

Minutes of the 225th Meeting of the State Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC), Haryana constituted for considering Environmental Clearance of Projects (B Category) under Government of India Notification dated 14.09.2006 held on 10.11.2021 under the Chairmanship of Sh. V. K. Gupta, Chairman, SEAC, through Video Conferencing (VC).

At the outset the Chairman, SEAC welcomed the Members of the SEAC and advised the Secretary to give brief background of this meeting. The minutes of the 224th Meeting were discussed and approved without any modification. In the meeting 20 no. of agenda projects received from SEIAA, were taken up for scoping, appraisal and grading as per agenda circulated.

In the wake of recent crises of COVID-19, lockdown situation, Committee took a decision to scope and appraises the EC cases as per the guidelines issued by MoEF& CC from time to time by video conferencing. It was decided that before the commencement of online video conferencing the agenda is required to be mailed beforehand. Accordingly the agenda of the present meeting was mailed to SEAC members in advance and a video conference meeting was organized in this regard on 10.11.2021.

The 225th meeting of SEAC Haryana was held online by video conferencing on 10.11.2021. The following members joined the meeting:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	ShriPrabhakarVerma	Member
2.	Dr. S. N. Mishra	Member
3.	Shri Raj Kumar Sapra	Member
4	Dr.Surinder Kumar Mehta	Member
5.	Ar. Hitender Singh	Member
6.	Dr.VivekSaxena	Member
7.	Dr.Mehar Chand	Member
8.	Shri Anil Kumar Mehta	Member
9.	Dr. R. K. Chauhan, Joint Director, Environment & Climate Change Department, Haryana	Secretary

225.01 EC for proposed mining of Sand (Minor Mineral) at Jairampur Block YNR/B-6 (ML area-33.85 Ha.) Village-Jairampur Jagiri, Tehsil-Jagadhari, District-Yamuna Nagar, Haryana by M/s Balaji Infra.

Project Proponent : Mr. Veerbhan Wadhwa
Consultant : Vardan Environet

The ToR was approved in the 136th meeting of the SEAC held on 09.07.2016 and conveyed to the project proponent vide letter No. 1264 dated 18.07.2016. Thereafter, the PP **225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021**

submitted the EIA/EMP Report on 08.05.2018 and lastly the case was considered by SEAC in its 193rd meeting held on 23.12.2019 and **recommended to SEIAA for grant of EC for one year** under category B1, 1(a) as per EIA Notification, 2006.

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in 123rd meeting of SEIAA held on 13.03.2020 and reviewed the facts and record of the project, the Authority observed that the language of recommendation & Appraisal of SEAC is not very clear whether the “EC” should be accorded or wait for one year to get the “Replenishment Studies” submitted.

The Authority, further observed that the case have initially been taken in 172nd meeting of SEAC held on 03/07/2018 and still there is no clear recommendation regarding grant of “EC”, therefore, after detailed deliberations and discussions in the matter, the Authority decided to sought clarification from SEAC (Haryana) on the their recommendations and also decided to defer this case till the receipt of reply from SEAC.

The Authority further decided to ask the Project proponent to submit the affidavit in the meantime stating that:

1. No mining activity is being carried out at the stated block & further mining will not give rise to cluster mining;
2. no intention to expand the mining activity beyond the stated/ approved area;
3. sprinkler would be deployed to curb fugitive emission by using treated water;
4. water trough would be provided for incoming/ outgoing water to wash the wheels;
5. no natural water course/ water body would be obstructed due to any mining activity or due to the dumping of the material and will not stack any mineral outside the concession area granted on mining contract without obtaining a valid mineral dealer license;
6. Total mineral excavated & stacked will not exceed 2 times of the average monthly production as per approved mining plan at any point of time;
7. No mining operations would be carried out in any reserved/protected forest or any area prohibited by any law force in India or by any authority without obtaining prior permission;
8. No mining operation in urbanizable zone of area;
9. No mining activity would be carried out in the river bed to a distance of 5 times of the span of bridge on up-stream side & 10 times the span on down-stream side;
10. Un-mined block of 50 meters width to be maintained after every block of 1000 meters over which mining is undertaken;
11. Maximum depth of mining will not exceed 3 meters from the un-mined bed level at any point in time;
12. Mining would be restricted within the central 3/4th width of river/rivulet;
13. No mining would be carried out outside the sanctioned block;
14. Mining would be carried out keeping a safety margin of 2 meters above ground water table.

The case again was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021; Authority found out complaint has been received by office of SEIAA. Authority decided to refer

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

back the case to SEAC to look into the nature of complaint, if need be can send a team to get the spot inspection. Authority asked SEAC to apprise SEIAA about the future developments

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The discussion was held on the observation raised in 129th minutes of meeting of SEIAA and the complaint received in SEIAA but PP submitted before the committee that they have not received a copy of complaint. The committee decided that the copy of complaint shall be provided to PP and raised the following observation:

1. The PP shall submit the reply of the complaint and thereafter the case will be considered by SEAC

The PP shall submit the required information as detailed above within 30 days and it was also made clear to the PP that the project will be considered as received only after the receipt of complete information. In case of non-receipt of information in time the case shall be recommended for rejection/ filing.

225.02 Violation ToR for project Expansion of Corporate Office Complex located at Plot No.13, Sector-32, Urban Estate, Gurugram-II, Haryana by M/s Padmini Technologies Ltd.

Project Proponent : Mr. P.K. Garg
Consultant : Perfect Enviro

The case was considered in 215th meeting of SEAC held on 17.06.2021 and recommended this case to SEIAA for approval of ToR under Violation Category and the Project Proponent will prepare the EIA by using Model Terms of Reference of MoEF & CC with following additional Terms of Reference.

The recommendation of SEAC was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 08.10.2021; after detailed deliberations, the Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to find out that a) whether the case has been applied during the stipulated time period for applying the cases under the "Violation category" as per the notification 14/03/2017 & subsequent notification 08/03/2018 or not b) the proof of credible action taken under the EPA, 1986.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

1.	<p>Whether the case has been applied during the stipulated time period for applying the cases under the “Violation category” as per the notification 14/03/2017 & subsequent notification 08/03/2018 or not</p>	<p>PP submitted the proposal to the SEIAA vide online proposal no.SIA/HR/MIS/154294/2020 on dated 20.08.2020 At that time the violation window was closed. Hence we have applied the case as fresh case Considering , the Point no 7 & 9 of Office memorandum dated 9th September 2019 “Proposals involving violation of EIA Notification, which had applied during the window (14.03.2017 to 13.09.2017 and 14.03.2018 to 13.04.2018) under violation category are being considered by the violation committee”.</p> <p>PP has submitted a request letter dated 02.02.2018 submitted on 05.02.2018 to SEIAA haryana asking the clarity of applicability/ requirement of Environmental Clearance on our project. The letter is attached herewith as placed on record. Keeping the above mentioned facts into consideration our case was considered as a violation case.</p> <p>Chronology of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Our case was taken up in the 203rd meeting of SEAC Haryana held on 15.10.2020. The PP presented the case before the committee stating that Case can be considered under the stipulated time period for applying the cases under the “Violation category” as per the notification 14/03/2017 & subsequent notification 08/03/2018 because they have submitted a request letter dated 02.02.2018 to SEIAA , Haryana for sake of Environmental Clearance ● Thereafter, the case was referred to SEIAA for further decision. After that recommendation of SEAC was considered in 126th meeting of SEIAA held on 11.12.2020 and the Authority decided to issue a Show-cause Notice to the PP for violating the Norms of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 as well as EP Act, 1986.The Project Proponent has submitted his reply on 25.01.2021 which was considered in 127th SEIAA meeting held on 17.03.2021 and the SEIAA after deliberations acceded the request of PP for consideration of the case under Violation Category. In the meanwhile, prosecution action will be initiated against the PP. The Minutes of 127th meeting attached herewith as placed on record. <p>The case was considered in 215th SEAC 17.06.2021 and TOR was recommended by SEAC to the project</p>
----	---	---

2.	The proof of credible action taken under the EPA, 1986.	The State Environment Impact assessment Authority, Haryana has written to the Chairman, HSPCB vide a letter no. SEIAA/HR//478 dated 12.05.2021 for initiating credible action against M/s Padmini Technologies Ltd, 101-ist floor, kundan Niwas, Hari Nagar Ashram, New Delhi-110014 under section 15 of the Environment (protection) Act, 1986 for commencing construction of “Corporate office complex” located at plot no.13, Sector 32, Urban Estate Gurugram-II Haryana without obtaining Environment clearance under EIA notification 14.09.2006.
----	---	---

The committee discussed the reply of PP, credible action, window period of violation cases, SEIAA direction to consider project under violation and decided to send the case again to SEIAA for approval of ToR under Violation Category and the Project Proponent will prepare the EIA by using Standard Terms of Reference of MoEF & CC with additional Terms of Reference and public consultation as recommended vide minutes of 215th meeting of SEAC held on 17.06.2021.

225.03 EC for w.r.t Expansion of Ware House at Village Behrampur, Gurgaon, Haryana by M/s P.D.Enterprises

Project Proponent : Mr. Mukesh Yadav
Consultant :Vardan Environet

The case pertains to Violation of EIA notification & submitted for approval of “Terms of Reference” under violation category.

The case has been taken up in 218th SEAC meeting & PP has submitted the following:

- The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana on 07.06.2013, was taken up in the 89th meeting of the SEAC held on 26.08.2013 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance
- The case was considered in the 60th, 68th and 72nd meeting of SEIAA held on 26.06.2014 wherein, as per observation the proponent was informed that the building plan stands invalid as validity of CLU has been lapsed. The representative of the project proponent was asked to submit copy of revalidated CLU and copy of revalidated building plan.
- The SEIAA on dated 28.12.2015 has returned the file with remarks that SEAC should inspect the site and submit report.
- Thereafter the case was taken up in the 129th meeting of the SEAC held on 14.03.2016 and a Sub-Committee for site visit was constituted. The committee visited the site on 04.04.2016 and submitted the report to the committee that M/s P.D Enterprises Gurugram has violated the provisions of EIA notification by constructing the warehouse of more than 20,000 sqm without obtaining prior EC from the Competent Authority.

- The report of subcommittee was placed before the committee in 134th meeting of SEAC and the committee accepted the report of sub-committee and after detailed discussion is of the unanimous view that the case be referred to SEIAA for further necessary legal action
- The project proponent has submitted the Form-1, Form-1A and Conceptual Plan to the SEIAA, Haryana on 15.06.2018 with reference to the Notification No. S.O.804 (E), dated the 14th March, 2017 and subsequent Notification No. S.O.1030 (E) dated 08th March, 2018, issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.
- Further the case was taken up in 203rd meeting of SEAC Haryana held on 15.10.2020 and decided to forward this case to SEIAA for taking Legal action under the provisions of EP Act, 1986 being a Violation Case for construction of Warehouse without taking the prior Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification 2006.
- The case was then taken up in the 127th and 128th Meeting of SEIAA held on 26.05.2021 for further consideration under violation category.
- The clarification regarding area mentioned in Occupational Certificate dated 28.11.2018 (enclosed as Annexure-8) and the Total built up area mentioned in the ToR application

The case was taken up in 129th SEIAA meeting held on 11.10.2021 and Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to verify & clearly state whether the case has been submitted during the “Time Window” for “Violation Cases” and the credible action taken report.

Authority further asked SEAC to look into the following too;

- i) Damage assessment to be done as per the guidelines of NGT /guidelines of CPCB issued in this regard
- ii) Budget for Remediation & Augmentation Plan to be calculated as per the norms of NGT/CPCB (Guidelines issued)
- iii) Green area shown is 819.219 sq. mt. out of the Plot area 14,973.36 Sq.mt., approx.. 5.47% which is very less considering the norms & type of Project. This aspect to be considered while assessing the “Environmental Damage”.
- iv) If unit is in operation, submitted data should be verified
- v) Public consultation required

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

S.No	Observations	Reply
1.	Damage assessment to be done as per the guidelines of NGT /guidelines of CPCB issued in this regard	TheDamage assessment guidelines of NGT/guidelines of CPCB are Not Applicable for violation cases.
2.	Budget for Remediation & Augmentation	Budget for Remediation &

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

	Plan to be calculated as per the norms of NGT/CPCB (Guidelines issued)	Augmentation Plan as per the norms of NGT/CPCB are not applicable for Violation cases.
3.	Green area shown is 819.219 sq. mt. out of the Plot area 14,973.36 Sq.mt., approx. 5.47% which is very less considering the norms & type of Project. This aspect to be considered while assessing the "Environmental Damage".	Due to constrain in the area, we will be able to provide 5.47% only
4.	If unit is in operation, submitted data should be verified	Yes, the unit is in operation.
5.	Public consultation required	Our project falls under item 8(a) for which public consultation is exempted.
6.	Verify & clearly state whether the case has been submitted during the "Time Window" for "Violation Cases"	We applied our case on 07.06.2013 and during appraisal some violation was found i.e well before the year 2017. The history of project with respect EC application in chronological order is placed on record.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, the Damage assessment guidelines of NGT/guidelines of CPCB, Green area (5.47%), public consultation and Committee also decided again to send to SEIAA for Grant of Terms of Reference along with public consultation and additional terms of reference for undertaking EIA and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP) as recommended vide minutes of 218th meeting of SEAC held on 30.07.2021.

225.04 EC for Expansion of Warehouse (For Storage of Commercial Goods) planned at Village Binola, & Bhora Kalan, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Skymettle Infrastructures Pvt Ltd.

Project Proponent : Mr. Abhishek
Consultant :Vardan Environet
Brief of the case:

The project was earlier submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana on 27.07.2018. The project proponent submitted the case to the SEIAA as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was taken up in 219th SEAC meeting & the committee forwarded the following recommendations to SEIAA for approval.

- a) For clubbing the 2 files submitted vide letter dated 27.07.2018 and 30.07.2021 respectively
- b) For Grant of Terms of Reference subject to outcome of Hon'ble Madras High Court Case along with public consultation and additional terms of reference for undertaking EIA and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP):

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

1. The State Government/SPCB to take action against the project proponent under the provisions of the section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and further no Consent to Operate or Occupancy Certificate to be issued till the project is granted EC.
2. Public hearing to be conducted for the project and the issues raised by the public should be addressed in the Environmental Management Plan.
3. The Project Proponent shall be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan with the SPCB prior to the grant EC. The quantum shall be recommended by the SEAC and finalized by the regulatory authority. The bank guarantee shall be released after successful implementation of the EMP, followed by recommendations of the SEAC and approval of the regulatory authority.

The recommendation of SEAC was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 13.10.2021; after detailed deliberations, *decided to refer the case back to SEAC* with the following directives:

- Damage assessment & the budget for remediation plan to be carried out as per Hon'ble NGT/CPCB guidelines issued in this regard
- The timeline must be factored in since when the Damage to environment has been done with the quantum to damage.
- Remediation & Resource Augmentation plan to be verifiable, sustainable and should additional to what PP is supposed to do under the conditions of CTO/EC.
- Budget for Remediation & Resource augmentation plan to be checked & verified by, after taking all the details needed from the record/PP/Consultant.
- To check whether the case has been applied during the "Time Window" provided for such cases
- Credible action report as per EPA,1986

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:

S. No	Observations	Reply
1.	Damage assessment & the budget for remediation plan to be carried out as per Hon'ble NGT/CPCB guidelines issued in this regard.	The Damage assessment & the budget for remediation as per Hon'ble NGT/CPCB guidelines are not applicable for violation cases.
2.	The timeline must be factored in since when the Damage to environment has been done with the quantum to damage.	We will factor duration of violation while calculating the remediation plan.
3.	Remediation & Resource Augmentation plan to be verifiable, sustainable and should additional to what PP is supposed to do under the conditions of CTO/EC.	We will submit verifiable, sustainable and Remediation & Resource Augmentation plan after grant of ToR.
4.	Budget for Remediation & Resource augmentation plan to be checked & verified by, after taking all the details needed from the record/PP/Consultant.	Budget for Remediation & Resource augmentation plan will be checked by PP & Consultant.

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

5.	To check whether the case has been applied during the "Time Window" provided for such cases.	We applied our case on 17.05.2021 with proposal no. SIA/HR/MIS/212461/2021 under violation category. Acknowledgement Slip of Online application is placed on record. We have not applied our case during the time window provided by MoEF & CC.
6.	Credible action report as per EPA, 1986.	Credible action will be taken after grant of ToR.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, The Damage assessment guidelines of NGT/guidelines of CPCB, R&R Plan, window of violation, credible action, show cause notice by SEIAA, appraise under violation category etc. and Committee also decided again to send to SEIAA for Grant of Terms of Reference along with public consultation and additional terms of reference for undertaking EIA and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP) as recommended vide minutes of 219th meeting of SEAC held on 13.08.2021.

225.05 Amendment in EC of Group Housing Project "Ibiza Town" at Village Lakkarpur, Surajkund, Faridabad Haryana by M/s Krrish Shalimar Projects Pvt. Ltd

Project Proponent : Mr. Navdeep
Consultant : Env Developmental Assistance systems Pvt. Ltd.

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/191611/2021 on dated 29.01.2020 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was considered in 216th& 219th meeting of SEAC held on 29.06.2021 & 13.08.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Amendment in Environment Clearance.

The recommendation of SEAC was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 13.10.2021; Authority observed that followings:

- EC was issued on 15/11/2012 & expired on 14/11/2019
- PP failed to apply for the extension of EC during the stipulated time
- Notification Sept. 15,2016 should be referred which very clearly states that application for "Extension of EC" to be applied
 - (a) within thirty days after the validity period of Environmental Clearance, such cases shall be referred to concerned Expert Appraisal Committee or State Level Expert Appraisal Committee or District Level Expert Appraisal Committee and based on their recommendations, the delay shall be condoned at the level of the Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change or Member Secretary, State Level Expert Appraisal Committee or Member Secretary, District Level Expert Appraisal Committee, as the case may be;
 - (b) more than thirty days after the validity period of Environmental Clearance but less than ninety days after such validity period, then, based on the recommendations of the Expert Appraisal Committee or State Level Expert Appraisal Committee or District Level Expert Appraisal Committee, the delay shall be condoned with the approval of the Minister in charge of Environment, Forest and Climate Change or Chairman, as the case may be :

Provided that no condonation for delay shall be granted for any application for extension filed beyond ninety days after the validity period of Environmental Clearance.”

The Authority deliberated on the issue & stated that applying for “OC” during the period when “EC” was expiring is no-ground for condonation. The failure to get the “Extension of EC” while project is still in construction phase means project is being carried out with “Expired EC”, seems to be in violation.

After detailed deliberations, the Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to re-examine the case thoroughly.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021.

The committee discussed the reply of PP in reference to the observation of SEIAA, letter of condonation, instruction, NITB project referred by PP, Covid instruction, Notification dated 18.01.2021, OM dated 07.07.2021 and PP submitted the affidavit along with undertaking that :-

- The Project was started after issuance of previous EC vide letter no. SEIAA/HR/2012-381 Dated 15 November, 2021. All the construction work has been done in the period of original EC and applied for OC on 25.09.2017 and again on 25.06.2018.
- No construction work has been done since submission of OC application. As the principal OC was received in Jan 2020, after this period Covid-19 lockdown happened and their EC validity needed to be extended to complete the finishing work of 7th Tower (TowerA).
- There is no change in the layout plan
- Green Area will remain the same as in previous EC
- No reduction will be made in EMP from the previous EC

The Committee also decided again send to SEIAA for consideration of extension for further period of validity within the existing norms and amendments in earlier Environmental Clearance issued vide letter dated 15.11.2012 under EIA Notification dated 14.9.2006 issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India with additional stipulations as recommended vide 219th meeting of SEAC dated 13.08.2021 and other conditions will remain same as per earlier EC issued vide letter dated 15.11.2012.

225.06 Correction in the EC letter issued for Warehouse/Logistic/ Industrial storage project located in the Revenue Estate of the Village Sehsaula, Taluka, Tauru, District Mewat (Nuh), Haryana by M/s ERPL Warehouse Park Private LTD

Project Proponent: Mr. Nitin Gawali

Consultant: M/s Aplinka Solutions and technologies pvt. Ltd.

M/s ERPL Warehousing Park Pvt. Ltd has submitted an application vide which requested for issuance of Corrigendum by amending the figures of FAR and Non- FAR area as

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

defined in EC letter. The Environment Clearance was granted vide letter No. SEIAA(125)/HR/2020/510 dated 02.11.2020 in favour of M/s ERPL Warehousing Park Pvt. Ltd.

The matter was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 13.10.2021; after detailed deliberations, the Authority decided to forward the request letter of project proponent to SEAC for further examination and to make the appropriate recommendations in this regard.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

S.No.	Query	Reply
1.	Submit a Self Content note regarding the change proposed in FAR and Non FAR values.	<p>During the SEAC meeting of project, clarification over the FAR and Non- FAR correction was given.</p> <p>Environment Clearance was granted to the project dated 02.11.2020.</p> <p>By mistake, the Mezzanine area of 25,500 sq.m. was proposed within the Non FAR area. However, the Mezzanine area must be a part of FAR as per the Haryana Building Code 2017 and amended thereof.</p> <p>Therefore, we have made a plea to consider the mezzanine area of 25,500 sq.m. in the FAR; the Builtup area remains the same.</p> <p>FAR is also within the permissible limit of 75% of the total plot area.</p> <p>There is no change in the population, water requirement, electricity demand and other environmental parameters as approved in the Environment Clearance since the project requirements were already taken into the consideration in the application forms submission.</p> <p>Thus, the correction is only being sought for the mistake in FAR and Non- FAR figures only.</p> <p>A Self Content note as asked to submit in this regard is shared in record.</p>

The committee discussed the reply of PP, change in FAR, NON FAR, Built up area, pollution caused, water requirement, power requirement, population. The other components will remain same and PP has submitted that the mistake was done in area calculation of FAR and NON FAR however total builtup area is same and has no change in other values i.e water, electricity, population etc as already calculated on the corrected values. And SEAC considered the following corrections in the EC letter dated 02.11.2020

Table1:

Proposed correction in EC letter dated 02.11.2020				
Sr. No.	Particulars	As per EC letter 02.11.2020	Correction	Final Corrected value
1	Total proposed FAR including Mezzanine area	101275.82	25500	126772.85
2	Total proposed Non FAR	33958.17	-25500	8458.17
3	Total Built up Area	135233.99	0	135,233.99

The Committee deliberated and decided to recommend to SEIAA for above correction in Built up area (FAR and NON FAR) in EC letter dated 02.11.2020 with following additional condition whereas the other stipulations will remain the same as recommended vide Environment clearance dated 02.11.2020

Additional Stipulation:

1. Consent to establish/operate for the project shall be obtained from the State Pollution Control Board as required under the Air (Prevention and Control of pollution) Act, 1981 and the Water (Prevention and control of pollution) Act, 1974 for amended/corrected EC dated 02.11.2020.
2. Any change in stipulations of EC will lead to Environment Clearance void-ab-initio and PP will have to seek fresh Environment Clearance.

**225.07 EC for Proposed Integrated Residential Colony Plotted and Group Housing Sushant City Royale at Sector 35/36 Karnal Haryana by M/s Ansal Landmark (Karnal).
Project Proponent: Mr. Amit Malhotra
Consultant: Ind Tech House Consult**

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online proposal no SIA/HR/MIS/56727/2017. The Project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana on 10.10.2016. The project proponent submitted the case the SEIAA as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC. The case was taken up for approval of Terms of Reference in the 143rd meeting of the SEAC held on 27.10.2016. The Project proponent requested for adjournment and the same was discussed in the meeting. The Committee acceded to the request and decided to issue 30 days' notice to the PP. Accordingly the notice will be issued by the Secretary, SEAC to the Project Proponent. The observations of 143rd meeting were conveyed to the PP vide letter No. 1582 dated 08.11.2016. The PP submitted the request on dated 27.06.2017.

The case was again taken up in the 219th meeting held on dated 13.08.2021 and PP presented the case before the committee after detailed deliberations, SEAC again recommended the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance under violation

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

category subject to the following specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects:

1. SEAC recommended for an amount of Rs. 23,88,300/- towards Remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation plan to be spend within a span of three years. The details are given below.
2. Total budgetary provision with respect to Remediation plan and Natural & Community Resource Augmentation plan is rupees 23,88,300/-Therefore, project proponent shall be required to submit a bank guarantee of an amount of Rupees ₹23,88,300/- towards Remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation plan with the Haryana State Pollution Control Board prior to the grant of EC.
3. Remediation plan shall be completed in 3 years whereas bank guarantee shall be for 5 years. The bank guarantee shall be released after successful implementation of the EMP, followed by recommendations of the SEAC and approval of the regulatory authority/SEIAA.
4. Approval/permission of the CGWA/SGWA shall be obtained, if applicable before drawing ground water for the project activities. State Pollution Control Board (SPCB) concerned shall not issue Consent to Operate (CTO) till the project proponent obtains such permission.
5. The PP should submit the 6 monthly action taken report on the compliance of environmental conditions to the Regional Officer, MoEF&CC, Haryana State Pollution Control Board and Chairman, SEIAA.
6. The PP shall bear the cost of remedial plan and will be responsible to maintain and manage the same.
7. The PP shall also submit the details of status of development of Green plan, species planted, survival status along with existing trees species wise and also maintain the record date wise along with digital mapping.
8. The PP shall also maintain the record of trees/plants to be planted as per the Remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation plan along with digital mapping, latitude, longitude details.
9. The PP shall submit the prosecution details filled by HSPCB in environment court Kurukshetra under EP act, 1986 before the meeting of SEIAA as prosecution has been sanctioned by Chairman, HSPCM vide letter dated 11.08.2021.
10. The PP shall not start construction and development works without getting EC under violation Act/provisions of notification.

The case taken up 129th meeting dated 13.10.2021 decided to refer back it to SEAC with the following directives:

- Damage assessment & the budget for remediation plan to be carried out as per Hon'ble NGT/CPCB guidelines issued in this regard
- The timeline must be factored in since when the Damage to environment has been done with the quantum to damage.
- Remediation & Resource Augmentation plan to be verifiable, sustainable and should additional to what PP is supposed to do under the conditions of CTO/EC.
- Budget for Remediation & Resource augmentation plan to be checked & verified thoroughly, after taking all the details needed from the record/PP/Consultant.

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- To check whether the case has been applied during the “Time Window” provided for such cases
- Credible action report as per EPA,1986

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

S.No.	Query	Reply
1.	Damage assessment & the budget for remediation plan to be carried out as per Hon’ble NGT/CPCB guidelines issued in this regard	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The damage assessment report submitted is based on the requirement of SEAC, Haryana. 2. SOP issued by the MoEF for handling violation cases, though stayed by Madras High Court, finds no mention of CPCB guidelines. Said SOP as placed on record. 3. Expert Committee of MoEF also not following CPCB guidelines while assessing violation cases. 4. The CPCB guidelines are for the projects, which are already operational. Since, our project is not in the operational phase, the CPCB norms are not applicable on us. Said notification as placed on record. The Current status of the project as placed on record. 5. CPCB rules are not being followed by any other state while assessing violation cases. 6. SEIAA, Haryana itself has assessed, in the past, violation cases without application of CPCB norms. 7. As far as NGT is concerned, it has till date not come up with any guidelines whatsoever for handling violation cases.
2.	The timeline must be factored in since when the Damage to environment has been done with the quantum to damage.	<p>The only violation is that the project proponent has continued the construction work of group housing (the built-up area of 12,026 sqm) after expiry of Environment Clearance (validity expired on 29.10.2012).</p> <p>The construction continued for group housing component till June 2014 for A5, B5, A6 and B6 and June 2015 for A3, B2, B3 and club.</p> <p>The total time taken for completion of 12026 sq.m. of built up area is 2 months</p>

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

		i.e. 60 days after which the construction has been stopped. Project proponent has, till date, not exceeded the area limits prescribed in original MoEF approval. The detailed description of the violation conducted as placed on record.
3.	Remediation & Resource Augmentation plan to be verifiable, sustainable and should additional to what PP is supposed to do under the conditions of CTO/EC.	Remediation and Resource augmentation plans have also been submitted which will be in addition to do under conditions of EC/CTO. The same are hereby as placed on record.
4.	Budget for Remediation & Resource augmentation plan to be checked & verified thoroughly, after taking all the details needed from the record/PP/Consultant.	It has been checked thoroughly. It is rather recommended that the approved budget be reduced keeping in mind the minimal violation of not applying for extension of MoEF approval within prescribed timeline, accidentally committed by the project proponent.
5.	To check whether the case has been applied during the "Time Window" provided for such cases	After the notification for violation published on 14.03.2017, the project was applied for Environment Clearance under violation category in EAC, MoEF&CC on 12.09.2017, within the Time window provided for such cases. The case was then transferred to SEAC, Haryana for appraisal under violation category.
6.	Credible action report as per EPA,1986	as placed on record.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, the Damage assessment guidelines of NGT/guidelines of CPCB, Time line, credible action, window of violation and SEAC again send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance under violation category whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 219th meeting held on dated 13.08.2021.

225.08 ToR for Proposed Development of Integrated Township in the name of Ardee City (133.40 acres already developed + 71.458 acres proposed) at Sector 52 and Sector 57, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Ardee Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd

Project Proponent: Mr. Vijay Gupta
Consultant: Ind Tech House Consult

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online proposal no. SIA/HR/MIS/61593/2021 on dated 12.01.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(b) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The TOR was granted on 08.07.2021.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

The case was considered in 219th meeting of SEAC held on 13.08.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance.

The recommendation of SEAC consider in 129th meeting of SEIAA dated 14.10.2021, Authority observed that:

- a) No. & volume of RWH pits mentioned in MoM of SEAC is 71 & 30 cm³ respectively, probably seems to be an error, even in the original documents no. is mentioned but size & volume of RWH pit is not mentioned
- b) Total waste water generation mentioned is 1106 KLD & proposed capacity of STP is 925 KLD, much lesser than the required capacity.

Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to look into the above written aspects and recommend accordingly.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

S.No.	Query	Reply
1.	No. & volume of RWH pits mentioned in MoM of SEAC is 71 & 30 cm ³ respectively, probably seems to be an error, even in the original documents no. is mentioned but size & volume of RWH pit is not mentioned	Rain water Harvesting pits proposed in Group housing, U.D. & School are 46 nos. and RWH pits proposed in plotted colony are 25 nos. So, total RWH pits proposed are 71 nos. and volume of each pit will be 30 m ³ (Radius =2m and depth 2.4 m). In documents submitted it was wrongly mention as 30 cm ³ instead on 30 m ³ .
2.	Total waste water generation mentioned is 1106 KLD & proposed capacity of STP is 925 KLD, much lesser than the required capacity.	739 KLD of waste water will be generated from the group housing project out of 1106 KLD which will be treated in onsite STP of 925 KLD capacity. Rest, 367 KLD of waste water will be generated from the plotted colony which will be discharged in public sewer for which the permission has already been granted. Since it is a old developed sector way before EIA notification, HUDA has already considered its infrastructure including sewer and water.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, RWH number, wrongly mention of pit size and the size of pit is 30m³ instead of 30cm³ and SEAC decided again to recommended the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance along with correction in size of RWH pit as 30m³ whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 219th meeting held on dated 13.08.2021

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

225.09 EC for FWS Logistic Park project at Village: Khurampur, Tehsil: Farrukhnagar, Distt: Gurgaon, Haryana by M/s S Y Logistic Park LLP

**Project Proponent: Mr. Jeet Shah
Consultant: Aplinka Solutions and technologies pvt. Ltd.**

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/215216/2021 on dated 02.07.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was considered in 217th & 219th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021 & 14.08.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance.

The recommendation of SEAC was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 14.10.2021; after detailed deliberations, the Authority observed that:

- Design calculations of RWH pits seem to be bit unusual & could not be understood. Why the “Intake capacity of Bore” to be included in volume of pit, secondly, 4 bores taken in single pit, doesn’t seem to be feasible?

Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to re-examine the calculations carried out to determine the no. of proposed RWH pits in the usual manner, SEAC should thoroughly check & if need be then the new design be endorsed by some expert of this field.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

Query 1	Submit the self contained note stating supporting facts and documents for considering the intake capacity of bore into the volume of the rainwater harvesting pit.
Reply	<p>For calculation of capacity of Artificial Recharge pits three components are required to be taken.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Free Board Area (without filter media) where only water is available, this is considered to be above the filter media and below the invert level of the Recharge Pit. 2. Filter media: As we fill the boulders and gravels as a filter media there are some spaces/voids left which are filled up by water and for this porosity of this material is considered i.e. 50% of media volume. 3. Intake capacity of the bore: Intake capacity depends upon the Recharge Test in that particular region, i.e. with what capacity the water can be absorbed by the land. As per CGWB Chandigarh, the intake capacity in Haryana Region varies from 5 LPS (Liter per second) to 10 LPS as maximum region is made up of old alluvium. <p>As recommended by CGWB, this needs to be taken into consideration as the water enters into the pit, filtration process starts and water starts flowing in the aquifer through this shaft. Recharge is done artificially and it continues till the water is not emptied completely into the aquifer. As this is a continuous flow, so this Intake capacity is also considered while designing.</p>
Query 2	Submit the certified copy of the Rain Water Harvesting design from the MEP.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

Reply	The rain water harvesting design is certified from the MEP. The copy of the same is Placed on record
Query 3	Submit the clarification for the surface run-off from roof top.
Reply	The rooftop design of the proposed project is slanted, hence, the run-off coefficient considered for the rain water harvesting calculation is taken as 0.9

The committee discussed the reply of PP, CGWA guideline, volume, intake capacity of pit and SEAC decided again to send to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 219th meeting held on dated 13.08.2021

225.10 EC of the Affordable Group Housing Colony at Revenue Estate Village Chandawali, Sector 64, Faridabad, Haryana by M/s Adore Buildtech LLP

Project Proponent: Mr. Sunny

Consultant: Aplinka Solutions and technologies pvt. Ltd.

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online proposal no. SIA/HR/MIS/218774/2021 dated 23.06.2021. The project proponent submitted the case to the SEIAA as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for EC under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was considered in 219th meeting of SEAC held on 14.08.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance.

Authority considered the recommendations & appraisal of SEAC in its 129th SEIAA dated 14.10.2021 Authority observed that :

- Design calculations of RWH pits seem to be unusual & could not be understood. Why the "Intake capacity of Bore" to be included in volume of pit, secondly, 2 bores taken in single pit, doesn't seem to be feasible?

Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC to re-examine the calculations carried out to determine the no. of proposed RWH pits in the usual manner, SEAC should thoroughly check & if need be then the new design be endorsed by some expert of this field.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

Query 1	Submit the self contained note stating supporting facts and documents for considering the intake capacity of bore into the volume of the rainwater harvesting pit.
Reply	For calculation of capacity of Artificial Recharge pits three components are required to be taken. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Free Board Area (without filter media) where only water is available, this is considered to be above the filter media and below the invert level of the Recharge Pit. 5. Filter media: As we fill the boulders and gravels as a filter media there are some spaces/voids left which are filled up by water and for this porosity of

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

	<p>this material is considered i.e. 50% of media volume.</p> <p>6. Intake capacity of the bore: Intake capacity depends upon the Recharge Test in that particular region, i.e. with what capacity the water can be absorbed by the land. As per CGWB Chandigarh, the intake capacity in Haryana Region varies from 5 LPS (Liter per second) to 10 LPS as maximum region is made up of old alluvium.</p> <p>As recommended by CGWB, this needs to be taken into consideration as the water enters into the pit, filtration process starts and water starts flowing in the aquifer through this shaft. Recharge is done artificially and it continues till the water is not emptied completely into the aquifer. As this is a continuous flow, so this Intake capacity is also considered while designing.</p>
Query 2	Submit the certified copy of the Rain Water Harvesting design from the MEP.
Reply	The rain water harvesting design is certified from the MEP. The copy of the same is attached as Annexure -I .
Query 3	Submit the clarification for the surface run-off from roof top.
Reply	The rooftop design of the proposed project is flat, hence, the run-off coefficient considered for the rain water harvesting calculation is taken as 0.8

The committee discussed the reply of PP, CGWA guidelines, volume, intake capacity of pit and SEAC decided again to send to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 219th meeting held on dated 13.08.2021

225.11 ToR for Existing Project for Manufacturing of Formaldehyde 90 M.T per day at Plot No. 54, HSIIDC, Manakpur Chhachhrauli Road, Jagadhri District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana -135003 by M/s Synochem Organics Pvt. Ltd.

Project Proponent: Mr. Ashu Jain
Consultant: Vardan Environet

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online Proposal No SIA/HR/IND3/63321/2021 dated 13.07.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for approval of TOR under Category 5(f) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The ToR were Auto generated for expansion on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report. Further, PP vide letter dated 09.07.2021 submitted reply in reference to the SEIAA office letter dated 06.07.2021 as well as MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021 and again requested to consider the proposal for approval of Terms of Reference under Violation in reference to OM dated 07.07.2021 and case was forwarded to SEAC for appraisal and additional ToR if required under the mandate of 07.07.2021.

The case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC Haryana held on 20.07.2021. The Project proponent, unanimously decided to recommend to SEIAA for Grant of Terms of Reference and additional terms of reference (under violation) for undertaking EIA and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP).

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 11.10.2021; after detailed discussion the authority intended to know whether the unit qualify

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the credible action taken under EPA,1986.

After due deliberation authority decided to refer back this case with the above observations.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021

Authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S.O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the status of credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

In compliance of the above we are hereby giving following reply for consideration:

1. Initially the unit has not applied for Environmental Clearance in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March 2017.
2. Further the proposal was submitted on 14.05.2021 after reopening of window for violation category projects.
3. There are number of proposals that have been granted ToR under violation from MoEF&CC. One such ToR dated 08.07.2021 under violation from MoEF&CC
4. Minutes of Meeting of 129th SEIAA meeting held on 11.10.2021 states "SEAC recommend the case to SEIAA for approval of ToR with directions to the Project Proponent to prepare EIA Report by using Model Terms of Reference as per MoEF&CC with the additional Terms of Reference along with Public hearing." We would like to inform that Public Hearing to be conducted only for those categories of projects for which the EIA Notification, 2006 itself requires public hearing to be conducted as per Office Memorandum vide F.No. 22-28/2020-IA.III dated 12th Nov, 2020. Being "B" category project (as the plant is located within the industrial area), Public Hearing is not required for the project.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, violation window, credible action, Auto generated TOR on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report, MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021. The SEAC discussed the auto TOR granted and deliberated on OM dated 07.07.2021 and SEAC again decided to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of TOR under violation category whereas specific TOR in addition to all standard TOR applicable for such projects, auto TOR will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting held on dated 20.07.2021.

225.12 ToR for Capacity Expansion of Formaldehyde Manufacturing Unit in existing facility from 100 TPD to 120 TPD at Plot No. M-28 & E-57, Industrial area Yamunanagar, Haryana by M/s Globe Panel Industries India Pvt. Ltd.

**Project Proponent : Mr. Saurabh
Consultant: Vardan Environet**

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online Proposal No SIA/HR/IND3/63305/2021 dated 13.07.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for approval of TOR under Category 5(f) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

The ToR were Auto generated for expansion on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report. Further, PP vide letter dated 09.07.2021 submitted reply in reference to the SEIAA office letter dated 06.07.2021 as well as MoEF, OM dated 07.07.2021 and again requested to consider the proposal for approval of Terms of Reference under Violation in reference to OM dated 07.07.2021 and case was forwarded to SEAC for appraisal and additional ToR if required under the mandate of 07.07.2021.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021 and after detailed deliberations; SEAC recommend the case to SEIAA for approval of ToR with directions to the Project Proponent to prepare EIA Report by using Model Terms of Reference as per MoEF & CC with the additional Terms of Reference along with Public hearing.

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 11.10.2021; after detailed discussion the authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

After due deliberation authority decided to refer back this case with the above observations.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021

Authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S.O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the status of credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

In compliance of the above we are hereby giving following reply for consideration:

1. Initially the unit has not applied for Environmental Clearance in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March 2017.
2. Further the proposal was submitted on 13.05.2021 after reopening of window for violation category projects.
3. There are number of proposals that have been granted ToR under violation from MoEF&CC. One such ToR dated 08.07.2021 under violation from MoEF&CC
4. Minutes of Meeting of 129th SEIAA meeting held on 11.10.2021 states "SEAC recommend the case to SEIAA for approval of ToR with directions to the Project Proponent to prepare EIA Report by using Model Terms of Reference as per MoEF&CC with the additional Terms of Reference along with Public hearing." We would like to inform that Public Hearing to be conducted only for those categories of projects for which the EIA Notification, 2006 itself requires public hearing to be conducted as per Office Memorandum vide F.No. 22-28/2020-IA.III dated 12th Nov, 2020, Being "B" category project (as the plant is located within the industrial area), Public Hearing is not required for the project.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

The committee discussed the reply of PP, violation window, credible action, Auto generated TOR on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report, MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021. The SEAC discussed the auto TOR granted and deliberated on OM dated 07.07.2021 and SEAC again decided to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of TOR under violation category whereas specific TOR in addition to all standard TOR , auto TOR applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting held on dated 20.07.2021.

225.13 ToR for Manufacturing of Formaldehyde 80 TPD at Plot No. 83, Sec-1, Phase-I, Growth Centre Saha (Approved Industrial Area), Ambala, Haryana by M/s Gayatri Industries

**Project Proponent: Mr Naresh Gupta
Consultant: Vardan Environet**

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online proposal no SIA/HR/IND3/63318/2021 dated 13.07.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for approval of TOR under Category 5(f) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The ToR were Auto generated for expansion on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report. Further, PP vide letter dated 09.07.2021 submitted reply in reference to the SEIAA office letter dated 06.07.2021 as well as MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021 and again requested to consider the proposal for approval of Terms of Reference under Violation in reference to OM dated 07.07.2021 and case was forwarded to SEAC for appraisal and additional ToR if required under the mandate of 07.07.2021.

The case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC Haryana held on 20.07.2021. The PP Project proponent, unanimously decided to recommend to SEIAA for Grant of Terms of Reference and additional terms of reference (under violation) for undertaking EIA and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP).

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 11.10.2021; after detailed discussion the authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

After due deliberation authority decided to refer back this case with the above observations.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021

Authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S.O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the status of credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

In compliance of the above we are hereby giving following reply for consideration:

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

1. Initially the unit has not applied for Environmental Clearance in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March 2017.
2. Further the proposal was submitted on 14.05.2021 after reopening of window for violation category projects.
3. There are number of proposals that have been granted ToR under violation from MoEF&CC. One such ToR dated 08.07.2021 under violation from MoEF&CC.
4. Minutes of Meeting of 129th SEIAA meeting held on 11.10.2021 states "SEAC recommend the case to SEIAA for approval of ToR with directions to the Project Proponent to prepare EIA Report by using Model Terms of Reference as per MoEF&CC with the additional Terms of Reference along with Publichearing." We would like to inform that Public Hearing to be conducted only for those categories of projects for which the EIA Notification, 2006 itself requires public hearing to be conducted as per Office Memorandum vide F.No. 22-28/2020-IA.III dated 12th Nov, 2020, Being "B" category project (as the plant is located within the industrial area), Public Hearing is not required for the project.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, window, credible action, Auto generated TOR on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report, MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021. The SEAC discussed the auto TOR granted and deliberated on OM dated 07.07.2021 and SEAC again decided to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of TOR under violation category whereas specific TOR in addition to all standard TOR, auto TOR applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting held on dated 20.07.2021.

225.14 ToR for Capacity Expansion of Formaldehyde Manufacturing Unit in Existing Facility from 80 TPD to 250 TPD at Plot No.211, HSIIDC Industrial Estate, Manakpur, Jagadhri, Distt. Yamuna Nagar (H.R) by M/s Sanwaria Polymers Industries Pvt. Ltd.

**Project Proponent: Mr. Satish Garg
Consultant: Vardan Environet**

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online proposal no SIA/HR/IND3/63311/2021 dated 13.07.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for approval of TOR under Category 5(f) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The ToR were Auto generated for expansion on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report. Further, PP vide letter dated 09.07.2021 submitted reply in reference to the SEIAA office letter dated 06.07.2021 as well as MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021 and again requested to consider the proposal for approval of Terms of Reference under Violation in reference to OM dated 07.07.2021 and case was forwarded to SEAC for appraisal and additional ToR if required under the mandate of 07.07.2021.

The case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021. The PP presented the case before the committee and committee recommend to SEIAA for Grant of Terms of Reference and additional terms of reference (under violation).

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 11.10.2021; after detailed discussion the authority intended to know whether the unit qualify

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

After due deliberation authority decided to refer back this case with the above observations.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021

Authority intended to know whether the unit qualify and has applied in the violation window as per the Notification S.O. 804 (E) dated 14th March, 2017 and Authority asked SEAC to verify the status of credible action taken under EPA, 1986.

In compliance of the above we are hereby giving following reply for consideration:

1. Initially the unit has not applied for Environmental Clearance in the violation window as per the Notification S. O. 804 (E) dated 14th March 2017.
2. Further the proposal was submitted on 13.05.2021 after reopening of window for violation category projects.
3. There are number of proposals that have been granted ToR under violation from MoEF&CC. One such ToR dated 08.07.2021 under violation from MoEF&CC.
4. Minutes of Meeting of 129th SEIAA meeting held on 11.10.2021 states "SEAC recommend the case to SEIAA for approval of ToR with directions to the Project Proponent to prepare EIA Report by using Model Terms of Reference as per MoEF&CC with the additional Terms of Reference along with Public hearing." We would like to inform that Public Hearing to be conducted only for those categories of projects for which the EIA Notification, 2006 itself requires public hearing to be conducted as per Office Memorandum vide F.No. 22-28/2020-IA.III dated 12th Nov, 2020, Being "B" category project (as the plant is located within the industrial area), Public Hearing is not required for the project.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, window, credible action, Auto generated TOR on 15.06.2021 for preparation of EIA report, MoEF, office memorandum dated 07.07.2021. The SEAC discussed the auto TOR granted and deliberated on OM dated 07.07.2021 and SEAC again decided to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of TOR under violation category whereas specific TOR in addition to all standard TOR, Auto TOR applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting held on dated 20.07.2021.

225.15 EC for Warehouse Project at Village Binola, Manesar, Gurgaon Haryana by India Land and Space Logistics Pvt. Ltd.

Project Proponent: Mr. Manoj Sarogi
Consultant: Aplinka Solutions and technologies pvt. Ltd.

The project pertains to the development of "Ware-house" in Manesar, Gurugram. The project has been started & completed without seeking the prior "Environmental Clearance" as per EIA, 2006.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

The case has been submitted to SEIAA with reference to the Notification No. S.O.804 (E), dated the 14th March, 2017 and subsequent Notification S.O.1030 (E) dated 08th March, 2018, issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

Total Plot area of the project is 50408.23 Sq. Meters and net plot area is 32412.52 Sq. Meters. Total built-up area is 28666.79 Sq. Meters. The ToR was granted to the project on 07.08.2018.

The case was initially taken up in 206th meeting of SEAC Haryana held on 27.11.2020. But the PP and the consultant requested in writing to defer the case. The case was again taken up in 212th meeting of SEAC held on 25.03.2021, certain observations were raised, and PP submitted the reply on 11.06.2021.

Finally, the case was taken up in 216th meeting held 30.06.2021. PP submitted that prosecution has been filed in special Environment court Faridabad vide case no. 33/2019. The committee has decided that an amount of ₹5836000/- towards Remediation Management Plan, Community & Natural Resources Augmentation Plan to be spent within a span of 3 years. Based on the information furnished by the project proponent, the SEAC recommended the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance under violation category subject to certain specific conditions.

The case was considered in 129th SEIAA meeting held on 09/10/2021, Authority observed the following

- As per the submission of PP in front of SEAC “the construction work started without obtaining the Environment Clearance due to unawareness of EIA Notification, 2006, after its building plans were approved by DTCP Haryana in 2012, therefore “Environmental damage” started with the start of construction. Volume & Quantum of construction/damage to environment should be assessed as per the guidelines of CPCB/Hon’ble NGT.
- Recalculate the “Budget for Remedial & Augmentation Plan” considering time line/volume of construction/Location of project etc. as per the guidelines of CPCB/Hon’ble NGT. PP & consultant to submit the various input factors needed for calculations under the oath of its authenticity.
- Submitted is 60 mt. wide “Green Belt” as part of total “Green area”, is this “Peripheral or inside”, if peripheral; is it part of total land mass meant for project?
- Plot area mentioned 50,408.23 sqm, net plot area 32412.52sqm & total no. of “RWH Pits” 4 pits (Diameter : 3.5 m and Depth : 4m), mentioned in MoM. Even considering the net plot area the no. & volume of RWH pits seems to be lesser.

Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC with the direction to look into the proof of credible action taken as per EPA, 1986 and whether the proponent applied during the window period as per Violation Notification dated 14.03.2017 & 08.03.2018.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

Query 1	Submit the proof of credible action has been taken against the project.															
Reply	The legal action was initiated by Haryana State Pollution Control Board and prosecution case is already filed via case No. 33/2019 at Special Environment court Faridabad. The copy of the proof of legal action as placed on record															
Query 2	Whether the proponent applied during the window period as per the Violation Notification 14.3.2017 & 08.03.2018.															
Reply	<p>Under the amendment to EIA Notification dated 14.3.2017 S.O. 3999(E), for violation cases, the window for submission of the Application period in MoEF&CC was valid from 14.03.2017 to 13.09.2017. The EC Application form of the project was accordingly submitted within the window period to MoEF&CC dated 23.08.2017. The copy of the online submission as placed on record.</p> <p>As per the Office memorandum of MoEF&CC vide S.O. 1030(E) dated 8th March 2018, it was required to submit the EC Application Form to SEIAA, Haryana within the window period valid from 14.03.2018 to 13.04.2018. Accordingly, the project was submitted to SEIAA, Haryana for obtaining the Terms of Reference (ToR) on 12.4.2018, before the window closes. The copy of the online acknowledgment as placed on record.</p> <p>Hence, it is deduced that submission of Application Form to the MoEF&CC and SEIAA Haryana was made within the prescribed window period.</p> <p>The detailed chronology of the project application as placed on record</p>															
Query 3	As per the submission of PP in front of SEAC “the construction work started without obtaining the Environment Clearance due to unawareness of EIA Notification, 2006, after its building plans were approved by DTCP Haryana in 2012, therefore “Environmental damage” started with the start of construction. Volume & Quantum of construction/damage to environment should be assessed as per the guidelines of CPCB/Hon’ble NGT.															
Reply	<p>As per the MoEF&CC Notification dated 14.03.2017, paragraph 13, sub-paragraph 7, “The project proponent will be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan with the State Pollution Control Board and the quantification will be recommended by Expert Appraisal Committee and finalized by Regulatory Authority and the bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of environmental clearance and will be released after successful implementation the remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan, and after the recommendation by regional office of the Ministry, Expert Appraisal Committee and approval of the Regulatory Authority”.</p> <p>Accordingly, the damage assessment was done which is summarized as follows :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="332 2010 1369 2279"> <thead> <tr> <th>S. No.</th> <th>Aspects(for 3 years)</th> <th>Amount (In INR)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Estimated Cost of Remediation Plan based on the Damage Assessment due to violation</td> <td>31,81,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Natural Resource Augmentation Plan</td> <td>15,50,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Community Resource Augmentation Plan</td> <td>11,05,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Grand Total</td> <td>58,36,000/-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB), underlines the estimation of Environmental Compensation, in its “Report of the Committee on Methodology for Assessing Environmental Compensation and Action Plan to Utilize the Fund”.</p>	S. No.	Aspects(for 3 years)	Amount (In INR)	1	Estimated Cost of Remediation Plan based on the Damage Assessment due to violation	31,81,000/-	2	Natural Resource Augmentation Plan	15,50,000/-	3	Community Resource Augmentation Plan	11,05,000/-	Grand Total		58,36,000/-
S. No.	Aspects(for 3 years)	Amount (In INR)														
1	Estimated Cost of Remediation Plan based on the Damage Assessment due to violation	31,81,000/-														
2	Natural Resource Augmentation Plan	15,50,000/-														
3	Community Resource Augmentation Plan	11,05,000/-														
Grand Total		58,36,000/-														

The cases considered for levying the Environmental Compensation are along with the applicability with respect to the project is shown below :

Considerations	Status of Applicability with respect to the project
Discharges in violation of consent conditions, mainly prescribed standards/ consent limits	Not applicable. At present, there is no discharge from the warehouse project.
Not complying with the directions issued, such as direction for closure due to non installation of OECMS, non-adherence to action plan submitted etc.	Not Applicable. There is no such direction issued.
Intentional avoidance of data submission or data manipulation by tempering the Online Continuous emission/Effluent Monitoring system.	Not Applicable. There is no installation of Online Monitoring System.
Accidental discharges lasting for short durations resulting into damage to the environment.	Not Applicable. There is no accidental discharge from the project site.
Intentional discharges to the environment – land water and air resulting into acute injury or damage to the environment.	Not Applicable. There is no discharge to the land water and air environment from the project site.
Injection of treated/partially treated/untreated effluents to the ground.	Not Applicable. There is no discharge of the effluent to the ground.

None of the above considerations is applicable to the Warehouse Project, hence, levying the Environmental Compensation is not applicable with respect to the project.

Query 4	Recalculate the “Budget for Remedial & Augmentation Plan” considering timeline/volume of construction/Location of project etc. as per the guidelines ofCPCB/Hon’bleNGT.PP&consultanttosubmitthevariousinputfactorsneeded For calculations under the oath of its authenticity.
Reply	The copy of the Remediation Plan, Community Resource Augmentation Plan And Natural Resource Augmentation Plan along with the various input factors is placed on record.
Query 5	Submitted is 60 mt. wide “Green Belt” as part of total “Green area”, is this“Peripheral or inside”, if peripheral; is it part of total land mass meant for project?.
Reply	The total plot area of the warehouse project is 50,408.23 m ² while the net plot area is 32,412.52 m ² upon which the warehouse is constructed. The total green area within the project premise is 2,228.19 m ² , which is approximately 6.87% of the net plot area. During the SEAC appraisal, it was suggested to increase the total green area. Since, the construction of the project has been completed, there is no further space left for the development of additional Green Area within the project premise. Hence, as an additional measure, M/s India Land and Space Logistics Pvt. Ltd is

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

	<p>developing and maintaining a 60m wide Greenbelt (measuring 10,385.88 m²) that falls outside the net plot area but remains within the total plot area. It may be noted that this 60m greenbelt lies in the ownership of India Land and Space Logistics Pvt. Ltd. and will be handed it over to the NHAI as and when notified in the future.</p> <p>As a result of this additional measure, the total cumulative green area (within project premise + 60m wide greenbelt) being developed and maintained is 12,614.07 m², which is approximately 25.03% of the total plot area (measuring 50,408.23 m²).</p> <p>The same clarification was provided to SEAC during the 212th Appraisal meeting.</p>
Query 4	Plot area mentioned 50,408.23 sqm, net plot area 32412.52sqm & total no. of "RWH Pits" 4 pits (Diameter : 3.5 m and Depth : 4m), mentioned in MoM. Even considering the net plot area the no. & volume of RWH pits seems to be lesser
Reply	There are 9 no. of rain water harvesting pits as approved by Haryana Water Resource Authority (HWRA). The copy of HWRA approval is attached as

The committee discussed the reply of PP, R& R plan, Damage assessment, 60m Green belt, 9 no. of RWH Pits as approved by HWRA and decided to consider 9 no of RWH as per approval of HWRA. After deliberation, SEAC decided again to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance along with 9 no. of RWH pits instead of 4 RWH Pits whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 216th meeting held on dated 30.06.2021 with additional stipulation as following:-

Additional Stipulation

1. 9Rain water harvesting recharge pits shall be provided for ground water recharging as per the CGWB norms.
2. The PP shall install Digital water level recorder for monitoring the water recharge and carry out quarterly maintenance and cleaning of 9 RWH pits.

225.16 EC for Residential Plotted Colony under Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna (10.30 Acres), Village Wazirpur, & Meoka, Sector 92, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Signature Infrabuild Private Limited.

Project Proponent : Mr. Vineet Kumar
Consultant: Grass Root Technology Pvt. Ltd.

Earlier, the Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide Online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/191905/2021 on dated 12.01.2021 for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was considered in 209th & 210th meeting of SEAC held on 30.01.2021&18.02.2021and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance.

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in 128th meeting of SEIAA held on 26.05.2021 and the following queries were raised:

- Total Green Area 5299.7sqm (@12.71% of the net plot area)? PP proposed to make it to 15% with Vertical Green.

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- On page no 22 of Form-1A, PP has mentioned “Proposed Landscape Area (@20.65% of the net plot area) 7,947.26 mt²”, why it is being reduced to 12.71%? Even mentioned 7,947.26 mt² under pt. 1.3 too.

After detailed deliberations; the Authority decided to refer back this case to SEAC for clarification that in the previous EC of Residential Plotted Colony Projects under Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna was sanctioned minimum 20% Green Area but in the present case, green area is recommended less than 20% ; why?

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021 but the PP requested vide letter dated 08.07.2021 for withdrawal of their case as their management have revised their decision and decided to apply fresh for additional area being expansion hence, they would like to withdraw the proposed EC application as the EC has not yet been granted and submitted affidavit that no construction has been carried on the plot. The request of PP and consultant was considered and acceded and decided to send the case to SEIAA for withdrawal in view of request of PP.

Presently:

Earlier, the Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide Online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/218872/2021 on dated 03.8.2021 for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was taken up 129th meeting of SEIAA Held On 14.10.2021, Authority observed that the same case has been recommended for withdrawal on the pretext of certain changes in plan in 217th meeting of SEAC and Authority agreed in 129th SEIAA meeting held on date-10/10/2021.

Authority after deliberations decided to refer back the case to SEAC with the directions to clearly mention the reasons for earlier withdrawal & subsequent changes in project.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021. The committee discussed the reply of PP, changes in plan, withdrawal reason, changes proposed in revised application, two application for one project etc. The committee deliberated that PP requested for withdrawal of prior application SIA/HR/MIS/191905/2021 vide letter dated 08.07.2021 to apply new application SIA/HR/MIS/218872/2021 for EC and PP was asked to submit the affidavit that no construction has been carried out at the project site

- Thereafter, the PP submitted the affidavit attested by the Notary dated 10.11.2021 stating that the company has not commenced any construction work at the project site and shall commence the work after obtaining EC.
- The PP also submitted the comparison table depicting the changes carried out due to the change in planning and subsequently applying for fresh case for EC . The details are given below:-

Sr. No.	Particulars	Earlier Application i.e withdrawn	Revised Application
1.	Online Proposal Number	SIA/HR/MIS/191905/2021	SIA/HR/MIS/218872/2021
2.	Plot Area	41,682.555 m ²	41,682.555 m ²
3.	Proposed Ground Coverage	25,922.272 m ²	25,922.272 m ²
4.	Proposed FAR	50,608.293m ²	50,645.497 m ²
5.	Non FAR Area	23,766.857 m ²	66,563.77 m ²
6.	Total Built Up area	74,375.15 m ²	1,17,209.267 m ²
7.	Total Green Area with %	5,299.7 m ²	5,299.7 m ² (@12.71% of the plot area)
8.	Rain Water Harvesting Pits (with size)	11 Pits (Dia.-3 m & Depth-2.5 m)	11 Pits (Dia.-3 m & Depth-3m)
9.	STP Capacity	340 KL	350 KL
10.	Total Parking	The project is a Plotted Residential Colony. For plotted development the parking will be within the plots by the individual plot owners.	The project is a Plotted Residential Colony. For plotted development the parking will be within the plots by the individual plot owners.
11.	Power Requirement	2,900 kVA	2,900 kVA
12.	Power Backup	4 nos. of DG sets of total 2,500 KVA capacity (2x750 + 2x500)	4 nos. of DG sets of total 2,500 KVA capacity (2x750 + 2x500)
13.	Total Water Requirement	337 KLD	340 KLD
14.	Domestic Water Requirement	313 KLD	324 KLD
15.	Fresh Water Requirement	232 KLD	236 KLD
16.	Treated Water	81 KLD	249 KLD
17.	Waste Water Generated	267 KLD	277 KLD
18.	Solid Waste Generated	1,878 KLD	1,988 kg/day
19.	Project Cost	358.99 Crores	373.49 Crores

After detail deliberation, SEAC decided again to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021.

225.17 EC of project Institutional Office Building located at plot No. 6, Sector 32, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Focus Energy Ltd

Project Proponent: Mr P.K. Manocha
Consultant: Perfect Enviro

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana on 23.04.2018 received in the SEAC on 27.04.2018. The project proponent has submitted the Form-1, Form-1A and Conceptual Plan to the SEIAA with reference to the Notification No. S.O.804 (E), dated the 14th March, 2017 and subsequent Notification No. S.O.1030 (E) dated 08th March, 2018, issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The MoEF& CC has prescribed the process for appraisal of projects for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance, which have started the work on site, expanded the production beyond the limit of environmental clearance or changed the product mix without obtaining prior environmental clearance as mandated under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 [S.O.1533 (E), dated the 14th September, 2006;

The project pertains to development of Institutional Office building at Gurugram.

The Project is under violation, as the Project Proponent has constructed built up area 72871.16 m² till date without obtaining Environmental Clearance. Occupation certificate was granted by the Estate Officer, HUDA Gurgaon vide memo no. Z0002/E0018/UE029/OCCER/00000002591219, for 1st to 15th floors June, 2013. The project was declared under violation as per EP Act 1986 dated 10.05.2019

The case has been taken up in "Violation category", the committee in its 215th meeting assessed & recommended an amount of Rs. 8,148,000/- towards Remediation Management Plan, Community & Natural Resources Augmentation Plan to be spent within a span of 5 years. SEAC has further recommended the case to SEIAA for grant of "EC" under violation category.

The case was taken up in 129th SEIAA meeting held on 08/10/2021, Authority after due deliberations decided to refer back the case with the following observations:

- The amount for Remediation & Augmentation plan to be calculated as per the guidelines of CPCB/Hon'ble NGT issued in this regard. The input data required to be submitted by consultant & PP.
- Remediation & Augmentation plans to be sustainable, verifiable & in addition to what is as such mandatory in compliance of "environmental Laws & Conditions".
- Proof of credible action taken by State/HSPCB under the provision of section-19, of EPA, 1986 to MoEF&CC prior to grant of "EC".

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021 as following:-

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

1.	<p>The amount for Remediation & Augmentation plan to be calculated as per the guidelines of CPCB/Hon'ble NGT issued in this regard. The input data required to be submitted by consultant and PP.</p>	<p>CPCB / Hon'ble NGT guideline is regarding Environmental Compensation may be levied under under Section 25 - Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and under Section 21 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 This is under polluter pay principle which means it is applicable to the projects which are already under operation and when it is proven that physically damage to environment done like disposal of untreated water, emissions in air with pollution control devices and solid waste disposal in open.</p> <p>CPCB/Hon'ble NGT has issued an report for assessing environment compensation and action plan to utilize funds (and not regarding Remediation & Augmentation Plan) whereby it consists of 4 chapters namely;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapter I: Environment compensation to be levied on industrial units- The said project is a commercial complex and hence it is not applicable. 2. Chapter II: Environmental Compensation to be levied on all violation of Graded Response Action Plan (GRAP) in Delhi- NCR- Not applicable 3. Chapter III- Environmental Compensation to be levied in case of failure of preventing the pollutants being discharged in water bodies and failure to implement waste management rules- wastewater from the project will be treated in the in-house STP and solid waste- biodegradable waste will be treated in the in-house Organic Waste Converter and non-biodegradable will be given to approved recycler. Hence no failure in waste management will be there. <p>Chapter IV- Environmental Compensation in case of illegal extraction of Groundwater- No extraction of Groundwater is envisaged in the project. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change vide Notification number S.O.804(E), dated the 14th March, 2017 has notified the process for appraisal of projects for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance, which have started the work on site, expanded the production beyond the limit of environmental clearance as mandated under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 [S.O.1533 (E), dated the 14th September, 2006]</p> <p>As per Notification The collection and analysis of data for assessment of ecological damage, preparation of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan shall be Prepared in all aspects</p> <p>CPCB guideline as placed in record</p>
----	---	--

2.	Remediation & Augmentation plans to be sustainable, verifiable & in addition to what is as such mandatory in compliance of “environmental Laws & Conditions”.	We have done Damage Assessment and prepare Remediation and Augmentation Plan based on the guideline given by the EAC in its several meetings and that in inline with the requirement of guidelines and several environmental clearances issued by EAC and SEAC Remediation and augmentation plans submitted are sustainable in nature and comply with the “environmental Laws & Conditions”. Project Cost Rs. 81 Crore The cost of remediation is Rs 7,095,000/- Natural Augmentation cost- Rs 567,000/- Community Welfare- Rs 1,053,000/- Total cost to be spent- Rs 8,148,000/- as per EIA under violation category. Total EMP cost- Rs 181 lakhs(Already Spent -139 lakh and proposed to be Spent -42 lakh)
3.	Proof of credible action taken by State/HSPCB under the provision of section-19, of EPA, 1986 to MoEF&CC prior to grant of “EC”.	Proof of Credible action placed on record The proposal for TOR was submitted during the violation window portal.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, R& R plan, Damage assessment, proof of credible action and SEAC decided again to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 215th meeting held on dated 18.06.2021.

225.18 EC for Residential Plotted Colony under Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna (Site-I) at Village Dhunela, Sector 36, Sohna, Gurgaon, Haryana by M/s Signature Global Homes Pvt. Ltd

Project Proponent: Mr. Vineet Kumar
Consultant: Grass Root Technology Pvt. Ltd.

The Project was earlier submitted to the SEIAA vide Online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/192630/2020 on dated 13.01.2020 for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was considered in 209th & 210th meeting of SEAC held on 29.01.2021&18.02.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance.

The recommendation of SEAC was considered in 128th meeting of SEIAA held on 26.05.2021 and the following queries were raised:

- Total Green Area proposed is 2065.222 mt²(@10.21 % of the total plot area)mentioned in MoM,

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- PP has mentioned "Proposed Landscape Area (@20.5 % of the total plot area) to be 4148.027 mt² on page no. 23 of Form-1A, whether its 10.21% or 20.5%, PP should clarify.
- Area statement of the project and why is the Green area less?

After detailed deliberations; the Authority decided to refer back this case to SEAC for clarification that in the previous EC of Residential Plotted Colony Projects under Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna was sanctioned minimum 20% Green Area but in the present case, green area is recommended less than 20% ; why?

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021 but the PP requested vide letter dated 08.07.2021 for withdrawal of their case as their management have revised their decision and decided to apply fresh for additional area being expansion hence, they would like to withdraw the proposed EC application as the EC has not yet been granted and submitted affidavit that no construction has been carried on the plot. The request of PP and consultant was considered and acceded and decided to send the case to SEIAA for withdrawal in view of request of PP.

Presently:

The Project was again submitted to the SEIAA vide Online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/218857/2021 on dated 03.08.2021 for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was taken up 129th meeting of SEIAA Held On 14.10.2021, Authority observed that the same case has been recommended for withdrawal on the pretext of certain changes in plan in 217th meeting of SEAC and Authority agreed in 129th SEIAA meeting held on date 10/10/2021.

Authority after deliberations decided to refer back the case to SEAC with the directions to clearly mention the reasons for earlier withdrawal & subsequent changes in project.

Thereafter, the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP submitted the reply of observations raised in 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 12.10.2021.

The committee discussed the reply of PP, changes in plan, withdrawal reason, changes proposed in revised application, two application for one project etc. The committee deliberated that PP requested for withdrawal of prior application SIA/HR/MIS/192630/2020 vide letter dated 08.07.2021 to apply new application SIA/HR/MIS/218857/2021 for EC and PP was asked to submit the affidavit that no construction has been carried out at the project site.

- Thereafter, the PP submitted the affidavit attested by the Notary dated 10.11.2021 stating that the company has not commenced any construction work at the project site and shall commenced the work after obtaining EC.

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- The PP also submitted the comparison table depicting the changes carried out due to the change in planning and subsequently applying for fresh case for EC . the details are given below:-

Sr. No.	Particulars	Earlier Application i.e withdrawn	Revised Application
1.	Online Proposal Number	SIA/HR/MIS/192630/2021	SIA/HR/MIS/218857/2021
2.	Plot Area	20,234.28m ²	20,234.28 m ²
3.	Proposed Ground Coverage	6,177.418 m ²	14,975.773 m ²
4.	Proposed FAR	22,566.803m ²	22,252.327 m ²
5.	Non FAR Area	8,640.869m ²	20,285.673 m ²
6.	Total Built Up area	31,207.672m ²	42,538 m ²
7.	Total Green Area with %	2,065.222 m ²	2,065.222 m ² (@10.21% of the plot area)
8.	Rain Water Harvesting Pits (with size)	5 pits (Dia. 4.5m and Depth 5m)	5 pits (Dia. 4.5m and Depth 5m)
9.	STP Capacity	120 KLD	125 KLD
10.	Total Parking	For plotted development the parking shall be within the plots by the individual plot owners.	For plotted development the parking shall be within the plots by the individual plot owners.
11.	Power Requirement	4,800 kVA	4,800 kVA
12.	Power Backup	3 DG sets of total capacity 2500 kVA (1*1500 kVA & 2*500 kVA)	3 DG sets of total capacity 2500 kVA (1*1500 kVA & 2*500 kVA)
13.	Total Water Requirement	122 KLD	121 KLD
14.	Domestic Water Requirement	110 KLD	115 KLD
15.	Fresh Water Requirement	82 KLD	83 KLD
16.	Treated Water	85 KLD	88 KLD
17.	Waste Water Generated	94 KLD	98 KLD
18.	Solid Waste Generated	659 kg/day	718 kg/day
19.	Project Cost	154.213 Crores	160.713 Crores

After detail deliberation, SEAC decided again to send the proposal to SEIAA for grant of Environmental Clearance whereas specific conditions in addition to all standard conditions applicable for such projects will remain same as recommended vide 217th meeting of SEAC held on 20.07.2021.

225.19 EC for Revision and Modification of Warehouse (Non-Agricultural Produce) over an area measuring 97123.75 sqm at Revenue estate of village Pathredi, Tehsil Manesar, District Gurugram by M/s Embassy Industrial Parks Private Limited

Project Proponent: Mr. Nikhil Sinha
Consultant: Paramarsh Servicing Environment and Development

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIS/212488/2021 dated 15.06.2021. The Project Proponent submitted the case to the SEIAA as per check-list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for amendment in EC under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The Project was granted earlier EC on dated 13.02.2018.

The case was considered in 216th meeting of SEAC held on 29.06.2021 and recommended to SEIAA for grant of Environment Clearance for Revision and Modification.

The recommendation of SEAC was taken up in the 129th meeting of SEIAA held on 09.10.2021; after due deliberations Authority observed that there is definite increase in pollution load. Authority further stated that even as per notification of MoEF & CC dtd. 02/03/2021, Project Proponent can apply under Amendment, if there is no "Increase in Pollution Load" and in the present case there is definite increase in "Pollution Load", therefore, the case should be applied under the category of "Expansion" and PP has to resubmit all the relevant data & studies as the usual case under "Expansion Category" *Authority decided to refer back the case to SEAC*

Thereafter the case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP requested for withdrawal of the said case as they have applied for separate application for the same project in view of some changing in the planning and the request was placed before the committee and committee acceded the request and decided to recommend to SEIAA for withdrawal of said application in view of the request of PP submitted to SEIAA and SEAC.

225.20 EC for Expansion of Warehouse (Non Agricultural Produce) over an area measuring 97123.75 sqm at Revenue estate of village Pathredi, Tehsil Manesar, Distt. Gurugram by M/s Embassy Industrial Parks Private Limited.

Project Proponent: Mr. Nikhil Sinha
Consultant: Paramarsh Servicing Environment and Development

The project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online proposal no. SIA/HR/MIS/235045/2021 on dated 21.10.2021 as per check list approved by the SEIAA/SEAC for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8 (a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006.

The case was taken up in 225th meeting of SEAC held on 10.11.2021. The PP presented the case before the committee.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- The proposed project is for EC for Expansion of Warehouse (Non Agricultural Produce) over an area measuring 97123.75 sqm at Revenue estate of village Pathredi, Tehsil Manesar, Distt. Gurugram by M/s Embassy Industrial Parks Private Limited
- Earlier EC has been granted vide letter dated 13.02.2018.
- Certified Compliance report has been received from MoEF vide letter dated 06.10.2021
- CLU has been obtained from Town and Country planning department, Haryana vide memo no. GN-2910-JE-(VA)-2017-20154 Dated 17.08.2017.
- OC has been obtained vide letter dated 05.02.2019
- Building plans have been approved vide letter dated 14.11.2018.
- No wildlife sanctuary falls within 10km from the project area

Table 1: Construction Status

Block	Sanctioned Ground coverage Area (Sq. Mtr.)	FAR	Construction Status
Block A+B	23,303.72	24,227.80	100% Completed
Block C	12,079.925	11,820.119	100% Completed
Block D	17,538.54	17,416.74	100% Completed
Block E	1,582.643	1,374.45	100% Completed
Security, admin & Others	357.19	168.48	100% Completed
	54862.018	55,007.20	

The details of the project, as per the documents submitted by the project proponent, and also as informed during the presentation:-

Table2: Basic details

Name of the Project:				
S.No.	Particulars	Existing	Expansion	Total
	Online Project Proposal Number	SIA/HR/MIS/235045/2021		
1.	Latitude	28°16'23.44"N		
2.	Longitude	76°52'14.58"E		
3.	Plot Area (sqm)	97123.75	-	97123.75
4.	Net Planned Area (sqm)	97123.75	-	97123.75
5.	Proposed Ground Coverage (sqm)	53412.76	-	53412.76
6.	Proposed FAR (sqm)	72552.62	-2000	70552.62
7.	Non FAR Area (sqm)			
8.	Total Built Up area (sqm)	72552.62	-2000	70552.62
9.	Total Green Area with Percentage (sqm)	16910.13	--	16910.13(17.4 % of the plot area)
10.	Rain Water Harvesting Pits (No's)	7	9	16
11.	STP Capacity (KLD)	65	90, 120	65, 90 & 120
12.	Total Parking (ECS)	262	-1	261
13.	Organic Waste Converter (No's)	1	-	1

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

14.	Maximum Height of the Building (m)	14.5	--	14.5	
15.	Power Requirement (KVA)	1121	6129	7250	
16.	Power Backup DG Sets (KVA)	750 x 2 + 625 + 750 x 2 + 125x2 +250			
17.	Total Water Requirement (KLD)	161	129	290	
18.	Fresh Water Requirement (KLD)	20	39	59	
19.	Treated Water (KLD)	48	183	231	
20.	Waste Water Generated (KLD)	56	171	227	
21.	Solid Waste Generated (KLD)	370	1250	1625.334	
22.	Biodegradable Waste (Kg/day)	975.20 kg/day			
23.	Number of Towers (No's)	5	-1	4	
24.	Total Population (No's)	1500	4200	5700	
25.	Stories	G+1			
26.	Total Cost of the project:	i) Land Cost	41.99 cr		
		ii) Construction Cost	104.41 cr		
27.	EMP Budget (per year)	1)Capital Cost	Completed	Completed	Completed
		2)Recurring Cost (During Construction phase)			
		1)Capital Cost 2)Recurring Cost (During Operation phase)			4,70,69,610lacs 14,44,000 lacs
28.	Incremental Load in respect of:				
	i. PM 10		0.034 µg/m ³	0.034 µg/m ³	
	ii. SO ₂		0.049 µg/m ³	0.049 µg/m ³	
	iii. NO _x		0.037 µg/m ³	0.037 µg/m ³	
29.	Status of Construction	Completed			

Table 3: EMP Budget

COMPONENT	(Rs. IN LACS)	(Rs. IN LACS/YEAR)
Operation Phase		
Sewage Treatment Plant	60,07,838	5,00,000
Rain water Harvesting Pits	48,38,000	3,25,000
Acoustic enclosure/stack for DG sets	51,47,472	50,000 (Includes B check- 20,000+ AMC - 22,000)
Solid Waste Management / OWC	5,00,000	24,000
Environmental Monitoring and six monthly compliances	-	95,000

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

Green Area/ Landscape Area	45,76,300	3,00,000
Environment Cell	10,00,000	1,50,000
Solar Energy Conservation	2,50,00,000	-
Total	4,70,69,610	14,44,000

The discussion was held on STP, water calculations, Fire NOC, ECBC, Geo Technical Report , CER etc. and certain observations were raised as following:

1. The PP shall submit the STP feasibility report
2. The PP shall submit the details of water calculations
3. The PP shall submit the CER details.
4. The PP shall submit the ECBC details
5. The PP shall submit the tangible EMP
6. The PP shall submit the one month monitoring AAQ data at three sites
7. The PP shall submit the Geo Technical Report.
8. The PP shall submit the Fire NOC
9. The PP shall submit the Air Dispersion Model along with Isopleths of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} SO₂, NO₂, CO viz-a-viz wind rose diagram The PP shall submit the
10. The PP shall provide the provisions of UV/ionization treatment technology with latest outlet testing report
11. The PP shall submit an undertaking for no storage of hazardous chemical in warehouse as per MSIHC rule, 1989 and its amendments

The PP submitted the reply of above said observations along with undertaking stating that:-

- No storage of hazardous chemicals in warehouse as per MSIHC rules 1989 and its amendment

After detailed deliberations the Committee rated this project with “**Gold Rating**” and was of the unanimous view that this case for granting Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India should be recommended to the SEIAA with the following specific and general stipulations:

A. Specific conditions:-

- 1) Sewage shall be treated in the STP based on latest Technology with tertiary treatment i.e. Ultra Filtration to achieve standards ordered by NGT. The Treated effluent from STP shall be recycled /reused for flushing. DG cooling and Gardening
- 2) The Project Proponent would devise a monitoring plan to the satisfaction of the State Pollution Control Board so as to continuously monitor the treated waste water being used for flushing in terms of faecal coli forms and other pathogenic bacteria.
- 3) The Project Proponents would commission a third party study on the implementation of conditions related to quality and quantity of recycle and reuse of treated water, efficiency of treatment systems, quality of treated water being supplied for flushing (specially the bacterial counts), comparative bacteriological studies from toilet seats using recycled treated waters and fresh

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

waters for flushing, and quality of water being supplied through spray faucets attached to toilet seats.

- 4) Separate wet and dry bins must be provided in each unit and at ground level for facilitating segregation of waste. Solid Waste shall be segregated into wet garbage and inert materials. Wet Garbage shall be composted in Organic waste convertor. Adequate area shall be provided for solid waste management within the premises which will include area for segregation, composting. The Inert waste from the project will be sent to dumping site.
- 5) Traffic management plan as submitted shall be implemented in letter and spirit. Apart, a detailed traffic management and traffic decongestion plan shall be drawn up to ensure that the current level of service of the roads within a 05 kms radius of the project is maintained and improved upon after the implementation of the project. This plan should be based on cumulative impact of all development and increased habilitation being carried out or purpose to be carried out by the project or other agencies in this 05kms radius of the site in different scenarios of space and time
- 6) The PP is required to plant 10 times trees at the project site and compensatory tree plantation will be done @1:10. No tree cutting has been proposed in the instant project. A minimum of 1 tree for every 80sqm of land should be planted and maintained. The Existing trees will be counted for this purpose. The landscape planning should include plantation of native species. The species with heavy foliage, broad leaves and wide canopy cover are desirable. Water intensive and/or invasive species should not be used for landscaping. As proposed 16910.13 sq. m (17.4 % of the plot area) shall be provided for green area development.
- 7) The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearance/permission from all relevant agencies including town planning authority before commencement of work. All the construction shall be done in accordance with the local building byelaws.
- 8) The PP shall install the Eco Friendly Green Transformer based on ester oil to reduce the carbon footprint
- 9) Consent to establish/operate for the project shall be obtained from the State Pollution Control Board as required under the Air (Prevention and Control of pollution) Act, 1981 and the Water (Prevention and control of pollution) Act, 1974.
- 10) The Approval of the Competent Authority shall be obtained for structural safety of building code due to earthquakes, adequacy of fire fighting equipments etc. as per National Building Code including protection measures from lightening etc.
- 11) The PP shall not carry any construction above or below the Revenue Rasta, if any
- 12) The PP shall not carry any construction below the HT Line passing through the project, if any.
- 13) The PP shall obtain the Fire NOC from the Competent Authority before taking occupation of the building.
- 14) The PP shall not give occupation or possession before the water supply and sewage connection permitted by the competent authority.
- 15) The PP shall not give occupation or possession before the electricity connection permitted by the competent Authority.
- 16) The PP shall obtain the permission regarding withdrawal of ground water from CGWA before the start of the project and also obtained the CTO from HSPCB after the approval from CGWA.
- 17) The PP shall carry out the quarterly awareness programs for the stakeholders of the commercial colony/project.
- 18) 9 Rain Water Harvesting pits shall be provided in addition to 7 already provided pits for rainwater usages as per the CGWB norms.

- 19) The PP shall install Digital water level recorder for monitoring the water recharge and carry out quarterly maintenance and cleaning of 16 RWH pits
- 20) The PP shall take all preventive measures including water sprinkles to control dust during construction and operational phase.
- 21) Any change in stipulations of EC will lead to Environment Clearance void-ab-initio and PP will have to seek fresh Environment Clearance.

B. Statutory compliance:

- [1] The project proponent shall obtain all necessary clearance/ permission from all relevant agencies including town planning authority for ground coverage, FAR and should be in accordance with zoning plan approved by Competent Authority before commencement of work. All the construction shall be done in accordance with the local building byelaws.
- [2] The approval of the Competent Authority shall be obtained for structural safety of buildings due to earthquakes, adequacy of fire fighting equipment etc as per National Building Code including protection measures from lightening etc.
- [3] The project proponent shall obtain forest clearance under the provisions of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1986, in case of the diversion of forest land for non-forest purpose involved in the project.
- [4] The project proponent shall obtain clearance from the National Board for Wildlife, if applicable.
- [5] The project proponent shall obtain Consent to Establish/Operate under the provisions of Air (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 and the Water (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 from the Haryana State Pollution Control Board.
- [6] The project proponent shall obtain the necessary permission for drawl of ground water /surface water required for the project from the competent authority.
- [7] A certificate of adequacy of available power from the agency supplying power to the project along with the load allowed for the project should be obtained.
- [8] All other statutory clearances such as the approvals for storage of diesel from Chief Controller of Explosives, Fire Department, Civil Aviation Department shall be obtained, as applicable, by project proponents from the respective competent authorities.
- [9] The provisions of the Solid Waste (Management) Rules, 2016, e-Waste (Management) Rules, 2016, and the Plastics Waste (Management) Rules, 2016 shall be followed.
- [10] The project proponent shall follow the ECBC Act/ECBC-Rules prescribed by Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power strictly in addition of bylaws of the State Government.

I Air Quality Monitoring and Preservation

- i. Notification GSR 94(E) dated 25.01.2018 of MoEF&CC regarding Mandatory Implementation of Dust Mitigation Measures for Construction and Demolition Activities for projects requiring Environmental Clearance shall be complied with.
- ii. A management plan shall be drawn up and implemented to contain the current exceedance in ambient air quality at the site.
- iii. The project proponent shall install system to carryout Ambient Air Quality monitoring for common/criterion parameters relevant to the main pollutants released (e.g. PM10 and PM25) covering upwind and downwind directions during the construction period.
- iv. Diesel power generating sets proposed as source of backup power should be of enclosed type and conform to rules made under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. The height of stack of DG sets should be equal to the height needed for the combined capacity of all proposed DG sets. Use of ultra low sulphur diesel. The location of the DG sets may be decided with in consultation with State Pollution Control Board

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- v. Construction site shall be adequately barricaded before the construction begins. Dust, smoke & other air pollution prevention measures shall be provided for the building as well as the site. These measures shall include screens for the building under construction, continuous dust/ wind breaking walls all around the site (at least 3 meter height). Plastic/tarpaulin sheet covers shall be provided for vehicles bringing in sand, cement, murrum and other construction materials prone to causing dust pollution at the site as well as taking out debris from the site.
- vi. Sand, murrum, loose soil, cement, stored on site shall be covered adequately so as to prevent dust pollution.
- vii. Wet jet shall be provided for grinding and stone cutting.
- viii. Unpaved surfaces and loose soil shall be adequately sprinkled with water to suppress dust.
- ix. All construction and demolition debris shall be stored at the site (and not dumped on the roads or open spaces outside) before they are properly disposed. All demolition and construction waste shall be managed as per the provisions of the Construction and Demolition Waste Rules 2016.
- x. The diesel generator sets to be used during construction phase shall be ultra low sulphur diesel type and shall conform to Environmental (Protection) prescribed for air and noise emission standards.
- xi. The gaseous emissions from DG set shall be dispersed through adequate stack height as per CPCB standards. Acoustic enclosure shall be provided to the DG sets to mitigate the noise pollution. Ultra low sulphur diesel shall be used. The location of the DG set and exhaust pipe height shall be as per the provisions of the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) norms.
- xii. For indoor air quality the ventilation provisions as per National Building Code of India.

II Water Quality Monitoring and Preservation

- i. The natural drain system should be maintained for ensuring unrestricted flow of water. No construction shall be allowed to obstruct the natural drainage through the site, on wetland and water bodies. Check dams, bio-swales, landscape, and other sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) are allowed for maintaining the drainage pattern and to harvest rain water.
- ii. Buildings shall be designed to follow the natural topography as much as possible. Minimum cutting and filling should be done.
- iii. Total fresh water use shall not exceed the proposed requirement as provided in the project details. The per capita supply should adhere to NBC 2016 and CGWA Notification dated 12.12.2018.
- iv. The quantity of fresh water usage, water recycling and rainwater harvesting shall be measured and recorded to monitor the water balance as projected by the project proponent. The record shall be submitted to the Regional Office, MoEF&CC along with six monthly Monitoring reports.
- v. A certificate shall be obtained from the local body supplying water, specifying the total annual water availability with the local authority, the quantity of water already committed, the quantity of water allotted to the project under consideration and the balance water available. This should be specified separately for ground water and surface water sources, ensuring that there is no impact on other users.
- vi. At least 20% of the open spaces as required by the local building bye-laws shall be pervious. Use of Grass pavers, paver blocks with at least 50% opening, landscape etc. would be considered as pervious surface.
- vii. Installation of dual pipe plumbing for supplying fresh water for drinking, cooking and bathing etc and other for supply of recycled water for flushing, landscape irrigation, car washing, thermal cooling, conditioning etc. shall be done.
- viii. Use of water saving devices/ fixtures (viz. low flow flushing systems; use of low flow faucets tap aerators etc) for water conservation shall be incorporated in the building plan.

225th Video Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- ix. Separation of grey and black water should be done by the use of dual plumbing system. In case of single stack system separate recirculation lines for flushing by giving dual plumbing system be done.
- x. Water demand during construction should be reduced by use of pre-mixed concrete, curing agents and other best practices referred.
- xi. The local bye-law provisions on rain water harvesting should be followed. If local byelaw provision is not available, adequate provision for storage and recharge should be followed as per the Ministry of Urban Development Model Building Byelaws, 2016. Rain Water Harvesting pits shall be provided for ground water recharging as per the CGWB norms.
- xii. A rain water harvesting plan needs to be designed where the recharge bores of minimum one recharge bore per 5,000 square meters of built up area and storage capacity of minimum one day of total fresh water requirement shall be provided. In areas where ground water recharge is not feasible, the rain water should be harvested and stored for reuse. The ground water shall not be withdrawn without approval from the Competent Authority.
- xiii. All recharge should be limited to shallow aquifer.
- xiv. No ground water shall be used during construction phase of the project.
- xv. Any ground water dewatering should be properly managed and shall conform to the approvals and the guidelines of the CGWA in the matter. Formal approval shall be taken from the CGWA for any ground water abstraction or dewatering.
- xvi. The quantity of fresh water usage, water recycling and rainwater harvesting shall be measured and recorded to monitor the water balance as projected by the project proponent. The record shall be submitted to the Regional Office, MoEF&CC along with six monthly Monitoring reports.
- xvii. Sewage shall be treated in the STP with tertiary treatment. The treated effluent from STP shall be recycled/re-used for flushing, AC make up water and gardening. As proposed, no treated water shall be disposed in to municipal drain.
- xviii. No sewage or untreated effluent water would be discharged through storm water drains.
- xix. Onsite sewage treatment of capacity of treating 100% waste water to be installed. The installation of the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) shall be certified by an independent expert and a report in this regard shall be submitted to the Ministry before the project is commissioned for operation. Treated waste water shall be reused on site for landscape, flushing, cooling tower, and other end-uses. Excess treated water shall be discharged as per statutory norms notified by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. Natural treatment systems shall be promoted.
- xx. Periodical monitoring of water quality of treated sewage shall be conducted. Necessary measures should be made to mitigate the odour problem from STP.
- xxi. Sludge from the onsite sewage treatment, including septic tanks, shall be collected, conveyed and disposed as per the Ministry of Urban Development, Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organization (CPHEEO) Manual on Sewerage and Sewage Treatment Systems, 2013.

III Noise Monitoring and Prevention

- i. Ambient noise levels shall conform to residential area/commercial area both during day and night as per Noise Pollution (Control and Regulation) Rules, 2000. Incremental pollution loads on the ambient air and noise quality shall be closely monitored during construction phase. Adequate measures shall be made to reduce ambient air and noise level during construction phase, so as to conform to the stipulated standards by CPCB / SPCB.
- ii. Noise level survey shall be carried as per the prescribed guidelines and report in this regard shall be submitted to Regional Officer of the Ministry as a part of six-monthly compliance report.
- iii. Acoustic enclosures for DG sets, noise barriers for ground-run bays, ear plugs for **225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021**

operating personnel shall be implemented as mitigation measures for noise impact due to ground sources.

IV Energy Conservation Measures

- i. Compliance with the Energy Conservation Building Code (ECBC) of Bureau of Energy Efficiency as per ECBC Act, 2017 read with ECBC Rules, 2018 shall be ensured. Buildings in the States which have notified their own ECBC, shall comply with the State ECBC also which is in no case should be less than 25% as prescribed.
- ii. Outdoor and common area lighting shall be LED.
- iii. Concept of passive solar design that minimize energy consumption in buildings by using design elements, such as building orientation, landscaping, efficient building envelope, appropriate fenestration, increased day lighting design and thermal mass etc. shall be incorporated in the building design. Wall, window, and roof R & U-values shall be as per ECBC specifications.
- iv. Energy conservation measures like installation of CFLs/ LED for the lighting the area outside the building should be integral part of the project design and should be in place before project commissioning.
- v. Solar, wind or other Renewable Energy shall be installed to meet electricity generation equivalent to 1% of the demand load or as per the state level/ local building bye-laws requirement, whichever is higher.
- vi. Solar power shall be used for lighting in the apartment to reduce the power load on grid. Separate electric meter shall be installed for solar power. Solar water heating shall be provided to meet 20% of the hot water demand of the commercial and institutional building or as per the requirement of the local building bye-laws, whichever is higher. Residential buildings are also recommended to meet its hot water demand from solar water heaters, as far as possible.
- vii. The PP will submit report indicating compliance of each parameter of ECBC requirement and submit quantification saving report for each component.

V Waste Management

- i. A certificate from the competent authority handling municipal solid wastes, indicating the existing civic capacities of handling and their adequacy to cater to the M.S.W. generated from project shall be obtained.
- ii. Disposal of muck during construction phase shall not create any adverse effect on the neighboring communities and be disposed taking the necessary precautions for general safety and health aspects of people, only in approved sites with the approval of competent authority.
- iii. Separate wet and dry bins must be provided in each unit and at the ground level for facilitating segregation of waste. Solid waste shall be segregated into wet garbage and inert materials.
- iv. Organic Waste Converter within the premises with a minimum capacity of 0.5 kg /person/day must be installed. Leaves to be put in earmarked pits for converting them into compost to be used as manure.
- v. All non-biodegradable waste shall be handed over to authorized recyclers for which a written tie up must be done with the authorized recyclers.
- vi. Any hazardous waste generated during construction phase, shall be disposed off as per applicable rules and norms with necessary approvals of the State Pollution Control Board.
- vii. Use of environment friendly materials in bricks, blocks and other construction materials, shall be required for at least 20% of the construction material quantity. These include Fly Ash bricks, hollow bricks, AACs, Fly Ash Lime Gypsum blocks, Compressed earth blocks, and other environment friendly materials.
- viii. Fly ash should be used as building material in the construction as per the provision of Fly Ash Notification of September, 1999 and amended as on 27th August, 2003

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

and 25th January, 2016. Ready mixed concrete must be used in building construction.

- ix. Any wastes from construction and demolition activities related thereto shall be managed so as to strictly conform to the Construction and Demolition Rules, 2016.
- x. Used CFLs and TFLs should be properly collected and disposed off/sent for recycling as per the prevailing guidelines/ rules of the regulatory authority to avoid mercury contamination.

VI Green Cover

- i. No tree can be felled/transplant unless exigencies demand. Where absolutely necessary, tree felling shall be with prior permission from the concerned regulatory authority. Old trees should be retained based on girth and age regulations as may be prescribed by the Forest Department. Plantations to be ensured species (cut) to species (planted).
- ii. A minimum of 1 tree (5' tall) for every 80 sqm of land should be planted and maintained. The existing trees will be counted for this purpose. The landscape planning should include plantation of native species. The species with heavy foliage, broad leaves and wide canopy cover are desirable. Water intensive and/or invasive species should not be used for landscaping.
- iii. Where the trees need to be cut with prior permission from the concerned local Authority, compensatory plantation in the ratio of 1:10 (i.e. planting of 10 trees for every 1 tree that is cut) shall be done and maintained. Plantations to be ensured species (cut) to species (planted). Area for green belt development shall be provided as per the details provided in the project document.
- iv. Topsoil should be stripped to a depth of 20 cm from the areas proposed for buildings, roads, paved areas, and external services. It should be stockpiled appropriately in designated areas and reapplied during plantation of the proposed vegetation on site.

VII Transport

- i. A comprehensive mobility plan, as per MoUD best practices guidelines (URDPFI), shall be prepared to include motorized, non-motorized, public, and private networks. Road should be designed with due consideration for environment, and safety of users. The road system can be designed with these basic criteria.
 - a. Hierarchy of roads with proper segregation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
 - b. Traffic calming measures.
 - c. Proper design of entry and exit points.
 - d. Parking norms as per local regulation.
- ii. Vehicles hired for bringing construction material to the site should be in good condition and should have a pollution check certificate and should conform to applicable air and noise emission standards be operated only during non-peak hours.
- iii. A detailed traffic management and traffic decongestion plan shall be drawn up to ensure that the current level of service of the roads within a 05 kms radius of the project is maintained and improved upon after the implementation of the project. This plan should be based on cumulative impact of all development and increased habitation being carried out or proposed to be carried out by the project or other agencies in this 05 Kms radius of the site in different scenarios of space and time and the traffic management plan shall be duly validated and certified by the State Urban Development department and the P.W.D./ competent authority for road augmentation and shall also have their consent to the implementation of components of the plan which involve the participation of these departments.

VIII Human Health Issues

- i. All workers working at the construction site and involved in loading, unloading, carriage of construction material and construction debris or working in any area with dust pollution shall be provided with dust mask.
- ii. For indoor air quality the ventilation provisions as per National Building Code of India.
- iii. Emergency preparedness plan based on the Hazard identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) and Disaster Management Plan shall be implemented.
- iv. 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.
- v. Occupational health surveillance of the workers shall be done on a regular basis.
- vi. A First Aid Room shall be provided in the project both during construction and operations of the project.

IX Corporate Environment Responsibility

- i. The project proponent shall comply with the provisions contained in this Ministry's OM vide F. No. 22-65/2017-IA.III dated 1st May 2018, as applicable, regarding Corporate Environment Responsibility for existing part.
- ii. The company shall have a well laid down environmental policy duly approved by the Board of Directors. The environmental policy should prescribe for standard operating procedures to have proper checks and balances and to bring into focus any infringements/ deviation/ violation of the environmental/ forest/ wildlife norms/ conditions. The company shall have defined system of reporting infringements/ deviation/ violation of the environmental/ forest/ wildlife norms/ conditions and/ or shareholders/ stake holders. The copy of the board resolution in this regard shall be submitted to the MoEF&CC as a part of six-monthly report.
- iii. A separate Environmental Cell both at the project and company head quarter level, with qualified personnel shall be set up under the control of senior Executive, who will directly to the head of the organization.
- iv. Action plan for implementing EMP and environmental conditions along with responsibility matrix of the company shall be prepared and shall be duly approved by competent authority. The year wise funds earmarked for environmental protection measures shall be kept in separate account and not to be diverted for any other purpose. Year wise progress of implementation of action plan shall be reported to the Ministry/Regional Office along with the Six Monthly Compliance Report.

X Miscellaneous

- i. The project proponent shall prominently advertise it at least in two local newspapers of the District or State, of which one shall be in the vernacular language within seven days indicating that the project has been accorded environment clearance and the details of MoEFCC/SEIAA website where it is displayed.
- ii. The copies of the environmental clearance shall be submitted by the project proponents to the Heads of local bodies, Panchayats and Municipal Bodies in addition to the relevant offices of the Government who in turn has to display the same for 30 days from the date of receipt.
- iii. The project proponent shall upload the status of compliance of the stipulated environment clearance conditions, including results of monitored data on their website and update the same on half-yearly basis.
- iv. The project proponent shall submit six-monthly reports on the status of the compliance of the stipulated environmental conditions on the website of the ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change at environment clearance

225thVideo Conferencing (VC) Meeting of SEAC, Haryana, dated 10.11.2021

- portal.
- v. The project proponent shall submit the environmental statement for each financial year in Form-V to the concerned State Pollution Control Board as prescribed under the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, as amended subsequently and put on the website of the company.
 - vi. The project proponent shall inform the Regional Office as well as the Ministry, the date of financial closure and final approval of the project by the concerned authorities, commencing the land development work and start of production operation by the project.
 - vii. The project authorities must strictly adhere to the stipulations made by the State Pollution Control Board and the State Government.
 - viii. The project proponent shall abide by all the commitments and recommendations made in the form-IA, Conceptual Plan and also that during their presentation to the Expert Appraisal Committee.
 - ix. No further expansion or modifications in the plan shall be carried out without prior approval of the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEF&CC)/SEIAA, Haryana. The project proponent shall seek fresh environmental clearance under EIA notification 2006 if at any stage there is change of area of this project.
 - x. Any change in planning of the approved plan will lead to Environment Clearance void-ab-initio and PP will have to seek fresh Environment Clearance
 - xi. The PP should give unambiguous affidavit giving land promoters in accordance with your ownership and possession of land legal the case referred for Environment Clearance to SEIAA.
 - xii. Concealing factual data or submission of false/fabricated data may result in revocation of this environmental clearance and attract action under the provisions of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
 - xiii. The Ministry/SEIAA may revoke or suspend the clearance, if implementation of any of the above conditions is not satisfactory.
 - xiv. The Ministry/SEIAA reserves the right to stipulate additional conditions if found necessary. The Company in a time bound manner shall implement these conditions.
 - xv. The Regional Office of this Ministry shall monitor compliance of the stipulated conditions. The project authorities should extend full cooperation to the officer (s) of the Regional Office by furnishing the requisite data / information/monitoring reports.
 - xvi. The above conditions shall be enforced, inter-alia under the provisions of the Water (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Air (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, Hazardous and Other Wastes (Management and Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016 and the Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991 along with their amendments and Rules and any other orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India / High Courts and any other Court of Law relating to the subject matter.