directions may provide legal immunity to Project Proponents, allowing them to continue indiscriminate and unscientific mining activities.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. The Standing Counsel shall be requested to file a review / appeal in both cases with immediate effect and the Legal Officer to supply all required details. The action taken shall be reported in the next meeting.**
- 2. The SEAC is requested to conduct a field inspection immediately, verify the compliance status of EC conditions, and submit a report. The SEAC has the liberty to recommend action against the Project Proponent, including the cancellation of the EC.**

Item No. 151.18 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite building Stone quarry of Sri. Jilmon John, Managing Director, M/s Gimsak Developers Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 2.2430 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy Nos: 163/1, 163/2 in Alakkod Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki - WP(C) No.38205/2024 filed by M/s Gimsak Developers Pvt. Ltd
(File No.1388/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions made in various SEIAA / SEAC meetings held on different dates as well as the interim orders issued on various dates in WP(C) No. 38205/2024. The Authority noticed that, as per the decision of 146th SEIAA meeting, a show cause notice dated 10.09.2024 was issued to the Project Proponent for the non-compliance with the EC conditions, with instructions to submit an explanation within 15 days of receiving the notice.

In the 148th meeting, the Authority decided to issue a stop memo, as the Project Proponent had failed to respond to the show cause notice on time. Subsequently, the Project Proponent, vide letter dated 25.09.2024 requested a 45-day extension to provide a response to the show cause notice. Therefore, the Authority decided to extend the deadline to 20th of

November 2024 for submitting the response. The Authority vide letter dated 16.11.2024, intimated the decision to the Project Proponent.

Meanwhile, the Project Proponent filed a WP(C) No. 38205/2024 before the Hon'ble High Court with a prayer to stay the decision taken as item No.10 in Ext P6 and all proceedings pursuant thereto. The Hon'ble Court vide interim order dated 30.10.2024, in WP(C) No.38205/2024 stayed Ext P6 (Minutes of the 148th SEIAA meeting) decision to issue the Stop memo. Further, vide interim orders dated 8.11.2024 26.11.2024, extends the interim stay till 27.01.2024.

The Authority noticed that, in light of the stay order, the Project Proponent has not submitted a reply to the show-cause notice, despite the deadline for furnishing the reply being extended until 20.11.2024, as requested by the Project Proponent.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided

- 1. To hear the Project Proponent in the next SEIAA meeting as per Clause 8(vi) of the EIA Notification, 2006. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue an intimation regarding the same well in advance.**
- 2. Direct Legal officer to take steps for vacating the stay.**

**Item No. 151.19 Environmental Clearance issued to the Laterite mining project of Sri. Ramachandran.P, at Re-Sy. No. 19/245 in Koodathai Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode
(SIA/KL/MIN/296253/2023, 1597/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the reply dated 28.11.2024 to the show-cause notice issued to the Project Proponent. The Authority reviewed the reply and found it satisfactory.

In light of these circumstances, the Authority decided to revoke the stop memo issued vide order dated 18.10.2024, subject to a strict directive to the Project Proponent to scrupulously follow all EC conditions. However, there is no bar on stop memo issued by Tahashildar Thamarassery as reported by District Collector.

Item No. 151.20 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shine Mathew at Block No. 13, Re-Sy. No. 541/2, Purappuzha Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki – Complaint Received.**

(SIA/KL/MIN/136876/2020; 1687/EC3/2020/SEIAA) & (783/A1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the letter dated 06.09.2024 from Sri. George Mathew and the letter dated 23.03.2024 from the Environment Department, which forwarded a mass complaint against the quarry's operations. The Authority observed that, although the SEIAA Secretariat forwarded the complaints to the District Collector for a report, the report has not yet been received.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to entrust the Technical Officials of the SEIAA for conducting a field visit and for submitting a compliance report. The complainants shall also be heard during the field inspection.

Item No. 151.21 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sabu Kuriakose at Block No. 14, Re-Sy Nos. 357/1, 357/2 & 357/3 in Karimkunnamm Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki – WP 9 C) No. 6424/2024 filed by Smt. Simi Sebastian and WP(C) No. 31463/2024 filed by Sri. Augustine Thomas**

(SIA/KL/MIN/239769/2021, 2062/EC3/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the reply from the Project Proponent dated 04.12.2024 to the show-cause notice, along with the compliance report and the remarks of the technical team on the HYCR. The Authority observed that the SEIAA Secretariat, vide letter dated 24.12.2024, directed the Project Proponent to furnish the latest HYCR in detail with valid supporting documents. The Authority also noted that two WP(C)s (WP(C) No. 6424 of 2024 and WP(C) No. 31463 of 2024) are still pending before the Hon'ble High Court, and the current status has not yet been received from the Standing Counsel.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. The Project Proponent is directed to submit the latest HYCR within 20 days, along with clarifications on the observations made by the SEIAA Technical**

Officials. A copy the remarks on HYCRs shall also be provided to the Project Proponent.

- 2. The Legal Officer is directed to consult with the Standing Counsel to obtain the current status of the WP(C)s pending before the Hon'ble High Court.**

Item No. 151.22 Environmental Clearance for Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Luka P.J, for an area of 0.9784 Ha at Re-Survey No.149/2,150/56 in Kadalundy Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode - Rejected
(SIA/KL/MIN/428190/2023, 2279/EC4/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the letter dated 01.12.2024 from the Project Proponent. The Authority observed that the proposal for laterite building stone quarry project was rejected in the 140th SEIAA meeting based on the recommendation of the SEAC. The Project Proponent has now submitted a detailed mitigation plan addressing the observations made by the SEAC.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to refer the representation of the Project Proponent to the SEAC for further examination and recommendations on merit.

Item No. 151.23 EC issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode for the quarry project of Sri. Shaji Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s Matha Industries for an area of 3.5367 Ha at field No. 2436 (Unsurveyed), in Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayth, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode – Complaint received from Sri. Peter Punnachottee.
(File No.2821/EC2/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decisions made in various SEIAA/SEAC meetings, as well as the complaint received on 07.11.2024 from Sri. Peter Punnachottee. The Authority observed that the EC was issued by the DEIAA, Kozhikode, which needs to be reappraised according to existing norms. It was also noted that the Authority, vide letter No. 2714/EC4/2020/SEIAA dated 20.09.2023, directed the submission of a fresh application through the Parivesh portal, along with all the documents mentioned in

the O.M. dated 28.04.2023, within the stipulated time period. Although the Project Proponent submitted an application for EC via PARIVESH (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/450873/2023), the application appears to have been delisted since 10.11.2023 for want of documents.

The Authority further noted that the complaint was forwarded by the SEIAA Secretariat to the Project Proponent for his remarks, but the reply has not yet been received.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to issue a show-cause notice to obtain an explanation within 20 days, on receipt of the show cause notice, as to why the EC should not be cancelled.

Item No. 151.24 Complaint filed by Sri. V. Vasudevan against the Stone quarries functioning at Mathilagampadi - Ambalakavala - Kattappana in Idukki District.
(File No. 3037/EC2/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaints dated 27.11.2023 and 18.12.2023 from Sri. V. Vasudevan, as well as the report dated 14.11.2024 from the District Geologist. The District Geologist reported that a quarry operated by M/s Alphonsa Granites was functional until 2020 under a lease issued on 25.04.2012 for a period of 11 years. However, due to the non-submission of the scheme of mining, the quarrying permit had not been issued since December 2020. The lease expired on 24.04.2023.

The Authority observed that no Environmental Clearance (EC) was issued to M/s Alphonsa Granites for mining in the project area mentioned in the complaint. It was also noted that, although prior EC was mandatory for all quarrying leases with effect from 15.01.2016, the Project Proponent continued mining operations without an EC, which constitutes a serious violation of the EIA Notification, 2006.

In light of the above circumstances, the Authority decided to seek clarification from the District Geologist, Idukki, and the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB, Idukki regarding the circumstances under which the quarry operated without an EC. It is also decided to provide a copy of the complaint to these statutory agencies for taking suitable action against Ms Alphonsa Granites.

Item No. 151.25 **WP (C) No. 6985 of 2023 filed by Sr. Celestine Francis before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala against the construction of Faecal Sludge Treatment Plant by Cherthala Municipality - O.A No. 48 of 2023 filed by Dr. Pyarelal against construction of Faecal Sludge Treatment Plant by Cherthala Municipality - Interim order dated 03.09.2024**
(469/EC2/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the judgement dated 12.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 6985 of 2023. The Hon'ble High Court vide its judgement directed the 5th Respondent – the Secretary, Municipality to scrupulously follow the 10 suggestions issued by the 4th Respondent-SEIAA while carrying on with the construction of the FSTP. There will be a further direction to the Municipality to submit compliance reports before the SEIAA, once in every three months. The SEIAA will review the compliance report submitted by the Municipality and take such measures, including a site inspection if required, and suggest corrective/remedial measures, if any, to prevent any kind of environmental degradation.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to direct the Secretary of Cherthala Municipality to comply with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and submit the first compliance report by 10th February 2024. Necessary directions in this regard shall be issued by the SEIAA Secretariat.

Item No. 151.26 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. J. Thomaskutty, Managing Partner, M/s Mary Matha Granites for an area of 2.0778 Ha at Block No. 25, Re-Survey Nos. 110/1, 110/2, 112/2 & 112/3 in Akathethara Village, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad – Rejection order issued – Judgment dated 20.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 6920/2024**
(SIA/KL/MIN/444012/2023, 2447/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the Judgement dated 20.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 6920 of 2024 and the representation of the Project Proponent dated 04.12.2024. The Authority noticed that the Hon'ble High Court vide its judgement the case is disposed with a direction that “...it is clear that any direction in the judgement in O.A. No. 124 of 2021 to extent it is contrary to observations in the judgement dated 12.04.2024 in WP(C) No. 29474 of 2023 as against the petitioner”.

The Authority noticed that the Judgement in WP(C) No. 29474 of 2023 filed by M/s Petra Crushers was considered in the 131st meeting of SEIAA and it was observed that the observations of the Hon'ble High Court are not as per existing OM's of MoEF&CC and is contradictory to the Order of the Hon'ble NGT on 13.01.2015 in O.A. No. 123/2014, O.A. No. 244 of 2017 (SZ) and the judgement dated 24.03.2023 of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLA No. 5563 of 2023. It is also observed that the Authority decided to file a review petition on the judgement.

The Authority vide letter No. 2438/EC1/2019/SEIAA dated 12.06.2024, requested Standing Counsel to file Review petition against the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 29474 of 2023 and the same is yet to be filed. The Authority observed this lapse seriously as M/s Petra Crushers are continuing mining operations under the guise of this order against the existing rules and regulations which is detrimental to the environment in the project region. Therefore, the Authority decided to adhere to the same decision as taken in the WP(C) No. 29474 of 2023. The Standing Counsel and the Legal Officer are once again requested to file a review / appeal in both cases with immediate effect and report the action taken in the next meeting.

Item No. 151.27 **Complaint received against the quarry project of Sri. A.M. Varghese, from Sri. Ashraf Alakkandy, President, Janakeeya Samara Samithy -Report from District Collector-DEIAA issued EC.**

(File No: 283/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaints dated 31.01.2024 and 27.08.2024 from Sri. Ashraf Alakkandy, President, Janakeeya Samara Samithy, and the report dated 06.09.2024 from the District Collector, Kannur, regarding the complaints. The Authority observed that the District Collector reported a pending case before the Hon'ble High Court concerning the quarry operation, which is currently non-functional. The Authority also noted that the EC was issued by DEIAA, Kannur, and requires reappraisal and a fresh EC to be issued by the SEIAA. However, the Authority has not yet reappraised or re-issued the EC for the project.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. A copy of the District Collector's report shall be forwarded to the District Geologist, Kannur, the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB, Kannur, and the Secretary, Sreekandapuram Municipality, directing them not to issue any further licenses without a valid EC re-issued by the SEIAA.**
- 2. Inform the complainant of the action taken in this regard.**

Item No. 151.28 **Clarification sought from DEIAA, Kannur in connection with the uploading of files in PARIVESH Portal – MoEF&CC Office Memorandum No. IA-22/01/2021-IA-III-Part (1), dated 15-01-2024, Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for dealing mining proposals under Ministry's OM dated 28-4-2023**
(File No. 654/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority noted the explanation for the delay in placing the matter before the authority with a warning that such lapses shall not be repeated in future.

Item No. 151.29 **Report of DC, Kannur for the cancellation of EC issued at Vayakkara Village, Payyanur Taluk, Kannur – Complaint received, against quarry project of Sri. Sibish Augustine**
(SIA/KL/MIN/171276/2020, 1389/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the reply dated 09.12.2024 from the Project Proponent to the show-cause notice issued on 15.11.2024. In the reply, the Project Proponent alleged that the relevant reports were not served with the show-cause notice and stated that he would be able to respond only after receiving the reports. He also requested an opportunity for a hearing to present his clarifications.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. All relevant reports shall be forwarded to the Project Proponent for remarks within 15 days from the date of receipt of the same.**

2. The Project Proponent shall be heard in the next SEIAA meeting. The SEIAA Secretariat shall provide necessary intimation of the hearing well in advance.

Item No. 151.30 **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. E. M. Madhu, for an area of 0.9845 Ha at Sy. No. 324/1, 318/7, 318/1 in Moonilavu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.**

(SIA/KL/MIN/279495/2022; 2115/EC3/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaint dated 05.11.2024 received from Sri. Jacob Thomas. The Authority observed that the complainant alleged that the Project Proponent had obtained the EC and other licenses by suppressing material facts. It was also alleged that the Project Proponent had not obtained an NOC from the Irrigation Officer before commencing mining.

In light of the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. The Project Proponent is directed to submit the NOC from the Irrigation Officer, Irrigation Department within one month in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 dated 19.04.2024 failing which action will be taken to cancel EC.
2. The complaint shall be forwarded to the Project Proponent for furnishing remarks within 15 days from the date of receipt of the same.

Item No. 151.31 **Complaint received from Sri. Benny Mathew and Sri. George Mathew - WP (C) No. 38448/2018 and IA No. 1/2024, filed by Sri. George Mathew**

File No: 2682.EC4/2024/SEIAA

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the representation dated 22.10.2024 received from Sri. George Mathew against the Granite Building Stone Quarry project at Monippally Village, Block No. 7, Sy. Nos. 70/5 and 70/6, and the judgments dated

02.07.2024 and 30.10.2024 in WP(C) No. 38448 of 2018. The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, in its judgment dated 02.07.2024, directed that the 2nd Petitioner, Sri. George Mathew, is free to submit a representation before the 2nd Respondent, i.e., SEIAA Kerala, as expeditiously as possible and within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. Upon receipt of such a representation, SEIAA Kerala was directed to consider the matter, after providing notice to the 2nd Petitioner and Respondents No. 10 and 12 (Sri. Raju Cyriac and Smt. Rosamma Mathew), and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with the law as expeditiously as possible, within three months from the date of receipt of the representation.

Subsequently, the Hon'ble High Court, in its judgment dated 30.10.2024, held that the representation submitted by Sri. George Mathew on 22.10.2024 could be treated as a valid submission.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance (EC) for the specified quarry was issued by DEIAA, and no information about the project is available with the Authority.

As no valid information is currently available with Authority, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. The representation submitted by the Petitioner shall be provided to Respondents No. 10 and 12, as directed by the High Court, for clarification. The Respondents shall also be directed to submit all details pertaining to the project.**
- 2. The Environmental Scientist and Environmental Officer, SEIAA shall be entrusted to inspect the project site as expeditiously as possible and submit a report. Prior intimation regarding the inspection shall be provided to the Petitioners and Respondents No. 10 and 12.**
- 3. The Petitioners and Respondents No. 10 and 12 shall be heard in the next SEIAA meeting. The SEIAA Secretariat shall provide necessary intimation of the hearing to both parties well in advance.**
- 4. The District Geologist, Kottayam, shall be directed to submit a detailed report on the quarry. A copy of the representation and the relevant judgment shall be provided to expedite the report.**

Item No. 151.32 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of M/s. P. J. Associates, Managing Partner, Sri. Pious Antony at Re-Survey Nos. 93/1, 94/1, 95/1, 95/1- 1, 95/2, 95/2-1, in Lalam Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam – Rejection Order issued**

(SIA/KL/MIN/410881/2022, 2186/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the representation dated 27.11.2024 from the Project Proponent. The Authority observed that the project proposal was previously rejected due to the cluster condition, with a direction to the Project Proponent to submit a ToR application for an EIA study. The Project Proponent has now claimed that there is no quarry located within a 500-meter distance.

The Authority decided to refer the representation of the Project Proponent to SEAC for scrutiny and a fresh recommendation, if any.

Item No. 151.33 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Proposed Residential-cum-Commercial Building Project ‘Artech Ferns’ at Re-Survey Nos. 238/11, 238/11-2, Kollam West Village, Kollam Taluk, Kollam – Erratum issued**

(1453/A1/2021/SEIAA) (1139/SEIAA/EC/2017)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the letter dated 30.11.2024 from Sri. Felix Babu and Sri. John A. Ferns. The Authority observed that the Environmental Clearance (EC) dated 05.02.2018 was issued for the construction of a residential-cum-commercial building project named ‘Artech Ferns,’ a joint venture by Sri. Felix Babu, Sri. John A. Ferns, and Artech Realtors. Based on complaints received by the Hon’ble Chairman of the Kerala Legislative Committee on Environment, the Government requested the Authority to inspect the site and submit a report.

The Sub-Committee of SEAC conducted a field inspection on 26.02.2024 after intimating the concerned parties in advance. According to the field inspection report, the EC holders, Sri. Felix Babu and Sri. John A. Ferns, who are also the landowners, were absent during the visit. The Managing Director of M/s Artech Realtors Pvt. Ltd., in a letter to the Member Secretary dated 22.02.2024 and communicated via email on 27.02.2024, stated that the EC was in the name of the landowners and that M/s Artech had entered into a joint venture. He further informed that Artech withdrew from the project on 19.06.2023 due to

disputes with the landowners. However, he deputed Mr. Sharat Chandran, Manager of Artech, Kollam, to represent them at the site.

The Authority noted that the field verification was conducted with prior intimation to the complainant and the EC holders. Although Sri. Felix Babu and Sri. John A. Ferns were absent during the field inspection, Sri. Sharat Chandran, Manager of Artech, along with the EIA Consultant, was present at the site.

The SEIAA, Kerala, constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, has been delegated with the powers under section 5 of the said Act. Therefore, the Authority holds the power to either cancel or modify the EC, if required, for the safeguarding of the environment. Additionally, as per General Condition No. xii of the EC issued, it is clearly stated: “The Authority reserves the right to add additional safeguard measures subsequently, if found necessary, and to take action, including revoking the environmental clearance under the provisions of the Environment Protection Act, 1986, to ensure effective implementation of the suggested safeguard measures in a time-bound and satisfactory manner.”

In light of the above, the Authority observed that the allegations of the Project Proponents were baseless and decided to direct the SEIAA Secretariat to provide a reply to the Project Proponent, citing the powers vested in the Authority to modify or cancel the EC if necessary.

Item No. 151.34 Complaints against the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s NAT Industries for an area of 1.8109 Ha in Block No: 39, Re Sy Nos: 178/8, 173/4-5, 173/4-6, 173/4-25, 173/4-30, 173/4-1, Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam
(SIA/KL/MIN/134188/2019; 1581/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

As intimated by the Authority, the complainant, Sri. Jishad D., along with Sri. Radhakrishnan of the Kannampara Powra Samithi, and Sri. Nizarudheen on behalf of the Project Proponent, Sri. Thajudeen, attended the hearing. The Authority heard the averments made by the complainants and the clarifications provided by the Project Proponent.

Upon deliberation, the Authority decided to direct both parties to submit a detailed hearing note within seven days, including any supporting documents to substantiate their claims.

Item No. 151.35 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shemeel R, Managing Partner & Authorized Signatory, M/s. Galaxy Rocks for an area of 4.2146 Ha at Re-Sy Nos: 416/10, 416/12, 416/3-2, 416/3, 416/3-3, 417/8, 417/7, 417/8-2, 417/3, 417/9, 417/2, 417/1-2, 413/2, 417/1-3, 417/1-6, 417/1-4, 417/1-5 in Kummil Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam**
(SIA/KL/MIN/445259/2023, 2162/EC2/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the request dated 19.12.2024 from the Project Proponent. It was observed that the 148th SEIAA was decided to issue the EC for the project. However, during the issuance of EC, a mismatch in the survey numbers was found in the documents submitted along with the application. The Project Proponent has now clarified that the correct survey numbers for the proposed quarry are 416/10, 416/12, 416/3-2, 416/3, 416/3-3, 417/8, 417/7, 417/8-2, 417/3, 417/9, 417/2, 417/1-2, 413/2, 417/1-3, 417/1-6, 417/1-4, and 417/1-5. The Authority further noted that the Letter of Intent (LoI) and the Mining Plan also contain the same survey numbers.

In view of the above, the Authority decided the following

- 1. To issue the EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 4.2146 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 416/10, 416/12, 416/3-2, 416/3, 416/3-3, 417/8, 417/7, 417/8-2, 417/3, 417/9, 417/2, 417/1-2, 413/2, 417/1-3, 417/1-6, 417/1-4, and 417/1-5 in Kummil Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.**
- 2. To direct the SEIAA Secretariat that, once it has been decided to issue the EC, there is no need to submit the proposal before the Authority for such errors. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the EC by adhering to the survey numbers specified in the LoI and Mining Plan, even if typographical errors are present in the application form or other documents.**

Item No. 151.36 **Complaint on the Removal of Ordinary Earth from an area of 0.9150 Ha at Sy Nos. 867/P-1 & 866/ 2-5 from Mullappilly Hill, Kadavallur Gramapanchayat, Perumbilavu Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur**
(File No. 2541/EC6/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaint dated 05.10.2024 from the Secretary, Kadavallur Grama Panchayat, and the report dated 19.11.2024 from the Senior Geologist, Thrissur. The Authority observed that the Secretary, Kadavallur Grama Panchayat, had raised a complaint regarding the illegal extraction of ordinary earth from an area of 0.9150 hectares at Survey Nos. 867/P-1 and 866/2-5 on Mullappilly Hill, Kadavallur Grama Panchayat, Perumbilavu Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

The Senior Geologist, Thrissur, reported that a quarrying permit had been granted to M/s Shivalaya Constructions Pvt. Ltd. for an NHAI project, in accordance with the guidelines and instructions mentioned in the notification issued by the Government of Kerala, following the receipt of an undertaking and a report signed by the Project Director, NHAI. He also stated that no permission or transit passes were issued for the removal of ordinary earth from the hilly terrain with steep slopes as part of any building construction activities.

The Authority further noted that, as per the judgment dated 21.03.2024 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Environmental Clearance (EC) is mandatory for the excavation and removal of ordinary earth for linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc. However, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in a subsequent judgment dated 05.09.2024, clarified that projects for which work orders were issued between 28.03.2020 and 21.03.2024 do not require prior Environmental Clearance. In this case, the Senior Geologist clarified that the permit dated 23.09.2024 for the removal of ordinary earth was issued for highway projects; however the date on which the work order was issued to M/s Shivalaya Constructions Pvt. Ltd., is not explicit in the report. If the work order was issued after 21.03.2024, then the excavation of ordinary earth is illegal and is a violation of EIA Notification, 2006.

Under the above circumstances, the Authority decided to provide a detailed reply by providing a copy of the judgement to the Secretary, Kadavallur Grama Panchayat, citing the difficulty in addressing the complaint. The District Geologist, Thrissur may clarify whether the work order for NH work to M/s Shivalaya Constructions Pvt. Ltd was issued before 21-03-2024.

Item No. 151.37 **Mining activities in Ponmukham hill spread over Vallapuzha, Nellaya and Chalavara villages in Ottapalam and Pattambi Taluks in Palakkad District – request for expert inspection**
(File No. 2802/A2/2022/SEIAA)
&
Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Palakkad to the Quarry Project of Sri. T. Gopinathan in Sy No. 59/1, Nellaya Grama Panchayat, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad - Report of DC, Palakkad received based on the complaint of Sri. Hamza
(File No.2393/EC1/2022/SEIAA)

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. Ajas attended the meeting on behalf of the Project Proponent, Sri. T. Gopinathan. The Authority noted that the EC was issued by the DEIAA and is required to be reappraised by the SEIAA as per existing norms. However, the Project Proponent has not submitted the application for reappraisal.

The Authority sought clarification regarding the non-submission of the reappraisal application and directed the Project Proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within seven days, including any supporting documents to substantiate their claims.

Item No. 151.38 **Environmental Clearance Application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Baiju Joseph for an area of 0.9307 Ha (2.2997 Acres) at Sy Nos. 463/5-4, 468/3-1 & 468/4-1 in Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam – Judgement dated 11.12.2024 in WP(C) No. 26411 of 2024**
(SIA/KL/MIN/137919/2020, 2059/EC3/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the earlier decisions of the SEIAA/SEAC and the judgment dated 11.12.2024 in WP(C) No. 26411 of 2024. The Authority observed that, considering the cluster condition as per the cluster certificate, the Project Proponent was previously directed to submit a ToR application to conduct an EIA study and public hearing. However, vide the judgment dated 11.12.2024, the Hon'ble High Court set aside the Authority's decision to mandate the EIA study.

The Authority opined that, given the ecological fragility and demographic peculiarities of the State, quarries not closed as per the approved mining plan pose potential

environmental impacts and threats to human and animal life. Additionally, several quarrying permits within a 500-meter radius contribute to cumulative impacts in the region, which require assessment through an EIA study.

Furthermore, the NGT, vide its order dated 13.09.2018, suggested a regional EMP considering all projects in clusters, even if the total area is below 5 Ha. In line with the precautionary principle and under Section 5 of the EP Act 1986, the Authority can insist an EIA study for projects to safeguard the environment and assess cumulative impacts, even if the project area is less than 5 Ha.

In this case, it is evident from the cluster certificate and the field inspection report that several quarries (both operational and non-operational) exist within a 500-meter radius. The ecological footprint of mining activities in the area is immense, necessitating an EIA study to assess the carrying capacity of the region for further mining. EIA is a critical tool for managing the environment and is integral to the decision-making and approval process for projects. It is indispensable for projects where cumulative impacts cannot be adequately assessed using the data provided by the Project Proponent.

In light of the above circumstances, the Authority decided to present the aforementioned observations before the Hon'ble High Court through a review or appeal petition, as applicable. The Legal Officer shall take necessary action to file the petition at the earliest, in consultation with the Standing Counsel.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

PART-1

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed City Side Developmental Project of M/s Adani Airport Holdings Ltd Sy Nos. 425 part, 429 part & 431 part in Pettah Village, Thiruvananthapuram Municipal Corporation, Taluk & District.**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/404656/2022, 2140/EC1/2022/SEIAA)

M/s Adani Airport Holdings Limited, Adani Corporate House, Shantigram, Near Vaishno Devi Circle, SG Highway, Khodiyar, Ahmedabad - 382421 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed City Side Developmental Project at Survey Nos. 425 part, 429 part & 431 part in Pettah Village, Thiruvananthapuram Municipal Corporation, Taluk & District.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed that the total plot area is 0.8093 Ha with a total built-up area of 33,903 sq. m. The proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 19,871 sq. m. (@2.45). The building consists of 2 basements, a ground floor, and 4 additional floors. Due to the proximity to the Lakshadweep Sea and the presence of a very shallow water table during monsoon period, there is a high likelihood of interference with the groundwater table. Further the area is an extension of Muttathara swamp wetland. Swamps protect the land from flooding by collecting excess water. Consequently, in its 148th meeting, the Authority decided to hear the project proponent. The project proponent and their consultant were heard in the 149th SEIAA meeting, and they submitted a hearing note vide letter dated 29.11.2024.

The Authority deliberated on the hearing note and noted the clarifications provided by the project proponent. It was observed that, to comply with the Kerala Municipal Building Rules (KMBR) parking requirements, two levels of basements are proposed. But the Project Proponent did not consider the nature and characteristics of soil, shallow water table and impact of the proposed construction on the surrounding area. The approximate depth for constructing the two basement levels, including the foundation level, is up to 10 m. This proposed excavation will extend beyond the groundwater table, involving the removal of approximately 78,000 cu. m. of ordinary earth, which is expected to intersect the groundwater table and pose a risk of saline water intrusion. Such deep excavation will destroy beneficial microorganisms present in the subsoil.

The Authority opined that although the project proponent has proposed storm water management and a dewatering system, such extensive construction with deep excavation is likely to raise the groundwater table in the surrounding areas, potentially affecting the structures of nearby inhabitants, particularly during the monsoon months. The Authority further noted that, given the changing climate scenario and the increase in extreme weather events and rainy days in the state, there is a significant risk of flooding in the basement floors, which may become uncontrollable leading extensive damage to life and property of inhabitants and in the surrounding area.

Authority is also of the opinion that such an extreme unpleasant situation is likely to bring immense adverse imbalance in the natural soil and water regimes in the project region. The flooding that occurred in the Technopark campus in recent years also underscores the need to apply the precautionary principle in the project area.

In view of the above circumstances, the Authority decided that since the first basement floor itself interferes with the groundwater table, the second basement cannot be permitted. The project proponent is directed to revise the conceptual plan considering the nature and characteristics of the area and resubmit it for consideration.

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Commercial Building of Sri. Muhammedkutty Haji at Survey Nos: 151/6 A-3, 8-26, 6A-2, 6B-3,7-8,6B-16,5,6B-15-3,7-5,6B-13,4,5-3,7- 2,6B-7, 6B-15-2, 7-6, 7-7, 6B-10, 6B-14, 6B-15, 5-2, 5-4, 6A-6, 6A-5, 6B-2, 6A-4, 6B-12, 6B-17 in Ward No: 31, Trikkandiyur Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram – Clarification from MoEF & CC

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/441661/2023, 2393/EC1/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the clarification from the MoEF&CC dated 16.12.2024. **In the light of clarification from MoEF&CC, the Authority decided to defer the item for further examination. The Authority also decided to request the Chief Town Planner to furnish a detailed report on the present built up area of the project within 30 days.**

Item No.03

Environmental Clearance for the Commercial Complex Project of M/s Lulu International Shopping Malls Pvt. Ltd. at Survey Nos. 409/2, 408/2, 407/2, 400/7, 407/3, 407/1, 410/2, 409/1, 405/4, 403/3, 403/2, 403/6, 406/2, 406/4, 406/6, 406/5, 405/2, 406/3, 405/3, 403/4, 403/5, 412/2, 409/3 in Ayyanthole Village, Thrissur Municipal Corporation, Thrissur Taluk & District.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/452684/2023, 2477/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the item and noted the minutes of 39th KSSWCB meeting. It is noticed that the Authority in its 149th meeting, the proposal was considered and decided to keep the file in abeyance until the disposal of the two Writ Petitions WP(C) No. 38444 of 2022 (E) and WP(C) No. 1045 of 2023 (E) pending before the Hon'ble High Court. The Court ordered status quo.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decision. The decision of the Authority shall be intimated to the Chairman, KSSWCB.

Item No.04

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, M/s. Crystal Granites at Block No. 26 Re-Sy Nos: 178/12pt, 178/11pt, 178/13pt (Patta land), 168/6pt, 168/9pt, 168/10, 168/11pt, 183pt, 175/1pt, 177/1pt, 177/2pt & 178/1pt (Govt. land) in Pallickal Village, Varkala Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/132461/2019, 1572/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates, the clarifications dated 20.11.2024 and notarised affidavit submitted by the project proponent and the letter dated 24.09.2024 from Adv. V Joy, Member, Legislative Assembly, Kerala. The Project Proponent clarified that they are ready to demolish 2 buildings (own sheds at 43.4m and 45.5m) before the commencement of quarrying operation or these buildings can also be retained as storage spaces for the quarrying equipments, spares and as vehicle workshop if the Authority gives necessary permission to do so.\

Besides, it is also stated that if the Authority insists, they are ready to leave an extra buffer of 12.5m from the mining area boundary on the eastern side so that we can have a total of 20m buffer (12.5m + 7.5m) from the lease boundary in order comply with the 50m safety

distance criteria from the own buildings near BP-20. A modified mining plan can be prepared and necessary approvals can be obtained in this regard before commencement of the quarrying operation. The Hon'ble MLA Adv. V Joy in his letter intimated that the proposed quarrying may adversely affect the proposed tourism development of the area.

The Authority opined that as per the existing norms no built structures can be allowed within the 50m buffer zone of the proposed project area. Now the project proponent stated that he is ready to leave an extra buffer of 12.5m from the mining area boundary in order to comply with the 50m safety distance criteria from the own buildings near BP-20 and the mine plan can be modified accordingly.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to refer back the proposal to SEAC to recommend afresh considering the modified mining plan as suggested by the project proponent. The letter of the Hon'ble MLA shall also be considered while appraising the project. The SEIAA Secretariat to provide the letter of the MLA to the project proponent for submitting his remarks along with the revised mining plan. A reply shall be given to MLA explaining the follow up action taken.

Item No.05

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Narikkadan Dasan at Re-Sy Nos: 236/3, 237/1 & 238/2 in Thirumeni Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur

(File No. 1292/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

(SIA/KL/MIN/269882/2022, 1292/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Narikkadan Dasan, Managing Partner, M/s. Thirumeni Stone Crushers, Parapoyil, Cherupuzha, Thirumeni P.O, Kannur, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed granite building stone quarry project for an area of 0.9742 Ha at Survey Nos. 236/3, 237/1 & 238/2 in Thirumeni Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. The 147th SEIAA meeting rejected the application physically by invoking Precautionary Principle, as the protection of the environmental integrity of the region is much more important than the mining activity. Subsequently, the rejection order was approved vide order dated 19.10.2024. But, the online processing of the

file remains incomplete. Hence, the proposal was placed in the 173rd SEAC meeting and the Committee adhered to its earlier decision to reject the proposal for issuing the necessary proceedings.

The Authority decided to adhere to its previous decision to reject the proposal and directed the SEIAA Secretariat to upload the rejection proceedings in PARIVESH Portal to complete the online processing of the proposal as it is pending for long time.

Item No.06

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Rajesan K., Managing Director, M/s Kodancheri Granites and Stones Pvt. Ltd, for an area of 4.3073 Ha at Re-Sy Nos: 159/3208, 159/3209, 159/5172, 159/8673, 159/8746, 159/8747, 159/8556, 159/8557, 159/8709, 159/4875, 159/7525, 159/8745 in Nellippoyil Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Judgment dated 29.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 39313/2024 filed by M/s Kodancheri Granites and Stones Pvt. Ltd.

(SIA/KL/MIN/406104/2022; 2173/EC4/SEIAA/2022)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates and the judgement dated 29.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 39313 of 2024. The Authority noticed that the Hon'ble High Court vide its judgement directed the SEIAA to consider the application for Environmental Clearance filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and also taking note of Ext. P27 (the minutes of the 123rd SEIAA meeting) after hearing the petitioner, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

As intimated by the Authority, the project proponent Sri. Rajesan K. and his Adv. S. K. Shaju were attended hearing. The Project Proponent claimed that the survey numbers of the proposed site not falls under the ESA and requested to reconsider the application as per the decision of 123rd SEIAA meeting regarding the ESA village. However, the Authority in its 147th meeting, in the wake of recent devastating landslide at Vellarimala, an ESA village in Wayanad and the final notification on ESA villages is in the offing, in line with precautionary principles, decided to defer all the mining proposals in ESA villages till the final notification issued by MoEF&CC.

Now the Hon'ble High Court directed the Authority to consider the application for Environmental Clearance in accordance with law and also taking note of the minutes of the 123rd SEIAA meeting. The Authority deliberated the matter and noted that the entire project area falls in moderate hazard zone and the distance to high hazard zone is only 2.32 km, the Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is at 11 km and distance to notified forest is 2.67 km. The field inspection report also reveals that the proposed area is steep sloping towards south-west direction and is on the flank of a hillock starting from its crust and boulders are spread over the area. The biodiversity of the area is seemingly high and vegetation density is moderate to high. Furthermore, the proposed project is in ESA village.

The Authority noticed that the MoEF&CC vide its Directions under Section 5 of EPA 1986 dated 13.11.2013 accepted the HLWG Report 'in principle' with certain stipulations and prohibited some activities including mining in ESA. As per HLWG Report Volume 1 (Page No. 57), *"the Ecological Sensitive Areas (ESAs) thus identified are at the smallest administrative unit - the village. Village was taken as the unit of ESA. Villages were selected on the basis of the proportion of ESA to the geographic area of the village. A threshold of 20% proportional ESA was used to mark villages as ESU (Ecological Sensitive Unit)"*. Therefore, the direction issued under section 5 of EPA 1986 is applicable for entire village.

The Authority also noticed that the 48th meeting of EAC of MoEF&CC, held on 28th – 30th March 2022, had returned few quarrying proposals from the state of Kerala with an observation that those projects fall in ESA and the mining is prohibited in the ESA of Western Ghats. In view of above, the Committee observed that "the area being ecologically sensitive and fragile, grant of Environmental Clearance to stone mines of small mine leases will ultimately lead to the fragmentation of habitat leading to creation of many edges which will over a time act as point of entry of destructive factors resulting in the overall ecological destruction of the area". The EAC of MoEF&CC has also returned few proposals, even if the projects are located adjacent (within 10km) to the ESA villages quoting ecological reasons as stated above.

Furthermore, the Authority also noticed that the Government of Kerala had submitted a new proposal on ESA to the MoEF&CC for final notification, which states *that the area notified in the draft notification is not final and may be modified* in the final notification. Since the entire project area falls in a medium hazard-prone zone within the ESA village, and in light of recent landslide disasters caused by extreme climate change events in the state, the

Authority opined that, in line with the precautionary principle, it is not feasible to consider the mining proposal in ESA villages until the final ESA notification is issued.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. To return the proposal in its original form to the project proponent.**
- 2. Not to consider mining proposals in ESA villages until the final ESA notification is issued, thereby suppressing the decision of the 123rd SEIAA.**
- 3. The direction of the Hon'ble High Court is hereby complied and the decision of the Authority shall be communicated to the Hon'ble High Court. The Legal Officer shall take the necessary initiatives for the same.**

Item No.07

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. A M Chackochan, M/s Aishwarya Granites for an area of 0.6803 Ha at Re-Sy. No. 121/2 part in Elamadu Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/422678/2023, 1675/EC2/2020/SEIAA)

Sri. A. M. Chackochan Managing Partner Aishwarya Granites, Arkkannoor P.O, Elavinmoodu, Ayoor, Kollam, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 0.6803 Ha at Re-Sy. No. 121/2 part in Elamadu Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 3 years. The Project Proponent obtained the NOC from the Irrigation Department vide order dated 05.12.2024 with 16 conditions for a period of 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 3 (Three) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **Culverts of adequate width may be provided at locations where the haulage road crosses the drainage lines.**
4. **Harvested water should be used to meet the local drinking water demands whenever required as per the demand of local governments.**
5. **The conditions stated in the NOC of the Irrigation Department must be strictly complied with, and the NOC should be renewed for the upcoming years.**
6. **The Project Proponent should implement the regional EMP by considering the adjacent mining projects.**
7. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
8. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
9. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*

10. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
11. The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.
12. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
13. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
14. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.
15. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
16. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.
17. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
18. Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.
19. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).
20. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.

21. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.
22. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
23. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
24. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.
25. 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.
26. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
27. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

28. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
29. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986*

Item No.08

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Anil Kumar for an area of 0.1863 Ha at Block No. 04, Re Survey No: 88/6-2 in Kattipparuthi Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/434954/2023, 2334/EC6/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. Anilkumar, Parammalthodi House, Vadakkumpuram P.O, Malappuram - 676 552 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 0.1863 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Sy No: 88/6-2 in Kattipparuthi Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 156th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*

2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. ***The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 5m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.***
4. ***The project proponent should strictly implement the regional EMP by considering the adjacent project sites.***
5. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
6. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
7. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
8. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
9. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
10. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
11. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
12. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*

16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
22. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*

23. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.09

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Harikrishnan P T for an area of 0.1863 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Sy Nos. 88/6-4, 88/7-1 in Kattipparuthi Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/435664/2023, 2335/EC6/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. Harikrishnan P T, Parammalthodi House, Vadukkumpuram P.O, Malappuram - 676552 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 0.1863 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Survey Nos. 88/6-4, 88/7-1 in Kattipparuthi Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 156th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

3. *The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 5m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.*
4. *The project proponent should strictly implement the regional EMP by considering the adjacent project sites.*
5. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
6. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
7. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
8. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
9. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
10. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
11. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
12. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*

17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
22. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
23. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.10

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Musthafa P.T.V, Proprietor, M/s P T V Granites for an area of 0.9900 Ha at Block No. 01, Re-Sy Nos. 347/5, 347/5-5 & 347/5-15 in Thachanattukkara-I Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/439323/2023, 2443/EC3/SEIAA/2023)

Sri. Musthafa P.T.V, Proprietor, M/s P T V Granites, Pothiyil Thottiparambil, Vadakethil House, Nattukal, Mannarkkad (P.O), Palakkad submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.9900 Ha at Block No. 01, Re-Survey Nos: 347/5, 347/5-5 & 347/5-15 in Thachanattukkara-I Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 161st SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The letter of DFO dated 24.05.2024 has clarified that the distance from the project boundary to the buffer zone of Silent Valley National Park is 12.61km and the distance regarding the same is wrongly given in the PFR submitted as clerical error. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 3 years.

After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

SEAC in its 173rd meeting noted that the distance to Silent Valley NP as 7.6 km which is against the report of the DFO which states that the distance from the project boundary to the buffer zone of Silent Valley National Park is 12. 61 km.

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

In the circumstances the Authority decided to refer back to SEAC for correcting its minutes before issuing the environmental clearance.

Item No.11

Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vinodlal N., M/s Daiwik Industries Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 5.4586 ha at Block No. 48, Re-Sy Nos. 346/1-2, 347/2- 4, 346/3, 346/1-1, 346/1-3, 347/5, 347/4, 346/4, 346/1-9, 347/2-3, 346/1-5, 346/1- 4, 346/1-7, 346/1-8, 354/1-5-1, 354/1-5, 354/1-16, 355/7, 345/4, 345/6, 345/3-1, 354/1-3, 354/1-7, 347/1, 347/2-1, 347/2, 355/6, 345/3, 354/1-7-1, 346/2-1, 347/3-2 in Aryanad Village & Panchayat, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram

(SIA/KL/MIN/444972/2023, 2407/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. Vinodlal N, Director, Daiwik Industries Pvt. Ltd. T.C. 15/836, Vazhuthacaud P.O., Behind Trivandrum Club, Sasthamangalam, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Granite Building stone Quarry for an area of 5.4586 Ha at Block No. 48, Re-Sy. Nos. 346/1-2, 347/2-4, 346/3, 346/1-1, 346/1-3, 347/5, 347/4, 346/4, 346/1-9, 347/2-3, 346/1-5, 346/1-4, 346/1-7, 346/1-8, 354/1-5-1, 354/1-5, 354/1-16, 355/7, 345/4, 345/6, 345/3-1, 354/1-3, 354/1-7, 347/1, 347/2-1, 347/2, 355/6, 345/3, 354/1-7-1, 346/2-1, 347/3-2 in Aryanad Village & Panchayat, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, EIA report, and the Field Inspection Report. The Project Proponent submitted proof of application submitted for Wildlife Clearance vide proposal No. WL/KL/QRY/447911/2023 since the Neyyar Wildlife Sanctuary and Peppara Wildlife Sanctuary are found within a 10km radius of the proposed site. The public hearing of the proposed project was conducted on 01.07.2023. As per the approved mining plan the life of the mine is 12 years. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommended EC for 12 years subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after obtaining NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19-04- 2024.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the

department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendations of 174th SEAC meeting and to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 12 (Twelve) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
- 4. The depth of mining should be limited to 105m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.*
- 5. All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the minutes of public hearing should be complied with and submit the report along with HYCR.*
- 6. A temporary protection wall of 5m height connecting boundary pillars BP5-BP4-BP2-BP10-BP9 should be provided prior to the commencement of mining activities.*
- 7. Boulders spread over in the site should be removed observing utmost safety*

precaution prior to the commencement of mining.

8. *Since the project area located within 10km radius from the Neyyar WLS and Peppara WLS, the Project Proponent has to obtain Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL as per the OM dated 17.05.2022 of MoEF&CC as per the directions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.04.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022 before the commencement of mining.*
9. *The Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
10. *Copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala, District Collector, Thiruvananthapuram and Department of Industries GoK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*
11. *Copy of the EC shall be marked to Wildlife Warden of respective wildlife sanctuaries and to the District Geologist. They are directed to ensure that Project Proponent will not commence the mining operations without clearance from SCNBWL.*
12. *The transportation management plan should be strictly implemented to prevent the impact on road traffic.*
13. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
14. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*

15. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
16. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
17. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
18. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
19. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
20. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
21. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
22. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
23. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
24. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
25. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*

26. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
27. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
28. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
29. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
30. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
31. *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.*
32. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
33. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

34. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

35. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.12

**Revalidation of the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s. Highland Silver Sands (P) Ltd for an area of 4.31 Ha at Re-Sy No. 2/1(p) in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode
(SIA/KL/MIN/447663/2023, 2484/EC2/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meeting held in different meetings. The Authority noticed that the SEAC in its 169th meeting had recommended EC for the project of M/s. Highland Silver Sands (P) Ltd for 7 years based on the Cluster Certificate dated 12.06.2023. However, the Authority in its 148th meeting, observed the presence of two quarries within 500m radius. Subsequently, the 173rd SEAC meeting observed that two EC were issued for the quarry projects of Sri. Aby Joy Pottas, for an area of 2.0040 Ha (EC issued vide File No. 1328/EC1/2019/SEIAA dated 30.07.2021) and Sri. Shamseer V. K. for an area of 0.9926 Ha (EC issued vide File No.

1790/EC4/2020/SEIAA dated 03/01/2024) fall within the cluster of the existing quarry of M/s. Highland Silver Sands (P) Ltd.

The Authority noticed that M/s Highland Silver Sands (P) Ltd had obtained the EC from DEIAA, Kozhikode, on 15.07.2017. Subsequently, ECs were issued to Sri. Aby Joy Pottas and Sri. Shamseer V.K. based on the cluster certificate submitted by them, which appears to have suppressed the facts regarding the original cluster condition in the area. Upon deliberation, the Authority opined that there was a suppression of facts and that, due to the cluster condition, an EIA study and public hearing are mandatory to address the environmental issues arising out of mining in a larger area of more than 5 Ha.

The Authority decided to hear all three project proponents, Sri. Vinay James Kynadi, Sri. Aby Joy Pottas, and Sri. Shamseer V.K., in the next meeting. The SEIAA Secretariat should provide prior intimation to all the parties well in advance.

Item No.13

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Vinodan K., for an area of 0.8441 Ha at Block No: 197, Re-Sy Nos: 73/221, 73/222, 73/223, 73/224, 73/225, 73/226 in Pattiyam Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/453804/2023, 2489/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

Sri. Vinodan K., Gopika Nivas, Kotteri Poyil, Muthiyanga P.O, Kannur- 670691 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 0.8441 Ha at Block No:197, Re-Survey Nos: 73/221, 73/222, 73/223, 73/224, 73/225, 73/226 in Pattiyam Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, Field Inspection Report and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 161st SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 3 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 3 (Three) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. **Since, the medium hazard zone is marked at a distance of 108.3m, provisions for proper drainage to prevent water stagnation in the mining area should be provided.***
- 4. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
- 5. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 6. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 7. The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
- 8. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 9. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
- 10. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
- 11. Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
- 12. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*

13. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
14. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
15. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
16. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
17. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
19. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
20. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*

21. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
22. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.14 **Environmental Clearance for Granite Building stone Quarry of Sri. Eldho Issac for an area of 4.7023 Ha at Sy No. 208/1 in Alanallur - III Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/72951/2022, 1590/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Eldho Issac, Kollialil House, Vengola P.O., Perumbavoor, Ernakulam, Kerala submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Granite Building stone Quarry project for an area of 4.7023 Ha at Survey No. 208/1 in Alanallur- III Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, EIA report, and the Field Inspection Report. The Project Proponent has submitted proof of application for Wildlife Clearance submitted to SCNBWL (Proposal No. FP/KL/QRY/5369/2020) on 24.10.2024.

The public hearing of the proposed project was conducted on 26.11.2021 at Jilla Panchayat Conference Hall, Palakkad. As per the approved mining plan the life of the mine is 16 years. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 173th meeting recommended EC for 16 years subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after obtaining NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendations of 173rd SEAC meeting and to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 16 (Sixteen) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. **All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the minutes of public hearing should be complied with and submit the report along with HYCR.**
5. **The blasting methodology, blasting pattern and blasting operations should strictly be as per the recommendations contained in the report of April 2023 submitted by M/s. NIT, Karnataka.**

6. Since the project area located within 10km radius from the Silent Valley National Park, the Project Proponent has to obtain Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL as per the OM dated 17.05.2022 of MoEF&CC as per the directions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.04.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022 before the commencement of mining.
7. The Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.
8. Copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala, District Collector, Palakkad and Department of Industries GoK, besides others for information and necessary further action.
9. Copy of the EC shall be marked to Deputy Conservator of Forests & Wildlife Warden of Silent Valley National Park and to the District Geologist. They are directed to ensure that Project Proponent will not commence the mining operations without clearance from SCNBWL.
10. The transportation management plan should be strictly implemented to prevent the impact on road traffic.
11. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are *Phyllanthus emblica* (Nelli), *Syzygium cumini* (Njaval), *Writia tinctoria* (Dhanthapala), *Ficus bengalensis* (Peral), *Ficus racemosa* (Atti), *Bambusa bamboos* (Mullumula), *Dendrocalamus strictus* (Kallan mula), *Strychnos nuxvomica* (Kanjiram), *Terminalia cattappa* (Thanni), *Schleichera oleosa* (Poovam), *Artocarpus hirsutus* (Ayiniplavu) etc.
12. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.

13. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
14. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
15. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
16. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
17. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
18. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
19. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
20. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
21. **The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.**
22. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
23. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*

24. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.
25. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.
26. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
27. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
28. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.
29. 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.
30. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
31. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble

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.

32. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

33. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.15

Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Apartment Project by Nest Realities Pvt. Ltd, submitted by Sri. Rahul K R., Finance Manager in an area of 0.7355 Ha at Sy No. 323/7 in Keezhmad Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam – Clarification from MoEF& CC (SIA/KL/MIS/289728/2022, 2269/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the clarification from the MoEF&CC dated 16.12.2024. **In the light of clarification from MoEF&CC, the Authority decided to defer the item for further examination. The Authority also decided to request the Chief Town Planner to furnish a detailed report on the present built up area of the project within 30 days**

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-2)

PART-1

Item No.01

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Subair P for an area of 0.7921 Ha at Block No: 18, Re-Sy Nos. 478/4-1-2, 478/4-1-3 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/494508/2024)

Sri. Subair P, Pariyarath House, Kottakkal ,Kuttippuram P.O,Malappuram- 676 503 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.7921 Ha at Block No: 18, Re-Survey Nos. 478/4-1-2, 478/4-1-3 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of 173rd SEAC meeting. The Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 3 years. The site falls under the moderate hazard zone. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions subject to the submission of NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group for mining and subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Upon verification, the Authority observed that the area is located within the Mudakoimala region, and the additional measures as per decision of 170th SEAC meeting should be followed. Moreover, the site falls under the moderate hazard zone. **In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 3 (Three) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions and the submission of NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group.**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should*

strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.

- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 6m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.*
- 4. The Project Proponent should implement the comprehensive Regional EMP considering the adjacent mining projects.*
- 5. Mining should be continued after maintaining the road with adequate width and drainage facility per standard specifications.*
- 6. Mining should be carried out only after evolving and implementing a comprehensive drainage plan for the entire area, collectively by the Project Proponents, and a site-specific drainage plan for each proposal in consonance with the comprehensive drainage plan to ensure proper drainage to avoid water logging.*
- 7. Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.*
- 8. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
- 9. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 10. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 11. The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
- 12. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 13. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*

14. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
15. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
16. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
17. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
18. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
19. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
20. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
21. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
22. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
23. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
24. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

25. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

26. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. K. Kunjumoyin, Managing Partner, M/s Friends Crushers at Sy Nos. 51pt, 47/1pt & 49/2pt in Kizhuparamba Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Extension of Validity

(Old File No.861/SEIAA/EC1/2990/2015)

(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/496481/2024)

Sri. K. Kunjumoyin, Managing Partner, M/s Friends Crushers, submitted an application for the extension of validity of the EC issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 4.8844 Ha at Sy Nos. 51pt, 47/1pt & 49/2pt in Kizhuparamba Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority reviewed the item and noted the decisions made during various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC appraised the proposal based on Form 6 and the documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Environmental Clearance (EC) for the proposed project (File No. 861/SEIAA/EC1/2990/2015) was issued on 23.12.2017 for an area of 4.8844 hectares, with its validity expiring on 22.12.2023 after considering the COVID-19 exemption.

As per the order of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 8118 of 2021, the Project Proponent submitted documents on 07.06.2021 seeking revalidation of the project life. The Sub-Committee of SEAC conducted a field inspection on 16.08.2021 and recommended that the project is eligible for revalidation, subject to certain conditions to be complied with within six months. Upon submission of the compliance report, SEAC examined the documents and found the compliance report satisfactory.

According to the scheme of mining dated 09.12.2022, the balance quantity proposed for mining is 9,70,886 MT, to be extracted over seven years. Considering the scheme of mining and the remaining resources, SEAC, in its 174th meeting, decided to recommend revalidation of the EC for the project life of seven years from the date of the original lease execution, as per the provisions of SO 1807(E) subject to submission of the NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003, as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) Nos. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024, dated 19.04.2024.

The Authority observed that the Project Proponent filed WP(C) No. 45040/2024, seeking a stay on all further proceedings regarding Item No. 6 in Exhibit P12 (the minutes of the 174th SEAC meeting). The Hon'ble High Court, through its interim order dated 18.12.2024, granted an interim stay as prayed for, effective for one month.

In light of the above circumstances, the Authority is unable to consider the Project Proponent's request or proceed further with SEAC's recommendations. Therefore, the matter is deferred pending the final judgment of the Hon'ble High Court. The Legal Officer is directed to provide details to the Standing Counsel to defend the case in the Hon'ble High Court **as well as to vacate the stay explain the consequences of stay order as the project proponent is Continuing mining as per court.**

Item No.03

ToR application for the existing Granite Building Stone quarry of Sri. K. Mohanakumar, Proprietor M/s Sree Sastha Blue Metals for an area of 1.2312 ha at Block No. 38, Re-Survey Nos. 268/3, 268/4, 268/5, at Anavoor Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Re-appraisal of DEIAA EC.
(SIA/KL/MIN/492047/2024)

Sri. Mohanakumar K, M/s. Sreesastha Blue Metals Kottackal Anavoor P O Neyyattinkara Thiruvananthapuram submitted a ToR application for the existing Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 1.2312 ha at Block No. 38, Re-Survey Nos. 268/3, 268/4, 268/5, in Anavoor Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority perused ToR proposal and noted the decisions of 174th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent obtained an environmental clearance dated 07.12.2018 from DEIAA for a period of 5 years. The lease deed was executed for a period of 10 years from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2029. As per the approved mining plan, the minable reserve is 3,12,396 MT and the life of mine is 10 years. As per the Pre-Feasibility Report, there are four quarries within the 500 m premises of the existing quarry and altogether the total area of a cluster is 10.4881 ha. The Mining and Geology Department vide letter dated 23.12.2023 issued demand notice to the Project Proponent for illegal extraction from the proposed site. Considering the cluster condition and the violation of illegal extraction, it is necessary to conduct EIA study and environmental damage assessment due to over extraction. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 3 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Environmental damage assessment Report and environmental compensation plan to be included with the EIA report.
2. Comprehensive traffic study considering all the mines in the impact zone.
3. Comprehensive EMP as per the guidelines of the SEIAA published on the website

Item No.04

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mohammed Nisar, M/s. Majestic Granites for an area 3.9509 Ha at Survey Nos. 147/2 (pt), 149/1(pt), 149/2 (pt), 150/1, 150/3(pt), 151/1(pt) & 151/2(pt) in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Validity Extension of EC

(Old File No. 1021/EC1/001/SEIAA/2016)

(New Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/496969/2024)

Sri. Mohammed Nisar, M/s Majestic Granites, Athani Tower, Room No. MP/7/1/1672-G&H Mukkam (PO) Near Bus Stand Kozhikode, 673602 submitted an application for the extension of validity of the EC issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project in an area of 3.9509 Ha at Survey Nos. 147/2 (pt), 149/1(pt), 149/2 (pt), 150/1, 150/3(pt), 151/1(pt) & 151/2(pt) at Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions made during various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 6 and the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance (EC) was issued on 29.05.2017, with its validity expiring on 28.05.2023 after accounting for the COVID-19 exemption. The lease deed (No. 389/2021-22) was executed on 02.02.2022. The Project Proponent submitted an application for revalidation on 07.05.2022.

The mineable reserve, as per the mine plan approved on 07.12.2015, was 35,79,000 MT with a mine life of 30 years. A revised mine plan, approved on 20.01.2021, indicates a reduced mineable reserve of 23,02,755 MT with a mine life of 12 years. The District Geologist, through a letter dated 24.08.2023, certified that the balance quantity available for mining during the lease period is 21,73,805 MT. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 174th meeting, recommended that the project is eligible for revalidation of the EC for 12 years from the date of lease execution (02.02.2022) as per the provisions of SO 1807(E).

Upon deliberation, the Authority noted that, as per the cluster certificate dated 27.04.2022, the following three authorized quarries situated within a 500-meter radius indicate a cluster situation: (i) Quarry of Sri. Jyothish Kumar with an area of 1.4075 ha; (ii) Quarry of M/s Malabar Bricks & Metals with an area of 2.3978 ha; (iii) Quarry of Azad M.M. with an area of 4.8522 ha. Additionally, the Authority observed that the project area is

located in a moderate hazard zone and that the Project Proponent has not submitted the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group.

In the above circumstances, the Authority opined that due to the cluster condition and the medium landslide susceptibility of the area, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study is necessary to evaluate the carrying capacity of the region and to implement the precautionary principle. Therefore, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC to consider the above observations and provide fresh recommendations. Since the lease deed was executed only on 02.02.2022, the validity of the original EC will be for 5 years which will be counted from that date only.**

Item No.05

Environmental Clearance issued for the Removal of Ordinary Earth Project of Shri. Paulose V. K for an area of 0.6313 Ha at Sy No. 947/3-A-1-2 in Onakkoor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam - Transfer of EC – Reg

(Old Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/126249/2019)

(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/497125/2024)

Smt. Suja, W/o Paulose V. K submitted an application for the transfer of EC issued for the Removal of Ordinary Earth project from an area of 0.6313 Ha in Survey No. 947/3-A-1-2 in Onakkoor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam due to the demise of EC holder.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of 174th SEAC meeting. The transfer EC is requested in favour of Smt. Suja, W/o Paulose V. K due to the demise of the EC holder Sri. V. K. Poullose. The EC for the project (SIA/KL/MIN/126249/2019) was issued on 08.10.2021, for a period of 1 year as per the decision of the 112th SEIAA meeting and the EC is non-existent at present. Since there is no valid EC at present, the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend rejection of the application for transfer of EC.

The Authority noted the request submitted by the transferee Smt. Suja vide letter dated 19.12.2024 in response to the observations of the 174th SEAC meeting. The proposed project did not start and the quarrying permit was not executed as the EC holder deceased on 18.07.2021. As per the letter of Mining and Geology Department dated 27.08.2024, the transfer EC in favour nominee is required for issuing quarrying permit. Recommendation of SEAC is not required for transferring EC.

Upon deliberation, the Authority decided to transfer the EC in favour of Smt. Suja, W/o Vetteeloth Kuriakose Poulose, Vetteeloth House, Near St Mary's Orthodox Church, Onakkoor, Ernakulam. The EC will be valid from the date of execution of lease / permit from the Department of Mining and Geology. Necessary orders in this regard shall be issued by SEIAA Secretariat.

Item No.06

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Gurudeeksha L, M/s. Chaprayil Granites Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 4.9500 Ha at Block No. 39, Re-Sy Nos. 173/4-7, 173/4-16, 176/1, 176/1-3, 177/1, 177/1-2, 177/1-3, 177/1-4, 177/1-5, 177/1-6, 177/1-7, 177/3, 177/5, 177/6, 177/6-2, 178/3, 178/3-2, 178/4, 178/5 in Chadayamangalam Village Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/460718/2024)

Sri. Gurudeeksha L., Managing Director, Cheerankavu, Ezhukone P.O., Kollam 691505 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 4.9500 Ha at Block No. 39, Re-Survey Nos. 173/4-7, 173/4-16, 176/1, 176/1-3, 177/1, 177/1-2, 177/1-3, 177/1-4, 177/1-5, 177/1-6, 177/1-7, 177/3, 177/5, 177/6, 177/6-2, 178/3, 178/3-2, 178/4, 178/5 in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions made during various SEAC meetings held on different dates. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, EIA report, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan the life of the mine is 10 years. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 173th meeting recommended EC for 10 years subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority noticed that the several complaints were received on different dates. One of the complainant Smt. Sheeba S. vide her letter dated 26.11.2024 asserted that the drainage waste water from the mining area would traverse her agricultural land. The area facing drought and the Government of Kerala has invested significant funds to protect the 'Kalladathani Watershed Development Scheme' for preventing soil erosion and to alleviate water scarcity of the area. Furthermore, the complaints dated 27.11.2024 and 05.12.2024 from Sri. Sharafudeen and Sri. Navas M. I. alleged that the quarrying will lead to landslide

and is very close to Illambarakad Reserve Forest and the proposed drainage channel from the mining site would traverse through his agriculture land. Besides, there is also a mass petition dated 28.12.2024 against the illegal functioning of adjacent quarry of NAT Industries.

The Authority noted that, as per the evaluation reports, the Project Proponent had received funds under the Kalladathani Watershed Development Scheme to prevent soil erosion and conserve water. These funds were utilized for constructing stone walls in the project area to mitigate soil erosion. In the above circumstances, **the Authority decided to seek clarification from the Soil Conservation Department, Kollam District Office on the feasibility of mining in the proposed location and likely impact on soil conservation activities of the area where considerable expenditure has already been incurred under Kalladathani watershed development scheme.**

As there are many complaints, after getting the clarification from Soil Conservation Department, Authority decided to post the case back to SEAC for re-examination and suggest corrective measures if required.

Item No.07 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Gopalakrishnan V., for an area of 0.9506 Ha at Block No.13, Re-Sy Nos. 111/1, 110/1, 112/16, 112/15, 112/7, 112/7-2, 112/17-1, 117/17-2, 112/17-3, 112/17 in Kalayapuram Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam
(SIA/KL/MIN/462531/2024)

Sri. Gopalakrishnan.V Chamakkalakuzhy Perumkulam post Kottarakkara, Kollam submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an extent of 0.9506 Ha at Re-Sy. No. 111/1, 110/1, 112/16, 112/15, 112/7, 112/7-2, 112/17-1, 117/17-2, 112/17-3, 112/17 in Kalayapuram Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 169th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the NOC from the Irrigation Department dated 26.07.2024, no irrigation structures under Kallada Irrigation Project within 1km radius is reported. The NOC, however, directed to conduct mining activities only by protected

blasting. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (Two) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected by connecting BP-1, BP-9 & BP-8 for the protection of the temple and auditorium adjacent to the site.**
4. **Protection fencing for the abandoned quarry should be provided before commencement of mining.**
5. **All the conditions in the NOC of the Irrigation Department are to be scrupulously followed.**
6. **Constitute a Monitoring Committee comprising the local ward member, Project Proponent, a representative of local residents and Mining Engineer to monitor the implementation of the EC conditions and blasting. The Committee shall meet once in 3 months and the Project Proponent is responsible for the implementation of the decisions taken.**
7. *A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at the boundary where houses are located to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
8. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral),*

Ficus racemosa (Atti), *Bambusa bamboos* (Mullumula), *Dendrocalamus strictus* (Kallan mula), *Strychnos nuxvomica* (Kanjiram), *Terminalia cattappa* (Thanni), *Schleichera oleosa* (Poovam), *Artocarpus hirsutus* (Ayiniplavu) etc.

9. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
10. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
11. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
12. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
13. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
14. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
15. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
16. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
17. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
18. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

19. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
20. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
21. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
22. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
23. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
24. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
25. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
26. *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.*
27. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the*

concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.

28. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
29. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
30. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.08

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jismon A. B., Designated Partner, M/s. J. S. Blue Metals LLP for an area of 0.8595 Ha at Sy Nos. 1065/1-4, 1065/3-D in Marady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/469930/2024)**

Sri. Jismon A.B, Designated Partner, M/s. J. S. Blue Metals LLP, Ambarappillil (H), Muvattupuzha P.O, Ernakulam submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.8595 Ha at Sy Nos. 1065/1-4, 1065/3-D in Marady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 168th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The Project Proponent submitted the NOC from the Executive

Engineer, Irrigation Department, Muvattupuzha, stating that no objection to conduct mining activities without affecting the irrigation structures subjected to 18 conditions. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2(Two) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. All the conditions in the NOC of the Irrigation Department are to be scrupulously followed.*
- 4. The depth of mining should be limited to 120m AMSL above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.*
- 5. Since the medium hazard zone for landslide susceptibility is located at a distance of 15m, the Project Proponent should implement adequate provisions for storm water drainage and ensure its proper maintenance.*
- 6. A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at the boundary where houses are located to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
- 7. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus*

(Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayniplavu) etc.

8. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
9. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
10. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
11. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
12. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
13. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
14. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
15. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
16. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
17. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

18. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
20. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
21. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
22. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
23. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
24. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
25. *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.*
26. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the*

concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.

27. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

28. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

29. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.09

Environmental Clearance for the Integrated Manufacturing Cluster (IMC) in Kerala under Kochi-Bengaluru Industrial Corridor (KBIC) at Kannambra I village of Alathur Taluk in Palakkad District

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/456060/2023)

Sri. Santhosh Koshy Thomas, Managing Director, Kerala Industrial Corridor Development Corporation Ltd (KICDCL), Government of Kerala, KINFRA Hi Tech Park, HMT Colony, P.O. Kalamassery, Ernakulam-683503 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the development of Integrated Manufacturing Cluster (IMC) in Kerala Under Kochi-Bengaluru Industrial Corridor (KBIC) at Kannambra I village of Alathur Taluk in Palakkad District.

The Authority perused the item and observed the decision made during various SEAC meetings held on different dates. As per the application, the plot area is 126.74 ha. The total built-up area is 36,000m² (450 housing units). The FAR is @1.25. The elevation of the

proposed area varies between 143m AMSL to 87m AMSL. The total earth to be excavated is 15,000m². As per the field inspection report, the Peechi-Vazhani Wildlife Sanctuary and the Chimmoni Wildlife Sanctuary are located within 10km distance. The 170th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the EIA report. The field inspection of the proposed project was conducted on 21.05.2024. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommended EC for 10 years subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noticed that the proof of application submitted for Wildlife Clearance was submitted vide proposal No. WL/KL/IND/477291/2024 dated 07/06/2024.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of 174th SEAC meeting and to issue Environmental Clearance for the development of Integrated Manufacturing Cluster (IMC) in Kerala Under Kochi-Bengaluru Industrial Corridor (KBIC) for a period 10 years (as per O.M. dated 13.12.2022) under subject to the following Specific Condition in addition to the General Conditions:

1. *The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
2. **50 percentage of CER expenditure earmarked for health check-ups should be used for maintenance of local roads outside the project area.**
3. **Primary treatment facility should be provided at the individual industry level prior to letting out the effluents from each industrial units to the common effluent treatment plant to improve the efficiency of the common treatment facility.**
4. *The details of primary treatment facility proposed for each industries should be included in the first HYCR.*
5. *The site is characterized by various natural drains and its micro watersheds and all the micro watersheds should be conserved for harvesting rain water and developing alternate source of water. The progress of conservation of such watersheds and harvesting of water should be monitored and the progress should be incorporated in the HYCR.*

6. *The harvested water within the project area should be used to the maximum thereby dependence on the external source should be reduced. The water usage from the external and internal sources should be monitored and provided in the HYCR.*
7. *The conservation plan for the existing canals, streams and ponds in the proposed site should be implemented meticulously and the progress should be incorporated in the HYCR.*
8. *The water table in the wells located within the project site should be monitored during pre-monsoon, post-monsoon and summer season and the details should be given in the HYCR.*
9. *Utmost care and safeguard should be adopted to prevent any accidental spillage of effluents from the CETP to the adjacent RWH facility.*
10. *SoP for mitigating human-wildlife conflict should be implemented to avoid nuisance and accidents.*
11. *Proper water conservation measures are to be implemented in the site and the water shall be used for their purposes.*
12. *Since the project area located within Peechi-Vazhani Wildlife Sanctuary and the Chimmoni Wildlife Sanctuary, the Project Proponent has to obtain Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL as per the OM dated 17.05.2022 of MoEF&CC as per the directions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.04.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022 before the commencement of mining.*
13. *The Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
14. *Copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala, District Collector, Palakkad and Department of Industries GoK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*

15. *Copy of the EC shall be marked to the respective Wildlife Wardens and to the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB. They are directed to ensure that Project Proponent will not commence the mining operations without clearance from SCNBWL.*
16. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirement during construction and operational phase is to be ensured and details should be given in HYCR.*
17. *Maximum efforts should be taken to maintain the local topography of the land profile as such by avoiding deep cutting /filling.*
18. *Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain.*
19. *The FAR norms should be complied with strictly.*
20. *The guidelines for green rating and green building certification to buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
21. *Green belt surrounding the campus, avenue tree planting, and garden development should commence from the beginning of the construction phase. Suitable local species should be used for green belt and avenue trees.*
22. *Vegetation should be developed appropriately on the ground as well as overbuilt structures such as roofs, basements, podiums, etc.*
23. *Adequate safety gadgets and instruments should be provided to the people engaged in the treatment of solid as well as liquid wastes. Periodic checkups regarding the health status of the people should be undertaken.*
24. *The Kerala Energy Conservation (Building Code) Rules 2017 should be complied with.*
25. *The Project Proponent should examine the scope for improving energy conservation measures periodically and should implement the same and the progress should be incorporated in the HYCR.*

26. *Periodic monitoring of water samples from the groundwater sources should be carried out. Adequate treatment methods should be followed to remove the contaminants.*
27. *Treated water from CETP should be reused to the maximum extent and balance if any should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local ground water, and for avoiding discharge of treated water into the nearby public drain.*
28. *Comprehensive drainage plan in consonance with the micro-watershed conservation plan should be implemented.*
29. *Water efficient plumbing features for saving water use should be adopted as per the plan submitted.*
30. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc. as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. 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).*
31. *Climate responsive design as per Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted.*
32. *The green building criteria notified in the GO (Ms) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adopted.*
33. *Appropriate greening measures should be adopted on the ground as well as over built structure such as roofs, basements, podiums etc.to reduce the urban heat effect of civil structures.*
34. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having high solar reflective index.*
35. *Building design should cater to differently-abled citizens.*

36. *Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area and if necessary, carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
37. *Design of the building should comply with Energy Building Code as applicable.*
38. ***Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total. Ensure 20% of the energy requirement shall be maintained by solar energy.***
39. *Buildings should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby during construction.*
40. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
41. *All vehicles, including the ones carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
42. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
43. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
44. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
45. *Occupational health safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
46. *All vehicles during the construction phase should carry PUC certificate.*
47. *D.G. set should be provided with adequate stack height and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase and would be provided with an acoustic enclosure.*
48. *Green belt should be developed along the periphery of the site with indigenous species.*
49. *Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment such as BLDC fans and LED lamps should be promoted as part of energy conservation.*

50. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.
51. There shall be an Environment Management Committee consisting of representatives from KCDCL official, industrial units, an environment expert, etc. The committee shall meet once in 6 months and the observations/decisions of the committee should find a place in the half yearly completion report.
52. Authority makes it clear that as per clause 8 (vi) of EIA notification 2006, deliberate concealment and/or submission of false or misleading information or data which is material to screening or scoping or appraisal or decision on the application shall make the application liable for rejection and cancellation of prior EC granted on that basis.
53. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) 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 local self Govt. Institutions. The indicated cost for CER shall be 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 Compliance Report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.
54. The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/licenses/permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ permission for the construction projects of this nature.
55. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

56. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.10

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Unneenkutty for an area of 0.5192 Ha at Block no. 36, Re-Sy No. 347 in Kulukkallur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.
(SIA/KL/MIN/473085/2024)**

Sri. Unneenkutty, Kallingal House, Pulassery P.O., Palakkad, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.5192 Ha at Block No. 36 Re-Survey No. 347 in Kulukkallur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 169th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The Project Proponent obtained NOC from the Irrigation Department dated 26.09.2024 subjected to 10 conditions for a period 1 year. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 5 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 5 (Five) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

3. *All the conditions in the NOC of the Irrigation Department are to be scrupulously followed.*
4. *The depth of mining should be limited to 52 above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.*
5. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
6. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
7. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
8. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
9. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
10. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
11. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
12. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*

13. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
14. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
15. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
16. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
17. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
18. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
19. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
20. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
21. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
22. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
23. *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.

- 24. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
- 25. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
- 26. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
- 27. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.11

Re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Nishad. P. V for an area of 3.4277 Ha at Sy Nos. 348/1, 2, 3 in Thrithala Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad

(SIA/KL/MIN/474076/2024)

Sri. P.V Nishad Parayamvalappil House, Ayilakkad P.O Edappal (via), Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application for reappraisal of DEIAA issued EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area 3.4277 Ha at Survey Nos. 348/1, 2, 3 in Thrithala -Village, Pattambi-Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan, the mine life is 8 years. The quarrying lease was executed on 08.11.2017 and it expires on 07.11.2026.

As per the approved Scheme of Mining (dated 14.03.2022), a total quantity of 3,10,314 MT has been mined out for the period of 2017-2022 and the remaining quantity of 45,44,26 MT. The 142nd SEAC meeting heard the presentation and the life of mine estimated is 6 years. The Project Proponent also obtained NOC from the Irrigation department vide letter dated 23.09.2024 for a period of one year subject to 21 conditions. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173rd meeting recommended EC for a project life of 6 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendations of 173rd SEAC meeting and to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 6 (Six) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Scheme of Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. **The depth of mining should be limited to 40m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.**
5. **All the conditions in the NOC of the Irrigation Department are to be scrupulously followed.**
6. **The mine pits formed within and adjacent to the proposed site should be safeguarded against any type of accidents.**
7. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
8. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
9. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
10. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*

11. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
12. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
13. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
14. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
15. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
16. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
17. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
18. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
20. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*

21. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.
22. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
23. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
24. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.
25. 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.
26. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
27. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

28. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

29. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.12

Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the existing Residential Building Construction Project of M/s Heera Construction Company Pvt. Ltd. at Re-Sy Nos. 4 & 2, in Thycaud Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/481230/2024)

Sri. Tiju Varghese Chacko, M/s Heera Construction Company Pvt. Ltd., Door No. 63/2982, Surabhi Enclave, Opp. Metro Pillars No. 775, SA Road, Kadavanthra, Kochi, Ernakulam, Kerala-682016 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the expansion of the existing Residential Building Construction project at Re-Sy. Nos. 4 & 2 in Thycaud Village, Thiruvananthapuram Corporation, Taluk & District.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decisions made during various SEAC meetings held on different dates. M/s Heera Construction Company was granted Environmental Clearance (EC) for five years by the MoEF on 26.05.2010 for the construction of the Four Pillars Residential Project in Thycaud Village. However, the construction was abruptly halted, and the project was abandoned as the company became bankrupt.

Now, the Project Proponent submitted an application on the PARIVESH Portal 2.0 on 14.06.2024 for the expansion of the existing residential building project by adding a built-up area of 9,439.20 sq. m. to the existing built-up area of 61,116.42 sq. m., bringing the total built-up area to 70,555.62 sq. m. The presentation of the proposed project was heard in the 169th SEAC meeting, and a field inspection of the project was conducted on 04.09.2024.

According to the additional documents provided, the total number of apartments is 544 units, comprising 152 units with a built-up area of less than 75 sq. m. (1 BHK) and 392 units with a built-up area ranging from 75 sq. m. to 185 sq. m. (2 BHK & 3 BHK). After due

appraisal, SEAC, in its 174th meeting, recommended granting EC for 10 years, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Authority studied the expansion proposal and decided to seek clarification from the Project Proponent on following points:

1. In which year the project was abandoned and what was the built-up area at that point of time.
2. What is the built-up area at present and whether valid EC was available throughout the construction phase as the EC period had expired long back.
3. The follow up action taken to rectify the observations made in CCR issued from regional office Bangalore.

Item No.13

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Pulliyil Madasseri Alavi for an area of 0.5900 Ha at Block No. 08, Re- Sy Nos. 1557/6, 1557/7, 1557/3, 1557/4 in Melmuri Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/475265/2024)**

Sri. Pulliyil Madasseri Alavi, Designated Partner, Pulliyil Madasseri Realtors LLP, 4/22, PM Arcade, Melmuri Post, Alathurpadi, Malappuram - 676517 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.5900 Ha at Block No. 08, Re- Sy Nos. 1557/6, 1557/7, 1557/3, 1557/4 in Melmuri Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 169th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (Two) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 6m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.***
- 4. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.***
- 5. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
- 6. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 7. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 8. The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
- 9. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 10. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
- 11. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
- 12. Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*

13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

22. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.14

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s. VJJ Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd for an area of 0.9965 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy. No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam
(SIA/KL/MIN/474394/2024)**

Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s VJJ Infrastructure Pvt Ltd., submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.9965 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy. No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision 173rd SEAC meeting. The Expert Committee appraised the project using the outputs of a Drone based LiDAR survey conducted including Contour map with 1m interval, Digital Elevation model map (DEM), Slope Map and Ortho map of 5m Interval. Upon deliberation, the Committee concluded that the site is located on a ridge on the eastern end of the hill and as per the Google imagery, the elevation of the ridge varies from 240-522m AMSL. Such land forms are important to be conserved from the point of microclimate of the region. Another quarry proposal in the same hill owned by Neeloor Aggregates Pvt Ltd. (SIA/KL/MIN/435475/2023) was rejected vide letter dated 18.10.2024.

The SEAC had also noted that the terrain is highly fragile and the entire project area falls under the moderate hazard zone. There are houses and infrastructure developed in both the side slopes along with the valley portions leading to increased environmental fragility.

After due appraisal the SEAC in its 173rd meeting recommend rejection of the proposal by invoking Precautionary Principle.

Subsequently, the Authority noted that the Project Proponent, via a letter dated 27.12.2024, requested reconsideration of the observations made during the 173rd SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent stated that he had obtained an NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group, Kottayam, to carry out quarrying activities, as per Order No. DCKTM/1859/2024-DM1 dated 21.12.2024, subject to five conditions. The Project Proponent also requested a field inspection before any final decision is made. Additionally, the Project Director, NHAI, in a letter dated 26.12.2024, stated that the mined material is intended for the development of the Paravoor-Kottukulangara Highway (NH-66).

In these circumstances, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC to examine the Project Proponent's request and provide fresh recommendations on merit after site inspection.

Item No.15 Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Musthafa P. for an area of 0.3489 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Sy Nos. 98/3-12, 98/3-15 in Aliparamba Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/474534/2024)

Sri. Musthafa P., Pothukandan House, Puthanangadi Post, Angadippuram, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.3489 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Sy Nos. 98/3-12, 98/3-15 in Aliparamba Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 169th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (Two) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 6m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.***
- 4. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.***
- 5. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
- 6. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 7. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 8. The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
- 9. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 10. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
- 11. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
- 12. Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*

13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

22. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.16

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Dominic for an area of 0.1643 Ha at Sy No. 133/1-2-2 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kannayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/480699/2024)**

Sri. Dominic, Kaithakottil House, Arakkunnam P.O, Ernakulam submitted an for Environmental Clearance application the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.1643 Ha at Sy No. 133/1-2-2 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kannayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. ***The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 2m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.***
4. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
5. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
6. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
7. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
8. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
9. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
10. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
11. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
12. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
13. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*

14. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
15. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
16. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
17. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
19. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
20. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
21. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the*

project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

22. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.17 **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jose for an area of 0.2984 Ha at Sy No. 246/1 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/481778/2024)

Sri. Jose, Kallarimyalil House, Chethicode P.O, Kanjiramattam, Ernakulam submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.2984 Ha at Sy No. 246/1 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 2m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.**
4. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.
5. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.
6. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area
7. The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.
8. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.
9. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.
10. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.
11. Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
12. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.
13. A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.
14. No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.
15. The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.
16. The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.

17. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.
18. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)
19. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
20. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.
21. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.
22. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.18

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Rasack P. for an area of 2.1509 Ha at Survey Nos. 95/9-3, 95/7-4 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram – Transfer of EC

**(SIA/KL/MIN/161069/2020, 1799/EC6/2020/SEIAA
(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/484647/2024)**

Sri. Abdul Rasack P., Pattakkal House, Vadakkangara P.O, Malappuram submitted an application for the Transfer of Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.1509 Ha at Survey Nos. 95/9-3, 95/7-4 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of the 171st SEAC and the 149th SEIAA meeting. As per the documents submitted, the EC No. EC23B001KL133253 was issued dated 24.03.2023 in favour of Sri. Abdul Rasack. P for the project period of 11 years. As per the covering letter dated 15.06.2024, the project proponent stated that the proposed project has not received statutory licences, and the mine lease was not granted.

The Project proponent also states that the quarrying is not yet started. As per the application, the EC holder requested to transfer the same in favour of Sri. Muhammed Sathik V., Vengasseri, Vadakkekulamba, Vadakkangara PO, Malappuram as he is unable to manage the project due to focusing on other business. As per the direction of the 149th SEIAA, the Project Proponent vide letter dated 20.11.2024 has submitted the HYCR along with signed affidavit. As per the HYCR, the proposed quarry has not commenced mining activities since the quarrying lease deed is not executed.

Upon discussion, the Authority found that the affidavit was not satisfactory. Therefore, separate affidavits from both the transferor and the transferee are required for further processing of the proposal.

Item No.19

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Muhammed Iqbal for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block No. 42 Re-Sy Nos. 35/868 (35/2B old) of Panappuzha Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/493918/2024)

Sri. Muhammed Iqbal P. A., Pulukkool Asharivalappil House, Kottila P.O, Kannur-670334 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone quarry project for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block No: 42 Re-Sy Nos. 35/868 (35/2B old) in Panappuzha Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (Two) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 6m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.**
4. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.**
5. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*

6. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
7. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
8. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
9. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
10. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
11. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
12. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*

20. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
21. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.
22. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.
23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.20

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Razack for an area of 0.4045 Ha at Block No: 14, Sy No. 38/3-4 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/493633/2024)

Sri. Abdul Razack, Kambrath House, Poovad, Ponmala P.O., Malappuram - 676528 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry

Project for an area of 0.4045 Ha at Block No: 14, Survey No. 38/3-4 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 3 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 3 (Three) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 6m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.**
4. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.**
5. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
6. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
7. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
8. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*

9. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
10. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
11. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
12. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt.*

Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.

21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.*
22. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
23. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.21

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Mr. Sabu Thomas for an area of 0.0971 Ha at Survey No. 573/1 in Parappa Village, Vellarikundu taluk, Kasaragod.
(SIA/KL/MIN/457645/2024)**

Sri. Sabu Thomas, Maniyangat (H), Punnakkunnu P.O., Pathikkara, Vellarikkundu VIA, Kasaragod - 671533, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.0971 Ha at Survey No. 573/1 in Parappa Village, Vellarikundu taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 173rd SEAC meeting heard the

presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 173th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 4m bgl considering the depth to water table, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.**
4. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.**
5. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
6. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
7. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
8. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
9. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
10. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
11. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*

12. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
13. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
14. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
15. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
16. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
17. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
18. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
21. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.

22. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.22

ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s BE ONE ASSOCIATES (Represented by its Managing Partner, Mr. Eldhose K Varghese) for an area of 3.8510 ha at Re-Sy Nos: 46/1, 46/2, 46/3, 47, 48/1- 1, 48/1, 48/2-1 in Thalanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/497389/2024)

Sri. Eldhose K Varghese, M/s BE ONE ASSOCIATES, XVII/286/A3, NAS Road, Near 130 Jn, Muvattupuzha, Ernakulam - 686661, submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 3.8510 Ha at Re-Sy Nos: 46/1, 46/2, 46/3, 47, 48/1- 1, 48/1, 48/2-1 in Thalanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

The Authority perused ToR proposal and noted the decisions of 173th SEAC meeting. As per the Form-1, the total mineable reserve is 13,67,455 MT. The life of mine proposed is 8 years. The elevation of the area varies between 160m to 95m AMSL. The distance to medium hazard zone is 163m from the proposed site. The high hazard zone is located at a distance of 1.1 km from the proposed area. The project cost is Rs. 3,62,49,960/-. Nearest habitation is 105.4m from the lease boundary.

As per the Cluster Certificate dated 21.08.2024, there is another quarry of M/s Deccan Rocks adjacent to the proposed area, and the quarrying operations are not yet commenced. The EC for the quarry project of M/s Deccan Rocks for an area of area of 3.9736 Ha was issued on 03/05/2023. Hence altogether the total area comes to more than 5

Ha. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 173th meeting recommended Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 2 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Impact on the hydrology of the watershed in which the site is located and mitigation measures to conserve and enhance the natural resources in the watershed
2. Landslide susceptibility of the area considering the slope characteristics, soil thickness, drainage aspects and structural characteristics.

Item No. 23

Extension of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M. A. Ashraf for an area of 3.0757 Ha at Re-Sy Block No. 41, Re-Sy Nos. 81, 82 & 83 in Cherpulassery Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/498265/2024)

Sri. M. A. Ashraf, Managing Partner, M/s Infra Granites LLP, Branch Office at Veetikadu Thekkumuri (P.O), Cherpulassery Palakkad, Kerala – 679506, submitted an validity extension application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 3.0757 Ha at Re-Survey Block No. 41, Re-Survey Nos: 81, 82 & 83 in Cherpulassery Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad.

The erstwhile EC was issued for an area of 7.1056 ha to Sri. Jassin Joseph, vide EC No.124/SEIAA/KL/2334/2013 dated 22.11.2013 with validity of 5 years. Sri. Jassin Joseph handed over the quarry project to Sri. M.A. Ashraf. Subsequently, the SEIAA transferred the EC to Sri. M.A. Ashraf Managing Partner, M/s Ferro Granites LLP and Infra Granites LLP, Karad P.O, Kondotty, Malappuram as EC No. 3423/EC1/2015/SEIAA dated 28.01.2016.

The Authority noticed that the field inspection was held on 17.12.2018 and based on the report, the 90th meeting of SEAC sought two additional details. The Project Proponent submitted the details on 02.02.2019 and the SEAC in its 94th meeting recommended the EC. The 90th meeting of SEIAA decided to issue extension of EC for an area of 3.0757 ha for 5 years and the EC was issued to M/s Infra Granites vide order dated 03.04.2019.

Subsequently, as per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 28265 of 2020, the 119th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the project for revalidation and as per the decision of the Committee, a field inspection was carried out on 15.7.2021. The 127th meeting of the SEIAA directed the Project Proponent to upload the application and details in Parivesh 2 Portal vide letter dated 2.9.2023 and 19.8.2024 and the Project Proponent uploaded the application on 26.9.2024.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meeting held on different dates. The SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 6 and the details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the original mine plan approved on 20.4.2018, the mineable reserve was 12,70,705 MT which was revised to 8,88,775 MT in the Scheme of Mine approved on 22.4.2024. The balance mineable resource available as per the Scheme of Mine is 5,76,275 MT as on 22.4.2024 for mine life of 5.76 years. The cluster certificate dated 5.6.2024 does not indicate cluster conditions.

After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend revalidation of EC for 6 years with effect from 22.4.2024 (the date on which the resource availability and mine life was estimated) subject to submission of the NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024 and the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 174rd SEAC meeting and decided to extend the validity Environmental Clearance with effect from 22.4.2024 for a period of 6 years subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Scheme of Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*

2. *The EC shall be valid with effect from 22.4.2024 i.e., from the date on which the resource availability and mine life was estimated by the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. **All the specific conditions stipulated in the original EC shall be part of this EC as well.**
5. **The mining shall not intercept the ground water regime of the area and maximum depth of mining should be limited to 25m AMSL as proposed.**
6. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
7. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
8. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
9. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
10. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
11. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*

12. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
13. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
14. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
15. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
16. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
17. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
19. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
20. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
21. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*

22. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
23. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.
24. 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.
25. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
26. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble 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.
27. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

28. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.24 **ToR application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Jovin George, for an area of 4.5180 Ha at Re-Sy No. 275/1A in Thripangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/498385/2024)

Mr. Jovin George, Madathina mattathil House, Palisseri, Thalassery P.O., Kannur District, Kerala – 670101, submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 4.5180 hectares in Re-Sy No. 275/1A, Thripangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District.

The Authority perused ToR proposal and noted the decisions of 173th SEAC meeting. The total mineable reserve reported is 32,12,325 MT. The life of mine proposed is 11 years. As per the contour plan, the highest elevation of the lease area is 450 m MSL and lowest is 350 m MSL. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 29.08.2024, there is another quarry for an area of 3.7556 Ha within 500m radius owned by the same Project Proponent. Altogether the area comes to more than 5 Ha. As per the PFR the project cost is given by Rs. 10.745 Crores. The nearest habitation is located at a distance of 157 m from the site. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 173rd meeting recommended Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 2 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Impact on the hydrology of the watershed in which the site is located and mitigation measures to conserve and enhance the natural resources in the watershed

2. Landslide susceptibility of the area considering the slope characteristics, soil thickness, drainage aspects and structural characteristics.

Item No.25

**TOR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry of M/s. Chengalathu Quarry Industry Private Limited for an area of 8.0029 Ha at Sy Nos. 575/1-3-8-2-1, 575/1-3-19-1, 575/1-3-19-2, 575/1-3-19, 575/1-3-20, 575/1-3-18, 575/1-3-7, 581/1-5-7, 575/1-3-6-2, 575/3-6-1-86, 575/1-36, 575/1-3-8-2-84, 575/3-8-2, 575/1-8-10, 575/3-8-4-40, 575/3-8-4, 575/3-6-1, 575/1-3-8-2 in Konnithazham Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta
(SIA/KL/MIN/477104/2024)**

Sri Thomas Mathew, M/s. Chengalathu Quarry Industry Pvt. Ltd submitted an application for TOR for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry project for an area of 8.0029 Ha at Survey Nos. 575/1-3-8-2-1, 575/1-3-19-1, 575/1-3-19-2, 575/1-3-19, 575/1-3-20, 575/1-3-18, 575/1-3-7, 581/1-5-7, 575/1-3-6-2, 575/3-6-1-86, 575/1-36, 575/1-3-8-2-84, 575/3-8-2, 575/1-8-10, 575/3-8-4-40, 575/3-8-4, 575/3-6-1, 575/1-3-8-2 in Konnithazham Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority perused ToR proposal and noted the decisions of 174th SEAC meeting. The total mineable reserve is 22,50,800 MT and the life of mine is 10 years. The elevation of the lease area varies between 230m to 90m AMSL. The site falls under the medium hazard zone and the high hazard zone is located at a distance of 4.74km from the proposed site. The Project Proponent has obtained NOC from the District level Crisis Management Group, issued on 08.11.2023. The project cost is 800 Lakhs. The Cluster Certificate dated 07.06.2024, states that there are 3 quarries within a 500m radius with total area more than 5 Ha. The EIA study should address the environmental impacts due to all the quarries within the cluster and its mitigation measures. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 4 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Impact on the hydrological regime of the impact zone.
2. Impact on nearby built structures.

3. Comprehensive traffic study considering all the mines in the impact zone.
4. Comprehensive EMP as per the guidelines of the SEIAA published on the website

Item No.26

ToR applciatoin for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Saji K Elias, Managing Director, M/s Factum Granites Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 0.6377 ha at Re-Sy Nos: 35/23, 35/6, Erimayur-1 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/476534/2024)

Sri. Saji K Elias, Managing Director, M/s Factum Granites Pvt. Ltd, Chenoth Kuzhikandathil House, Thiruvaniyoor PO, Ernakulam, Kerala, 682308 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.6377 Ha at Re-Survey Nos.- 35/23, 35/6, Erimayur-1 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused ToR proposal and noted the decisions of 174th SEAC meeting. The proposed production capacity is 1,21,323 MT for a mine life of 3 Years. The highest elevation of the area is 102 m RL and the lowest elevation is 85 m RL. The cluster certificate dated 23.03.2024, indicates that the total area of quarries within the 500m radius of the proposed site is more than 5 Ha. The Committee noted that the proposed area is relatively smaller (0.6377 ha) and the environmental feasibility of mining will be very limited. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 3 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Impact on nearby built structures.
2. Comprehensive traffic study considering all the mines in the impact zone.
3. Comprehensive EMP as per the guidelines of the SEIAA published on the website

Item No.27

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Manoj. K for an area of 0.6565 Ha at Sy No. 98/2-6 in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/491628/2024)

Sri. Manoj K, Proprietor, Mukkatta, Nilambur (RS) P.O, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.6565 Ha at Survey No. 98/2-6 in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of the 174th SEAC meeting. As per the cluster certificate dated 30.07.2024 there are four authorised quarry projects for a total area of 13.3092 Ha. The cluster condition necessitates an EIA study and public hearing. The project area is only 0.6565 Ha where there are environmental limitations for mining as proposed. The SEAC had observed that the Mining plan is not legible and many of the essential details for appraisal are not submitted. Hence, the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend rejection of the application.

Under these circumstances, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the necessary proceedings accordingly, explaining the reasons for rejection.

Item No.28

ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri Nazar for an area of 0.9463 Ha at Sy Nos. 173/4-24 (Part) & 173/4-26 (Part) of Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/500088/2024)

Sri. Nazar, Vilayil Veedu, Avanavanchery, Attingal P.O, Thiruvananthapuram, submitted an application for ToR for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.9463 Ha at Survey Nos. 173/4-24 (Part) & 173/4-26 (Part) in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of the 174th SEAC meeting. The mineable reserve is 1,48,987.5 MT and the life of mine is 3 years. The elevation of the proposed area varies from 101m to 131m AMSL. The estimated project cost is estimated project cost is Rs. 94 lakhs. As per the cluster certificate dated 29.07.2024, there is one

working quarry within a 500m radius with an area of 1.8109 Ha. However, a proposal with site adjacent to the proposed site is under the appraisal of SEAC altogether making a cluster condition. The Committee observed that the mining proposed up to the depth 35m AMSL is not environmentally feasible. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 174th meeting recommend Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with 3 additional studies.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional studies:

1. Impact on nearby built structures.
2. Comprehensive traffic study considering all the mines in the impact zone.
3. Comprehensive EMP as per the guidelines of the SEIAA published on the website

General Decisions

1. Delay in issuance of EC for want of NOC from Irrigation Officer

The Authority noticed that even after the decision to issue the EC for the mining projects, a considerable number of applications are pending in the PARIVESH Portal with a status 'Awaiting EC' and is also reflected in the pending status. The Authority noticed that as per the Judgement in WP(C) Nos. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024, dated 19.04.2024, the Hon'ble High Court directed that “....no person shall, without the written permission of the Irrigation Officer conduct mining or quarrying operation using explosives within a radius of 1 km of any bridge, dam, check dam or any other works, structure or construction owned, controlled or maintained by the Government, a local authority or any other authority.” Authority decided to issue EC subject to the production of NOC from the Irrigation Officer in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003.

The Authority observed that there is considerable delay for the production of NOC by the project proponent which in turn leads to the pendency of application, even after completing all the appraisal procedures. In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. The proposals, which are pending for more than 1 month after the final decision, the EC shall be issued subject to the condition that “*The Mining and Geology Department shall issue permit / lease only after the production of the NOC from the Irrigation Officer in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003*”. The copy of the EC shall be forwarded to the Mining and Geology Department with a covering letter intimating the above decision.
2. The project proponent shall submit the copy of the NOC with the first Half Yearly Compliance Report.
3. All those proposals which are under various stages of appraisal, the project proponent shall submit the NOC from the Irrigation Officer in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 along with the additional documents.
4. In the case of fresh proposals, the project proponent shall submit the NOC as a mandatory document along with other documents.

2. Non-compliance / timely compliance of directions of Authority for filing Review / Appeal Petitions

The Authority noticed that a few cases in which the directions of Hon'ble Single Bench are against the directions of the Hon'ble NGT, the existing norms and decisions of the Authority. This is adversely affecting the environment in the project region and the EC holders are taking it as an opportunity to violate EC condition with utter disregard to existing rules, regulations and decisions of the Authority. Even though the Authority had decided to file a Review / Appeal petition against those judgements and forwarded instructions to the Standing Counsel for the same, the Authority is unaware of the further action taken in those matters. In these circumstances, the Authority decided to request the Standing Counsel to take necessary time-bound action in all such cases. The Legal Officer should provide regular updates on the status of all such cases as a separate agenda before the Authority every month.

Sd/-
Dr H Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd)
Chairman, SEIAA

Sd/-
Sri K Krishna Panicker
Expert Member, SEIAA

Sd/-
Dr Rathan U. Kelkar IAS
Member Secretary, SEIAA