

**MINUTES OF THE 154th MEETING OF THE STATE
LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 25th FEBRUARY, 2025**

Present:

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

The 154th meeting of SEIAA, Kerala, was held from 25th February 2025. The meeting commenced at 10:30 A.M. and was chaired by Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu, Chairman, SEIAA Kerala, Sri. Mir Mohammed Ali IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA, attended the meeting. The Authority reviewed the agenda for the 154th meeting and took the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No. 154.1 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. J. Baiju, Managing Partner, M/s B & B Granites, for an area of 0.8075 Ha at Sy Nos. 911 & 912 in Thekkumkara Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur - Compliance with the Interim Order dated 31.05.2024 in WP(C) No. 35912/2023 - Interim Order in WP(C) No. 4302 of 2025 - Hearing**
(SIA/KL/MIN/272314/2022; 1339/EC2/2019/ SEIAA)

In order to comply with the judgment dated 10.02.2025 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 4302 of 2025, as intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri K. J. Biju, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent stated that he had addressed all the non-compliances of the EC conditions observed by the SEAC and submitted the compliance report. The Authority informed the Project Proponent that the compliance report, as per Ext P4 and P5, was incomplete. Accordingly, vide letter dated 15.02.2025, the Project Proponent was directed to submit a proper compliance report, citing all EC conditions and providing substantiating documents along with geo-tagged photographs. The Project Proponent agreed to do so.

Under these circumstances, the Authority, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, heard the Project Proponent and after considering his clarifications decided to direct the SEAC to inspect the site to verify the compliance status after receiving the revised compliance report from the Project Proponent. The action taken by the Authority shall be intimated to the Standing Counsel for submission before the Hon'ble Court.

As such decisions of Hon'ble High Court to permit mining operations without clearance from National Board for Wildlife, will adversely affect the environment in the project region leading increased man animal conflict around National Park and Sanctuaries, which is always on the raise in the densely populated state like Kerala, causing immense loss to life and property day by day, Authority decided request the Standing Counsel to file an appeal on priority. The legal officer to follow up the case with Standing Counsel.

Item No. 154.02 Environmental Clearance for the Commercial Complex Project of Sri. Mohamed Fazeem P, Designated Partner, M/s Thamarassery Lands LLP at Sy. No. 2/1B (Re Sy. Nos. 2/793, 794, 795, 796) in Kedavur Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/447068/2023, 2423/EC2/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. Mohamed Fazeem.P, Designated Partner, M/s Thamarassery Lands LLP, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Commercial Complex project at Sy. No. 2/1B (Re Sy. Nos. 2/793, 794, 795, 796) in Kedavur Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

In its 152nd SEIAA meeting, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance (EC) for the project as per the SEAC's recommendation. However, on further verification, the Authority observed that the proposed project area is located in Kedavur village, which is classified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village. This important aspect was not mentioned in the application for Environmental Clearance.

The Authority noticed that the MoEF&CC vide its Directions under Section 5 of EPA 1986 dated 13.11.2013 accepted the HLWG Report 'in principle' with certain stipulations and prohibited some activities including development projects like building and construction

projects for more than 20000 sq. m. in ESA villages. The MoEF&CC issued a draft notification on ESA on 31.07.2024, and the final notification is expected soon. In light of the recent devastating landslide at Vellarimala, an ESA village in Wayanad, the Authority, applying the precautionary principle, decided to withdraw its earlier decision taken in the 123rd SEIAA meeting to issue ECs for developmental projects as well as mining projects. Accordingly, the Authority has decided to defer all project proposals in ESA villages until the final notification is issued by MoEF&CC.

Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to cancel the decision taken in the 152nd SEIAA meeting to issue Environmental Clearance for the commercial complex project of M/s Thamarasserry Lands LLP and to return the application in original form to the Project Proponent

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

PART-1

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility by IMAGE-IMA at Block No 26, Re-Sy Nos: 340/1/19, 340/1/20, in KINFRA Park Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/434354/2023, 2308/EC1/2023/SEIAA)

The IMAGE – IMA, Head Quarters, Anayara, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala - 695029 submitted and Environmental Clearance for proposed Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility at Block No 26, Re-Sy Nos: 340/1/19, 340/1/20, Endaimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEIAA / SEAC meetings held on different dates. The Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report and Public Hearing documents and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the application, the total plot area is 1.214 Ha. The total built-up area is 5204.84 m² with a total treatment capacity of 20,000 kg/day.

The total project cost is Rs. 23.40 crore. The Kallada River is at 3.9 km south to the project area. A few houses (2 - 5) are noticed at a distance of 300 m. The ToR for the project was approved vide letter No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/404217/2022 dated 24.01.2023. The Public Hearing was conducted on 07.09.2024 and the Project Proponent vide letter dated 30.10.2024 submitted the response to the concerns raised in the Public Consultation.

The Authority noticed that the wastes generated from the health care facility will be disposed in accordance with the provisions of the Solid Waste Management Rules 2016. The methodology adopted in handling biomedical waste is based on CPCB guidelines. The possibility of contamination of the biomedical waste with radioactive waste is very meager. However, periodic screening will be done at the time of collection at the plant using detectors to avoid such contamination. No waste is directly exposed to the atmosphere at any stage of handling. Incinerable wastes will be treated in rotary kiln type double chamber incinerator

and the chance of odour nuisance or other related issues will be minimum. The proposed double chamber incinerator has a capacity of 500 kg/hour and can operate 20 hours a day. The water management will be done scrupulously as suggested in the detailed study carried out and Zero Liquid Discharge will be ensured for the surface and sub-surface flow.

The SEAC observed that the environmental issues raised during the public hearing and those issues raised in the complaints, are environmentally manageable with the implementation of the recommendations in the expert study, appropriate application and adoption of the proposed technologies and strict compliance to the guidelines of the enforcement agencies. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 179th meeting recommend EC for 10 years subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit.*
- 2. KSPCB and Project Proponent to ensure that the guidelines for CBWTF issued by CPCB are followed scrupulously with due care for ensuring proper treatment and disposal of biomedical waste.*
- 3. A Local Monitoring Committee (LMC), under the chairmanship of the President of the Grama Panchayat and including the elected member of the GP from the locality, representative of the industrial park, official of the Pollution Control Board and the Project Proponent should be formed to monitor the activities of the proposed plant on a regular basis to ensure that all the safeguards are intact.*
- 4. Green belt shall be maintained minimum at a rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in the Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
- 5. The measures proposed to ensure the prevention of any accidental spill of the waste/ leachate should be monitored on a daily basis and safeguards ensured.*
- 6. Appropriate number of wells within 1 km radius of the project site towards downstream side of the site should be identified through the LMC and weekly*

monitoring of water quality should be carried out for six months, initially, and monthly monitoring should be carried out subsequently by a NABL accredited laboratory. The results should be placed in the LMC and should be made available at the gate of the plant for public to refer.

- 7. Monitoring well should be maintained as recommended in the hydrogeological study and the groundwater quality should be monitored periodically by engaging NABL accredited Lab.*
- 8. Surface outflow and groundwater outflow from the project area should be monitored periodically by engaging NABL accredited Lab.*
- 9. All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the environmental management plan and suggested in response to the complaints raised should be complied with scrupulously.*
- 10. All the measures recommended in the hydrological and hydrogeological study should be complied with and reported to the LMC*
- 11. Rotary type of incinerator should be installed as it has better thermal efficiency, air mixing in the burning chamber and operational efficiency with improved emission quality.*
- 12. The onsite storage facility for storage of ETP sludge, ash, and mercury waste should have adequate storage capacity and the Proponent should ensure weekly removal and disposal of this waste in the treatment, storage and disposal facility (TSDF) for Hazardous Waste, currently located at Amabalamedu, Ernakulam.*
- 13. Project Proponent should install Ultra Filtration (UF)/RO facility in addition to Pressure Sand Filter and Pressure (PSF) and Pressure Carbon Filter (PCF) for enabling and ensuring recycling/reusing of tertiary treated wastewater to achieve zero discharge.*
- 14. The recommendations of the engineering feasibility study and hydrological and hydrogeological study should be implemented strictly*

15. *The surface water drainage system comprising of drains, channels, catch drains, culverts etc. should be implemented prior to the commissioning of the plant and it should be maintained properly and periodically.*
16. *Harness maximum solar energy, to meet partial power requirement and providing post type, solar yard lighting system, within and adjoining areas.*
17. *Rain water falling on active tipping areas should be collected separately and it should be collected through the leachate collection drain and leachate collection sumps and finally lead to the leachate treatment for treatment and disposal/ reuse.*
18. *Green belt should be developed all around the compound of the proposed plant in consultation with KFRI using indigenous species of trees, herbs and climbers prior to the commissioning of the plant.*
19. *Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented using indigenous species of plants, herbs and climbers prior to the commissioning of the plant and the progress of implementation of the plan and its maintenance should be submitted in the half-yearly compliance report along with geo-tagged photographs.*
20. *Disinfection and cleaning arrangements for the vehicles should be maintained at the entry and exit gates*
21. *The Corporate Environment Responsibility Plan should be implemented during the first two years of the project and it should be operated and maintained during the rest of the period of EC.*
22. *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 Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
23. *There should be regular vigil on the safeguard measures installed for possible accidental spillage of contaminants to the water body in the downstream area and the findings should be recorded in a log book which should be placed in the LMC on a regular basis.*
24. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirement during construction and operational phase is to be ensured and details should be given in HYCR.*

25. *The excavation of earth for construction should be limited to minimum and the activity should not affect the water sources of the nearby houses.*
26. *Climate responsive design as per Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted.*
27. *The green building criteria notified in the GO (Ms) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adopted.*
28. *Appropriate greening measures should be adopted on the ground as well as over built structure such as roofs, basements, podiums etc.to reduce the urban heat effect of civil structures.*
29. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having high solar reflective index.*
30. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
31. *All vehicles, including the ones carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
32. *All vehicles carrying construction / waste materials should be fully covered and protected.*
33. *All construction / waste materials of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
34. *Occupational health safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction & operation phases.*
35. *All vehicles during the construction / operation phase should carry PUC certificate.*
36. *D.G. set should be provided with adequate stack height and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase and would be provided with an acoustic enclosure.*
37. *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.***

38. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.
39. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste as the capacity of the local LSGD is inadequate.
40. Authority makes it clear that as per clause 8 (vi) of EIA notification 2006, deliberate concealment and/or submission of false or misleading information or data which is material to screening or scoping or appraisal or decision on the application shall make the application liable for rejection and cancellation of prior EC granted on that basis.
41. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with local self Govt. Institutions. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the Half Yearly 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.
42. 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.
43. 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.
44. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the existing Residential Building Construction project (Condor Cyber Gardens) M/s Condor Builders Pvt. Ltd. at. Sy. Nos. 172/9, 156/12, 171/5, 171/15, 171/12, 171/14, 171/17, 171/19, 171/20, 171/7, 157/33-1, 157/9 -1, 170/11, 170/2, 170/21-1, 171/11, 171/13, 171/18, 171/16, 171/3, 171/4, 171/6-1, 176/11-1, 176/12, 176/12-1, 176/7-1, 171/1, 170/1, 170/1-2, 170/1-1, 172/6, 172/8, 172/8-1, 171/2, 169/13-2, 157/6, 157/5, 171/6-2, 156/20-0, 157/20-0, 171/9-1, 172/4-0, 172/7-0, 172/2 in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/443950/2023, 2420/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decisions of various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. It was noted that, as per the application, the existing built-up area is 87,245.55 m² on a plot area of 2.297 Ha, comprising 522 dwelling units. The proposed expansion includes a built-up area of 32,190.23 m² with 163 additional dwelling units. The Project Proponent has also acquired an additional land area of 0.45409 Ha. Consequently, the total built-up area will be 1,19,435.78 m² for 685 dwelling units, with a total plot area of 2.75109 Ha. The proposed project cost is Rs. 263.8 Crore.

The Authority observed that the project had received Environmental Clearance (EC) on 13.07.2011 from MoEFCC for the construction of three residential towers with a total area of 1,00,876.64 m² on 2.297 Ha of land. By availing the two-year automatic extension, the EC period expired on 12.07.2018. As per the CCR dated 18.08.2023, the project was in the operational phase at the time of inspection. Two towers had been completed, while only the external structure of the third tower was completed and construction stopped due to the expiry of the EC period.

However, during a field inspection on 18.02.2024, the Sub-Committee observed that some construction work was ongoing at the project site, as corroborated by site photographs. The SEAC, in its 172nd meeting, noted that Google Imagery also indicated construction activity continuing beyond the EC expiry date of 12.07.2018. Therefore, referred the proposal to the Authority for appropriate action. In its 150th meeting, the SEIAA requested the SEAC to reconsider the proposal with the revised documentary evidence submitted by the Project Proponent.

The proposal was then placed in the 179th SEAC meeting, where the Committee found that the additional documents sought in the 164th and 168th SEAC meetings were not acceptable as documentary evidence to confirm that all existing built structures were developed before 12.07.2018. Google imagery further indicated that construction continued beyond the EC expiry date, suggesting a violation. Consequently, the Committee decided to recommend rejecting the EC application and initiating appropriate action for the violation.

On deliberation, the Authority is of the opinion that, since the Project Proponent had obtained prior environmental clearance for the construction of 1,00,876.64 m² but, as per the application, had only constructed 87,245.55 m², the SEAC shall provide the Project Proponent an opportunity to present his clarifications.

In view of the above, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for reconsideration, allowing the Project Proponent to be heard and for verifying the additional documentary evidences submitted by him as may be required by SEAC.

Item No.03

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ashraf P. for an area of 2.3203 Ha at Re-Sy. No. 172 in Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode
(SIA/KL/MIN/138725/2020; 1653/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Ashraf P., Pullancheri House, Valillapuzha P.O, Malappuram- 673639 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for Environmental Clearance in SEIAA for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.3203 Ha, at Re-Sy. No. 172 in Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The field inspection was conducted on 05.08.2023. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 10 years. As per the Cluster certificate dated 26.11.2024, there is no quarry in operation within a 500m radius of the proposed site.

As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 4,46,764 MT with an annual production of 44,676 MT. The depth to water table is 4m bgl at 85m above MSL. The highest

elevation of the proposed area is 190m MSL and lowest elevation of the proposed area is 95m MSL. Mining is proposed only up to 130m above MSL. The District Level Crisis Management Group issued the NOC vide dated 13.12.2024 for the project, subject to 3 conditions. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 10 years subject to submission 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 and certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

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

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field*

verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.

4. **The depth of mining should be limited to 130 AMSL as proposed in the mining plan.**
5. **A temporary protection wall of metal sheet should be erected between BP 1 – BP12 before the commencement of mining to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents and properties.**
6. **The conditions stated in the NOC from District Level Crisis Management Group should be strictly complied with.**
7. **The Comprehensive EMP, considering the adjacent projects, should be implemented diligently in consultation with the adjacent Project Proponents.**
8. 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), *Wrightia tinctoria* (Dhanthapala), *Ficus bengalensis* (Peral), *Ficus racemosa* (Atti), *Bambusa bamboos* (Mullumula), *Dendrocalamus strictus* (Kallan mula), *Strychnos nuxvomica* (Kanjiram), *Terminalia cattappa* (Thanni), *Schleichera oleosa* (Poovam), *Artocarpus hirsutus* (Ayiniplavu) etc.
9. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.
10. Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR
11. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
12. The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.
13. 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.

14. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
15. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
16. *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.*
17. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
18. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
19. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
20. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
21. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
22. *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.*
23. *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.*
24. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*

25. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
26. *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.*
27. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
28. *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.*
29. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.*
30. *Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*

31. *The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
32. *In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
33. *The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
34. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.04

Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. V. Radhakrishnan for an area of 0.5706ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 471/l(P) and 471/4(P) in Kuzhalmannam -1 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad

(SIA/KL/MIN/251165/2022, 2012/EC1/2022/SEIAA)

Sri. K. V. Radhakrishnan, Kundilpura House, Malamchittikalam, Kuthanur Post, Palakkad-678721 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Re-Sy Nos. 471/l(P) and 471/4(P) in Kuzhalmannam -1 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The proposal was considered in the 179th SEAC

meeting and the Committee examined the proposal and found that the SEAC in its 147th meeting recommended EC for a mine life of 5 years based on secondary information available.

Subsequently, the 131st SEIAA meeting noticed discrepancies in the Mining Plan as the area was found almost mined out without maintaining any benches. Accordingly, the Project Proponent submitted a revised mining plan, and the 144th SEIAA meeting directed the SEAC to conduct a field inspection to assess the feasibility of mining as per the revised mining plan. The Committee discussed the Field Inspection Report conducted on 27.12.2024 and inferred that the area is totally mined out and the possibility of mining as per norms is non-existent. After due appraisal, the SEAC recommended rejection of application considering the following salient aspects in the field.

1. The entire area is almost mined out and further systematic mining by maintaining benches is not found feasible at the site.
2. The existing mine pit has a depth of almost near to the level of water table and therefore, mining further one more bench is not found feasible.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.05

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. V. K. Ramachandran for an area of 0.9999 ha at Re-Sy Nos. 124/3 and 124/4 in Akathethara Villlage, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad

(SIA/KL/MIN/420459/2023, 2450/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. V. K. Ramachandran, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 0.9999 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 124/3 and 124/4 in Akathethara Villlage, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The proposal was considered in

the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee examined the proposal and discussed the field inspection report conducted on 27.12.2024. As per the field inspection report, it is observed that:

1. The project area falls in the fringe area of the Palakkad Gap of Western Ghats and breaking up the constellation of sheer rocky escarpments on the side of the Gap would seriously imperil the fragile land scape of the gap fringe.
2. The area experiences frequent wild elephant movement from the forested mountains adjacent to the Palakkad Gap. The man animal conflict in this project region of Palakkad are on the raise and the proposed Quarrying will further ~~may~~ aggravate this phenomenon, as wild animals specially wild elephants are known to receive and react to vibrations in the ground caused by blasting during mining.
3. Mining activity and the resultant dust pollution will affect the vegetative cover in the nearby forested areas.
4. A seasonal stream is flowing from N-S on eastern side of the proposed project area.
5. Presence of NE-SW and E-W trending lineaments are evident from the google imagery of the surrounding area of the proposed project. Along lineaments there are good aquifers and continued blasting may adversely affect such aquifer system.
6. The project area is surrounded by vested forest on three sides and ecologically fragile land (EFL) on the southern side. The site is surrounded by the forest ecosystem and the proposed project activities will have irreversible adverse environmental impact on the forest ecosystem.
7. A hanging power fence was seen erected by Forest department on the southern boundary of the property and the road to the proposed project site is through EFL land for a length of 140m.

After due appraisal, the SEAC observed that the project area is environmentally fragile and prone to heavy man animal conflict and hence recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking Precautionary principle.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.06 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sukumaran E., M/s. Perattur Rocks N Sands for an area of 4.6189 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 430/1pt116, 430/1pt607, 430/1pt66, 430/1pt841, 430/1pt473, 430/1pt842, 430/1pt701, 430/1pt843 in Thayanoor Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod (SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023, 2033/EC2/2022/SEIAA)

Sri. Sukumaran E., M/s. Perattur Rocks N Sands submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 4.6189 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 430/1pt116, 430/1pt607, 430/1pt66, 430/1pt841, 430/1pt473, 430/1pt842, 430/1pt701, 430/1pt843 in Thayanoor Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The field inspection was conducted on 21.03.2024. Public hearing of the project was conducted on 07.06.2023. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 20 years.

As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 33,16,864 MT with an annual production of 1,65,834 MT. The depth to water table is 10m bgl. The highest elevation of the area is 280 m AMSL and lowest is 160 m AMSL. The distance to the high hazard zone is 0.67 km. The nearest habitation is at 211 m towards the eastern side. The total project cost is Rs.3.51 Crore. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 20 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Upon deliberation, the Authority noted that the SEAC had expressed concerns that the proposed mineable reserve of 33,16,864 MT from an area of 4.6189 Ha appears to be higher than the projected yield. Additionally, the cluster EMP submitted by the Project Proponent, along with an affidavit, was found to be inadequate and not practical. The Authority is of the opinion that the mineable reserve mentioned in the mining plan may not be realistic,

considering the elevation difference of the area. Many of the TOR requirements are not addressed properly.

In light of these concerns, the Authority decided to hear the Project Proponent in the next meeting. Necessary intimation regarding the same shall be provided to the Project Proponent well in advance.

Item No.07

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Musthafa P.T.V, Proprietor, M/s P T V Granites for an area of 0.9900 Ha at Block No. 01, Re-Sy Nos. 347/5, 347/5-5 & 347/5-15 in Thachanattukkara-I Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/439323/2023, 2443/EC3/SEIAA/2023)

Sri. Musthafa P.T.V, Proprietor, M/S P T V Granites, Pothiyil Thottiparambil, Vadakethil House, Nattukal, Mannarkkad (P.O), Palakkad submitted Environmental Clearance application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Block No. 01, Re-Survey Nos. 347/5, 347/5-5 & 347/5-15 at Thachanattukkara-I Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 2,07,140 MT and the life of mine is 3 years. The highest elevation is 160 m above MSL and the lowest is 120 m above MSL. The high hazard zone is at 10.2 km and the medium hazard zone is at 1.71 km. The Silent Valley National Park is at a distance of 12.61 km as per the letter dated 24.05.2024 from the DFO, Silent Valley Division. The project cost is Rs.1.38 crore. As per the additional documents submitted on 07.06.2024, the water table is at a depth of 20 – 22 below the ground level. In the monsoon season, the water table is at a depth of 2m below ground level.

After due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for 3 years subject to the submission of 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 and certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue EC for a period of 3 years subject to the production of 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 dated 19.04.2024.

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

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The depth of mining should be limited to 120m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.*
- 4. A temporary protection wall of 5m should be erected at appropriate locations on the boundary before the commencement of mining to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents and properties.*
- 5. 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), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
- 6. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*

7. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
8. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
9. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
10. *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.*
11. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
12. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
13. *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.*
14. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
15. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
16. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
17. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*

18. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
19. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
20. *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.*
21. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
22. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
23. *A copy of the EC shall be marked to Wild Life Warden Silent Valley National Park for information and necessary further action as per local Environmental consideration.*
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 OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
26. *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.

27. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.

28. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.

29. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.

30. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.

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

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.08

Re-appraisal DEIAA, Kasaragod issued EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Biju Thomas, for an area of 1.6540 Ha at Sy No. 146/1 in Kallar Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod

(SIA/KL/MIN/452003/2023, 2511/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

Sri. Biju Thomas submitted a re-appraisal application for the Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, for an area of 1.6540 Ha at Sy. No. 146/1 in Kallar Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions made in various SEAC meetings held on different dates. It was observed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, the Pre-Feasibility Report, the Mining Plan, and additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during the appraisal process. The SEAC noted that the project had obtained Environmental Clearance (EC) from the DEIAA vide No. A 6500/17/DEIAA, dated 20.10.2017.

As per the Mining Plan approved on 07.07.2017, the proposed mineable reserve was 6,44,268 T for a mine life of 12 years. The Project Proponent obtained a lease order vide order dated 09.01.2018 for a period of 12 years, valid until 08.01.2030. The balance quantity, as per the Scheme of Mining approved on 25.05.2022, is 3,64,330 MT. However, contradicting the Scheme of Mining, a letter dated 17.04.2024 from the District Geologist stated that the balance resource available for mining is 5,90,120 MT.

Citing this contradiction, the SEAC, after due appraisal, recommended granting environmental clearance for 12 years from the date of the original EC (20.10.2017), subject to the condition that the Project Proponent shall submit a No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Irrigation Department, in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003, as directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024, dated 19.04.2024.

Upon deliberation, the Authority noted the discrepancy in the balance quantity of mineable resources as per the Scheme of Mining approved on 25.5.2022 is given as 3,64,330 MT. and in the letter dated 17.4.2024 from the District Geologist stated that the balance resource available for mining is 5,90,120 MT.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to seek clarification on the balance mineable resources. The Project Proponent is directed to submit the data on ROM as per the KOMPAS as of 31.01.2025.

Item No.09 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Kaderbabu E. K for an area of 3.4739 Ha at Block No. 2, Sy Nos. 111/4, 111/7, 111/8, 111/2, 111/10, 111/5, 111/6 in Kannamangalam Village, Tirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/47565/2019, 1515/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Kaderbabu E. K, Edathola Kottasseri House, Eranipadi, Kannamangalam P.O, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 3.4739 Ha at Block No. 2, Sy Nos. 111/4, 111/7, 111/8, 111/2, 111/10, 111/5, 111/6 in Kannamangalam Village, Tirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the revised EIA, the project cost is Rs. 3.85 Crore. The public hearing was conducted on 24.09.2021. The field inspection was conducted on 05.08.2023. The total mineable reserve is 10,56,417.5 MT for a mine life of 12 years. The elevation of the area varies between 365m MSL to 190m MSL. The ultimate pit level proposed is 185m AMSL.

The Project Proponent has obtained NOC from the Irrigation Department, Malappuram vide order dated 09.12.2024 subject to 12 conditions. The site falls under the medium hazard zone and the Project Proponent has obtained NOC from the District Crisis Management Group, Malappuram vide order No. DCMPPM/7056/2024-DM5 dated 26.05.2014 subjected to 3 remarks. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 12 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the

department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 12 (Twelve) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

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

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
- 4. The depth of mining should be limited to 185 AMSL as proposed in the mining plan.*
- 5. The conditions stated in the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group should be strictly complied with.*
- 6. The conditions stated in the NOC from the Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with.*
- 7. All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the minutes of the Public Hearing should be complied with.*
- 8. 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), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.

- 9. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
- 10. Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
- 11. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
- 12. The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
- 13. 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.*
- 14. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 15. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
- 16. 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.*
- 17. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
- 18. 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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.

- 19. Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
- 20. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
- 21. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 22. 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.*
- 23. 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.*
- 24. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
- 25. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 26. 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.*
- 27. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise.*

The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.

- 28. 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.*
- 29. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.*
- 30. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 31. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 32. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 33. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 34. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.10 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Muhammedali P. for an area of 5.0511 Ha at Block No. 56, Sy No. 382/1-2, 382/2, 383/1, 383/1-1 in Morayur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.**

(SIA/KL/MIN/78419/2019, 1516/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Muhammedali.P, Parancheeri House, Aravankara, Pookkottur.P.O. Malappuram, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 5.0511 Ha at Block no.56, Sy.No.382/1-2, 382/2, 383/1, 383/1-1 in Morayur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram. The ToR for the proposal was issued on 31.05.2021.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, EIA Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The revised project cost is Rs. 2.83 Crore. The public hearing was conducted on 19.01.2022.

The field inspection was conducted on 20.10.2024. The total mineable reserve is 30,34,007.5 MT for a mine life of 20 years. The elevation of the proposed area varies between 365 m MSL to 255m MSL. The Project Proponent has obtained NOC from the Irrigation Department, Malappuram vide order dated 21.11.2024 subject to 12 conditions. The site falls under the medium hazard zone and the Project Proponent has obtained NOC from the District Crisis Management Group, Malappuram vide order No. DCMPM/9076(4)/2023-E7 dated 12.07.2024. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 20 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 20 (Twenty) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

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

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. **The depth of mining should be limited to 255 AMSL as proposed in the mining plan.**
5. **Considering the slope, terrain, and nature of soil conditions, water logging at the higher reaches is to be avoided at every stage of quarry operations.**
6. **The garland canal with required carrying capacity has to be ensured right from the initial stages of quarry operation and its connectivity through the culvert (crossing the road) and under the crusher area are to be ensured.**
7. **The boulders at the project site should be managed prior to the commencement of the quarry operation.**

8. *A permanent mines manager has to be posted and mining has to be undertaken as per strict norms as outlined in the reports of slope study, land susceptibility study and vibration studies during blasting.*
9. *Removal of vegetation has to be undertaken only in a phased manner.*
10. *The conditions stated in the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group should be strictly complied with.*
11. *The conditions stated in the NOC from the Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with.*
12. *All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the minutes of the Public Hearing should be complied with.*
13. *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), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
14. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
15. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
16. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
17. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
18. *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.*

19. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
20. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
21. *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.*
22. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
23. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
24. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
25. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
26. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
27. *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.*
28. *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.*
29. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*

30. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
31. *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.*
32. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
33. *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.*
34. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.*
35. *Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*

- 36. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 37. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 38. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 39. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

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

Item No.01 **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. C.K. Abdul Azeez, Managing Director, M/s Grand Stone Metals Pvt. Ltd for an area of 4.8240 Ha at Sy Nos. 3, 21/1, 21/2, 22, 23, 24 in Kannamangalam Panchayat & Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/306709/2023, 906/SEIAA/EC1/ 3538/2015)

Sri. C. K. Abdul Azeez, Managing Director, M/s Grand Stone Metals Pvt. Ltd. submitted an application for the revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued from SEIAA to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. Nos. 3, 21/1, 21/2, 22, 23, 24 in Kannamangalam Panchayat, Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 4, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The SEAC noticed that EC for the project was issued on 16.11.2017 for a period of five years and the validity has expired on 15.11.2022. The mine life estimated as per the approved mining plan is 22 years.

As per the scheme of mining dated 12.06.2023, the remaining mineable reserve is 14,87,845 MT. The Project Proponent also submitted the photographs showing rectification of bench height and maintenance of 45° slope. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 20 years from the date of original EC after obtaining 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 subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to revalidate the Environmental Clearance for a period of 20 years from the date of issuance of original EC, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has

violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

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

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. **All the specific conditions stipulated in the original EC dated 16.11.2017 shall form part of this EC as well.**
5. **Depth of mining should be limited to confine the mining to the terrain slope and prevent formation of mine pit to avoid water impoundment in the sloping terrain.**
6. **The natural drain in and around the proposed area should be preserved and drainage should be allowed without any hindrance.**
7. **The non-compliance, if any, reported in the CCR should be rectified within 6 months and the rectification report should be uploaded along with the HYCR.**
8. **A buffer distance of 100m should be maintained between the project boundary and all the built structures near the proposed site.**
9. **A temporary wall of 5m height should be provided at appropriate locations prior to the commencement of mining to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residences and other built structures.**
10. *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), *Writhia tinctoria* (Dhanthapala), *Ficus bengalensis* (Peral), *Ficus racemosa* (Atti), *Bambusa bamboos* (Mullumula), *Dendrocalamus strictus* (Kallan mula), *Strychnos nuxvomica* (Kanjiram), *Terminalia cattappa* (Thanni), *Schleichera oleosa* (Poovam), *Artocarpus hirsutus* (Ayiniplavu) etc.

11. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
12. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
13. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
14. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
15. *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.*
16. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
17. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
18. *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.*
19. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
20. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

21. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
22. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
23. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
24. *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.*
25. *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.*
26. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
27. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
28. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
29. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the*

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

- 30. 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.*
- 31. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.*
- 32. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 33. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 34. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 35. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 36. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of

the Chief Engineer, 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-2)

PART-1

Item No.01

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Bijulal D, for an area of 2.4113 Ha at Re-Sy Block No. 4, Re-Sy Nos. 199/11-2, 200/2, 200/4 & 200/5 in Pattazhy Village, Pathanapuram Taluk, Kollam
(SIA/KL/MIN/459288/2024)

Sri. Bijulal D., Mundakkal Melathil, Panconam, Mukhathala P.O, Kollam – 691 575 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.4113 Ha at Re-Survey Block No.4, Re-Survey Nos. 199/11-2, 200/2, 200/4 & 200/5 in Pattazhy Village, Pathanapuram Taluk, Kollam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The SEAC observed that the DEIAA, Kollam rejected environmental clearance to the proposal in the past, due to the objections raised by Pattazhy Grama Panchayath and Kerala Water Authority stating that quarrying can damage the water tank and treatment plant situated adjacent to the proposed quarry. Subsequently, the applicant obtained NOC from the Executive Engineer, KWA for quarrying operations without causing damage to the water tank or water purification plant.

The Committee observed that the total mineable reserve is 5,75,430 MT for a mine life of 5 years as per the Mining Plan. The elevation of the area varied between 165 m to 80m AMSL. The depth to water table is 6m below ground level at 66 m AMSL. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 5 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan*

and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.

2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.
3. **The depth of mining should be limited to 76m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.**
4. **A buffer of 200m should be maintained between the water tank and the project boundary at BP5 as per the Order No. G.O.(Ms) No. 6/2025/WRD dated 20.01.2025.**
5. **Blasting for mining should be in strict compliance to the recommendations provided in the study report of NIT, Karnataka.**
6. **The conditions stated in the NOC from the Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with.**
7. 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), *Wrightia tinctoria* (Dhanthapala), *Ficus bengalensis* (Peral), *Ficus racemosa* (Atti), *Bambusa bamboos* (Mullumula), *Dendrocalamus strictus* (Kallan mula), *Strychnos nuxvomica* (Kanjiram), *Terminalia cattappa* (Thanni), *Schleichera oleosa* (Poovam), *Artocarpus hirsutus* (Ayiniplavu) etc.
8. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.
9. Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR
10. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.

11. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
12. *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.*
13. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
14. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
15. *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.*
16. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
17. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
18. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
20. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
21. *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.*

22. *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.*
23. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
24. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
25. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
26. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
27. *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.*
28. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.

- 29. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 30. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 31. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 32. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 33. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Unnikrishnan K. for an area of 0.6067 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 186/1, 3, 5 in Thachanattukkara-II Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/468658/2024)

Sri. Unnikrishnan K, Katturayil House, Mattarakkal, Perinthalmanna, Malappuram - 679322 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area at 0.6067 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 186/1, 3, 5 in Thachanattukkara-II Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. It is noted that by considering the

existing norms, the SEAC had observed that the mining shall be permitted by maintaining a buffer of 50m from all the built structures adjacent to the project boundary. The width of the area proposed is 62m on top of an isolated hillock and it is difficult to maintain a buffer of 50m from the nearest built structures and the formation of deep water body at a top of hill is not advisable. Hence, the mining with feasibility of only 2 benches by removing the vegetation in the site is not desirable for the upkeep of the environment and hence the SEAC in its 172nd meeting recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking the precautionary principle.

The proposal was again considered in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee examined the proposal in detail as directed by the 150th SEIAA meeting and discussed it in detail. The Project Proponent clarified that the mineable reserve proposed is 1,09,285 MT for a mine life of 3 years. The ultimate pit level proposed is 30m AMSL and the elevation of the area varies between 55m to 44m AMSL.

It is also stated that the mining plan is prepared by considering the depth to water table and the development plan suggests only 4 benches. The Committee observed that the project is proposed on top of an isolated hillock and developing a mine pit up to the proposed depth is not desirable. Therefore, the Committee adhered to the earlier decision taken in the 172nd SEAC meeting to reject the proposal by invoking the precautionary principle.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.03 Environmental Clearance for the Ordinary Earth Removal Project of Sri. Suresh K. K. for an area of 0.5722 Ha (57.22 Ares) at Block No. 32, Re-Sy Nos. 383/13-1, 384/9-2-2, 384/13-2-2, 384/10, 384/22, 384/23 in Mazhuvannoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/469574/2024)

Sri. Suresh K. K., Karikakuzhiyil House, Nellad, Mazhuvannoor P.O, Ernakulam submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for the Ordinary Earth Removal Project for an area of 0.5722 Ha (57.22 Ares) at Block No. 32, Re- Sy No. 383/13-1, 384/9-2-

2, 384/13-2-2, 384/10, 384/22, 384/23 in Mazhuvannoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. During appraisal, the SEAC observed that the work order dated 12.08.2024 stated that the 30,000 m³ ordinary earth will be utilized for the filling of Perumbavoor Bypass Phase-1. But the details of the land to be filled are not included in the work order. The maximum depth of excavation proposed is relatively high, up to 12m and the impact of excavation of soil on the three houses is not addressed adequately. Hence the SEAC in its 172nd meeting recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking precautionary principle.

As per the decision of the 150th SEIAA, the project proposal reconsidered in the 179th SEAC meeting and discussed it in detail. The Committee noted the representation submitted by the Project Proponent vide letter dated 23.11.2024 requesting reconsideration of the proposal along with revised production plan. As per the revised production plan, considering the close proximity of houses, a buffer of 50m from the houses near to the site is proposed and the excavation is limited up to 68m RL.

The total quantity of ordinary earth proposed to be extracted is 27,727 m³. The Committee observed that the mining is feasible only up to 6.5m below ground level considering the depth to water table at 8.5m bgl. Since the site is proposed on top of a hillock and considering the risk to the nearby population and environmental impacts to the nearby areas, the SEAC rejected the application invoking Precautionary Principle.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application by invoking Precautionary Principles. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.04

Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued by SEIAA for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vinu Mani, Managing Partner, M/s. Paramount Granites for an area of 3.8669 ha at Sy Nos. 223 pt, 223/2, 223/6 pt, 118/14 pt, & 118/15 in Vandazhi - I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad

Sri. Vinu Mani, Managing Partner, M/s. Paramount Granites, 11/780, Odukoor, Chittadi, Palakkad 678706 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area at 3.8669 ha at Sy Nos. 223 pt, 223/2, 223/6 pt, 118/14 pt, & 118/15 in Vandazhi - I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings. The Authority noticed that the Project Proponent had submitted the revalidation application on 06.04.2022 and the Sub-Committee, SEAC inspected the site on 27.09.2022 and the presented the project on 08.06.2022. Subsequently, the Project Proponent has directed to apply through PARIVESH Portal and he submitted the application on 04.01.2024. The proposal was again presented in the 164th SEAC meeting as per approved scheme of mining and based on discussion, the SEAC recommended EC for 12 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to general conditions.

However, due to technical issue in the PARIVESH 1.0 Portal, the project proposal was not submitted before the Authority and the Project Proponent was directed to submit fresh application in Form 6 via PARIVESH 2.0. Accordingly, the Project Proponent resubmitted his application in 21.06.2024. The proposal was then considered in the 167th, 169th and 172nd SEAC meeting and the 172nd SEAC has directed to the Project Proponent has to apply for ToR for conducting EIA study, considering the cluster condition.

As per decisions of the 150th SEIAA, the proposal was re-considered in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee examined the proposal in detail. The Committee noticed that the project was issued EC No. 664/SEIAA/EC1/5179/2014 dated 18.8.2017 for 5 years. Subsequently, the Project Proponent submitted an application for revalidation on 6.4.2022. The 164th SEAC meeting recommended issuance of EC. As required due to technical reasons with respect to PARIVESH portal, the Project Proponent was directed to upload the application along with all details online.

The uploaded Cluster Certificate from the M&G Department dated 06.09.2024, stated that there are 3 quarries within 500m radius; the Quarry of M/s Peejay Granites (4.7664 Ha (Working)), Quarry of M/s. Prakash (0.9712Ha. (Permit expired)) and M/s TMT Granites (5.0116 Ha (Working)) and hence the total area of mine within the cluster is more than 5 Ha.

As per the EIA notification, the cluster condition warrants EIA study and Public Consultation. During the earlier appraisal process, the Project Proponent had submitted a cluster certificate from the Village officer stating that there is a quarry within 500 m radius, but the areal extent of the quarry was not mentioned in it and there was an inadvertent error from the part of the SEAC in judging the cluster condition earlier during the 164th meeting of the SEAC. Therefore, the SEAC recommended ToR for EIA study as per the provision of EIA notification.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application, with a direction to the Project Proponent to submit ToR application for EIA study. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.05 Reappraisal of Environment Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. P. M. Abdul Rahiman for an area of 3.2420 Ha at Sy No: 428/pt in Thayannur Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod.
(SIA/KL/MIN/448887/2023)

Sri. P. M. Abdul Rahiman, Muhammed Kunhi, Rahmaniya Manzil, Udma-Post, Kasaragod – 671319, submitted reappraisal application for the Environment Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kasaragod, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, for an area of 3.2420 Ha at Sy No: 428/pt in Thayannur Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of the 172nd SEAC meeting. As per the cluster certificate dated 23.07.2024, there is another working quarry owned by Smt. Savithri Thamban, for an area of 2.9727 Ha within 500m radius. Hence, the area altogether comes more than 5 Ha indicating cluster condition. Accordingly, the SEAC in its 172nd meeting directed the Project Proponent to submit application for ToR for conducting EIA study.

The Authority in its 150th SEIAA meeting refer the representation of the Project Proponent dated 11.11.2024, requesting for exemption from ToR and EIA study to the SEAC for reconsideration. The Project Proponent stated that M/s. Perattur Rocks (SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023), a quarry located within the 500m cluster has already prepared

EIA report, considering all the aspects of his quarry as well. It is also claiming that the EIA report/EMP covers all the essential environmental details considering the Core Zone, Extended Zone, and Buffer Zone. In addition, the production details and minable reserves of the aforementioned proposal are also included in the combined EIA and EMP by anticipating the environmental impacts.

As per the decision of the 150th SEIAA, the 179th SEAC examined the proposal and the Committee noted the letter of the Project Proponent dated 11.11.2024, requesting exemption from ToR for EIA study as there is an EIA study conducted for the cluster by M/s. Perattur Rocks (SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023) in which the details pertaining to his quarry is also included. The Committee examined the EIA report prepared by the accredited EIA consultant for M/s. Perattur rocks and observed that all the projects including this one are described in the report and the activities of the projects are considered while assessing the environmental impacts.

However, the EMP is prepared only based on the mitigation measures applicable to the project of M/s. Perattur Rocks and the CER applicable to it. M/s. Perattur Rocks submitted an affidavit signed by the Project Proponents of the three projects falling in the cluster which incorporated a Project EMP describing the environment management measures pertaining to the project of M/s. Perattur Rocks and a Cluster EMP describing certain management measures applicable to the projects in the cluster.

The Cluster EMP is found sketchy and need revision. The EIA report also does not address the Environmental Monitoring Plan and Risk Assessment Plan pertaining to the other two projects in the cluster. The Cluster EMP also does not describe the responsibility sharing. Therefore, the Committee recommended to direct the Project Proponent to submit a detailed Regional EMP applicable to the entire cluster incorporating the mitigation measures, environmental monitoring requirements, risk management measures and CER applicable for his projects, in particular and cluster projects, in general, along with detailed responsibility mapping for implementation of the Regional EMP.

Further, the SEAC scrutinized the reappraisal application submitted by the Project Proponent and observed that the Project Proponent has submitted mine plan dated 18.01.2018, scheme of mining dated 06.03.2023, baseline monitoring data of November 2023, survey map dated 07.08.2024, cluster certificate dated 23.7.2024, CCR dated 05.02.2024, HYCR pertaining to Oct 23 to Mar 24, EMP, valid mine lease document, DSR

and the DEIAA EC dated 05.07.2018. The Committee noted that the Project Proponent has not submitted all the applicable documents required for the appraisal, such as the PFR, details of ecologically sensitive zones, details of Schedule I species, if any, compliance of Hon. Supreme Court judgment dated 02.08.2017 and proposal for re-grassing in compliance to the direction of Hon. Supreme Court dated 08.01.2020. Therefore the Committee is unable to reappraise the project and recommended rejection for applying afresh with all the required documents.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application with a direction to the Project Proponent to apply afresh with all the documents as stipulated in the O.M dated 28.04.2023, including the regional EMP as decided by the SEAC for the cluster condition. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.06

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Saji Abraham for an area of 0.8212 Ha at Block No.1, Sy Nos. 533/1-4, 533/1-5 in Manjalloor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk Ernakulam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/495489/2024)

Sri. Saji Abraham, Thekkeyil House, Kaithakkadu, Pazhamthottam, Ernakulam – 683565 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.8212 Ha at Block No. 1, Sy Nos. 533/1-4, 533/1-5 in Manjalloor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk Ernakulam.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 1,70,463 MT with an annual production of 85,231 MT and life of mine is 2 years. The project cost is Rs. 1 Crore. The elevation of the proposed area varies between 64m RL and 96m RL. The depth to water table is provided as 10m below ground level. After the due appraisal, the 179th SEAC recommended EC for a period of 2 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for a period of 2 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit subject to submission of NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

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

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **The depth of mining should be limited to 56m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.**
4. **Temporary wall of 5m height should be provided along the boundary connecting BP5 and BP6 considering the nearness of the road.**
5. **On completion of the mining activity, a permanent protective wall should be provided to the mine pit formed along the boundary adjacent to the road**
6. *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), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*

7. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
8. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
9. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
10. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
11. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
12. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
13. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
14. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
15. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
16. *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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
17. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*

18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
19. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
20. *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.*
21. *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.*
22. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
23. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
24. *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 OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
26. *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.

- 27. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.*
- 28. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 29. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 30. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 31. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 32. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, 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 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

Item No.07

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Survey Nos. 147/2 (pt), 149/1(pt), 149/2 (pt), 150/1, 150/3(pt), 151/1(pt) & 151/2(pt) in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Extension of Validity - Reg

(Old File No. 1021/EC1/001/SEIAA/2016)

(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/496969/2024)

Sri. Mohammed Nisar, M/s. Majestic Granites submitted an application for the revalidation of the Environmental Clearance issued on 29.05.2017, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Survey Nos. 147/2 (pt), 149/1(pt), 149/2 (pt), 150/1, 150/3(pt), 151/1(pt) & 151/2(pt) at Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions made during various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 6 and the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance (EC) was issued on 29.05.2017, with its validity expiring on 28.05.2023 after accounting for the COVID-19 exemption. The lease deed (No. 389/2021-22) was executed on 02.02.2022. The Project Proponent submitted an application for revalidation on 07.05.2022.

The mineable reserve, as per the mine plan approved on 07.12.2015, was 35,79,000 MT with a mine life of 30 years. A revised mine plan, approved on 20.01.2021, indicates a reduced mineable reserve of 23,02,755 MT with a mine life of 12 years. The District Geologist, through a letter dated 24.08.2023, certified that the balance quantity available for mining during the lease period is 21,73,805 MT. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 174th meeting, recommended that the project is eligible for revalidation of the EC for 12 years from the date of lease execution (02.02.2022) as per the provisions of SO 1807(E).

Upon deliberation, the 151st SEIAA noted that, as per the cluster certificate dated 27.04.2022, the following three authorized quarries situated within a 500-meter radius indicate a cluster situation: (i) Quarry of Sri. Jyothish Kumar with an area of 1.4075 ha; (ii) Quarry of M/s Malabar Bricks & Metals with an area of 2.3978 ha; (iii) Quarry of Azad M.M. with an area of 4.8522 ha. Additionally, the Authority observed that the project area is located in a moderate hazard zone and that the Project Proponent has not submitted the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group. Therefore, the Authority referred the

proposal back to SEAC to consider the above observations and provide fresh recommendations.

As per the decision of the 151st SEIAA, the project proposal was reconsidered in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee examined the proposal and discussed it in detail. By considering the cluster condition, the medium landslide susceptibility of the area and desirability of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study and evaluation of the carrying capacity of the region, the SEAC recommended rejection of the proposal for facilitating the submission of application for ToR for conducting EIA study and Public Consultation.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application, with a direction to the Project Proponent to submit ToR application for EIA study. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.08

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. O. P. Muhammed Basheer, Managing Director, M/s Bestonne Granite Metals Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 3.9924 Ha at Block No. 16 Re-Sy Nos: 490/10, 490/9, 490/7, 490/8, 490/3, 478/9, 478/3, 479/1 & 480/7, in Kuzhalmannam I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/483460/2024)

Sri. O. .P Muhammed Basheer, Managing Director, M/s Bestonne Granite Metals Pvt. Ltd., XIII/64A, Nochully P.O., Armamcode, Kuzhalmannnam, Palakkad 678702 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 3.9924 Ha at Block No. 16, Re-Survey Nos: 490/10, 490/9, 490/7, 490/8, 490/3, 478/9, 478/3, 479/1 & 480/7, in Kuzhalmannam I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The proposal was considered in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee found that as per the Cluster Certificate dated 10.01.2025, the following 3 quarries are found within 500m radius.

1. Quarry Sri OP Muhammed Rasheed with an extent of 0.9947 Ha and the mine closure plan submitted on 09.12.2024.
2. Quarry of Sri. V Sasidharan for an area of 0.6530 Ha (Validity expired, currently not working).
3. Quarry of Mr. K.V. Radhakrishnan for an area of 0.5706 Ha (Letter of Intent issued on 28/03/2018. Statutory licenses not submitted till date)

The total area of the quarries within 500m radius is more than 5Ha and the area within the cluster is found environmentally very fragile. Further the cumulative impact on the environment and local livelihood due to existing and proposed mining can be properly understood only through a detailed EIA study. Cumulative carrying capacity of the local roads is also to be considered. So the Committee decided that it is necessary to conduct EIA study and public consultation as per the EIA Notification 2006 for which the Proponent has to apply for ToR. Therefore, the SEAC recommend rejection of the present proposal.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application with a direction to the Project Proponent to submit the TOR application for EIA study. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.09 Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Building project of M/s Sobha Contracting Pvt. Ltd at Re-Sy Nos. 128/2, 128/18-2, 128/19-2, in Cheruvakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/487184/2024)

Sri. Venugopal V. G., Authorized Signatory, M/s Sobha Contracting Pvt. Ltd., 91/1042 (4), 1st Floor, Tritvam Building, N.H. Bypass Road, Karikkakam, Anayara PO, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala - 695029 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Residential Building Project in an area of 0.8024 ha at Re-Survey Nos. 128/2, 128/18-2, 128/19-2, in Cheruvakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents

obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The proposal was considered in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee noticed that as per the application, the total built-up area is 34,771.48 sq. m for 120 apartments in a proposed plot area of 0.8024 Ha. However, during the presentation, the Project Proponent requested to change the built-up area to 38,620.6 sq. m and the number of dwelling units to 118 nos. Consequently, there will be change in the FAR area, ground coverage, number of parking and excavation of the quantity of ordinary earth, resources requirements etc. As there is contradiction in the built-up area given in the application uploaded and requested in the presentation, the Project Proponent agreed to apply afresh as the Form 1 forms part of the EC. Therefore, the Committee recommended rejection of the application.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.10

Environmental clearance for the Laterite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. Prakasan C. V., for an area of 0.1944 Ha at Block No. 70 in Re-Sy Nos. 49/689, 49/1039 of Nidiyenga Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur.

**(Old Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/447673/2023)
(SIA/KL/MIN/505275/2024)**

Sri. Prakasan C. V., Cheran Veettil, Cheparamba, Nidiyenga P.O., Kannur – 670631 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.1944 Ha at Block No. 70, Re-Survey Nos. 49/689, 49/1039 in Nidiyenga Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 157th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 2 years. The depth to the water table is 7m bgl and the depth of mining is 5.5m bgl. The total project cost is Rs.6.12 lakh. The site is not in landslide hazard zone. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in

its 179th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 2 (Two) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. **The Comprehensive EMP should be implemented by considering the adjacent projects owned by the Project Proponent.**
4. **The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 5m bgl, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.**
5. **Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.**
6. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
7. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
8. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area.*
9. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
10. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
11. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*

12. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
13. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
14. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
15. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
16. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
17. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
18. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
19. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
20. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
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 CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
22. *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.

23. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.

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

Item No.11

Modification of Environment Clearance issued to Sri. Mathew Daniel for the Granite Building Stone Quarry at Block No.26, Sy.No. 340/1-26/3, 340/1-28/2, 340/1-30/1, 340/1/26-2, 340/1/26-1 in Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta (SIA/KL/MIN/505242/2024)

Sri. Mathew Daniel submitted an application for the modification of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project at Block No.26, Sy.No. 340/1-26/3, 340/1-28/2, 340/1-30/1, 340/1/26-2, 340/1/26-1 in Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the EC for the project was issued vide No. EC22B001KL140624 dated 20.07.2022 as per the decision of 144th SEIAA. The SEAC in its 126th meeting recommended EC with a project life of 12 years with specific condition, to limit the depth of mining up to 85m AMSL. However, as per the approved mining plan dated 24.04.2018, the elevation of the area varies between 105 to 60m AMSL. The field inspection report conducted on 22.11.2020 also noted the elevation of the area as 60 to 105m AMSL. The modification application was considered by the SEAC in its 179th meeting and by considering the elevation of the area and the depth to water table, the Committee now

agreed with the amendment of EC subject to the condition that depth of mining should be limited to 55m AMSL.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC to amend the EC condition and decided to amend the specific condition No. 7 of the EC issued as “*The depth of mining shall be limited to 55m AMSL considering the depth to water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit*”. Necessary proceedings in this regard shall be issued as per norms.

Item No.12 Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry proposal of Sri. Prakasan C.V. for an area of 0.0972 Ha at Block No. 70, Re-Sy No. 49/336 in Nidiyenga Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur
(SIA/KL/MIN/505400/2024)

Sri. Prakasan C. V., Cheran Veettil, Cheparamba, Nidiyenga P.O., Kannur – 670631 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.0972 Ha at Block No. 70, Re-Survey Nos. 49/336 in Nidiyenga Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 157th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved mining plan the mine life is 2 years. The depth to the water table is 6m bgl. The total project cost is Rs. 3.69 lakh. The site is not in landslide hazard zone. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 179th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 1 year, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 1 (One) year, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. ***The Comprehensive EMP should be implemented by considering the adjacent projects owned by the Project Proponent.***
4. ***The mining should be restricted to maximum depth of 4m bgl, subject to limiting the depth 1 m above the lithomarge.***
5. ***Proper benches should be provided at an interval of every 1.5 m.***
6. *The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*
7. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
8. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
9. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
10. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
11. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
12. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
13. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
14. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*

15. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
16. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
17. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
18. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
19. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
20. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm)*
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 CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
22. *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.*

23. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.

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

Item No.13

Re-appraisal of EC issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Ismail Makki at Re-Sy Nos. 1610/2 & 1611/1 in Kanthaladu village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

(SIA/KL/MIN/505641/2024)

Sri. Muhammed Ismail Makki submitted an application for the reappraisal of DEIAA, Kozhikode issued Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Re-Sy Nos. 1610/2 & 1611/1 in Kanthaladu village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The Authority noticed that the proposal was placed in the 179th SEAC meeting and the Committee scrutinized the proposal and discussed it in detail. The Committee observed that the proposed site falls in a moderate landslide hazard zone and the distance to the high hazard zone is only 250m. As per application form, the Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is located at a distance of 3.4 km from the proposed site. After detailed verification the Committee noticed the following shortcomings.

1. Original Mining Plan
2. Scheme of Mining is not legible.
3. The proposed area falls under medium hazard zone.

Since, the Project Proponent failed to submit the original Mining Plan required as per the checklist stipulated in the OM dated 28.04.2023 for scrutiny and appraisal, the Committee recommended rejection of the application.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.14 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Smt. Omana P. for an area of 0.9800 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy Nos. 149/2, 150/3, 150/6 in Kilimanoor Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/491573/2024)

Smt. Omana P., Kumara Vilasam, Pazhaya Chantha, Ponganadu P.O., Thiruvananthapuram 695601 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.9800 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy Nos. 149/2, 150/3, 150/6 in Kilimanoor Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the drone video, the built structures within 50m radius from the project site were demolished.

As per the application, the total mineable reserve proposed is 1,98,350 MT for a mine life of 3 years. The depth to water table is recorded as 7m below ground level at 77m AMSL. The elevation of the area varies between 125m AMSL to 90m AMSL. The Project Proponent obtained NOC from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Dept., Thiruvananthapuram dated 04.01.2025 for conducting quarrying activities by protected blasting. After the due appraisal, the SEAC recommended EC for a period of 3 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 179th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for a period of 3 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit, subject to the following additional Specific Conditions in addition to General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan*

and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.

- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
- 4. **The depth of mining should be limited to 90 AMSL as it is not desirable to develop a quarry pit considering the terrain slope. The mineable resources shall be reassessed by the Mining and Geology Department, while issuing the permit or lease.***
- 5. **The conditions stated in the NOC from the Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with.***
- 6. 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), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
- 7. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
- 8. Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR*
- 9. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
- 10. The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*

- 11. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 12. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 13. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
- 14. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
- 15. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
- 16. 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 and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 17. Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
- 18. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
- 19. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 20. 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.*

21. *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.*
22. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
23. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
24. *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 OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
26. *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.*
27. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining 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.

- 28. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 29. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 30. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 31. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 32. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No. 153.31 **Environmental Clearance for the Building and Construction project, M/s KGA International Trades Pvt. Ltd. of Sri. K. C. Eapen at Block 105, Sy Nos. 56/67, 28/65, 29, 51/2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 9 & Block 104, Survey No. 4/1 in Vazhappally East Village, Changanassery Taluk, Kottayam**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/460048/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of 153rd SEIAA meeting. It is noted that the project proposal was considered physically in the 153rd SEIAA meeting to hear the Project Proponent and accepted the EC recommendation of 175th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Commercial Complex for a period 10 years subject to the certain Specific Condition in addition to the General Conditions. Therefore, the Authority decided to adhere to its 153rd SEIAA meeting decision to issue EC for the project.

