

**MINUTES OF THE 164th MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT
IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA, HELD ON 25th April 2026
(ONLINE MODE)**

Present:

- 1. Sri. P.H. Kurian IAS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA Kerala.**
- 2. Sri. Raveendran T., Expert Member, SEIAA Kerala**
- 3. Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA Kerala.**

The 164th meeting of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Kerala, was convened on 25th April, 2026 at 10:30 a.m. under the Chairmanship of Sri. P.H. Kurian, IAS (Retd). The meeting was attended by Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao, IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri. Raveendran Thekkeparambil, Expert Member, SEIAA. The Authority reviewed the agenda items of the 164th meeting and adopted the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No.164.01 **Minutes of the 163rd SEIAA meeting held on 12th & 13th March, 2026 was placed for Information.**

Noted and confirmed the Minutes.

Item No.164.02 **Reappraisal of EC issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode to the quarry project of Sri. Shahil A. M, Director, M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd for an area of 4.9919 Ha in Unsurvey Field No. 2442 at Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayat, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Judgment dated 05.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 33674/2024 & Interim order dated 26.11.2024 in WP(C) No.41663/2024 & Interim order dated 24.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 11213/2025 - Hearing
(SIA/KL/MIN/510005/2025)**

The Authority considered the matter relating to the reappraisal application submitted by Sri. Shahil A. M., Director, M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd., for the Granite

Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 4.9919 Ha in Valillapuzha Village, Kozhikode District, along with the various proceedings of the SEIAA and SEAC, inspection reports, judicial directions of the Hon'ble High Court, reply to the show-cause notice, and the status of the reappraisal proceedings.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance originally issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode vide proceedings dated 17.06.2017, expired on 16.06.2023, even after availing the applicable COVID-19 relaxation period, and that the Project Proponent presently does not possess a valid Environmental Clearance. The Authority further noted that the reappraisal application submitted by the Project Proponent pursuant to the Ministry's O.M. dated 28.04.2023 was considered by the SEAC in its 180th meeting held on 25.02.2025, wherein the Committee observed cluster conditions requiring EIA study and public consultation and accordingly recommended rejection of the reappraisal application. The SEAC had also recommended assessment of environmental damages arising from the violation of Environmental Clearance conditions and over-extraction of mineral resources.

The Authority further noted that, based on the recommendation of the SEAC, the Authority, in its 156th meeting, rejected the reappraisal application due to the cluster situation and environmental violations and also initiated violation proceedings under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 by issuing a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent. The Authority had further directed the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) to assess the environmental damages caused due to the violations and illegal mining activities through the Joint Committee already constituted for such purposes and to submit a report before SEIAA. However, the Authority noted that the said report has not yet been received from the KSPCB.

The Authority further took note of the various interim orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) Nos. 33674/2024, 41663/2024, and 11213/2025. The Authority observed that the interim orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court were limited to stay of the rejection order and certain consequential decisions of the Authority and do not restrain the Authority from proceeding with statutory action relating to environmental violations, illegal mining activities, and compliance enforcement in accordance with law.

The Authority further noted that, pursuant to the decision of the 159th SEIAA meeting, the Project Proponent was directed to appear for a personal hearing in the Show Cause proceedings. The hearing was initially postponed on the request of the Project Proponent, citing personal circumstances, and a fresh hearing intimation was subsequently issued vide

email dated 16.04.2026. However, the Project Proponent again failed to appear before the Authority. The Authority viewed the repeated non-appearance of the Project Proponent seriously and observed that the conduct of the Project Proponent prima facie indicates a deliberate attempt to avoid the hearing proceedings and avert further statutory action by the Authority.

The Authority also noted, upon verification through the KOMPAS portal of the Department of Mining and Geology, that quarrying activities appear to be continuing with concession/transit permits, despite the expiry of the DEIAA-issued Environmental Clearance and pending reappraisal proceedings. The Authority observed that the Project Proponent is continuing mining activities without obtaining a valid reappraised Environmental Clearance, notwithstanding the judicial proceedings and repeated observations of the Authority regarding the absence of a valid Environmental Clearance.

The Authority further observed that continuation of quarrying operations without valid Environmental Clearance amounts to prima facie violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, apart from constituting continued environmental non-compliance and possible ecological damage.

After detailed deliberation and considering the repeated non-appearance of the Project Proponent, the continued operation of the quarry without valid Environmental Clearance, the judicial proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court, and the necessity to protect the environment and enforce statutory compliance, the Authority decided as follows:

- 1. The Environmental Clearance granted to M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd. is hereby temporarily suspended for a period of three months or until a final decision is taken on the reappraisal application and violation proceedings, whichever is earlier. During the suspension period, the Project Proponent shall abstain from mining and related activities.**
- 2. The Department of Mining and Geology and the Kerala State Pollution Control Board shall be informed immediately and directed to take necessary action to the above extent.**
- 3. The Kerala State Pollution Control Board shall expedite the assessment of environmental damages, as already directed by the Authority in its 156th meeting, through the Joint Committee constituted for such purposes, and**

submit the report before SEIAA without further delay for appropriate action.

- 4. The Project Proponent shall appear before the Authority in the next meeting for a personal hearing in the ongoing Show Cause proceedings, failing which the matter shall be proceeded ex parte in accordance with law.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly and to intimate the above decision to the Standing Counsel for placing the factual position before the Hon'ble High Court in the pending writ proceedings.

**Item No.164.03 Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Smt. Savithri Thamban, M/s Sree Siva Granites, for an area of 2.9727 Ha at Re-Survey No. 428/pt in Thayannur Village, Vellarikund Taluk, Kasaragod
ToR Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/455634/2023, 2472/EC4/2023/ SEIAA
EC Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIN/458791/2024**

As invited, the representative of the Project Proponent, Sri. Jaijan attended the hearing and presented the matter, including the explanations that were submitted as a reply to the show cause notice. The representative submitted that the mining operations had reached only up to approximately 301 m AMSL and contended that no over-extraction had been carried out beyond the permissible annual production quantity stipulated in the Environmental Clearance. It was further submitted that the SEAC Sub Committee, during the site inspection, was shown the entire project area and that the project had complied with all the conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance. The representative also admitted that a revised Mining Plan had been prepared and subsequently approved; however, it had not been implemented and was submitted only to obtain a reappraisal of the Environmental Clearance before SEIAA, since the DEIAA had issued the original EC. In addition, it was also admitted that for the illegal/excess extraction, a penalty had been remitted to the Mining and Geology Department and further no violations were committed.

Further, the Authority considered the deliberations and decisions of the SEAC and SEIAA in the previous meetings, the complaints received from various stakeholders, the field inspection reports, the legal opinion furnished by the Standing Counsel, the reply submitted by the Project Proponent to the Show Cause Notice dated 17.04.2026, and the directions

passed by the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 9769/2025, WP(C) No. 10463/2025 and WA No. 836/2026.

The Authority, after detailed deliberation, observed that the Project Proponent had revised the Mining Plan on 25.08.2023 without obtaining prior approval/consent of the SEIAA, despite being fully aware that the Environmental Clearance issued by the DEIAA was liable for reappraisal before the SEIAA in terms of the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the MoEF&CC and the subsequent proceedings initiated before the Authority. The Authority further observed that the Project Proponent had admittedly not informed the Authority regarding the revision of the Mining Plan and that mining operations had already reached approximately 300 m AMSL, which was the ultimate pit level contemplated in the original approved Mining Plan.

The Authority further noted that, as per the original approved Mining Plan based on which the Environmental Clearance had been granted, the ultimate pit level of 300 m AMSL was intended to be reached only during the final years of the mining period. However, the field inspection conducted on 08.05.2025 by the Technical Team deputed pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court had specifically recorded that the mining pit had already reached a depth ranging between 295 m and 300 m AMSL. The Authority also took note of the findings that the Project Proponent had already remitted penalties amounting to Rs. 52,61,722/- before the Mining and Geology Department towards excess extraction, extraction from the buffer zone and excess stocking of mineral, thereby establishing admitted violations relating to illegal extraction and mining within the buffer zone.

The Authority further observed that even after the field inspection conducted in May 2025 and despite the observations regarding violations, mining activities had continued till the interdiction imposed by the Hon'ble High Court through an interim order dated 26.03.2026 in WP(C) No.10463/2025. Therefore, the Authority observed that it is presently not ascertainable as to whether further extraction had been carried out beyond the permissible depth and limits prescribed in the original approved Mining Plan and Environmental Clearance conditions. The Authority also noted that the SEAC Sub Committee had conducted a further field inspection on 12.04.2026 to assess the ground realities and compliance with the EC conditions and that the detailed appraisal and recommendations of the SEAC are awaited.

The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble High Court, in its interim order dated 26.03.2026 in WP(C) No.10463/2025, had specifically directed SEIAA to issue Show Cause Notice, obtain explanation from the PP, and thereafter take an appropriate decision, including on the question as to whether a Stop Memo is to be issued. The Hon'ble High Court had also interdicted the Project Proponent from conducting further mining activities in view of the grave and serious findings recorded in the inspection report. The Hon'ble Division Bench, in WA No.836/2026 dated 08.04.2026, further directed SEIAA to take and communicate a decision regarding issuance of Stop Memo within the stipulated period.

The Authority carefully examined all the details along with the reply submitted by the PP to the Show Cause Notice and found that the explanation offered was not satisfactory and failed to adequately explain the admitted violations relating to extraction from the buffer zone, premature attainment of the ultimate pit level, revision of the Mining Plan without approval of the SEIAA, and the continued mining activities despite the pendency of reappraisal proceedings before the Authority. It is also noted that the Project Proponent has no revalidated fresh EC either with the original mining plan or with the revised mining plan. During the hearing, the gravity of the violations and non-observance of norms was brought to the representative of the Project Proponent, and he is convinced of that.

The Authority also observed that as per Condition No. 36 of the EC, *“No change in mining technology and scope of working should be made without prior approval of the SEIAA. No further expansion or modifications in the mine shall be carried out without prior approval of the SEIAA, as applicable”*. In addition, the norms of the EIA Notification 2006 also clearly depict that any modification/change to products or product mix requires prior approval of the EAC / SEIAA.

Based on the above discussions and deliberations and taking into account the seriousness of the violations, the inspection findings, the pending SEAC appraisal proceedings, and the interim directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Environmental Clearance issued by the DEIAA, Kasaragod, in respect of the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Smt. Savithri Thamban, M/s Sree Siva Granites, shall stand suspended pending completion of the reappraisal proceedings and final issuance of a valid fresh EC by the Authority.**

- 2. A proceedings to suspend the EC shall be issued forthwith, directing the Project Proponent to immediately cease all mining and allied activities in the project area until further orders of the Authority. The decision shall be provided to all respective agencies/departments for necessary action.**
- 3. The SEAC shall expedite consideration of the matter and furnish detailed recommendations after verifying:**
 - whether any mineable mineral resources are available for further extraction within the limits prescribed in the original approved Mining Plan and Environmental Clearance conditions;**
 - whether extraction has been carried out beyond the approved depth, approved quantity and permitted mining area, including the buffer zone; and**
 - The extent of environmental damage caused due to the violations already noticed.**
- 4. The SEAC shall also specifically examine the implications of the revised Mining Plan approved on 25.08.2023 and the permissibility of any future mining operations in the light of the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the MoEF&CC and the applicable provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.**
- 5. The Standing Counsel shall inform the Hon'ble High Court regarding the action taken by the Authority in compliance with the interim orders passed in WP(C) No.10463/2025 and WA No.836/2026, including the issuance of the suspension of the Environmental Clearance to stop all the mining activities.**

The Authority further recorded that the above decision is purely interim in nature and subject to final orders to be passed upon receipt and consideration of the detailed recommendations of the SEAC and all connected statutory records.

Item No.164.04 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Karim, Director, M/s Malabar Aggregates Pvt. Ltd for an area of 2.3732 Ha at Sy Nos. 36/3 (pt), 37/1 (pt), 37/2 (pt) and 37/3 (pt) in Morayoor Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Sri. Shahad .P – Joint Field Inspection Report Received (67/EC1/2025/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Karim, Director, M/s Malabar Aggregates Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 2.3732 Ha in Morayoor Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District, vide proceedings dated 31.10.2016, subsequently revalidated on 01.08.2023 for the project life of 12 years from the date of original Environmental Clearance, along with the complaints received from Sri. Shahad P., the reports of the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), Department of Mining and Geology, and the joint inspection report submitted by the Committee constituted pursuant to the decision of the 157th SEIAA meeting.

The Authority noted repeated complaints about non-compliance with Environmental Clearance conditions, excess mineral extraction, and environmental pollution from the quarry operations. Pursuant thereto, a joint inspection was conducted on 23.12.2025 by officials of the KSPCB, Department of Mining and Geology, and the representative nominated by SEIAA.

The Authority further noted that the inspection team observed several deficiencies and non-compliances, including absence of fixed water sprinklers, lack of garland canals, siltation ponds and clarifiers, absence of adequate protective measures in the overburden dump area, incomplete boundary fencing, non-provision of scientific bench cutting, and discrepancies in the location of boundary pillars. The Authority also noted the findings of the Department of Mining and Geology that excess granite building stone had been extracted from the lease area and buffer zone, that a demand notice had already been issued for excess extraction, and that the quarry lease had been temporarily cancelled pending rectification of defects and revision of the mining plan.

The Authority further noted the submission of the KSPCB that, despite issuance of show cause notice dated 22.09.2025 and assurances given by the Project Proponent to rectify the deficiencies within 45 days, none of the directions had been complied with at the time of

inspection.

The Authority observed that the findings of the joint inspection disclose prima facie violation of Environmental Clearance conditions and deficiencies in implementation of statutory environmental safeguards, warranting immediate corrective action in the interest of environmental protection and public safety.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided the following:**

- 1. Suspend the Environmental Clearance issued to the project for a period of three months to enable the Project Proponent to rectify all the non-compliances and deficiencies pointed out in the joint inspection report.**
- 2. The Project Proponent to undertake all necessary corrective measures during the suspension period, including installation of proper dust suppression systems, scientific bench cutting, erection of complete boundary fencing, stabilization and protection of overburden dump areas, installation of garland canals, siltation ponds and clarifiers, rectification of boundary pillar discrepancies, and strict compliance with all specific and general conditions of the Environmental Clearance.**
- 3. The Project Proponent shall submit a detailed compliance report, along with supporting documents and photographs, before the expiry of the suspension period.**
- 4. The Project Proponent to conduct an Environmental Damage Assessment study through a NABET-accredited consultant, assessing the extent of environmental damage caused due to the observed violations and non-compliances, along with appropriate remedial and mitigation measures. The Environmental Damage Assessment Report shall be submitted together with the compliance report before the suspension period expires.**
- 5. In the event of any revision or modification of the approved mining plan by the Project Proponent, the revised mining plan shall be submitted before the SEIAA for verification and for consideration of consequential modification of Environmental Clearance conditions, if required, in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and applicable guidelines.**

6. The SEAC shall verify the compliance status after submission of the compliance report and place the matter before the Authority with appropriate recommendations for further consideration.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.05 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.M. Kuttiamu Haji for an area of 0.8577 Ha at Survey No. 174 in Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Sri. Manoj Kedaram – Joint Field Inspection Report Received (1817/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P. M. Kuttiamu Haji for an area of 0.8577 Ha in Survey No. 174 of Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District, vide proceedings dated 04.05.2023, valid up to 03.05.2028, along with the complaint forwarded by the Secretary, Cherukavu Grama Panchayath, the joint inspection report of the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), Department of Mining and Geology, and the representative nominated by SEIAA/SEAC, and the observations recorded therein.

The Authority noted that the complaint submitted by Sri. Manoj Kedaram alleged various violations of Environmental Clearance conditions and environmental safeguards by the Project Proponent. Pursuant thereto, a joint inspection was conducted on 23.12.2025 by officials of the KSPCB, Department of Mining and Geology, and the SEIAA/SEAC representative.

The Authority further noted that the inspection team observed several non-compliances and deficiencies, including encroachment into the buffer zone, failure to construct the mandated temporary protection wall, absence of proper green belt development and afforestation measures, inadequate dust suppression systems, lack of technical monitoring mechanisms, absence of siltation control infrastructure, failure to provide fencing around the project area, and deficiencies in environmental management measures. The Authority also noted the findings of the Department of Mining and Geology regarding excavation within the buffer zone and the requirement for verification of the balance mineable reserves through

updated plan and section details.

The Authority observed that the inspection findings disclose prima facie violation of specific and general conditions of the Environmental Clearance as well as deficiencies in implementation of mandatory environmental safeguards, warranting immediate corrective action in the interest of environmental protection and public safety.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided the following:**

- 1. Suspend the Environmental Clearance issued to the project for a period of three months to enable the Project Proponent to rectify all the non-compliances and deficiencies pointed out in the joint inspection report.**
- 2. The Project Proponent to undertake all necessary corrective measures during the suspension period, including restoration of the buffer zone, construction of protective fencing and retaining structures, implementation of proper green belt and afforestation measures, installation of adequate dust suppression and siltation control systems, and compliance with all specific and general conditions of the Environmental Clearance.**
- 3. The Project Proponent shall submit a detailed compliance report, along with supporting documents and photographs, before the expiry of the suspension period.**
- 4. The Project Proponent to conduct an Environmental Damage Assessment study through a NABET-accredited consultant, assessing the extent of environmental damage caused due to the observed violations and non-compliances, along with appropriate remedial and mitigation measures. The Environmental Damage Assessment Report shall be submitted together with the compliance report before the suspension period expires.**
- 5. The SEAC shall verify the compliance status after submission of the compliance report and place the matter before the Authority with appropriate recommendations for further consideration.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.06

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sabu Kuriakose for an area of 0.9883 Ha at Block No. 14, Re-Sy Nos. 357/1, 357/2 & 357/3 in Karimkunnam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki - Order dated 10.04.2025 in WP(C) Nos. 31463 and 46375 of 2024 and 12.08.2025 in WP(C) No. 22797/2025.

(SIA/KL/MIN/239769/2021, 2062/EC3/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sabu Kuriakose for an area of 0.9883 Ha in Karimkunnam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, along with the various complaints received from residents, reports and submissions made by the Project Proponent, directions of the Hon'ble High Court in the connected writ petitions, and the recommendations of the SEAC.

The Authority noted that, based on complaints alleging unauthorised quarrying activities and non-compliance of Environmental Clearance conditions, a stop memo and show cause notice had earlier been issued vide proceedings dated 16.11.2025 pursuant to the decision of the 149th SEIAA meeting. The Authority further noted that, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) Nos. 31463/2024, 46375/2024, and 22797/2025, hearings were conducted by the Authority, following which the matter was referred to the SEAC for field inspection and detailed examination.

The Authority further noted that the Sub-Committee constituted by the SEAC conducted field inspection on 04.12.2025 and submitted its report, which was considered by the SEAC in its 197th meeting. The Committee observed several non-compliances and environmental concerns, including damage caused to a neighbouring residence due to fly rock during blasting operations, deviations from scientifically prescribed bench height and width ratios, improper overburden stacking without adequate retaining protection, non-implementation of Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) commitments, absence of mandatory water quality monitoring data, and concerns relating to slope stability, traffic congestion, safety measures, and protection of nearby residential areas.

The Authority observed that the findings of the Sub-Committee disclose prima facie non-compliance of Environmental Clearance conditions and deficiencies in implementation of environmental safeguards by the Project Proponent. The Authority further observed that the

issues identified require immediate corrective measures and verification prior to permitting continuation of quarrying activities.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided the following:**

- 1. Extend the stop memo already issued to the Project Proponent for a further period of three months.**
- 2. Direct the Project Proponent to rectify all the non-compliances and deficiencies pointed out by the SEAC and the Sub-Committee and to submit a detailed compliance report before the Authority within a period of two months, specifically addressing all observations relating to blasting impacts, fly rock incidents, overburden management, water quality monitoring, fencing and safety measures, CER implementation, traffic management, and environmental protection measures.**
- 3. Upon receipt of the compliance report, the SEAC shall verify the compliance status, conduct inspection if required, and submit its recommendation to the Authority for further consideration.**
- 4. The Law Officer, SEIAA to immediately inform the Standing Counsel regarding the present decision and to take necessary steps for filing an appropriate petition before the Hon'ble High Court seeking extension of time by a further period of four months for complying with the directions of the Hon'ble Court, in view of the requirement for detailed compliance verification and technical appraisal.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.07 **ToR issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Kunjali Marakkar V.M. for an area of 0.9993 ha at Kakkad Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode – Request of the PP to consider final EIA Report of Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara in Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/569326/26.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/507458/2024)

The Authority considered the request submitted by Sri. Kunjali Marakkar V. M. vide letter dated 26.02.2026 in respect of the Terms of Reference (ToR) issued on 15.01.2025 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.9993 Ha in Kakkad Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District. The Project Proponent requested that the EIA Report, submitted by Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/569326/2026) may also be considered for his project, and a separate Public Hearing/EIA study may be dispensed with, since his quarry forms part of the same cluster considered in the cluster certificate and EIA study submitted by Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance application of Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara is presently under appraisal by SEAC. The Authority further observed that, upon verification of the EIA Report submitted by Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara, the quarry project of Sri. Kunjali Marakkar has been referred to in the report; however, the report mentions that the quarry is not operational, as only LOI had been issued and does not contain a comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), mitigation measures, or project-specific environmental assessment pertaining to the quarry of Sri. Kunjali Marakkar.

The Authority further noted that, as per Appendix XI, Clause (3) of the applicable procedure, a common Public Hearing is to be conducted for the entire cluster, after which a Final EIA/EMP for the cluster shall be prepared. The Authority observed that, since the project of Sri. Kunjali Marakkar was already included in the cluster considered during the Public Hearing conducted for the proposal of Sri. Manshoorshafi Vattappara, a separate Public Hearing for the project of Sri. Kunjali Marakkar may not be necessary, provided the cluster EIA/EMP is suitably updated in accordance with Clause (4), taking into account any significant changes and project-specific impacts.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority directed the Project Proponent to revise and update the cluster EIA/EMP by specifically incorporating complete details relating**

to his quarry project, including project-specific environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and a comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP) containing specific physical and financial commitments for environmental safeguards, management measures pertaining to the quarry project and the specific mitigation measures for the apprehensions raised in the public hearing. The revised EIA/EMP shall be submitted before further appraisal of the proposal for Environmental Clearance.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.08 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P.M., Managing Partner, M/s Profile Granites for an area of 4.380 Ha at Sy No. 78/2A in Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode - Request for reconsideration and processing of EC validity extension.**
(130/SEIAA/KL/2437/2013)

The Authority considered the representation submitted by Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P. M., Managing Partner, M/s Profile Granites, dated 21.02.2026, seeking reconsideration of the request for extension of validity of the Environmental Clearance issued vide Order No. 130/SEIAA/KL/2437/2013 dated 01.04.2014 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 4.380 Ha in Survey No. 78/2A of Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, along with the decisions of various SEIAA and SEAC meetings in the matter.

The Authority noted that the proposal for revalidation/extension of the Environmental Clearance had been considered by the SEAC in various meetings, including the 134th SEAC meeting, wherein the Committee, based on field inspection and appraisal of the project, observed several deficiencies, non-compliances, cluster-related concerns, discrepancies in revenue records and survey details, possible violation of EC conditions, and other shortcomings. The SEAC had also observed that the project was not eligible for revalidation in terms of the judgment in WP(C) No. 10301/2021, since the Environmental Clearance had originally been granted for the entire anticipated life of mine projected in the approved quarry plan.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent had subsequently requested

withdrawal of the revalidation application as well as withdrawal of the decision of the 134th SEAC meeting. Accordingly, the Authority, in its 121st meeting, accepted the request of the Project Proponent to withdraw the revalidation application and decided that any request for extension of validity shall be considered separately based on proper appraisal, including field inspection and compliance verification of the original Environmental Clearance conditions.

The Authority examined the records in detail and observed that the Environmental Clearance issued on 01.04.2014 was based on a quarry plan indicating an average annual production of 2,17,400 MT with an anticipated mine life of 8 years. Subsequently, a mining plan was approved on 04.04.2016 indicating a total mineable reserve of 16,06,873 MT with an annual production capacity of 1,00,000 MT. Thereafter, the Project Proponent again modified the mining plan in the year 2020, wherein the remaining mineable reserve was shown as 6,06,150 MT for a further period of 7 years. However, no approval or modification of the Environmental Clearance corresponding to the revised mining plan and altered project parameters was obtained from SEIAA.

The Authority further observed that the quarrying lease was executed on 24.01.2015 and, considering the provisions of Notification S.O. 1807(E) and the originally projected mine life of 8 years, the validity of the Environmental Clearance expired on 23.01.2024, inclusive of the applicable COVID-19 relaxation period. The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was never modified or revalidated in accordance with the subsequent mining plans approved in 2016 and 2020. Accordingly, the Authority found that the Project Proponent presently does not possess a valid Environmental Clearance for continuing mining operations.

The Authority further noted, upon verification through the KOMPAS portal of the Department of Mining and Geology, that mining activities appear to have continued after expiry of the Environmental Clearance, based on concession and transit permits issued by the Department of Mining and Geology. The Authority observed that continuation of mining operations without a valid Environmental Clearance is in violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its subsequent amendments. The Authority also viewed seriously the fact that mining operations were allegedly permitted without verifying the subsistence and validity of the mandatory prior Environmental Clearance.

The Authority further observed that the Project Proponent had undertaken modification of the mining plan and extraction of mineral resources without obtaining prior appraisal and approval from SEIAA for consequential environmental impacts, revised

Environmental Management Plan (EMP), altered project life, and modified production parameters, as required under the EIA Notification, 2006 and the conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority arrived at the following conclusions:

- a) The Environmental Clearance issued to the project expired on 23.01.2024 and any mining activity carried out thereafter without valid Environmental Clearance is prima facie unauthorized and in violation of the EIA Notification, 2006.
- b) Modification of mining plans and continuation of extraction activities without obtaining corresponding amendment/revalidation of Environmental Clearance constitutes non-compliance of statutory requirements and EC conditions.
- c) The matter requires detailed examination regarding continuation of mining activities after expiry of Environmental Clearance and the role of the concerned authorities in permitting such operations.

In the above circumstances, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent is directed to immediately stop all mining activities carried out without valid Environmental Clearance for a period of three months or until obtaining fresh/revalidated Environmental Clearance from the competent authority, whichever is earlier.**
- 2. The Project Proponent shall be heard in the next meeting of the Authority to explain the continuation of mining activities without valid Environmental Clearance and to enable the Authority to consider further action in accordance with law.**
- 3. The Department of Mining and Geology and the Kerala State Pollution Control Board shall take appropriate action in accordance with applicable statutes and ensure stoppage of all mining activities being carried out without valid Environmental Clearance.**
- 4. The Director, Department of Mining and Geology, shall be informed to examine the matter and take appropriate action regarding issuance of permits/transit passes for mining operations without verifying validity of the Environmental Clearance.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.09 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Smt. Jayasree, Managing Partner, M/s. Saroj Realtors and Builders at Block No: 25, Re-Sy Nos. 191/1-3, 192/1-4, 192/1-3, 192/2, 193/20, 193/20-1, 180/4, 180/3-1, 180/3-2 in Perumkadavila Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Judgment dated 05.11.2025 in WP (C) No. 37197/2023**
(1748/EC1/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued on 24.08.2023 to M/s Saroj Realtors and Builders for the project in Perumkadavila Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, along with the judgment dated 05.11.2025 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 37197/2023, the submissions made by the Managing Trustee, Missionary Society of St. Francis Xavier (MSFX) Trust, and the subsequent representations submitted by the Project Proponent.

The Authority noted that the Hon'ble High Court, vide judgment dated 05.11.2025 in WP(C) No. 37197/2023, had directed SEIAA to consider Ext. P21 complaint dated 27.10.2023, treating the same as a statutory appeal, and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. In compliance with the said directions, the matter was considered in the 161st SEIAA meeting held on 17.01.2026, wherein Adv. Shivaprasad K. V., representing the Project Proponent, and representatives of the MSFX Trust, including Fr. Sinto, Sri. James, and Dr. Premjith G. S., were heard.

During the hearing, the representatives of the MSFX Trust reiterated their contention that the subject land belongs to the Trust and sought cancellation of the Environmental Clearance, whereas the Project Proponent sought time for amicable settlement of the dispute. Considering the request of the Project Proponent and the consent expressed by the Trust representatives, the Authority had granted one month's time to the Project Proponent to submit detailed documents substantiating their claim and decided to reconsider the matter thereafter.

The Authority further noted that Fr. Thomas John Maruthoor, Managing Trustee, MSFX Trust, vide letter dated 02.03.2026, informed that no discussions had taken place from the side of M/s Saroj Realtors and Builders even after expiry of the time granted by the Authority and requested cancellation of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Project Proponent. The Authority also noted the submission of the Project Proponent vide letter dated

16.04.2026 stating that disputes relating to the authority and management of the Trust are presently pending before the Vanchiyoor Court.

After detailed deliberation, and considering the rival claims raised by the Project Proponent and the Trust authorities regarding ownership and entitlement over the project land, the Authority decided to afford a further opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties before taking a final decision in the matter.

Accordingly, the Authority decided to hear the Project Proponent and the authorities/representatives of the MSFX Trust in the next meeting of the Authority. The Authority further directed that all parties shall appear before the Authority with certified and authenticated documents in support of their respective claims, including ownership records, revenue documents, trust-related records, court pleadings/orders, and any other relevant documents necessary for proper examination of the matter.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue notices to the concerned parties and place the matter before the Authority in the next meeting for further consideration.

Item No.164.10 **Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sibish Augustine, for an area of 1.0854 ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 264/1, 295/6, 296/3, 296/4, 296/5, 297/1 in Vayakkara Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur - Order of Hon'ble High Court dated 27-02-2026 in WP(C) No. 4896 of 2025.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/171276/2020, 1389/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Sibish Augustine for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project in Vayakkara Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur District, along with the reports of the District Collector, Kannur, the replies submitted by the Project Proponent, complaints raised by residents, and the judgment dated 27.02.2026 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 4896 of 2025.

The Authority noted that the Project Proponent had already been afforded an opportunity of personal hearing before the Authority in its 153rd meeting held on 21st and 22nd February 2025. However, the hearing note/document undertaking detailed submissions from the Project Proponent has not yet been received by the Authority.

The Authority further noted the directions of the Hon'ble High Court that SEIAA shall

consider the matter after taking into account all relevant materials and specifically address its satisfaction regarding the invocation of Clause 8(vi) of the EIA Notification, 2006, in the event the Authority decides to cancel the Environmental Clearance. The Hon'ble Court further directed that the petitioner as well as the contesting respondent shall be permitted to place relevant materials before the Authority.

The Authority observed that the issues involved in the matter are predominantly technical in nature, relating to environmental sensitivity of the project area, hazard zonation, possible impacts on the adjoining stream, and apprehended disturbance to the local inhabitants due to quarrying activities. The Authority further observed that proper appreciation of these aspects requires scientific and technical evaluation by the Expert Appraisal Committee.

Considering the above circumstances, and in order to ensure effective compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court as well as adherence to the principles of natural justice, **the Authority decided to entrust the matter to the SEAC. Accordingly, the Authority directed the SEAC to afford an opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent as well as the complainants/respondents concerned, examine all relevant materials and technical aspects, and conduct field inspection, if found necessary, for proper assessment of the environmental sensitivity and site conditions. The SEAC shall thereafter submit a detailed factual and technical report along with its recommendation to the Authority for further consideration in accordance with law and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to communicate the above decision to the SEAC and take necessary follow-up action accordingly.**

The Authority further directed the SEIAA Secretariat to immediately communicate the present decision to the Standing Counsel for apprising the Hon'ble High Court and to take necessary steps for filing an appropriate petition seeking extension of time before the Hon'ble Court for compliance with the directions contained in the judgment dated 27.02.2026.

The Authority also observed that, in matters involving environmental appraisal, hazard zonation, ecological sensitivity, and complaints from local inhabitants, the period of one or two months generally granted by Courts may not always be sufficient for the Authority and Expert Committees to undertake detailed technical scrutiny, field inspection, stakeholder hearings, and, where necessary, additional scientific studies before arriving at a reasoned decision.

Accordingly, the Authority directed the Law Officer, SEIAA to discuss the matter with the Standing Counsel and suitably bring the above practical and procedural difficulties to the notice of the Hon'ble High Court, including the requirement of detailed technical appraisal, stakeholder hearing, field inspection, and additional scientific studies in environmental matters, and to request that reasonable and adequate time may be granted by the Hon'ble Court in appropriate cases to enable effective compliance with judicial directions and proper technical appraisal by the Authority and the Expert Appraisal Committee.

**Item No.164.11 Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Muhammed Naha Salim, for an area of 0.8525 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 370/1pt and 370/2pt in Vallichira Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam
(SIA/KL/MIN/134307/2019; 1671/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the request submitted by Sri. Muhammed Naha Salim for extension of the validity of the Environmental Clearance issued on 22.09.2021 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.8525 Ha in Vallichira Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District, which had expired on 21.09.2024. The Authority noticed that the EC was issued for a period of 3 years from the date of execution of a valid permit, and the Project Proponent could function only for one year.

The Authority noted the various judicial proceedings connected with the project, including WP(C) No. 4655 of 2024, WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022, WA Nos. 680 and 681 of 2024, and WP(C) No. 15084 of 2025, wherein the Hon'ble High Court had considered issues relating to compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 and the effect of litigation on the implementation of the project. The Authority further noted the judgment dated 25.03.2026 in WP(C) No. 15084 of 2025, wherein the Hon'ble High Court directed SEIAA to consider the request of the Project Proponent, taking into account the period during which quarrying operations could not be carried out due to litigation and judicial interdictions.

The Authority further observed that the MoEF&CC, vide Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, clarified that the duration of stay orders issued by competent Courts, resulting in non-implementation of projects or activities for which the Project Proponent was unable to

utilise the Environmental Clearance granted, shall be treated as “zero period” for the purpose of calculating the validity of Environmental Clearance.

In view of the above, and considering the period during which the Project Proponent was prevented from carrying out quarrying activities on account of pending litigation and judicial orders, **the Authority decided to accept the request of the Project Proponent for extension of the Environmental Clearance and extended the validity of EC for a period of two years from the date of execution of mining permit.**

However, the Authority observed that continuation of quarrying operations shall be subject to compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 and directed that a valid No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Irrigation Department shall be obtained and maintained for the remaining period of operation.

The Authority further directed the Department of Mining and Geology to ensure that a valid NOC from the Irrigation Department is produced by the Project Proponent before issuance of any quarrying permit for the remaining period covered under the Environmental Clearance.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

**Item No.164.12 Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA Kasaragod, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Anwar Sadath K., M/s Galaxy Metals, for an area of 4.6085 Ha at Sy No. 122/11/A-3 in Balal Village & at Sy No. 40/1A in Parappa Village, Vellarikkund Taluk, Kasaragod - Interim order in WP (C) No. 5524 of 2023, dated 09-03-2026
(SIA/KL/MIN/451629/2023)**

The Authority considered the matter along with the legal opinions received and the interim order dated 09.03.2026 passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 5524 of 2023. The Authority noted that Environmental Clearance had earlier been issued by DEIAA, Kasaragod, to Sri. Anwar Sadath K., M/s Galaxy Metals, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 4.6085 Ha in Balal and Parappa Villages, Vellarikkund Taluk, Kasaragod District, and that the Project Proponent has subsequently submitted an application for reappraisal of the said Environmental Clearance.

The Authority further noted the legal opinion furnished by the Standing Counsel that the Project Proponent cannot continue quarry operations unless the Environmental Clearance is duly reappraised and granted by the competent authority. The Authority also took note of the opinion of the Legal Officer of SEIAA regarding the legal status of Environmental Clearances issued by DEIAA and the requirement for reappraisal in accordance with the prevailing regulatory framework.

The Authority further noted that the reappraisal proposal was considered by the SEAC in its 177th meeting, wherein various deficiencies and additional document requirements were identified. However, the proposal presently stands delisted due to the non-submission of the requisite documents by the Project Proponent.

The Authority also took note of the complaints received from local stakeholders raising environmental and public concerns in relation to the project, as well as the observations contained in the interim order dated 09.03.2026 of the Hon'ble High Court staying the operation of the Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kasaragod, pending disposal of the writ petition.

In view of the pendency of judicial proceedings, stakeholder concerns, and the requirement to ensure compliance with the principles of natural justice, the Authority decided to afford an opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties before taking any further decision in the matter.

Accordingly, the Authority decided to hear the petitioner(s), complainants, and the Project Proponent in the next meeting of the Authority. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue notices to all concerned parties and place the matter before the Authority in the next meeting for further consideration.

Item No.164.13

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. K. G. Ajikumar, for an area of 1.2328 Ha, at Block No. 13, Re-Sy Nos. 394/4(p), 394/14(p), 394/15(p), 394/16(p), 399/3-1(p), 399/3-1-2(p), 399/3-2-2(p), 399/3-2, 399/3-3, 399/3-3-2, 399/4, 399/4-2, 399/4-3, 399/4-4(p) & 396/5-1 in Kalayapuram Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam - Compliance with the direction of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala via Interim Order dated 11.03.2026 in WP(C) No. 25928/2025
(SIA/KL/MIN/448332/2023, 2491/EC1/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance issued on 25.01.2025 to Sri. K. G. Ajikumar for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 1.2328 Ha in Kalayapuram Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, along with the subsequent developments arising out of WP(C) No. 25928 of 2025 filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

The Authority noted that the Hon'ble High Court, in its interim order dated 11.03.2026, directed the SEIAA to examine the specific allegations raised in Ext. P14 complaint, particularly regarding the presence of "Ayiravalli Para" rock formation, a water reservoir, and a shrine within the project area, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as the Project Proponent. The Hon'ble Court further directed SEIAA to submit a report indicating whether the Environmental Clearance needs to be recalled, within a period of two months.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority observed that the issues raised in the complaint involve site-specific environmental and factual aspects, which require technical verification and field-level assessment.

Accordingly, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, **the Authority decided to refer the matter to the SEAC for detailed examination. The Authority directed that the SEAC shall verify the allegations raised in the complaint, conduct field inspection, if necessary, after providing due notice and opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and the Project Proponent, and submit a factual and reasoned report to the Authority indicating whether the Environmental Clearance requires to be recalled or otherwise acted upon.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to communicate the above decision to the SEAC and to take further action for submission of the report before the Hon'ble High Court within the stipulated time.

Item No.164.14 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. L. Syju, M/s K. Lekshmanan Company Infrastructures & Industries Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 1.4754 Ha at Block No. 40, Re-Sy Nos. 28/4pt (Govt. Land), 28/8 & 28/3-1 (Pvt. Land) in Nilamel Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam - Rejection Order issued – Reconsideration & Rejected by 198th SEAC meeting - Request of PP**
(SIA/KL/MIN/463911/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal along with the entire appraisal history, including the earlier decision of the Authority rejecting the EC application based on the findings of the SEAC, which had relied upon detailed field inspection conducted by erstwhile SEAC and site-specific environmental assessment.

The Authority further noted that, subsequent to the said rejection, the Project Proponent submitted additional studies, technical reports, and clarifications addressing the concerns raised during earlier appraisal stages. The proposal was re-examined by the SEAC in its 198th meeting, wherein the Committee, after deliberation on the additional submissions, reiterated its earlier recommendation for rejection of the proposal, invoking the precautionary principle.

The Authority observed that even though the earlier rejection was substantially based on findings derived from field inspection of the site and associated environmental sensitivities, the present recommendation of the SEAC in the 198th meeting appears to have been made without the benefit of a fresh field inspection, particularly in the context of the additional technical submissions and modified positions put forth by the Project Proponent.

In view of the above, the Authority was of the considered opinion that, for a fair and comprehensive appraisal, the additional submissions of the Project Proponent require on-ground verification. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC with a direction to conduct a fresh field inspection of the project site, duly considering the additional studies and clarifications submitted by the Project Proponent, and to submit a reasoned report and recommendation to the Authority.**

Item No.164.15 Environmental Clearance for the Warehouse Project of M/s Avanthi Warehousing Services Pvt. Ltd. for a built-up area of 25632.91 m² at Sy. Nos. 118/1, 124/1, 124/1-1, 124/1-2, 124/1-3, 124/1-4, 124/2, 125/1-3, 125/1-4, 125/1-6 & 125/1-7 in Panancheri Village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur – Clarification requested by the Executive Director, M/s Avanthi Warehousing Services Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 546/EC6/2026/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the request submitted by M/s Avanthi Warehousing Services Pvt. Ltd. seeking clarification regarding the applicability of Environmental Clearance (EC) to their warehouse project established at Panancheri Village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, having a built-up area of 25,632.91 sq.m.

The Authority noted that the project was established on the basis of Consent to Establish dated 08.04.2025 issued by the KSPCB, during which period such projects were exempted from obtaining prior Environmental Clearance as per the MoEF&CC Notification dated 29.01.2025. Subsequently, the said exemption was quashed vide Office Memorandum dated 25.08.2025, thereby bringing such projects within the ambit of Environmental Clearance requirements.

The Authority further noted the submission of the Project Proponent that the project had already been established and had progressed substantially prior to the issuance of the Office Memorandum dated 25.08.2025, and therefore cannot be subjected to retrospective compliance of prior Environmental Clearance. The Project Proponent has requested formal confirmation of the project status for the purpose of processing Integrated Consent to Operate by KSPCB.

The Authority also noted that the Project Proponent has submitted a fresh application dated 10.04.2026 through the PARIVESH portal (File No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/575270/2026) for expansion of the existing warehouse project, which is presently under verification before SEAC.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority observed that the project was established during the period in which such warehouse projects were exempted from obtaining prior Environmental Clearance in terms of the MoEF&CC Notification dated 29.01.2025 and that the Consent to Establish had been validly issued by the KSPCB during the subsistence of the said exemption. The Authority therefore **decided that a clarification letter may be issued to**

the Project Proponent confirming the applicability of the exemption prevailing at the relevant point of time, for the limited purpose of enabling processing of the Integrated Consent to Operate by the KSPCB. The Authority further directed the SEAC to take up and appraise the expansion proposal submitted by the Project Proponent vide File No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/575270/2026 in accordance with the applicable provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and subsequent amendments thereto. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary communications accordingly.

**Item No.164.16 Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sudhakaran C., for an area of 1.1932 Ha at Block No.71, Re-Sy. Nso: 74/2, 75 &76 in Karimpuzha I Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad
(SIA/KL/MIN/467815/2024)**

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance issued on 15.03.2025 to Sri. Sudhakaran C. for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 1.1932 Ha in Karimpuzha I Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District, pursuant to reappraisal of the EC earlier granted by DEIAA, Palakkad. The EC was issued with specific conditions, inter alia, directing the Project Proponent to submit within one month: (i) detailed CER proposal, (ii) NOC from the Irrigation Department under Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, (iii) compliance of the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in Common Cause vs Union of India, and (iv) proposal for re-grassing and ecological restoration of the mined area, failing which the EC would be liable for cancellation. The EC was initially granted for 5 years, extendable up to 10 years subject to periodic review by SEAC.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent submitted the required documents on 04.07.2025 and that the SEAC, in its 197th meeting, examined the submissions and found them satisfactory, and recommended that no revision of the Environmental Clearance is required at this stage.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided that no revision of the Environmental Clearance is warranted at present.**

The Authority further directed the Project Proponent to ensure strict implementation of the approved Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) activities within the stipulated timeframe and to submit progress reports along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCR) as per the prescribed norms.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.17 District Survey Reports (DSR) of Minor Minerals (Except River Sand) - Approval

The Authority considered the recommendations of the SEACs of respective zones, regarding the revised District Survey Reports (DSRs) of various districts, as examined in the SEAC meetings.

The Authority noted that the SEAC had undertaken a detailed technical evaluation of the DSRs with respect to data integrity, regulatory compliance, and uniformity, and had recommended approval of the DSRs subject to specific modifications and conditions, particularly with regard to uniform treatment of Ecologically Sensitive Areas (ESAs), in adherence to statutory directions issued by the MoEF&CC and other judicial proceedings.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendations of the SEAC and approved the revised District Survey Reports (DSRs) of Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam, Pathanamthitta, Kottayam, Ernakulam, Thrissur, Palakkad, Malappuram, Kozhikode, Wayanad and Kannur subject to incorporation of the modifications and conditions stipulated by the SEAC.**

The Authority directed the Department of Mining and Geology to carry out necessary modifications in the DSRs strictly in accordance with the recommendations of the SEAC. The Authority further directed that, upon incorporation of the required modifications, the approved DSRs shall be published on the official website of the Department of Mining and Geology for public access and transparency. A copy of the modified DSR to the above extent shall be made available to the District Administration to publish in their website.

The Authority also directed that the approved DSRs shall be uploaded and made available on the official website of the SEIAA.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.18 Environmental Clearance issued to the Outer Ring Road (ORR) under CRDP-II, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala (Southern Ring: Mangalapuram-Thekkada-Vizhinjam) – Request by Project Proponent to Surrender the EC issued.
(File No. 1143/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017)

The Authority considered the request submitted by the Capital Region Development Project (CRDP) vide letter dated 17.03.2026 seeking surrender of the Environmental Clearance (EC) issued to the Outer Ring Road (ORR) Project under CRDP-II, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala (Southern Ring: Mangalapuram–Thekkada–Vizhinjam), vide EC No. 54/Q/2023 dated 15.03.2023.

The Authority noted that the subject project is presently being taken up for development by the National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) as NH-866. The Authority further noted the submission of the Project Director, NHAI, that the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) of the MoEF&CC, in its 429th meeting held on 09.12.2025 had directed the Project Proponent to surrender the existing EC issued by SEIAA, Kerala, in view of the change in implementing agency and appraisal jurisdiction.

The Authority examined the request and observed that the surrender of the existing EC is necessitated in order to facilitate appraisal of the project under the competent authority, i.e., MoEF&CC, through the EAC, in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the request of the Project Proponent and decided to permit surrender of the Environmental Clearance issued vide EC No. 54/Q/2023 dated 15.03.2023 for the Outer Ring Road (ORR) Project under CRDP-II, Thiruvananthapuram (Southern Ring: Mangalapuram–Thekkada–Vizhinjam).**

The Authority further directed that the surrender of EC shall be subject to the condition that no construction or project activity shall be carried out under the said EC and that any further development of the project shall be undertaken only after obtaining requisite Environmental Clearance from the competent authority. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.164.19 Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shinumon Thomas, for an area of 0.0972 Ha at Block No. 137, Re- Sy No. 50/292 in Chuzhali Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur - WP (C) No. 5707 of 2026, filed by Sri. Krishnan. (SIA/KL/MIN/560161/2026)

The Authority considered the judgment dated 27.02.2026 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 5707 of 2026 filed by Sri. E. V. Krishnan and Sri. Mohanan C. V., wherein objections were raised against the grant of quarrying permit and Environmental Clearance sought by Sri. Shinumon Thomas. The Hon'ble High Court has directed the SEIAA to afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners before the issuance of Environmental Clearance.

The Authority noted that the application submitted by Sri. Shinumon Thomas for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.0972 Ha in Chuzhali Village, Kannur District, is presently under appraisal before the State Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC).

After deliberation, the Authority observed that, under the EIA Notification, 2006, SEAC is the competent expert body mandated to undertake technical appraisal of proposals, including assessment of environmental impacts and stakeholder concerns, and to submit its recommendation to SEIAA for final decision.

Considering that the proposal is at the appraisal stage and that the issues raised by the petitioners pertain to technical and environmental aspects, the Authority decided that compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court can be effectively ensured by providing an opportunity of hearing before the SEAC.

Accordingly, the Authority decided that the SEAC shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners as well as the Project Proponent during the appraisal of the proposal and thereafter submit a reasoned recommendation to the Authority, duly considering the submissions made.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to communicate the above decision to the SEAC for necessary action and to place the matter before the Authority upon receipt of the recommendation.

Item No.164.20

Environmental clearance issued to the Residential Apartments cum commercial complex building project, Sri. M. Najeeb, M/s Spring Infradev Limited at Sy. Nos. 111/7, 112/ (1, 7-13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, 28) 116 (5, 6, 14) Pangappara Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram - Request for confirmation of EC validity

(File No. 309/EC3/SEIAA/2025

The Authority considered the request submitted by Sri. Ajith Prasad, Authorised Signatory, M/s Spring Infradev Limited, seeking clarification and extension of validity of the Environmental Clearance (EC) issued vide EC No. 20/2018 dated 12.02.2018 for the Residential Apartments cum Commercial Complex Building Project of Sri. M. Najeeb, President, M/s Spring Infradev Limited, at Sy. Nos. 111/7, 112 (1, 7-13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, 28) and 116 (5, 6, 14) in Pangappara Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District.

The Authority noted that the original Environmental Clearance was issued for a total built-up area of 10,07,773.54 sq. m over a plot area of 19,480 sq. m and that the validity of the said EC had originally expired on 11.02.2025.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent, vide letters dated 10.03.2026 and 13.03.2026, requested issuance of a clarification to the effect that the validity of the EC stands extended up to 11.02.2030. The Authority examined the matter in detail and noted that, in accordance with the Notification dated 20.01.2021 issued by the MoEF&CC, the period from 01.04.2020 to 31.03.2021 is to be excluded for the purpose of computing the validity of Environmental Clearances due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown.

The Authority further observed that, as per the prevailing regulatory framework governing construction projects under the EIA Notification, 2006, the maximum validity period of Environmental Clearance is 10 years from the date of grant of EC. Accordingly, in the present case, the maximum permissible validity of the EC issued on 12.02.2018 extends up to 11.02.2028.

The Authority also noted that, considering the relaxation granted during the COVID-19 period, the validity is eligible for extension by an additional period of one year. Accordingly, the outer permissible validity of the EC in the present case is reckoned up to 11.02.2029.

In view of the above, the Authority observed that the request of the Project Proponent

to extend the validity of EC up to 11.02.2030 is not in accordance with the applicable statutory provisions and cannot be acceded to.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided to modify the Environmental Clearance dated 12.02.2018 by extending its validity up to 11.02.2029, being the maximum permissible period under the prevailing norms, inclusive of COVID-19 related relaxation.**

The Authority further directed that all conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance shall be strictly complied with by the Project Proponent without any deviation. The Project Proponent shall also ensure submission of Half-Yearly Compliance Reports on the status of implementation of EC conditions to the Authority within the prescribed timelines.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

PARIVESH (Ver-1)

Item No.01 Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIS/52532/2019; 1555/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the application submitted by The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Technopark, Park Centre, Technopark, Karyavattom P.O., Thiruvananthapuram – 695581, seeking Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III at Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk and District.

The Authority noted that the proposal pertains to the expansion of “Technopark Phase III” as a Township and Area Development Project falling under Category 8(b) of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006, over an extent of 32.49 Ha with a proposed total built-up area of 8,19,287.41 sq. m after modification of the original proposal. The Authority further noted that the Technopark campus already accommodates earlier developments, including Technopark Phase III and various lessee projects developed under separate Environmental Clearances.

The Authority further observed that the project land has a documented history as paddy land (“Nilam”) and that the Government had accorded conversion permission vide G.O. No. 66/2023/AGRI dated 14.07.2023 for development of IT Area Development activities in Technopark Phase III subject to various conditions, including earmarking of approximately 10% of the project area for rainwater harvesting and implementation of comprehensive storm water and rainwater management systems.

The Authority noted that the proposal had undergone detailed appraisal before the SEAC across multiple meetings commencing from the 121st SEAC meeting up to the 186th SEAC meeting, including field inspection conducted on 06.06.2022 and examination of various technical studies, hydrological assessments, environmental management plans, and legal aspects associated with the proposal.

The Authority also took note of the complaints submitted by Sri. K. J. Chacko, President, High Range Environment Protection Council, alleging issues relating to paddy land reclamation, environmental impacts, sub judice status of certain leased projects, and alleged violations associated with the Technopark Phase III Expansion proposal. The Authority

observed that the said complaints were duly considered by the SEAC during appraisal proceedings.

The Authority further noted that the proposal was thereafter considered by the SEAC in its 198th meeting and the Committee verified the reply submitted by the Project Proponent dated 23.01.2026 and noted that the revised proposal incorporates rainwater harvesting ponds and trenches, river buffer retention zones, annual pre-monsoon cleaning measures, and cooperation with the Minor Irrigation Department for widening of downstream drainage and culvert systems. The Authority also noted that the Project Proponent committed to the implementation of measures intended to minimise flash flood risks and downstream hydrological impacts.

The Authority further observed that the Project Proponent had revised the proposal by excluding the land area of M/s Dragonstone Realty Pvt. Ltd., measuring approximately 3.94 Ha, in view of the fact that the Environmental Clearance granted to the said project is presently stayed and sub judice before the Hon'ble Court. Consequently, the revised proposal seeks Environmental Clearance only for an extent of 32.49 Ha with a total built-up area of 8,19,287.41 sq.m.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal and deliberation, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the expansion of Technopark Phase III over an extent of 32.49 Ha with a total built-up area of 8,19,287.41 sq.m for a period of 10 years, subject to General Conditions applicable to Township and Area Development Projects and additional Specific Conditions prescribed by the Committee.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III at Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram District, over an extent of 32.49 Ha with a total built-up area of 8,19,287.41 sq.m for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to strict compliance with the General Conditions applicable to Township and Area Development Projects and the following Specific Conditions.**

- 1. The EC has been issued to the modified master plan submitted by the Project Proponent vide letter dated 17.01.2026, for an area of 32.49 Ha, and a built up area of 8,19,287.41 sq. m. Any change or modification from the above master plan will attract modification of Environmental Clearance.*

2. *Rainwater harvesting pond and non-linear trenches in common areas and rainwater harvesting tanks by the individual lessees, should be constructed, thus reducing the possibility of flash flood.*
3. *A buffer with a width of 3-4m should be provided between the Thettiyyar River and the boundary wall of the project area.*
4. *Riparian restoration shall be carried out in an area of 0.5 ha.*
5. *The Project Proponent should cooperate with any proposal of the Government Department/s for widening of Thettiyyar River including downstream culvert which is currently having a width of only 1.0 meter.*
6. *Rainwater harvesting plan should be carried out in 5.41 acres for a quantity of 26,446 m³ rain water to comply with the G.O No.66/2023/AGRI dated 14.07.2023.*
7. *Afforestation should be carried out in an area of 1 ha in common area and a total of 1ha in individual lessee's area.*
8. *The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
9. *Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.*
10. *A proper drainage system shall be provided to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, taking into account the depth to the water table and the proximity of the natural stream.*
11. *Appropriate flood-mitigation measures shall be implemented, considering the regional topography, in anticipation of extreme rainfall events.*
12. *Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
13. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
14. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and*

operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.

- 15. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 16. The proposed STP for the additional sewage management with MBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
- 17. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
- 18. The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
- 19. Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
- 20. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
- 21. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 22. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
- 23. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in*

total.

- 24. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
- 25. Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
- 26. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
- 27. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
- 28. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
- 29. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
- 30. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
- 31. D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
- 32. Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment, such as BLDC fans and LED lamps, should be promoted as part of energy conservation. At least 20% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.*
- 33. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
- 34. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
- 35. Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
- 36. 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.

37. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
38. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.*
39. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities, which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
40. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.02

**ToR application for the China Clay Project of M/s EICL Limited in Survey Nos. 177, 178, 179, 180, 241, 242, 181/21, 181/10, 182/3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 17, 183, 184, 240/2, 12, 13, 14, 229/14-1 (existing mine lease area of 14.5129 ha) and Survey Nos. 196/7, 10-5, 10, 10-2, 10-3, 245/1, 1-2, 1-3, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17 (proposed mine lease area of 1.0910 ha) in Veiloor Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District – Judgement dated 16.04.2024 in No. 11630/2022 and WM No. 111030/2022 filed before the Hon’ble High Court of Madras and Judgment dated 27.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 41621/2024 of HC of Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/67030/2021; 1926/EC1/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. N. Manoj Pillai, Deputy

General Manager (Mines), M/s EICL Limited, Thonnakkal P.O., Thiruvananthapuram – 695317, seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the China Clay (Minor Mineral) Mining Project of M/s EICL Limited over an extent of 15.6039 Ha in various Survey Nos. of Veiloor Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk.

The Authority noted the extensive procedural and litigation history associated with the proposal, including earlier Environmental Clearance applications relating to mining over an extent of 14.5129 Ha, which had been rejected on account of violations arising from mining operations undertaken without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance. The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (Southern Zone), in OA No. 41/2017, had constituted a Joint Committee which assessed environmental damage to the tune of ₹12,24,32,014/-.

The Authority further noted the subsequent judicial proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, and the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, including the judgment dated 27.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 41621/2024, wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala directed SEIAA to consider the application in accordance with the applicable MoEF&CC notifications, guidelines, and CPCB norms after hearing both the Project Proponent and the complainants represented by Janasakthi Action Council.

The Authority also took note of the various complaints submitted by the Janasakthi Action Council alleging serious environmental, hydrological, and public health impacts arising from the earlier mining operations, including groundwater depletion, air pollution, and environmental degradation in the surrounding areas. The Authority further noted that hearings had been conducted before the Authority in compliance with the judicial directions, during which both the Project Proponent and the complainants were heard in detail.

The Authority observed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 16.05.2025, had set aside the concept of ex post facto Environmental Clearance and the Violation Standard Operating Procedure (SoP). However, the Authority further noted that, subsequently, pursuant to the order dated 18.11.2025 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the MoEF&CC issued Office Memorandum dated 20.01.2026 directing that all violation cases pending under the Office Memorandum dated 07.07.2021 as on 02.01.2024 may continue to be processed.

The Authority further noted that the present ToR application of M/s EICL Limited was

pending consideration before the SEAC as on 02.01.2024 and therefore falls within the ambit of the said Office Memorandum dated 20.01.2026. The Authority also noted that the proposal was thereafter considered by the SEAC in its 200th meeting, wherein the Committee examined the proposal in detail in the light of the prevailing legal framework, the judicial directions, the environmental damage assessment made by the Joint Committee, and the submissions made by both the Project Proponent and the complainants.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, after detailed scrutiny, recommended issuance of Violation Terms of Reference (ToR) for the mining project covering the entire extent of 15.6039 Ha subject to comprehensive safeguards and certain additional studies.

The Authority further noted the subsequent communication dated 12.03.2026 submitted by M/s EICL Limited stating that there are no pending legal cases in respect of the leasehold area and requesting issuance of ToR for the project.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority observed that the present proposal pertains to a long-standing violation matter involving serious allegations of unauthorised mining, assessed environmental damage, and substantial public concerns relating to environmental and health impacts. The Authority further observed that, in view of the Office Memorandum dated 20.01.2026 issued by MoEF&CC and the judicial directions presently governing the field, the proposal is legally eligible for processing at the ToR stage, subject to strict compliance with the applicable environmental safeguards and remedial measures.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendations of the SEAC that any further appraisal of the proposal shall necessarily be based on a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment study incorporating cumulative environmental assessment, remediation planning, environmental restoration measures, and detailed evaluation of the impacts of past and proposed mining activities on the surrounding environment and local communities.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to issue Violation Terms of Reference (ToR) for the China Clay Mining Project of M/s EICL Limited over an extent of 15.6039 Ha, subject to the specific conditions and following additional studies recommended by the SEAC.**

1. Preparation of a comprehensive Remediation Plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan;

2. **Submission of an action plan for remediation of the total environmental damage assessed at ₹12,24,32,014/- by the Joint Committee constituted pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble NGT;**
3. **Conduct of a specific study relating to the impacts of abandoned quarries situated within the impact zone; and**
4. **Conduct of mandatory Public Hearing for addressing local grievances and public health concerns raised by the affected residents and Janasakthi Action Council.**

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the Violation Terms of Reference accordingly.

Item No.03

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shans Paul, M/s Chattupara Granites Pvt Ltd, for an area of 3.0274 Ha at Survey Nos. 734/1B-1, 734/1B-4, 734/1B-5, 734/1B-6, 734/1B-7, 734/1B-8, 734/1B-9 in Kalloorkkad Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam
(SIA/KL/MIN/437379/2023, 2342/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Shans Paul, Managing Director, M/s Chattupara Granites Pvt. Ltd., East Marady P.O., Ernakulam – 686673, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 3.0274 Ha at Survey Nos. 734/1B-1, 734/1B-4, 734/1B-5, 734/1B-6, 734/1B-7, 734/1B-8 and 734/1B-9 in Kalloorkkad Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal had undergone appraisal before the SEAC in various meetings commencing from the 152nd SEAC meeting, during which constituted a Sub-Committee to conduct a field inspection and submit a report. The field inspection was conducted on 20.01.2024 and the report was placed before the Committee for further appraisal.

The Authority further noted that the proposal was subsequently considered in the 158th and 163rd SEAC meetings, during which additional documents and clarifications were sought, and a presentation of the proposal was conducted. Thereafter, the proposal was considered in the 166th SEAC meeting and was recommended for Environmental Clearance for a period of 5

years, subject to the submission of a No Objection Certificate from the Irrigation Department.

The Authority observed that, upon consideration in the 146th SEIAA meeting, discrepancies were noticed regarding the cluster status of the project area. It was observed that, in addition to the quarries reflected in the original cluster certificate, another quarry owned by the Project Proponent, having an extent of 0.97 Ha, existed within the 500 meter radius of the proposed project area. Accordingly, the Authority had referred the proposal back to the SEAC for re-examination of the cluster condition considering the status of all adjacent quarries within the cluster area.

The Authority further noted that a complaint had also been received from Sri. Shinaj Ali alleging violations of the provisions of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963 and that the SEAC, in its 170th meeting, sought various clarifications and reports including clarification from the District Collector regarding permissibility of mining activities in the light of the legal issues raised, updated cluster clarification, response to the complaint, and No Objection Certificate from the Irrigation Department in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 dated 19.04.2024.

The Authority noted that the proposal was thereafter considered in detail by the SEAC in its 198th meeting held on 20th and 21st February 2026, wherein the Committee examined the updated cluster clarification, responses submitted by the Project Proponent, NOC from the Irrigation Department, and other supporting documents.

The Authority further observed that, although the Project Proponent contended that the cumulative extent of working quarries within the cluster area is only 3.9974 Ha, detailed verification of the cluster certificate dated 27.08.2024 revealed the existence of two additional quarries having extents of 2.5 acres and 0.8502 Ha respectively, which were categorised as non-working quarries. The Authority noted the finding of the SEAC that, in the absence of approved and certified mine closure and restitution of over extraction of resources, if any, in accordance with the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules and approved Mine Closure Plans, such non-working quarries continue to retain their environmental footprint and are liable to be treated as live quarries for the purpose of cluster appraisal.

The Authority further observed that the cumulative cluster area, inclusive of the operational and non-working quarries, works out to 5.8188 Ha, thereby attracting the requirement for comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study and Public

Hearing under the cluster appraisal framework. The Authority noted that the SEAC had consistently adopted the view in similar cases that where adjacent quarries have not undergone formal closure and environmental restoration in accordance with applicable statutory provisions, the cumulative environmental impacts of such quarrying activities necessitate integrated environmental appraisal through comprehensive EIA study.

The Authority further observed that the project area forms part of an environmentally stressed and mining-impacted cluster region where cumulative impacts relating to air quality, groundwater regime, drainage pattern, ecology, transportation, blasting impacts, and public safety require detailed scientific assessment prior to consideration of any further mining activity.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that appraisal of the present proposal without a comprehensive EIA study and Public Hearing would be environmentally unsustainable and contrary to the precautionary principle and the objectives of informed environmental decision-making under the EIA Notification, 2006.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the present application for Environmental Clearance. The Authority further directed the Project Proponent to submit an application for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment study and Public Hearing for the cluster area in accordance with the applicable environmental norms and statutory requirements. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.04

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sebastian. V. J for an area of 2.0827 Ha at Survey Nos. 1/166 in Pullippadam Village, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/129437/2019, 1539/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Sebastian V. J., Vadaparambil House, Myladi, Nilambur, Malappuram District, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 2.0827 Ha at Survey No. 1/166 in Pullippadam Village, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the present proposal is pending for a long period and had undergone appraisal before the SEAC in various meetings commencing from the 111th and 114th SEAC meetings, during which the Committee sought additional documents and clarifications from the Project Proponent. The Authority further noted that, upon submission of certain additional documents, the proposal was reconsidered in the 169th SEAC meeting and the Project Proponent was invited for presentation. Subsequently, the proposal was presented before the SEAC in its 172nd meeting, following which a Sub-Committee of SEAC had conducted field inspection on 17.01.2025 and the report was placed before the Committee for appraisal.

The Authority further noted that the field inspection report was considered in the 179th SEAC meeting, wherein the Committee sought further additional documents and clarifications from the Project Proponent for continued appraisal of the proposal. The Authority observed that the proposal was thereafter considered in detail by the SEAC in its 197th meeting, during which the Committee scrutinized the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent on 05.02.2026.

The Authority noted the serious observations recorded by the SEAC that the actual location of the project site furnished before the Committee did not correspond with the location indicated in the uploaded KML file. The Committee observed that, as per the uploaded KML data, the site appeared to be located at Nediyruppu, whereas the latitude and longitude coordinates indicated that the actual project area is situated near the foothills of Vavul Mala, approximately 10 kilometres away, and in proximity to environmentally sensitive and landslide-prone regions including the Mundakkai landslide area and the Kakkadampoil hill ranges.

The Authority further observed that the field inspection findings revealed that the project area falls within a gentle to moderate slope terrain surrounded by environmentally sensitive regions and areas exhibiting moderate to high hazard vulnerability. The Authority noted that accurate identification and delineation of the project area through authenticated geo-referenced KML data is essential for proper environmental appraisal, hazard zonation verification, terrain analysis, and assessment of ecological sensitivity.

The Authority further noted that the proposal was originally submitted in the year 2019 and that the appraisal process has been considerably delayed due to the repeated failure of the Project Proponent to furnish the required documents and clarifications within

reasonable time. The Authority observed that, although the SEAC had sought additional documents as early as 30.10.2020 in its 114th meeting, the Project Proponent submitted the same only on 19.07.2024 after an inordinate delay of several years.

The Authority also noted that, despite repeated opportunities and substantial time granted by the SEAC, the Project Proponent failed to submit essential statutory documents, including the No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Irrigation Officer as required under Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003, pursuant to the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) Nos. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 vide order dated 19.04.2024.

The Authority further observed that the Project Proponent also failed to furnish a correct, updated, and authenticated KML file of the proposed project area, thereby preventing the SEAC from accurately assessing the present hazard zonation status, terrain characteristics, environmental sensitivity, and other critical site-specific factors relevant for appraisal.

The Authority concurred with the findings of the SEAC that, in the absence of accurate geo-spatial data and mandatory statutory documents, proper environmental appraisal of the proposal is not feasible. The Authority further observed that the prolonged pendency of the proposal is attributable solely to the persistent non-compliance and inaction on the part of the Project Proponent despite repeated opportunities granted during the appraisal process.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sebastian V. J. on account of persistent failure to comply with the requirements of the appraisal process and non-submission of essential statutory and technical documents.**

However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent shall be at liberty to submit a fresh application through the PARIVESH portal along with all requisite statutory clearances, authenticated geo-spatial data, and supporting documents in accordance with the prevailing environmental norms and appraisal requirements. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

PARIVESH (Ver-2)

Item No.01

Re-appraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode, to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Smile M. Anto for an area of 1.0320 Ha, at Re-Sy No. 424/3, 425/1 in Maruthonkara village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode – WP (C) No. 2607/2025 filed by Sri. Saji T. K.

(SIA/KL/MIN/463823/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal relating to the reappraisal of the Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode, to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Smile M. Anto for an extent of 1.0320 Ha in Re-Survey Nos. 424/3 and 425/1 of Maruthonkara Village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode District. The Authority examined the records placed before it, including the observations and recommendations of the SEAC, reports furnished by various authorities, complaints received from local residents, and the proceedings connected with the pending litigation before the Hon'ble High Court.

The Authority noted that the issue raised by the SEAC pertains to the applicability and regulatory implications of the recent GIS-based Landslide Hazard Zonation Mapping in respect of quarry projects that were granted Environmental Clearance and had commenced lawful operations prior to the publication/adoption of the revised hazard zonation framework. The Authority further noted that a portion of the project area is presently classified under High Hazard Zone as per the latest hazard zonation map, whereas under the earlier landslide susceptibility mapping, the project area had been categorised under Medium Hazard Zone.

The Authority further observed that the issue involves substantial questions relating to the legal applicability, retrospective effect, and regulatory consequences of hazard zonation mapping on already functioning quarries and existing Environmental Clearances, particularly in cases where mining operations had commenced pursuant to valid statutory permissions granted under the prevailing legal and technical framework at the relevant point of time.

The Authority also took note of the serious environmental and public safety concerns associated with continuation of mining activities in landslide-prone and environmentally fragile areas, especially in the backdrop of recent extreme rainfall events, slope failures, and landslide incidents reported in various parts of the State. The Authority observed that the matter has wider environmental, legal, technical, and policy implications extending beyond the present proposal and may have substantial bearing on similarly situated quarry operations

across the State.

The Authority further noted that deliberations had already been undertaken at the inter-departmental level involving the KSDMA, Environment Department and the Department of Mining and Geology regarding the scope and implications of the revised hazard zonation mapping. However, considering the complexity and sensitivity of the issue, the Authority was of the considered opinion that an authoritative legal opinion is necessary before arriving at any final decision regarding the continuation of quarrying operations in areas now falling within High Hazard Zone or other landslide-prone categories.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided to obtain a detailed legal opinion on the following aspects:**

- 1. The applicability and legal effect of the revised GIS-based Landslide Hazard Zonation Maps on quarry projects that had already obtained Environmental Clearance and commenced operations before publication/adoption of the revised hazard zonation framework;**
- 2. Whether mining and quarrying activities can legally and environmentally be permitted to continue in areas presently classified as High Hazard Zone or landslide-prone areas under the revised hazard zonation mapping;**
- 3. The legal and regulatory course of action to be adopted in respect of pending applications involving existing quarry operations situated in areas subsequently classified under High Hazard Zone.**

The Authority further decided to defer further consideration of the proposal pending receipt of the legal opinion and further examination of the matter in consultation with the concerned departments and expert agencies. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to take necessary steps for obtaining the legal opinion and to place the matter before the Authority thereafter for further consideration.

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Shri. Antony S. Alukkal, Authorized Signatory, M/s. Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 3.6127 Ha at Block No – 20, Re-Sy. Nos: 131/5, 131/11, 132/3, 132/3 1, 133/4-2, 133/7-1 & 139/3 in Manimala Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/529942/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, Authorised Signatory, M/s Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Private Limited, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 3.6127 Ha at Block No. 20, Re-Survey Nos. 131/5, 131/11, 132/3, 132/3-1, 133/4-2, 133/7-1 and 139/3 in Manimala Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam District, which was forwarded by the MoEF&CC on 21.07.2025.

The Authority noted that the proposal was examined by the SEAC in its 198th meeting and observed that another application pertaining to the very same project of M/s Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Private Limited bearing Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/496038/2024, submitted on 11.12.2024, is already pending consideration and appraisal before the SEAC through the PARIVESH portal.

The Authority noted the finding of the SEAC that the present proposal forwarded from MoEF&CC constitutes a duplicate application in respect of the same project proposal already under active appraisal before the competent authority. Accordingly, the SEAC recommended rejection of the present application in order to avoid parallel processing and multiplicity of proceedings relating to the same project.

The Authority further observed that the Project Proponent has subsequently withdrawn/pulled back the present proposal and that no further action remains pending in respect of the said application. After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to close/reject the present application as infructuous and duplicative in nature, in view of the existence of the parallel proposal already under appraisal before the SEAC. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

The Authority further directed the SEAC to expedite the appraisal process in respect of the pending proposal bearing No. SIA/KL/MIN/496038/2024 in accordance

with the applicable statutory provisions and environmental appraisal procedures.

Item No.03 Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajikumar N. for an area of 0.9690 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 458/4, 458/4-1, 458/3, 458/12, 458/13, 458/9 in Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta. (SIA/KL/MIN/514750/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Ajikumar N., Niranilathu Veedu, Malayalappuzha, Eram P.O., Pathanamthitta – 689664, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.9690 Ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 458/4, 458/4-1, 458/3, 458/12, 458/13 and 458/9 in Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 198th meeting and heard the Project Proponent, Sri. Ajikumar N., and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy. The Authority further noted that the mining plan was revised during appraisal to exclude approximately 0.3335 Ha falling within the High Hazard Zone, with corresponding modifications in the mineable reserve and production plan.

The Authority further noted the findings of the SEAC that the project site is located in Vadasserikkara Village, which falls within an Eco-Sensitive Area (ESA) village as per the draft Eco-Sensitive Area Notification issued by the MoEF&CC, and that mining and quarrying activities are prohibited in such notified Eco-Sensitive Areas in accordance with the directions issued by MoEF&CC vide communication dated 13.11.2013. The Authority observed that, notwithstanding the revisions proposed by the Project Proponent, a portion of the project area continues to fall within High Hazard Zone, thereby indicating environmental fragility and susceptibility to slope instability and associated risks.

The Authority further observed that the location of the project within an Eco-Sensitive Area, coupled with the presence of High Hazard Zone within the lease area, renders the proposal environmentally impermissible and legally untenable for grant of Environmental Clearance. The Authority noted that permitting quarrying activities in such areas would be in contravention of the applicable regulatory framework, including the provisions governing Eco-Sensitive Areas, as well as the principles of environmental protection, precautionary approach, and sustainable development.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that the proposal is liable to be rejected in view of the statutory prohibition on mining activities in Eco-Sensitive Areas and the environmental sensitivity of the site. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajikumar N. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.04

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Shri. Vasundharan. K., for an area of 3.2314 Ha at Block No. 064, Survey Nos. 100/9049, 100/9053, 100/299, 100/1434, 100/9406, 100/1825 & 100/9034 in Thimiri Village, Thalipparamba Taluk, Kannur
(SIA/KL/MIN/525594/2025)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Vasundharan K., seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 3.2314 Ha at Block No. 064, Survey Nos. 100/9049, 100/9053, 100/299, 100/1434, 100/9406, 100/1825 and 100/9034 in Thimiri Village, Thalipparamba Taluk, Kannur District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was initially considered by the SEAC in its 189th and 196th meetings, wherein the Committee examined the proposal in detail and deliberated the field inspection report, hazard zonation status, terrain characteristics, and technical details of the proposed quarrying operations.

The Authority further noted the findings of the SEAC that approximately 55% of the total lease area, covering about 1.78 Ha, lies within the High Hazard Zone, while the remaining area is situated within Medium Hazard Zone. Besides, the project site is situated on the flank of a hill characterized by steep slopes and exposed rock formations, with the upper portions of the site being significantly steeper than the lower terrain. The Authority observed that the presence of extensive High Hazard Zone terrain within the lease area renders the site environmentally fragile and highly vulnerable to slope instability, landslides, soil erosion, and associated geomorphological hazards.

The Authority further observed that, under the prevailing environmental and hazard zonation framework based on the GSI Landslide Susceptibility Mapping, quarrying and

mining activities are impermissible in High Hazard Zones owing to the serious environmental and disaster risks associated with such activities. The Authority also observed that permitting excavation, bench cutting, blasting, and allied quarrying operations in a steep hill flank containing substantial High Hazard Zone coverage is likely to aggravate slope destabilisation and increase the likelihood of landslides and environmental degradation, thereby posing significant threats to nearby habitations, public safety, ecology, and infrastructure.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that the environmental fragility of the terrain, the substantial extent of High Hazard Zone within the lease area, and the continued presence of Medium Hazard Zone conditions warrant strict application of the Precautionary Principle in environmental decision-making.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vasundharan K. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.05 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Rajan P. P., Managing Partner, M/s. Diamond Crushers, for an area of 1.4800 Ha, at Block No. 199, Re-Sy Nos. 275/587, 275/584, 275/583 in Thrippangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/554650/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Rajan P. P., Managing Partner, M/s Diamond Crushers, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 1.4800 Ha at Block No. 199, Re-Survey Nos. 275/587, 275/584 and 275/583 in Thrippangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by SEAC in its 189th and 196th SEAC 3 meeting, wherein the Committee examined the proposal in detail, heard the presentation of the Project Proponent, along with the accredited consultant, Sri. Cyriac Joseph. The Authority further noted that the SEAC had examined the drone videography of the project site and the surrounding terrain along with the latest hazard zonation maps produced during appraisal. The Authority observed that, as per the latest Geological Survey of India (GSI) Hazard Zonation Map, 2025, approximately 90% of the proposed quarry area falls within the

High Hazard Zone.

The Authority observed that High Hazard Zone areas are environmentally sensitive and geologically unstable terrains vulnerable to landslides, slope failures, soil erosion, and mass movement, particularly during periods of intense rainfall and extreme climatic events. The Authority further observed that quarrying and mining activities in such hazard-prone areas are environmentally impermissible owing to the serious risks posed to ecological stability, public safety, nearby habitations, infrastructure, and downstream environmental systems.

The Authority concurred with the findings of the SEAC that permitting quarrying operations in a terrain substantially falling within High Hazard Zone is likely to aggravate slope instability and environmental degradation and may result in irreversible environmental consequences and disaster risks. The Authority further observed that the environmental sensitivity and fragility of the terrain necessitate strict adherence to the precautionary approach in environmental decision-making. The Authority noted that the SEAC, after detailed deliberation, recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking the Precautionary Principle in view of the extensive High Hazard Zone coverage and the environmentally fragile nature of the terrain.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Diamond Crushers. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.06

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sudarsan C.K., for an area of 4.9326 Ha, at Re-Sy. Block No. 01, Re-Sy Nos. 188/3022, 188/3023, 188/3024, 188/3025, 188/2026, 188/3027, 188/3028, 188/3029, 188/3030, 188/3031 & 188/3032 in Vilangad Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode (SIA/KL/MIN/536643/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Shri. Sudarsan C. K., S/o Balan K. K., Cherukunnothuparambath House, Cheruparamba P.O., Kannur – 670693, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an

extent of 4.9326 Ha at Re-Sy. Block No. 01, Re-Sy. Nos. 188/3022, 188/3023, 188/3024, 188/3025, 188/2026, 188/3027, 188/3028, 188/3029, 188/3030, 188/3031 and 188/3032 in Vilangad Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 196th meeting, wherein the proposal and supporting documents were examined in detail. The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC that approximately 40% of the proposed project area falls within the High Hazard Zone and that the remaining portion is contiguous with Medium Hazard Zone areas. The Authority also observed that the project site is substantially surrounded by High Hazard Zone terrain, thereby indicating significant geomorphological instability, slope vulnerability, and susceptibility to landslides and associated disaster risks.

The Authority took serious note of the findings of the SEAC regarding the major landslide incidents that occurred on 30th July 2024 in the Vilangad region of Kozhikode District following intense monsoon rainfall, which reportedly resulted in extensive slope failures, destruction of residential structures, damage to roads and public infrastructure, and loss of human lives. The Authority further noted that subsequent assessments conducted by competent agencies had identified multiple landslide epicentres within the region, thereby establishing the fragile and disaster-prone nature of the terrain.

The Authority observed that quarrying and mining activities in High and Medium Hazard Zones are environmentally impermissible and contrary to disaster risk reduction principles, particularly in ecologically sensitive hill terrains vulnerable to slope instability and mass movement. The Authority further observed that permitting quarrying operations in such environmentally fragile and hazard-prone landscapes is likely to aggravate slope destabilisation, alter natural drainage systems, accelerate soil erosion, and increase the probability of landslides and associated environmental disasters, thereby posing serious threats to life, property, ecology, and public infrastructure in the surrounding region.

The Authority further noted that the hazard zonation status of the site, coupled with the recent history of landslide disasters in the locality, clearly demonstrates the environmental unsuitability of the project area for quarrying operations. The Authority observed that the environmental risks associated with the proposed activity are substantial, irreversible, and incapable of being adequately mitigated through ordinary environmental safeguards.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that the

proposal is liable to be rejected by invoking the Precautionary Principle, which mandates that where there are credible threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of complete scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for permitting environmentally hazardous activities.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Shri. Sudarsan C. K. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.07 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s. VJJ Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 0.9965 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/474394/2024)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s VJJ Infrastructure Private Limited, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.9965 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy. No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal had undergone detailed appraisal in various meetings of the SEAC, including examination of additional documents, field inspection reports, technical studies, and personal hearing of the Project Proponent pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and the subsequent decision of the Authority.

The Authority further noted that the proposal was initially considered by the erstwhile SEAC in its 168th, 170th and 173rd meetings, during which, by invoked the Precautionary Principle considering the environmental fragility of the site and recommended rejection of the proposal. The Authority noted that, upon reconsideration by the Authority in its 151st meeting, the matter was referred back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal after field inspection, taking into account the subsequent submissions of the Project Proponent, including the No Objection Certificate issued by the District Level Crisis Management Group.

The Authority further noted that a detailed field inspection was conducted by the Sub-Committee constituted by the SEAC and that the field inspection report, technical materials

including Drone-based LiDAR survey outputs, contour maps, Digital Elevation Models (DEM), slope analysis, and ortho imagery were examined during appraisal.

The Authority observed that the proposed quarry area is situated on the flank of a hill slope descending towards the southeast with a general slope ranging from 10° to 17° and that the site constitutes a relatively undisturbed virgin terrain covered with moderate-density natural vegetation. The project area lies within a moderate hazard zone and forms part of an elevated ridge system having elevations ranging between 240 m and 522 m above MSL.

The Authority further observed that the geomorphological characteristics of the site render the area environmentally fragile and highly sensitive to anthropogenic disturbances. The Authority noted the findings of the SEAC that quarrying activities in such terrain are likely to accelerate soil erosion, destabilise slopes, alter natural drainage patterns, increase sediment transport to downstream agricultural lands, and create risks of drainage congestion and siltation, particularly during intense monsoon events. The Authority also observed that excavation activities on elevated ridge systems may adversely affect the natural hill profile, weaken slope stability, and increase the possibility of localised landslides and irreversible ecological degradation.

The Authority further noted that the ridge and hilltop landforms in the region perform significant ecological functions, including maintenance of regional microclimatic conditions, groundwater recharge, and ecological balance. The Authority also took note of the fact that a previous quarry proposal situated on the same hill and owned by M/s Neeloor Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. had already been rejected in October 2024 owing to similar environmental concerns and fragile terrain conditions.

The Authority noted that, pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023 and the subsequent decision of the Authority in its 160th meeting, the Project Proponent was afforded a detailed personal hearing before the SEAC in its 198th meeting held on 20th and 21st February 2026. The Authority observed that, despite being granted sufficient opportunity, the Project Proponent failed to produce any substantial or material evidence capable of addressing or overcoming the environmental concerns, hazard-related findings, and technical deficiencies recorded during earlier appraisals.

The Authority concurred with the repeated findings and recommendations of the SEAC that the proposal, if permitted, is likely to result in irreversible environmental impacts

on the fragile hill ecosystem and surrounding habitations and that the environmental risks associated with the project outweigh any projected benefits claimed by the Project Proponent.

The Authority further observed that the principles of sustainable development, inter-generational equity, and the Precautionary Principle mandate that where there exists a credible threat of serious or irreversible environmental damage, the absence of complete scientific certainty cannot be used as a ground for permitting environmentally risky activities.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s VJJ Infrastructure Private Limited. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.08

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

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. M. T. Thomas, Managing Partner, M/s Thomson Granites, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 4.0590 Ha at Block No. 06, Re-Survey Nos. 28/1-3, 28/1-5, 28/1-6, 28/1-7, 28/1-8, 29/2, 29/2-1, 29/2-3, 29/4, 29/5, 29/5-1, 29/6, 29/6-1, 29/6-2, 29/7, 29/8, 29/8-1, 29/9, 29/9-1, 29/9-2 and 29/11 in Edakkunnam Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC in its 186th and 198th meetings, wherein the Committee examined the project proposal in detail along with the field inspection report. The Authority further noted that the field inspection was conducted on 19.12.2025 and the inspection report was placed before the SEAC for further appraisal.

The Authority further observed that, as per the latest Hazard Zonation Map, approximately 75% to 80% of the proposed project area falls within the High Hazard Zone,

and the remaining portion falls within the Medium Hazard Zone. The Authority also noted that the field inspection report and appraisal records indicate that the project area is characterised by steep terrain and environmentally fragile topography.

The Authority observed that the SEAC, after detailed examination of the field inspection findings, hazard zonation status, topographical conditions, and environmental sensitivity of the locality, concluded that the predominance of High Hazard Zone within the project area renders the site unsuitable for quarrying activities. The SEAC further observed that mining activities in High Hazard Zones are environmentally impermissible in view of the significant risks associated with slope instability, soil erosion, land degradation, hydrological disturbance, and potential threat to life and property.

The Authority further noted that the steep elevation variation of approximately 128 metres within the quarry site constitutes a high-slope terrain, thereby aggravating the environmental vulnerability and hazard potential of the area. The Authority observed that permitting quarrying operations in such ecologically fragile and hazard-prone terrain would be contrary to the principles of environmental protection, the precautionary principle, and sustainable development embodied under the environmental regulatory framework.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that the proposal is environmentally unsuitable for the grant of Environmental Clearance owing to the substantial extent of the project area falling within High Hazard Zone and the fragile geomorphological characteristics of the site.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Thomson Granites. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.09

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Noorudheen Panthapulakkal for an area of 0.9750 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 53/2-2 & 53/2-7, in Nellaya Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.
(SIA/KL/MIN/553051/2025)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Noorudheen Panthapulakkal, Panthapulakkal House, Koottakkadavu, Anakkara, Palakkad District, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.9750 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 53/2-2 and 53/2-7 in Nellaya Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 197th meeting, wherein the project and the submissions made by the Project Proponent were examined in detail. The Authority further noted that, as per the Cluster Certificate dated 26.09.2025, the proposed quarry forms part of a cluster situation with multiple quarrying operations situated within a radius of 500 metres from the project site, including:

- a) Quarry of Sri. M. M. Ashraf, Managing Partner, M/s Infra Granites LLP – 3.0757 Ha;
- b) Quarry proposal of M/s Veettikkad Granites – 1.8714 Ha, for which a Letter of Intent (LoI) has been issued;
- c) Working quarry of Sri. Sukumaran – 0.9407 Ha; and
- d) Proposal of Sri. Suhair T. (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/472789/2024), having an extent of 2.2366 Ha, in respect of which a Letter of Intent had been issued vide proceedings dated 19.09.2023, and was rejected for want of an EIA study and public hearing.

The Authority observed that the cumulative extent of quarrying and quarry-related activities within the cluster area exceeds the threshold limit prescribed for standalone appraisal and therefore attracts the requirement for comprehensive appraisal through EIA study and Public Hearing in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the applicable Office Memoranda and guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent had submitted an explanation

seeking exemption from the requirement of Terms of Reference (ToR), EIA study, and Public Hearing, contending that the proposal of M/s Veettikkad Granites ought not to be reckoned for cluster calculation on the ground that the said project had only obtained a Letter of Intent and had not submitted a mining plan or uploaded the proposal in the PARIVESH portal.

The Authority noted the finding of the SEAC that the explanation offered by the Project Proponent is untenable and devoid of merit, particularly in view of the fact that Terms of Reference had already been issued to M/s Veettikkad Granites for conducting an EIA study, thereby establishing the existence and continuance of the cluster condition for environmental appraisal.

The Authority further observed that the requirement for cumulative impact assessment through EIA study and Public Hearing is intended to ensure comprehensive evaluation of the environmental carrying capacity, cumulative impacts on air, water, land, traffic, ecology, hydrology, and public safety arising from multiple quarrying operations located in proximity. Such statutory requirements cannot be diluted or circumvented on technical or procedural grounds when the factual existence of the cluster situation is established.

The Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC that the proposal cannot be appraised as an individual standalone project in view of the subsisting cluster condition and the mandatory requirement for prior conduct of an EIA study and Public Hearing.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Noorudheen Panthapulakkal. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

The Authority further observed that the present proposal is also reflected as part of the cluster in the Cluster Certificate issued in respect of the proposal of M/s Veettikkad Granites and therefore the Project Proponent has the liberty to conduct the EIA and public hearing in association with M/s Veettikkad Granites, thereby covering the cumulative environmental impacts arising from the cluster area, in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the applicable guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC.

Item No.10

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Azeez for an area of 0.4723 Ha at Survey No. 64/2-2, 63/3-4-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram
(SIA/KL/MIN/561221/2026)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Abdul Azeez, Makkakkad House, Pulikkal, Andiyoorakunnu P.O Malappuram – 673637, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.4723 Ha at Survey No. 64/2-2, 63/3-4-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 197th meeting. As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. Abdul Azeez, and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy attended the meeting and made a presentation on the salient features of the project and the additional documents submitted. It was noted that the targeted production of the mine is 43,767.4 MT, with an expected Life of Mine of 3 years. The revised project cost is estimated at Rs. 16,44,000/-.

The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC that there are multiple quarrying operations situated within a radius of 500 metres from the proposed project site, including projects owned by various proponents such as Sri. Noushad C. K., Sri. Muhammed Razil K. P., Sri. Haneefa Kottai, and Sri. Abdul Rahiman. The SEAC also observed, based on available satellite imagery and other records, including drone videos, that several quarry sites in the vicinity appear to have either not been scientifically closed or have failed to implement approved mine closure and reclamation measures in accordance with statutory requirements.

The Authority noted with concern the findings of the SEAC that the adjoining valley portions of the area are densely inhabited and environmentally sensitive and that the cumulative impact arising from multiple operational, abandoned, legal, and illegal quarrying activities has already resulted in substantial environmental degradation in the locality. The SEAC had specifically observed that the proposed drainage arrangement directing runoff towards the northern valley area was technically inadequate and environmentally unsuitable, considering the terrain characteristics and the fragile ecological setting of the area.

The Authority further observed that laterite mining activities, both authorised and unauthorised, in several parts of the State have resulted in significant and irreversible

alterations to the natural terrain, drainage patterns, hydrological regime, and ecological balance of the affected regions. Unscientific quarrying and improper mine closure practices have led to accelerated soil erosion, land degradation, destabilisation of slopes, and deterioration of the local environmental setup. It was also observed that numerous abandoned mine pits remain unreclaimed and unattended, thereby becoming susceptible to invasion by invasive plant species and contributing to long-term adverse impacts on local biodiversity, groundwater recharge, and public safety.

The Authority further noted that the SEAC had observed that three proposals placed before the Committee are situated within a radius of 500 metres from one another and that the cumulative environmental impacts of the cluster area require integrated assessment. The SEAC had therefore opined that a comprehensive EIA study may be necessary for proper appraisal of the cumulative environmental impacts relating to drainage management, traffic movement, slope stability, environmental safety, ecological degradation, and risks posed to nearby inhabitants.

The Authority also considered the subsequent representation dated 20.03.2026 submitted by the Project Proponent requesting exemption from the requirement of Terms of Reference and Public Hearing on the ground that the certified cluster area is only 3.0326 Ha, which is below the threshold limit of 5 Ha prescribed for cluster consideration. The Project Proponent further contended that certain quarry sites within the cluster have already ceased operations and that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP) would be implemented for the area.

After detailed deliberation and considering the representation submitted by the Project Proponent, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and consideration by obtaining necessary EIA report from the Project Proponent.**

The Authority further observed that the SEAC, being the Expert Appraisal Committee constituted under the EIA Notification, 2006, shall have the liberty to seek a comprehensive EIA Report and cumulative environmental assessment from the Project Proponent, including any additional scientific or region-specific studies relating to drainage pattern, hydrology, slope stability, ecological impacts, abandoned mine pits, biodiversity impacts, traffic management, environmental carrying capacity, or any other environmental concerns relevant to the locality.

The Authority further directed that the Project Proponent shall submit all studies, reports, assessments, and additional documents as may be sought by the SEAC for proper environmental appraisal of the proposal.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to place the matter before the SEAC for further appraisal and necessary recommendation.

**Item No.11 Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Razil K.P for an area of 0.1112 Ha at Re-Sy No. 64/3-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram
(SIA/KL/MIN/561240/2026)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Muhammed Razil K. P., Pulikkalakandi House, Chullikkode, Thavanoor P.O., Malappuram – 673641, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.1112 Ha at Re-Survey No. 64/3-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 197th meeting. As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. Muhammed Razil K. P., and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy attended the meeting and made a presentation on the salient features of the project and the additional documents submitted. It was noted that the targeted production of the mine is 12,232 MT with an anticipated mine life of 1 year and a revised project cost of ₹3,25,498/-.

The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC that there are multiple quarrying operations situated within a radius of 500 metres from the proposed project site, including projects owned by various proponents such as Sri. Noushad C. K., Sri. Abdul Azeez, Sri. Haneefa Kottai, and Sri. Abdul Rahiman. The SEAC also observed, based on available satellite imagery and other records including drone videos, that several quarry sites in the vicinity appear to have either not been scientifically closed or have failed to implement approved mine closure and reclamation measures in accordance with statutory requirements.

The Authority noted with concern the findings of the SEAC that the adjoining valley portions of the area are densely inhabited and environmentally sensitive and that the

cumulative impact arising from multiple operational, abandoned, legal, and illegal quarrying activities has already resulted in substantial environmental degradation in the locality. The SEAC had specifically observed that the proposed drainage arrangement directing runoff towards the northern valley area was technically inadequate and environmentally unsuitable, considering the terrain characteristics and the fragile ecological setting of the area.

The Authority further observed that laterite mining activities, both authorised and unauthorised, in several parts of the State have resulted in significant and irreversible alterations to the natural terrain, drainage patterns, hydrological regime, and ecological balance of the affected regions. Unscientific quarrying and improper mine closure practices have led to accelerated soil erosion, land degradation, destabilisation of slopes, and deterioration of the local environmental setup. It was also observed that numerous abandoned mine pits remain unreclaimed and unattended, thereby becoming susceptible to invasion by invasive plant species and contributing to long-term adverse impacts on local biodiversity, groundwater recharge, and public safety.

The Authority further noted that the SEAC had observed that three proposals placed before the Committee are situated within a radius of 500 metres from one another and that the cumulative environmental impacts of the cluster area require integrated assessment. The SEAC had therefore opined that a comprehensive EIA study may be necessary for proper appraisal of the cumulative environmental impacts relating to drainage management, traffic movement, slope stability, environmental safety, ecological degradation, and risks posed to nearby inhabitants.

The Authority also considered the subsequent representation dated 20.03.2026 submitted by the Project Proponent requesting exemption from the requirement of Terms of Reference and Public Hearing on the ground that the certified cluster area is only 3.0326 Ha, which is below the threshold limit of 5 Ha prescribed for cluster consideration. The Project Proponent further contended that certain quarry sites within the cluster have already ceased operations and that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP) would be implemented for the area.

After detailed deliberation and considering the representation submitted by the Project Proponent, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and consideration by obtaining necessary EIA report from the Project Proponent.**

The Authority further observed that the SEAC, being the Expert Appraisal Committee constituted under the EIA Notification, 2006, shall have the liberty to seek a comprehensive EIA Report and cumulative environmental assessment from the Project Proponent, including any additional scientific or region-specific studies relating to drainage pattern, hydrology, slope stability, ecological impacts, abandoned mine pits, biodiversity impacts, traffic management, environmental carrying capacity, or any other environmental concerns relevant to the locality.

The Authority further directed that the Project Proponent shall submit all studies, reports, assessments, and additional documents as may be sought by the SEAC for proper environmental appraisal of the proposal.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to place the matter before the SEAC for further appraisal and necessary recommendation.

Item No.12 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Noushad C K for an area of 0.4571 Ha at Survey Nos. 64/2-2, 64/3-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram**
(SIA/KL/MIN/560856/2026)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Noushad C. K., Kanjirathingal House, Valiyaparambu, Pulikkal P.O., Malappuram – 673637, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 0.4571 Ha at Survey Nos. 64/2-2 and 64/3-2 in Muthuvallur Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 197th meeting. As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. Noushad C. K., and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy, attended the meeting and made a presentation on the salient features of the project and the additional documents submitted. It was noted that the targeted production of the mine is 40,525.2 MT with an anticipated mine life of 3 years and a revised project cost of ₹16.10 Lakhs.

The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC that there are multiple quarrying operations situated within a radius of 500 metres from the proposed project site, including projects owned by the same proponent and various proponents such as Sri. Abdul

Azeez, Sri. Muhammed Razil K. P., Sri. Haneefa Kottai, and Sri. Abdul Rahiman. The SEAC also observed, based on available satellite imagery and other records including drone videos, that several quarry sites in the vicinity appear to have either not been scientifically closed or have failed to implement approved mine closure and reclamation measures in accordance with statutory requirements.

The Authority noted with concern the findings of the SEAC that the adjoining valley portions of the area are densely inhabited and environmentally sensitive and that the cumulative impact arising from multiple operational, abandoned, legal, and illegal quarrying activities has already resulted in substantial environmental degradation in the locality. The SEAC had specifically observed that the proposed drainage arrangement directing runoff towards the northern valley area was technically inadequate and environmentally unsuitable considering the terrain characteristics and the fragile ecological setting of the area.

The Authority further observed that laterite mining activities, both authorised and unauthorised, in several parts of the State have resulted in significant and irreversible alterations to the natural terrain, drainage patterns, hydrological regime, and ecological balance of the affected regions. Unscientific quarrying and improper mine closure practices have led to accelerated soil erosion, land degradation, destabilisation of slopes, and deterioration of the local environmental setup. It was also observed that numerous abandoned mine pits remain unreclaimed and unattended, thereby becoming susceptible to invasion by invasive plant species and contributing to long-term adverse impacts on local biodiversity, groundwater recharge, and public safety.

The Authority further noted that the SEAC had observed that three proposals placed before the Committee are situated within a radius of 500 metres from one another and that the cumulative environmental impacts of the cluster area require integrated assessment. The SEAC had therefore opined that a comprehensive EIA study may be necessary for proper appraisal of the cumulative environmental impacts relating to drainage management, traffic movement, slope stability, environmental safety, ecological degradation, and risks posed to nearby inhabitants.

The Authority also considered the subsequent representation dated 20.03.2026 submitted by the Project Proponent requesting exemption from the requirement of Terms of Reference and Public Hearing on the ground that the certified cluster area is only 3.0326 Ha, which is below the threshold limit of 5 Ha prescribed for cluster consideration. The Project

Proponent further contended that certain quarry sites within the cluster have already ceased operations and that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP) would be implemented for the area.

After detailed deliberation and considering the representation submitted by the Project Proponent, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and consideration by obtaining necessary EIA report from the Project Proponent.**

The Authority further observed that the SEAC, being the Expert Appraisal Committee constituted under the EIA Notification, 2006, shall have the liberty to seek a comprehensive EIA Report and cumulative environmental assessment from the Project Proponent, including any additional scientific or region-specific studies relating to drainage pattern, hydrology, slope stability, ecological impacts, abandoned mine pits, biodiversity impacts, traffic management, environmental carrying capacity, or any other environmental concerns relevant to the locality.

The Authority further directed that the Project Proponent shall submit all studies, reports, assessments, and additional documents as may be sought by the SEAC for proper environmental appraisal of the proposal.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to place the matter before the SEAC for further appraisal and necessary recommendations.

Item No.13

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shibu Pynadath John, Managing Director, M/s Pynadath Petra Park (P) Ltd., for an area of 4.7997 Ha. at Block No. 30, Re-Survey Nos. 59/1, 59/3-1, 59/3- 2, 59/3-3, 60/8-1, 61/1-1, 61/1-2, 61/1-3, 61/1-4, 62/3, 62/4, 62/5, 63/2 in Kadanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam
(SIA/KL/MIN/553205/2025)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Shibu Pynadath John, Managing Director, M/s Pynadath Petra Park (P) Ltd., seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 4.7997 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Survey Nos. 59/1, 59/3-1, 59/3-2, 59/3-3, 60/8-1, 61/1-1, 61/1-2, 61/1-3, 61/1-4, 62/3,

62/4, 62/5 and 63/2 in Kadanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 200th meeting. As invited, the Project Proponent, Sri. Shibu Pynadath John, and the accredited consultant, Sri. Jomon of M/s Environmental Engineers Pvt. Ltd., attended the meeting and made a detailed presentation on the project proposal.

The Authority further noted that, during the course of appraisal, the consultant categorically submitted before the Committee that approximately 20% of the project area falls within a High Hazard Zone. It was also submitted that, in view of the said constraint, the Project Proponent sought permission to modify the approved mining plan by excluding the portions falling within the High Hazard Zone from the present quarry proposal.

The Authority observed that the SEAC, after examining the proposal and the submissions made by the Project Proponent, found that the project, in its present form and configuration, includes environmentally sensitive and hazard-prone areas and therefore does not satisfy the requirements for environmental appraisal under the prevailing regulatory framework. The SEAC further observed that the request for subsequent modification of the mining plan after submission of the Environmental Clearance application amounts to a material alteration affecting the very basis of the project appraisal.

The Authority noted the finding of the SEAC that the inclusion of High Hazard Zone areas within the project boundary renders the proposal environmentally unsuitable for consideration in its present form and that the proposal, as submitted, cannot be appraised further without fundamental revision of the project configuration and supporting statutory documents.

The Authority further noted that the SEAC had informed the Project Proponent during the appraisal proceedings itself that the proposal was liable to be rejected on the above grounds and thereafter recommended rejection of the proposal.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority concurred with the findings and recommendation of the SEAC and observed that the proposal, in its present form, is not legally and environmentally tenable for the grant of Environmental Clearance in view of the admitted presence of High Hazard Zone within a substantial portion of the project area. Accordingly, the Authority decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Pynadath**

Petra Park (P) Ltd. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.

Item No.14 Environmental Clearance application for the Residential Building 'Oceanus Harmony Phase II' located at Block No. 01, Re-Sy No. 237/2APT2 in Kasaragod Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod. (SIA/KL/INFRA2/557749/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Kuriakose P. K., Power of Attorney Holder and Authorised Signatory, M/s Oceanus Dwellings (P) Ltd., seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Building Project “Oceanus Harmony Phase II” at Block No. 01, Re-Sy. No. 237/2APT2 in Kasaragod Village, Kasaragod Taluk and District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 196th meeting and heard the detailed presentation on the project and the environmental safeguards proposed by the Project Proponent, Sri. Kuriakose P. K., and the Accredited Consultant.

The Authority observed that the total plot area of the project is 4,429 sq.m with a total proposed built-up area of 26,334.40 sq.m. The project comprises Basement + Ground + 15 floors with a maximum building height of 49.3 m and a Floor Space Index (FSI) of 3.982 against the permissible FSI of 4.0. The total project cost is reported as ₹42.52 Crores.

The Authority further noted that the proposed development consists of 138 dwelling units, including 82 units of 2 BHK and 56 units of 3 BHK apartments, with an anticipated occupancy of 746 residents and 15 staff members. The total operational water requirement is estimated at 116 KLD during non-monsoon period and 108 KLD during monsoon period, of which the fresh water requirement is approximately 67 KLD. The project proposes recycling and reuse of approximately 38–42% of treated wastewater.

The Authority also noted that domestic sewage generation of 83 KLD is proposed to be treated through a 100 KLD Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) based on MBBR technology, with reuse of treated water for flushing, gardening, and floor/car washing purposes. Excess treated water is proposed to be discharged into soak pits in accordance with applicable norms.

The Authority noted that the estimated excavation quantity is 8,435.44 cu.m and that

the excess excavated earth of approximately 7,812 cu.m is proposed to be transported through a registered PWD contractor after obtaining necessary statutory permits. The average depth of excavation is reported as 3 metres.

The Authority also observed that renewable energy and environmental sustainability measures including the installation of 60 kWp solar panels and the development of a greenbelt area of 1,146 sq.m have been proposed. It was further noted that compensatory plantation at a ratio of 1:10 is proposed against the removal of 10 existing trees, with 155 trees proposed to be planted within the project area.

The Authority noted the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) proposed by the Project Proponent with capital and recurring environmental management expenditure during both construction and operation phases. The Authority also took note of the Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) commitment amounting to ₹85.20 Lakhs earmarked for the construction of additional rooms for the Government School for the Blind, Kasaragod.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal and deliberation, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Building Project “Oceanus Harmony Phase II” for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and additional Specific Conditions prescribed by the Committee.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Building Project “Oceanus Harmony Phase II” of M/s Oceanus Dwellings (P) Ltd. for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to strict compliance with the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and the following Specific Conditions.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The excavated earth for a quantity of 7812 cu. m., removed from the site should not be used for the reclamation of paddy fields/ wetland areas.*
- 3. Adequate agro shade-net fencing shall be provided during the construction phase, considering the proximity of the adjacent college hostel, to prevent dust dispersion*

and ensure safety.

- 4. Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.*
- 5. The Project Proponent shall obtain formal consent from the Kerala Water Authority (KWA) for the dedicated supply of water*
- 6. A proper drainage system shall be provided to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, considering the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.*
- 7. Appropriate flood-mitigation measures shall be implemented, considering the regional topography, in anticipation of extreme rainfall events.*
- 8. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
- 9. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
- 10. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
- 11. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 12. The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
- 13. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
- 14. The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc.,*

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

- 15. Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
- 16. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
- 17. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 18. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
- 19. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
- 20. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
- 21. Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
- 22. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
- 23. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
- 24. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
- 25. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*

26. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
27. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
28. *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.*
29. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
30. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
31. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
32. *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.*
33. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
34. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.*
35. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project site is not used by antisocial elements*

for nefarious antisocial activities, which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.

36. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.15 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed IT Park Building & Construction Project of M/s Kerala State Information Technology Infrastructure Ltd., at Re-Sy. No. 10 in Paduvilayi Village, Vengad Panchayat, Thalassery Taluk & Kannur**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/555626/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Rahul A. Raj, KAS, General Manager (Technical) and Authorised Signatory, M/s Kerala State Information Technology Infrastructure Limited (KSIITIL), seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed I.T. Park Building Construction Project at Re-Sy. No. 10 of Paduvilayi Village, Vengad Panchayat, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC in its 189th, 192nd and 196th SEAC 3 meetings, wherein the Committee examined the proposal in detail, the field inspection report and a detailed presentation regarding the project and the environmental safeguards proposed.

The Authority observed that the proposed I.T. Park project is planned over a total plot area of 2.0 Ha with a total proposed built-up area of 53,795 sq.m comprising Podium-2 + Ground + 6 Floors and Terrace, with a maximum building height of 35.20 m. The total project cost is reported as ₹293.23 Crores.

The Authority further noted that the total operational water requirement of the project is estimated at 216 KLD, consisting of 94 KLD fresh water and 122 KLD recycled water. Domestic sewage generation of 135 KLD is proposed to be treated through a 200 KLD STP based on MBBR technology with anoxic treatment, Activated Carbon Filter (ACF), UV treatment and ozonation, with reuse of treated water for flushing, horticulture and HVAC make-up water, thereby adopting a Zero Liquid Discharge (ZLD) approach.

The Authority also noted the proposal for rainwater harvesting through storage tanks having a cumulative storage capacity of 525 KL along with recharge pits and peripheral drainage systems designed to manage surface runoff without adversely affecting nearby natural drainage channels connected to the Anjarakkandy River.

The Authority further noted that the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) provides a capital expenditure of ₹497 Lakhs towards implementation of environmental safeguards and that the Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) plan proposes community development activities in consultation with Vengad Grama Panchayat with a total outlay of ₹439 Lakhs.

The Authority also took note of the detailed clarifications furnished by the Project Proponent regarding excavation and utilisation of laterite and ordinary earth generated from the project site. It was clarified that approximately 15,120 cu.m of hard laterite may be encountered, out of which about 3,780 cu.m would be utilised for construction purposes. It was further clarified that approximately 1,68,027 cu.m of ordinary earth proposed to be excavated for site development would be entirely utilised within the project premises for landscaping, backfilling, internal road works and storage within the KSIITIL campus, and that no unauthorised disposal or commercial mining activity is involved.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent submitted a comprehensive drainage management plan and cumulative impact assessment considering the adjacent proposed Science Park project and addressed all observations raised by the SEAC during earlier appraisals.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal and deliberation, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the proposed I.T. Park project for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and additional Specific Conditions prescribed by the Committee.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed I.T. Park Building Construction Project of M/s Kerala State Information Technology Infrastructure Limited for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to strict compliance with the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and the following Specific Conditions.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not*

exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.

- 2. The excavation of ordinary earth and laterite from the site should be limited to a minimum, and the activity should not affect the water sources of the nearby houses.*
- 3. The plan for rainwater harvesting and recharging ponds should be implemented with a larger number of ponds or percolation pits.*
- 4. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 5. The Project Proponent shall obtain formal consent from the Kerala Water Authority (KWA) for the dedicated supply of water*
- 6. The Project Proponent shall implement the comprehensive drainage as approved by the Committee, also by considering the adjacent IT Park to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, considering the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.*
- 7. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
- 8. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
- 9. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
- 10. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 11. The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*

12. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
13. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
14. *Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
15. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
16. *Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
17. *Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
18. *Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
19. *The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
20. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
21. *All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
22. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*

23. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
24. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
25. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
26. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
27. *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.*
28. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
29. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
30. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
31. *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.*
32. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
33. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions*

from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.

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

35. The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.16

Environmental Clearance for the Residential cum Commercial Building Construction Project of M/s Sanferrero Premium Living LLP, with a total built-up area of 58,312 sq. m. at Sy. Nos. 222/4, 222/5, 222/6, 223/1, 223/2, 223/4-1, 223/4-2, 223/5, 223/7, 223/7-1, 224/2, 221/4-1, 223/5-1, 223/4, 223/3, 223/3-1, 223/4-8, 224/3, 224/9-1, 224/4-1 in Akalakunnam Village & Grama Panchayat, Kottayam Taluk & District.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/497569/2024)

The Authority considered the application submitted by M/s Sanferrero Premium Living LLP seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential-cum-Commercial Building Construction Project over an extent of 2.6597 Ha at Sy. Nos. 222/4, 222/5, 222/6, 223/1, 223/2, 223/4-1, 223/4-2, 223/5, 223/7, 223/7-1, 224/2, 221/4-1, 223/5-1, 223/4, 223/3, 223/3-1, 223/4-8, 224/3, 224/9-1 and 224/4-1 in Akalakunnam Village and Grama Panchayat, Kottayam Taluk and District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC in its 186th meeting, wherein the Committee examined the proposal in detail and heard the detailed presentation of the representative of the Project Proponent, Sri. Raiwin Chandy, and the Accredited Consultant.

The Authority observed that the proposed project has a total plot area of 2.6597 Ha (26,597 sq.m) and a total built-up area of 58,312 sq.m with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.40. The total project cost is reported as ₹102 Crores. The project comprises 119 apartments, 1 villa, 4 semi-detached row houses, a commercial area, a restaurant/food court with 80 seating

capacity, a conference hall with 122 seating capacity, a clubhouse, scuba facilities, and associated infrastructure amenities.

The Authority further noted that the project site is situated in and around an abandoned quarry area and that the existing abandoned quarry pond, having an extent of 1.64 Ha is proposed to be retained as an integral part of the project development. It was also noted that a protection wall of adequate height is proposed around the water body to isolate the construction area from the pond and to prevent any adverse environmental impact.

The Authority observed that the total quantity of excavated soil/earth is estimated at 10,495 cu.m, a portion of which will be utilised within the project site for various construction-related purposes. In addition, approximately 3,140 cu.m of Ordinary Earth is proposed to be sourced from an external mine site located within 10 km of the project area for internal road construction, building levelling, and landscaping purposes. The Authority further noted that all excavated earth generated within the project site will be utilised internally and that no construction activity is proposed below the groundwater table.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal and deliberation, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the proposed project for a validity period of 10 years, subject to the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and additional Specific Conditions prescribed by the Committee.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential-cum-Commercial Building Construction Project of M/s Sanferrero Premium Living LLP for a period of 10 years, subject to strict compliance with the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and the following Specific Conditions.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The Town Planning Department should ensure the stability of the construction considering the past blasting history of the quarry area and the fractures that may have occurred during the operation of the quarry.*
- 3. Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.*

4. *A proper drainage system shall be provided to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, taking into account the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.*
5. *Appropriate flood-mitigation measures shall be implemented, expecting extreme rainfall events, considering the regional topography.*
6. *Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
7. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
8. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
9. *The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
10. *The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
11. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
12. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
13. *Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building*

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

- 14. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
- 15. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 16. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
- 17. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
- 18. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
- 19. Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
- 20. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
- 21. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
- 22. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
- 23. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
- 24. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
- 25. D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*

26. *Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment, such as BLDC fans and LED lamps, should be promoted as part of energy conservation. At least 20% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.*
27. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
28. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
29. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
30. *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.*
31. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
32. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.*
33. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
34. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.17**Environmental Clearance for the Science Park, Building & Construction Project of M/s KSCSTE at Re-Sy Nos. 1, 2 and 4 (Eeradam Desom) and Re-Sy No. 11 (Venmanal Desom), Paduvilai Village, Vengad Panchayat, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/INFRA2/545491/2025)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Dr A. Sabu, Member Secretary, Kerala State Council for Science and Technology (KSCSTE), seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Building Construction Project “Science Park, Kannur” at Re-Sy. Nos. 1, 2 and 4 (Eeradam Desom) and Re-Sy. No. 11 (Venmanal Desom) of Paduvilai Village, Vengad Panchayat, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 189th, 192nd, and 196th meetings, during which the proposal, field inspection report, and additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent were examined in detail. The Authority further noted that a Sub-Committee constituted by the SEAC conducted a field inspection of the project site on 23.12.2025 and submitted its report for consideration.

The Authority observed that the proposed Science Park project is planned over a total plot area of 10.1171 Ha with a total proposed built-up area of 1,00,000 sq.m to be developed in a phased manner, comprising Administrative Building, R&D Blocks, Residential Block, Convention Centre, Multi-Level Car Parking (MLCP) Block, and allied infrastructure facilities. The Authority also noted the details regarding building configuration, infrastructure facilities, environmental management measures, water requirement, wastewater treatment, solid waste management, rainwater harvesting systems, energy conservation measures, and the proposed Zero Liquid Discharge (ZLD) system.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has proposed an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) with a capital cost of ₹1,889 Lakhs and recurring environmental management expenditure of ₹137.2 Lakhs per annum. It was also noted that the Project Proponent earmarked an amount of ₹590 Lakhs towards CER activities in consultation with the concerned local body.

The Authority also took note of the clarification furnished by the Project Proponent regarding excavation activities, wherein it was stated that the total excavated ordinary earth of approximately 1,23,926 cu.m would be entirely utilised within the project premises for landscaping, backfilling, and internal road works, and that no transportation of excavated ordinary earth outside the project site or commercial mining activity is proposed.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the proposed Science Park project for a validity period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and additional Specific Conditions recommended by the Committee.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed Building Construction Project “Science Park, Kannur” for a period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to strict compliance with the General Conditions applicable to construction projects and the following Specific Conditions.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The excavation of ordinary earth and laterite from the site should be limited to a minimum and the activity should not affect the water sources of the nearby houses.*
- 3. The plan for rainwater harvesting and recharging ponds should be implemented with a larger number of ponds or percolation pits.*
- 4. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 5. The Project Proponent shall obtain formal consent from the Kerala Water Authority (KWA) for the dedicated supply of water*
- 6. The Project Proponent shall implement the comprehensive drainage as approved by the Committee also by considering the adjacent IT Park to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area, considering the depth to the water table and the proximity of the irrigation channel.*
- 7. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
- 8. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*

9. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
10. *The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
11. *The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
12. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
13. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
14. *Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
15. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
16. *Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
17. *Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*

18. *Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
19. *The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
20. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
21. *All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
22. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
23. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
24. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
25. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
26. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
27. *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.*
28. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
29. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
30. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*

31. 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.
32. As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.
33. The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.
34. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.
35. The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.18

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Construction Project of Sri. John Varghese Muckadackal at Re-Sy. Nos. 293/14, 294/5, 293/21-2 in Thiruvankulam Village, Tripunithura Municipality, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/INFRA2/559756/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. John Varghese Muckadackal, Door No. 10/490, Annjinos, Muckadackal House, Opp. H.S. Irimpanam, Ernakulam – 682309, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Construction Project at Re-Sy. Nos. 293/14, 294/5 and 293/21-2 in Thiruvankulam Village, Tripunithura Municipality, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 200th SEAC-1 meeting, during which the Project Proponent and the accredited consultant made a detailed presentation on the project and the environmental safeguards proposed.

The Authority further noted that the total plot area of the project is 0.6118 Ha and the total built-up area proposed is 25,443.21 sq.m with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 3.06. The total project cost is reported as ₹59.0253 Crores. The proposed development consists of 140 residential apartments, clubhouse, amenity facilities, and associated infrastructure facilities.

The Authority also noted that the total quantity of excavated soil/cutting of earth is estimated at 2,729 cu.m for foundation and basement construction works, which will be used for landscaping purposes and for backfilling and internal road construction. It was further noted that no excess excavated earth is proposed to be transported outside the project site.

The Authority observed that the project is expected to generate 84 KLD of wastewater per day, of which 34 KLD will be treated and recycled. The proposed Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) has a capacity of 98 KLD based on MBBR technology with in-built anoxic treatment.

The Authority noted that, after detailed appraisal, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance under Category 8(a) – Building and Construction Projects for a validity period of 10 years, subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions applicable to construction projects.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed Residential Construction Project under Category 8(a) – Building and Construction Projects for a period of 10 years, subject to strict compliance with the general conditions applicable to construction projects, and the following additional specific conditions:**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The area within 100 meters of the nearby school shall be treated as a “Silence Zone,” and the ambient noise levels shall strictly conform to the standards prescribed under the Noise Pollution (Regulation and Control) Rules, 2000.*
- 3. A temporary noise barrier/sound-insulating curtain having a minimum height of 5*

to 6 meters shall be erected along the project boundary facing the school before commencement of construction activities.

- 4. No high-decibel construction activities, including piling, drilling, heavy earthmoving, or similar operations, shall be carried out during school hours, generally between 9:00 AM and 4:30 PM, and during examination periods.*
- 5. Continuous high-density green agro-net or tin-sheet barricading shall be provided and maintained to prevent dust dispersion towards the school premises.*
- 6. Frequent water sprinkling shall be undertaken, particularly on the side facing the school, for effective suppression of fugitive dust emissions.*
- 7. Movement of heavy vehicles, including trucks, concrete mixers, and cranes, shall be strictly prohibited during school opening and closing hours to ensure the safety of students and avoid traffic congestion.*
- 8. The Project Proponent shall deploy trained traffic marshals at the entry and exit points of the project site for safe regulation of vehicular movement and pedestrian safety.*
- 9. Appropriate "School Zone" and "No Honking" signboards shall be prominently displayed at all relevant locations near the project site.*
- 10. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
- 11. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
- 12. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
- 13. The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 14. The proposed STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and any*

balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.

- 15. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
- 16. The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
- 17. Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
- 18. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
- 19. Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
- 20. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
- 21. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
- 22. The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
- 23. Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
- 24. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be*

- cleaned and wheels washed.*
- 25. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
 - 26. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
 - 27. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
 - 28. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
 - 29. D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
 - 30. 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.*
 - 31. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
 - 32. Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
 - 33. Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
 - 34. 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.*
 - 35. As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field*

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

36. The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/permissions for the construction projects of this nature.

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

38. The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.19

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Expansion of Existing Residential Building Construction project (Purva Moonreach) of M/s Puravankara Limited at Re-Sy. No. 573/1 in Kakkanad Village, Thrikkakara Municipality, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/563879/2026)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Sreejith Lenin Das, Sr. General Manager, M/s Puravankara Limited, 1st Floor, Areekal Mansion, Panampilly Nagar, Kochi – 682036, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Expansion of the Existing Residential Building Construction Project “Purva Moonreach” at Re-Sy. No. 573/1 in Kakkanad Village, Thrikkakara Municipality, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC in its 200th SEAC–1 meeting, during which the Project Proponent and the accredited consultant made a detailed presentation on the project and its environmental aspects.

The Authority further noted that prior EC had been granted by the MoEF&CC vide order dated 08.09.2009 for the construction of a residential building project having a total built-up area of 34,893.4 sq.m over a plot area of 0.6862 Ha, comprising two residential towers, namely Tower-A and Tower-B. It was observed that only Tower-A, having a built-up

area of 19,065.104 sq.m with 78 residential units, was completed and commissioned within the validity period of the original EC.

The Authority also noted that the present proposal pertains to the construction of Tower-B with a proposed built-up area of 25,114.10 sq.m comprising 120 dwelling units, thereby resulting in a cumulative built-up area of 44,179.204 sq.m within the same project site. The total project cost is reported as ₹180.26 Crores, including ₹54.26 Crores for the existing development and ₹126 Crores for the proposed expansion.

The Authority further noted the environmental safeguards proposed by the Project Proponent, including provision of a Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) of 135 KLD capacity based on MBBR technology with in-built anoxic treatment, and the undertaking that no excavation of ordinary earth/soil is involved in the proposed construction activities. The Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) commitment submitted by the Project Proponent amounts to ₹95 Lakhs.

The Authority noted that, after a detailed appraisal, the SEAC recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the expansion project for a validity period of 10 years, subject to the general conditions applicable to construction projects and the specific conditions applicable to residential building projects.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the SEAC and decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the proposed Expansion of the Existing Residential Building Construction Project “Purva Moonreach” of M/s Puravankara Limited for a period of 10 years, subject to strict compliance with all conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance dated 08.09.2009 and the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions applicable to construction projects.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The proposed expansion and construction activities relating to Tower-B shall be carried out in such a manner that they do not adversely interfere with, endanger, or cause undue disturbance, inconvenience, or environmental nuisance to the occupants/residents of the already commissioned Tower-A, if any. The Project*

Proponent shall ensure adequate safety measures, dust suppression mechanisms, noise mitigation measures, controlled movement of construction vehicles, and regulated construction activities throughout the construction phase.

3. *Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
4. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
5. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
6. *The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
7. *The existing STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
8. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
9. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche, etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*
10. *Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*

11. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
12. *Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
13. *Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
14. *Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
15. *The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
16. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
17. *All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
18. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
19. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
20. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
21. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
22. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
23. *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.*

24. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
25. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
26. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
27. *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 the prior EC granted on that basis.*
28. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
29. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ permissions for the construction projects of this nature.*
30. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities, which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
31. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.20

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

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance application of Sri. Wincent A. for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an area of 1.1550 Ha at Block No. 18, Re-Survey Nos: 202/1-2, 202/1-3-1, 202/5, 202/6, 202/7, 202/7-1, 202/8, 202/13, 202/13-1, 202/14, 232/10 in Anadu Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. The Authority noted that SEAC-1 had recommended the grant of EC for the project in its 198th SEAC meeting. The Authority further observed that the project had been appraised and recommended without an approved DSR.

The Authority observed that, as per Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEF&CC, the DSR constitutes a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, the preparation of project reports, and the appraisal for the grant of EC for minor mineral projects. The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its order dated 10.11.2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and in its judgment dated 08.05.2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has unequivocally reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. It was also emphasized that EC appraisal cannot be undertaken based on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to the assessment of resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

In view of the above and after due deliberation, **the Authority resolved to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendation, based on a revised and duly approved DSR prepared strictly in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC vide Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018. The Authority further directed the SEIAA Secretariat to place the matter before the SEAC at the earliest for fresh appraisal and appropriate recommendation.**

Item No.21

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

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance application of Sri. Madhulal M. G. for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an area of 0.8300 Ha at Block No. 52, Re-Sy. Nos. 387/5-2, 387/7-2, 387/7, 387/13, and 387/13-2 in Mancode Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District. The Authority noted that SEAC-1 had recommended the grant of EC for the project in its 198th SEAC meeting. The Authority further observed that the project had been appraised and recommended without an approved DSR.

The Authority observed that, as per Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEF&CC, the DSR constitutes a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, the preparation of project reports, and the appraisal for the grant of EC for minor mineral projects. The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its order dated 10.11.2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and in its judgment dated 08.05.2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has unequivocally reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. It was also emphasized that EC appraisal cannot be undertaken based on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to the assessment of resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

In view of the above and after due deliberation, **the Authority resolved to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendation, based on a revised and duly approved DSR prepared strictly in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC vide Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018. The Authority further directed the SEIAA Secretariat to place the matter before the SEAC at the earliest for fresh appraisal and appropriate recommendation.**

Item No.22

Environmental Clearance for the proposed additional construction of Block F (G + 3 Floors) and Toilet Block (G+1 Floor) of M/s. Al Madeena Institute of Medical Science at Survey Nos: 5/46, 5/8-4, 15/16-2, 5/22, 5/20, 5/21-2, 15/17-2, 5/16-2, 15/16-4, 15/18, 15/6, 15/4-8, 15/6-1, 5/14-7, 5/14-8, 15-6/6, 15/5, 5/46, 5/19-2, 5/18-2, 5/14, 15/6-1- 3, 15/19-3, 5/4-2, 5/1, 5/4-3, 5/4-4, 5/4-5, 5/2, 5/2, 5/3-3, 5/5-2, 5/2-3 Kottakkal Village, Tirur Taluk, Malapuram.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/557704/2025)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Dr. P. Ahmed Kabeer, Chairman & Managing Director, M/s Al Madeena Institute of Medical Science, Kottakkal, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram District, seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed additional construction of Block F (G + 3 Floors) and Toilet Block (G + 1 Floor) in the existing institutional campus situated in Kottakkal Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was appraised by the SEAC 2 in its 197th meeting, during which the Project Proponent and the accredited consultant made a detailed presentation on the project and the supporting documents submitted along with the application.

The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC that the proposal involves an additional built-up area of 5,283.97 sq.m in an existing project having a disclosed built-up area of 23,901.42 sq.m, thereby resulting in a total built-up area of 29,185.39 sq.m. However, during the course of appraisal, the Project Proponent admitted that approximately 9,000 sq.m of the existing structures are proposed to be demolished as part of the redevelopment activities. The SEAC observed that the application failed to properly disclose the total existing built-up area by excluding the structures proposed for demolition and thereby presented an incomplete and misleading account of the actual built-up area existing at the project site.

The Authority noted the finding of the SEAC that the non-disclosure of the entire existing built-up area, including the portion proposed for demolition, amounts to suppression of material facts having direct bearing on the environmental appraisal of the project. The Authority further noted that the application also failed to include a detailed Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Management Plan specifying the quantity of waste likely to be generated and the manner of handling, transportation, processing, and disposal of such waste in accordance with the applicable statutory framework.

The Authority also took note of the observations of the SEAC that, under Item 8(a) of

the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006, prior Environmental Clearance is mandatory for Building and Construction Projects having a built-up area exceeding 20,000 sq.m. The SEAC had observed that construction activities beyond the threshold limit had already been undertaken without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, thereby constituting a violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority further noted the various deficiencies and shortcomings identified by the SEAC, including absence of an enhanced traffic management plan, inadequate parking details in conformity with prevailing Building Rules, lack of a comprehensive C&D Waste Management Plan, inadequacies in the proposed Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) allocation, reliance on outdated rainfall data for the rainwater harvesting plan, lack of clarity regarding sustainable water availability, and insufficiency in the details relating to the proposed green belt area.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority concurred with the findings and recommendations of the SEAC and observed that the Project Proponent had failed to make full and true disclosure of material particulars relevant for environmental appraisal and had undertaken construction activities attracting the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance as mandated under law.

The Authority was therefore of the considered view that the proposal constitutes a violation case under the EIA Notification, 2006 and that the conduct of the Project Proponent in withholding and suppressing material information amounts to a deliberate attempt to mislead the regulatory authority and frustrate the statutory appraisal process.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, **the Authority decided to reject the application for Environmental Clearance. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings accordingly.**

Item No.23

ToR application for the proposed Construction of the Residential Building Project of Sri. K.C. Raju, M/s Kent Construction Pvt. Ltd at Survey Nos: 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 & 141/8 in Puthencruz Village, Kunnthunadu Taluk, Ernakulam.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/447418/2023)

The Authority considered the recommendation of the SEAC 1 in respect of the

proposal submitted by Sri. K.C. Raju, Director, M/s Kent Constructions Pvt. Ltd., seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Residential Building Project – “Kent Mahal” at Sy. Nos. 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 and 141/8 in Puthencruz Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal pertains to a violation case involving commencement of construction activities without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance under the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent had originally submitted the application before the MoEF&CC on 09.11.2023 and that the proposal remained pending before the Ministry till 06.03.2025. Thereafter, the Ministry transferred the ToR application to SEIAA Kerala on 07.03.2025 for further consideration and appraisal by the State Level Authorities.

The Authority also noted that the SEAC, while reconsidering the matter in the light of the Office Memorandum dated 20.01.2026 issued by the MoEF&CC, observed that the present online application appeared to have been received beyond the cut-off date i.e., 02.01.2024 prescribed pursuant to the proceedings before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Vanashakti v. Union of India*, and accordingly recommended return/rejection of the proposal in its present form.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority observed that the factual matrix clearly indicates that the Project Proponent had already approached the Ministry on 09.11.2023, well before the relevant cut-off date, and that the matter remained pending before the Ministry for administrative processing till 06.03.2025. The subsequent transfer of the proposal to SEIAA Kerala on 07.03.2025 was an administrative action undertaken by the Ministry and cannot, by itself, prejudice the rights of the Project Proponent or render the application ineligible for consideration.

The Authority was therefore of the considered view that the date relevant for determining the applicability of the Office Memorandum and the directions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court is the original date of submission of the application before the competent authority, namely 09.11.2023, and not the later date on which the proposal was transferred to SEIAA Kerala through the PARIVESH portal.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, and in the interest of ensuring procedural fairness and proper appraisal in accordance with law, **the Authority decided to refer the**

proposal back to the SEAC for reconsideration and for furnishing a fresh recommendation, taking into account the original date of submission of the application before the Ministry and the subsequent administrative transfer of the proposal to SEIAA Kerala.

The Authority further directed the SEIAA Secretariat to place the matter before the SEAC at the earliest for fresh appraisal and appropriate recommendation.

Item No.24 **ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of M/s Janatha Granites, Sri. Sabu P.T., Designated Partner, for an area of 3.0441 Ha at Re-Sy Block No. 54, Re-Sy Nos. 443/1, 442/7, 442/6 & 442/10 in Ananganadi Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.**

SIA/KL/MIN/565418/2026

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Sabu P. T., Designated Partner, M/s Janatha Granites, Kayiliad, Kattilapadam Chalavara, Palakkad, seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 3.0441 Ha at Re-Sy Block No. 54, Re-Sy Nos. 443/1, 442/7, 442/6 & 442/10 in Ananganadi Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC 2 in its 197th meeting and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

After due consideration, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

The Authority also directed the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the Standard ToR accordingly.

Item No.25

ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of M/s Rock N Rock Associates Pvt. Ltd., Sri. Devadas Ayyappan Nair, Managing Director, for an area of 4.9500 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 11, 12, 13/1-1, 13/2 in Venganalloor Village, Thallappally Taluk, Thrissur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/565439/2026)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Devadas Ayyappan Nair, Managing Director, M/s Rock N Rock Associates Pvt. Ltd., seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 4.9500 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 11, 12, 13/1-1, 13/2 in Venganalloor Village, Thallappally Taluk, Thrissur.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC 2 in its 197th meeting and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

After due consideration, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

The Authority also directed the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the Standard ToR accordingly.

Item No.26

ToR application for proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. R J Karunanidhi, Managing Partner, M/s K. P. Granite Industries, for an area of 2.0925 Ha at Block No. 33, Re-Sy Nos. 31/1 in Kalanjoor Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta

(SIA/KL/MIN/568297/2026)

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. R J Karunanidhi, Managing Partner, M/s K P Granite Industries, 36/999, Sri Santh, T. R. Sukumaran Nair

Road, Perunthanni, Thiruvananthapuram, seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.0925 Ha at Block No. 33, Re-Sy No. 31/1 in Kalanjoor Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC 1 in its 198th meeting and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

After due consideration, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

The Authority also directed the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the Standard ToR accordingly.

Item No.27

**ToR for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ratheesh M R, Director, M/s Extreme Black Aggregate Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 2.9327 Ha at Sy Nos. 503/1-3, 503/1-2-3, 503/1-2-3-7, 503/1-2-3-7-3-2, 503/1-2-3-7-2, 503/1-2-3-6, 503/1-5, 503/2-3 in Varapetty Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/566741/2026)**

The Authority considered the application submitted by Sri. Ratheesh M. R., Director, M/s Extreme Black Aggregates Private Limited, Reg. Office: V/87, Thondumalil Complex, Aruvappara, Kunnathunad, Ernakulam – 683545, seeking Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project over an extent of 2.9327 Ha in Survey Nos. 503/1-3, 503/1-2-3, 503/1-2-3-7, 503/1-2-3-7-3-2, 503/1-2-3-7-2, 503/1-2-3-6, 503/1-5 and 503/2-3 of Varapetty Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the proposal was considered by the SEAC 1 in its 198th meeting and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

After due consideration, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

The Authority also directed the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the Standard ToR accordingly.

Item No.28

Application for Transfer of Environmental Clearance issued to M/s Spatium Ventures Pvt. Ltd., for the Residential Project at Sy. Nos. 104/9, 104/10 (Re-Sy No.104/2 B) in Chelavoor Village, Kozhikode Municipal Corporation and Sy. Nos 45/22, 29, 28 (Re-Sy Nos. 45/2, 3) in Kuttikatoor Village, Kunnamangalam Panchayat, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode to M/s GAIA Properties and Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/570721/2026)

The Authority considered the transfer proposal submitted by Sri. Ramachandra Bha, Director, M/s GAIA Properties and Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd, seeking transfer of the EC granted by the MoEF&CC vide order dated 14.10.2025 in favour of M/s Spatium Ventures Pvt. Ltd for the residential project located at Sy Nos. 104/9 and 104/10 (Re-Sy. No. 104/2B) in Chelavoor Village, Kozhikode Municipal Corporation and Sy. Nos. 45/22, 45/29 and 45/28 (Re-Sy. Nos. 45/2 and 45/3) in Kuttikatoor Village, Kunnamangalam Grama Panchayat, Kozhikode Taluk & District, having a total plot area of 5,927.50 sq. m and total built-up area of 30,773 sq. m.

The Authority noted that the application for transfer of EC was submitted through the PARIVESH portal along with the requisite documents, including affidavit, Board Resolution, and No Objection Certificate in Form-7 executed by the transferor and transferee entities. The Authority further observed that the documents submitted are in order and satisfy the requirements prescribed under the EIA Notification, 2006 and subsequent amendments thereto.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority accepted the request for transfer of EC and decided to transfer the EC issued vide order dated 14.10.2025 from M/s Spatium Ventures Pvt. Ltd to M/s GAIA Properties and Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd, subject to the condition that all terms and conditions stipulated in the original EC and subsequent statutory directions, if any, shall be strictly complied with by the transferee project proponent. The Authority also directed the SEIAA Secretariat to issue necessary proceedings in this regard.**

General Decisions

1. Scientific Mine Closure, Ecological Restoration, and Post-Mining Rehabilitation under the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules (KMMCR)

The Authority considered the larger environmental, ecological, and public safety issues arising from the non-implementation of Mine Closure Plans under the KMMCR 2015 and its subsequent amendments, particularly in relation to abandoned quarry pits, inadequate ecological restoration, and lack of post-closure monitoring mechanisms in the State of Kerala.

The Authority observed that the statutory framework under the KMMCR envisages scientific and sustainable mining practices, including preparation and approval of Mining Plans and Mine Closure Plans for quarrying operations. The Authority further noted that the Rules also contemplate financial assurance and obligations relating to the implementation of quarry closure measures and environmental safeguards.

However, the Authority observed that, although Mine Closure Plans are being prepared by Project Proponents and approved by the Department of Mining and Geology, there is presently no effective statutory mechanism for systematic post-closure verification of ecological restoration measures; continuous monitoring of implementation of approved Mine

Closure Plans; certification of successful mine closure; and long-term environmental rehabilitation of disturbed mining landscapes.

The Authority noted with serious concern that several quarry pits and mined-out areas across the State remain abandoned and scientifically unreclaimed after cessation of mining activities. Many such abandoned pits are either left as deep excavated voids or as water-filled quarry ponds without adequate slope stabilization, fencing, ecological restoration, or public safety measures. The Authority further observed that these abandoned mining areas have increasingly become sources of environmental degradation and public hazard.

The Authority also noted that, during extreme rainfall events and climate-induced disasters, breaches and overflow from abandoned quarry pits have been reported in several regions, aggravating local flooding, slope instability, soil erosion, and downstream environmental impacts. Further, incidents involving accidental drowning, fall of vehicles and animals into abandoned quarry pits, and loss of life and injuries to local residents have also been reported from different parts of the State.

The Authority further observed that unscientific laterite and granite quarrying activities, both authorised and unauthorised, have caused significant alterations to natural terrain, drainage channels, hydrological regimes, hill slopes, and ecological balance in many environmentally sensitive regions of Kerala. The Authority observed that inadequate mine closure and reclamation practices have resulted in long-term deterioration of local environmental conditions, accelerated soil erosion, destabilization of slopes, and invasion of abandoned quarry areas by invasive plant species, thereby adversely affecting local biodiversity and groundwater recharge systems.

The Authority further observed that such abandoned quarries are treated as operational or non-closed quarries for the purpose of environmental appraisal and cluster assessment. The Authority noted that, in cases where the cumulative extent of such abandoned or non-closed quarries together with adjacent quarrying areas exceeds the threshold limit of 5 hectares, the projects attract the “cluster situation” provisions under the EIA Notification, 2006 and subsequent amendments thereto, thereby requiring Project Proponents to obtain Terms of Reference (ToR) for preparation of an EIA Report and conduct Public Hearing proceedings prior to consideration of Environmental Clearance applications. The Authority further observed that such procedures are time-consuming and often result in substantial delay in submitting the Environmental Clearance applications for

otherwise eligible quarrying projects, which may adversely affect the lawful availability of minor minerals required for infrastructure and developmental activities in the State and may also lead to consequential revenue loss to the Government due to interruption in regulated mining operations and resource supply constraints.

The Authority also took note of the landmark judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Common Cause v. Union of India*, wherein the Hon'ble Court emphasized strict compliance with environmental laws and scientific mining principles and held that mining operations without valid environmental and statutory clearances are illegal. The Authority further noted the order dated 08.01.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in WP(C) No. 114/2014, wherein the Government of India was directed to ensure incorporation of specific conditions in mining leases, Environmental Clearances, and approved mining plans, mandating that, after cessation of mining operations, the lease holders shall undertake re-grassing and ecological restoration of the mined-out and disturbed areas and restore the land to a condition fit for the growth of fodder, flora, fauna, and biodiversity.

The Authority observed that the aforesaid directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court clearly establish that mine closure is not confined merely to physical backfilling or abandonment of pits, but requires comprehensive ecological restoration, biodiversity rehabilitation, environmental stabilization, and long-term reclamation of disturbed landscapes based on a specific mine closure plan.

The Authority further observed that, despite approval of Mine Closure Plans, effective monitoring and certification mechanisms relating to successful implementation of mine closure obligations are presently inadequate, resulting in continuing environmental degradation and public safety concerns in many mining regions of the State.

After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Government of Kerala may be requested to examine and undertake necessary amendments/modifications to the provisions of the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules (KMMCR) to strengthen the legal and regulatory framework relating to mine closure, including: (i) mandatory scientific verification of implementation of approved Mine Closure Plans; (ii) ecological restoration and biodiversity rehabilitation of mined-out areas; (iii) post-closure environmental monitoring; (iv) stabilization and reclamation of**

- abandoned quarry pits; (v) mandatory public safety measures; and (vi) issuance of formal Mine Closure Certificates only after satisfactory completion and verification of all approved closure and restoration measures.
2. The Department of Mining and Geology and KSPCB shall ensure strict implementation of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Common Cause v. Union of India relating to ecological restoration, re-grassing, biodiversity rehabilitation, and post-mining reclamation of quarry and mining areas.
 3. All District Geologists shall strictly monitor implementation of approved Mine Closure Plans and ensure that no quarry or mining area is abandoned without scientific closure, ecological restoration, slope stabilization, drainage management, fencing, public safety measures, and rehabilitation in accordance with approved Mine Closure Plans and other statutory conditions if any.
 4. Till necessary amendments are incorporated in the KMMCR, the Industries Department / Department of Mining and Geology may issue appropriate circulars/guidelines for the issuance of Mine Closure Certificates in respect of quarrying projects that have been scientifically closed and rehabilitated in accordance with the approved Mine Closure Plans. Further, it is recommended that the said circular/guidelines shall also prescribe a standardized format and procedure for verification and issuance of Mine Closure Certificates by the competent authority.
 5. The Principal Secretary, Environment Department, and the Principal Secretary, Industries Department, Government of Kerala, may be requested to take necessary actions to the above extent.
 6. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary communications accordingly.

The Authority further decided that, in cases where Project Proponents have failed to implement mandatory Mine Closure Plans in respect of projects operated based on approved Mining Plans and Environmental Clearances, such Project Proponents shall not ordinarily be considered eligible for grant of

Environmental Clearance for new quarrying/mining projects in future until satisfactory implementation of the approved Mine Closure Plan and restoration activities is completed; and a specific certification to that effect is issued by the Department of Mining and Geology confirming successful implementation of mine closure, ecological restoration, and rehabilitation measures.

2. Modification / Revision of Mining Plan post Environmental Clearance

The Authority, upon examination of various cases placed before it, observed that, subsequent to the grant of Environmental Clearance (EC), several Project Proponents are undertaking revisions/modifications to the approved Mining Plans, particularly with respect to quantities of mineable reserves, topsoil, overburden, bench configuration, production plan, mine depth, mine life, and other operational parameters, on the ground that the quantities and geological features assessed at the initial stage were based on estimations and may vary during the course of actual mining operations.

Besides, Authority also noted that, in several cases, Project Proponents, after obtaining prior Environmental Clearance for a larger quarrying area based on an approved Mining Plan, are subsequently splitting or subdividing the project into multiple quarry leases or permits through the preparation and approval of separate or revised Mining Plans.

The Authority noted with serious concern that, although such revised Mining Plans are being approved by the Department of Mining and Geology, in many cases the revised Mining Plans are not being placed before the Environmental Clearance granting authority for appraisal, concurrence, or modification of EC conditions, despite specific conditions incorporated in the Environmental Clearance requiring prior intimation and approval in the event of any change in the project parameters or mining operations as stipulated in the EIA Notification.

The Authority is of the considered view that the approved Mining Plan constitutes one of the fundamental and material documents forming the basis for environmental appraisal and grant of Environmental Clearance under the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006. The environmental impacts and project life assessed during appraisal, including impacts relating to slope stability, hydrology, drainage, blasting, transportation, dust generation, overburden

management, biodiversity, mine closure, and carrying capacity, are intrinsically linked to the approved Mining Plan and the project parameters disclosed therein.

Accordingly, any alteration or revision in the approved Mining Plan, including changes relating to extent of area, mineable reserve, annual production quantity, mine depth, bench configuration, extent of excavation, topsoil and overburden generation, life of mine, method of mining, haulage arrangements, alteration of buffer, drainage pattern, or any other operational parameter having environmental implications, without prior intimation to and concurrence of the Environmental Clearance granting authority, amounts to suppression of material facts and constitutes violation of the conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance and the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority observed that, although certain alterations or subdivisions of quarry leases may be permissible under the provisions of the KMMCR, any such alteration undertaken after obtaining prior Environmental Clearance under the EIA Notification, 2006, without prior appraisal and concurrence of the Environmental Clearance granting authority, amounts to a material alteration of the project originally appraised and cleared. The Authority is of the considered view that the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, issued under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, being a Central legislation, shall prevail over any provisions contained in subordinate State Rules, including the KMMCR. Therefore, alteration, bifurcation, or subdivision of the approved project area or Mining Plan after grant of Environmental Clearance, without prior permission or concurrence of the Environmental Clearance granting authority, constitutes a serious violation of the Environmental Clearance conditions and the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority further observed that a well-established statutory mechanism already exists through the PARIVESH portal for submission and appraisal of amendment/modification proposals relating to Environmental Clearance, and therefore no Project Proponent can claim practical difficulty in approaching the Authority for necessary modification or amendment of the Environmental Clearance consequent upon revision of the Mining Plan. After detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. Any revision or modification of a Mining Plan after grant of Environmental Clearance, including changes relating to mine depth, production capacity, mineable reserve, mine life, bench configuration, excavation quantity, topsoil/overburden generation, or any other project parameter having**

environmental implications, shall mandatorily be placed before the Environmental Clearance granting Authority for appraisal and concurrence prior to implementation of such revised Mining Plan.

2. No further mining activity, extraction, deepening of quarry, enhancement of production, or modification of mining operations based on a revised Mining Plan shall be permitted unless the revised Mining Plan is duly intimated to the Environmental Clearance - granting authority and necessary amendment/modification of the Environmental Clearance is obtained through the prescribed procedure.
3. The Department of Mining and Geology shall not issue any permit/lease with the revised Mining Plan, unless the Project Proponent produces a revised/amended Environmental Clearance granted by the Authority, after due appraisal.
4. The Department of Mining and Geology shall ensure that no quarry lease, permit, subdivided Mining Plan, or fragmentation of quarrying area is approved, processed, or acted upon in cases where EC has already been granted for the original project, unless the Project Proponent produces prior amendment/modification or specific concurrence issued by the competent Environmental Clearance granting authority under the EIA Notification, 2006.
5. Project Proponents who undertake mining activities based on revised Mining Plans without obtaining necessary concurrence/amendment from the Environmental Clearance granting authority shall be liable for action under the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and other applicable environmental laws.

The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary communications to all the stakeholders accordingly.

Sd/-
Sri. P.H. Kurian IAS (Retd)
Chairman

Sd/-
Sri. Raveendran T.
Expert Member

Sd/-
Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS
Member Secretary