

**MINUTES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE  
ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)  
KERALA, HELD ON 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2021 THROUGH VIDEO  
CONFERENCING.**

**Present:**

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

The 108<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA was held online on 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2021 observing all the COVID protocols stipulated by the Government for video conferencing. Chairman participated from his home office at Bangalore, Member Secretary participated from his office in the Government Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram and the Member from his office at Kottayam. The meeting started at 11.00 AM on 22<sup>nd</sup> and agenda items were taken up for discussion.

**Physical Files**

**Item No.108.01**      **Minutes of the 107<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2021 for information**

Noted

**Item No.108.02**      **Action Taken Report of 106<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA**

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

**Item No.108.03**      **Action Taken Report of 107<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA**

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

**Item No.108.04**      **Environmental clearance for the Development of Govt. Medical College cum Hospital in Sy.No.643 at Iravan Village, Kodencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by The Principal Incharge, Konni Medical College (File No. 810.A/SEIAA/EC4/2373/2015)**

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

The Authority noted that as per the decision taken in 106<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, a letter dated 02.02.2021 was sent to the Member Secretary, KSPCB for taking necessary action under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 as detailed in S.O.804(E) of MoEF&CC dated 14<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

Authority noted that as per S.O.804 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 14<sup>th</sup> March 2017, SEAC has approved the EIA report and EMP which comprises the ecological damage assessment, remediation plan, and the natural and community resource augmentation plan and the cost involved.

**Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit a Bank Guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and the natural and community resource**

**augmentation plan to the KSPCB as per clause 7 of S.O.1030 (E) of MoEF&CC dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018 and inform the same to SEIAA so that the prior EC can be issued.**

**Item No.108.05      Amendment in Environmental Clearance issued for the proposed expansion of Artech Colors, Residential Apartment at Karyavattom in in Re Sy No 351/3-1, 351/3-2,351/3-3, 351/3-4, or Sy No 3023/14-1,14 3023/14-1 at Uliyazhathura Village , Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District Kerala by Sri.Viju Varghese (File No. 827/SEIAA/EC1/2616/2015)**

EC was issued vide Proceedings No.827/SEIAA/EC1/2616/2015 dated 1-8-2016(EC No. 117/2016) to M/s Artech Colours Residential Apartment in Re Sy No 351/3-1, 351/3-2,351/3-3, 351/3-4, or Sy No 3023/14-1,14 3023/14-1 at Uliyazhathura Village , Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District.

The Project Proponent vide letter dated 29-08-2016 has informed that the number of floors for the proposed building project was written as 19 in the Form-1, basic information and certain other documents submitted, but it was a mistake and the actual number of floors was G+19 (20 floors)and it was clearly indicated in the drawings provided by them.

Now the Project Proponent vide letter received dated 06.02.2021 has informed that he has not started the construction activities at the site and now he is planning to start the construction activities. The proponent has requested to issue erratum notification with the no. of floors as G+19.

The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 23rd -25th February, 2021.The Committee scrutinized the details submitted by the proponent. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of erratum as requested by Proponent, without altering the height and the built up area of the proposed building as specified in the EC.

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to issue an erratum to the EC issued as recommended by SEAC.**

**Item No.108.06**      **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Residential Project Construction-“VKL Garden” in Sy.No.415/21 at Chellanmangalam Uliyazhathura, Kariyam villages, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala of Mr. Shaji.K.Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 1190/A2/2018/ SEIAA)**

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

Authority perused the action taken so far both by SEIAA and SEAC for the appraisal of the Project.

**Authority decided to request the Secretary, Thiruvananthapuram Corporation to speed up the process and also decided to issue a copy of the Letter to the Project Proponent for necessary follow up action.**

**Item No. 108.07**      **Application for transfer of Environmental Clearance issued to Sri.K.A.Jaleel (Proposal No. SIA/KL/EC1/4652/2015, File No.985/SEIAA/EC1/4652/2015)**

An application for transfer of Environmental Clearance was submitted by Sri.K.A.Jaleel through Parivesh on 10/11/2020 as Proposal No SIA/KL/EC1/4652/2015. The EC was issued by SEIAA vide order No. 985/SEIAA/EC1/4652/2015 dated 17.08.2017 to Sri.K.A.Jaleel, for the building stone quarry project in Sy.Nos. 251/1, 251/1-1, 251/1-2 at Pazhayakannummel Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. The validity of EC will expire on 16.08.2022.

Sri.K.A.Jaleel informed that he is unable to manage the proposed project due to his worst health conditions and he has commenced a partnership firm named M/s Sun Granites, Door No.9/653, PazhayaKunnammel, Thottivilla, Charupara.P.O., Kilimanoor, Thiruvananthapuram- 695601. He has requested to authorize all EC related transaction in the name of M/s Sun Granites. All the necessary documents have been uploaded in Parivesh.

**Authority decided to transfer the EC to M/s Sun Granites as per clause 11 of EIA Notification 2006, on the same terms and conditions under which the EC was initially granted for the same validity period.**

**Item No: 108.08 Environmental Clearance issued for the proposed Commercial Complex (Hotel, Convention Centre & Shopping Mall) project, M/s LULU International Shopping Mall Pvt. Ltd., Thiruvananthapuram District - Clarification sought regarding CER/CSR commitments (File No.1047/EC1/899/SEIAA/2016))**

Environmental Clearance was issued to M/s Lulu International Shopping Mall Pvt. Ltd in Kadakampally Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District vide Proceedings No. 1047/EC1/899/SEIAA/2016 (EC No.156/2016) dated 04.10.2016. The validity of EC will expire on 03.10.2023. One of the conditions in the said EC is “upkeep and maintenance of T.S. Canal”.

Now the Project Proponent vide letter dated 23.02.2021 has informed that the proposed project is abutting National Highway By-pass on the north-east & east side and T.S. Canal on the south-west and west side.

The Authority in its 98<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> October 2019, directed M/s Lulu Mall to earmark minimum 1% of total cost of project towards CSR/CER which includes upkeep and maintenance of TS canal and the proponent assured that he shall provide a detailed action plan for the same in consultation with the concerned department of Irrigation/Tourism/Corporation. The proponent has now expressed his interest to take up activities leading to Rejuvenation of Aakkulam lake along with upkeep and maintenance of T.S. Canal. The proponent has sought for clarification regarding the procedures to be followed in this aspect.

Authority also noted that a complaint has been filed by Sri.K.J.Chacko vide e-mail dated 28.02.2021, alleging illegal grant of EC.He has stated that the upcoming building is in the take off funnel of the International Airport and it is inside the Red Zone of the Trivandrum International Airport.

Authority noted that Project proponent has prepared a EIA report /EMP which was approved by SEAC for the implementation of the Project. Proponent has also submitted an action plan for the implementation of CER activities, at a cost of not less than 1 % of project cost which includes maintenance of TS canal.

**Authority decided to inform the project Proponent that both TS canal and Aakkulam lake are Ecologically and Economically important assets of the state and utmost care has to be taken in maintaining/rejuvenating them. Authority decided to inform the proponent that for the rejuvenation of both TS canal and Aakkulam lake, a detailed action plan has to be prepared in consultation with the department of Irrigation/Tourism and Thiruvananthapuram Corporation. Proponent shall also consult National highway and National Waterway Authorities while preparing the action plan. The action plan so prepared shall be approved by SEAC before it is taken up for implementation.**

**Authority decided to forward the complaint of Sri.K.J.Chacko to District Collector Thiruvananthapuram for enquiry and report.**

<b><u>Item No.108.09</u></b>	<b>Request from Secretary, Kizhakkencherry GramaPanchayath for re-examining the EC issued to the granite stone quarry project of Shri.K.N.Nandakumar in Kizhakkanchery II Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad (File No. 1134/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017)</b>
------------------------------	---

**As the information provided in the Agenda are not clear enough to arrive at a decision, Authority directed JS Administration to put up a detailed Agenda note in the next SEIAA meeting, after referring to the EC already issued, the letter of Secretary, Kizhakkencherry Grama Panchayath dated 26.02.2021 and comments offered by Environmental Scientist.**

**Item No.108.10**      **Application for Environmental Clearance for mining of ordinary earth – Sri. Gee Varghese Varghese, PalalKalappurayil, Ernakulam (File No. 1165/A2/2019/ SEIAA)**

**Authority decided to forward the approved mining plan submitted by the Project Proponent to SEIAA, along with correction in length of mining area as pointed out by the Project Proponent, to SEAC for a fresh recommendation.**

**Item No.108.11**      **Application for environmental clearance for mining of Ordinary earth- in Sy.No.353/8, 353/9 at Arakkapadi Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri.P.A.Sainudeen (File No. 933/A2/2019/SEIAA)**

**Authority decided to refer the case back to SEAC with copy of the Judgement for a fresh recommendation in the light of directions contained in the judgement. Authority also decided to seek extension of time for the compliance of the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in this regard explaining the reasons and keep the proponent informed of the decision taken by SEIAA.**

**Item No: 108.12**      **Request for Transfer of EC- Construction of retail shopping complex project at Survey Nos.43,44,29,55,54,45,51/ 1,14,13,47, 47/1,46, 11,7,10, 9/1,9/2,3 & 4 Muttambalam village, Kottayam Municipality, Kottayam (Proposa INo. SIA/KL/MIS/198814/2021, File No. 1881/EC3/2021/ SEIAA)**

Environmental Clearance was issued to Shri. V. Thiruvenkitam for Expansion of existing retail shopping complex project at Survey Nos.43,44,29,55,54,45,51/1,14,13,47,47/1,46,11,7,10, 9/1,9/2,3 & 4 Muttambalam Village, Kottayam Municipality, Kottayam as per order dated 24-05-2014 File No. 296/SEIAA/KL/1495/2014. The proponent Shri. V. Thiruvenkitam expired on 14-04-2020. The validity of the Environmental Clearance has been expired on 23-05-2019.

The daughter of late Shri. V. Thiruvengadam, Smt. Beena Veriah Reddy submitted application for Transfer of EC through PARIVESH on 18-02-2021. As per the Heirship certificate Smt. Beena Veriah Reddy is the legal Heir and all the responsibilities of late Shri. V. Thiruvengadam are now transferred to Smt. Beena Veriah Reddy. Hence she has requested for transfer the Environmental Clearance under the provisions of clause 11 of EIA Notification, 2006.

**Authority decided to inform the applicant that there is no provision under EIA Notification 2006 for the transfer of EC, the validity period of which had already expired and hence her application for transfer of EC cannot be considered.**

**Item No.108.13**

**Judgment in WP (C) 28825 of 2019 filed by Mr.Raji Mathew (File No. 1211/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Mr.Raji Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s Highrange Metal Crusher, Ranimudi, Lakshmikovil P.O., Peermade, Idukki – 685531, vide the hardcopy of application received on 30.01.2019, has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the quarry project in Survey Nos.1119, 969/3, 969/3, 969/4, 969/4, 969 in Peermade Village, Peermade Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala for an area of 4.606 hectares. The project comes under Category B & Schedule : 1 (a) of EIA Notification 2006. The estimated Project cost is 4 crore and the life of mine is about of 12 years.

The proposal was placed in the 93<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 21.02.2019. The Committee decided to ask the proponents to produce the minutes of DEAC and a sub committee of SEAC experts consisting of Dr.S.Sreekumar, Shri.G.Sankar & Dr.Easa was constituted for site inspection. *The site inspection was held on 10.03.2019 and certain field observations were made. The Sub Committee recommended for EC to this project with certain conditions in addition to the usual general conditions for quarrying projects.*

The proposal was placed in the 95<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> & 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2019. The Committee accepted the report of the Sub Committee and decided to ask the proponent to file certain affidavits and Proponent filed the same on 10.04.2019. The proposal was placed in the 98<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> JUNE 2019 for further appraisal. SEAC perused all relevant documents and recommend for the issuance of EC.



The proposal was placed in the 95<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Authority noticed that the proposed quarry area is within 10 km distance from protected area (Idukki Wildlife Sanctuary). As per OM No. J-11013/41/2006-IA-II of MoEF& CC dt.20.08.2014, clearance from Wild Life Warden, Idukki Wild Life Sanctuary is required. The proponent was asked to produce Clearance Certificate from the Wild Life Warden, Idukki as per the OM cited.

The proponent filed WP (C) 28825/2019 in which the project Proponent has prayed that the SEIAA may be directed to reconsider his application and dispose it of adverting to his objections and after making necessary verification with respect to the distance between the proposed quarrying area and the Idukki Wild Life Sanctuary.

The Hon'ble Court has also directed SEIAA to cause an enquiry as to the distance between the proposed quarry of the petitioner from the nearest protected area or wildlife sanctuary and then decide whether their application can be considered on its merits, if the distance is found to be more than 10 KM, as asserted by the petitioner. If on the contrary, the competent Authority of the SEIAA finds that the distance is less than 10 KM, then the petitioner will be obligated to get necessary clearance from the competent warden in terms of Exhibit P-10 so as to enable the SEIAA to issue the Environmental Clearance in terms of law, thereafter.

The Hon'ble Court has also directed the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent (The Chief Wildlife Warden and principal Chief, Conservator of Forests) to take up Exts.P6 and P8 and consider the same and dispose them of through a final order, after making all necessary enquires and communicate the resultant order to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible but not later than three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The proposal was placed in the 103<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup>& 25<sup>th</sup> February 2020. Authority noted the steps taken by SEAC and SEIAA so far for the appraisal of the project. As per the directions contained in the Judgment dt.3.12.2019 in WP(C) No.28825/2019, the PCCF & Wild Life Warden informed to SEIAA to issue direction to the petitioner in this case i.e. Raji Mathew to file an application in the web site <https://parivesh.nic.in/> for obtaining Wildlife Clearance for the quarrying proposal. Accordingly the proponent may be informed to apply for Wild Life Clearance as suggested

by the PCCF & Chief Wild Life Warden. Decision of the meeting has been informed to the proponent through Vide Letter dated 17-03-2020.

Now the Project Proponent, Sri.Raji Mathew has filed in WP (C) No. 24297 of 2020 (J) and a copy of the Judgment dated 16.02.2021 was received in the office of SEIAA on 20-02-2021. As per the judgment the court has ordered to issue the Environmental Clearance applied for by the petitioner, if the petitioner is otherwise entitled for the same, subject to the condition that the same will be operative only if the petitioner obtains clearance of the Standing Committee of the National Board for Wild life, for the quarry proposed by him.

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

In obedience to the directions of H'ble High court of Kerala in WP (C) No. 24297, Authority **decided to issue EC for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.**

- 1. As the Project Proponents quarry site is located within 10 KMs distance from Periyar Tiger Reserve, 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 Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at site.*
- 2. The proposed quarry project area is located in Survey Nos. 1119, 969/3, 969/3, 969/4, 969/4, 969 in Peerumade Village, which is a notified ESA village as per the MoEF&CC Notification 5135(E) dated 03.10.2018. As per section 3(a) of the said notification **“there shall be a complete ban on mining, quarrying and sand mining in Ecologically Sensitive Area and all existing mines shall be phased out within five years from the date of issue of the final notification or on the expiry of the existing mining lease, whichever is earlier”**. As Peermade village is ecologically very sensitive, taking enough precaution, the Project Proponent shall ensure that the survey nos of his quarry do not fall in the ESA region of of Peermade village. **To this***

*effect he shall produce a certificate from the Thasildar / Village Officer, in case he gets a clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife, before commencing the quarrying operations*

3. *As per the Landslide Susceptibility Map prepared by NCESS (2010) and published by the Kerala State Disaster Management Authority (KSDMA), the proposed quarry project area in Survey Nos. 1119, 969/3, 969/3, 969/4, 969/4, 969 is found to be very close or within the red and orange zone of landslide prone areas. Again taking enough precaution, the Project Proponent shall produce a no objection certificate from the District Collector, Idukki, the Chairman of District Disaster Management Committee, before commencing the quarrying operations, in case he gets a clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife,*
4. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems (CER) in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2 % of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
5. *The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
6. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
7. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court, the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing of 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.*

- 8. Since the approach road is narrow the proponents should not use heavy transportation vehicles (use only light tippers) which are more than 10 tons.*
- 9. Additional silt traps should be provided in the slope breaks.*
- 10. Larger and deep silt traps should be made in the garland canal and it should be maintained periodically..*
- 11. The proponents should shift the proposed Overburden dumping site to the level ground with proper protection of side walls.*
- 12. The proponents should give adequate protection with side walls to the present metal and sand dumping site to prevent downslope movement of the material.*
- 13. Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
- 14. A copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF(WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief wild life Warden, Kerala, SEAC, District collector, Idukki and Director Mining and Geology, Department of Industries GOK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*

**Item No: 108.14**

**Environmental Clearance issued to the building stone quarry project in survey Nos. 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 397/1-1, Varapetty Village & Panchayat, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala owned by Sri. P.K. Prasad -Request for obtaining Annual compliance report of project site[File No:1103/EC/SEIAA/2020]**

Environmental Clearance was issued to Sri. P.K. Prasad for the building stone quarry project in survey Nos. 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 396/1B2, 397/1-1, 397/1-1, Varapetty Village & Panchayat, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala vide proceedings

No.1103/EC/SEIAA/KL/ 2017; EC No.26/2018 dated 27-02-2018. In the Environmental Clearance issued at Part C; Para 8, states that the validity of the EC will be for 5 years from the date of this clearance, subject to inspection by SEIAA on annual basis and compliance of the conditions, subject to prior review of E.C. in case of violation or non-compliance of conditions or genuine complaints from residents within the security area of the quarry.

Vide letter No D2: 2153/19 dated 13-01-2021, of the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department (MVIP Division No. 3) has requested to provide a Field Inspection report of SEIAA to extend the validity of NOC for continuing the quarrying activity in Kakkattoor near Varappetty distributory of MVIP Valathukara Canal. Vide Letter No. dated 27/01/2021 the proponent also As decided by the Authority requested the same.

**Authority decided forward the request of Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department (MVIP Division No. 3) to SEAC for site inspection and report.**

**Item No: 108.15      Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Mixed use Township Development Project ‘Landmark Trade Centre’ in Survey Nos. 27/1, 30/4c, 31/4, 7, 8, 9, 32/4, 351b of Pantheerankavu Village, Olavanna Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk& Kozhikode District, Kerala by Mr. Anwar Sadath, Director, M/s Calicut Landmark Builders & Developers (India) Pvt. Ltd (1193/EC2/2018/SEIAA)**

As per the decision of the 101<sup>st</sup> meeting of SEIAA the Environmental Clearance was issued to Sri.AnwarSadath (Director), M/s Calicut Landmark Builders & Developers Pvt.Ltd, Kozhikode as per order No. 1193/EC2/2018/SEIAA Dt.12/03/2020 for the period of 5 years from 12/03/2020 for the Mixed use Township Development project “Landmark Trade Centre” in Sy. No. 27/1,30/4c,31/4,7,8,9,32/4,351b of Patheerankavu Village, Kozhikode Taluk & Kozhikkode District, Kerala for an area of 3.309 hectares and the validity of EC will expire on 11/03/2025.

As decided by the Authority the EC was issued considering it as an expansion project, subject to the following conditions.

- 1. In the SEIAA meeting held on 17th January 2020, after the personal hearing, proponent has given an undertaking and he shall scrupulously follow his undertaking during the construction and operation phase of the project.*

2. *Proponent shall not violate any rules and regulations under EIA Notification 2006 as well as other rules and regulations of Govt. Kerala applicable to this Project.*
3. *Proponent shall carry out all ameliorative measures to rectify the environmental damage caused if any, in the project region, due to present construction activity, as suggested by SEAC to the best satisfaction of SEAC.*
4. ***During the pendency of EC, SEAC shall make an inspection and the proponent shall abide by the conditions if any suggested.***
5. *Activities relating to Corporate Environmental Responsibilities amounting to Rs.7 crores shall be carried out leading to protection and promotion of environment including waste management in the project district as per OM F.No.22-65/2017-IA-III dt.01.05.2018 of MoEF& CC as directed by Director, Directorate of Environment & Climate Change and supervised by District Collector.*
6. *Provision shall be made for the housing of construction labour within the site with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) of GoI, MoEF dt.22.09.2008).*

The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup>, 03<sup>rd</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee decided to conduct field inspection as suggested by SEIAA and entrusted Shri.K.Krishna Panicker and Dr.R.AjayakumarVarma for the same. The field inspection was carried out on 09.02.2021.

The field inspection report was placed in 119<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021. The Committee discussed and accepted the Field Inspection Report. The Committee decided to communicate to SEIAA the following recommendations for further consideration:

1. Proponent may be directed to file compliance reports on time.
2. Emergency / second access suitable for fire engine movement must be developed.
3. Water spraying must be done for dust control.
4. Temporary accommodation for construction workers must be made as directed by SEIAA.
5. Proponent must be directed to submit a reasonable time schedule for the

implementation of CER activities.

6. Necessary steps must be taken to prevent soil erosion from the soil dump area.

**Authority decided to forward the field inspection report of SEAC to the Project Proponent with a direction to attend the observations of SEAC on priority. The Project Proponent shall also be informed that the position of compliance of the directions of SEAC as well as other EC conditions will be reviewed after 6 months and appropriate action will be taken for noncompliance including cancellation of EC.**

**Item No.108.16                      Request for reconsidering the rejection order- M/s Alacode Granites (File No. 1277(A)/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

As per the decision of the 106<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA the Rejection Order was issued to Sri.Mathew, M/s Alacode Granites, Managing Partner, Kannur as per order No. 1277(A)/EC2/2019/SEIAADt.06.02.2021 for the building stone quarry project in Survey No.292/1A of Vellad Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala for an area of 1.6923 hectares.

Now, the proponent submitted certain documents on 15.02.2021 *with a* request to reconsider the decision taken in the 106th meeting of SEIAA. He has also requested for an opportunity of being heard

**Authority decided to give an opportunity of being heard to the Proponent through video conferencing in the next SEIAA meeting. The Proponent shall be informed sufficiently in advance.**

**Item No: 108.17                      ToR application for the prior Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Phase I Development of Azhikkal Port at Azhikkal, Kannur District, Kerala. (SIA/KL/MIS/53915/2020, 1753/EC4/SEIAA/2020)**

**Authority decided to approve the TOR recommended by the SEAC for carrying out EIA study and preparation of EMP and convey the same to Managing Director and CEO Azhikkal Port. Authority also decided to convey that while applying for EC the Project Proponent shall follow the directions contained in section 4 and Section 4.2 of the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification 2011.**

**Item No.108.18      Application for Environmental Clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy.No.270/6 & 270/3 at Kulakkada Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District by Sri.Thambu.S [File No.916/A1/EC1/2019/SEIAA]**

**&**

**Item No.108.19      Application for Environmental Clearance for mining of brick clay in Sy.No. 111/1 & 111/2 in Puthoor Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District by Sri.P.Sundaran [File No.929/A1/2019/SEIAA]**

As the contents and activities proposed in the Agenda item 18 and 19 are interlinked, Authority decided to club both the Agenda items to arrive at a decision. As the project proponents were unable to answer the issues raised in the 101<sup>st</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> January 2020, they were given an opportunity of presenting their cases in person with supporting documents. On the appointed day i.e on 19.02.2021 the project proponents did not appear however they have deputed a representative to present their cases. The representative has failed in answering issues raised by SEIAA.

The Authority noted that this issue is pending before SEIAA for more than a year. The repeated attempts by SEIAA to find a solution to the problem has not yielded any result. Everytime the project Proponents are coming out with different explanations to answer the issues tagged by SEIAA. Since then there could be some changes in the field conditions also.

Under the circumstances to put an end to the issue once for ever, Authority decide to post the case back to SEAC for a fresh field inspection and report so that the issues raised by SEIAA are squarely answered.



In the meantime, Authority decided to inform the Project Proponent under Agenda 19 i.e. Sri Sunderan, to extend the validity of Bank Guarantee for another two years and to inform the concerned Bank Manager not to permit the Project Proponent to encash the BG without the approval of District Geologist, Mining Geology Department, Kollam in whose name the BG was issued. The position may be brought to the notice of Director Department of Mining and Geology/District Geologist for necessary follow up action.

**Item No.108.20**

**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, KanathilParambil, Moolakayam, Parappa, Kasargod, Pramod.K, Parappa, Kasargod, Sudhakaran.M, EdavilVeedu, Parappa, Kasargod and U.V.Mohammed Kunhi, Valappil Kammadath, Parappa, Kasargod**

Authority took note of the actions taken by SEIAA and SEAC to implement the directions contained in Judgement in WP(C) No. 12147/2020(P) dated 09.09.2020 and Judgement in WP(C) No. 15745/2020(P) dated 18.08.2020.

Authority decided to inform the Petitioners in both the WP (C) that an expert team of SEAC has conducted a field inspection on 25.1.2021 & 14.2.2021 in their presence and they have verified the veracities of complaints raised by them. The expert committee is of the opinion that majority of the EC conditions have been complied with however there are some irregularities and SEIAA will be directing the Project Proponent 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.

Authority decided to forward the inspection report of SEAC to project proponent to attend the observation made by SEAC within 6 months otherwise appropriate action will be taken against him including cancellation of EC.

Authority decided to inform the above position to Standing Counsel of SEIAA in Hon'ble High Court of Kerala for information and necessary follow up action.

**Item No.108.21**      **Complaint of Sri.Benny Sebastian to revoke Environment Clearance to VKL Resort given by MoEF. (File No.13/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

Government had forwarded the complainant of Sri.Benny Sebastian to revoke Environment Clearance to VKL Resorts India Pvt.Ltd, at Mullackal Village, Alapuzha given by MoEF. Government had requested SEIAA to furnish remarks. The complaint of the petitioner is to revoke of Environmental Clearance to VKL resorts. EC mentioned in the Government letter was issued by Ministry of Environment and Forest (MOEF &CC). SEIAA have not issued any EC to VKL Resort so far.

Director MoEF Regional Office Bangalore had been requested to furnish remarks regarding the matter. But no reply has been received from MoEF so far.

**Authority decided to inform the above position to Government and forward the complaint to the concerned District Collector to get a report.**

**Item No.108.22**      **Clarification sought from Kerala State Pollution Control Board regarding public hearing (File No. 791/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

Authority decided to inform the Kerala State Pollution Control Board that in a cluster situation, there shall be one Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)/ Environmental Management Plan (EMP) report, for the entire cluster addressing all the environmental issues in the cluster and all project proponents shall collectively implement the activities proposed in Environmental Management Plan. There shall be only one Public hearing and combined publicity for public hearing.

The expenditure incurred for the preparation of EIA/EMP and implementation of EMP shall be proportionately shared by all the Project Proponents in the cluster. The Project

Proponent who has the larger business share in entire cluster shall provide the leadership for all activities. The project Proponents may use the same EIA/EMP report for the Appraisal of the Projects and other requirements

**Item No.108.23**      **Transfer of category B proposals received between two window period. (File No.859/A1/2021 /SEIAA)**

Authority decided to forward all pending cases in the list of cases forwarded by MoEF & CC, for issuing EC under violation proceedings, to SEAC for further appraisal following the provisions mentioned in the Notification dated 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2017. SEAC may be requested follow the direction contained in the letter of MoEF&CC while appraising the project. The respective project proponents may also be informed accordingly. Copies of the letter of MoEF& CC with enclosures may be given to both SEAC and Project Proponents for necessary follow up action.

**Item No. 108.24**      **Judgment dated 2.11.2020 in WP (C) 17533/2020 and other cases - regarding the validity of EC–Request from proponents without judgment to extend their validity of EC (File No.1858/A1/2020/SEIAA)**

WP (C) No.17533/2020 and other WP (C) s were filed before Hon'ble High Court stating that the EC period shall be life of mine/ Life of Project as estimated in the Mining plan, instead of 5 years norm generally followed by SEIAA for the previous few years. Authority noted the directions contained in the Judgement in WP (C) 17533/2020

Quarry holder's Association had submitted a request to make the order directing SEIAA & SEAC to grant Environmental Clearance for the life of the project, binding to all stakeholders rather than the petitioners in different WP(C)s specific.

The request of the petitioners placed before 119<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting and Committee decided to seek the advice of the SEIAA whether their requests have to be considered by the SEAC or not.

**Authority decided to seek a legal opinion from the Standing Counsel regarding this matter.**

**Item No. 108.25**      **Order dated 06-01-2021 in OA No.1/2021 registered SuoMotu by the Hon. NGT (SZ) – Joint Committee Appointed – SEIAA made Nodal Agency – Action taken so far– Reg. (File No. 84/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

Authority noted the follow up action taken on the decisions of 107<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA. Authority also noted that Member Secretary SEIAA has written DO letter to Principle Secretary, Revenue and Disaster Management requesting to give necessary directions to Dr.A.Kowsigan to file the report of the Joint Committee before the Tribunal based on inputs taken from ILDM and other relevant data sources. Authority noted that the Committee has taken action to file an extension petition seeking extension for three months from NGT for submitting the final report. Authority perused the report submitted by Joint Commissioner land revenue on behalf of Principle Secretary Revenue and Disaster Management answering all issues raised by NGT.

Authority suggested that a meeting of the Joint Committee has to be called on priority to collect the inputs from all members of Joint Committee and also to suggest further course of action on field visit etc. so that a combined report can be filed before NGT in line with the report already furnished by Joint Commissioner Land Revenue. The Authority opined that as Dr.A.Kowsigan has been put on election duty and also the Standing Counsel has been given instructions to file an extension petition, the joint committee meeting and other related issues maybe taken up after the return of Dr.A.Kowsigan from election duty. Alternatively, the officer in charge of duties and responsibilities of Dr.A.Kowsigan may also follow up the further course of action. Joint Secretary SEIAA was requested to monitor the follow up action and update the Member Secretary SEIAA for necessary further action

**Item No.108.26**      **Application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey No 326/2-9 in Eramalloor Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala for an extent of 0.5522 Ha of land by Sri. P.M. Moitheen– Review petition Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/145890/2020, File No: 1430/EC3/2019/SEIAA**

Sri. P.M. Moitheen has applied for Environmental Clearance on 08 July 2020 for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey No 326/2-9 in Eramalloor Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala for an extent of 0.5522 Ha of land. After the Appraisal SEAC has recommended to reject the proposal.

The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021. Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance and communicate the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection. Rejection order issued dated 19-02-2021.

Now the proponent submitted petition to review the rejection order issued by SEIAA and he has requested for an opportunity of being heard.

**Authority decided to give an opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent in the next SEIAA meeting through video conferencing and the Proponent shall be informed sufficiently in advance.**

**Item No.108.27      Upgrade/redesign the website of SEIAA with the assistance of NIC regional office, Thiruvananthapuram (391/EC5/2021/SEIAA)**

**Authority noted the follow up action taken on the decision taken in 106<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting and decided to go ahead with redesigning of SEIAA website through NIC.**

**Item No.108.28      Environmental Clearance for the proposed granite building stone quarry project in Survey No. 729/Pt in Vagamon Village, Peermade Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by Shri. Anish Abraham (File No. 1204/EC2/2018/SEIAA)**

Shri. Anish Abraham, Athiyali House, Teekoy (P.O.), Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala – 686580, vide the hardcopy of application received on 29.01.2019, has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the quarry project in Survey No. 729/Pt in Vagamon Village, Peermade Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala for an

area of 4.990 Ha ( 12.3302 Acres). The project comes under Category B2, Activity 1(a), (i) as per the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006.

The proposed project site falls within Latitude 09°42' 29.44" N to 09°42' 31.46" N to Longitude 76° 55' 04.17" E to 76° 55' 06.97" E. The total project cost is 2.2Crores.

The proposal was placed in the 93<sup>rd</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2019 and the Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents. The proponent submitted the same. A field inspection was also carried out on 27.10.2019 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 106<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents. The proponent submitted the documents on 18.12.2019. The proposal was placed in the 107<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> December, 2019.

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020. The Committee decided to recommend for issuance of EC after the proponent getting the clearance from the National Board for Wildlife. In the meanwhile, the proponent was directed to submit to SEIAA a print out of his application to NBWL. The proponent has submitted the documents on 28.01.2020.

The proposal was placed in the 102<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> February 2020. As per the report of SEAC, Authority noticed that the project area falls at a distance of 2.26 kms from the Idukki Wild Life Sanctuary. The Proponent had applied for the Clearance from the National Board of Wild Life as per the existing norms. Authority decided to wait for the Clearance from the National Board of Wild Life for issuing EC.

The file was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020. Authority decided to wait for the Clearance from the National Board of Wild Life for issuing EC. Now the Project Proponent vide his letter dated 16.02.21 has requested for issue of EC subject to clearance from National Board of Wildlife quoting relevant OM's of MoEF&CC.

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

Authority decided to issue EC subject to the Clearance from the National Wild Life Board, for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

- 1. As the quarry site is located within 2.26 KMs distance from Idukki 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 Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at site.*
- 2. As the quarry site is located in the Ecologically very sensitive Idukki District of Kerala which is prone for repeated natural disasters like landslides etc and also located near to Idukki wildlife sanctuary, taking enough precaution, the Project Proponent shall produce a no objection certificate from the District Collector, Idukki, the Chairman of District Disaster Management Committee, before commencing the quarrying operations, in case he gets a clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife.*
- 3. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 4. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 5. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*

6. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
7. *Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
8. *A copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF(WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief wild life Warden, Kerala, SEAC, District collector, Idukki and Director Mining and Geology, Department of Industries GOK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*

**Item No.108.29**

**Environmental clearance for the Proposed Mining of Heavy Mineral Sand in Re survey Nos. 81/3 to 81/4, 81/7 to 81/13, 82, 83, 84/1 to 84/14, 85 to 93, 122 to 126, 127/1 to 127/4, 127/7 to 127/13, 128, 129/1, 129/4 to 129/16, 139/1 to 139/5, 139/9, 139/10, 140 to 142, 143/1 to 143/3, 143/6 to 143/10, 151/1, 151/2, 152, 153, 168 at Alappad Village and 1, 2/12/8 to 2/18, 5/1 to 5/4 at Panmana village, Karunagappally Taluk, Kollam District by M/s Indian Rare Earth Ltd. (File No. 610/SEIAA/KL/4639/2014)**

Shri.A.J. Janarthanan, Head Chavara Unit, M/s Indian Rare Earth Ltd, Chavara, Kollam, Kerala, Pin 691583, vide his application received on 27.9.2014(Hard Copy), has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the Proposed Mining of heavy mineral sand at Alappad Village and Panmana village, Karunagappally Taluk, Kollam District, of 40.566 hectares. The project comes under Category B, Activity 1(a), (i) as per the



Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 (since it is below 50 hectares) and as per O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012 of Ministry of Environment and Forests.

Authority noted that a composite Environmental and CRZ clearance was issued to IREL for mining heavy mineral sand, subject to certain Specific and General conditions. Now the Project proponent has requested for some corrections in the quantity of heavy mineral sand to be mined vide his letter dated 28.01.2021.

**Authority noted the contents of letter no CH/MNG/SEIAA/2021 dated 28.01.2021 from IREL and decided to inform the Project Proponent that the quantity of heavy mineral sand to be mined is as per the quantity mentioned in the mining plan approved by the Department of Atomic Energy Govt. of India.**

**Item No.108.30 Environmental Clearance for the proposed building stone quarry in Re- Survey No. 498/2, 498/3, 499/3, 499/4 in Chalavara Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by Mr.Paul.K.T., Managing Director, M/s K.T.Crusher's& Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 1260/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Mr.Paul.K.T., Managing Director, M/s K.T.Crusher's& Aggregates Pvt. Ltd, Karimbanakkal House, Oorakkad, Edathala P.O., Ernakulam- 679122, vide the hardcopy of application received on 25.02.2019, has sought Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the quarry project in Re- Survey No. 498/2, 498/3, 499/3, 499/4 in Chalavara Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala for an area of 4.9700 Ha. The project comes under Category : B & Schedule : 1 (a) of EIA Notification 2006.

Authority noted that after the appraisal SEAC has rejected the proposal and based on the recommendation of SEAC Authority has also rejected the proposal and it was communicated to the Project Proponent with reasons for rejection.

Now the proponent vide letter dated 11.02.2021 has requested for an opportunity of being heard.

**Authority decided to give an opportunity of being heard to the Project Proponent through video conferencing in the next SEIAA meeting. The Proponent shall be informed sufficiently in advance.**

**Item No: 108:31**

**Judgment in WP(C) No: 22161 of 2020 (U) by Ashiq K.S.  
against M/s Thomsun Sands and Metals, Kottayam**

Environmental Clearance was issued to Shri. K.V. Abraham for the quarry project in Sy.No.120/1-23 at Erumely, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam district.

Complaint received from Ashik K.S., Kaithakkal (H) Erumeli (P.O.) Kottayam-686 509 received on 16-09-2020. Complaint was forwarded to District collector, Kottayam for urgent report.

The Hon'ble High court vide judgment in WP(C) No. 22161/2020, dated 19-10-2020 has ordered to take a decision on Ext.P4 within two months. Ext.P4 is the complaint submitted by Ashik K.S. which was received in SEIAA on 16-09-2020. A copy of the judgment in WP(C) No. 22161 of 2020, dated 19-10-2020 was forwarded to District collector, Kottayam vide Authority's letter dated 10-11-2020 for an urgent report but no reply has been received from DC Kottayam so far.

**Authority decided to post the case to SEAC for an urgent field inspection and report. The District Geologist shall be informed well in advance to join the inspection team. The District Collector may be once again requested to submit the report within 15 days to comply the directions of Hon'ble High court within the time limit fixed. Authority also decided to seek extension of time for 2 months for the compliance of the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala quoting reasons for extension.**

**Item No.108.32**

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Building stone quarry project in Re Survey No. 47/1-1, 47/1-2 in Purakkady Village, Sulthan Bathery Taluk, Wayanad District, Kerala by Mr.Sudheesh A.T, Proprietor, (File No. 1294/EC1/2019/SEIAA**

Mr.Sudheesh.A.T, Proprietor, Adakkathottathil House, Purakkady Village, Wayanad District, vide the hardcopy of application received on 25.03.2019, has sought Environmental clearance under EIA Notification, 2006 for the quarry project in, Re Survey No.47/1-1, 47/1-

2 in Purakkady Village, Sulthan Bethery Taluk, Wayanad District, Kerala for an area of 0.9906 ha. The project comes under Category: B & Schedule: 1 (a) of EIA Notification 2006. The proposed project is for quarrying of 167179 MT mineable reserve and the Capacity of production is 33435.8MTA. Total project cost is Rs. 85 Lakhs and the Life of mine is about 5 years.

The proposal was placed in 96<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting as 53<sup>rd</sup> item. The Committee decided to obtain certain additional details/documents and the Project Proponent submitted the same. The proposal was placed in 98<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2019. The committee decided to invite the proponent for a presentation. The Proponent was asked to produce Wildlife clearance from the forest department.

The proposal was placed in the 100<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> July 2019. The RQP made a presentation. The Committee entrusted Dr.S.Sreekumar & Dr.P.S.Easa for field inspection and the field inspection was carried out on 19.07.2019.

The proposal was placed in the 105<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on October 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> 2019. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit the receipt from the Wildlife Warden for the wildlife clearance application filed in this regard. The proponent submitted the proof of having applied for wildlife clearance and also the status on 03.12.2019

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The Committee decided to recommend issuance of EC subject to certain specific conditions.

The proposal was placed in the 102<sup>nd</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 10th & 11th February 2020, Authority noticed that the project area falls within the prescribed limit from the Sanctuaries and National Park as indicated by SEAC. The Proponent had applied for the Clearance from the National Board of Wild Life as per the existing norms. Authority decided to wait for the Clearance from the National Board of Wild Life.

Now the project Proponent vide his letter dated 12.11.2020, has requested process his proposal for issue of EC subject to clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife quoting relevant OMs of MoEF&CC.

Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form I, Pre-feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent during

Appraisal, Mining Plan and the filed inspection report. After the due appraisal SEAC had recommend to issue EC subject to certain conditions. Authority also noted that the project Proponent had submitted the proof of having applied for wildlife clearance.

Authority decided to issue EC subject to the Clearance from the National Wild Life Board, for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

- 1. As the quarry site is located within 10 KMs distance from Wayanad 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 Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at site.*
- 2. As the quarry site is located in the Ecologically very sensitive Wayanad district prone for repeated natural disasters like landslidesetc and also located near to wildlife rich Wayanad wildlife sanctuary, taking enough precaution, the Project Proponent shall produce a no objection certificate from the District Collector, Wayanad , the Chairman of District Disaster Management Committee, before commencing the quarrying operations, in case he gets a clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife,*
- 3. Since the first bench of the quarry is located in the mid slope with over burden, the upper slope of the quarry should be stabilised with a toe wall prior to commencement of quarrying. The toe wall could be strengthened with bamboo and other plants.*
- 4. Since the last bench elevation is lower than the nearby stream, the last bench should be avoided.*
- 5. OB dumping site should be protected appropriately with gabion walls*
- 6. Ensure continuous maintenance and upkeep of garland canal by engaging at least a couple of labourers. Appropriate register should be maintained to prove the continuous maintenance of garland canal by engaging labourers.*
- 7. As agreed by the proponent, the 3.5 acres of his land outside lease area should be planted with trees of local species as compensation.*
- 8. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal , covering the issues to address the environmental problems*

*in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*

- 9. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 10. 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.*
- 11. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Honourable Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the half yearly compliance report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 12. Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.***
- 13. A copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF(WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief wild life Warden, Kerala, SEAC, District collector, Idukki and Director Mining and Geology, Department of Industries GOK, besides others for information and necessary further action.***

## **PARIVESH FILES**

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

**Item No.1                      Application for obtaining Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary Earth from 0.6313 Ha in survey no.947/3- A-1-2 in Onakkoor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk by KuriakoseVettiloth Proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/127980/2019,File No.1513/EC4/2019/SEIAA**

Shri.Kuriakose V. K., Vettiloth House, Onakkoor P. O, Muvattupuzha -686667 has submitted an application through online on 28/11/2019 for the removal of ordinary Earth from 0.7952 Ha in survey no.947/3- A-1-2 in Onakkoor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District. The total project cost is Rs.10 Lakhs.

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup>&14<sup>th</sup> January, 2020. The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation along with all documents including photographs of the proposed site.

The proposal was placed in the 110<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup>&12<sup>th</sup> February, 2020 and the Committee directed the proponent to submit approved mining plan. The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 and the Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. A field inspection was also carried out on 29.11.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain field observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held during 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2020 and the Committee discussed and accepted the Field Inspection Report and decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC Kerala held during 23<sup>rd</sup>- 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2021. The Committee scrutinized the additional details submitted by the proponent. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to a condition that the Project Proponent shall submit the original demand letter from KINFRA.

**As recommended by SEAC Authority decided to inform the proponent to submit the original demand letter from KINFRA to process his EC application further.**

**Item No.2                      Environmental Clearance for the mining of ordinary earth in Re survey no.36/10 in Velom village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.0876 ha of land by Smt.Nafeesa (SIA/KL/MIN/132197/2019) {1735/EC4/2019/SEIAA}**

Smt.Nafeesa, D/o Kunhabdulla, ThazheNellarath House Ayancheri P.O, Kozhikode District, Kerala State-673 541 vide application dated 19/12/2019 has sought environmental clearance for the mining of ordinary earth project at Re. Sy No.36/10 in Velom Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.0876 ha.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup>,29<sup>th</sup>& 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on January 2021 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 23<sup>rd</sup>,24<sup>th</sup>& 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Excavation of ordinary earth is for land development within the project area and not for commercial purpose and hence the proposal does not require prior EC.

Authority noticed that SEAC has not recommended for EC under the presumption that the activity proposed comes under the exempted category. Authority decided to bring it to the notice of SEAC that no quarrying permit is required under amended rules (Notification of Industries (A) department,S.R.O.No.391/2020 dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2020) for extraction of ordinary earth in connection with the construction and digging of foundation for the buildings not requiring environmental clearance under EPA Act 1986 , if the owner of the land has obtained a prior valid permit for construction of such building from the Local Self Government Authorities concerned.

The activity proposed here is land development which is not an exempted activity and hence SEAC may re-examine their recommendation. If the proponent has applied for EC there shall be an approved mining plan and the appraisal shall be carried out as per the procedure under EIA Notification 2006.

**Item No. 3                      Environmental Clearance for the mining of ordinary earth in Re survey no.36/10 in Velom village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.1064 ha of land by Smt.Nafeesa (SIA/KL/MIN/132416/2019) {1691/EC4/2019/SEIAA}**

Smt.Nafeesa, D/o Kunhabdulla, ThazheNellarath House Ayancheri P.O, Kozhikode District, Kerala State-673 541 vide application dated 19/12/2019 has sought environmental clearance for the mining of ordinary earth project at Re. Sy No.36/10 in Velom Village,Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.1064 ha.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup>,04<sup>th</sup>& 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020 and the Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation along with certain documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>& 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The proponent and consultant were present. A field inspection was also carried out on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 23<sup>rd</sup>,24<sup>th</sup>& 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Excavation of ordinary earth is for land development within the project area and not for commercial purpose. Hence the proposal does not require prior EC.

Authority noticed that SEAC has not recommended for EC under the presumption that the activity proposed comes under the exempted category. Authority decided to bring it to the notice of SEAC that no quarrying permit is required under amended rules (Notification of Industries (A) department,S.R.O.No.391/2020 dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2020) for extraction of ordinary earth in connection with the construction and digging of foundation for the buildings not requiring environmental clearance under EPA Act 1986 , if the owner of the land has obtained a prior valid permit for construction of such building from the Local Self Government Authorities concerned.

The activity proposed here is land development which is not an exempted activity and hence SEAC may re-examine their recommendation. If the proponent has applied for EC there shall be an approved mining plan and the appraisal shall be carried out as per the procedure under EIA notification 2006.



**Item No.4                      Environmental Clearance for the mining of ordinary earth in Re survey no.36/9 in Velom village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.7928 ha of land by Sri.Nizar(SIA/KL/MIN/132450/2019) {1624/EC4/2019/SEIAA}**

Sri.Nizar, S/o Kunhabdulla, ThazheNellarath House Ayancheri P.O, Kozhikode District, Kerala State-673 541 vide application dated 19/12/2019 has sought environmental clearance for the mining of ordinary earth project at Re. Sy No.36/9 in Velom Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala from an area of 0.7928 ha.

The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup>,29<sup>th</sup>& 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team. The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 23<sup>rd</sup>,24<sup>th</sup>& 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Excavation of ordinary earth is for land development within the project area and not for commercial purpose. Hence the proposal does not require prior EC.

Authority noticed that SEAC has not recommended for EC under the presumption that the activity proposed comes under the exempted category. Authority decided to bring it to the notice of SEAC that no quarrying permit is required under amended KMMC Rules rules2015 (Notification of Industries (A) department,S.R.O.No.391/2020 dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2020) for extraction of ordinary earth in connection with the construction and digging of foundation for the buildings not requiring environmental clearance under EPA Act 1986 , if the owner of the land has obtained a prior valid permit for construction of such building from the Local Self Government Authorities concerned.

The activity proposed here is land development which is not an exempted activity and hence SEAC may re-examine their recommendation. If the proponent has applied for EC there shall be an approved mining plan and the appraisal shall be carried out as per the procedure under EIA notification 2006.

**Item No.5                      Environmental Clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project at Re. Sy No.322/109, 110, 111, 112, 118 (322/3, 322/5 old )**

**in Chavasseri Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala over an area of 0.2513 Ha. (SIA/KL/MIN/45874/2019) {1541/EC3/2019/SEIAA}**

Mr.Kunhikannan T.C, Proprietor, Krishna Kripa House, Kolari, Mattannur P.O, Kannur 670702, vide application dated 05/11/2019 has sought environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project at Re. Sy No.322/109, 110, 111, 112, 118 (322/3, 322/5 old ) in Chavasseri Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala over an area of 0.2513 Ha.

The proposal was placed in the 108<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup>& 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020 and the Committee directed the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proponent has submitted documents online on 04.03.2020. The proposal was placed in the 111<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 02<sup>nd</sup>,03<sup>rd</sup>& 04<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The proponent was invited for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 112<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 12<sup>th</sup>,13<sup>th</sup>& 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The proponent was present. The RQP made the presentation. The Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit certain additional documents/details. The proponent submitted the same on 12.10.2020. A field inspection was also carried out on 29.9.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 03<sup>rd</sup>,04<sup>th</sup>& 05<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Committee discussed and accepted the field inspection report, and decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proponent has submitted the documents online on 30.11.2020. The proposal was placed in the 117<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 28<sup>th</sup>,29<sup>th</sup>& 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020. The Committee scrutinized the additional documents/details submitted by the proponent and the Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 23<sup>rd</sup>,24<sup>th</sup>& 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021 for further appraisal. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to the general conditions.

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

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

- 1. Appropriate soil conservation measure should be taken up at all the three boundary buffers of the quarry where the terrain slope is moderate to steep.*
- 2. Garland drain should be adequate enough to carry the entire overland flow of the adjacent slope region of the quarry.*
- 3. On completion of the quarrying operation, rehabilitation should not be limited only to the proposed site alone. Rehabilitation should be done for the existing abandoned quarry as well.*
- 4. During rehabilitation quarry pond should be retained as water harvesting structure to be used for meeting the water demand of the immediate vicinity where seasonal water shortage is experienced*
- 5. The development of green belt should commence prior to the commencement of mining activity*
- 6. As a part of CER activity effort shall be made to promote local indigenous species including Rock banana seen in the Project locality.*
- 7. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 8. The proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 9. 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.*

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

**Item No.6                      Environmental Clearance for the proposed Medical Devices Park at Life Science park, Thonakkal in Sy No. 185 (Part), 186 (Part) & 187, Veiloor, village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, in Thiruvananthapuram District SIA/KL/MIS/142532/2020, 1606/EC1/2020/SEIAA**

Biju B. G., Manger(Projects),Kerala State Industrial Development Co operation Ltd., Keston Road, Kowdiar, Thiruvananthapuram,Kerala-695003has submitted an application for Environmental Clearance through PARIVESH portal on14/02/2020 for the proposed Medical Devices Park at Life Science Park, Thonakkal in Sy No. 185 (Part), 186 (Part) & 187, Veiloor Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District .

Medical Devices Park is a Joint Venture between Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences & Technology (SCTIMST) and Kerala State Industrial Development Corporation (KSIDC), Trivandrum. The endeavour is aimed at making rapid strides in the field of development of medical devices. Medical Devices Park combines KSIDC's commitment to nurturing the life sciences and Med Tech industry in the state and SCTIMST's longstanding history of pioneering innovation in medical devices, especially the most complex Class D devices. The total built up area of the project is 25931.2 sq. mt.

The proposal was placed in the 115<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3 – 5, November 2020.The Committee decided to invite the proponent for presentation. The proposal was placed in the 116<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 7th December, 2020. The proponent and consultant were present. The consultant made the presentation. A field inspection was

also carried out on 31.12.2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 118<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2021. The Committee discussed the Field Inspection Report and decided to direct the proponent to submit certain documents/details. The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> -25<sup>th</sup> February, 2021. The Committee scrutinized the additional details submitted by the proponent. The Committee decided to recommend the issuance of EC subject to certain specific conditions.

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

**Authority accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to issue EC for 7 years subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.**

- 1) Action for ensuring treatment of Sewage generated from unit by adding Ultrafiltration Unit to the proposed treatment Unit, for ensuring reuse / recycle of treated water for flushing/gardening.*
- 2) Include tentative cost for waste management, especially for Solid and Liquid Waste Management in the EMP.*
- 3) Action for harnessing solar energy to meet power requirement at least partially. Providing post type solar yard lighting system within the compound should be considered.*
- 4) A properly designed Plan for planting of local species of trees in the Green Belt area / open space, compensatory afforestation area, including avenue plantations should be prepared with the help of experts.*
- 5) Action for Bio fencing with appropriate species all around the compound in addition to planting avenue trees*
- 6) Action for providing two line (dual) plumbing system, for ensuring reuse of treated waste water for flushing and use of water efficient /conserving plumbing system/fixtures.*

- 7) *Action for ensuring design of the building in compliance to Energy Building Code, wherever possible.*
- 8) *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with District Collector. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the half yearly report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals.*
- 9) *Provision shall be made for the housing of construction labour within the site with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) of GoI, MoEF dt.22.09.2008).*

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

**Item No.1                      Application for Extension of EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, M/s Manimaeth Crusher Industries in Survey Nos 781/1-23-1 & 781/1-23-2 in Athikkayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by Shri. Tomy Abraham. SIA/KL/MIN/167099/2020, 121/SEIAA/EC4/2200/2014**

Environmental Clearance was issued to M/s Manimaeth Crusher Industries in Survey Nos 781/1-23-1 & 781/1-23-2 in Athikkayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala for an area of 4.2755 Ha vide proceedings No. 121/SEIAA/EC4/2200/2014 (EC No.112/2015) dated 23.12.2015. The validity of EC has expired on 22.12.2020. Shri.

Tomy Abraham submitted an application for Extension of EC via PARIVESH on 07/08/2020.

The proposal was placed in the 114<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020. A field inspection was also carried out on January 2020 by a team of experts of SEAC and certain observations were made by the team.

The proposal was placed in the 119<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2021. The Committee discussed and approved the Field Inspection Report. Since the proposal is for expansion, it is not considered under extension of EC.

The Project Proponent vide e-mail dated 15.03.2021 has informed SEIAA that his proposal was for Extension of EC and not for Expansion as pointed out by SEAC.

**Authority decided to forward the Email dated 15.03.2021 to SEAC for re-examination of their recommendation and report. The project Proponent may be directed to contact SEAC to clarify the issues he has raised in his Email.**

**Sd/-**

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

**Sd/-**

**Dr.V.Venu IAS  
Member Secretary, SEIAA**

**Sd/-**

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