

# **MINUTES OF THE 128<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA, HELD ON 27<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> June 2023**

## **Present:**

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

The 128<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA, Kerala was held on 27<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 in the Conference Hall, SEIAA, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram in hybrid mode. The meeting started at 10.30 AM on 27<sup>th</sup> June 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 128<sup>th</sup> meeting and took the following decisions:

## **Physical Files**

**Item No.128.01**      **Minutes of the 127<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023**

Noted

**Item No.128.02**      **Action Taken Report on 127<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023**

Action taken by SEIAA Team is appreciated.

**Item No.128.03**

**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 taken in various SEIAA/ SEAC meetings, the WP(C) No 18680/2023 filed by M/s Shanio Metal Crusher and the reply dated 05.06.2023 submitted by the Project Proponent for the Show Cause Notice issued on 28.04.2023. In WP(C) No 18680/2023, the Project Proponent contended that "...they will be able to convince the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent (SEIAA) about the wrong conclusion arrived at in Ext P10 (Minutes of 125<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting), if they are granted an opportunity of hearing by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent".

Authority noticed that even after the expiry of Environmental Clearance i.e., on 30.10.2018, the Project Proponent has continued the mining activities without a valid prior EC and the Authority has to take appropriate action against illegal mining. Prior to taking an appropriate action, the Authority decided to get the explanation of the project proponent. In order to get the explanation of the project proponent the authority issued a Show Cause Notice on 28.04.2023 and gave 15 days time for submitting his remarks. Instead of submitting the reply on time, the project proponent requested vide his letter dated 05.05.2023 for granting a further period of one month for furnishing the reply. It is also noted that the project proponent has not requested for any hearing.

The Authority verified the averments in the reply to the Show Cause Notice submitted on 05.06.2023 and observed that the appeal of the Project Proponent that they are entitled to operate the quarry without an environmental clearance in accordance with the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in All Kerala River Protection Council v. State of Kerala, since the quarrying lease was granted to them prior to 18.05.2012. The Authority noticed that the Principal Bench of National Green Tribunal, New Delhi, vide its Judgment dated 13.01.2015 in O.A. No.123/2014 and connected cases held that no quarrying/ mining shall be done, without obtaining Environmental Clearance (EC), relying on the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Deepak Kumar Vs. State of Haryana (2012) 4 SCC 629. In this judgment it is stated that "*.....the existing mining lease right holders would also have to comply with the*

*requirement of obtaining Environmental Clearance from the competent authorities in accordance with law. However, all of them, if not already granted Environmental Clearance would be entitled to a reasonable period (say three months) to submit their applications for obtaining the same, which shall be disposed of expeditiously and in any case not later than six months from pronouncement of this judgment”.*

As per the order of the Hon’ble NGT in Original Application No. 244 of 2017 (SZ) it is stated that “..... carrying out mining operation, even after consent from SPCB without prior Environmental Clearance (EC), then it will amount to violation of EIA Notification, 2006 and the operations are liable to be stopped immediately. The mining operation shall not be allowed to continue till such time Environmental Clearance (EC) is obtained. The State Department of Mines and Geology is the nodal authority entrusted with the enforcement and regulation of mining operations in the State, including illegal mining”. Besides, it is also stated that “.....Judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court and the Principal Bench of National Green Tribunal observed that after 15.01.2016, all existing mining leaseholders whether minor or major mineral irrespective of the area of lease has to obtain Environmental Clearance (EC) for continuance of their operation and further held that, those who have not filed application prior to 31.03.2016, will be considered as a violation case”.

In the said case the Hon’ble NGT(SZ) declared that the mining operations after 15.01.2016, on the basis of the old lease is illegal and unauthorized and they are liable to pay environmental compensation for the quantity of mined articles which has to be assessed by the Mining and Geology Department. The Hon’ble Supreme Court vide its Judgement dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 2023 in SLA No. 5563/2023 upheld the Judgement of Hon’ble NGT and directed the Registry to communicate these orders to the Registrar General of the High Court to place the present order before the High Court in the pending proceedings which may be taken into consideration by the High Court while hearing the proceedings before it and while extending the stay granted earlier staying the order passed by the NGT dated 27.05.2021 against which the Civil Appeal was preferred before this Court which was dismissed and subsequently the review application was also dismissed. In addition, the Hon’ble High Court in its judgments in W.P.(C).No.25153 of 2015 (T) and similar cases, has observed that carrying out any quarry operations on the basis of the permits after 2012 is illegal. Authority also found that action of Mining & Geology Department and Kerala State Pollution Control Board in the this case is against decisions of Hon’ble NGT and Supreme Court

**In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decisions its 125<sup>th</sup> and 127<sup>th</sup> meetings. In addition to this, the authority also decided the following:**

1. A detailed reply shall be given to the project proponent explaining the non-acceptance of his reply to show cause notice, point by point, quoting relevant court orders and OMs of MOEF&CC.
2. Stop Momo shall be issued for stopping illegal mining.
3. Concerned Authorities/ Agencies shall initiate action for illegal mining based on relevant Rules/ regulations.
4. The Project Proponent shall engage a NABET accredited consultant to assess the environmental damages caused by the illegal mining from the date of expiry of Environmental Clearance till date. SEAC will appraise this assessment and recommend the quantum of penalty to be imposed in this regard.
5. The Legal Officer shall take necessary action in consultation with Standing Counsel for defending the WP(C) No 18680/2023 filed by M/s Shanio Metal Crusher and WP(C) 31869/2016.
6. The instructions forwarded vide letter dated 3.06.2023 shall be revised accordingly.

**Item No.128.04      Environmental Clearance issued to the Building stone quarry project of Sri. K.V. Mathew, M/s Kachanathu Minerals and Metals Pvt. Ltd at Sy. Nos. 135/2-3, 135/7, 135/7-1,135/6, 135/2-2, 135/2, 135/2-1, 167/1, 167/1-1, 167/5, 167/2-2, 167/2-13 of Block 27 in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala – Complaint received (File No.765/SEIAA/EC4/505/2015)**

Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting, 124<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting and the decision of previous SEIAA meeting regarding the applicability of SO 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022. The Project Proponent filed WP(C) No.34722/2022 and the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 03.11.2022 directed the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, Geologist, Pathanamthitta to issue transit passes. The Authority observed that EC had expired on 15.01.2023 with Covid relaxation and the Project Proponent has not applied for revalidation

of EC. Now the project proponent is claiming for the benefit of OM dated.12.04.2022. It is also noted that the quarry is not operational due to the irregularities noted by the Tahsildhar.

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

1. The project proponent with valid EC at the time of the issuance of notification i.e., 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022 should apply for revalidation 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 / CTO, etc.
2. After getting the application SEAC shall estimate the project life of the mine considering the geological, environmental and socio-economic factors in the project region/area for revalidation of EC as mandated in SO 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022
3. Decision of the Authority regarding the applicability of SO 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022 shall be intimated to the Mining and Geology Department and the District Geologist, Pathanamthitta as per the decision already taken by SEIAA.
4. Decision of the Authority regarding the applicability of SO 1807 (E) dated 12.04.2022 shall be intimated to the Standing Counsel for defending similar cases as per the decision already taken by SEIAA.
5. A suitable reply has to be given to letter dated 5.6.2023 of Project Proponent answering all issues.

**Item No.128.05**

**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, Kerala - Order dated 30.05.2023 in Appeal No.54/2021 filed by Sri. Thomas Lawrence  
SIA/KL/MIS/52546/2018, 1202/EC2/2018/SEIAA**

The Authority perused the item along with the legal opinion of the Standing Counsel and decided to file a review petition before the Hon'ble NGT. The Legal Officer should consult the Standing Counsel and make arrangements to file the review petition with all necessary additional inputs. The draft review petition prepared by the Standing Counsel shall be brought to the notice of the Authority before filing.

The Authority also decided to inform the Standing Counsel of SEIAA in the Hon'ble

High Court that the Government of Kerala has decided to get legal opinion from the Advocate General for further course of action. The Standing Counsel in consultation with office of Advocate General shall advise Authority for further course of action. Copies of the Govt letter forwarded along with legal opinion of AG and review petition filed before NGT shall also be furnished to Standing Counsel.

It is also decided to correct the minutes of 127<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, agenda 39 ( physical files). In clause 2 the term “project proponent” will be corrected as “Government of Kerala”.

**Item No.128.06**      **Environmental Clearance issued by MoEFCC to the hospital Complex project, St. Gregorios Medical Mission Hospital at Sy. Nos. 286/2, 286/3, 286/16 in Kadapra Village & Panchayat, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala – Request for final inspection of the remedial measures and release of Bank Guarantee (File No. 1346/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item along with the request of the project proponent requesting to release the Bank Guarantee. The Authority observed that the Environmental Clearance for the project was issued from MoEF&CC on 08.04.2019, under violation category. In the EC, it is stipulated that the Project Proponent has to implement the Augmentation plan in three years. The Authority decided to refer the case to SEAC to inspect the activities implemented under Remediation Plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan as mentioned in the Environmental Clearance. The Authority also decided to direct the project proponent to get the recommendation from IRO, Bangalore as per clause 7 of S.O.1030(E) dated 8<sup>th</sup> march 2018.

**Item No. 128.07**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Muhammed Hashim for an area of 1.7488 Hectares at Block No.10, Re-Survey Nos. 22/2-2pt & 22/3pt, in Pazhavangadi Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala  
SIA/KL/MIN/129508/2019, 1528/EC1/2019/SEIAA**

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision taken in the 125<sup>th</sup> meeting and the letter dated.18.05.2023 received from the Tahsildar, Ranni, stating that all the distance norms were complied with by the project proponent. The Authority decided to inform the

Petitioner that EC was issued after following all procedures as per EIA Notification 2006. The report of the Tahasildar is also to be forwarded to the petitioner. If there is any further complaint about the functioning of the quarry, the Petitioner shall approach the District Geologist/ other statutory agencies.

**Item No.128.08**      **Common judgment dated 11.12.2019 in WP (C) No.5589/2019, WP (C) No.9656/19 and WP (C) No.25439/2019 filed by Sri. Unnikrishnan K.P and the President, Vaniyamkulam Grama Panchayat against M/s JMC Granites, Palakkad-Constitution of Joint Committee for monitoring the status of compliance (File No.4429/A2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEAC along with the report of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee constituted by the SEIAA with Dr. K. Vasudevan Pillai as the nominee of SEIAA conducted several site visits & monitored the experimental blast conducted by experts from NIT, Surathkal. The Joint Committee concluded from the results that, if the blast is carried out observing specific protocols as suggested by NIT, it will not lead to the development of cracks on built structures located beyond 100m. The experimental study has been carried out in the presence of all the members of the expert committee constituted by SEIAA and in the presence of the complainants and LSGD authorities.

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

1. Forward the report of the Joint Committee to the petitioner.
2. SEAC shall give a definite recommendation after hearing the petitioner and Project Proponent.

**Item No.128.09**      **Complaint against Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M D Sreenivasan, transferred to M/s. Shivsa Granites LLP (SIA/KL/MIN/294754/2019, 1452/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the reply dated 31.05.2023 received from the project proponent along with the documents submitted for the alternative site for

afforestation with explanation as sought by the 125<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting. The project proponent stated that one of the plots selected for the afforestation plan belongs to another person was a mistake from the consultant. The Authority agreed to the alternate site as suggested by the project proponent. Authority decided to issue an addendum in this regard by including the copy of the revised afforestation plan as annexure of the EC and inform the Petitioner about the change in site for afforestation.

**Item No.128.10**

**Judgement in WP(C) No. 12147/2020(P) dated 09.09.2020 filed by A.K.Joseph, Arackal House, Mundathadam, Parappa, Kasargod, 671533 Jimmy Alex, Manjakunnel, Parappa P.O, Kasargod, 671533, Vinayan V.K , District Environmental Samithi, Parappa, Kasargod**

**&**

**Judgement in WP(C) No. 15745/2020(P) dated 18.08.2020 filed by K.P.Balakrishnan, Kanathil Parambil, Moolakayam, Parappa, Kasargod, Pramod.K, Parappa, Kasargod, Sudhakaran.M, Edavil Veedu, Parappa, Kasargod and U.V.Mohammed Kunhi, Valappil Kammadath, Parappa, Kasargod (1992/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

The Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 4.7325 Ha to Sri. C N Narayanan, Managing Partner, M/s CeeYen Stone Crushers was issued from the DEIAA, Kasargod on 16.03. 2017. The copy of the judgment in WP(C) No. 12147/2020(P) dated 09.09.2020 filed by Sri. A K Joseph and others with a representation to cancel the EC was received in this office on 29.09.2020 and was considered in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020. As per the judgment, the Authority heard all the complainants and the project proponent through video conferencing and gave an opportunity to both teams to submit a written statement explaining their grievances, with all documentary evidences in support of their claims, within one week. The Authority also forwarded the copy of the judgement with all the exhibits marked in the W.P. (C) to SEAC to conduct a field inspection in the presence of the complainants, the project proponent, and the District Geologist and submit a report within one month with clear recommendations for necessary follow up action. In the meantime, another representation including the judgment in W.P. (C) No. 15745/2020 was received against the quarry project.



The extension of 3 months in the time limit to comply with the Court directions in both the W.P. (C)s was filed on 24.12.2020 before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

As directed by SEIAA, the team including the Sub-Committee of SEAC and the other members conducted the field inspection twice, i.e., on 25.1.2021 & 14.2.2021. During field verification the team had a stakeholder meeting to discuss the situation. The field inspection report was discussed and accepted in the 119th SEAC meeting held on 23rd to 25th February 2021 and decided to place before SEIAA. The SEIAA considered the matter in its 108th meeting held on 22nd- 23rd March 2021 and observed from the field verification report that majority of the EC conditions have been complied with however there are some irregularities to comply with.

The Authority observed that out of the 36 EC conditions, 8 conditions were not complied/ fully complied with by the project proponent. Authority observed that there is no sufficient reason to cancel EC and proponent can be given an opportunity to rectify defects. Considering the natural justice, the Authority directed the project proponent vide letter dated 15.04.2021 to attend all those irregularities pointed out by SEAC within 6 months and another field inspection will be carried out after 6 months to verify whether the observations of SEAC are attended or not. If the project proponent does not attend the observations made by SEAC, appropriate action will be taken against the project proponent including cancellation of EC.

The Authority vide its letter dated 15.04.2021 intimated the Standing Counsel the action taken report to submit before the Hon'ble Court. The tenure of the then SEIAA/SEAC ended in September 2021. The PP submitted the progress report on 10.12.2021 and intimated that since the study on soil piping and biodiversity were delayed due to heavy rain and Covid pandemic, it will be submitted at the earliest. The SEIAA/SEAC was reconstituted in March 2022. The 113th meeting of the SEIAA held on 19th – 20th April, 2022, immediately after its reconstitution in March 2022, directed SEAC to conduct a field inspection after giving prior intimation to the Project Proponent, the Complainant of the WP(C) 15745 of 2020 (P) and other members of the inspecting team, to verify the compliance status and recommend to SEIAA for further action to be taken. The SEAC Sub-Committee conducted field verification on 23.06.2022 in the presence of the petitioners and the project proponents.

The field verification report was discussed in the 132nd SEAC meeting held on 13th to 15th September 2022 and directed the sub-committee to re-submit the report with specific

recommendations considering the compliance status of the observations made by earlier by SEAC. After getting the revised field verification report, the SEAC in its 134th meeting held on 9th to 11th November 2022, decided to recommend SEIAA to cancel the EC with immediate effect and address the Mining & Geology Dept. to take actions against the violations of the EC conditions and Mining Plan by the Proponent.

The Authority in its 121st meeting held on 29th & 30th December 2022 referred the case back to SEAC to give a definite recommendation after hearing the project proponent. The SEAC in its 140th meeting held on 13th -15th March, 2023 invited the project proponent for hearing, but the project proponent informed his inability to attend the hearing due to the non-availability of his consultant. The SEAC in its 141st meeting held on 11th to 12th April, 2023 heard the project proponent and decided get the hearing note within 7 days and also to give one more month to comply with all the observations of the SEAC as per the field verification report. After getting the report the 144th SEAC meeting held on 6th to 8th June 2023 based on the evaluation of the documents submitted by the project Proponent, field verification report and discussions, the Committee observed the following:

1. Quarrying has not been done in full compliance to the Mining Plan.
2. The width and height of the benches are not maintained as stipulated
3. The conditions to provide barbed wire fencing is not fully complied with.
4. The expert study report on soil piping does not rule out the possibility of soil piping in the area. The report states that there are no scientific reports published so far from this area in support of vulnerable factors so as to induce subsurface erosion and soil piping. However, this statement is not substantiated with adequate data.
5. The structural characteristics of the rock mass does not rule out the possibility for inducing landslides
6. There are two natural seasonal drains within the mining lease area on the eastern side of the quarry with general flow direction towards south. These natural drains are not obstructed but diverted consequent to the formation of a road within the project area. In the process, the carrying capacity of the drains are reduced, which is undesirable and can pose risks. In a high-slope region, especially succeeding a high hazard zone, maintenance of drainage is critically important.

The mine area is environmentally fragile as part of it fall in the hazard zone and therefore, compliance of Mining Plan and EC conditions are of utmost important. Therefore,

the Committee do not find any reason for changing the decision taken in the 134th meeting of the SEAC. Therefore, the Committee recommended SEIAA to take actions against the violations of the EC conditions and Mining Plan by the project Proponent with immediate effect.

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

1. Mining and Geology Department shall take necessary action for the violation as per KMMCR. The Department shall also inquire about any illegal mining happened in the area, if any and take appropriate action for violation of KMMC Rule 2015.
2. The Mining and Geology Department shall take necessary action to implement the mine closure plan by the Project Proponent or take action to close the mine utilising the funds available under the District Mineral development fund.
3. The SEAC shall assess the environmental damages due to non-compliance with the EC conditions and suggest suitable penal measures for environmental damages.
4. The Legal Officer SEIAA, shall intimate the decision of the Authority to the Standing Counsel, SEIAA to defend the CCC on priority through email.
5. The Project Proponent will not be eligible for extension as per S.O. 1807(E) dated 12-04-2022 since he failed to comply EC conditions and inform the District Geologist and Environmental Engineer, KSPCB, Kasargod for necessary action.
6. The SEIAA Secretariat shall intimate the action taken by SEIAA to the petitioners of the WP(C) 15745 of 2020 (P) and WP(C) No. 12147/2020(P) through email on priority.
7. The decisions of the Authority shall be informed to the petitioners through email.

**Item No.128.11**      **Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.K. Prasad at survey Nos. 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 397/1-1 in Varapetty Village & Panchayat, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala– Revalidation [File No: 1103/EC/SEIAA/2020]**

The Authority perused the item and observed that the SEAC appraised the proposal based on the documents received from the project proponent, report of field verification conducted on 06.07.2021, CCR received from IRO, MoEFCC, Bangalore etc. The 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting recommended the project for revalidation of EC with a project life of 12 years

from the date of the original EC i.e., 27.02.2018 subject to certain additional Specific Conditions in addition to the Specific and General Conditions stipulated in the original EC.

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 revalidate the EC initially for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan and then extend the EC period to cover Project Life of 12 years, from the date of issuance of original EC i.e., 27.02.2018, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has caused any damage to the Environment in the Project Region by violating any EC conditions.**

The EC is subject to Terms and Conditions in the original EC in addition to the General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. Buffer zones should be demarcated and planted with indigenous plants, climbers and herbs as mentioned in the biodiversity assessment report. The green belt so developed should be nurtured and strengthened regularly.
2. More number of avenue trees should be planted and nurtured.
3. Garland canal with silt traps, siltation pond, outflow channel and connectivity to natural drain should be provided considering the entire project area.
4. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.
5. The cleaning and desiltation of silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel should be done periodically and the geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR.
6. 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.

7. 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 once and included in the first Half Yearly Compliance Report.
8. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and retaining/protective wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage.
9. 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).
10. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office.
11. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
12. Adequate sanitation, waste management, and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.
13. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street lights and office.
14. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert and the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) including the action taken report should be submitted along with the HYCR.
15. 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.
16. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.
17. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the

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

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

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

**Item No.128.12**      **Environmental Clearance to M/s TRIF Kochi Projects Ltd for the construction of Residential Building “Cochin Residential Development Project” at Sy. No. 843 part in Ernakulam Village, Kerala (File No. 504/ EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item along with the copy of the letter received from the IRO, MoEF&CC, Bangalore and the decision of 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting. The Authority noted that there is no particular action assigned to SEIAA, Kerala in this regard. The IRO, MoEF&CC addressed the State Pollution Control Board for further action.

**In these circumstances, the Authority decided to request the Pollution Control Board to inform about the action taken based on the communication received from IRO, MoEF&CC.**

**Item No.128.13**      **Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. K.V. Abraham, Managing Partner, M/s Thomsun Sands and Metals Pvt. Ltd. for the Quarry Project at Sy. No.120/1-23 in Erumely South village, Erumely Panchayat, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam- Request for Extension of EC.  
(File No: 963/EC4/4473/2015/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item with the letter of the project proponent dated 5.5.2023 and the minutes of the 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting. The Authority noted that the

Monitoring Committee has constituted by the project proponent and convened its meeting. It is also observed that the CoC No. 1013/21 filed by Sri Ashik K.S was closed by Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 01-09-2021.

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

1. The Project Proponent shall submit the application through Parivesh Portal for the extension of EC along with mandatory CCR and other documents. SEAC shall appraise it based on its merit.
2. The observations of the Monitoring Committee shall be included in the HYCRs.

**Item No.128.14**      **Application for Environment Clearance for the Granite Stone Quarry of M/s. Kizhakethalackal Rocks, for an extent of 12.4408 Ha. in Survey. Nos. 184/1A (Government Land), Elappara Village, Peermade Taluk, Idukki, Kerala.**  
**( SIA/KL/MIN/145075/2020, File No. 1195/EC2/2018/SEIAA**

The Authority deliberated the item with the observations of various SEAC meetings, the field visit reports, the evaluation report of the slope stability study, the request of the project proponent, the letter of the DC, Idukki dated 18.06.2023, and the Judgment dated 23/04/2021 in WP (C) No. 9972 of 2021. The Authority observed that a part of the proposed site falls in red and orange zones and the altitude of the project area is 1070m to 1300m and the slope of the site varies from 6.5 to 40°.

The rejection order was issued on 05-03-2021 and the proposal was reconsidered as per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court. Now the District Collector, Idukki vide letter dated 18-06-2023 intimated the Member Secretary, Kerala State Disaster Management Authority, to take necessary action to conduct a detailed study in the proposed area, since part of the area comes in Red and Orange zones, which maybe more susceptible to disasters in future. The NOC was issued by the District Collector, Idukki dated 11.06.2023.

The SEAC in its 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting observed the following and recommended rejection of the proposal.

- a. The Project was not accorded EC due to hazard proneness of the site and the application was rejected in the 107<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA
- b. The site is located on the side-slope of a very prominent elongated ridge with an

elevation of around 1500m above MSL and the destabilization of this ridge will have irreparable environmental impacts including on the climate.

- c. The risk and accident proneness of the mining activity is extremely high in the site with significant presence of boulders, steep to very steep slope and transportation through fragile narrow High Range roads
- d. NIRM report admits that there may be hidden slips and geological surprises within the rock mass which could not be anticipated or presumed.
- e. In cases like this, it is important to invoke the 'Precautionary Principle'. *"The principle of precaution involves the anticipation of environmental harm and taking measures to avoid it or to choose the least environmentally harmful activity. It is based on scientific uncertainty. Environmental protection should not only aim at protecting health, property and economic interest but also protect the environment for its own sake. Precautionary duties must not be triggered by the suspicion of concrete danger but also by justified concern or risk potential"*. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a recent judgment in IA No.1000 of 2003 dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2022 has underlined the necessity for following the Precautionary Principle. The judgment states that *a situation may arise where there may be irreparable damage to environment after an activity is allowed to go ahead and if it is stopped, there may be irreparable damage to economic interest*. The Hon'ble Court held that in case of a doubt, protection of environment would have precedence over economic interest. It was further held that precautionary principle requires anticipatory action to be taken *to prevent harm and that harm can be prevented even on reasonable suspicion. Further, the Hon'ble Court emphasizes in the said judgment that it is not always necessary that there should be direct evidence of harm to the environment.*
- f. In the case of this quarry, there is every reason to suspect the risk potential in the context of extreme events due to Climate Change and proximity to hazard zones. The ravages of extreme events due to Climate Change have been conspicuously present in Kerala over the past few years, particularly in the High Range region. Hence, the greatest of caution has to be exercised while deciding about the fate of steep inclines and precipitous drops on the western face of the Western Ghats which take the brunt of the increasingly heavy downpours during monsoons.
- g. The site is located on the rocky escarpment region of the Western Ghats and it



constitute a unique geological entity and have outstanding geological value of global importance and therefore needs to be preserved for posterity. The rocky stretches may also have unique floral assemblages that are narrowly endemic to that region. Recent botanical expeditions to the areas around the quarry site region (rocky surfaces at an altitude of 1000-1500m) could uncover species (*Argostemma quarantena*, *Impatiens stolonifera*), that are found only in this particular area in the entire globe. Once lost, it is gone forever.

- h. Western Ghats is globally considered as a "hottest of hot spots" of biodiversity (Myers) and listed as World Heritage Site. The quarry is situated at the upper crust of the Ghats (almost at the altitude of Munnar) and should not be seen in isolation. It is possible that perturbation caused to such mountain systems may even affect orographic effect that facilitates summer rains in Kerala

**In the above circumstances the Authority decided the following:**

1. The project proponent shall be heard in the next SEIAA meeting. The intimation regarding the same shall be given by the SEIAA Secretariat well in advance.
2. The project proponent shall submit his response to the observations of 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC within 10 days.

**Item No.128.15      Legal opinion in WP(C) No: 17384/2017 and Civil Appeal Nos. 7699-7700 of 2019 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 7792-7793 of 2019) (File No: 964/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

Legal opinion was received from Advocate General, with respect to the WP(C) No: 17384/2017 and Civil Appeal Nos. 7699-7700 of 2019 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 7792-7793 of 2019). The legal opinion was sought by the Director, Mining and Geology department, to obtain a clarification whether quarrying lease can be granted to the area (Plantation as per section 81 (e)). Advocate General is of the opinion that a quarrying lease or a quarrying permit cannot be issued in a plantation area. In addition to this, the Revenue Department has issued the Circular (No. REV-A2/18/2022-REV dated 06.10.2022) on the basis of the judgment in WP(C) Nos. 11249/2010 dated 25.05.2022

**Authority noted the details and decide refer the same to SEAC for information.**

**Item No.128.16      Environmental Clearance for the mining of Building Stone Quarry project for an Area of 3.1424 Ha of Nissamudeen K S at Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/407128/2022, 2154/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item with the decisions of various SEAC meetings and observed that the 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting noted that the mining plan is not well conceived thereby it leads to loss of significant quantity of resource and also enhances the environmental fragility. There is a quarry adjacent to the proposed site owned by the project proponent and the proposal for extension for the same was delisted due to non- submission Certified Compliance Report. Therefore, the Committee directed the proponent to submit revised mining plan and intimated the Authority that the proponent seems to have violated the EC conditions as inferred from the satellite imagery.

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

1. If the project proponent violated the EC conditions, SEAC has to verify the same and have the freedom to direct the project proponent for submitting a damage assessment report by a NABET-accredited agency for assessing the penalty for the non-compliance with EC conditions.
2. Intimate Mining and Geology Department to take necessary action if the project proponent has violated the KMMC Rules and the norms in the mining plan.

The Authority decided to refer back the proposal to SEAC for further action

**Item No.128.17      Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry in Sy.No. (Un Survey) at Kumaranellor Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala-Judgment dated 10.05.2022 in the WPC No.5545/2021 filed by M/s Mukkom Property Developers (P) Ltd, before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIN/43696/2019; 1448/EC3/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the report of the Tahsildhar Kozhikkode, the observations of various SEAC/ SEIAA meetings, the judgment dated 10.05.2022 in

WP(C) No. 5545/2021 of Hon'ble High Court and CoC No. 1067/2023. The report of the Tahasildar about the nature of the land, inquiring whether mining can be allowed on such lands as per the existing rules and regulations was received only on 26.06.2023, after a few remainder letters including a D O letter.

As per the report of the Tahasildar, the land comprised 5.2678 ha under the ownership of the Mukkom Properties was originally under the partnership of KMA Estate and is a part of rubber estate. It has got relaxation as per Sec.81 of KLA Act. Besides, this land is under dispute in TLB (E) 1760/73 of Earanad Taluk and also in CR-91/13 of Ponnani Taluk.

The 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC observed that the Revenue Department, issued Circular No. REV-A2/18/2022-REV dated 06.10.2022 as per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C)11249/2010. It mentions that "the assigned land should be used only for 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. As stated above, if any of the violations like mining, quarrying, construction activities etc. are noticed on the assigned land, Tahsildar/District Collector should take necessary action to stop such activities and resume the land as per the provisions of the Kerala Land Assignment Act 1960 and the Rules framed thereunder". The orders of the High Court in WP (C)11249/2010 was also agreed with the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide its judgment dated 14th March 2023 in the appeal filed by the quarry owners.

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

1. On the basis of recent developments occurred in the matter, and a subsequent judgment of the Hon'ble High Court and the Supreme Court on the same subject matter, EC for mining in the assigned land for plantation cannot be issued.
2. It shall be intimated to the Hon'ble Court that there is no wilful negligence or disobedience for complying with the judgment dated 10.05.2022 in WP(C)No.5545/2021 from the part of SEIAA.
3. A review petition shall be filed before the Hon'ble High Court on the judgment dated 10.05.2022 in WP(C)No.5545/2021.
4. A detailed statement including all the actions taken by SEIAA/ SEAC and the decision taken on the judgment dated 10.05.2022 in WP(C)No.5545/2021 shall be intimated to the Hon'ble High Court to defend the CoC No.1067/2023

5. The Legal Officer is directed to necessary action in this regard. The decision of the Authority shall be conveyed to the Standing Counsel for further action.

**Item No.128.18**      **Reconsideration of rejected the environmental clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Smt. K. Reema, Director, M/s Kudiyanmala Granites for an area of 0.8893 Ha, in Re.Sy.No 292/1A in Newnaduvil Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur.**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/131195/2019) {1577/EC3/2019/SEIAA}**

The Authority perused the item and examined the request of the project proponent dated 27.05.2023 to reconsider the decision for rejecting the proposal and provide an opportunity to carryout detailed studies and submit the report from the expert to proceed with EC application.

**The Authority observed that the project was rejected due to multiple reasons and there is no need to review the decision of the Authority and hence decided to adhere to its earlier decision.**

**Item No.128.19**      **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)**

Environmental Clearance was issued to Sri. Sreelath. T, Thottathil Veedu, Vaakayadu P.O, Kozhikode as per order No. SIA/KL/MIN/271936/2022 dated 02.12. for the project Life of 7 years, for the quarry project for an area of 1.7613 ha at Re-Sy. Block No.7, Re.Sy.No.93/27 in Raroth Village, Thamassery Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.

The Condition No.4 of Environmental Clearance reads as under: “As the quarry site is located within 10 km radius of the Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary, as per OM dated 8.8.2019 of MoEF&CC Clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife is mandatory for starting a quarry. Hence Project Proponent is directed to obtain a clearance

from the Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at the site”.

The Project Proponent filed WP(C) No.34050 of 2022 in the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala to delete clause no 4 of Environmental Clearance dated 02-12-2022. The Hon’ble Court in its judgement dated 19-12-2022 directed the 4th respondent i.e., SEIAA Kerala to issue Environmental Clearance in favour of the petitioner without insisting for SCNBWL Clearance, if the petitioner is otherwise eligible.

On receipt of the judgment the proposal was placed in the 123rd meeting of SEIAA held on 27th & 28th January 2023. The Authority deliberated the matter and other similar cases. Considering the Judgement of Hon’ble High Court in various cases, the Authority took a decision in Item No. 123.30. As per the decision, the Project Proponent must obtain certificate from the Wildlife Warden / DFO regarding the distance of the project site as mentioned in the minutes in Item NO. 123.30. Authority decided to post the proposal back to SEAC for fresh recommendation in the light of decision taken as per Agenda 123.30.

The proposal was considered in the 140<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 13<sup>th</sup> -15<sup>th</sup> March 2023. The Committee discussed the direction of SEIAA and decided to direct the proponent to submit the letter from the Wildlife Warden, regarding the distance of the site from the Malabar Wild life Sanctuary and whether the site falls within the proposed/approved ESZ around Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary. The above decision was intimated to the Project Proponent on 29.03.2023.

The Project proponent vide his letter dated 20.04.2023 informed that the proposed quarry lies far beyond the Eco Sensitive Zone (ESZ) proposed for the Malabar Wild Life Sanctuary as per the draft Notification No.S.O.2634 (E) dated 05.08.2020 and therefore no clearance from the SCNBWL is required as stipulated by the SEIAA in its EC. He also intimated that in compliance to the distance of the proposed the quarry site is 9.523 Kms which is identified as far beyond the proposed ESZ. The Proponent also submitted the copy of the Statement filed by the Divisional Forest Officer, Kozhikode.

In the judgement dated 26-04-2023 in I.A. NO. 131377 OF 2022 ( T N Godavarman Thirumulpad vs Union of India & Others ) hon’ble Supreme Court of India ordered that as 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 17th May 2022 issued by MoEF & CC”.***

MoEF & CC has issued an Office Memorandum dated 17th May 2022 which requires 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. As per above OM and Supreme Court judgement NBWL clearance is mandatory in the present case as the final notification ESZ of Malabar Wildlife sanctuary is not issued.

The Project Proposal was placed in the 127<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting and it was deferred. The Member Secretary SEIAA took up the matter with Advocate General for legal opinion.

Advocate General of Kerala vide his letter dated 16<sup>th</sup>, June 2023, gave the following legal opinion. “The parties to the Judgment on WP(C) No.34050 of 2022 dated 02-12-2022 including 4th respondent who have suffered an inter-partes judgment which has become final in the absence of any challenge before the appellate forum, could not have entertained the view that SCNBWL clearance is mandatory for Projects that are located within 10 Km of National Park or Wildlife Sanctuary where the final ESZ notification has not yet been published. In view of the above, I am of the opinion that there is no necessity for SEIAA to insist that the Project Proponent should be asked to get clearance of Standing Committee of National Board for Wild Life (SCNBWL) in the matter”.

**Considering all the above facts, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable High court of Kerala in WP(C) No.34050 of 2022 dated 02-12-2022, Authority decided the following:**

1. SEAC may complete the review without insisting on NBWL clearance in this case and make recommendation accordingly.
2. In all other cases in which the project falls within 10 km radius of NP's and WLS's where final notification of ESZ are not issued, the OM dated 17-05-2022 will be applicable.

**Item No.128.20      Environmental Clearance for the granite building stone quarry project of Sri. A. M. Muhammed Ali, M/s. Mubaraq Granites in Sy.**

**No. 93/1 pt, 94 pt, 95 pt, 96 pt of Perakamannna Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Request for revalidation  
(File No.902/SEIAA/EC1/3463/2015)**

The Authority perused the item with the request of the project proponent dated 06.08.2022 requesting extension of the EC, the judgements in various WP(C)s, the complaints received from the Sri. Mujeeb Rahman requesting not to give Environmental Clearance, and the decision of the 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEAC. The Authority observed that EC was issued on 22.02.2020 based on the Mining Plan with a mine life of 4 years and hence the direction of the Hon'ble Court in the Judgment dated.03.08.2022 is complied with. Now the project proponent submitted an application for extension of EC issued on 22.02.2020 with new Mining Plan having a mine life of 10 years.

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

1. The request of the project proponent for the extension of EC as per the provisions of the SO 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022 cannot be considered since the mining plan considered ( submitted along with application in 2015 ) for the issuance of earlier EC is having a mine life of 4 years only.
2. The project proponent has to submit a fresh application for the extension of the EC through PARIVESH portal with new mining plan and necessary documents.
3. SEAC shall appraise the application with the new Mining Plan and give definite recommendation for extension of EC according to its merit.

**Item No.128.21      Environmental Clearance for the quarry project of Sri. Abdul Khader K, at Sy. Nos. 105 pt& 111pt in Kannamangalam Village & Panchayat, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram – complaint received from Sri. Kadeesumma – reg :-  
(File No. 846/SEIAA/EC1/2858/2015)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the reply submitted by the project proponent on 25 May 2023 to the Show Cause Notice issued on 03 May 2023. The Authority noticed that the Letter dated.01.10.2021 of SEIAA asking the additional documents were not received by the project proponent.

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

1. Provide a copy of the Letter dated.01.10.2021 to the project proponent for submitting the additional documents for revalidation of EC
2. After receiving the documents, SEAC may give definite recommendation after appraising the proposal for revalidation of EC.

**Item No.128.22**      **Environmental Clearance for the Quarry Project at Sy. Nos 2059/1, 2060, 2061, 2063 of Kuttichira Village & Survey Nos. 928, 929, 930, 931, 932/1, 932/2 in Kodassery Village, Kodassery Panchayat, Chalakudy Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala –Judgment dated 02.11.2020 in WP(C) No.11048 of 2020 - Revalidation of EC- reg :- (847/SEIAA/EC1/2859/2015)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that EC was revalidated with a project life of 6.5 years from the date of issuance of original EC. i.e. 23.04.2016 excluding the Covid extension. Authority observed that the District Collector, Thrissur vide Letter No. DCTSR/5282/2021-B7 dated.27.02.2023 reported 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 the following:**

- 1) To cancel the EC issued to the project proponent based on the Letter received from the District Collector, Thrissur.
- 2) Before cancelling the EC, Show Cause Notice shall be issued to the Project Proponent as to why the EC given to him should not be cancelled.
- 3) The Project Proponent should submit his explanation within 15 days from the date of receipt of the Notice.
- 4) The Project Proponent shall be given an opportunity of being heard in the next SEIAA meeting.



**Item No.128.23**      **Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone quarry project at Sy. 36/3 (pt), 37/1(pt), 37/2(pt), 37/3(pt) in Morayoor Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Sri. E. A. Abdul Karim, M/s Malabar Aggregates – Judgment dated 23.02.2021 in WP(C) No.4687 of 2021 - Revalidation of EC (File No. 853/SEIAA/EC1/2977/2015)**

The Authority perused the item and observed that as per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court in judgment dated 23.02.2021 in WP (C) No.4687/2021, the SEAC appraised the proposal based on the documents received from the project proponent, report of field verification conducted on 15.08.2021 & 02.07.2022, CCR received from IRO, MoEFCC, Bangalore etc. The 141<sup>st</sup> SEAC meeting recommended the project for revalidation of EC with a project life of 12 years from the date of the original EC i.e., 31.10.2016 subject to the certain additional specific conditions in addition to the Specific and General Conditions stipulated in the original EC.

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 also noted the report received from KSPCB and the Senior Geologist.

**The Authority decided to revalidate the EC initially for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan and then extend the EC period to cover Project Life of 12 years, from the date of issuance of original EC i.e., 31.10.2016, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has caused any damage to the Environment in the Project Region by violating any EC conditions.**

The EC is subject to Terms and Conditions in the original EC in addition to the General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. 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.*

- 2. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 3. 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.*
- 4. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the 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.*
- 5. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*
- 6. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
- 7. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office.*

**Item No.128.24**

**Environmental Clearance issued to the quarry project owned of Sri. Ummer Kutty. K, M/s. Morayoor Granites Pvt. Ltd at Sy.No.153/2, 154/Pt in Morayur Village, Kondotty Taluk,**

**Malappuram. – Order of NGT in Appeal No.30 of 2020 filed by  
Sri. Mohammed. O – reg :- (File No.1239/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that EC was issued to the project on 06.08.2020. Sri. Mohammed. O filed Appeal No. 30 of 2020 before the Hon'ble NGT challenging the Environmental Clearance granted to the project proponent. The Hon'ble NGT vide Order dated.24.12.2021 suspended the EC for a period of 7 months and remitted back to the SEIAA to consider the same again afresh. The 113<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Authority forwarded the order of the Hon'ble NGT to SEAC and the Project Proponent for compliance of the directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal. The 128<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC directed the project proponent to submit certain additional documents. As decided by the Committee in its 132<sup>nd</sup> meeting a field inspection was also carried out by the Sub-Committee on 02.10.2022.

Based on detailed discussions, the SEAC in its 136<sup>th</sup> meeting decided to intimate SEIAA that it is not desirable to permit mining in the proposed site from the point of view of precautionary principle. This is due to the fact that the stability of the slope is not adequate enough to support high intensity activities such as mining in the site located in a hazard zone with extensive slope of steep to very steep category with intermittent break-in-slope, deep soil cover and hydrologic heterogeneities. Further, the density of population in the downstream area of the proposed site is also very high, who will always be on threat of land failures or debris flow in case of a slope failure. Therefore, in the given environmental scenario, it is desirable to discourage the proposed project in the suggested site.

The Authority considered the proposal in its 123<sup>rd</sup> meeting and decided to agree with the recommendation of the SEAC and issue Show Cause notice to the Project Proponent for the cancellation of EC. An opportunity of hearing was also given to the proponent during the 127th meeting of SEIAA held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023. The Authority examined the hearing note submitted by the Project Proponent on 19.06.2023 and noted that there is no reasons to substantiate his claims.

**Under the circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection. The Authority also observed that the direction of the Hon'ble NGT in Appeal No.30 of 2020 is also compiled herewith.**

**Item No.128.25**      **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Majeed. P, for an area of 0.9716 Ha in Re. Survey No.1/4 in Pulikkal Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Request to amend the EC condition**  
**SIA/KL/MIN/261884/2022, 2072/EC6/2022/SEIAA**

The Authority perused the item and noted that there are series of cases pending before various Courts about the ownership of land. EC was issued as per the decision of 125<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA subject to the interim and final judgement in the court cases regarding land dispute. The Authority decided to stick on to its earlier decision. The decision of the Authority may be conveyed to the Hon'ble Member of Parliament indicating that SEIAA has issued the EC after the due appraisal as per EIA notification 2006 and it is for the Project Proponent to follow the EC conditions.

**Item No.128.26**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sameer P. for an area of 2.7047 Ha at Re. Sy. No. 237/2, 237/1, 237/1-2 of Nediyruppu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Request to change the Survey Nos. mentioned in the EC – reg :-**  
**SIA/KL/MIN/173485/2020, 1834/EC6/2020/SEIAA**

The Authority perused the item and noted the request of the project proponent dated 26.05.2023 to change the old survey nos. in the EC documents with the new one. The Authority observed that EC was issued based on the Mining Plan approved by the Department of Mining & Geology which is one of the basic document for the issuance of EC. Hence the Authority decided to direct the project proponent to make the correction in the Mining Plan and give EC modification application through Parivesh portal.

The Authority also examined the request received from Sri. Abdul Hakeem T.P vide email dated.29.05.2023 and observed that EC was given after following all the rules and regulations prevailing at the time of issuance of EC and there was no such built structures during appraisal period.

**Item No.128.27**      **Case Regarding District Survey Report  
(File No.412/A2/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and decided to refer the District Survey Report, Kannur to SEAC to appraise as per the norms of EIA Notification (Appendix X) and report.

**Item No.128.28**      **Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram for the granite building stone quarry project in Uzhumalakkal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District by Smt. Shaila Nasar, Director, M/s Al-Nassar Granites Pvt.Ltd - Judgment dated 30.11.2020 in WP (C) No. 26372/2020 - Revalidation of EC- Interim order dated 06.03.2023 in WP(C)No.7289/2023  
(File No. 2793/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. Nazar, on behalf of the Project Proponent attended the hearing on 27.06.2023. The project proponent intimated that he has submitted letter from the Wildlife Warden stating the distance from the boundary of the proposed ESZ. He is has also intimated that the project area is not included in the proposed ESZ area. 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.

**Item No.128.29**      **Environmental Clearance for Building Stone Quarry Project in Survey No.59/1-1,86/4 in Block number 79 in Koottikkal village, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam District  
(SIA/KL/MIN/60903/2019 File No. 2438/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

As intimated as per the decision of the 127<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting the project proponent Sri. Thomas Mathew and Sri. P Z Thomas, Consultant, M/s Environmental Engineers and Consultants present before the Authority for hearing. The Consultant made presentation and explained that the working of quarry till date with valid mining lease and consent to operate from KSPCB is legal as per the OM of MoEFCC dated 18.05.2012. The consultant intimated that as per the said O M no Environmental Clearance is required if the area is less than 5 Ha for the leases issued before 2012.

The Authority observed that the above averments cannot be accepted as per the decisions of the Hon'ble NGT and the Supreme Court. The Authority noticed that The

Principal Bench of National Green Tribunal, New Delhi, vide its Judgment dated 13.01.2015 in O.A. No.123/2014 and connected cases held that no quarrying/ mining shall be done, without obtaining Environmental Clearance (EC), relying on the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Deepak Kumar Vs. State of Haryana (2012) 4 SCC 629. In the judgment it is stated that ".....the existing mining lease right holders would also have to comply with the requirement of obtaining Environmental Clearance from the competent authorities in accordance with law. However, all of them, if not already granted Environmental Clearance would be entitled to a reasonable period (say three months) to submit their applications for obtaining the same, which shall be disposed of expeditiously and in any case not later than six months from pronouncement of this judgment".

As per the order of the Hon'ble NGT in Original Application No. 244 of 2017 (SZ) it is stated that "..... carrying out mining operation, even after consent from SPCB without prior Environmental Clearance (EC), then it will amount to violation of EIA Notification, 2006 and the operations are liable to be stopped immediately. The mining operation shall not be allowed to continue till such time Environmental Clearance (EC) is obtained. The State Department of Mines and Geology is the nodal authority entrusted with the enforcement and regulation of mining operations in the State, including illegal mining". Besides, it is also stated that ".....Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Principal Bench of National Green Tribunal observed that after 15.01.2016, all existing mining leaseholders whether minor or major mineral irrespective of the area of lease has to obtain Environmental Clearance (EC) for continuance of their operation and further held that, those who have not filed application prior to 31.03.2016, will be considered as a violation case".

In the said case the Hon'ble NGT(SZ) declared that the mining operations after 15.01.2016, on the basis of the old lease is illegal and unauthorized and they are liable to pay environmental compensation for the quantity of mined articles which has to be assessed by the Mining and Geology Department. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its Judgement dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 2023 in SLA No. 5563/2023 upheld the Judgement of Hon'ble NGT and directed the Registry to communicate these orders to the Registrar General of the High Court to place the present order before the High Court in the pending proceedings which may be taken into consideration by the High Court while hearing the proceedings before it and while extending the stay granted earlier staying the order passed by the NGT dated 27.05.2021 against which the Civil Appeal was preferred before this Court which came to be dismissed and subsequently the review application also came to be dismissed. In addition, the Hon'ble High

Court in its judgments in W.P.(C).No.25153 of 2015 (T) and similar cases, it is observed that carrying on any quarry operations on the basis of the permits after 2012 are held to be illegal, by the Court.

**In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decisions held in its 127<sup>th</sup> meeting. In addition to this, the Authority also decided the following:**

1. Project Proponent shall submit a detailed hearing note along with all the supporting documents within 7 Days.
2. Stop Momo shall be issued for stopping illegal mining after issuing Show Cause Notice as per earlier decision.
3. Concerned Authorities/ Agencies shall initiate action for illegal mining based on relevant Rules/ regulations.
4. The Project Proponent will engage a NABET-accredited consultant to assess the environmental damages caused by illegal mining without EC. SEAC will appraise this assessment report and recommend the quantum of penalty with compensation in this regard.

**Item No.128.30      Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. C. Firos Babu for an area of 4.3520 Hectare at Survey No 201, 202, 203, 214, 215, 216/1 & 218 in Thiruvilwamala Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/43559/2019; 1483/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, the project proponent Sri. C. Firos Babu, attended the hearing on 27.06.2023. The Authority observed that SEIAA in its earlier meeting decided that 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. Before taking the decision it was decided to hear the project proponent. Heard the Proponent and directed the project proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within 7 days with necessary supporting documents to substantiate their claims.

**Item No.128.31**      **Present status of the pending EC application as on  
23.06.2023 - reg  
(File No: 2058/A1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority noted the pending status of the EC application in PARIVESH portal and observed that there are some applications pending with SEAC for more than 365 days. So, the Authority decided to inform SEAC to take urgent actions to dispose of those applications pending for more than 365 days, within two months. Authority also noticed that this pendency for more than 365 days has been adversely commented by MOEF&CC in all review meetings. Hence SEAC may consider only these applications in the coming two SEAC meetings on priority. SEIAA Secretariat shall provide all necessary assistance.



# **PARIVESH FILES**

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

**Item No.1**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shamseer V.K, at Re Survey Nos. 2/18, 2/20, 2/46, 2/76, 2/11, 2/78 in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/134486/2020, 1790/EC4/2020/SEIAA}**

Sri. Shamseer V.K, Varuvil Kayayil House, Vadikkal, Valiyaparamba P.O, Kozhikode-673572 submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 01.01.2020 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project, for an area of 0.9926 Ha, in Re-Sy. Nos. 2/18, 2/20, 2/46, 2/76, 2/77, 2/78 of Raroth Village, Thamarassery 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 2, 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 142<sup>nd</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 has to comply OM dated 17-05-2022 of MoEF&CC if the project area falls within 10 km radius of Wild Life Sanctuary as per the directions contained in the Honourable Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.4.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022.*
- 2. 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 its amendments thereby.*

- 3. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. A copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 4. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.*
- 5. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 6. 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.*
- 7. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
- 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 half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 9. 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.*
- 10. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabbion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
- 11. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 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 should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*

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. *If the abandoned quarries 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.*
18. *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.*
19. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
20. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
21. *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.*
22. *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.*
23. *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.*

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

**Item No.2**

**Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Baiju Joseph for an area of 0.9307 Ha. (2.2997 Acres) at Sy Nos. 463/5-4, 468/3-1 & 468/4-1, Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/137919/2020; 2059/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Baiju Joseph submitted an application for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry over an extent of 0.9307 Ha. (2.2997 Acres) at Sy Nos. 463/5-4, 468/3-1 & 468/4-1, in Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, 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 2, 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 6 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 6 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noted that as per the Cluster Certificate, there were several permits for the quarry. Hence the Authority decided to direct the project proponent to submit the details of each permit/lease included in both cluster certificates and the copy/copies of corresponding EC if accorded. The project proponent may be informed to submit the same for the perusal of SEIAA and the copy of the letter shall be marked to the District Geologist for information.

**Item No.3****Environmental Clearance of the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Deepak Cheerothy at Sy. Nos: 171/2-2, 171/4 in Karukutty Village Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/156655/2020; 1754/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Deepak Cheerothy submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project at Sy. Nos. 171/2-2, 171/4 in Karukutty Village Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, 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 142<sup>nd</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, 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. Since there is no bench wise production details in the Mining Plan, the mineable reserve shall be reworked by the District Geologist by limiting the depth to 70m above MSL. Permit / lease shall be issued accordingly*
- 4. The ultimate mine depth should be limited to 70m above MSL instead of 60m above MSL.*
- 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 gabbion 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. *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.4**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sudheermon. P.P at Survey No. 217/4, in Pulpatta Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/169289/2020, 1843/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Sudheermon. P. P S/o Saidalavi Padikuth (H) Chengara, Iruvetty (P.O) Malappuram, submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on

02.12.2020 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, for an area 0.9569 Ha at Survey No. 217/4 in Pulpatta Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. As per the approved mining plan, the mine life is 5 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions. The Authority also noted that based on a complaint, the SEAC recommended to issue EC only after the verification of the authenticity of the Mining Plan by the District Office of the Mining & Geology Department, Malappuram.

**In the above circumstance, the Authority decided to refer the complaint to the Department of Mining & Geology and the District Geologist for enquiry and report. After receipt of the report, the Project Proponent and the Complainant shall be given an opportunity for hearing.**

**Item No.5                      Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Minor Mineral Mining (Quarry) project of M/s Rockfield Estates Pvt. Ltd. at Block No. 48 Re-Survey No. 400/1, 400/2, 401/5-2, 406/5 in Chengalam (E) Village, Kottayam Taluk, Kottayam, Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIN/175300/2020; 1987/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Shibu Mathew, Managing Director, M/s. Rockfield Estates Pvt. Ltd. submitted an Environmental Clearance application *via* PARIVESH Portal on 29 April 2022, for the Building Stone Quarry project of M/s Rockfield Estates Pvt. Ltd. at Block No. 48, Re-Sy No. 400/1, 400/2, 401/5-2, 406/5 in Chengalam (E) Village, Kottayam Taluk, Kottayam, Kerala.

The Authority noticed that there is an O.A. No. 56/2022 against the Project Proponent and M/s Palathara Constructions Pvt. Ltd, which is pending with Hon<sup>ble</sup> NGT (SZ). The Hon<sup>ble</sup> NGT prima facie made out a case against both Respondents - Respondent No.4 (Palathara Construction Pvt. Ltd.) & Respondent No. 5 (Rock Field Estates Pvt. Ltd). The Hon<sup>ble</sup> NGT also enquired about the present position of EC issued by SEIAA. Hence taking precautions, the Authority decided to defer the proposal for the outcome of the NGT Order to take further decision on M/s. Rockfield Estates Pvt. Ltd.



The Authority also directed the project proponent, M/s Palathara Construction Pvt Ltd to get a environmental damage assessment report done by a NABET Accredited Agency for verification and evaluation by SEAC.

**Item No.6**                      **Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry for an Area of 0.7694 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 10/1- 2, 10/1-3, 10/9, Block No.16 of Mookkannoor Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIN/189134/2020; 1953/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Amal P. Wilson submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the building stone quarry project for an area of 0.7694 Ha at Block No.16, Re-Survey Nos. 10/1-2, 10/1-3,10/9, in Mookkannoor Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, 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 2, 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 142<sup>nd</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, 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 mining should be limited to 50m above MSL considering the depth to water table.*
- 4. Compulsory use of muffling arrangements during blasting in addition to NONEL blasting*

5. *Regulate blasting to a time fixed in consultation with the local population in the vicinity of the proposed site*
6. *Road should be widened to 7m width as per the plan submitted prior to the commencement of mining.*
7. *All the mitigation measures provided in the EMP should be implemented on priority.*
8. *Development of green belt using indigenous species should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*
9. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 500m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay prior to the commencement of mining to ensure that there is no impact and the result should be displayed in front of the project entry gate.*
10. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 500m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay should be monitored and the result included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
11. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
12. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
13. *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).*
14. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
15. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabbion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
16. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*

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. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
19. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
20. *Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
21. *A monitoring Committee should be constituted under the Chairmanship of the elected ward member, representative of the proposed mining project and representatives of the complainants.*
22. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
23. *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.*
24. *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.*
25. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
26. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
27. *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.*

28. *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.*
29. *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.*
30. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.7**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry 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}**

Smt. Sini Joseph, Director, M/s Puthalam Constructions Pvt. Ltd, PP 11 408 A, V. K. Crusher, Vellarvally, Kannur-670673 submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 27.01.2021 for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.0235 Ha at Re-Sy. Block No.64, Re-Sy. 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.

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, 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 proposal was placed in the 127th meeting of SEIAA held on 30th & 31st May 2023. Authority decided to hear the project proponent in the next SEIAA meeting to clarify the details regarding the quantity of topsoil/overburden, management plan, and area proposed for storage, protective measures to be adopted to avoid the seepage of overburden, etc. The Authority heard the Project Proponent and Consultant and considered the details regarding topsoil management proposed.

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. Development of green belt using indigenous species should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 5. 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.*
- 6. 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.*
- 7. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
- 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 half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 9. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geo-tagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
- 10. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
- 11. Maximum height of top soil dump must be limited to 6 m.*
- 12. Ensure that drainage from top soil dump is not polluting nearby water bodies.*
- 13. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 14. 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).*
- 15. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*

16. *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*
17. *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.*
18. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
19. *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.*
20. *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.*
21. *Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
22. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
23. *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.*
24. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides,*

*formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*

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

**Item No.8**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. C. K. Abdul Azeez, Managing Director, M/s Grand Stone Metals Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 4.9039 Ha at Survey No. 425 in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram (SIA/KL/MIN/199564/2021; 1356/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. C. K. Abdul Azeez, Managing Director, M/s Grand Stone Metals Pvt. Ltd. Malappuram, submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 20.07.2021 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, for an area of 4.9039 Ha at Survey No. 425 in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

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 25 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 25 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority observed that 76% of the site falls in the Moderate Hazard Zone and as per the Kerala State Disaster Management Plan 2016, quarrying in Moderate hazard zone shall be permitted only after getting the approval of the District Level Crisis Management Group for Mining constituted vide G.O (Rt) No. 542/14/ID dated 26-05- 2014. SEAC has also recommended for the same.



**Hence the Authority decided to direct the project proponent to submit the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group for Mining.**

**Item No.9                      Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry of Smt. K. Malathy for an area of 3.9800 Ha at Sy. No. 253/14, 266/1 & 266/2 in Cherukavu village Kondaty Taluk, Malappuram (SIA/KL/MIN/204626/2021, 1351/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Smt. Malathy. K, Kottarathil House, Kannanvettikavu, Ambalakandi, Cherukavu, Pulikkal, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 11.07.2021 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 3.9800 Ha at Sy. No. 253/14, 266/1 & 266/2 in Cherukavu village Kondaty Taluk, Malappuram.

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 139<sup>th</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 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. *The depth of mining should be limited to 80m above MSL or 10m above the local water table and the quantity of mineral should be reassessed accordingly.*
5. *The mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent during the public hearing must be fulfilled.*
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 houses and built structures upto 200m from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of peak particle velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
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. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office*
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. *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.10**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jayaprakash K for an area of 4.4462 Ha at Sy. No. 253/14 & 266/2 of Cherukavu Village, Kondaty Taluk, Malappuram (SIA/KL/MIN/204850/2021; 1352/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. Jayaprakash. K, Kottarathil House, Kannanvettikavu, Ambalakandi, Cherukavu, Pulikkal, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 12.07.2021 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, for an area of 4.4462 Ha at Sy. No. 253/14 & 266/2 of Cherukavu Village, Kondaty Taluk, Malappuram.

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 139<sup>th</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. The mitigation measures committed by the proponent during the public hearing must be complied with.*
- 5. 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.*
- 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 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. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office.*
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.11**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jimmy Jose, for an area of 0.9950 Ha at Sy. No. 318/2/2, 318/2/3 in Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk Thrissur (SIA/KL/MIN/229494/2021; 2029/EC6/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Jimmy Jose, Designated Partner, Hilton Stones Aggregates LLP, Thrissur submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 07.06.2022 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.9950 Ha at Sy. Nos. 318/2/2, 318/2/3 in Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 132<sup>nd</sup>, 134<sup>th</sup> & 142<sup>nd</sup> meetings held on different dates. The SEAC in its 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting examined the proposal and discussed the field inspection report conducted on 29-03-2023. The SEAC observed that the District Collector, Thrissur as per Letter dated.28.04.2023 intimated that the quarrying can't be permitted in the land since the proposed area is assigned for rubber plantation as per the KLR Act 1963.

The SEAC also noted that as per the Circular No. REV-A2/18/2022-REV dated 06.10.2022, the assigned land should be used only for cultivation or house cites beneficial enjoyment of adjoining lands or for other specific and special purposes, under the KLA Act

1960 and the Rules framed there under, 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. If any of the violations like mining, quarrying, construction activities etc, are noticed on the assigned land, Tahsildar/District Collector should take necessary action to stop such activities and resume the land as per the provisions of the KLA Act 1960 and the rules framed there under. The Circular is issued to uphold the common judgment dated 25.5.2022 in WP(C) Nos. 11249/2010 and connected cases of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in letter and spirit. Therefore, the 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC recommended rejection of the project proposal.

**Authority noticed that the 'Sreekrishna Estate' comes under the Category of assigned land as per the report of Tahsildhar, Thalappilly, Thrissur and hence should not be used for other purpose. The 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.12                      Environmental Clearance for the Mining of Laterite Building Stone project of Babu Joseph, Keezeth, Edakkattuvayal, at Re-Survey No.33/10 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/235350/2021; 2061/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Babu Joseph, Keezeth, Chethicode, Edakkattuvayal, Ernakulam, submitted an Environmental Clearance application on 28 July 2022, via PARIVESH for the mining of Laterite Building Stone project at Re-Survey No. 33/10 in Edakkattuvayal Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam, 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 2, 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 2 year. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.



**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (two) 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 mining should be done by maintaining a buffer of 50m between the project area and built structure.*
- 4. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting.*
- 5. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 6. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 7. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose*
- 8. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap*
- 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 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area*
- 14. No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 15. The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any*

*hindrance.*

- 16. The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
- 17. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented 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.13**

**Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Adeshkumar C.S in Survey No. 208/1-62,208-1-28 in Alanallur-III Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/239186/2021; 2056/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that Committee in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting decided to bring to the notice of the SEIAA that the operation of the two quarries of Mannarkkad Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators Vyavasaya Sahakarana Sangham, functional adjacent to the proposed site, prima-facie is not in compliance to the conditions stipulated in the Mining Plan

and EC.

The Authority decided to forward the observation of SEAC to the District Collector, Palakkad and the District Geologist, Palakkad to take necessary action against the two quarries. The Authority also noted that the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting directed the project proponent to submit certain documents. The Authority decided to direct the project proponent to submit all the documents sought by the SEAC.

**Item No.14**

**Environment Clearance for mining of M/s Perumannoor Granites Private Limited for an extent of 3.5238 Ha. at Sy No. 611/1A/19W/17, 611/1A/19W/19, 611/1A/83/13/16, 611/1A/84/14/23 & 611/1A/196/73/2 in Keerampara Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/267357/2022; 2034/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted that the project proponent has submitted the recent Cluster Certificate from the Department of Mining and Geology. Hence the Authority decided to refer the case back to SEAC to reconsider the decision in the light of new Cluster Certificate. The Project Proponent has to comply the OM dated 17/05/2022 of MoEF & CC as per the directions contained in the Honourable Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.4.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022.

**Item No.15**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Saburaj E.G. for an extent of 0.0971 Ha, at Survey No-246/1PT401 in Kinanur Village, Vellarikkund Taluk, Kasaragod, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/273789/2022; 2117/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Saburaj E. G. submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the mining of Laterite building stone quarry project for an extent of 0.0971 Ha at Survey No-246/1PT401 in Kinanur 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 2, 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 142<sup>nd</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 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 material 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.16**

**Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. James Joseph, Managing Partner, M/S J&P Constructions at Survey Nos. 322, 323/1, 323/2 in Ongallur- I Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala ( SIA/KL/MIN/274693/2022; 2055/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. James Joseph, Managing Partner, M/S J&P Constructions, Kizhakkambalam P.O, Aluva, Ernakulam- 683562, submitted an Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH for the Granite Building Stone Quarry at Survey Nos. 322, 323/1, 323/2 in Ongallur- I Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, 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 12 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</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 its amendments thereby.*

- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of the permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. A 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. Topsoil dump should be protected with gabion walls.*
- 5. The turbulent water should not get mixed with nearby water bodies.*
- 6. An abandoned quarry is found adjacent to the proposed project area. This land is understood to be owned by the proponent. This abandoned quarry should be protected with fencing to avoid danger to humans and animals and rehabilitated as water storage or for cultivation prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 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. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
- 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 half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 9. 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.*
- 10. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining operation*
- 11. CER proposed should be implemented during the first two years and it should be operated and maintained during the rest of the project period till the closure plan is implemented.*
- 12. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 500m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay prior to the commencement of mining to ensure that there is no impact and the result should be displayed in front of the project entry gate.*
- 13. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and built structures within 500m should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum*

*charge per delay should be monitored and the result included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

- 14. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites*
- 15. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 16. 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).*
- 17. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 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. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
- 20. If the abandoned quarries 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.*
- 21. 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.*
- 22. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority*
- 23. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 24. 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.17**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite building stone quarry project of Sri. Pratheep K. C for an extent of 0.0971 Ha at Survey No- 628/1A1pt12 in Munnad Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/279609/2022, 2119/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Pratheep K. C, Ottamavungal House, P. O Shankarampadi, Kasaragod-671541, vide application received on 07.10.2022, sought Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry at Survey No. 628/1A1pt12 in Munnad Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod District of 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 2, 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 143<sup>rd</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 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.18**

**Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Tom George for an extent of 2.0508 Ha at Sy No. 80/5/B, 80/6 & 82/2/B, in Palakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/280530/2022; 2088/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Tom George, S/o K J kuruvila, Keeparayil House, Veliyannoor - Post, Kottayam, Kerala - 686 634 submitted an Environmental Clearance application on 17 Aug 2022, via

PARIVESH, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an extent of 2.0508 Ha at Sy No. 80/5/B, 80/6 & 82/2/B in Palakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, 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 2, 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 8 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143rd meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 8 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority noticed that the depth to water table is mentioned as 9.68 m below ground level in FIR and elevation is 55-100m and the ultimate depth is 25 m. Then the mine pit depth is 30m. As per Mining Plan water level is 4m below ground level. The Authority decided to refer the case back to SEAC to seek clarification in this matter.**

**Item No.19                      Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry project of P J Jose for an area of 2.7057 Ha. at Pindimana Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/288699/2022, 2136/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item with the observations of all the SEAC meetings and the documents submitted by the project proponent including the Cluster Certificate. As per the Cluster Certificate, the total area of mines in the cluster is 5.9322 Ha. Authority observed that in the 140<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, the Committee observed that the Thattekad bird sanctuary is at a distance of 3.35km and based on the Cluster Certificate dated 12.08.2022, the SEAC directed the PP to submit application for ToR. Then, the Project Proponent submitted another Cluster Certificate dated 14.2.2023 based on the report of the Village Officer and claimed that there is no cluster situation. The SEAC observed that the Cluster Certificate dated 14.02.2023 indicated that the quarries that were reported as working in the cluster certificate dated 12.08.2022 is found not working. It is not clear whether the quarries are closed permanently after the expiry of lease period or EC or not. Therefore, the project proponent should submit clarification from Mining & Geology Department whether the quarries which are stated as “not working” are permanently closed after implementing mine closure plan and if so proof of the implementation of mine closure plan.

After getting the clarification the 143<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting observed that Cluster Certificate condition received from Mining and Geology Department indicates that there is a cluster situation. Therefore, Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit an application for ToR for conducting EIA study & EMP.

**The Authority agreed to the decision of the SEAC and decided to direct the project proponent to submit application for ToR for approval. The project proponent also has to submit an application before the SCNBWL for Wildlife Clearance.**

**Item No.20                      Environment Clearance for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Johnson Rocks at Sy. No. 138/4 (Pt) & 140/4 (Pt), Patta Land in Iravon Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/290613/2022; 2128/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Smt. Susamma John, Managing Partner, M/s Johnson Rocks, Payyanamon, Perinjottackal PO, Konni, Pathanamthitta submitted an Environment Clearance application via PARIVESH for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Johnson Rocks for an extent of 0.8949 Hectares at Sy. No. 138/4 (Pt) & 140/4 (Pt), Patta Land in Iravon Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 141<sup>st</sup> & 143<sup>rd</sup> meetings held on different dates. The Committee in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting discussed the field inspection report conducted on 06.05.2023 and observed the following:

1. Panchayat road is 50.3 m away from the BP 11 and is passing parallel to the southern boundary of the project site for a total distance of 190m.
2. The outflow water from the siltation pond will directly reach to the Panchayat road
3. The proposed siltation pond and silt traps are on the steep side and will not get enough settling time and depth for properly settling the drain water. Also may require concrete structures for the siltation tanks and silt traps, otherwise the ponds may prove disastrous during high intensity rainfall.
4. No proper OB dump plan given
5. The area shown for the afforestation program is unsuitable as it is a rocky terrain. Hence an alternate area for compensatory afforestation along with the geo-coordinates of the demarcated area for compensatory afforestation, geo-tagged

photographs of the location, ownership details and number and the type and species of trees, shrubs, herbs and climbers included in the afforestation program.

6. Nearby quarry is owned by the same proponent and is not followed scientific mining

Further, the Committee also observed that the environmental quality data is more than 4 years old. Based on detailed discussions, the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the proposal invoking precautionary principles and based on the following grounds.

- a. The southern portion of the site is very steep where a Panchayat road is located which will be affected due to the outflow discharges, accidental spillages and breaches, if any from the quarry from the quarry.
- b. The higher steepness of the southern portion of the proposed site does not provide feasibility to construct a drainage channel with suitable siltation ponds and silt traps.
- c. The built-structures located in the southern portion of the proposed site, having significant downward slope, will always be on threat of accidental spillages or breaches from the quarry.
- d. The proposed site requires precaution to preserve the natural equilibrium around the areas which is likely to get altered due to the proposed operations.

**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.21**

**Environmental Clearance for Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mohammed Shafi. E for an area of 0.8593 Ha at Re-Survey No- 449/2 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram  
(SIA/KL/MIN/400725/2022; 2128/EC6/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Muhammed Shafi.E S/o. Kunjali.E Unniyalungal House Srambya bazar Kumminipparambu- P.O, Malappuram, submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 22.10.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project, for an area of 0.8593 Ha at Re-Survey No- 449/2 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, 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 4 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 4 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 4 (four) 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 a maximum depth of 2m below general ground level at the site.*
- 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 mishap*
- 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 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
14. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
15. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
16. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
17. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented 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.22**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, of Sri. Saji K. Elias for an area of 0.9586 Ha. at Re Survey No. 300/1, 300/2-1 Block No.41, in Thiruvaniyoor Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala**



**(SIA/KL/MIN/403066/2022; 2163/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Saji K. Elias submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the building stone quarry project for an area of 0.9586 Ha. at Block no.41, Re Survey No. 300/1,300/2-1 in Thiruvaniyoor Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.

The Authority noted that the Committee in its 143<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting examined the documents submitted by the project proponent and found that as per the Cluster Certificate dated 03.12.2012, there are 6 adjacent quarries of which 2 are working and 4 are not working. Letter from Mining and Geology Dated 19.04.23 informed that the 4 non-working quarries were not closed as per the approved mine closure plan. Therefore there is a cluster condition and the committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit application for ToR for conducting EIA/EMP.

**The Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC and directed the project proponent to submit application for ToR for conducting EIA/EMP. The project proponent may be informed the same.**

**Item No.23**

**Environmental Clearance for Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. George Joseph, for an extent of 0.1936 Ha, at Re-Survey No.143/61, 63(143/1) in Perumanna Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala**

**(SIA/KL/MIN/403254/2022; 2172/EC4/SEIAA/2022)**

Sri. George Joseph, S/o Joseph, Chirayil House, Vadapuram P.O, Malappuram-676542 submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 02.10.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.1936 Ha, at Re-Sy. Nos. 143/61, 63(143/1) in Perumanna 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 2, 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 2 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for

the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (two) 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 material 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.24**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. K. M. Stephen for an extent of 4.9003 Ha. at Block No. 27 (Re-Sy. Block no. 37) Re-Sy. Nos. 399/2, 399/2-1, 399/2-2, 399/2-3, 399/3, 745/2, 745/3, 745/4, 745/5, 745/7, 745/8, 745/9, 745/10, 745/11, 745/12, 745/13, 745/14, 746/1, 746/2, 746/2-1, in Karimannur Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala.  
(Earlier rejected proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/126172/2019; 1527/EC1/2019/SEIAA)  
(SIA/KL/MIN/405925/2022, File: No. 1527/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. K. M. Stephen, Kaniyarkuzhiyil, Karimkunnam P.O, Idukki, Kerala – 685 586 submitted an Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH on 20/11/2019 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry over an extent of 4.9003 Ha. (12.1086 Acres) at Block No. 27,

(Re-Sy. Block no. 37) Re-Sy. Nos. 399/2, 399/2-1, 399/2-2, 399/2-3, 399/3, 745/2, 745/3, 745/4, 745/5, 745/7, 745/8, 745/9, 745/10, 745/11, 745/12, 745/13, 745/14, 746/1, 746/2, 746/2-1, in Karimannur Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki, Kerala. As directed by the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 36171 of 2022 filed by Sri. Vincent K. George with a prayer to give an opportunity of being heard, the SEAC heard the project proponent Sri. K M Stephen, his partner, Sri. K J Paul & RQP, Sri. Tambu Cheriyan and the Complainants Sri. Vincent K George and Sri. Joy Varghese in the 140<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting.

The project proponent has submitted a detailed hearing note on 11.04.2023 answering the allegation of the complainants. The complainants have not submitted a hearing note even after the prescribed time period. In these circumstances the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the Committee, recommended EC for a period of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority noticed that, Sri. Vincent K. George again filed a Writ petition before the Hon'ble Court in WP(C) No. 20030 of 2023, to pass an interim order staying all further proceedings pursuant to Ext. P7, pending disposal of the writ petition, in the interest of justice. Since the matter is subjudice, the Authority decided to defer the item. The Standing Counsel is requested to defend the case and the Legal officer to submit a Statement of Facts on priority.**

**Item No.25**

**Environmental Clearance for Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Muhammed at Survey No. 385/3 in Kappur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/406956/2022; 2155/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Muhammed, S/o. Enamu, Kanjullynhilil House, Kappur P.O., Mannarkkad, Palakkad submitted Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH for the Laterite building stone quarry for an extent of 0.0809 Ha at Survey No. 385/3 in Kappur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad District, 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 2, 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 143<sup>rd</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, 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. Mineable reserve shall be recalculated at the time of issuance of permit by M&G Department.*
- 4. The excavation activity associated should not involve blasting.*
- 5. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
- 6. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
- 7. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose*
- 8. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap*
- 9. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emission by covering excavated earth during transportation*
- 10. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to 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 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area*

14. No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.
15. The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.
16. The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.
17. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented 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.26**

**Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Shijil P.P, for an area of 0.0972 Ha, at Block No. 107, Re-Survey No: 86/2503 in Maniyoore Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/407320/2022; 2171/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Shijil P.P, Puthiya Purayil, Kuttiyattoor P.O, Kannur-670602 submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 21.11.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.0972 Ha at Re-Sy. Block No.107, Re-Sy.No. 86/2503 in Maniyoor Village, Taliparamba 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 2, 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 143<sup>rd</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 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 material 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.27**

**Granite Building Stone Quarry in Re-Survey Nos. 98/2-1, 98/1, 98/1-1 in Nellanad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala by Sri. Abdul Nazar A (Re-uploaded the previous proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/161967/2020) (SIA/KL/MIN/407637/2022; 1747/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Abdul Nazar. A submitted an Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH for the Granite Building Stone Quarry at Re-Survey Nos. 98/2-1, 98/1, 98/1-1 in Nellanad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 120<sup>th</sup>, 122<sup>nd</sup>, 126<sup>th</sup>, 128<sup>th</sup>, 131<sup>st</sup>, 137<sup>th</sup> & 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on different dates. Invoking the Precautionary Principle the Committee in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting recommended rejection of the proposal. The Authority observed that the project proponent vide email dated 14.06.2023 requested to give an opportunity of hearing before taking further decision.

**The Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to give a final recommendation after giving a hearing opportunity to the project proponent.**

**Item No.28**

**Environmental Clearance for Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Muhammed Afsal.T for an area of 0.5579 Ha at Re-Survey No-134/2-9, 134/2-23, 137/3, 137/4 in Pulikkal Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram (SIA/KL/MIN/408064/2022 , 2182/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

Sri. Muhammed Afsal.T, S/o. Kunhali. E Thanari House Melmuri Post Malappuram, submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 26.12.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.5579 Ha at Re-Survey Nos 134/2-9, 134/2-23, 137/3, 137/4 in Pulikkal Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, 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 3 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for

the mine life of 3 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (two) 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 material 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.29**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. K. M. Salim for an area of 0.3840 Ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 178/4, 178/5, 178/6, 178/7 and 178/8 in Killimangalam Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur**

**SIA/KL/MIN/40868/2019 , 1447/EC2/2019/SEIAA**

Sri. K. M. Salim, Kalapurakkal House, Killimangalam Post, Thrissur, submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 09.08.2019 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.3840 Ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 178/4, 178/5, 178/6, 178/7 and 178/8 in Killimangalam Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

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 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for a period of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

**Authority noted that as the project is located within 10 KMs of Peechi Vazhani WLS the Project Proponent has to comply the OM dated 17/05/2022 of MoEF & CC as per the directions contained in the Honourable Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.4.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022.**

The Authority noticed that after leaving the buffer distance quarrying is possible only in 0.23 Ha. No scientific mining is possible in this area. The Authority observed that the SEAC has constituted a Sub-Committee to study the feasibility of scientific mining in smaller areas.

**The Authority decided to defer the proposal till the receipt of the report from the SEAC and inform SEAC to speed up the process. The Authority also decided to inform the Department of Mining & Geology to take steps to give approval only for mining having minimum area where scientific mining is possible with buffer, benches, drainage plan etc.**

**Item No.30                      Environmental Clearance for Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Abu Thahir. P. K for an area of 0.9496 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 339/8, 338/1-1, 477/1-1 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram (SIA/KL/MIN/408697/2022, 2183/EC6/2023/SEIAA**

Sri. Abu Thahir. P. K, Pandikadavath (H), Oorakam Melmuri (P O), Karathode, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application through PARIVESH on 22.12.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.9496 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 339/8, 338/1-1, 477/1-1 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, 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 3 years. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 3 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 material 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.31**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Vijayan R. at Re-Sy No. 339/4 in Pallikkal Village, Varkala Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram (Re uploading of the proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/164458/2020)  
(SIA/KL/MIN/411101/2022; 1847/EC1/2020/SEIAA**

Sri. Vijayan. R submitted an Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 0.3900 Ha at Re-Survey No. 339/4 in Pallikkal Village, Varkala Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

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 2, 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 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noticed that after leaving the buffer distance quarrying is possible only in 0.24 Ha. No scientific mining is possible in this area. The Authority observed that the SEAC has constituted a Sub-Committee to study the feasibility of scientific mining in smaller areas.

**The Authority decided to defer the proposal till the receipt of the report from the SEAC and inform SEAC to speed up the process. The Authority also decided to inform the Department of Mining & Geology to take steps to give approval only for mining having minimum area where scientific mining is possible with buffer, benches, drainage plan etc.**

**Item No.32**

**Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Metarock Private Limited at Block No. 41, Sy. Nos. 340/8, 340/19, 340/22, 341/2-1, 341/2-2, 341/2-3, 341/3, 341/8, 341/8-1, 356/2, 356/4, 356/5, 356/5-1, 356/5-2pt, 356/5-3, 356/5- 5, 356/6pt, 356/10, 356/10-1pt, 356/10-1-1pt, 357/7-1pt, 357/26pt, 341/1pt, 356/3pt, in Aruvikkara Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala  
(SIA/KL/MIN/59482/2020; 1871/EC1/2021/SEIAA)**

Sri. N. Vinodlal, Managing Director, M/s Metarock Private Limited submitted an Environmental Clearance application via PARIVESH for the Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Metarock Private Limited at Block No. 41, Sy. Nos. 340/8, 340/19, 340/22, 341/2-1, 341/2-2, 341/2-3, 341/3, 341/8, 341/8-1, 356/2, 356/4, 356/5, 356/5-1, 356/5-2pt, 356/5-3, 356/5- 5, 356/6pt, 356/10, 356/10-1pt, 356/10-1-1pt, 357/7-1pt, 357/26pt, 341/1pt, 356/3pt, in Aruvikkara Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, 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, 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 142<sup>nd</sup> meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 10 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noticed that there are four other quarries nearby and there are several complaints regarding the functioning of these quarries. The water level in this area get lowered as a result of total functioning of these quarries as per the complaints. It is also noticed that the data depending on is pre-monsoon data and the rainfall data of 2007 & 2008. The recent data is not taken for the study.

**The Authority decided to refer the case to SEAC to give a hearing to the project proponent and to the petitioners, Sri. Ajay K., Sri. Rajendran, and the representative of the CheriyaKonni residents and representative of Kootayma ‘Swasikkan Sudhavayu Nammuda Avakasam’ and give a definite recommendation. Hearing notices shall be issued well in advance through courier or registered post.**



**CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
CLEARANCE (Extension/Amendment/Corrigendum)**

**Item No.1**                      **Revalidate the Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Stone Quarry of Sri. Ramachandran.P, at Re.Sy. No. 19/245 in Koodathai Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/296253/2023; 1597/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

Environmental Clearance was issued to Sri. Ramachandran. P, Kozhikode as per order No. 1597/EC4/2020/SEIAA Dt.13.09.2021 for the period of 1 year from 13.09.2021 for the Laterite mining project at Re-Sy. No.19/245 in Koodathai Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended extension of EC for remaining period of 3 years subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority also noted that Legal Notice was received from Kozhikkode District Legal Services Authority on 08.03.2023 and 17.05.2023 and the Chairman, District Legal Services Authority, Kozhikode issued Letter on 26.05.2023.

**The Authority decided to give a reply to the Legal Services Authority informing that SEAC had given the recommendation for the extension of the EC for the project and the Authority have to make a decision and hence the decision on the Legal Notice may be informed to SEIAA within one month time from the date of the letter otherwise SEIAA will proceed as per the recommendation of SEAC.**

**Item No.2**                      **Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry for an Area of 2.4169 Ha at Sy No.217/2- 2, 217/2-3, 217/2-1, 218/3 of Parakkadavu Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala WP(C) No. 6024/2023, filed by Sri. K.M. Joy (Project Proponent), M/s JB Granites, Kachappily House, Puliyanam P.O., Angamaly, Ernakulam  
(SIA/KL/MIN/293383/2022, File No: 843/SEIAA/EC3/2805/2015)**

Extension of Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry at Survey No. 217/2-2, 217/2-3, 217/2-1, 218/3 of Parakkadavu Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala for an area of 2.4169 Ha.

The Authority noticed that the Project Proponent Sri. K.M. Joy filed a WP(C) No. 6024/2023 before the Hon'ble High court seeking to consider and pass orders on Ext. P3 application for revalidation of Ext. P1 EC in tune with Ext. P4 Notification [S.O., 1807 (E), dated 12-04-2022]. The Committee in its 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> May 2023 observed that the Environmental Clearance issued on 15.02.2017, was set aside by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala vide judgment dated 24.01.2018. Therefore, the project does not have a valid EC and therefore, the Committee cannot consider the application for extension of EC.

**The Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC and decided not to consider the application for extension of EC since the original EC was set aside by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala vide judgment dated 24.01.2018**

## **CONSIDERATION OF TOR PROPOSALS**

### **Item No.1**

**Application for ToR for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Ellora Stones, at Block No. 45, Sy Nos. 291/2, 293/101, 293/103, 293/104, 293/105, 293/106, 293/107, 293/108, 293/110, 293/112, 293/3, 299/103, 299/109, 299/4, 348/1 in Vayakkara Village and at Block No. 42, Sy Nos. 135/1, 135/101, 135/116, 135/118, 135/119, in Peringome Village, Payannur Taluk, Kannur. (SIA/KL/MIN/426310/2023, 2257/EC4/2023/SEIAA)**

Sri. Shanker T Ganesh, Partner, M/s Ellora Stones, Room No.239/S, Ward No.3, South Marady P.O, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam-686673 submitted an ToR application through PARIVESH on 21.04.2023 for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 3.9001 Ha, at Block No.45, Sy Nos. 291/2, 299/101, 293/103, 293/104, 293/105, 293/106, 293/107, 293/108, 293/110, 293/112, 293/3, 299/103, 299/109, 299/4,

348/1 in Vayakara Village and at Block No. 42, Sy Nos. 135/1, 135/101/ 135/116, 135/118, 135/119, in Peringome Village, Payannur Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority noted that SEAC in its 143<sup>rd</sup> meeting examined the proposal and decided to recommend Standard ToR 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. A comprehensive EMP considering the adjacent quarry.

The Authority also noted there is a compliant forwarded by the District Collector vide Letter No. DCKNR/7623/2023-DM6 dated 16.06.2023. The Authority decided to refer the complaint to the District Collector to examine the same during public hearing. The SEAC shall also consider the application during the appraisal of the proposal.

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

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

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