MINUTES OF THE 198th SEAC-1 (SOUTH ZONE) MEETING HELD ON 20th AND 21st FEBRUARY 2026 AT THE CONFERENCE HALL, STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY KERALA.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 AM on 20.02.2026. Sri. Anirud Kumar Dharni IFS (Retd), Chairman, SEAC-1 (South Zone) Kerala, chaired the meeting. The Committee discussed the agenda items in detail and took the following decisions:

Item No.198.01 **Noting the Minutes of the 194th SEAC meeting held on 27th January 2026.**

Noted and confirmed Minutes.

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No. 198.02 **Consideration of District Survey Reports (DSRs) of the Kottayam, Ernakulam, Trivandrum, Kollam and Pathanamthitta received for grant of approval under MoEF&CC Notification dated 25.07.2018-Presentation Reg (SEIAA/4/2026/ASST-1)**

a. The District Survey Report of Kottayam District

As invited by the Committee Smt. Gita S. R District Geologist, Kottayam, Smt. Smita C. V Environmental Engineer, KSPCB, and Sri. Sarath Kumar, Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division were present. District Geologist presented the DSR.

The report provides a comprehensive overview of mining activities in the district, focusing mainly on granite building stone, laterite building stone, and ordinary earth as key minor minerals, The lithology is dominated by high-grade metamorphic rocks such as charnockite, hornblende gneiss, and biotite gneiss, which exhibit high density, strength, and suitability for construction purposes. Extensive laterite formations occur in the midland regions and are widely utilized for building blocks. Hydrogeological conditions include shallow and deep crystalline aquifers, tertiary sediments (Vaikom beds), laterites, and alluvium, with groundwater occurrence varying by geomorphic setting.

The DSR documents drainage through major river systems including the Muvattupuzha, Meenachil, and Manimala rivers, supported by irrigation projects such as the Muvattupuzha Valley Irrigation Project. Climatically, the district experiences high monsoonal rainfall, with the southwest monsoon contributing nearly 59% and northeast monsoon contributing nearly 21% of the annual precipitation, significantly influencing mining operations and environmental management.

Resource assessment indicates substantial reserves of granite building stone, supported by data from active quarrying leases and permits. Production and royalty statistics over recent years highlight the economic importance of the sector, while also revealing a widening

demand–supply gap driven by rapid infrastructure development, regulatory constraints, climatic disruptions, and post-disaster restrictions.

The District Survey Report identifies cluster mining areas based on the concentration of granite building stone quarries, particularly in villages such as Ramapuram, Kondoor, Erumely South, Kooroppada, Vallichira, and Vellilappally. These clusters necessitate enhanced regulatory oversight due to cumulative environmental impacts arising from the proximity of multiple leases and permits. The identification of clusters enables authorities to plan collective mitigation, disaster management, and eco-restoration measures at a landscape level.

Portions of the district fall within the Eco-Sensitive Zone of the **Periyar Tiger Reserve**, particularly in Erumely North and South villages. The report evaluated mining impacts on air, water, noise, land, flora, fauna, agriculture, and forest ecosystems, noting risks such as dust

After the presentation, the Committee decided to direct the District Geologist to revise the DSR submitted incorporating the following observations.

- Groundwater-stressed regions/blocks/villages, if any, need to be mentioned.
- The details of closed mines that followed the closure plans and wherever they were not followed by the quarry owners, the effort made by the district authorities to close the quarries using the financial security/ guarantee.(under remedial and mitigation measures)
- All tabular columns must include a row for the total sum of the represented credentials/data. Give details on the percentage of the total mining area relative to the overall land area of the district.
- The DSR is required to include scientific references.
- High risk and ESA will not be issued LOI (under the heading risk management)
- Use of NONEL to be recommended under the heading risk management.

Further Clarifications

- Short-term quarry permits for a maximum period of 3 years and long-term quarry leases for 15 years. For the Trivandrum district these periods were 1 and 12, respectively. Please clarify the same.
- In Table 2, a list of quarry leases is given. A few of them have ECs issued in 2013 and 2016 and are still working. Whether EC was renewed?
- In Section 14, Table 8 was erroneously mentioned as Table 9. Similarly, 9 quarry permits are mentioned instead of the 11 permits shown in Table 3 earlier.

b. The District Survey Report of Ernakulam District:

As invited by the Committee the District Geologist Smt. Shajumol presented the DSR. Assistant Geologist, Sri. Rajappan S was present. The DSR provides an overview of mining

activity in the district, identifying granite building stone, laterite building stone, ordinary earth, china clay, fire clay, and brick/tile clay as the principal minor minerals. The district also hosts occurrences of major minerals such as graphite, lime shell, mica, and peat. Mining and quarrying activities occupy only a very small fraction of the district's land area (approximately 0.15–0.20%), reflecting the highly urbanized nature of the district. Granite building stone derived from charnockite, biotite gneiss, and hornblende gneiss exhibits high strength and durability, while laterite building stone is widely used as a traditional construction material.

The report documents drainage through major river systems including the Periyar and Muvattupuzha rivers, supported by irrigation projects such as the Periyar Valley and Muvattupuzha Valley projects. Hydrogeologically, the district comprises crystalline aquifers in the highlands and midlands, productive sedimentary aquifers (Warkali and Vaikom beds) in the midlands and lowlands, and alluvial aquifers along the coastal belt. The district receives high monsoonal rainfall, which significantly influences quarry operations, slope stability, and water management.

Resource assessment indicates substantial mineable reserves of granite building stone, supported by production, royalty, and demand–supply data. The DSR notes a consistently high demand for granite building stone due to extensive infrastructure development, urban expansion, and national highway projects, with ordinary earth playing a critical role in embankment construction across low-lying areas. The District Survey Report identifies cluster mining areas based on the concentration of granite building stone quarries, with Mazhuvannur village showing the highest concentration, followed by Kottappady, Varappetty, Mookkannur, and Malayattoor villages across Muvattupuzha, Kunnathunadu, Kothamangalam, and Aluva taluks. These clusters necessitate enhanced regulatory oversight to address cumulative environmental impacts and to enable coordinated mitigation and monitoring measures.

Environmentally sensitive features within the district are specifically highlighted. Parts of the district fall within the Eco-Sensitive Zones of the Thattekkad Bird Sanctuary and the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary, and the sole ESA village identified is Kuttampuzha in Kothamangalam Taluk, where a substantial portion of the village area lies within the notified eco-sensitive boundary. The DSR evaluates potential impacts of mining on air, water, noise, land use, soil, flora, fauna, agriculture, and forest ecosystems.

After the presentation, the Committee decided to direct the District Geologist to revise the DSR submitted incorporating the following observations.

- Groundwater-stressed regions/blocks/villages, if any, need to be mentioned.
- The details of closed mines that followed the closure plans and wherever they were not followed by the quarry owners, the effort made by the district authorities to close the quarries using the financial security/ guarantee (under remedial and mitigation measures).
- High risk and ESA will not be issued LOI (under the heading risk management)
- Use of NONEL to be recommended under the heading risk management.

- All tabular columns must include a row for the total sum of the represented credentials/data.
- Give details on the percentage of the total mining area relative to the overall land area of the district.
- The DSR is required to include scientific references.

Further Clarifications

- Many quarries in Table 2 with EC given in 2013, 2014, 2016, 2017 and 2018. Is there a need for renewal of EC?
- Table 6 shows validity of LOI as NA.

c. The District Survey Report of Trivandrum District:

As invited by the Committee District Geologist Sri. Rajeev V. S , the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB and the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department, were present and the District Geologist presented the DSR.

The Minor minerals in the district, includes granite building stone, laterite building stone, ordinary earth, clay, china clay, and brick clay and major minerals includes bauxite, graphite, chrysoberyl, mica, peat, lignite, and heavy mineral beach sands containing ilmenite and monazite along the Vizhinjam, Kovalam, Varkala and Veli coastal belt. Granite building stone derived predominantly from charnockite exhibits high strength and durability, while laterite building stone is widely used as a traditional construction material.

The report documents drainage through major river systems including the Neyyar, Karamana, and Vamanapuram rivers, supported by irrigation projects such as the Neyyar Irrigation Project. Surface water resources also include backwaters, lakes, and reservoirs, while groundwater occurs in both sedimentary and fractured crystalline aquifer systems. The district experiences a tropical monsoon climate with rainfall from both southwest and northeast monsoons, influencing quarry operations and environmental management.

Resource assessment indicates substantial mineable reserves of granite building stone, supported by production and royalty data. The DSR highlights a growing demand–supply gap for granite building stone due to accelerated infrastructure development, including highways, bridges, public buildings, housing, and KIIFB-funded projects, with demand consistently exceeding current production levels.

The District Survey Report identifies cluster mining areas based on the concentration of granite building stone quarries, with the highest concentration in Aruvikkara village, followed by Nellanad, Thekkada, Maranallur, Pullampara, and Pallickal villages across Nedumangad, Kattakkada, Chirayinkeezhu, and Varkala taluks. These clusters are characterized by close spatial proximity of multiple quarrying leases and permits, warranting enhanced regulatory oversight to manage cumulative environmental impacts.

Environmentally sensitive features within the district are prominently addressed. Parts of the district fall within the Eco-Sensitive Zones of the Neyyar Wildlife Sanctuary and the Peppara Wildlife Sanctuary, with ESA villages identified in Neyyattinkara Taluk.

After the presentation, the Committee decided to direct the District Geologist to revise the DSR submitted incorporating the following observations.

- Groundwater-stressed regions/blocks/villages, if any, need to be mentioned.
- Incorporate demand and production of the minerals (laterite, clay).
- The details of closed mines that followed the closure plans and wherever they were not followed by the quarry owners, the effort made by the district authorities to close the quarries using the financial security/ guarantee (under remedial and mitigation measures).
- High risk and ESA will not be issued LOI (under the heading risk management)
- All tabular columns must include a row for the total sum of the represented credentials/data. Give details on the percentage of the total mining area relative to the overall land area of the district.
- The DSR is required to include scientific references.

Further Clarifications

- The difference between less than 1 ha and more than 1 ha of quarrying is not clear (2.2.1.1 and 2.2.2.1).
- Details of quarries provided only for granite.
- Revenue from other minerals is shown in Table 5, but details of those quarries are not given. Could not make out what GDS is.
- Validity of LOI not given in Table 7 for many clearances; the reason is not clear.
- Financial guarantee of Rs.25000 per ha (minimum 1 lakh) indicated for closure plan. For the contemplated activities under engineering measures and biological measures for eco restoration, this amount is very less. The quarry owner would prefer to forgo this amount rather than implementing the closure plan.
- Use of NONEL to be recommended in remedial and mitigation measures.

d. The District Survey Report of Kollam District:

As invited by the Committee, District Geologist Sri. Sunil Kumar presented the DSR. Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department and Environmental Engineer, KSPCB were present.

Kollam district's DSR provides an overview of mining activity in the district, identifying granite building stone, laterite building stone, ordinary earth, china clay, fire clay, and ball clay as the principal minor minerals. The district has significant occurrences of major minerals, notably heavy mineral beach sands containing ilmenite, monazite, rutile, zircon, and sillimanite along the Chavara–Neendakara coastal belt, as well as bauxite, graphite, lignite, and shell limestone. Geologically, Kollam District exhibits a succession from

Archaean crystalline formations such as charnockite and khondalite to laterite caps and Quaternary alluvial deposits.

Granite building stone derived from charnockite, biotite gneiss, and hornblende gneiss exhibits high strength and durability, while laterite building stone is widely used as a traditional construction material.

The drainage include major river systems including the Achenkovil, Pallikkal, Kallada, Ithikkara, and Ayroor rivers, supported by large-scale irrigation infrastructure such as the Kallada Irrigation and Tree Crop Development Project. The district experiences a tropical humid climate with high seasonal rainfall, which significantly influences mining operations, slope stability, and water management practices.

Resource assessment presented in the DSR indicates substantial mineable reserves of granite building stone, with detailed production and royalty data demonstrating the economic importance of the sector. The report also identifies a growing demand–supply gap for granite building stone, driven by increased infrastructure and construction activities within the district and surrounding regions. The District Survey Report identifies cluster mining hotspots, particularly in Elamadu village, followed by Kummil, Mancode, and Valakam villages of Kottarakkara Taluk, where a high concentration of granite building stone quarries exists. These clusters are characterized by close spatial proximity of multiple quarrying permits and leases, necessitating enhanced regulatory oversight to address cumulative environmental impacts. The identification of cluster areas enables authorities to plan coordinated monitoring, disaster management measures, and area-level mitigation and reclamation strategies.

Environmentally sensitive features within the district are highlighted in the report. Portions of the district fall within the Eco-Sensitive Zone of the Shendurney Wildlife Sanctuary, with village-level demarcation provided for affected areas. The DSR systematically assesses potential impacts of mining on air quality, water resources, noise and vibration, land use, soil stability, flora, fauna, agriculture, and forest ecosystems.

After the presentation, the Committee decided to direct the District Geologist to revise the DSR submitted incorporating the following observations.

- Groundwater-stressed regions/blocks/villages, if any, need to be mentioned.
- The details of closed mines that followed the closure plans and wherever they were not followed by the quarry owners, the effort made by the district authorities to close the quarries using the financial security/ guarantee (under remedial and mitigation measures).
- High risk and ESA will not be issued LOI (under the heading risk management)
- Use of NONEL to be recommended under the heading risk management.
- All tabular columns must include a row for the total sum of the represented credentials/data.

- Give details on the percentage of the total mining area relative to the overall land area of the district.
- The DSR is required to include scientific references.

Further Clarifications

- Many quarries were given EC in 2017 and 2018. Is there a need for its renewal?
- In Table 3(b), QP was granted for ordinary earth, but EC details are shown as NA.
- Table 6 LOI validity is NA for cases where LOI has been issued.

e. The District Survey Report of Pathanamthitta District:

As invited by the Committee, the Squad Geologist, Pathanamthitta presented the DSR. The Environmental Engineer, KSPCB and Executive Engineer, Irrgation Department were present.

The DSR of Pathanmathitta district outlines the status of mining activity in the district, identifying granite building stone, laterite building stone, and ordinary earth as the principal minor minerals. Occurrences of major minerals such as bauxite, graphite, muscovite mica, and molybdenum are also documented. Geologically, the district is characterized by Archaean crystalline formations including charnockites and khondalites, overlain locally by laterite and Quaternary alluvium. Physiographically, the district is divided into lowland, midland, and high hill regions, with mining activity largely concentrated in the midland and upland zones. Granite building stone derived from charnockite and gneiss exhibits high strength and durability, while laterite building stone is widely used as a traditional construction material.

The drainage includes Achankovil, Manimala, and Pamba river systems, supported by the Pamba Irrigation Project. Surface and groundwater resources are controlled by fractured crystalline, lateritic, semi-consolidated Tertiary, and alluvial aquifer systems. The district receives high annual rainfall, averaging over 3,100 mm, with maximum rainfall recorded in the eastern highland regions such as Konni.

Resource assessment indicates substantial mineable reserves of granite building stone, with production and royalty data presented for existing quarrying leases and permits. The DSR highlights a demand–supply gap, noting that annual demand for granite building stone exceeds local production, with neighboring districts also depending on Pathanamthitta for construction materials and ordinary earth.

The District Survey Report identifies cluster mining areas, with the highest concentration of granite building stone quarries in Koodal village of Konni Taluk, followed by Enadimangalam village in Adoor Taluk. These clusters necessitate enhanced regulatory oversight to address cumulative environmental impacts and ensure coordinated environmental management. Environmentally sensitive features are prominently addressed. Parts of the district fall within the Eco-Sensitive Zones influenced by proximity to the Periyar Tiger Reserve and the Ranni Reserve Forest, and the DSR provides village-level details of

Eco-Sensitive Areas. Potential impacts of mining on air, water, noise, soil, land use, flora, fauna, agriculture, and forest ecosystems have been systematically assessed.

After the presentation, the Committee decided to direct the District Geologist to revise the DSR submitted incorporating the following observations.

Details of Corrections to be incorporated

- Groundwater-stressed regions/blocks/villages, if any, need to be mentioned.
- The details of closed mines that followed the closure plans and wherever they were not followed by the quarry owners, the effort made by the district authorities to close the quarries using the financial security/ guarantee (under remedial and mitigation measures).
- High risk and ESA will not be issued LOI (under the heading risk management)
- Use of NONEL to be recommended under the heading risk management.
- All tabular representations in the DSR must specify the data collection period, including the 'start date' and the 'as-of date.
- All tabular columns must include a row for the total sum of the represented credentials/data. Give details on the percentage of the total mining area relative to the overall land area of the district.
- The DSR is required to include scientific references.

Item No. 198.03 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. L Syju, M/s K. Lekshmanan Company Infrastructures & Industries Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 1.4754 Ha at Block No. 40, Re-Sy Nos. 28/4pt (Govt. Land), 28/8 & 28/3-1 (Pvt. Land) in Nilamel Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam – Rejection Order Issued – (SIA/KL/MIN/463911/2024)**

As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. L Syju and the consultant Sri. Saurabh Sakhre from NIIST attended the hearing before the Committee. The consultant, Sri. Saurabh Sakhre presented the details of the proposal. The committee noted that SEAC in its 169th meeting initially recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking the Precautionary Principle. Following a formal rejection order on November 15, 2024, the project proponent requested reconsideration, citing the need for aggregates in National Highway projects and a production agreement with M/s Adani Vizhinjam Port Pvt. Ltd., support from some local residents for employment and development and submission of remedial measures and a new Environment Management Plan (EMP) prepared by CSIR–NIIST to address the seven specific reasons for rejection. The State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) has referred the proposal back to SEAC for reappraisal. While acknowledging SEAC's concerns, the Authority ruled that the rejection must be supported by more detailed scientific data regarding slope stability, soil thickness, and geomorphological characteristics to be legally defensible. Hence the PP was invited for hearing. During the hearing the PP provided 7 reasons as reply to the concern raised by the authority during the rejection of the proposal and

they claimed that there is no OB dump site in the project site. The committee noted that the maximum elevation is at 138 AML and the minimum elevation is at 131 AMSL.
The Committee discussed the Environment Management Plan prepared by NIIST in reply to the points raised by the SEAC as reason for the rejection.

a) On a hilltop location and steep slopes

The Committee examined the additional material including elevation profiles and slope calculations furnished by the proponent and having regard to the overall hill form, local relief, and the vulnerable settlement pattern downslope as observed during field appraisal, the Committee is not satisfied that the area can be regarded as a low-risk, gently undulating terrain for the purpose of quarry development. The proposed mining area is situated on the top portion of a hill with steep slopes on multiple sides. Excavation in such terrain can significantly destabilize the natural slope profile, increasing the risk of slope failure, landslides, and soil erosion, particularly during heavy rainfall events common in Kerala, therefore the earlier concern is still maintained.

b) On risk to houses on slope and downhill side

The PP's reply relies mainly on house counts within buffer zones, statutory distances under KMMC Rules, and general statements on slope stability and controlled blasting. The Committee reiterates that the earlier objection was not confined to mere numerical proximity or compliance with minimum buffer, but to the cumulative risk to multiple houses situated along the slope and foot of the hill in a high-rainfall, landslide-prone region. Several residential structures are located along the slope and on the downhill side of the proposed mining area. Quarrying at the hilltop may lead to rock fall and rolling debris, slope instability, increased runoff and sediment movement toward the habitations, that pose direct safety risks to the houses located downslope.

The Committee finds that no site-specific structural vulnerability assessment of individual houses, no detailed blast vibration prediction at each recept, and no independent geotechnical stability analysis for downslope habitation have been provided, and hence the reply is not satisfactory to allay the originally recorded safety concerns.

c) On narrow approach road and traffic safety

The approach road to the site appears narrow and passes through residential areas and sloping terrain. The traffic congestion and safety risks make the site unsuitable for regular heavy vehicle movement associated with mining operations. The PP has proposed an alternate 218 m long, 7.5 m wide access road and provided traffic calculations indicating about 40 tippers per day and "modest" incremental traffic on existing roads. Eventhough the Project Proponent had intimated the Committee on the meeting day morning that they want to purchase one acre of land for the proposed road, the Committee notes that (i) no authenticated

drawings showing exact ‘Right of Way’ availability, land ownership, and acquisition/consent for the proposed new link have been produced; (ii) no certified geometric design, gradient, and turning-radius analysis for laden multi-axle vehicles on the hilly approach has been submitted; and (iii) no independent traffic impact and road-safety study has been placed on record for the full haul route through already congested settlement stretches. In the absence of these, the Committee finds that the earlier concern regarding limited feasibility of safe road widening and increased traffic risk through densely populated areas remains unaddressed.

d) On overburden and top-soil dumping on steep slopes

The proponent now states that no permanent overburden/top-soil dump is proposed, that top-soil is “minimal” and will be reused, and that any temporary stacking, if required, will be kept below 5 m with toe protection and drains. The Committee noted that the OB and the topsoil shall be stacked for the implementation of the mine closure activities. The Committee observes that: (i) no quantified, stage-wise mass balance for top-soil and mineral rejects over the full mine life has been furnished; (ii) no specific, geo-referenced locations and cross-sections of any temporary stacks within the rugged hill terrain have been demarcated; and (iii) stability assessment of such stacks under extreme rainfall conditions has not been carried out. Given the steep surrounding slopes and the documented high-intensity rainfall regime of the region, the Committee is not convinced that dump-related risks can be ruled out merely by generic statements and standard guidelines; the reply is therefore not acceptable.

e) On high rainfall and aggravated site risk

While the proponent has contested the interpretation of daily rainfall values and emphasized the massive, crystalline nature of the rock mass along with bench geometry and drainage controls, the Committee notes that: (i) no long-term, site-specific IMD rainfall data series and design storm analysis have been submitted; (ii) no quantitative peak-runoff estimation or hydraulic design of drains and silt traps for extreme events has been provided; and (iii) the reply does not adequately address compound risk under concurrent conditions of intense rainfall, blasting, and saturated slopes downslope of the lease. In view of recent regional experience of extreme rainfall events and associated disasters, the Committee, applying the precautionary principle, considers that the proponent’s response does not sufficiently mitigate the earlier apprehension on rainfall-aggravated risk. Further, the Committee noted that due to the elevated hilltop position, the site is likely to generate high-velocity runoff during rainfall. In such slopy area, quarrying may intensify soil erosion, cause sediment-laden runoff toward downhill residential areas, which may result in localized flooding or siltation in adjacent lands. In addition, an effective stormwater management would be extremely difficult in such steep terrain.

f) On feasibility of green belt all around the site and air-pollution control

The proponent has argued that continuous peripheral green belt is not feasible due to hard rock exposure and proposes a three-tier model: fragmented vegetative strips, geo-net with creepers, and off-site compensatory plantation, with primary reliance on water sprinkling and other engineering dust controls. The Committee observes that, given the hill-top setting, proximity of habitations within 100–250 m buffers in multiple directions, and prevailing wind conditions, an effectively continuous, on-site peripheral attenuation belt is a critical safeguard. The proposed fragmented and partly off-site plantation, coupled with standard dust-control measures, is not considered adequate to offset the dispersion of dust and gaseous emissions towards nearby houses in this topography. Accordingly, the Committee finds the reply unsatisfactory and upholds its earlier view.

g) On storm-water management feasibility

The proponent has described a generic bench-wise garland drain, down-take channel and silt-trap arrangement, supported by schematic figures and references to CPCB/MoEF&CC guidance, and notes that no quarrying is proposed in monsoon. The Committee notes that: (i) no detailed, scaled drainage layout with invert levels, capacities, and outfall locations tied to actual contours has been submitted; (ii) there is no quantitative demonstration that peak flows under extreme rainfall can be safely contained and discharged without affecting downslope habitations, roads, and natural drainage; and (iii) there is no clear plan for safe terminal disposal of storm water from the lease to the natural drainage network in this constrained hill-top setting. In the Committee's view, these generic proposals do not overcome the inherent difficulty of safely routing storm water from the summit of an isolated hill with surrounding settlements, and therefore the earlier finding of lack of feasibility of safe storm-water discharge is reaffirmed.. Further, the Committee noted that due to the elevated hilltop position, the site is likely to generate high-velocity runoff during rainfall. In such slopy area, quarrying may intensify soil erosion, cause sediment-laden runoff toward downhill residential areas, which may result in localized flooding or siltation in adjacent lands. In addition, an effective stormwater management would be extremely difficult in such steep terrain.

The Committee observed that, in view of the environmental sensitivity of the hilltop terrain, proximity of residential structures along the slope, inadequate approach infrastructure, challenges in safe overburden management, and potential stormwater drainage impacts, the site is not suitable for carrying out mining activities and the earlier meetings also ascertained the same after thorough appraisal of all the documents. After detailed deliberation on the additional Environmental Management Plan and responses submitted by the proponent, the Committee finds that the replies remain largely generic, rely heavily on literature references and broad guidelines, and do not adequately address the site-specific geotechnical, hydrological, and safety concerns previously recorded by SEAC. The Committee further noted that the reports

submitted cannot alter the inherent environmental fragility of the area or the prevailing environmental setting of the locality. Accordingly, invoking the precautionary principle and considering the fragile nature of the locality, SEAC decided to reiterate its earlier recommendation for rejection of the proposal.

Item No.198. 04 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shans Paul, Managing Director, M/s Hanna Rock Products for an area of 7.2855 Ha at Survey Nos. 79/2, 80/1A-02, 80/1A-03, 80/1A-04, 80/1A-05, 80/1A-06, 80/1A-07, 80/1A-08, 80/1A-09,80/1A-10, 80/1A-11, 80/1A-12, 80/1A-13, 80/1A-14, 80/1A-15,80/1A-16, 80/1A-17, 80/1A-18, 80/1A-19, 80/1A-20, 80/1A-21 in Arakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam – (File No.1378/EC1/2025/SEIAA)**

The committee discussed the matter in detail and noted that the reply of the Project Proponent to the show cause notice issued by the Authority has denied violations, stating that operations ceased following the High Court judgment. The Proponent attributed the 61,636.525 MT discrepancy (1.424%) to differences in measurement methodologies and density factors, and asserted compliance with EC conditions, supported by inspection reports of IRO, MoEF&CC, Bengaluru. It was also noted that the Project Proponent has applied for expansion of the quarry area from 7.2855 Ha to 16.7709 Ha. The SEAC had recommended revalidation earlier and subsequently recommended the Standard ToR for the expansion proposal. The SEIAA has referred the proposal to SEAC to consider the clarifications submitted in response to the Show Cause Notice, examine compliance status and earlier issues during appraisal of the expansion proposal, and make a reasoned recommendation to SEIAA. However, from the verification of the documents, it is clear that the PP has extracted resource from the buffer and outside the lease area.

After detailed discussion, considering the above, the committee decided to assess the environmental damage after the field visit along with the members from KSPCB and the Mining and Geology Department. The committee entrusted Dr. V. B. Vinayan and Sri. Anirud Kumar Dharni IFS, for the field visit.

Item No. 198. 05 **Complaint against quarrying operations owned by Mr. Ashly John Tharakan, Madaparambil House, South Mazhuvannur P.O., Mazhuvannur Village, Ernakulam – Refer back from 157th SEIAA meeting – Assessment of Revised Environmental Damage Assessment Report - Reg**
(File No. 290/EC3/2021/SEIAA)

The Committee verified the matter and noted that Sri. K.M. Mathew had filed a complaint on 21.01.2021 against Sri. Ashly John Tharakan (M/s. Madaparambil Quarry). The

complaint alleged non-compliance of EC conditions and environmental damage from the 0.5565 Ha building stone quarry. The EC was originally issued by DEIAA, Ernakulam on 23.01.2018 which was valid till 22.01.2021. Later, the MoEF&CC Regional Office, Bangalore inspected the site on 26.03.2021. It identified 10 violations and directed SEIAA to take action under S.O. 637(E) dated 28.02.2014. Post-EC expiry, SEIAA pursued the compliance verification and requested KMMCR enforcement from Mining & Geology Department and CPCB-based environmental damage assessment. SEAC further conducted a site visit on 28.11.2022 and the quarry was inactive at that time. As per their report, Partial/non-compliance existed on general conditions like EMC details, avenue plantation, mine closure plan, and bench marking. Following this, the SEIAA directed violation action, NABET-accredited damage report, and compensation computation per CPCB norms. The proponent had submitted the Environmental Damage Assessment Report prepared by PARIVESH Environmental Engineering Services'. This report was rejected by SEAC in its 166th meeting for non-conformity with CPCB 2019/2022 guidelines. SEAC ordered a revised report. Kerala State Pollution Control Board further initiated action under Section 19 of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. In the meantime, Kerala State Human Rights Commission ordered SEIAA to conduct hearings and decide compensation within two months. As per directions, SEAC held hearings in February 2025 and the complainant alleged his property damage from blasting and wastewater. The proponent denied responsibility and submitted revised reports in April 2025.

SEIAA, in its 157th meeting held personal compensation claims outside its jurisdiction. It advised the complainant to approach civil forums and SEIAA tasked SEAC with verifying revised damage report. The complainant again vide representation dated 14.11.2025, alleged inaccuracies in PARIVESH report, data concealment, and ignored proximity of sensitive structures. In the complaint the complainant alleged certain suppression of facts that were submitted during the time of issuance of EC. The Committee noted that as the EC is currently not valid, the averments in the complaint has currently no relevance.

The Committee, verified the revised Environmental Damage Assessment Report. During the examination, the Committee noted that the report mentions the "number of days of violation" as 50 days; however, the basis for arriving at this figure have not been explained in the report.

In view of the above, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit a detailed clarification regarding the calculation of the 50 days of violation mentioned in the report. The PP shall also furnish supporting data, including the records of quarry working days obtained from the KOMPAS portal of the Department of Mining and Geology/District Geologist.

Further, the Project Proponent shall submit all relevant data and assumptions considered for the assessment of environmental damage, including the parameters and values adopted in the calculation, so as to enable proper verification by the Committee.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Madhusoodhanan for an area of 2.1449 Ha at Block No. 35, Re Survey Nos. 352/7, 353/1, 353/2, 353/2-1, 353/3, 353/4, 353/8, 353/9, & 354/2 in Nedumangad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram (SIA/KL/MIN/401155/2022, 2123/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

The Committee verified the proposal and noted that the proposal has been placed in various SEIAA/SEAC meetings. The total mineable reserve is 683641MT and the proposed life of mine is 10 years as per the mine plan. The project cost is mentioned as Rs.62,15,000/. The filed inspection has already been carried out and the Committee heard the presentation in its 150th meeting. The elevation difference prior to the mining is 75m to 150m above MSL. The depth of mining is 80m above MSL. There are three houses at a distance 107m. 117m and 118m respectively and Bhadrakali temple at a distance of 460m. Part of the project area was mined as per EC dated 24.3.2018 for four years with the DEIAA issued EC. During the appraisal, the committee also noticed that the Mining and Geology Department has penalized Rs. 61,25,128 lakh for excess extraction of about 87,224MT.

Pursuant to the violation committed by the Project Proponent, SEIAA has directed KSPCB to constitute a Joint Committee (KSPCB, SEAC, Mining & Geology, others) to assess the environmental damage by the Project. The Committee had inspected the site and submitted Environmental Damage Assessment Report quantifying EC at ₹71.52 lakh. Further, the Project Proponent had accepted the damage assessment report and sought instalments. SEIAA had permitted ₹21.52 lakh first, balance ₹50 lakh in four equal instalments, full remittance to Environmental Benefit Fund prior to the mining. Proponent later requested six instalments with interest. The SEAC in its 186th meeting, SEAC directed the project proponent to remit the first instalment of ₹21.52 lakh as originally decided and submit proof of payment before further appraisal of the proposal.

The Committee noted that the Project Proponent had paid the first instalment in the Environmental Benefit Fund account. After evaluating the proof of the same, the Committee decided that further consideration of the proposal shall be taken up only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018.

The Committee further decided that if the proposal is subsequently recommended for Environmental Clearance (EC), for a project life 10 years, based on the revised DSR, in addition to the General Conditions for minor mineral mining, the following additional Specific Conditions may be stipulated while issuing the EC.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

2. ***The Project Proponent should remit the rest of the amount, i.e. Rs. 50,00,000/- assessed for the Environmental Damage caused by the project, towards the Environment Benefit Fund prior to the commencement of mining.***
3. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
4. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
5. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*
6. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
7. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
8. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
9. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
10. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
11. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
12. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
13. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
14. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
15. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
16. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*

17. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
18. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
19. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
20. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
21. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
22. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
23. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
24. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

Item No.02 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shans Paul, M/s Chattupara Granites Pvt Ltd for an area of 3.0274 Ha at Survey nos. 734/1B-1, 734/1B-4, 734/1B-5, 734/1B-6, 734/1B-7, 734/1B-8, 734/1B-9 in Kalloorkkad Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/437379/2023, 2342/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Committee noted that earlier, this proposal was recommended for EC for 5 years in the 166th SEAC meeting, based on the ADS submitted by the PP subject to the submission of NOC from Irrigation Department under Section 40(2) of Kerala Irrigation and Water

Conservation Act, 2003 (as per High Court order dated 19.04.2024 in WP(C) 30737/2022), and 23 Specific Conditions.

Later in the 146th SEIAA meeting the Authority noted the cluster certificate dated 30.06.2023 in which it was mentioned two non-working quarries within 500 m radius and the field inspection report noted an additional 0.97 Ha quarry owned by the proponent within 200 m, and hence, the proposal was referred back to SEAC to re-examine cluster condition considering all quarries within 500 m radius. Further, a complaint dated 13.08.2024 was filed by Sri. Shinaj Ali against the proposed project, alleging violation of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963. In connection with the details on the cluster and the allegations raised by the complainant, the SEAC sought clarification from the Project Proponent and the reply was received from the Project Proponent.

The Project Proponent denied allegations in the complaint as baseless and submitted clarification stating no excess land possession by Directors., produced updated Cluster Certificate dated 27.08.2024 and submitted NOC proceedings dated 16.04.2025 from Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Ernakulam.

The Committee verified the additional details along with updated cluster clarification, Proponent's response to complaint, NOC from Irrigation Department, and related documents. **The Project Proponent stated that there is one working quarry for an area of 0.9700 ha is located within the proposed quarry project of M/s Chattupara Granites Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 3.0274 ha as per the cluster certificate vide No. DOERN-DMG/2708/2022-MDO dated 27.08.2024 issued by the Department of Mining & Geology District Office, Ernakulam. Further explained that the cumulative area of all working quarries including proposed quarry is 3.9974 ha [3.0274 ha + 0.9700ha] and which is below 5 ha.**

However, upon detailed verification of the cluster certificate dated 27.08.2024, the Committee noted that, in addition to the currently operational quarry with an extent of 0.9700 Ha, there are two additional quarries having extents of 2.5 acres and 0.8502 Ha, respectively, which are stated as not working at present. Altogether, these quarries constitute a total cluster area of 5.8188 Ha.

The Committee observed that, in the absence of certified completion of the Mine Closure Plan and restitution of environmental damage, the environmental impacts of mining activities persist. In such circumstances, quarries that have not been formally closed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules continue to be treated as live quarries.

The Committee further recalled that in similar cases, where adjacent quarries had not been finally closed in accordance with the approved Mine Closure Plan and the relevant provisions of the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, the State Expert Appraisal Committee, Kerala had insisted upon submission of an application for Terms of Reference for conducting a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment study under cluster conditions. The Committee also noted that the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Kerala had concurred with such recommendations in similar cases and rejected the applications with directions to apply for ToR.

Considering the above circumstances, the Committee assessed that the issuance of Environmental Clearance in an already environmentally stressed and dilapidated cluster area would require careful evaluation of cumulative environmental impacts, along with appropriate precautionary and mitigation measures. For such an assessment, a comprehensive EIA study is considered essential.

In view of the above, the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the present application for Environmental Clearance and to direct the Project Proponent to submit an application for ToR for conducting a detailed EIA study and Public Hearing, as the project area forms part of a cluster exceeding 5 Ha and is located within an environmentally stressed cluster area.

Item No. 3 **Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.**
(SIA/KL/MIS/52532/2019, 1555/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

Technopark, Thiruvananthapuram has sought Environmental Clearance for the expansion of 'Technopark Phase III' as a Township and Area Development project (Category B, 8(b)) over 36.43 ha in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, with a proposed total built-up area of 10,90,451 m². The campus already hosts earlier developments, including Technopark Phase II (EC for 3,40,000 m² in 11.87 ha) and specific lessee projects such as the twin towers Ganga–Yamuna and the Dragonstone and Speridian projects, while additional land parcels are leased for IT and commercial uses under separate ECs. The land has a documented history as paddy land (Nilam), for which the Government has progressively accorded conversion sanctions; vide G.O. No.66/2023/AGRI dated 14.07.2023 permits conversion of 39.54 ha for IT area development in Phase III, subject inter alia to earmarking 10% of Technopark Phase III land (about 4 acres, later revised to 5.41 acres) for rainwater harvesting with a storage capacity of 24,000 m³ and comprehensive rainwater tapping from buildings.

Across multiple appraisals from the 121st SEAC meeting up to the 186th SEAC meeting the Committee has undertaken detailed scrutiny of the proposal, including a field inspection on 6 June 2022 and subsequent technical and legal reviews. SEAC repeatedly sought additional submissions on stormwater and watershed management (particularly the hydrologically fragile Thettiyar micro-watershed and shrinkage of the main stream), drainage diversion and stream protection, integrated EMP (covering Phases I–III), waste and sewage management (including clarification of the 3,600 KLD wastewater generation vis-à-vis the 1,250 KLD common STP and lessee-level facilities), compensatory afforestation (including Miyawaki concepts, geotagged sites, and stream-bank eco-restoration), carbon footprint estimation with mitigation and biocapacity, and comprehensive community impact assessment. While the proponent progressively addressed many of these, including revising the rainwater harvesting plan to 5.41 acres (26,446 m³), elaborating stormwater management, community impact assessment, carbon footprint mitigation and socio-economic benefits, SEAC has continued to flag unresolved or sensitive issues such as the need to widen the Thettiyar to safely carry additional flows, the precise treatment and inclusion of the Dragonstone Realty plot within the expanded master plan when its EC stands set aside and

sub judice, and the consequences of relevant NGT and appellate decisions—leading the Committee to seek further clarification from the proponent and legal opinion from SEIAA's Legal Officer before advancing the appraisal to final recommendation. Besides, Sri. K.J. Chacko, President of High Range Environment Protection Council, filed multiple complaints against Technopark Phase III Expansion, alleging paddy wetland reclamation, sub-judice status, and violations in leased projects. The complaints were considered and noted by the SEAC in its various meetings.

In the 186th SEAC meeting held in November, 2025, the PP presented revised proposal addressing earlier shortcomings. SEAC acknowledged that many earlier deficiencies were addressed in the latest presentation. However, the Committee observed the need for widening of the Thettiyar River to safely handle project discharge, inclusion of M/s Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd. within the master plan area as the EC granted to Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd. is sub judice, raising legal concerns. Based on these, the SEAC decided to seek further clarification from the Project Proponent on hydrological impacts on the Thettiyar River, inclusion and status of Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd. land, and Legal implications of on-going litigation.

The Committee verified the reply of the Project Proponent dated 23.01.2026 with regard to the queries raised by SEAC and noted that it proposes RWH ponds/trenches (common/lessee), 3-4m river buffer for retention, and annual pre-monsoon cleaning. Also, the Project Proponent commits cooperation with Minor Irrigation Dept. for widening/downstream culvert (current 1m width). Besides, the PP aims to minimize flash flood/discharge risks. Further, regarding the inclusion of M/s Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd, it is explained that currently the application is modified with a conceptual plan by omitting the area of M/s Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd, and seeking Environmental Clearance only for an area of 32.49 Ha., instead of 36.43 ha. for a built-up area of 819287.41m2. Since the EC issued to the M/s Dragonstone Reality Pvt. Ltd has been stayed by the Hon'ble Court and is sub-judice now, and accordingly, the corresponding area falls under M/s Dragonstone Reality Pvt. Ltd, ie, 3.94 Ha. has been omitted from the area already sought for the Environmental Clearance. Based on detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to recommend EC for Technopark phase III for an area of 32.39 Ha, for a total built up area of 8,19,287.41m^2, for a period of 10 years, with the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. **The EC has been issued to the modified master plan submitted by the Project Proponent vide letter dated 17.01.2026, for an area of 32.49 Ha, and a built up area of 8,19,287.41m^2. Any change or modification from the above master plan will attract modification of Environmental Clearance.**
2. **Rainwater harvesting pond and non-linear trenches in common areas and rainwater harvesting tanks by the individual lessees, should be constructed, thus reducing the possibility of flash flood.**
3. **A buffer with a width of 3-4m should be provided between the Thettiyar River and the Boundary wall of the Project area.**
4. **Riparian restoration shall be carried out in an area of 0.5 ha.**

5. **Technopark should cooperate with any proposal of the Government Department/s for widening of Thettiyar River including downstream culvert which is currently having a width of only 1.0 metre.**
6. **Rainwater harvesting plan should be carried out in 5.41 acres for a quantity of 26,446 m^3 rain water to comply with the G.O No.66/2023/AGRI dated 14.07.2023.**
7. **Afforestation should be carried out in an area of 1 ha in common area and a total of 1ha in individual lessee's area.**
8. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.
9. Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.
10. A proper drainage system shall be provided to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, taking into account the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.
11. Appropriate flood-mitigation measures shall be implemented, expecting extreme rainfall events, considering the regional topography.
12. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).
13. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.
14. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.
15. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.
16. The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.
17. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.
18. The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).
19. Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification

to buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.

20. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.
21. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.
22. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.
23. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.
24. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.
25. Construction work should be carried out during day daytime only.
26. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.
27. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.
28. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.
29. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.
30. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.
31. D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.
32. Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment, such as BLDC fans and LED lamps, should be promoted as part of energy conservation. At least 20% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.
33. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.
34. Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.
35. As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.
36. The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ permission for the construction projects of this nature.

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

PARIVESH FILES (VER-2)

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Syju Lekshman for an area of 4.998 ha at Block no. 41, Re-Sy Nos. 322/2-2-1, 322/1, 322/6, 323/3, 324/6, 324/9-2, 324/6-3, 324/5-2, 324/3-2, 324/3-3, 324/4 (Private land), 325/1, 322/3, 323/2, 323/6, 323/7 & 324/3 (Govt. land) in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/469043/2024)**

The Committee noted that the application for Environmental Clearance was recommended rejection by the SEAC in its 186th meeting due to various reasons. Further, the proposal was considered by SEIAA referred back to SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal and to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing.

Accordingly, the hearing intimation was given to the project proponent and at the scheduled day, the Project Proponent had appeared physically before the Committee and requested two weeks' time to submit additional reports. In this circumstances, the Committee decided to grant two weeks' time for the submission of details by the Project Proponent. After the submission of the same, the Project Proponent should be intimated for hearing in the subsequent meeting.

Item No. 02 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. K J Thomaskutty, M/s Shah Quarry for an area of 4.8894 ha at Block no. 41, Re-Sy Nos. 320/1, 320/1-2, 320/1-3, 320/1-4, 320/1-5, 320/1-2-2, 320/2-3, 320/2-4, 320/2-5, 320/2-6, 320/2-8, 320/2-10, 322/2-2, 322/2-3, 322/5, 326/2-2, 325/3, 324/5-1, 324/7, 324/5-1-2, 318/1-6, 320/3, 321/15, 321/28, 321/16, 322/7, 322/4 & 318/1-2 in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District- (SIA/KL/MIN/468799/2024)**

The Committee noted that the application for Environmental Clearance was recommended rejection by the SEAC in its 186th meeting due to various reasons. Further, the proposal was considered by SEIAA and referred back to SEAC to afford a personal hearing

to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal and to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing.

Accordingly, the hearing intimation was given to the project proponent well in advance and the Project Proponent was absent during the meeting. In this circumstances, the Committee decided to grant one more final hearing opportunity to the project proponent.

Item No.03 **Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA Kollam, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. L. Syju, M/s Akkavila Sajeenan Aggregates for an area of 2.6491 Ha at Survey Nos. 474/4, 474/16, 474/17, 474/5, 474/18, 474/6, 474/21, 474/20, 474/7, 474/24, 474/10, 476/8, 476/7, 476/6, 476/4, 475/23, 475/24, 475/9-1, 476/17, 474/19 & 476/20 in Veliyam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District – (SIA/KL/MIN/477635/2024**

The Committee noted that the present application pertains to the re-appraisal of the Environmental Clearance (EC) originally issued by the District Environment Impact Assessment Authority (DEIAA), Kollam, on 24.09.2018 with a validity period of five years. The project involves a total project cost of ₹250 lakh and proposes an annual production of 1,50,000 MT of mineral over a period of three years based on the revised Scheme of Mining dated 24.01.2024, which indicates mineable reserves of 4,16,927 MT.

During the initial scrutiny of the proposal, the Committee had observed several critical deficiencies, including the absence of a site-specific Environmental Management Plan prepared by a NABET-accredited agency. Subsequently, upon submission of certain additional documents by the Project Proponent, the SEAC Sub-Committee conducted a field inspection on 16.11.2024. The inspection revealed moderate terrain vulnerability and potential impacts on groundwater, air quality, noise, and vibration levels. More significantly, the inspection and subsequent reports revealed serious instances of illegal mining, including extraction of 10,94,478 MT of mineral beyond the permitted buffer limits, for which a fine of ₹3,55,84,675/- was initially imposed and subsequently enhanced.

The Committee further noted that the matter had been deliberated in the 172nd and 175th meetings of the Committee, wherein the additional submissions made by the PP on 27.08.2024 and 20.01.2025 were examined. The Committee observed that the issues earlier identified had not been satisfactorily addressed. Persistent deficiencies included the continued non-compliance with the site-specific EMP, unsatisfactory implementation of re-grassing and restoration measures, illegal over-extraction of 5,74,986.69 MT of mineral, imposition of penalties amounting to ₹3,55,84,675/-, violations relating to the permitted mining depth, and inadequate infrastructure for stormwater drainage, overburden management, sanitation facilities, and rainwater harvesting systems.

The Committee also took serious note of the multiple complaints received from local residents, including Sri. Sasidharan Nair, Sri. Thulaseedharan Nair, Sri. Venugopalan Nair, Sri. Shaji M.S., Sri. Sathyababu, Sri. Rajiv, Sri. Ajayakumar and Sri. Deepak. The complaints alleged that residential structures located at distances ranging from 17 m to 40.5 m from the quarry boundary had developed structural cracks, that polluted water was being discharged into the KIP Canal located at distances of 15 m to 39 m, and that the quarry operations had resulted in groundwater depletion, health hazards, excessive dust and noise pollution, biodiversity loss, and increased risk of landslides. Procedural deficiencies such as the absence of Public Consultation and Cumulative Impact Assessment were also raised.

However, the Committee noted that reports from the District Collector and the District Geologist indicated that the houses inspected were located beyond 50 m from the quarry boundary, and that certain structural damage could be attributed to the age and structural condition of the buildings. At the same time, it was confirmed that the No Objection Certificate issued by the Irrigation Department had been cancelled on 25.07.2025, though the said cancellation was subsequently stayed by the Hon'ble High Court on 01.08.2025. It was also noted that penalties amounting to ₹5,70,11,301/- had been imposed for violations relating to extraction within the buffer zone.

The Committee further noted that the High Court of Kerala, in WP(C) No. 17919/2024 dated 23.05.2024, directed that the proposal be uploaded in the PARIVESH portal and that a decision be taken by the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Kerala within one month. Subsequently, in WP(C) No. 12375/2025 dated 24.09.2025, the Hon'ble Court directed that the re-appraisal process be completed within two months, which necessitated the submission of requests for extension of time.

The Committee also noted that the 178th SEAC meeting held on 24.01.2025, considering the time-bound nature of the re-appraisal process, had recommended grant of a conditional Environmental Clearance for a period of three years, subject to compliance with 22 specific conditions, including preparation of a damage assessment report by a NABET-accredited agency and implementation of remedial measures within three months of resumption of mining operations.

Subsequently, in view of the multiple complaints relating to mining in the buffer zone, discharge of polluted water into the KIP Canal, alleged health impacts, structural damage to nearby houses, and the initiation of an enquiry by the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Bureau (VACB) pursuant to communication from the Department of Environment, the Authority, during its 159th meeting, decided to refer the matter back to SEAC for further examination.

The Committee also noted that the Standing Counsel, vide email dated 21.01.2026, had sought clarification regarding the time required for completing the re-appraisal process in order to file an appropriate extension petition before the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 12375/2025.

Upon detailed deliberation, the Committee observed that the records including reports from the Department of Mining and Geology, communications from the Department of Environment, and findings emerging from the enquiry by the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Bureau, reveal grave and repeated violations committed by the Project Proponent, including illegal extraction of minerals beyond permitted limits, mining within the buffer zone, and non-compliance with environmental safeguards. The magnitude of the violations and the associated environmental consequences necessitate a comprehensive and scientifically robust assessment of environmental damage caused by the mining activities.

In view of the seriousness and scale of the violations, the Committee decided that a detailed Environmental Damage Assessment shall be conducted jointly with the Kerala State Pollution Control Board and the Department of Mining and Geology, Kerala. The Committee further decided to entrust Dr. Ansari Jamal with the responsibility of carrying out the said assessment in coordination with the concerned departments.

Considering the complexity of the issues involved and the gravity of the violations committed by the Project Proponent, the Committee also decided to request the Standing Counsel to seek at least six months' time from the Hon'ble High Court to complete the re-appraisal process in a comprehensive and legally sustainable manner.

Item No.04 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shibu Mathew, M/s Rockfield Estates Private Limited, for an area of 3.9206 Ha at Block No. 40, Re-Survey 162/11, 162/12, 163/1, 163/2, 163/3, 163/8 of Pampady Village, Pampady Grama panchayat, Kottayam Taluk, Kottayam. (SIA/KL/MIN/470219/2024)**

The Committee discussed the proposal in detail and verified the evaluation of the documents submitted by the Project Proponent and noted that the lease surrender was executed on 1st November 2023 with regard to the nearby quarry area of 3.9365 Ha. The Project Proponent has also produced the Letter No. DOKOT-DMG/1347/2025-M dated 21.01.2026 from the Mining and Geology Department stating that activities such as basic quarry closure, stabilization and site management measures were undertaken at the site, in line with the approved mining plan. The Committee found the details satisfactory. The proposal was presented in the 175th SEAC meeting and the SEAC sub-committee had conducted the field inspection to the project site on 15.01.2025.

The Committee also noted the complaints dated 27.11.2025 and 08/12/2025 from Sri. Sebastian G. Varghese, alleging the presence of a drinking water pond nearby the proposed site, presence of another quarry, presence of high tension line and the presence of road adjacent to the project area. The Committee verified the field inspection report in detail and observed that no pond or public road were recorded within 50m of the proposed project area. Also, the possibility of ground water lowering the due to the quarrying is recorded as minimal, as the quarrying is limited to 65m AMSL. Besides, the Project Proponent had

obtained the NOC from KSEB and Power Grid Corporation. Hence the Committee decided to inform the matter to the complainant.

The elevation of the area varies between 110 m AMSL to 70 m AMSL. The total mineable reserve is reported as 15,12,009 MT for a mine life of 5 years. The total quantity of overburden is 1,77,071 MT. The total project cost is Rs. 7.01 Crores. The depth to water table is 1.80m below ground level at 55.20 RL. There is a 110 kVA Tower line at a distance of 105m as per the presentation. The PP obtained NOC from Power Grid Corporation of India dated 30-07-2024. The NOC from KSEB was obtained on 13.10.2023. The nearest house is located at 55.22 m from the site. The soil depth of the core area varies from 1.0 m. to 4.0 m. and in the buffer area it varies from 3.1 to 3.0 m. A first order stream is found at a distance of 120m from the proposed site.

After detailed deliberation of the proposal, the Committee decided that further consideration of the proposal shall be taken up only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018.

The Committee further decicded that, if the proposal is subsequently recommended for Environmental Clearance (EC), for a project life of 5 years, based on the revised DSR, in addition to the General Conditions for minor mineral mining, the following additional Specific Conditions may be stipulated while issuing the EC.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
2. *Temporary covered fencing of 5 m height all along the boundary to prevent nuisance to the nearby population.*
3. *The Mining should be limited to 65m AMSL, and the mining plan should be revised by Mining and Geology Department accordingly. The revised mining plan should be submitted to SEIAA prior to the execution of mining lease.*
4. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
5. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
6. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*
7. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*

8. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
9. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
10. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
11. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
12. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
13. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
14. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
15. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
16. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
17. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
18. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
19. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
20. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
21. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
22. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
23. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and*

financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.

24. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
25. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
26. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.05 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s. VJJ Infrastructure Private Limited. for an area of 0.9965 Ha. at Block No. 30, Re-Sy. No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam**
(SIA/KL/MIN/474394/2024)

As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. Jaison Jacob, along with the consultant Sri. Cyriac Joseph, attended the hearing, as the proposal had been referred back by the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Kerala in its 160th meeting. The consultant made a detailed presentation before the Committee. During the presentation, it was submitted that a new digital elevation model indicates that the elevation of the site is lower than previously cited and that the concern regarding highly fragile terrain may be addressed as the site has a comparatively gentle slope. It was also stated that a No Objection Certificate (NOC) has been obtained from the District Crisis Management Group. With regard to habitation, it was submitted that the nearest house is located at a distance of 62 m from the project boundary, which exceeds the minimum distance criterion of 50 m, and that adoption of safe mining practices would prevent any adverse impact on nearby houses.

The Committee also noted that no substantial or material evidence had been presented by the Project Proponent that would warrant reconsideration or alteration of the earlier decision of the State Expert Appraisal Committee, Kerala. The Committee further observed that the proposed permit area lies on the flank of a hill slope descending towards the southeast, with a general slope ranging from 10° to 17°, and the site remains a virgin land

with moderate-density natural vegetation, situated at an elevation between 235 m and 260 m above mean sea level (MSL).

The Committee examined the submissions in detail and noted that the proposed project area lies on an elevated hilltop terrain surrounded by steep slopes. Due to the elevated position and slope gradient, the site is prone to generation of high-velocity surface runoff during monsoon events. The Committee observed that mining operations in such terrain may accelerate soil erosion, increase sediment transport towards the lower slopes, and result in drainage congestion and siltation in downstream areas where agricultural activities are prominent, particularly along the southern and western sides of the project area.

The Committee further observed that excavation activities in such geomorphologically sensitive terrain may alter the natural hill profile, weaken slope stability, and increase the likelihood of soil erosion, slope destabilization, and localized landslides, particularly during periods of intense monsoon rainfall. Considering the environmental fragility of the hillock, its role in maintaining local climatic conditions, the relatively undisturbed (virgin) nature of the terrain, and the proximity of agricultural lands, earlier Committees had already examined the proposal in detail and decided to recommend rejection by invoking the Precautionary Principle.

The appraisal using outputs from a Drone-based LiDAR survey, including contour maps with 1 m intervals, Digital Elevation Models (DEM), slope maps, and ortho imagery confirmed that the site is located on a ridge at the eastern end of the hill, with elevations ranging between 240 m and 522 m above MSL. Such landforms play a significant role in maintaining the regional microclimate and ecological balance.

The Committee also noted that a previous quarry proposal located on the same hill and owned by Neeloor Aggregates Pvt Ltd (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/435475/2023) had been rejected in October 2024 due to the fragile terrain conditions and associated environmental concerns. The Committee reaffirmed that the project area forms part of a moderate hazard zone where residential structures and infrastructure have developed both along the hill slopes and in the valleys, thereby increasing the environmental sensitivity and potential risk to nearby habitations.

In view of the above considerations and since the Project Proponent failed to place any new or substantive material facts addressing the reasons for the earlier rejection, the Committee decided to adhere to its earlier decision and reiterate its recommendation for rejection of the proposal, invoking the Precautionary Principle, in order to prevent potential and irreversible environmental impacts in the project region.

Item No.06 **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building stone Quarry project of M/s New Shanio Metal Crusher Unit Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.9877 Ha in Sy. Nos. 193/5, 193/6, 193/7, 193/9-1, 160/6, 192/5, 193/8-1 at Thottappuzhessery Village, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta. (SIA/KL/MIN/493112/2024)**

The Proposal was referred back from 160th SEIAA meeting for re-examination and final recommendation after giving an opportunity of hearing. As invited, Sri. Byju Varghese, on behalf of the Project Proponent and Sri. Arnkumar, Consultant were attended the hearing. They explained that the adjacent plot, where unscientific coring was reported, belonged to the crusher, and two leases were granted there in 2008 and 2012. They stated that a closure plan for the adjacent area was approved in 2024, summarizing that there was no serious violation regarding extraction. The project proponent addressed the concern about the old pit being a continuation of the applied area, stating that the old pit is part of the applied area but has a reduced height. They also noted that a nearly vertical wall is 50 meters from the project area, an offset they believe will prevent slope failures or breakage due to proposed mining activities. The proponent also stated that regional issues due to mining could be nullified through comprehensive Environmental Management (EM).

The Committee noted that the Project was recommended for rejection after thorough appraisal of the application. However, upon request of the project proponent, the Committee decided to entrust the sub-committee consisting of Dr. Ansari and Dr. Rajendraprasad for the field inspection and report.

Item No.07 **Environmental Clearance for the Residential cum Commercial Building Construction Project of M/s Sanferrero Premium Living LLP, with a total built-up area of 58,312 sqm at Sy. Nos.222/4, 222/5, 222/6, 223/1, 223/2, 223/4-1, 223/4-2, 223/5, 223/7, 223/7-1, 224/2, 221/4-1, 223/5-1, 223/4, 223/3, 223/3-1, 223/4-8, 224/3, 224/9-1, 224/4-1, in Akalakunnam Village & Grama Panchayat, Kottayam Taluk & District. (SIA/KL/INFRA2/497569/2024)**

The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The Committee noted that the proposal was presented in the 186th SEAC meeting and salient features were detailed by the project proponent.

The total plot area is 2.6597 ha. (26,597 sqm). The project is in and around an abandoned quarry project. The total built-up area is 58,312 sqm. The FAR is @1.40. Total project cost is Rs. 102 Crores. The proposed project consists of 119 Apartments, 1 Villa, 4 semi-detached row houses, a Commercial area, a Restaurant / Food court (80 seats), a Conference Hall (122 seats), clubhouse and Scuba with supporting infrastructure facilities. The quantity of soil to be excavated is given by 10,495 cu.m and a portion of the same shall be used in the project site for various purposes. The existing abandoned quarry pond, with an area of 1.64 ha. will

be retained as part of the proposed development of the site. Ordinary Earth (O.E.) with a total quantity of 3,140 cu.m. will be sourced for internal road construction, building levelling & landscape purposes from the external mine site (Aruvikkuzhi ward) located within 10 km from the site. The proposed STP Capacity is 140 KLD with MBBR technology and in-built anoxic treatment. It is proposed that the construction site will be isolated from the existing water body (pond) through a protection wall with an appropriate height all around the water body. The basement floors will be provided with effective waterproofing measures to prevent seepage. There is no construction below the groundwater table; all excavated soil/earth will be consumed within the site.

After detailed deliberation, **the committee decided to recommend EC for a period of 10 years with the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.**

1. **The Town Planning Department should ensure the stability of the construction considering the past blasting history of the quarry area and the fractures that may have occurred during the operation of the quarry.**
2. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.
3. Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.
4. A proper drainage system shall be provided to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, taking into account the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.
5. Appropriate flood-mitigation measures shall be implemented, expecting extreme rainfall events, considering the regional topography.
6. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).
7. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.
8. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.
9. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.
10. The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.
11. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.
12. The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment

and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).

13. Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification to buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.
14. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.
15. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.
16. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.
17. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.
18. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.
19. Construction work should be carried out during day daytime only.
20. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.
21. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.
22. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.
23. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.
24. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.
25. D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.
26. Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment, such as BLDC fans and LED lamps, should be promoted as part of energy conservation. At least 20% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.
27. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.
28. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.
29. Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.
30. As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be subjected to field

inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.

31. The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ permission for the construction projects of this nature.
32. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

Item No. 8 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T.P Sajad, Managing Partner, M/s P P Associates for an area of 0.7530 Ha at Block no: 12, ReSurveyNo. 110/7,110/8 in Vengoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam. (SIA/KL/MIN/500685/2024)**

The Committee verified the additional document submitted by the Project Proponent and noted that the NOC from the irrigation Department has not been submitted by the Project Proponent. Instead the PP had submitted a notarised affidavit stating that he had submitted the application for NOC before the irrigation Department.

The proposal was presented in the 186th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent had submitted the application in Form-1, along with the Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and other details as sought by the Committee. The total project cost is Rs. 80,00,000/-, of which Rs. 12,25,000 is allocated for the EMP. The targeted production of mine will be 1,50,955 MT. The expected life of mine estimated is to be about 2 years. The highest elevation within the permit area is 64 meters above mean sea level (MSL), and the lowest is 44 meters above MSL. The ultimate mining depth proposed is 30m AMSL.

The Committee decided that further consideration of the proposal shall be undertaken only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018, subject to the receipt of the NOC from the Irrigation Department.

The Committee further decicded that, if the proposal is subsequently recommended for Environmental Clearance (EC), for a project life of 2 years, based on the revised DSR, in addition to the General Conditions for minor mineral mining, the following additional Specific Conditions may be stipulated while issuing the EC.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
2. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula),*

Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.

3. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
4. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*
5. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
6. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
7. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
8. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
9. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
10. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
11. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
12. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
13. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
14. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
15. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
16. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
17. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*

18. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
19. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
20. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
21. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) shall be 2% of the total project cost.*
22. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
23. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

Item No.09 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, M/s. Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Private Limited, for an area of 3.6127 Ha at Block No. 20, Re-Survey Nos. 131/5, 131/11, 132/3, 132/3-1, 133/4-2, 133/7-1 & 139/3, in Manimala Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/496038/2024)**

The Committee examined the proposal and discussed it in detail. It is noted that in its 191st SEAC Meeting, the Committee revised the earlier rejection of the proposal and decided to reconsider after informing SEIAA. Further, SEIAA in its 160th meeting referred the proposal back to SEAC to re-examine the proposal and to give final recommendation.

As per the application, the project cost is given as 1026.10 Lakhs. As per the Mining Plan dated 30.08.2024, the mineable reserve is estimated as 13,22,647.50 T for a

mine of 6 years. The level of the bottom most benches proposed at 115m above MSL. The elevation of the proposed area varies between 160m AMSL to 115m AMSL. The nearest hazard zone is 1.13km away from the project boundary. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 17.09.2024, states that no operational quarries found within 500m radius.

After detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to ask the Project Proponent to submit the following details.

1. **CER details as per guidelines published in the SEIAA website.**
2. **Biodiversity Report of the project area and the compensatory afforestation plan geo-tagged photograph of the proposed area and the consent of the land owner, if the land not belongs to the PP.**
3. **Baseline data analysis report**
4. **Copy of the receipt of the processing fee paid to the Govt. Treasury.**

Item No. 10 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Gimmy George for an area of 0.9965 Ha at SurveyNo.529/1B2, 530/1A2 in Manjalloor Village, MuvattupuzhaTaluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/524781/2025)**

As invited, the Project Proponent Sri. Gimmy George and the RQP Sri. Balaraman were present before the Committee. The RQP made the presentation. The total mineable reserve is 2,12,053 MT and the proposed life of mine is 3 years as per the mine plan. The project cost is mentioned as Rs.1,00,00,000/. The hazard zone is 4.63km away from the project boundary. The elevation difference prior to the mining is 80m to 128m above MSL. The depth of mining is 80m above MSL and there will be no pit formation. The water table is stated as 59m AMSL as per the nearest open well water level. The Environmental Management Plan was presented as revised from the original submission.

After discussion, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following additional documents/details.

1. **Revised Environment Management Plan prepared by the NABET Accredited consultant**
2. **The proposed OB dump area and the plan for overburden protection.**
3. **Revised compensatory afforestation Plan incorporating planting of existing plants in the project area**
4. **Thickness of the top soil details along with the geotagged photographs of the measurement.**

Item No.11 **Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Ernakulam for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. K.J Poulose for an area of 1.5565 Ha at Survey Nos. 143/1, 143/2, 142/3-2 in Maneed Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam – ADS Received - Reg**
(SIA/KL/MIN/512716/2025)

The Committee had viewed the drone video of the Project area as submitted by the Project Proponent.

The EC for the quarry was issued vide proceedings dated 23.06.2017 for 5 years by DEIAA, Ernakulam and the validity of the EC was expired on 22.06.2023 after covid relaxation. The application has been submitted in Form 2. As per the revised mining plan dated 19.06.2024, the balance mineable reserve is 63982 MT. The elevation of the project area varies between 75 – 50m AMSL. As per the order dated 24.05.2024, a demand notice has been raised due to the illegal extraction beyond the boundaries of the mine lease, by the Mining and Geology Department for an amount of Rs. 78,89,955/- for which the Project Proponent has agreed to pay the amount in three instalments. In these circumstances, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the drone video of the location, highlighting the project area covering a 500m radius.

During the meeting the committee noted that CER is not submitted. **After detailed deliberation, the Committee entrusted Dr. Manoharan M and Dr. Vinayan V.B for the field inspection and further Environmental Damage Assessment of the quarry project.**

Item No.12 **ToR for the proposed Construction of High-Rise Residential Building of Sri. K. C Raju, M/s Kent Construction Pvt. Ltd at Survey Nos. 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 & 141/8 in Puthencruz Village,Kunnthunadu Taluk, Ernakulam – Refer back from 159th SEIAA meeting - Reg**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/447418/2023)

The Committee earlier observed that construction had already been completed over the entire built-up area. It reiterated that construction commenced after the EIA Notification, 2006, without prior EC, constituting a grave violation. SEAC also took note of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated 16.05.2025 (in *Vanashakti v. Union of India*), which set aside the SOP for violation cases and the concept of ex post facto EC. Accordingly, SEAC recommended rejection of the proposal. The proposal was considered in the 159th SEIAA meeting**.** While noting SEAC's recommendation for rejection, SEIAA also took note of a significant subsequent development: the Hon'ble Supreme Court, by judgment dated 18.11.2025 in a Review Petition filed by Confederation of Real Estate Developers' Association of India (CREDAI) and others, recalled its earlier judgment dated 16.05.2025 and restored the writ petitions and civil appeal for fresh adjudication. In light of this change in the legal framework, SEIAA concluded that the basis for outright rejection no longer subsists. The Authority therefore decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for fresh

technical appraisal and recommendations, considering the Supreme Court's judgment dated 18.11.2025.

The Committee verified the Proposal which was referred back from SEIAA for fresh technical appraisal. The application for Fresh ToR application was received 07.03.2025. As per the latest OM dated 20.01.2026 by the MoEF&CC, *'All violation cases pending as per the provisions of the OM dated 07/07/2021 as on 02/01/2024 (i.e. till the stay was imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in W.P. 1394/2023 titled Vanashakti vs. Union of India) may be processed.'* The current online application is being received outside the date mentioned in the OM. However, it was noted that the Project Proponent (PP) had originally submitted the application in physical form, and the proposal has remained with the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Kerala since 2013. During the appraisal of the proposal, it was observed that the PP had initiated construction activities without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, thereby violating the provisions of the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006.

The Committee further noted that the Authority, in its 124th meeting, had decided to provide an opportunity of hearing to the PP, and accordingly the PP was heard during the 125th meeting. Subsequently, the Authority, in its 127th meeting, directed the PP to submit a fresh Terms of Reference (ToR) application in accordance with the Standard Operating Procedure dated 07.07.2021 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change for dealing with violation cases.

However, the PP has not proceeded with the submission of the ToR application as directed. The Committee also noted that, at present, there is no provision available in the PARIVESH Portal to submit a ToR application in accordance with the said Standard Operating Procedure.

In view of the above circumstances, the Committee decided to recommend that the proposal may be returned in its present form, with liberty to the PP to submit a fresh ToR application in accordance with the applicable procedure once the necessary provision becomes available in the PARIVESH Portal.

Item No. 13 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jimmy Jose for an area of 0.9992 Ha at Survey No. 916/1-2-2, 916/3-4, 917/1 in Kalloorkad Village, MuvattupuzhaTaluk, Ernakulam.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/527488/2025)

As invited, the Project Proponent Sri. Jimmy Jose and the RQP Sri. Nazar Ahamed were present before the Committee. The RQP made the presentation. The total mineable reserve is 3,81,120 MT and the proposed life of mine is 2 years as per the mine plan. The project cost is mentioned as Rs.1,50,00,000/. The medium hazard zone is 5.77km and High Hazard zone is 6.97km away from the project boundary. The elevation difference prior to the mining is 86m to 100m above MSL. The depth of mining is 65m above MSL. The water table

is stated as 59m AMSL as per the nearest open well water level. The Environmental Management Plan was presented as revised from the original submission.

After discussion, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following additional documents/details.

1. **A comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP) incorporating specific mitigation measures with due consideration of all adjacent and related projects, the presence of river, particularly with respect to transportation management, drainage arrangements, regulation of blasting time, development of greenbelt and implementation of compensatory afforestation activities, establishment and functioning of the Environmental Management Cell (EMC), and clear delineation of responsibilities of each Project Proponent. The EMP should include the affidavit outlining the collective responsibilities of each Project Proponents in the Cluster.**
2. **Details about the proposed site for OB and its Plan for protection plan.**
3. **Alternate site for compensatory afforestation plan with geo-tagged photograph of the proposed area and the consent of the land owner, if the land does not belong to the PP.**
4. **Details of the depth to water table and the ultimate mine pit proposed.**

<u>Item No.14</u> **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. AjithKumar S, Managing Director, M/s. AKR Metals and Crushers Pvt. Ltd for an area of 0.9900 Ha at Block no. 31 Re survey no: 422/1, 422/3, 422/4, 422/9, 422/10 in Pazhayakunnummel Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/542959/2025)

As invited, the Project Proponent Sri. Ajith Kumar and the RQP Sri. V.K Roy were present before the Committee. The RQP made the presentation. The total mineable reserve is 1,94,000 MT and the proposed life of mine is 3 years as per the mine plan. The project cost is mentioned as Rs.1,08,00,000/. The medium hazard zone is 12.67km and High Hazard zone is 12.94km away from the project boundary. The elevation difference prior to the mining is 65m to 105m above MSL. The depth of mining is 65m above MSL. The water table is stated as 57m AMSL as per the nearest open well water level.

The Committee decided that further consideration of the proposal shall be undertaken only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018, subject to the submission of detailed drainage plan including silt traps, outflow channels, culverts if any leading to the natural streams.

The Committee further decided that, if the proposal is subsequently recommended for Environmental Clearance (EC), for a project life of 3 years, based on the revised DSR, in addition to the General Conditions for minor mineral mining, the following additional Specific Conditions may be stipulated while issuing the EC.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
2. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
3. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
4. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*
5. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
6. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
7. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
8. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
9. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
10. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
11. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
12. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
13. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*

14. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
15. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
16. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
17. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
18. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
19. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
20. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
21. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) shall be 2% of the total project cost.*
22. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
23. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

Item No.15 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Roy Jacob, M/s Beekay Granites Pvt Ltd. for an area of 1.4894 Ha at Block No. 37, Survey No. 44/3 in Vellinalloor Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/543036/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-2 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The project site is located 16km away from the Hazard Zone, as per the hazard zonation map published by the State Disaster Management Authority. The highest elevation within the lease area is 110 m above MSL on the north-east side, and the lowest elevation is 69 m above MSL towards the south-west side. The depth to the water table is 8m BGL from the elevation of 66m AMSL. The mining is limited up to a depth of 65m AMSL. The estimated life of the mine is 5 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 1,45,86,200/-. Under the comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, two other quarries of Sri. Udayan and Shibu were included. Activities amounting to Rs. 20,50,000/- will be implemented by M/s Beekay Granites and Rs. 6,00,000/- by Sri. Udayan, and Rs. 13,86,840/- by Sri. Shibu. Total Mineable Reserve is 2,57,500MT. The CER amount allocated is Rs. 16,16,200/-.

The Committee noted two abandoned quarry pits on the south-west part of the project area and also a quarry pit of the Project Proponent inside the proposed project area which is stated as partly worked out. The SEAC also observed that the OB dump plan not satisfactory as the area proposed is in slope. **Hence the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent the following details for further appraisal of the proposal.**

1. **Details of the abandoned quarry pits on the south-west part of the proposed project area and the partly mined out quarry pit of the Project Proponent in side the proposed area.**
2. **Detailed OB dump plan with geotagged photographs of the proposed area and the elevation profile along with the protective measures for the dump.**

Item No. 16 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shibin William Varghese, M/s Nalayyath Granites Shibin William, at Survey Nos. 120/1-12, 120/1-14 for an area of 0.9546 Ha. in Erumeli South Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/543420/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the EIA report, approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Project Proponent had obtained the ToR letter on 16.05.2024 and the public hearing was conducted on 03.04.2025. The EIA report was prepared by M/s. Parivesh Environmental Engineering Services, a NABET accredited consultant. The project site is

located in the Low Hazard Zone, and about 0.13 Ha is in the medium hazard zone. The High Hazard Zone is 360m away from the project site. The highest elevation of the permit area is 138m MSL and lowest is 112m MSL as per the approved mining plan. The ultimate pit depth is 90m AMSL. As per the CGWB groundwater monitoring well at an elevation of 78m AMSL, from 1km NW of the project area, the water depth varies from 0.96 to 5.76m BGL. The estimated life of the mine is 5 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 2,09,17,667/-. Total cost of the EMP including the CER is Rs. 68,77,379/-

After detailed discussion, the Committee entrusted Dr. A.N Manoharan, member SEAC for the evaluation of EIA report.

Item No. 17 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Shri. Antony S. Alukkal, Authorized Signatory, M/s. Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Private Limited, for an area of 3.6127 Ha. at Re-Survey. Nos: 131/5, 131/11, 132/3, 132/3 1, 133/4-2, 133/7-1 & 139/3, Block No - 20 of Manimala Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/529942/2025)**

The Committee scrutinized the proposal and noted that the current application was forwarded from MoEF &CC on 21/07/2025. However, the same project is under appraisal of SEAC with the proposal number SIA/KL/MIN/496038/2024, (date of Submission 11/12/2024). **Since the instant proposal is a duplicate of the existing proposal, that is under appraisal, the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the Proposal.**

Item No. 18 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. R Sreedharan Nair, Managing Director, M/s. Mallelil Industries Private Limited for an area of 2.9050Ha at Block No: 34, Re-Survey. Nos: 195, 69/2, 69/7, 192/30, 68/9 in Airavan Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta (SIA/KL/MIN/530279/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. Majority area of the project site is not in the Hazard Zone, and some parts in the north-east area is under medium hazard zone. The High Hazard Zone is 704m away from the project site. The highest elevation in this area is 116.9m above MSL and the lowest elevation is 80m above MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 80m AMSL. Average water level as per the open well nearby is 42m AMSL. The estimated life of the mine is 5 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 4.758 Crores. Total cost of the EMP is 39.65 Lakh.

After detailed discussion**, the Committee entrusted a subcommittee of Dr. Rajendraprasad and Dr. Ansari Jamal for field inspection and report. Also, the Project Proponent is directed to revise the CER as per existing guidelines of SEIAA.**

Item No. 19 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Nelson Chakkappan, Managing Partner, M/s Five Star Rocks for an area of 2.5110 Ha. at Sy. No. 575/1-2, 5811-4-2, 575/1-2-2 in Konnithazham Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta (SIA/KL/MIN/531513/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the EIA report, approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Project Proponent had obtained the ToR letter on 10.12.2024 and the public hearing was conducted on 31.01.2025. The EIA report was prepared by M/s. Parivesh Environmental Engineering Services, a NABET accredited consultant. The project site is 25 m away from the medium hazard and 157m from High Hazard Zone. The highest elevation in the area is 236 m MSL and lowest elevation is 144 m MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 70m AMSL. As per the details submitted by the Project Proponent, the average water level varies from 5-10m BGL. The estimated life of the mine is 9 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 2.54 Crores. Total cost of the EMP is 15.02. Lakh and CER is Rs. 10.50 Lakh.

After detailed discussion, the Committee entrusted a subcommittee of Dr. Rajendraprasad and Dr. Ansari Jamal for field inspection, evaluation of EIA and report.

Item No.20 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Roshan, M/s Broyal Industries for an area of 2.1700 Ha at Re-survey Nos. 141/2-5, 145/13, 141/3, 145/1, 145/1-2, 141/2-2-2, 141/2-2-3, 141/2-2, 141/2-3 & 141/2-4 in Kottukkal Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/529572/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. Environmental Management Plan is prepared by SBA Enviro Systems Private Limited, a NABET accredited consultant. The area is not in hazard zone and the nearest medium High Hazard Zone is 3.3 km away. Highest elevation of the lease area is 100 m above MSL and the lowest is 80 m above MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 70m AMSL. The estimated life of the mine is 5 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 2,50,00,000. Total cost of the EMP including the CER is Rs. 73,47,286/-.

Upon verification of the submitted documents and the Google imagery, the Committee observed that an adjacent quarry owned by the same PP had earlier operated with Environmental Clearance issued by the District Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Kollam. On detailed examination, the Committee noted indications that the said quarry may have violated the conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance, particularly with regard to extraction of mineral resources from the buffer zone and possibly from areas outside the approved lease boundary.

Further scrutiny revealed that the mine closure activities in the said adjacent quarry have not been implemented, and the site presently appears to be abandoned without implementing the mine closure and environmental restoration measures. The Committee also expressed apprehension that mineral extraction might have been carried out in the presently proposed project area.

In view of the above observations and concerns, and after detailed deliberations, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following details for further appraisal:

1. **Certified Compliance Report issued by the Integrated Regional Office, Bengaluru of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change for the adjacent quarry owned by the PP.**
2. **Detailed information regarding illegal or excess mining, if any, carried out from the buffer zone and/or outside the approved lease area, along with copies of demand notices or proceedings issued by the Department of Mining and Geology.**
3. **Status and documentary evidence regarding the implementation of the Mine Closure Plan and environmental restoration measures undertaken in the adjacent quarry area.**
4. **A clear clarification regarding whether any mining or mineral extraction activities have been undertaken within the presently proposed project area, along with supporting records from the competent authority.**
5. **A Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan prepared specifically considering the cumulative environmental impacts arising from the adjacent quarry and the proposed project area, including measures for mitigation, site restoration, and environmental safeguards.**

<u>Item No. 21</u> **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joby Jose Joji for an area of 1.0705 Ha at Block No.15 Re Survey No. 207 in Kurupuzha Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram . (SIA/KL/MIN/538898/2025)**

As invited, the authorised person of the Project Proponent Sri. Geethar was present along with the RQP Sri. V.K Roy and the NABET accredited consultant Sri. Haneesh

Panicker representing ABC Consultancy, were present before the Committee. The consultant made the presentation.

It is noted that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The area is in medium and low hazard zone and the nearest high Hazard Zone is 444m away. The Project Proponent has agreed to submit the NOC from the District Crisis Management Committee. Highest elevation of the lease area is 215 m above MSL and the lowest is 160m above MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 150m AMSL. As per the open well at 153 AMSL, from 71m of the BP8, the water table is at 147m AMSL. Total mineable reserve is 2,88,425MT. The estimated life of the mine is 5 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 1,70,00,000. Total cost of the EMP is Rs. 33,00,000/- and Rs. 4,50,000/- has been allocated for the CER.

After detailed deliberation, the Committee entrusted the Sub Committee of Dr. Ansari Jamal and Dr. Rajendraprasad for the field inspection and report.

Item No. 22 **Terms of Reference for Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s K P Granite Industries (Represented by its Managing Partner, Mr. R J Karunanidhi is situated at Block No.33,Resurvey Nos.31/1 over an area of 2.0925 ha in Kalanjoor Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/568297/2026)**

The Committee examined the ToR application and discussed it in detail. Total mineable reserve is 6,05,700 MT and the life of mine is 5 years. Highest elevation of the lease area is 221.42 m MSL and lowest elevation is 155.3 m MSL. The total project cost is given as 400 lakhs. As per the cluster certificate letter no. DOPAT-DMG/356/M/2023 dated 31.01.2026 issued by District Office, Department of Mining & Geology, Pathanamthitta there is a working quarry within 500 m radius of the proposed project site having area 15.07 Ha. Hence total area including proposed quarry area is 17.1625 ha. It is observed that the area is exposed to mining and a small area comes under the medium hazard zone. The nearest High Hazard Zone is 1km away. Based on the discussion, **the Committee decided to recommend the Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with a condition that the Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, incorporating cumulative impact assessment of the adjacent quarry operations.**

Item No. 23 **Granite/Building Stone Quarry of M/s Extreme Black Aggregates Private Limited, Director, Sri. Ratheesh M R, at Survey No.-503/1 3, 503/1-2-3, 503/1-2-3-7, 503/1-2-3-7-3-2, 503/1-2-3-7-2, 503/1-2-3-6, 503/1-5, 503/2-3, Village- Varapetty, Taluk, Kothamangalam, District- Ernakulam, of State- Kerala for lease Area of 2.9327 ha SIA/KL/MIN/566741/2026)**

The Committee examined the ToR application and discussed it in detail. Total mineable reserve is 11,00,130 MT and the life of mine is 5 years. Highest elevation of the lease area is 84 m MSL and lowest elevation is 68 m MSL. The total project cost is given as 2.94 Crores. Under cluster condition, total area including proposed quarry area is 7.9492 ha. The hazard zone is 8km away from the project site. Based on the discussion, **the Committee decided to recommend the Standard ToR under Category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals, with a condition that the Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, incorporating cumulative impact assessment of the adjacent quarry operations.**

Item No. 24 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Wincent A for an area of 1.1550 Ha at Block no. 18, re-survey no: 202/1-2, 202/1-3-1, 202/5, 202/6, 202/7, 202/7-1, 202/8, 202/13, 202/13-1, 202/14, 232/10 in Anadu Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District. (SIA/KL/MIN/477368/2024)**

The Committee scrutinised the evaluation report of the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent and found it satisfactory. The site is located at the ridge top. The life of mine is 5 years and the depth to water table is 6m bgl. The hearest house is at 55m . The Project was presented in the 173rd SEAC meeting and the field inspection was conducted by the subcommittee of SEAC on 02.02.2025. The NOC submitted from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Thiruvananthapuram dated 05.10.2024 states that no irrigation structures are located within 1km radius of the proposed site. The high hazard zone is 5 km away from the project site. The total mineable reserve reported is 3,00,200 MT for 5 years. The distance to the nearest house is 55m. The depth to water table is 6m below ground level at 122 m AMSL. The elevation difference of the site varies between 170m to 145m AMSL. The Project cost is Rs. 1.77 Crore. The total cost for the implementation of Environment Management Plan is Rs. 73,00,000/- including the recurring cost. The fund allocated for the CER implementation is Rs. 16,89,000/-.

Based on detailed discussion, field inspection report and the additional detail submitted by the Project Proponent, the Committee decided to recommend EC for a period of 5 years, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
2. ***A temporary barrier of 5m height has to be constructed connecting BP13–BP14–BP15–BP1–BP2–BP3–BP4–BP5–BP6 to reduce nuisance to nearby residence by using Precast concrete barriers/ metal sheet barriers/ geotextile fabric barrier as proposed.***
3. ***The boulder management plan should be implemented at the site comprehensively.***
4. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
5. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
6. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*
7. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
8. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
9. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
10. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
11. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
12. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
13. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
14. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*

15. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
16. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
17. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
18. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
19. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
20. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
21. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
22. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
23. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) shall be 2% of the total project cost.*
24. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
25. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

Item No.25 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Madhulal M G for an area of 0.8300 Ha at Block No. 52, Re-Sy. Nos. 387/5-2, 387/7-2, 387/7, 387/13 & 387/13-2 in Mancode Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District. (SIA/KL/MIN/505526/2024)**

The Committee discussed the evaluation report of the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent and found it satisfactory. Drone video of the project area within 500m radius was submitted by the Project Proponent. The project was presented in the 186th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent had submitted the application in Form-1, along with the Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and other details as sought by the Committee. The total project cost is Rs. 1.01 crore, of which Rs. 16,45,000 is allocated for the EMP. The targeted production of mine will be 1,15,500 MT. The expected life of mine is estimated to be 3 years (It was erroneously stated as 2 years in the 186th SEAC meeting minutes) as per the mine plan. The highest elevation within the permit area is 205 meters above mean sea level (MSL), and the lowest is 180 meters above MSL. The ultimate mining depth has to be limited to 175m AMSL as the water table comes up to 170m AMSL.

Based on detailed discussion, documents submitted as part of the application and the additional details submitted by the Project Proponent, the Committee decided to recommend EC for a period of 3 years, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

1. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
2. *The ultimate mine depth should be restricted to 175m AMSL considering the water table of the region and accordingly, the mineable reserve should be revised by the Mining and Geology Department before the commencement of the mining.*
3. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicher oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
4. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees on available land owned by the proponent, at the lower portion of the land.*
5. *Proper fencing with green Argo net at a height of 5m shall be installed around the project area.*

6. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
7. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
8. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
9. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. -Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
10. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
11. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for a maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
12. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
13. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first year itself of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
14. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
15. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
16. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
17. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power*
18. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
19. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
20. *Rainwater harvesting measures should be provided as per the guidelines of the Central Groundwater Authority and geotagged photographs of the same shall be submitted along with first HYCR.*
21. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
22. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should*

implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) shall be 2% of the total project cost.

23. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
24. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF & CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

Item No.26 **Reappraisal of Environment Clearance from DEIAA to SEIAA to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. V. Somasekharan Nair for an area of 4.5116 Ha. at Block No. 41, Re-Sy No. 214/11 pt, 214/11- 3 pt, 214/7 pt, 214/19 pt, 212/12 pt, 212/2-2, 212/3-1, 212/3-1-1, 212/3-2, 212/6 pt, 212/13 pt, 212/10 pt, 212/10-1 pt, 212/7 pt, 212/16, 212/9 pt, 212/1, 212/1-1, 211/12 pt, 211/13, 211/17, 211/11 pt, 211/16 pt, 211/4 pt, 210/27, 210/26 pt, 232/10 pt, 232/3, 232/2, 213/9, 213/9-1 pt & 213/12 pt at Aruvikkara Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/494061/2024)**

The Committee discussed the field inspection report by the sub-committee conducted on 03.11.2025 and observed that certain documents have to be submitted by the Project Proponent. As per the application, the ToR for the proposed project was approved vide letter No. SIA/KL/MIN/454714/2023, 2468/EC3/2023/SEIAA dated 03.04.2024. The application is for reappraisal of DEIAA issued EC dated 23.11.2018 for a period of 5 years. The lease deed was executed for a period of 10 years from 07.03.2019 to 06.03.2029. As per the Approved mining plan, the life of mine is 10 years with a total mineable reserve of 26,87,415 MT and production rate of about 2, 68,000 TPA. The quantity mined out from the proposed area is 10,87,420 MT up to 25.07.2023. The quantity mined out from the period of 26.07.2023 to 12.01.2024 is reported as 87,250 MT. The quantity mined out from outside the lease area is 3,085 MT. The quantity mined out from the buffer zone is 21,044 MT. The quantity mined out for 2023-24 is 1,86,063.39 MT. Therefore, the balance reserve available is 14,88,616 MT.

The elevation difference of the proposed area varies between 185m AMSL to 120 m AMSL. There are three working and one abandoned quarries on the ridge and quarry area in the cluster is above 16 Ha. ULTRA TECH has carried out the EIA studies and preparation of Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The Public hearing was conducted on 23.07.2024.

Based on discussion, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following additional documents for further appraisal of the proposal.

1. **A time-bound Progressive Greenbelt Development Plan and the plan for Compensatory Afforestation shall be prepared in a tabular form Phase-wise plan of plantation and clearly indicating the area to be covered under plantation and the species to be planted.**
2. **Details of the onsite shelter and facilities to be provided to the mine workers**
3. **Conceptual post mining land use in a table format which shall include Mined out area, Buffer area, Afforested area, Rain water harvesting facilities. Please give area wise bifurcation**
4. **Maximum and Minimum elevation before and after mining for Block A and BlockB**
5. **Revise CER by incorporating the renovation of the Panchayath Well at Mylom.**
6. **NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04.2024.**

Item No.27 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Shri. S. Raveendran, Managing Director, M/s. Raveendra Rock Products Private Limited at Re-Sy Block No: 27, Re-Sy. Nos: 132/2, 132/2-1, 132/2-2, 132/2-3, 137/1-2, 137/2, 137/3, 137/4, 137/5, 137/6, 137/7, 137/8, 137/8-1, 137/9, 137/10, 137/11, 137/12-1, 137/12-2, 138/3, 138/4, 138/5, 138/6, 138/7-2, 138/8, 139/2, 139/2- 2, 139/3, 139/4, 139/5, 139/6, 139/7, 139/7-1, 139/10 & 139/11 in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta.**
SIA/KL/MIN/479878/2024

The Committee discussed the evaluation report of the Additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent and noted that the Compensatory afforestation plan is not satisfactory.

The ToR for the proposed project was approved vide letter no. SIA/KL/MIN/422416/2023, 2240/EC1/2023/SEIAA dated 17.06.2023. The project cost is 918.20 Lakhs**.** The minable revere proposed is 14,83,915.70 Tonnes for mine life of 7 years. The thickness of over burden ranges from 0 to 2.2m. A quantity of 9548.00 m^3 Ordinary Earth is to be removed from the site. The elevation of the area varies between 95m AMSL to 155m AMSL. The nearest habitation is located at distance of 110m from the project

boundary. The Public Hearing for the Proposed Project was held on 21.03.2024 at St. Marthomma church, Mallappally. The depth to water table is 5m bgl as per the hydrology map provided.

In this circumstances, the Committee decided to direct the project Proponent to submit the following additional documents for further appraisal of the application.

1. **Comprehensive and progressive compensatory afforestation plan.**
2. **NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655of 2024 dated 19-04-2024.**

Item No.28 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry of Smt. C Beenakmari for an area of 4.7730 Ha at Block No. 32, Re-Survey No. 288/1, , in Koodal Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta. (SIA/KL/MIN/520035/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and discussed it in detail. The ToR for conducting the EIA study was issued vide letter No. SIA/KL/MIN/451712/2023, 2451/EC2/2023/SEIAA dated 29.01.2024. As per the EIA report, the project cost is Rs. 3,65,62,049/-. The Public hearing for the project was conducted on 29.11.2024. The elevation of the area varies between 250m AMSL to 167.617 m AMSL. The groundwater data measured from the nearest wells vary from 5.1m to 7.5m below ground level. As per the approved mining plan dated 29.09.2023, the total mineable quantity which was available in the original landform before the extraction of 80,914.5 MT of granite building stone was 32,89,225.75 MT. The land survey shows that a quantity of 8,914.5 MT of granite building stone is partly mined out from the mining area, and 2,41,675 MT of granite building stone is partly mined out from outside of the mining lease area. The remaining mineable reserve of 32,08,311.25 MT, in which 14,00,000 MT of granite building stone has been planned for extraction for the next 7 years and hence arrived at an annual production of 2,00,000 MT/Year. The remaining quantity of 18,08,311.25 MT of granite building stone will be left for future mining activity for a further period of 9 years. Therefore, the life of mine will be 16 years. The total area of the Cluster is 14.5031. The nearest high hazard zone I 725m away and the small portion of the northern and southern area are in the medium hazard zone. The rest of the area is in no hazard zone.

The Committee had discussed the field inspection report conducted on 09.01.2026 and EIA evaluation report in details and decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following details.

1. **Provide proper Boundary fencing and give proof.**
2. **Plantation monitoring programme to ensure survival and growth rate of plantations**

3. **NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala 19-04-2024**
4. **Revised CER with specific location of implementation and beneficiary details.**
5. **Drone video of the project site and surrounding areas within a 500m radius as per the Guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website with UI number of the Drone used for the survey**
6. **Depth to water table below ground level in the nearest dug well along with geotagged photograph of the well, distance from the project boundary and site elevation**
7. **Annual occupational health surveillance of the workers shall be done by the doctor who is expert in occupational health and hygiene and its records shall be maintained.**

Item No.29 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jose A.K for an area of 1.5906 Ha at Survey Nos 491/3A-6, 491/3A-7, 491/3A-8 in Pindimana Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam. (ToR approved proposal) – ADS Received - Reg (SIA/KL/MIN/514854/2024)**

The Committee examined the proposal along with the EIA report and discussed it in detail. As per Form 1, the project cost is estimated as Rs. 2,76,61,710/-. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the preparation of EIA/EMP were approved vide File No. SIA/KL/MIN/45176/2023, 2500/EC1/SEIAA/2024 dated 21.05.2024. The Public Hearing of the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project was conducted on 01.10.2024.

As per the application, the Periyar River is located at a distance of 1.18 km. The depth of the water table of the monitoring well station is 5.61m below ground level. The highest elevation of the mining area is 57 m AMSL, and the lowest is 46 m AMSL. The Mineable reserve assessed is 5,08,090 MT for a mine life of 5 years. As per the Cluster certificate dated 30.11.2023, the total area of the Cluster is 7.5228 Ha.

The Committee noted that t**he proposed site does not fall under the one-kilometre buffer zone stipulated in the now-expired draft notification S.O. 3454(E) (dated 29/09/2020) for the Thattekkad Bird Sanctuary area. Besides, the Project Proponent had submitted the NOC proceedings No. A1-313/NOC/2025-26 dated 04/08/2025 from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Ernakulam subject to 14 conditions, detailed drainage Plan, boulder management plan, detailed waste management plan and energy conservation plan and detailed plan for rain water harvesting and its utilization as sought by the Committee. The Committee observed that the overall revision of the EIA report is satisfactory, but the ToR compliance table needs revision.**

After detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to entrust the Subcommitte of Dr. Manoharan and Dr. Vinayan for the field inspection and report.

The PP has to submit the valid certificate issued by the Wildlife Warden of the respective Wildlife Sanctuaries. The certificate must clearly state that the project area does not fall within the proposed ESZ or within 1 km of the Protected Area boundary and must specify the exact distance of the project site from the Protected Area boundary.

Item No. 30 **Validity Extension for the of Environmental clearance issued for the proposed china clay mining project in for an area of 2.4953 ha Sy. Nos. 427/1, 1-1, 1-2, 2, 4 & 5 at Melthonnakal Village, Trivandrum Taluk, Trivandrum District, Kerala by Sri. Chandrasekaran for M/s EICL limited. (SIA/KL/MIN/557042/2025)- reg**
(Old File No. No.2111/EC3/2025/SEIAA)

The SEIAA in its 112th Meeting held on 14th, 15th& 16th September 2021 Considered the letter of the Project Proponent dated 14.12.2020 requesting for extension of Environmental Clearance. The SEIAA noted that SEAC has already recommended issuing EC for 5 years out of which 2 years will be covered by 15.10.2021. Authority decided to extend the EC period for the balance period of 3 years to cover the recommendation by SEAC and the extension beyond this period will be considered after a field inspection by SEAC to confirm the compliance of EC conditions. Subsequently the EC was extended for a further period of 3years from 15/10/2021 up to 14/10/2025 including Covid relaxation.

Accordingly, the Authority vide letter dated 07.09.2025 directed the Project to submit the application for modification/extension of EC in Parivesh Portal with all the necessary documents such as Approved Mine Plan, Scheme of Mining, Pre-Feasibility Report, CCR, EMP, HYCR, valid lease order, copy of CTE, etc. Upon receipt of the Application for Validity Extension of EC- in Form-6, the Committee had verified the proposal and noted that as per the Scheme of Mining the for the Period of 2026-2029 the reserve is estimated as 3,22,097.4 MT. The Committee further entrusted a sub-committee for the field inspection and compliance report.

The Committee had discussed the field inspection and compliance report from the site inspection conducted on 11.12.2025 in detail and decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following additional documents/details.

1. Specific Hydrogeological survey covering 500 meters radius of the site.
2. Provide proper boundary fencing and give proof for that.
3. A clear plan for Compensatory Afforestation and provide the geo-tagged photographs of the proposed area and the consent of the land owner, if the land is owned by other persons.
4. Environmental Management Plan to be revised.
5. Revised CER with specific location of implementation and beneficiary details.
6. Provide a Comprehensive Storm Water Drainage Plan showing garland drains, silt traps, holding ponds and flow away channels

7. Plan for side protection made for the OB dump, considering its quantity, location and terrain specialty.
8. Drone video of the project site and surrounding areas within a 500m radius as per the Guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website with UI number of the Drone used for the survey
9. Steps should be taken to establish and monitor observation wells in the buffer zone through the District Officer, Ground Water Department, Kollam
10. Latest Survey Map indicating distance to all the built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary
11. Boundary Demarcation Certificate

Item No. 31 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Binu S, for an area of 2.6084 Ha at Block no. 01, Re-Sy Nos. 496/8, 467/5, 467/1, 467/2, 468/6, 468/7, 468/10 & 468/11in Pattazhi vadakkekkara village, Pathanapuram Taluk, Kollam - (SIA/KL/MIN/516038/2024)**

As per the application, the project cost is Rs. 1,70,50,000/-. The nearest house is located at a distance of 56m from the project boundary. The elevation of the area varies between 90m AMSL to 65m AMSL. The mining plan dated 29.11.2024; the mineable reserve is estimated as 9,43,475 MT for a mine life of is 5 years. The depth to the water table is 8m below ground level at 37m AMSL. The project proponent obtained NOC from the Irrigation Department, Kollam vide No. D2-QNOC/4076/EEI/KLM/2024 dated 20.11.2024, for conducting mining activities by controlled blasting method. The Cluster Certificate dated 29.11.2024, states that no working quarry in operation within a 500-meter radius of the quarry project. The nearest high hazard zone is 3.9 km and the medium hazard zone in 1.9 km away from the project site. The entire project area is in no hazard zone. **The Committee had entrusted a sub-committee for the field inspection in its 186th SEAC meeting and the field inspection was conducted on 12.12.2025**

The Committee had discussed the field inspection report in detail and decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following documents/details.

1. Vibration Study through a competent agency, measuring the impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay.
2. Provide proper boundary fencing and give proof for that.
3. Detailed working plan for Compensatory Afforestation.
4. Revised CER with specific location of implementation and beneficiary details.
5. Provide a Comprehensive Storm Water Drainage Plan showing garland drains, silt traps, holding ponds and flow away channels considering the site elevation and location of nearby water bodies.

6. Plan for side protection made for the OB dump, considering its quantity, location and terrain specialty.
7. Slope stability study report prepared by a competent agency
8. Drone video of the project site and surrounding areas within a 500m radius as per the Guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website with UI number of the Drone used for the survey.
9. Depth to water table below ground level in the nearest dug well along with geotagged photograph of the well, distance from the project boundary and site elevation.
10. Revise Project Cost incorporating all the aspects including land cost.
11. Provide Green belt development plan.
12. Revised biodiversity report.

Item No. 32 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M. T. Thomas, Managing Partner, M/s Thomson Granites, for an area of 4.0590 Ha at Block No. 06, Re-Survey Nos. 28/1-3, 28/1-5, 28/1-6, 28/1-7, 28/1-8, 29/2, 29/2-1, 29/2-3, 29/4, 29/5, 29/5-1, 29/6, 29/6-1, 29/6-2, 29/7, 29/8, 29/8-1, 29/9, 29/9-1, 29/9-2, 29/11 in Edakkunnam Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/517996/2025)**

As per the application, the expected project cost is provided as 4.1 crores. The elevation of the area varies between 234m to 106m AMSL. As per the Approved mining plan, the Mineable Reserves is 16,83,748 MT for a mine life of 8 years. 75-80% of the area of the proposed site falls within the High Hazard zone, and the rest is in medium hazard zone, as per the latest hazard zonation map. As per the Cluster certificate dated 02.12.2024, there are no quarries within 500 meters of the aforementioned quarry. As per the PFR, the nearest house is located outside the 100m of the mine boundary. Since the proposed site was under appraisal of the previous Committee and at that time, the project was in a medium hazard zone, and the field inspection was pending, the SEAC in its 186th meeting entrusted a subcommittee **to conduct the field inspection and report. The Field Inspection was conducted on 19-12-2025 .**

The Committee discussed the field inspection report in details and noted that 75-80% of the proposed site falls under the High Hazard Zone and the rest of the area is in the medium hazard zone. It is also noted that the elevation variation is about 128m, that constitutes high slope. Since the majority of the area comes under high hazard zone, wherein mining is prohibited. Considering the environmental fragility and the hazard status of the area the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the proposal.

Item No. 33 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Bhaskaran A.P, for an area of 3.7062**

Ha at Survey No. 465/1, 464/2, 464 & 465/2-1 at Vellilappally Village of Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/506416/2024)

As per the application, the project cost is Rs 2,94,00,000/-. As per the approved mining plan dated 08.10.2024, the mineable reserve is 10,50,450 MT for a mine life of 5 years. The elevation of the proposed area varies between 220m AMSL to 160m AMSL. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 26.10.2024, there are no quarries within 500 m of the proposed project area. The Water table is found at a depth of 10-12m below ground level (135-133m above MSL). The nearest house (H/o. Jomon Joseph) is located at a distance of 53.8m from the project boundary. Most of the area comes under low hazard zone and some parts is in the medium hazard zone. The nearest high hazard zone is 365m away from the project site. The Committee in its 186th SEAC meeting entrusted a subcommittee **for field inspection and report and the inspection was conducted on 18-12-2025**.

The Committee discussed the field inspection report in detail and decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following additional documents/details along with the presentation to be presented before the subsequent SEAC meeting.

1. Vibration Study report measuring teh impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay.
2. Biodiversity conservation and management plan
3. Risk Assessment and Disaster Management Plan
4. Valid NABL Certificate of the lab
5. Clear plan for Compensatory Afforestation.
6. Occupational Safety and Health Plan
7. Detailed Environment Management Plan
8. Revised CER with specific location of implementation and beneficiary details.
9. Provide a Comprehensive Storm Water Drainage Plan showing garland drains, silt traps, holding ponds and flow away channels considering the site elevation and location of nearby water bodies.
10. Plan for side protection made for the OB dump, considering its quantity, location and terrain specialty.
11. Slope stability study by a competent agency
12. Drone video of the project site and surrounding areas within a 500m radius as per the Guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website with UI number of the Drone used for the survey
13. Road connectivity to the project area with layout plan and other details.

Item No. 34. **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jismon A.B, M/s JS BLUEMETALS LLP, for an area of 1.9841 Ha at Block No. 23, Re-Survey Nos. 346/2pt, 346/3pt & 346/4pt at Vellilappilly Village of Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/508513/2024)**

As per the application, the project cost is Rs. 1,63,50,000/-. The elevation of the proposed area varies from 122m AMSL to 72m AMSL. The Mineable Reserves is estimated as 4,44,580 MT for a mine life of 5 years. The overburden thickness is 2m. As per the Cluster certificate dated 26.11.2024, there are two quarrying permits and an abandoned quarry pit within 500m of the proposed site. As per the PFR, the depth to the water table is found at a depth of 10-12m (53-55m above MSL). The Nearest house (H/o. Sabu Shreedharan) is located at a distance of 103 m from the lease boundary. The nearest high hazard zone is at a distance of 75m from the project site and the area is very close to medium hazard zone. The entire area comes under low hazard zoen. T**he Committee in its 186th SEAC meeting, entrusted a sub committee for field inspection and report. The Field Inspection was conducted on 18-12-2025.**

The Committee discussed the field inspection report in detail and decided to invite the Project Proponent for presentation along with the additional details mentioned below.

1. Biodiversity conservation and management plan
2. Comprehensive afforestation plan
3. Valid NABL Certificate of the lab
4. Relevant Risk Assessment and Disaster Management Plan
5. Vibration Study report measuring the impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per.
6. Provide proper Boundary fencing and give proof for that.
7. Plantation monitoring programme to ensure survival and growth rate of plantations
8. Occupational Safety and Health Plan
9. Hydrogeological survey considering the depth to water table and depth of mining
10. Explosions hazard management
11. Revised CER with specific location of implementation and beneficiary details.
12. Provide a Comprehensive Storm Water Drainage Plan showing garland drains, silt traps, holding ponds and flow away channels considering the site elevation and location of nearby water bodies.
13. Plan for side protection made for the OB dump, considering its quantity, location and terrain specialty.
14. Slope stability study
15. Drone video of the project site and surrounding areas within a 500m radius as

per the Guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website with UI number of the Drone used for the survey

16. Depth to water table below ground level in the nearest dug well along with geotagged photograph of the well, distance from the project boundary and site elevation
17. Revise Project Cost incorporating all the aspects including land cost
18. Provide Green belt plan & Revise EMP & CER

Item No.35 **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Group Housing Project, GREEN VISTAS – "PRAKRITI" of Sri. Saurabh Gulechha, Chief Operating Officer, M/s Green Vistas Infrastructure Projects at Re-survey No.359/3, in Kakkanad Village, Thrikkakara Municipality, Kanayanur Taluk, Ernakulam – Refer back from 161st SEIAA - Reg**
(File No.1189(A)/EC2/2018/SEIAA)
(Proposal No.SIA/KL/INFRA2/547905/2025)

The matter pertains to the Environmental Clearance (EC) application for the "Green Vistas – Prakriti" group housing project (75,886 m² built-up area; 500 apartments) by M/s Green Vistas Infrastructure Projects in Kakkanad Village, Ernakulam. The project is a designated violation case under the EIA Notification, 2006, as construction commenced and progressed without the mandatory prior EC. Despite this, municipal permits and partial occupancy certificates were obtained. Although the MoEF&CC issued Terms of Reference (ToR) under the 2017 amnesty notification with strict prohibitions on further work, a 2019 SEAC sub-committee inspection revealed active construction, a non-functional STP, and blatant ToR violations. Consequently, SEIAA enforced stop memos and directed KSPCB to initiate prosecution under the Environment (Protection) Act. This led to prolonged litigation in the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, and the appraisal process was further stalled by a Supreme Court stay on the MoEF&CC's July 2021 Violation Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

The legal impediments were recently removed following the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment on 18 November 2025 (CREDAI v. Vanashakthi), which upheld the validity of the 2017 Violation Notification and the 2021 SOP. Noting this development, SEIAA, in its 161st meeting on 17 January 2026, directed SEAC to resume the appraisal of the long-pending application in accordance with the existing MoEF&CC ToR and the EIA Notification, 2006. Pursuant to this directive, the project proponent submitted a revised Damage Assessment and Remediation Plan via email on 13 February 2026. The proposal, alongside the revised remediation plan, was placed before the Committee for detailed appraisal and the formulation of recommendations for SEIAA's further consideration.

After Detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to defer the proposal for further appraisal

Item No. 36 **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Ajikumar N for an area of 0.9690 Ha in Re-Sy No. 458/4, 458/4-1, 458/3, 458/12, 458/13, 458/9 at Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta SIA/KL/MIN/514750/2025**

As invited, the Project Proponent Sri. Ajikumar N and the RQP, Sri. V.K Roy were present before the Committee. The RQP made the presentation. The project cost is Rs. 1.159 Crores. Total mineable reserve as per the approved mining plan is 2,31,990MT. The elevation of the project site varies from 165m to 115m. The RQP made the presentation by revising the mining plan as 0.3335Ha in High Hazard Zone. Accordingly actual mineable reserve and production plans were modified.

After detailed discussion, the Committee noted that the Proposed Project is in Vadasserikkara Village which falls within an Eco-Sensitive Area (ESA) village as per the draft ESA Notification, where mining activities are prohibited in accordance with the directions dated 13.11.2013, by MoEF&CC. Since mining is not allowed in the ESA village, and the presence of High Hazard Zone in the proposed project area, the Committee decided to recommend rejection of the application.

Item No. 37 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Moitheen P.M. for an area of 2.0353 Ha at Block No.1, ReSurvey No. 611/1A/116/35/3, 611/1A/116/35/5, 611/1A/215/82/2 in KeeramparaVillage, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam.**
SIA/KL/MIN/552549/2025

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The project site is located 1.7 km away from the High hazard zone and 300m away from Medium Hazard Zone, as per the hazard zonation map published by the State Disaster Management Authority. The highest elevation within the lease area is 120 m above MSL on west, and the lowest elevation is 60 m above MSL towards the east. Nearest water table is available at a distance 203mtr away from BP4 is an (10°06'18.4"N 76°41'43.6"E) open well at an elevation of 48m AMSL. The water table is 10m BGL in the open well and the ultimate pit depth is 40m AMSL. The estimated life of the mine is 10 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 1,35,00,000/- as per CAF and Rs. 40,00,000/- as per form 1M.

After detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the following additional details and to entrust the sub-committee of Dr. Manoharan and Dr. V.B Vinayan for the field inspection and report.

1. **The realistic project cost should be submitted.**
2. **Environmental Management Plan prepared by a NABET accredited consultant.**

Item No. 38 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sunny P.K, Managing Partner, M/s St.Mary's Granites for an area of 2.9662 Ha at Block No.12, Survey Nos. 127/1-5, 127/1-6, 127/3-1, 127/3-2, 127/1-7 in Kombanad Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/548701/2025).**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the EIA report, approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Project Proponent had obtained the ToR letter on 06.07.2024 and the public hearing was conducted on 04.03.2025. The EIA report was prepared by M/s. Parivesh Environmental Engineering Services, a NABET accredited consultant. The project site is located 4.3 km from the high hazard zone and 1.3km from medium hazard zone. The highest elevation in the area is 95 m RL and lowest elevation is 50 m RL. The ultimate pit depth is 60m AMSL. As per the CGWB groundwater monitoring well water table varies from 0.54 to 12.05m BGL. The estimated life of the mine is 8 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 2.98 Crores/-. Total cost of the EMP is Rs. 18.17 Lac. The Committee noted that complaints from Sri.Ajesh and Sri.Gireeshkumar vide email dated 10.04.2025 and letter dated 07.11.2025, were received respectively against the quarry.

After detailed discussion, the Committee decided to entrust the sub-committee of Dr. Manoharan and Dr. Vinayan V.B for the evaluation of EIA and field inspection report. During the field visit, the complainants may also be heard.

Item No. 39 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Johnson. V, Director, M/s Kavalon Mines Solutions Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.9900 Ha at Block No.11, ReSurvey No. 215/1, 216/6 in Vengoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam. SIA/KL/MIN/552707/2025**

As invited, the Project Proponent Sri. Johnson was present along with the RQP Sri. V.K Roy were present before the Committee. The RQP made the presentation. Drone video of the proposed project site within a 500m radius was presented during the presentation. It is noted that the application was submitted in Form-1 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other essential documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The area is 3.3 km away from the medium hazard and 6.2km away from the High hazard zone. Highest elevation of the lease area is 55 m above MSL and the lowest is 30m above MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 15m AMSL. As per the open well at 20m AMSL, from a distance of 60m of the BP6, the water table is at 12m AMSL. Total mineable reserve is 1,95,364 MT. The estimated life of the mine is 3 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 1,25,00,000. Total cost of the EMP is Rs. 12,60,000/- and Rs. 7,50,000/- has been allocated for the CER.

After detailed deliberation, the Committee noticed certain shortcomings and decided to direct the following documents/details from the project proponent.

1. **Detailed plan for compensatory afforestation**
2. **Detailed Environment Management Plan prepared by a NABET accredited Consultant**
3. **A report based on actual pit measurements and/or core samples, clearly indicating the soil thickness over the proposed granite mining area including the photographs.**

Item No. 40 **Item No: 198 Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vijai Wilson, M/s. Hebron Mines and Industries Private Limited, at Block No. 43, Re-Survey Nos. 39/1 & 39/1-1, for an area of 2.8212 Ha. in Kondoor Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/552645/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal and noticed that the application was submitted in Form-2 and was accompanied with the approved Mining Plan, Pre-Feasibility Report, EMP, and other documents submitted by the Project Proponent. Majority of the project site is in low hazard zone with presence of Medium hazard zone on the north-east and south-west area of the project area. The highest elevation within the lease area is 130 m above MSL and the lowest elevation is 90 m above MSL. The highest water level has been observed in Open well at 71m above MSL. The ultimate pit depth is 80m AMSL. The estimated life of the mine is 7 years, and the total project cost is Rs. 5,96,00,000.

After detailed deliberation, the Committee decided to entrust the subcommittee of Dr. Rajendraprasad and Dr. Ansari Jamal for the filed inspection and evaluation of the project and to report.

Item No.41 **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Construction of Apartment cum Hotel project 'Artech Waves' of Sri. T.S Asok, Managing Director, AW Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. at survey nos. BL 16,382/12, 382/13, 382/14, 382/15, 382/16, 382/16-1, 382/16-2, 382/50, 382/52, 382/53, 382/56, 382/57, 382/58, 382/59, 382/60, 382/62, 382/63, 383/11, 383/12, 383/13, 383/14, 383/15, 383/16, 383/16-1 383/17, 383/18, 383/19-1, 383/20, 383/21, 383/21-1, 383/22, 383/24, 383/26, 383/4-1, 383/5, 383/5-1, 383/6, 383/7, 383/8, 383/9, 416/1-12, 416/8, 416/9, 417/2, 417/3-1, 417/3-2, 417/3-3-1, 417/3- 4-1, 417/3-4-2, 383/2, 382/45-1, 382/45, 382/46 in Chowara, Kottukal Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.- (SIA/KL/INFRA2/547241/2025)**

The Committee examined the proposal in detail along with the evaluation report. The total plot area is 24,543 m² and the total built-up area is 80,613.28 m², with a total project

cost of ₹130 crores. The proposed development consists of a G+26 floor building comprising 210 one-bedroom apartments, 63 studio rooms, 234 hotel rooms and 36 suite rooms. Demolition of four existing buildings with built-up areas of about 92.76 m^2, 19.40 m^2, 42.80 m^2 and 48.46 m^2 is also proposed. The estimated quantity of earth cutting is 50,000 m^3, and the excavated earth will be reused for filling within the project site to the extent possible, while the excess will be transported outside the site for use in government or private projects after obtaining necessary permission from the Department of Mining and Geology. Total wastewater generated within the project site ancillary area will be 3 kLD, which will be managed in a septic tank with soak pit. The total wastewater/sewage generation from the main blocks will be 96 kLD from the apartment block and 243 kLD from the hotel block, which will be treated in sewage treatment plants of capacities 100 kLD and 250 kLD, respectively. Solar panels are proposed to meet 5% of the total power requirement. As per the CZMP, the proposed site falls in Category 1 within CRZ II. The application for CRZ clearance was submitted to KCZMA vide File No. 1789/25 dated 08.05.2025, and the same has been uploaded in the PARIVESH portal under Proposal No. IA/KL/CRZ/540924/2025 dated 11.06.2025.

After detailed discussion, the Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following details/documents.

1. Land Environment: Attach panoramic view of the project site and the vicinity. Attach Maps of (i) site location, (ii) surrounding features of the proposed site (within 500 meters) and (iii) the site (indicating levels & contours) to appropriate scales. Details of soil type, slope analysis, vulnerability to subsidence, seismicity may be submitted
2. Details of on-site facilities provided for the collection, treatment & safe disposal of sewage (Give details of the quantities of wastewater generation, treatment capacities with technology & facilities for recycling and disposal). Storm water management, details of dual plumbing system
3. Give details of proposal for tree plantation, landscaping, creation of water bodies etc. along with a layout plan to an appropriate scale. Also furnish the direct or indirect impacts on the flora and fauna with special mentioning about micro, meso, and macro fauna coming under RET category.
4. Give details of background air quality levels and predicted values based on dispersion models considering the increased traffic density, due to the proposed constructions.
5. Furnish details of the present level of transport infrastructure and measures proposed for improvement including the traffic management at the entry & exit to the project site. During the construction period, because of loading, unloading, transport and handling of materials along with inhabitation of additional manpower may result in pollution in various segments: dust, noise, water, and waste dumbing. These may create a public nuisance and unhygienic conditions. What measures are proposed to control and minimize these negative impacts. Will the proposal create shortage of parking spaces for vehicles?
6. Aesthetics: Specify or list out the adverse impacts from new constructions on the existing nearby structures

7. Socio-Economic Aspects: Details of existing social infrastructure around the proposed project. Will the project cause adverse effects on local communities, disturbance to sacred sites or other cultural values? If so, what are the safeguards proposed.
8. Building Materials: Give details of energy conservation measures in the selection of building materials and their energy efficiency. Are recycled materials used in roads and structures? State the extent of savings achieved.
9. Garbage Management: Methods of collection, segregation and disposal of the garbage generated during the operation phases of the project.
10. Energy Conservation: Details of the power requirements, source of supply, backup source etc. What is the energy consumption assumed per square feet of built-up area?
    a. Methods employed to minimize energy consumption, characteristics of the glass including specifications of its characteristics related to both short wave and long wave radiation, Provide a self-assessment on the likely impacts of the proposed construction on creation of heat island & inversion effects?
    b. What are the general energy conservation measures (Electricity and Water) planned in the construction and operation phase of the project.
    c. Provide details of the transformers and motor efficiencies, lighting intensity and air-conditioning load assumptions?
    d. Details of using CFC and HCFC free chillers?
    e. Provide specifications. What are the thermal characteristics of the building envelope? (a) roof (b) external walls and (c) fenestration?
    f. Give details of the material used and the U-values or the R values of the individual components.
11. Fire Hazards: What precautions and safety measures are proposed against fire hazards? Furnish details of emergency plans
12. The submitted EMP is incomplete. The EMP should include all mitigation measures and item wise activity to be undertaken during the construction, operation and the entire life span of the project to minimize adverse environmental impacts. It should delineate the environmental monitoring plan for compliance with various environmental regulations. And it shall include the steps to be taken in case of emergency such as accidents including fire.

The Meeting ended at 5.30 PM
The Committee decided to convene its next meeting on 16th and 17th of March 2026.

Sd/-	**Sd/-**
Sri. Anirud Kumar Dharni IFS(Rtd)	**Suneel Pamidi IFS**
Chairman, SEAC	**Member Secretary, SEAC**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:

Sl.No.	Name	20th and 21st February 2026
1.	Sri. Anirud Kumar Dharni IFS(Rtd)	✓
2.	Dr. Ansari Jamal U.	✓
3.	Dr. M Rajaendraprasad	✓
4.	Dr. A. N. Manoharan	✓
5.	Dr. V. B. Vinayan	✓
6.	Sri. Suneel Pamidi IFS **(Secretary)**	✓