

# **MINUTES OF THE 127<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA, HELD ON 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023**

## **Present:**

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

The 127<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA, Kerala was held on 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023 at the Conference Hall, SEIAA, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram in hybrid mode. The meeting started at 10.30 AM on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2023. Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu, Chairman, SEIAA Kerala chaired the meeting. Dr. Venu V. IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA and Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA attended the meeting. The Authority considered the agenda for the 127<sup>th</sup> meeting and took the following decisions:

## **Physical Files**

**Item No.127.01**      **Minutes of the 126<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2023**

Noted

**Item No.127.02**      **Action Taken Report on 125<sup>th</sup> & 126<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> March 2023 and 126<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2023**

Noted

**Item No.127.03**

**Application for Environment Clearance for the Quarry project of M/s Shanio Metal Crushing Unit at Sy. Nos. 160/4, 160/5, 161/7, 161/8-1, 161/8-2, 161/8-5, 160/1, 160/1-1, 160/1-2, 160/1-3, 160/1-4, 160/2, 160/6, 160/3 and 160/7 in Thottappuzhessery Village, Thottappuzhessery Panchayat, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta (File No. 75/SEIAA/KL/170/2013)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of SEIAA in 125<sup>th</sup> meeting, the observations of 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting, the request of Project Proponent dated 05.05.2023 and the reply from Environmental Engineer, KSPCB Pathanamthitta. As per the 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the SEAC requested SEIAA to direct the project proponent to get a damage assessment report done by a NABET Accredited Agency and submit a report within 3 months for verification and evaluation of SEAC. The Environmental Engineer, KSPCB intimated that since the Project Proponent has the valid lease upto 01.04.2024 and hence he issued Consent to Operate after the expiry of EC on 30.10.2018. The Authority noted that the action of the KSPCB is illegal and observed that as per Judgement of H'ble Apex Court and NGT, prior Environmental Clearance is mandatory for all mining projects irrespective of the area, from 15.01.2016 onwards.

**Under this circumstance, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent has to submit the explanation for Showcause Notice within one month from the date of approval of these minutes.
2. The Project Proponent shall submit a detailed Damage Assessment Report due to the illegal mining continuing from 30.10.2018 by a NABET Accredited Agency within a period of 3 months.
3. On receipt of the report, the SEAC shall verify and assess the damages and the environment compensation for the same.
4. The Project Proponent shall remit the commensation amount to the Environment Benfit Fund created in the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change. Suitable reply letter shall be given to the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB Pathanamthitta citing the reasons for non-acceptance of his explanation based on existing norms and court directions with copy to the Member Secretary, KSPCB, Thiruvananthapuram.

5. Inform the Director, Mining & Geology Department that his decision to allow the mine to function after 15-01-2016 without prior environmental clearance was against the Judgement of H'ble Apex Court and NGT making prior Environmental Clearance mandatory for all mining projects irrespective of the area, from 15.01.2016 onwards. ( Letter no 12617/M3 /2018 dated 12-01-2018 addressed to the District Geologist, Pathanamthitta)
6. The SEIAA Secretriare shall comply with the all the directions as per the 125<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting.

**Item No.127.04**      **Application for Revalidation of EC for the proposed Quarry Project of Sri. Biju, Managing Partner, M/s Sahara Granites at Re-Sy No. 35/3, 35/2 part, 41 part in Erimayur-1 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala (File No. 146/SEIAA/KL/2747/2013)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted its previous decisions in various meetings, minutes of the 136<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting in which the project proposal was recommended for revalidation for a project period of 7 years from the date of orginal EC, the direction of the H'ble High Court in WP(C)No. 27299 /2019 and the hearing note submitted the Project Proponent. The Authority observed that the Project Proponent has continued the quarrying operation without obtaining NBWL clearance, which is in violation of exiting norms. Besides, the Project Proponent has submitted the application for Wildlife Clearance only on 01.03.2021.

**In this circumstance the Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent shall submit a detailed Environmental Damage Assessment Report due to quarry operation without obtaining NBWL Clearance and non compliance of NBWL conditions for operating quarry within 10 km radius of Choolannur Pea Fowl WLS by a NABET Accredited Agency within a period of 3 months.
2. On receipt of the report, the SEAC shall verify and assess the damages and the environment compensation for the same.
3. The Project Proponent shall remit the commensation amount to the Environment Benfit Fund created in the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change. Is it operative if not he should deposit the same in KSPCB.

4. The recommendation of the SEAC in its 136<sup>th</sup> meeting shall be considered after completion of the procedures in the decisions 1 to 3 above.

**Item No.127.05**      **Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Shamsudheen. M.P, M/s. Darkstone Land Developers Pvt. Ltd at Sy. No. 1/1 (pt) in Ottappalam Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala – Crl. M.C. No. 1232 of 2021 - Judgement dated 1.12.2020 in WP (C) No.26042 of 2020 regarding revalidation of EC (File No. 705/SEIAA/KL/5657/2014)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the complaint from Sri. P. Parameswaran dated 19.04.2023. The Authority noted that the EC was issued by appraising all the environment aspects, field inspection and by considering the complaints received during the time of appraisal. Hence, the Authority decided to forward a copy of the complaint to Department of Mining and Geology, Kerala State Pollution Control Board and District Administration to assess the EC compliance status / norms as per KMMCR, 2015 and to take necessary corrective measures if required under intimation to SEIAA for follow up.

**Item No.127.06**      **Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District  
SIA/KL/MIS/52532/2019; 1555/EC1/2019/SEIAA**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of the letter from the Member Secretary, KSPCB regarding clarification for the requirement of separate EC for individual projects enclosing the complaint from Sri. K. J.Chacko. Authority noted that as per the existing norms if the EC was issued for a Scheduled Activity under 7(c) Industrial Estates / Parks/Complexes/Areas, EPZs, SEZs, Biotech Park, Leather Complexes, etc shall not require separate EC for individual projects, if all such activities / projects covered under the EC. If there is a change in the approved master plan / approved activity, separate EC for such activity / projects is required.

**Item No.127.07**      **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance to Mr. Arun Varghese, Managing Partner, M/s Tasna Mines for the proposed Building stone quarry project at, Re-Sy No. 76/8, 77/1, 77/2, 78/6, 97/1, 97/2 in Mancode Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam, Kerala**

**(File.No.1201/EC2/ 2018/ SEIAA)**

Authority noted that as per the Judgement dated 30-09-2022 in Appeal No 21/2020 and Appeal No 22/2020, National Green Tribunal (SZ) ordered that

- i) Regarding the period of environmental clearance as has been directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala also, we feel that till that the decision is taken by the State Expert Appraisal Committee and State Environment Impact Assessment Authority –Kerala, the environmental clearance can be suspended for that purpose till that period especially the 7th respondent had mined excess quantity and penalty was imposed by the Mining Department
- ii) The State Environment Impact Assessment Authority -Kerala can also consider the question as to whether any action to be taken against the 7th respondent for the violations noted by the Joint Committee in the report which was extracted above after following the procedure provided under the EIA Notification 2006 by giving an opportunity to the 7th respondent and take appropriate action against them in accordance with law
- iii) The State Environment Impact Assessment Authority –Kerala is directed to refer the matter to State Expert Appraisal Committee to consider the question of validity of the environmental clearance period, the quantum of mining that can be carried out applying the „Precautionary Principle“ the terrain of the area and the availability of mining articles and impact of mining on environment and then take appropriate decision in this regard and make appropriate recommendation to State Environment Impact Assessment Authority – Kerala and on that basis, State Environment Impact Assessment Authority –Kerala is directed to pass appropriate directions in accordance with law. The entire exercise of quantifying the validity period of the environmental clearance and quantum of building stone can be quarried and further conditions, if any, to be issued had to be completed by State Environment Impact Assessment Authority –Kerala and State Expert Appraisal Committee within the period of four (4) months from the date of receipt of this Judgment.
- iv) The Mining Department is directed to assess the environmental compensation for excess mining based on the directions issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Common cause Vs. Union of India (2017) 9 SCC 499 and also the directions

issued by the Principal Bench of National Green Tribunal in O.A. No. 360 of 2015 and other connected cases by order dated 26.02.2021 besides the royalty, fine and value already collected as per the mining law.

Now Tasna Mines vide their letter dated 17/5 2023 had informed that they had paid Rs 30,62,899/- to Kerala State Pollution Control Board towards environmental compensation for excess mining as ordered by the National Greens Tribunal (SZ). This was confirmed by the Kerala State Pollution Control Board.

**The Authority discussed the matter in detail and decided the following:**

A) SEAC may examine the question as to whether any action to be taken against the M/S Tasna Mines for the violations noted by the Joint Committee appointed by the NGT (SZ) after following the procedure provided under the EIA Notification 2006 by giving an opportunity to the Project Proponent of M/S Tasna Mines and recommend appropriate action against them in accordance with law.

B) SEAC to consider the question of validity of the environmental clearance period, the quantum of mining that can be carried out applying the “Precautionary Principle”, the terrain of the area and the availability of mining articles and impact of mining on environment and make appropriate recommendation.

C) SEAC has to complete the process within one month as the period given by National Green Tribunal (SZ) has already come to an end.

**Item No.127.08**      **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Binoj K Baby for an area of 0.7905 Ha in Re-Sy. Nos. 399/1, 399/15 & 399/18 Padichira Village, Sulthan Bathery Taluk, Wayanad, Kerala.**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/133893/2019; 1788/E2/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/ SEIAA meetings and the Judgment in WP (C) No. 26010/2022 dated 12.08.2022 filed by Sri. Binoj K Baby, Managing Partner, Pulpally Stone Crushers. The Authority noted that the proposal was rejected on 18.11.2022 due to the presence of a built structure (31m) within 50m from the proposed area after providing an opportunity to the project proponent for hearing and providing the hearing note.

The Hon'ble High Court in its judgment dated 22.03.2023 in WP(C) 38004/2022 directed 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, SEIAA to reconsider the question of grant of EC to the petitioner, taking specific note of the contention that the building in question is used only as a site office and will not use for any residential purpose. The Hon'ble Court ordered to consider the Exts. P15 – P17 (EC No. EC22B001KL173817, EC No. EC22B001KL170297 and EC No. 34/Q/2021) and issue orders after considering the undertaking given by the petitioner within 3 months from the date of receipt of the copy of the Judgment.

**In the above circumstances, considering the order of the Hon'ble High Court, the Authority decided the following:**

1. Agreed to consider the request of the project proponent subject to the condition that the built structure shall not be used for residential purposes and he will be responsible any damage to life and property.
2. The SEAC shall re-appraise the application of the project proponent as directed by the Hon'ble Court and recommend with specific conditions in the next meeting.

**Item No.127.09      Complaint received from RQP Sri. Reghunadh K., against the misuse of his RQP Certificate and Signature  
(File No: 2230/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority verified the item and noted the contents of the hearing note submitted by the Project Proponents, Sri. Mathew and Sri. Mahesh and the RQP Sri. Reghunath. Authority is convinced that there was grave irregularity in preparing mining plans.

**Authority after deliberation decided the following:**

1. The ECs issued for the following proposals based on erroneous mining plan shall be canceled with immediate effect.
  - a. Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/229543/2021;  
File No: 2018/EC3/2022/SEIAA
  - b. Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/229745/2021;  
File No: 2017/EC3/2022/SEIAA
  - c. Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/229743/2021;  
File No: 2016/EC3/2022/SEIAA

2. Intimate Mining and Geology Department to take action against Sri. Reghunath, RQP for the lapses on his part which lead to manipulation.
3. Project Proponents had informed that some middle men are working in this field and misguiding the Project Proponents. Authority noted this seriously and decided to inform the Director, Mining & Geology Department to ensure that only Project Proponents and RQP/NABET accredited Consultants shall approach the department and carry out the field work. Intervention of other persons in the process of approval of mining plan must be discouraged at any cost and an advisory in this direction shall be issued to all District Geologists.
4. The project proponents have the liberty to apply for fresh EC with valid mining plans.

**Item No.127.10      Environmental Clearance for Building Stone Quarry Project in Survey No.59/1-1, 86/4 in Block No. 79 in Koottikkal village, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam District (SIA/KL/MIN/60903/2019; 2438/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and observed that the project proponent has submitted an EC application for an area of 6.8976Ha which was rejected by the earlier SEIAA as the proposed area is in an ESA village. Now the project proponent submitted this application for an area of 1.5657 ha and the appraisal of the same was stopped by the SEAC due to the above reason. The Authority in its 124<sup>th</sup> meeting decided to refer the case back to SEAC for appraisal as per the decision of its 123rd meeting (Item No. 123.29). The Authority also noted the complaint received against the project.

Now from the letter of the Secretary, Koottickkal Grama Panchayath requesting a clarification to stop the quarrying activities of the project due to complaints, it is understood that the project proponent is continuing the quarrying activities without getting prior EC, which is a violation of the EIA Notification 2006, and the directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court and the NGT.

**In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent has committed serious violation of EIA Notification, 2006, EPA, 1986 and KMMC Rules and Regulations and carried out illegal mining with out prior EC. A show Cause Notice in this regard shall be issued



to the Project Proponent for working without EC. The Project Proponent should submit his explanation within 15 days from the date of receipt of the Notice.

2. Also decided to invite the Project Proponent and Consultant for hearing in the next SEIAA meeting. They should give details of present status of quarry.

**Item No.127.11**      **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Mining Project of Sri. T.C. Johnson, Managing Partner, M/s Star Rock Products Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 0.9995 Ha in Re-Sy Nos. 50/4, 52/2/2, at Ayyampuzha Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/40283/2019; 1457/EC3/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/ SEIAA meetings, the explanation of the project proponent regarding the non-closure of the adjacent quarry, and the letter from the Mining and Geology Department dated 09.03.2023. From the letter of Mining and Geology Department, the Authority observed that the project proponent has not submitted the mine closure plan for the adjacent quarry owned by him.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. Inform the project to complete the mine closure as per the mine closure plan approved by the Mining and Geology Department and submit a certificate regarding the completion of the closure activities from the M& G Department.
2. The recommendation of the 132<sup>nd</sup> SEAC shall be considered after getting the above certificate from the M& G Department.

**Item No.127.12**      **EC issued to M/s Prestige Hill Side Gate Way-Thrikkakara Municipality - Complaint received from Link Valley Association against M/s Prestige Hill Side Gate Way project - EC issued**  
**(File No. 588/SEIAA/KL/4504/2014)**

The Authority verified the proposal along with the complaint filed by Link Valley Association and observed that the Environmental Clearance was issued to Shri. Thankachan Thomas, Sr. Vice President, M/s Prestige Hill Side Gate Way for the Township and area development project in Sy. Nos. 671/1, 674/1, 675/4 at Kakkanad village, Kanayannoor taluk,

Ernakulam District with EC No. 14/2017, on 30-01-2017. The validity of the project expires on 29-01-2024.

The Authority noted that the complaint received from the complainant was forwarded to District Collector, Ernakulam on 06-01-2022. In the complaint it is stated that the project proponent has violated the EC conditions. In this circumstances the Authority decided to refer the proposal with complaint to the SEAC to assess the violation of the EC conditions and report. The SEAC shall conduct field verification with prior intimation to the complainant and the KSPCB. The Authority also noted that the Complainants have filed an Original Application 17 of 2023, in which the SEIAA is the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and the Counter Affidavit to defend the NGT O.A. was forwarded to the Standing Counsel on 06.05.2023.

**Item No.127.13**      **Application for the Environmental Clearance of Expansion of the Building Project, M/s Adlux Medicity & Convention Centre Pvt. Ltd, at Karukutty Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala (Older EC issued File No. 1186/A2/2018/SEIAA) (Expansion Project Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIS/273775/2022; File No: 2109/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC/ SEIAA meetings and the field verification report of the Sub-Committee of SEAC and the letter from MoEF & CC dated 31.01.2023 enclosing the complaint. The Authority observed that the project proponent has not submitted the additional documents sought as per the 138<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting. Besides, the project proponent also not implemented the activities approved as per the Remediation Plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan even after the prescribed period of completion.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The project proponent has to implement the activities approved as per the Remediation Plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan.
2. The project proponent shall submit the progress report from the Monitoring Committee for the implementation of the Remediation Plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan.
3. The project proponent shall submit all the additional documents sought by the SEAC as part of the appraisal.

4. On receipt of the same, the SEAC shall appraise the application for the expansion of the project.
5. His request for downsizing the community resource Augmentation plan will be considered after producing the details sought by SEAC

**Item No.127.14**      **Application for Residential Building Project – Kent Mahal of M/s. Kent Constructions Pvt. Ltd., in Sy. Nos. 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 & 141/8 of Puthencruz Village, Vadavucode Puthencruz Grama Panchayat, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.**  
**(File No. 99/SEIAA/EC3/1481/2013)**  
**(SIA/KL/NCP/57270/2020; 1890/EC3/2019/ SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated and noted the contents of the hearing note submitted by the project proponent dated 24.05.2023. The Authority noted that the validity of the ToR for violation issued by the MoEFCC on 26.06.2018 has already-expired and hence the project proponent must submit a fresh ToR for violation cases as per SoP dated 07.07.2021 of MoEFCC. In the meantime, the KSPCB/Project Proponent must complete the other violation procedures as detailed in the TOR given MoEFCC on 26.06.2018. The Authority also decided to seek clarification from the Municipality for issuing Permit / Occupancy Certificate for the project without valid prior EC.

**Item No.127.15**      **Environmental clearance for the quarry proposed quarry project in Sy. No. 431 at Vayakkara Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala by Sri. T. P. Abdul Basheer (Judgment in WP (C) No. 4804/2021 filed by T. P. Abdul Basheer- regarding the validity of EC).**  
**(File No.817/EC4/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the contents of the letter from Secretary, Cherupuzha Grama Panchayat, Kannur dated 02.05.2023 and the Judgement dated 04.11.2022 in WP(C) No. 35384/2022 directing Geologist to issue transit pass under Rule 26 of Kerala Minerals (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Storage and Transportation) Rules, 2015 extending the benefit of S.O. 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022 of MoEFCC. The Authority observed that the EC for the present project was issued by DEIAA, Kannur and as per the O.M dated 28.04. 2023, all the ECs issued by the DEIAAs between 15.01.2016 to 13.09.2018 shall be reappraised by the concerned SEACs and all fresh ECs in this regard shall be granted

only by SEIAAs based on such appraisal and hence the provisions of S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022 can not be made applicable for this project.

**The Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent has to submit fresh EC application in Parivesh Portal by including all the documents mentioned in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023.
2. Intimate the Secretary, Cherupuzha Grama Panchyat regarding the decision of the Authority.

**Item No.127.16**      **Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Sreelath T, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project, at Re-Sy. Block No.7, Re.Sy. No.93/27 in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala- Judgment dated 19.12.2022 in WP(C) No. 34050/2022. (SIA/KL/MIN/271936/2022 1995/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority decided to deferred the item.

**Item No.127.17**      **Environmental Clearance issued to M/s Sobha Highrise Ventures Private Limited for the construction of multistoried residential and commercial buildings at Re Survey No. 174/14-1 (Old Sy. No. 180/P, 181/1P, 182/2P), Ollur Village, Thrissur Taluk & Thrissur District, Kerala – Request for the removal of excavated soil from the project site – reg:- (File No. 1188(A)/A2/2018/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of the 141<sup>st</sup> meeting of SEAC regarding the recommendation to amend Clause 5 Specific Condition of Construction Phase of the EC issued to the project. The Authority agreed with the recommendation of SEAC and decided to amend Clause 5 of the Specific Condition of Construction Phase that “the excess topsoil after meeting the requirement for Horticulture/Landscape development within the project site may be removed from the site with a condition that it should not be used to reclaim any wetland areas and it should not be deposited in any environmentally sensitive areas and the transportation shall be carried out with the valid permits issued by dept. of mining and Geology”. Necessary addendum shall be issued from the SEIAA Secretariate.

**Item No.127.18**      **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Asees Kadakkadan for an area of 0.5827 Ha in Sy.No. 458/2, 3 of Ponmala Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram, Kerala**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/194573/2021; 1889/EC6/2021/SEIAA)**

The proposal was considered in the 135th meeting of SEAC. The committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 03/10/2022 as per the 129th SEAC meeting in detail and found that there is a house at 38 m from the proposed site. So, the committee decided to recommend rejecting the proposal as per the existing norms. The proposal was placed in the 122nd meeting of SEIAA held on 7th January 2023. Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection. Rejection Order dated 15.02.2023 was issued to the proponent quoting the reasons for decision.

The proponent submitted a Letter on 09.01.2023 requesting to reconsider the decision of SEIAA to reject the proposal. The proposal was placed in the 124th meeting of SEIAA held on 27th & 28th February 2023. The Authority perused the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated 09.01.2023 to reconsider the decision of rejecting the proposal. Project Proponent submitted that the activity is to construct a safer parking ground for Grace Valley College Management. Besides, he also intimated that the building mentioned in the field inspection report at a distance of 38m is not a residential building, but it is a mini industrial shed of spices grinding unit. The Project Proponent submitted the consent from the building owner. In this circumstance, the Authority decided to refer the case to SEAC for reappraisal in the light of the request of the Project Proponent. The proposal was placed in the 141st meeting of SEAC. As per the distance norms, the proposed project area should be 50m away from the nearest built structure. The Committee verified the consent and found that it is not adequate to review the decision of the previous SEAC.

The Authority deliberated the item with the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings and the letter submitted by the project proponent dated 09.01.2023. The Authority noted that the SEAC decided to recommend to reject the proposal due to the presence of a built structure at 38m from the proposed site. Now the project proponent has submitted the consent of owner of the built structure. In a similar case Honourable High Court in its Judgment in WP (C) No. 26010/2022 dated 12.08.2022 has directed SEIAA to reconsider the decision of SEIAA and SEIAA has considered the same.

**Under the circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the undertaking of the Project Proponent and to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (one) year, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The building at the distance of 38m shall not be used for residential purpose and he shall be responsible for any damage to life and property.*
- 4. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting and preventive measures to protect nearby structure from dust pollution shall be adopted.*
- 5. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the ground water 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 useful purpose.*
- 8. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishaps.*
- 9. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of 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 excavation of earth.*
- 11. Workers/labourers 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 proposed excavation.*

13. *A minimum distance of 15m 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 as per norms.*
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 pm).*
19. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> 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 violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.127.19**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri.Micheal T.T in Survey No.294, 285, 103 in Mupliyam Village, Chalakudi Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala.  
(File No. 1240/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings. The Authority observed that the project proposal was rejected by SEIAA in its 122<sup>nd</sup> meeting and the rejection order was issued on 15.02.2023 as per the recommendation of the SEAC for the reasons detailed in the minutes of 135<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC. The Authority observed that the rejection order was issued not only on the basis of the presence of a built structure within 50m, but also for 7 another valid reasons. In these circumstances, the Authority agreed with the decision of the 145<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC and decided to reject the proposal as there are no adequate/additional reason for the review of previous decision.

**Item No.127.20**      **Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Thrissur for the quarry project in Sy.No.53/2 of Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District – Judgment dated 24.11.2020 in WP(C) No.25848 of 2020- Revalidation of EC- reg :-  
(1028/EC6/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 141<sup>st</sup> SEAC, the complaint received from Sri. Jimmy Dominic and the O.M of MoEFCC dated 28.04.2023. The Authority observed that the EC for the present project was issued by DEIAA, Thrissur and as per the O.M dated 28.04. 2023, all the ECs issued by the DEIAAs between 15.01.2016 to 13.09.2018 shall be reappraised by the concerned SEACs and all fresh ECs in this regard shall be granted only by SEIAAs based on such appraisal.

**In this cirucustances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent has to submit fresh EC application in Parivesh Portal by including all the documents mentioned in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023.
2. The SEAC shall reappraise the project and recommend / reject with specific reasons, once the application is received from the project proponent.



**Item No.127.21**      **Environmental Clearance to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri.P.M.Abdul Shukkur, Managing Director, M/s. PMR Granites India Private Limited for an area of 5.5373 Ha at Sy.Nos.200/1, 202/1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Block No.27 in Oorgattiri Village and Panchayath, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.**  
**(File No.112/SEIAA/KL/1930/2013)**

The Authority deliberated the item and observed that EC was issued on 22.11.2013 for the period of 18 years, with an annual production of 333000 MT. The validity of the EC will expire on 21.11.2031. The earlier lease was issued by Mining and Geology Department by restricting the annual production to 90000 MT. Now, as per the Judgement dated 21.12.2021 in WP(C) No.28987/2021, the lease issued on 03.03.2023 for an annual production of 200000 MT, which is well within the approved production as per the issued EC. The Authority noted the same.

**Item No.127.22**      **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey No. 163 (Block No.22),2/2-2,2/4-3,2/4-2,3/1-2,2/3,2/2-3,2/4-4,2/4-5 (Block No.27) in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr. K.V. Moideenkoya, M/s Kallarattikkal Granites**  
**(File No. 1230/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the prayer in WP(C) No. 10825/2023 and the hearing note received on 29.03.2023. The Authority observed that the project proposal was rejected by SEIAA in its 122<sup>nd</sup> meeting and the rejection order was issued on 15.02.2023 as per the recommendation of the SEAC. The Authority observed that the rejection order was issued by considering all the aspects and also by hearing the project proponent. Under the circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere with its earlier decision since there is no adequate reason to review the same.

**Item No.127.23**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Mr. C. Firos Babu for an area of 4.3520 Hectare in Survey No 201, 202, 203, 214, 215, 216/1 & 218 in Thiruvilwamala Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala.**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/43559/2019; 1483/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the the decision of the earlier meetings of SEAC and SEIAA and the letter from the Wildlife Warden, Peechi Wildlife Division dated 01.03.2023. In the letter of the Wildlife Warden, it is stated that “the project is located at 0.84 km away from Chulannur Peafowl Sanctuary. Since it is positioned below 1 km from the boundary the mining proposal may be rejected. The minimum distance of the unit from the boundary of the proposed ESZ is also 0.84 km from the north west boundary of ESZ”. The Authority observed that as per the Judgement of the Apex Court, mining within a distance of 1km from the boundary of the National Parks / Wildlife Sanctuaries is a prohibited activity. The Authority also noted that the project proponent has not submitted the documents regarding the distance from the Wildlife Sanctuary till date.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The decision of the 136<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC shall not be accepted, since the project area is within one kilometre from the boundary of the Choolanoor Peafowl Sanctuary.
2. A final decision shall be taken after hearing the project proponent in the next SEIAA meeting. The project proponent has to attend the hearing with all supporting documents.
3. Necessary prior intimation shall be issued to the project proponent in this regard.

**Item No.127.24**      **Environmental Clearance for the Quarry Project of Sri. Shibu Pynadath John, Managing Director, M/s Pynadath Granite Pvt. Ltd. in Sy. Nos. 2066/1, 2067/2, 2063, 2057, 2056/2, 3 and 2067/1 at Kuttichira Village, Kodassery Panchayath, Chalakkudy Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala – Judgment dated 18.11.2020 in WP(C) No.24278 of 2020 - Revalidation of EC.**

**(File No. 606/SEIAA/ EC1/4633/2014)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of the earlier meetings of SEAC and SEIAA, the letter submitted by the project proponent dated 09.05.2023 and the letter of the District Collector, Thrissur dated 27.02.2023. The Authority observed that the project was recommended for revalidation of EC for a period of 11years in its 120<sup>th</sup> meeting subject to a condition that the project proponent has to submit the Certificate from the Wild Life Warden Peechi to show the distance of the quarry to the Peechi Vazhani Wildlife

Sanctuary is more than 10 KMs. As per the report from the Wildlife Warden, Peechi it is understood that the distance to Chimmony Wildlife Sanctuary is 3.5km and the project is not located within the proposed ESZ of the Sanctuary.

However, as per the letter from the District Collector it is understood that the quarrying operations were stopped as per the directions of the judgement in WP(C) No. 11249/2010 and connected cases. The Authority perused that as per the Circular No. REV-A2/18/2022-REV dated 06.10.2022, the assigned land should be used only for the purpose of cultivation or house sites beneficial enjoyment of adjoining lands or for other specific and special purposes, under the KLA Act 1960 and the Rules framed thereunder, such as the KLA rules 1964, the Special Rules for Assignment of Government Lands for Rubber Cultivation 1960 and the Arable Forest Land Assignment Rules 1970.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to reject the EC revalidation application. The intimation regarding the rejection shall be forwarded to the Project Proponent, Mining and Geology Department, KSPCB, Thrissur and the District Authorities.**

**Item No.127.25      Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey Nos. 1 of Kannamangalam Village, Tirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram, Kerala. – Judgment dated 08.07.2021 in WP(C) No.13553 of 2021 - Revalidation of EC**  
**(File No. 1831/EC6/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 141<sup>st</sup> SEAC to revoke the Stop Memo. The Authority observed that the EC for the present project was issued by DEIAA, Malappuram and as per the O.M dated 28.04. 2023, all the ECs issued by the DEIAAs between 15.01.2016 to 13.09.2018 shall be reappraised by the concerned SEACs and all fresh ECs in this regard shall be granted only by SEIAAs based on such appraisal.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. The Project Proponent has to submit fresh EC application in Parivesh Portal by including all the documents mentioned in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 within the stipulated time, otherwise to cancel the EC.

2. The SEAC shall appraise the project and recommend / reject with specific reasons, once the application is received from the project proponent.

**Item No.127.26**      **Environmental Clearance for the quarry project of Sri. Peter M. Puravath, M/s. B.P. Associates in Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690, 691, 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p at Desamangalam Village Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala – Judgment dated 05.04.2022 in WP(C) No. 12328 of 2022 - Revalidation of EC (File No.153/SEIAA/KL/3073/2013)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the discrepancies of the documents submitted by the project proponent on 19.04.2023 for revalidation of EC. The Authority noticed the following discrepancies:

- 1) The lease was issued for an area of 4.7024 Ha and the Certificate regarding the extraction details are for the lease area only.
- 2) Instead of recent Survey Map, the Project Proponent has submitted the map certified by the Village Officer on 19.06.2013.
- 3) The copy of the Lease Order is not enclosed. Instead the Project Proponent intimate that the lease was issued by the Mining & Geology Department on 28.08.2014 upto 27.08.2024 for an area of 4.7024 Ha vide Order No.306/2014-15/9173/M3/2014.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to direct the project proponent to submit all the required documents by rectifying the discrepancies within one month, else the application will be rejected at the cost of project proponent.**

**Item No.127.27**      **Decision of the 123<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting regarding Mining Proposals in ESA Villages and applicability of NBWL Wildlife Clearances-reg. (File No. 986/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the matter and decided to relook its decision taken in its 123<sup>rd</sup> meeting regarding the NBWL Clearance for the projects within 10km radius from the National Parks / Sanctuaries in the light of the judgement of the Apex Court decision in I.A. No. 131377 of 2022 dated 26<sup>th</sup> April 2023. The Authority noticed that as per the Judgement,

in Para 50 “..... MoEFCC has issued an Office Memorandum dated 17<sup>th</sup> May 2022 which required that any activity listed in Schedule of the EIA Notification 2006, when conducted in a notified ESZs, or in the case of National Parks and Sanctuaries for which no ESZ has been finally notified, when conducted within 10 kilometres of such National Park or Sanctuary, requires the consideration and recommendation of the NBWL or its Standing Committee in addition to the Environment Clearance under the 1986 Act.....” and as per Para 66(ii)

“.....We further direct 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 17<sup>th</sup> May 2022 issued by MoEFCC.....”

As per the OM dated 17<sup>th</sup> May 2022 of forest clearance, it is mandatory to get prior clearance from the NBWL for the projects located within 10km from the boundary of the protected areas, where the final notification not yet published. The OM issued by the MoEFCC dated 08.08.2019 and 16.07.2020 also insists the procurement of Wildlife Clearance for such projects. The Authority also understood that in WP (C) No. 27299 of 2019 the H’ble High Court of Kerala directed the project proponent to submit application with necessary documents for Wildlife Clearances, and that the matter regarding the clearance from the Wildlife Board is under the consideration of Division Bench of H’ble High Court of Kerala since there is contradiction in judgements regarding the same.

Under the above circumstances as per agenda 16 Authority has decided to refer the matter to MoEFCC for clarification. In the mean time, Authority decided to direct the project proponents to submit the proof application submitted before SCNBWL for Wildlife Clearance along with the application for the EC. The project proponent should obtain the Wildlife Clearance before the commencement of the quarrying activity with special reference ESZ around National Parks and sanctuaries as per existing norms and direction of honourable Apex court. The Mining and Geology, Department has to ensure the procurement of the Wildlife Clearance before the issuance of lease / permit. The minutes of the 123<sup>rd</sup> meeting in item No. 123.30 is modified to this extent.

**Item No.127.28**

**Decision of 138<sup>th</sup> & 141<sup>st</sup> SEAC regarding presentation by RQPs  
(File No: 1098/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and decided to agree with the decision taken by the SEAC in its 138<sup>th</sup> and 141<sup>st</sup> meeting. Further the Authority noted the OM dated 18-05-2023 on verification of Consultants for preparing EIA/EMP reports. These details shall be uploaded in the Website of SEIAA.

**Item No.127.29**

**Request for exemption of Environmental Clearance for quarrying Ordinary Earth for Calicut International Airport development works - reg.  
(File No: 998/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the contents of the letter from the HoD (Civil), Calicut International Airport. The Authority noted that the proposed activity is a government sponsored project and the resurfacing of runway is an exempted activity as per the O.M. dated 12.10.2022 of MoEFCC. Under these circumstances, the Authority observed that EC is not required for the project. However, the project proponent must comply with the SoP dated 08.08.2022 regarding the burrowing of ordinary earth for linear projects. The project proponent has to manage the construction and demolition wastes as per O.M. dated 12.10.2022. They shall also comply the following:

- i) General Slope of the area from where ordinary earth is excavated will be retained.
- ii) Drainage should not be affected due to excavation.
- iii) They shall obtain all mandatory clearances from all concerned authorities for taking up activities of this nature.
- iv) Precautions shall be taken to ensure that no damage is done to the Environment in the Project region.

**Item No.127.30**

**Application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri.Abdul Nasar.P, for an area of 2.1748 Ha in Survey No.137/10-13, 137/10-15, 137/10-14, 137/10-11 in Valambur Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram  
(SIA/KL/MIN/165260/2020; 1977/EC6/2022/SEIAA)**

The 136<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting observed that the mined out area is different from the area for which EC was issued and there seems to be illegal mining and hence the Proponent seems to have violated the EC condition and KMMC rules. Therefore, the Committee decided to recommend to SEIAA to seek a report from the Mining & Geology Department on the following aspects:

1. Whether the Proponent resorted to illegal mining or not making use of the EC No. 756/SEIAA/KL/331/2015 with validity up to 29/05/2021 and extended validity up to 29/05/2022.

2. Whether the new mining plan can be used for the appraisal of the current project proposal.

The matter was considered in the 124<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting. Authority viewed the matter very seriously, and decided the following:

1) The Project Proponent has committed serious violation of KMMC rules and regulations and EC Conditions and carried out illegal mining. Show Cause Notice in this regard shall be issued to the Project Proponent as to why the EC given to him should not be cancelled for violation of EC conditions. The Project Proponent should submit his explanation within 15 days from the date of receipt of the Notice.

2) Show Cause Notice shall be issued to the RQP who prepared the Mining Plan by misrepresenting the facts and submitting the Mining Plan for the area where mining has already been done. The RQP should submit his explanation within 15 days from the receipt of the Notice as to why he should not be blacklisted by SEIAA.

3) Intimate the Director, Mining and Geology Department to take stringent action against the concerned Officials who approved and issued the mining lease / permit and the transport permit in all these years without verifying the EC.

4) Intimate the concerned Panchayat authority to verify and take action against the illegal mining.

The 125<sup>th</sup> SEIAA Meeting deliberated the item and noted the clarification submitted by the project proponent on 21.03.2023. The Authority decided that the Member, SEIAA and the Environmental Scientist will conduct a field inspection under an intimation to Department of Mining & Geology and the Project Proponent.

Sri. V K Roy who had prepared Mining Plan replied to the show cause notice that he was unaware that the proponent had done quarrying in the proposed project area on the strength of EC issued to him for another area. Further RQP informed that he was unaware

that the proponent had come with an application where mining was done after executing mining lease deed with the strength of an existing EC.

K Krishna Panicker, Member, SEIAA and Dr. Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist inspected the area on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2023 after giving notice to the project proponent and the District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, Malappuram. Sri. Abdul Nasar P, Project Proponent, R Sunil Kumar, Assistant Geologist and PV Ajeesh, Assistant Geologist were present during the field inspection.

**The Authority deliberated the item with the field inspection report conducted on 16.05.2023. The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendations of the field inspection team and decided the following:**

1. The District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, Malappuram shall be asked to furnish an explanation for continued mining in a different area using EC issued for another area.
2. District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, Malappuram shall assess the quantity of material mined out from the proposed project area and take penal action for illegal mining.
3. SEAC shall assess the environmental damages and degradation due to illegal mining. SEAC shall have the freedom to obtain the damage assessment report prepared by NABET Accredited Agency from the project proponent.
4. Director, Mining & Geology Department shall be requested to incorporate details of EC and Geo coordinates of the project area in the Quarrying Lease/Permit in future to avoid such situations.
5. The proposal submitted by the project proponent for Environmental Clearance is rejected for the reasons stated above.

**Item No.127.31**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Shareef for an area of 0.8786 Ha, Re. Sy No. 82/1-20 in Puzhakkattiri Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram  
(SIA/KL/MIN/158114/2020; 1801/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the direction of the H'ble High Court dated



02<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 in WP (C) No. 40448 of 2022. The Authority noted that the proposal was rejected by the SEIAA in its 118<sup>th</sup> meeting and the rejection order was issued on 09<sup>th</sup> November 2022. In order to comply with the direction of the H'ble High Court, the Authority decided to entrust SEAC to hear the petitioner and take appropriate decisions and recommend the same to SEIAA as per existing norms / rules considering the environmental condition of the project area.

**Item No.127.32**      **Present status of pending EC application as on 25.05.2023 - reg (File No: 2058/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority noted the present status of the pending applications and directed the SEIAA Secretariate to present the pending cases as per the format followed by the MoEFCC for reviewing the pending cases. The effort put in by SEIAA Secretariat is appreciated. .

**Item No.127.33**      **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance – Long pending Cases – Disposal – reg. (File No.1241/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and decided to dispose of the long pending cases by providing an intimation to the project proponent. The Authority also decided that all the applications pending with SEIAA for revalidation / renewal / extension, etc shall be processed through PARIVESH portal only. The project proponent has to submit the applications with all the ADS through PARIVESH Portal (ModEC) with in a period of 3 months otherwise the application will be closed at his risk and cost. The SEAC shall provide necessary seniority for appraising such applications.

**Item No.127.34**      **Environmental Clearance for the quarry project in Re.Sy.No.28/1 of Kayanna Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode District- Judgment in WP (C) 8003/2021 filed by Sri.U.T.Raveendran - regarding the validity of EC. (File No.1431/EC4/SEIAA/2021)**

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. U.T. Revendran, the project proponent attended the hearing on 30.05.2023. After hearing, the Authority directed the project proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within 7 days with necessary supporting documents to substantiate his claims. The Authority also decided to get the report from the Chairman, KSPCB on assessment and recovery of compensation for the past violations submitted by the Joint Committee constituted as per direction of Hon'ble NGT. The SEIAA Secretariat shall comply with the directions of the 125<sup>th</sup> of the SEIAA meeting.

**Item No.127.35**      **Environmental Clearance issued to the quarry project at Sy. No. 153/2, 154/Pt in Morayur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District owned by Sri. Ummer Kutty K., M/s. Morayoor Granites Pvt. Ltd. – Order of NGT in Appeal No.30 of 2020 filed by Sri. Mohammed. O**  
**(File No.1239/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. Ummer Kutty K, the project proponent and the consultant attended the hearing on 30.05.2023. After hearing, the Authority directed the project proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within 7 days with necessary supporting documents to substantiate their claims. The SEIAA Secretariat shall comply with the directions of the 125<sup>th</sup> of the SEIAA meeting.

**Item No.127.36**      **Guidelines for the submission of CER Proposals and its Appraisal by the SEAC**  
**(File: 713/A1/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of the Guidelines on CER submitted by the SEAC. The Authority agreed to the guidelines and decided to approve and publish the same on the Website of the SEIAA. The Project Proponents have to follow the guidelines for submitting the CER proposals along with the EMP of respective projects in future. The efforts put in by SEAC and others in SEIAA Secretariat is appreciated.

The Authority deliberated the O.M dated 28.04.2023 issued by the MoEFCC and observed that all the ECs issued by the DEIAAs between 15.01.2016 to 13.09.2018 shall be reappraised by the concerned SEACs and all fresh ECs in this regard shall be granted only by SEIAAs based on such appraisal.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. All the Project Proponents having valid ECs obtained from DEIAAs have to submit fresh EC application in Parivesh Portal along with all the documents mentioned in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 within the stipulated time period i.e., one year from the date of issuance of O.M.
2. Those ECs, which are not renewed within the stipulated period by SEIAA shall be stand cancelled with effect from 27.04.2024. Other statutory agencies, LSGs and Mining & Geology Department have to follow the directions in the O.M before issuing clearances / licences.
3. The provisions of S.O 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022 is not applicable for the ECs issued by DEIAA.
4. SEIAA Secretariate shall address all the district authorities to provide the EC applications with all the documents considered for the issuance of EC during the period 15.01.2016 to 13.09.2018 with in one month.
5. Intimate the Director, Mining and Geology Department regarding the directions in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023.
6. Intimate the Member Secretary, KSPCB regarding the directions in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023.
7. Intimate Standing Counsel regarding the non-applicability of the provision of S.O. No. 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022 to ECs issued from various DEIAAs.
8. SEIAA Secretariate shall publish the decision in the website of SEIAA and leading dailies both in Malayalam and English.

**Item No.127.38**      **Amendment No. S.O.1807 (E) dated 12/4/2022 in the EIA Notification S.O.1533 (E) dated 19/9/2006- Discussion- reg. (File No.1497/A1/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the S.O No. 1807 (E) dated 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and its clarification vide O.M dated 13.12.2022 along with the directions of the H'ble High Court in various cases regarding its applicability on valid ECs. The Authority noted that as per the S.O. the MoEFCC extended the validity of mining projects for the project life as laid down in the mining plan approved and renewed by the competent authority, from time to time, subject to a maximum of thirty years, whichever is earlier. Vide its O.M dated 13.12.2022 it is stated that the validity of the EC which had not expired on the date of publication of Notification, i.e., 12.04.2022, shall stand automatically extended to respectively increased validity as mentioned above. Besides the S.O. also indicated that the validity of the EC shall be counted from the date of execution of the mining lease.

Considering the various scientific factors and practices followed in the Dep. Of mining and Geology the Authority had already differentiated the Mine Life and Project Life and its implications on the environment in the project region. Accordingly Authority decided to issue EC for the period mentioned in the mine plan/ assessed by the Committee if the project life or mine life is below 5 years, and if the mine life/ project life is more than 5 years the EC is issued initially for a period of 5 years and then to extend for the project life/ mine life subject to the verification of the compliance status of the EC by the SEAC.

The matter has already been intimated to the Ministry and the Standing Counsel to defend the cases. Moreover, neither the project life nor mine life were estimated / mentioned in most of the ECs issued by the SEIAA, Kerala. Nevertheless, there are several court directions by the H'ble High Court with an interim direction to the respondents to treat the Environmental Clearance issued to the petitioner as extended for the Project Life as laid down in the Mining Plan approved. Besides, the Department of Mining and Geology and the KSPCB enquired whether licences has to be issued to the project proponents as per the provisions of the amendment or not.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. In EIA notificationas as per clause 9, the EC period for mining projects shall be project life as estimated by SEAC to a maximum of 30 years. In OM dated 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022 also, EC for mining projects shall be valid for project life as

laid down in the mining plan approved subject to maximum of 30years. OM dated 13.12 2022 is only a clarification to OM dated 12.4.22. As per this for mining projects, the automatic extension of EC period for the ECs valid as on 13.12.22 stands extended to 30 years or mine life whichever is less subject to certain conditions.

2. As stated in EIA notification 2006 and in OM dated 12.4.22, the valid EC can be for the project life as estimated by SEAC. Hence wherever project life is not mentioned in the approved mining plan or in the EC issued, SEAC shall appraise such applications to estimate the project life of the mine considering the Geological, Environmental and socio economic factors in the project region.
3. All the project proponents with valid EC at the time of the issuance of notification i.e., 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022 should apply for modification of EC in Parivesh Portal with all the necessary documents such as Approved Mine Plan, Scheme of Mining, Pre-Feasibility Report, CCR, EMP, HYCR, valid lease order, copy of CTE, etc
4. Project proponents without valid EC should submit fresh EC application for appraisal through Parivesh Portal.
5. In order to avail the benefit of lapsed period due to delay in the execution of lease / permit, the project proponents with valid EC should also apply online in the Parivesh Portal for modification of EC with valid documents such as Lease / Permit deed or details, HYCR, CCR, etc.
6. The project proponents holding the ECs issued by the respective DEIAAs shall not be eligible for the provisions of the S.O. 1807 (E) dated 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022. All those EC holders have to apply afresh for the EC as per the O.M dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2023.
7. This procedure is not applicable to prior Environmental Clearances issued by DEIAA. They have to follow Office Memorandum F. No IA3-22/11/2023-IA.III (E-208230 dated 28/04/2023 of MoEF & CC

The SEIAA Secretariate should publish necessary instructions regarding the above in the SEIAA Web portal in both Malayalam and English.

**Item No. 127.39**

**Environmental Clearance issued to the proposed expansion of the Mixed Land Use (Master Plan) project by M/s Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd. at Technopark Phase-3 Campus in Re-Sy. Nos. 290/2 part & others, in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala-NGT(SZ) Order dated 30.05.2023 in Appeal No.54/2021 filed by Shri.Thomas Lawrence (SIA/KL/MIS/52546/2018, 1202/EC2/2018/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item with the judgement dated 30.05.2023 of Hon'ble NGT. The Authority noticed that the Environmental Clearance (EC) granted by the SEIAA – Kerala to M/s Draganstone Realty Pvt. Ltd is set aside, as grant of EC by the MoEF&CC for Main Phase – 3 Project (1,33,491 Sq.M. built up area) and grant of EC by the SEIAA – Kerala for Expansion of Phase – 3 Project (1,37,673.4 Sq.M. built up area) amounts to splitting of project and such splitting is violative of the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Keystone Realtors Private Limited Vs. Anil V. Tharthare and Ors. (2020) 2 SCC 66.

Besides, the Hon'ble NGT also directed SEIAA to examine the proposal afresh and ensure that the PP conducts a cumulative impact study for the entire Phase-3 with a built up area of 2,71,164.4 Sq.M. i.e. a cumulative impact assessment for the entire project and also identify the mitigation measures that may have to be in place in Phase – 3 project area where construction is already completed to ensure that adverse environmental impacts, if any, due to construction of main project of Phase – 3 are remediated. In Para 44 (IV) of the Judgement, it is also mentioned that “the SEIAA, Kerala, which should have considered the project comprehensively and having treated the Phase-3 as an expansion without application of mind is also liable for its conduct. We recommend to the MoEF&CC to take appropriate action against the authorities who were responsible in granting the Environmental Clearance for the Phase-3 project”.

**In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:**

1. Gets a legal advice from Standing Counsel regarding the appeal provision and further procedures to be followed on the basis of the judgment.
2. Authority requested Member Secretary to put a word to Advocate General or Additional Advocate General to appear for the case if a review petition is filed by the Project Proponent.
3. Administrator is directed to follow up the posting of a Standing Counsel for SEIAA in NGT (SZ) on priority.

4. A detailed note shall be forwarded to Standing Counsel at the time of consideration of the case before H'ble High Court of Kerala/NGT.
5. During the consideration of this case before H'ble Apex Court, NGT and High Court of Kerala, Dr Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist in SEIAA should give all necessary support to the Standing Counsel and during hearing he must present in the Court for briefing Standing Counsel on technical matters involved in the case.

**Item No.127.40      **Inspection Report on the audit of office of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority for the period June 2015 to March 2022 - Discussion- reg.****

The Authority discussed the inspection report of by the Accountant General, Kerala for the period from June 2015 to March 2022. The Authority noticed that the audit report highlights that even though the Government of Kerala formed an independent Secretariat for the functioning of SEIAA and SEAC to safeguard the independent nature of its statutory functions, no Rules and Regulations for governing the Authority were framed by Government of India as well as Government of Kerala. As such, a separate independent statutory entity with full functional freedom as envisaged by the Government of Kerala has to be achieved.

It is also noted that the Authority did not prepare administrative reports or annual reports expressing the periodical financial performance and financial position. Moreover, the Authority did not frame its delegation of powers to various officers. In the absence of Rules and Regulations governing the Authority and absence of clearly defined duties, powers, and responsibilities to designated officer / officers with over all authority on financial as well as administrative matters, the purpose envisaged therein to make SEIAA and SEAC a separate independent statutory entity with full functional freedom is yet to be achieved.

The Authority considered this part of Audit report in detail and acknowledged the necessity of the Rules and Regulations for the Authority to maintain its status as a separate independent statutory entity with full functional freedom. Under this circumstances, the Authority decided that immediate action has to be taken to prepare draft rules and regulations. The Member Secretary and the Administrator are requested take necessary follow up action. This work of preparing draft rules and regulations of SEIAA may be assigned to an expert in this field or agencies like Centre for Management Development or Institute of Management in Government. The draft report may be placed before the Authority within three months.

# **PARIVESH FILES**

## **CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE**

**Item No.1**                      **Environmental Clearance to Sri. Babu.P for Granite Building Stone Quarry for a area 0.8673 Ha at Survey No. 535/1 in Thayannur Village, Vellarikkund Taluk, Kasaragod District, Kerala**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/148066/2020; 1693/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Babu P., Periyadath House Mundiyanam, Thayannur (P.O) Parappa Kasaragod, vide application received on 30.07.2020, sought Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry at Survey No. 535/1 in Thayannur Village, Vellarikkund Taluk, Kasaragod, Kerala.

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 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, mine life is 5 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 5 (five) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. Development of green belt using indigenous species should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*



4. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 200m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
5. *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.*
6. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
7. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
8. *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.*
9. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
10. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
11. *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 pm).*
12. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
13. *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*
14. *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.*
15. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
16. *The transportation from the quarry should be done only using the trucks suitable for rural roads in India as per the guidelines of the Indian Road Congress.*
17. *As the project site is located in an abandoned quarry the possible and relevant*

- final mine closure activities as per the previous approved mining plan shall be carried out and the activities so carried out shall be mentioned in the half yearly completion report.*
- 18. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority.*
  - 19. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
  - 20. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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. 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.*
  - 22. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
  - 23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.2**

**Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Puthalam Construction Private Limited for an area of 2.0235 Ha at Block No. 64, Re-Survey Nos. 21/149, 21/124, 21/145, 21/148, 21/147, 21/156, 21/144 (Old Sy. No. 21/1A1) in Kolayad Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/195129/2021; 1893/EC4/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that as per field inspection report about 5m depth of over-burden (19975MT) have to be removed from the project site. Since, a huge quantity of overburden has to be removed from the project site, Authority would like to hear from the Project Proponent about the proposed overburden management.

**Authority decided to hear the project proponent in the next SEIAA meeting to clarify the details regarding the quantity of topsoil/overburden, management plan, area proposed for storage, protective measures to be adopted to avoid the seepage of overburden, etc. The intimation regarding the hearing shall be given to the project proponent well in advance.**

**Item No.3**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Rajendran Nair for an area of 1.1862 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 233/10, 233/11, 233/12, 233/13, 233/14, 233/15, 233/16, 233/22, 233/23, 234/4, 234/6, 234/7, 234/8 & 234/36 in Pullampara Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram  
(SIA/KL/MIN/195590/2021; 2041/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Rajendran Nair TC-84/969, (APRA-92B), Palkulangara, Petta (PO), Thiruvananthapuram - 695 024, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH for Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 1.1862 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 233/10, 233/11, 233/12, 233/13, 233/14, 233/15, 233/16, 233/22, 233/23, 234/4, 234/6, 234/7, 234/8 & 234/36 in Pullampara Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field

Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 8 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 8 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

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.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved mining plan, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 8 years, from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, 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 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 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. A buffer distance of 50m should be maintained from the boundary of quarry to the crusher.*
- 5. Correction measures for the steep side of the abandoned quarry should be done prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 6. The height and width of all the benches should be maintained as 5 x 5.*
- 7. Development of green belt using indigenous species should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 8. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 200m*

*should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

- 9. 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.*
- 10. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the natural drain after adequate filtration*
- 11. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 12. 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.*
- 13. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
- 14. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 15. 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 pm).*
- 16. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 17. 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.*
- 18. 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.*
- 19. Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented as proposed.*
- 20. The ultimate mine depth should be limited to 100m AMSL*
- 21. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority*
- 22. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 23. In the interest of residential buildings located at a distance of 51-200 m radius from*

*the quarry site, the Project Proponent shall attend the following:*

- An impact vibration study has to be carried out through a reputed agency and the Impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay within 3 months of commencing quarry operations and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report. This study must be monitored by a committee which includes concerned ward member of Grama Panchayat and a representative of residents within 200 mts radius. The corrective measures have to be taken to minimize the vibration effect if any as suggested by the agency engaged for the study and the monitoring committee.*
- Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- Priority should be given to the needs of local residences while implementing CER activities. If the need be the EMP approved shall be modified to accommodate these changes under intimation to SEAC*
- One of the local residents shall be made member of the Environmental management cell and their grievances shall be heard and addressed.*

*24. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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. 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 the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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 violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.4**

**Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry, M/s SRI SRI GRANITES at Block No: 12, Re-Sy Nos: 664/2, 664/19, 665/22, 665/13, 666/36, 666/34 in Kuthanur-I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/262881/2022; 1956/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. V. Sasidharan, Managing Partner, M/s Sri Sri Granites, Peecha Road, Chithali, Palakkad submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Sri Sri Granites at Block No:12, Re-Survey Nos: 664/2,664/19, 665/22, 665/13, 666/36, 666/34 in Kuthanur-I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala.

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 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 mine life is 5 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 5 (five) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

3. *Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented from the 1st year itself and the geo-coordinates and geo-tagged photographs of the area shall be submitted in HYCR.*
4. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to the nearest natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
5. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR.*
6. *Impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of peak particle velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
7. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 Years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented*
8. *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 pm).*
9. *The haulage road should be developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well and dust-free with sprinkling arrangement.*
10. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
11. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office. A minimum of 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar energy.*
12. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert and the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
13. *If the abandoned quarry located near to the site belong to project proponent, he/she shall carry out final closure plan within 6 months as per the approved mine closure plan and submit the progress of the closure activities along with the HYCR.*
14. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
15. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*



16. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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.
17. 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.
18. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.
19. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

**Item No.5**

**Granite (Building Stone) Quarry of Sri. G Rajeevan, Managing Partner, M/s Koodal Granites at Block No. 30, Survey Nos: 404/3, 404/4, 404/5, 404/7, 404/7 -1 in Koodal Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/263676/2022; 1982/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. G Rajeevan, Managing Partner, Koodal Granites, Jaya Mandiram, Kudavathoor P.O, Kollam submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH for the Granite (Building Stone) Quarry at Block No. 30, Survey Nos: 404/3, 404/4, 404/5, 404/7, 404/7 -1 in Koodal Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 6 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 6 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

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.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved mining plan, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 6 years, from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, 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 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 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. Road leading to the site is narrow and is not feasible for transportation of material from the mine. So, road should be widened the road with 7m width as per the submitted plan before commencement of mining.*
- 5. Soil thickness of the site is high and therefore, the soil protection measures should*

*be implemented.*

- 6. Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented from the 1st year itself and the geo-coordinates and geo-tagged photographs of the area shall be submitted in HYCR.*
- 7. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to the nearest natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 8. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR.*
- 9. Impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of peak particle velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 10. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 Years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented*
- 11. 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 pm).*
- 12. The haulage road should be developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well and dust-free with sprinkling arrangement.*
- 13. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 14. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert and the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
- 15. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street lights and office. At least, 40% of the energy requirement of the project should be met from the solar power.*
- 16. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
- 17. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 18. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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.*

- 19. 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.*
- 20. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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 violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.6**

**Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sukumaran, President of Ottappalam Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators Industrial Co-Operative Society Ltd at Re. Survey No. 495 in Ananganadi Village, Ottapalam Taluk , Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/268812/2022; 2101/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Sukumaran, President of Ottappalam Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators submitted an application for EC via PARIVESH for the Granite Building Stone quarry project in an extent of 0.3332 Ha at Re. Survey No. 495 in Ananganadi Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and took note of the decisions made during

various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The Authority observed that in its 135<sup>th</sup> meeting, the SEAC thoroughly examined the proposal and commented that the site is located on the summit portion of an elongated hill ridge. The conservation of the hill ridge is crucial for the microclimate of the region. It was found that the investment required to operate a mine in such a small area, while ensuring environmental and social safeguards, is significantly higher than the proposed project cost. Therefore, the committee concluded that establishing a small mine on the summit of a ridge may not be financially viable. However, the final recommendation of the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting contradicts this above observations.

Furthermore, it is also noted that in its previous meeting, the Authority had already inquired SEAC about the feasibility of scientific mining in an area less than 0.5 hectares.

**Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for a reassessment of the feasibility of such small-scale mining on the summit of a ridge.**

**Item No.7**

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Ashraf. K, over an extent of 0.8094 Ha at Re Survey No. 64/75, in Ulliyeri village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/285616/2022; 2107/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Ashraf K., S/o Abdurahman, Kalathingal House, Perumanna P.O, Kozhikode-673019 submitted an application through PARIVESH on 28.07.2022 for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.8094 Ha at Re. Sy. No. 64/75 in Ulliyeri Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 133<sup>rd</sup>, 135<sup>th</sup> & 141<sup>st</sup> meetings held on different dates. The Committee in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting verified the proposal and observed the following in the field inspection report.

1. The area forms top of a hillock, which is moderately sloping towards the west.
2. Exposed laterite, grass lands and bushes with intermittent trees are noticed in the project site. Santalum album is found growing intermittently in the site.
3. Water resources meant for quarry operations are not seen within the project site.
4. An educational institution (M-Dasan College of Engineering) is seen nearer to the project site.
5. Presently there is no direct access road to the project site. The sub Committee entered the project site through the main gate of the nearby educational institution.

Based on discussions, the Committee noted that the road leading to the proposed site is through an educational institution. It is not a feasible option. Therefore, considering the transportation constraints and other observations in the FIR, the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the proposal.

**Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.**

**Item No.8**                      **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s V K Stone Crusher for an area of 3.7324 hectares at Re-Sy Block No. 59, Re-Survey Nos. 6/527, 6/526, 6/537, 6/600, Vellarvally Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/286117/2022; 2067/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that SEAC recommended to reject the project citing several reasons. The project requested an opportunity of hearing before taking a final decision. The Authority decided to refer the case to SEAC to hear the project proponent and make recommendation considering the explanation of the Project Proponent.

**Item No.9**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Abdul Asees K.P, for an area of 0.1942 Ha, at Block No. 92, Re-Survey No: 23/813 in Kaliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala. SIA/KL/MIN/404478/2022; 2142/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Abdul Asees K.P, S/o Muhammed, Nafiya Manzil, Olakkad, Mayyil P.O,Kannur – 670602 submitted an application through PARIVESH on 28.10.2022 for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project, for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Re. Sy .Block No. 92, Re. Sy. No. 23/813 at Kalliad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.

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 proposal based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the approved mining plan mine

life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (one) year, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting.*
- 4. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the ground water table at the site.*
- 5. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 6. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for a useful purpose.*
- 7. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 8. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of excavated earth during transportation.*
- 9. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to excavation of earth.*
- 10. Workers/labourers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
- 11. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation.*
- 12. A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
- 13. 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.*
- 14. 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.*

15. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
16. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
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 pm).*
18. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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.*
19. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
20. *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 Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Aji for an area of 0.1886 Ha, at Re-Survey Nos. 33/225, 33/262 in Kakkad Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIN/405222/2022; 2145/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Aji, S/o Krishnan, Kuzhimbattil House, Perumanna P.O, Kozhikode-673019 submitted an application through PARIVESH on 05.11.2022 for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.1886 Ha at Re. Sy. Nos. 33/225, 33/262 in Kakkad Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.



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 proposal based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (one) year, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting.*
- 4. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the ground water table at the site.*
- 5. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area.*
- 6. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for a useful purpose.*
- 7. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
- 8. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of excavated earth during transportation*
- 9. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to excavation of earth*
- 10. Workers/labourers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
- 11. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation*
- 12. A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area*

13. *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.*
14. *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.*
15. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
16. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented as per norms*
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 pm).*
18. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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.*
19. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
20. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.11**

**Environment Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. C. P. Sugunan for an area of 0.2913 Ha at Re. Survey No: 26/162 in Panappuzha Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/407328/2022; 2157/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. C. P. Sugunan, S/o Achuthan, Sreyas, Pallikunnu P.O, Kannur-670004 submitted an application through PARIVESH on 21.11.2022 for Environmental Clearance in SEIAA for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.2913Ha at Re. Sy. No. 26/162 in Panappuzha Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.

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 proposal based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 1 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of -three-years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 3 (three) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, 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 lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting.*
- 4. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 5. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 6. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose*
- 7. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap*
- 8. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of excavated earth during transportation*
- 9. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to excavation of earth*

10. *Workers/labourers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation*
11. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation*
12. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area*
13. *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.*
14. *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.*
15. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
16. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented as per norms*
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 pm).*
18. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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.*
19. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
20. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.12**

**Application for Environmental Clearance for the quarry project for an area of 1.8227 Ha at Sy. No. 85 pt in Pulamanthole Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram - Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No.41905/2017 (SIA/KL/MIN/422595/2023; 2017/A2/2018/SEIAA)**

Application for Environmental Clearance was submitted to DEIAA Malappuram by Shri. Najeed Ali M.K for the granite stone building stone quarry project for an area of 1.8227 Ha in Sy. No. 85pt, Pulamanthole Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

Shri. Shoukath Ali filed WP(C) No.41905/2017 (K) in which the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in its Judgment dated 11.04.2018 directed SEIAA to consider the application and pass orders therein and to submit a copy before the Hon'ble Court within 3 months from the date of receipt of files receiving from DEIAA. The DEIAA, Malappuram forwarded the whole file to SEIAA. As per the direction of 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA, Order dated.03.11.2021 was issued in compliance to the judgment dated.11.04.2018 of the Hon'ble High Court.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 12 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 138<sup>th</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 12 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

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.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved mining plan, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 12 years, from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, 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 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 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. *A temporary wall on the southern side of the proposed quarry should be set up to prevent any impact on the houses located on the southern side*
5. *Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented from the 1st year itself and the geo-coordinates and geo-tagged photographs of the proposed site should be submitted in HYCR.*
6. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to the nearest natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
7. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR.*
8. *Impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of peak particle velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
9. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 Years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented*
10. *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 pm).*
11. *The haulage road should be widened and developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well and dust-free with sprinkling arrangement.*
12. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
13. *The mitigation measures recommended in the EMP should be strictly implemented.*

14. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert and the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
15. *If the abandoned quarry located near to the site belong to project proponent, he/she shall carry out final closure plan within 6 months as per the approved mine closure plan and submit the progress of the closure activities along with the HYCR.*
16. *As the project site is located in an abandoned quarry the possible and relevant final mine closure activities as per the previous approved mining plan shall be carried out and the activities so carried out shall be mentioned in the half yearly completion report.*
17. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street lights and office. At least, 40% of the energy requirement of the project should be met from the solar power.*
18. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
19. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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. *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.*
22. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*

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

**Item No.13**

**Environmental Clearance for quarry project by M/s Sree Dhanya Metals at Survey Nos. 269/1, 269/1-1, 269/3, 269/4, 269/5, 269/5-1, 269/6, 269/8, 269/8-1, 269/17-1, 269/17-2, 270/6, 270/7-1, 270/8-1, 270/8-2, 270/9, 270/10, 270/11-1, 270/11-2, 272/11, 272/12, 272/13, 272/21, 272/14-1, 273/1-2 in Pallichal Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram  
SIA/KL/MIN/70164/2019, 1393/EC2/2019/SEIAA**

Sri. Chandrababu G., Managing Partner, M/s Sreedhanya Metals S/o Gangadharan 570/1, Sreedhanya, Sasthamangalam, Thiruvananthapuram submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH for quarry project at Survey Nos. 269/1, 269/1-1, 269/3, 269/4, 269/5, 269/5-1, 269/6, 269/8, 269/8-1, 269/17-1, 269/17-2, 270/6, 270/7-1, 270/8-1, 270/8-2, 270/9, 270/10, 270/11-1, 270/11-2, 272/11, 272/12, 272/13, 272/21, 272/14-1, 273/1-2 in Pallichal Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan mine life is 10 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 10 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

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.



**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved mining plan, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 10 years, from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, 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 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 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. Compensatory afforestation should be done from the 1st year itself and the coordinates and geo-tagged photographs of the site shall be submitted in HYCR.*
- 5. 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.*
- 6. Outflow channel from the abandoned pit should be enlarged to contain the entire overland flow of the adjacent sloppy region of the quarry.*
- 7. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR.*
- 8. Monitoring of drainage water should be carried out 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.*
- 9. The overburden dumping site should be protected with gabion walls to prevent erosion.*
- 10. The impacts due to blasting on all the built structures within 500m should be*

*monitored and the results submitted along with HYCR.*

- 11. The haulage road for about 100m should be developed prior to the commencement of mining activities. It should be maintained well and dust-free with permanent sprinkling arrangement.*
- 12. 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 pm).*
- 13. Adequate sanitation, waste management, and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 14. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street lights and office. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met by the solar energy.*
- 15. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert and the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
- 16. Buffer zones should be demarcated and planted with plants, climbers, and herbs of local species as mentioned in the biodiversity assessment report.*
- 17. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 Years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 18. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
- 19. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 20. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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. 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.*

22. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
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 Building Stone Quarry Project at Re-Survey No. 8/9, in Alakkod Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala by Mr. U. I. John, Managing Partner, M/s Marthoma Granites - Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in C.A. No. 878/16 arising from SLP(C ) 27079/2011 filed by M/s Marthoma Granites (SIA/KL/MIN/83001/2017; 1413(A)/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. U. I. John, Managing Partner, M/s Marthoma Granites, Alakkodu Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the quarry project for an area of 7.4590 Ha at Sy. No. 8/9, in Alakkodu Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 140<sup>th</sup> meeting recommended EC for mining the remaining resource of 18,16,550 MT at the rate of 1,75,000 TPA for 10 years with certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

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.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity of 18,16,550 MT at the rate of 1,75,000 TPA, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 10 years, from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, 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 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 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. Progress of implementation of approved remediation and damage assessment plan should be incorporated in HYCR*
- 5. Development of green belt using indigenous species should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 6. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 200m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 7. 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.*
- 8. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*

9. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
10. *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.*
11. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
12. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
13. *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 pm).*
14. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
15. *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.*
16. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
17. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street lights and office. At least, 40% of the energy requirement of the project should be met from the solar power.*
18. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
19. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
20. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> 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. 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.*
- 22. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
- 23. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

## **CONSIDERATION OF TOR PROPOSALS**

### **Item No.1**

**Al-Azhar Medical College and Super Speciality Hospital, Re-Survey No.: 99/5, 100/1, 84/1, 84/3/4, 84/4/2, 84/3/5, 84/3/1, 84/1/1, 406/5, 406/1, 84/3/1, 84/4/1, 84/3/2, 404/1, 404/3, 88/3, 88/2, 88/1, 406/3, 406/6, 89/7, 82/2, 89/6, 398/3, 398/9, 405/1 Kumaramangalam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/421264/2023, File No: 2014/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Pradeep Kumar, CEO, Al-Azhar Medical College and Super Speciality Hospital, Thodupuzha-Ezhalloor Road, Kumaramangalam, Idukki, Kerala submitted an application for Environmental Clearance *via* PARIVESH Portal on 10 Mar 2023, for the construction of Al-Azhar Medical College and Super Speciality Hospital, Re-Survey No. 99/5, 100/1, 84/1, 84/3/4, 84/4/2, 84/3/5, 84/3/1, 84/1/1, 406/5, 406/1, 84/3/1, 84/4/1, 84/3/2, 404/1, 404/3, 88/3, 88/2, 88/1, 406/3, 406/6, 89/7, 82/2, 89/6, 398/3, 398/9, 405/1 Kumaramangalam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala.

The Authority noted that SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting examined the proposal and observed that the proposal has to be treated under violation of EIA notification 2006 and is required to invoke the SOP for identifying and handling of violation cases. Accordingly, the Committee decided to approve Terms of reference for conducting EIA studies as per OM 28.01.2022 and 07.07.2021.

**The Authority decided to approve the Terms of Reference for conducting EIA study as per OM 28.01.2022 and 7.7.2021 as recommended by SEAC.**

### **Item No.2**

**Application for ToR for the proposed Integrated Manufacturing Cluster (IMC) in Kerala under Kochi-Bengaluru Industrial Corridor (KBIC) at Kannambra I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/421647/2023; 2238/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

Sri. Santhosh Koshy Thomas, Managing Director, Kerala Industrial Corridor Development Corporation Limited submitted application for ToR via PARIVESH on 17.03.2023 for the proposed Integrated Manufacturing Cluster (IMC) under Kochi-Bengaluru

Industrial Corridor (KBIC) at Kannambra I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District for the Palakkad Node in Kerala. The Authority noted that SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting recommended Standard ToR for conducting the EIA studies along with certain additional studies.

**The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional aspects for EIA Study as recommended by SEAC.**

- 1. Necessity and feasibility of primary treatment at the individual industry level prior to letting out the effluents to common treatment plant for improving efficiency.*
- 2. Overall water use in the basin is to be examined to ensure that the drawl of water for industrial use will not cause shortage of water for use in agriculture and drinking water. Additional water conservation and harvesting measures are to be considered to overcome this problem.*

**Item No.3**

**Application for ToR for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s. Raveendra Rock Products Private Limited at Re-Sy Block No: 27, Re-Sy. Nos: 132/2, 132/2-1, 132/2-2, 132/2-3, 137/1-2, 137/2, 137/3, 137/4, 137/5, 137/6, 137/7, 137/8, 137/8-1, 137/9, 137/10, 137/11, 137/12-1, 137/12-2, 138/3, 138/4, 138/5, 138/6, 138/7-2, 138/8, 139/2, 139/2- 2, 139/3, 139/4, 139/5, 139/6, 139/7, 139/7-1, 139/10 & 139/11 in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta District  
( SIA/KL/MIN/422416/2023; 2240/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

Sri. S. Raveendran Managing Director, M/s. Raveendra Rock Products Private Limited submitted an application for ToR via PARIVESH on 24.03.2023 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 5.9086 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: 27, Re-Sy. Nos: 132/2, 132/2-1, 132/2-2, 132/2-3, 137/1-2, 137/2, 137/3, 137/4, 137/5, 137/6, 137/7, 137/8, 137/8-1, 137/9, 137/10, 137/11, 137/12-1, 137/12-2, 138/3, 138/4, 138/5, 138/6, 138/7-2, 138/8, 139/2, 139/2- 2, 139/3, 139/4, 139/5, 139/6, 139/7, 139/7-1, 139/10 & 139/11 in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority noted that SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting examined the proposal and verified the documents submitted by the proponent and recommended Standard ToR for conducting the EIA studies along with certain additional studies.

**The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional aspects for EIA Study as recommended by SEAC.**



1. *Vibration studies to evaluate the zone of influence and impact of blasting on the neighbourhood as suggested in para ( e) of OM No Z -11013/57/2014-IA.II (M) dated 29-10-2014 of MoEF&CC*
2. *Breach potential study.*
3. *Impact of vibration due to blasting on all the built structures within a distance of 500m from the project boundary.*

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

**Sd/-**  
**Dr. V. Venu IAS**  
**Member Secretary, SEIAA**

**Sd/-**  
**Sri. K.Krishna Panicker**  
**Member, SEIAA**