

**MINUTES OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE, SIKKIM
HELD ON 24TH JANUARY 2022.**

VENUE: Through Physical and Video Conferencing

Date: 24th January, 2022

PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee, Sikkim held on 24th January, 2022 through dual mode seeing the protocols of Covid – 19 Pandemic. Shri P. Shrestha, Retd. PCE, Member attended physically and rest of the members including Chairman and participants attended through Video Conferencing. Attendance is as under;

1. Shri H.P Pradhan	Chairman	P
2. Shri Tshering Tashi	Member	P
3. Shri Pradhumna Shrestha	Member	P
4. Shri D.R. Chettri	Member	A
5. Dr. B.C Basistha	Member	P
6. Shri B.K Chettri	Member	P
7. Dr. Dinesh Agarwal	Member	P
8. Dr. Satya Deep Chettri	Member	P
9. Shri B.B Gurung	Member Secretary	P
10. Shri Chandan Kumar	Master Trainer	P

I. **Opening Remarks of the Chairman:** The Chairman welcomed all the members and participants and informed the house about **the Proposed Development of “WEST POINT”- Integrated Commercial cum MLCP Complex at Old West Point School Area, Near M.G Marg, Gangtok, East Sikkim.** The meeting was opened for proceeding as per the agenda of the meeting set on 11th January, 2022.

II. **Consideration of Proposal:** The SEAC considered the proposal as per the agenda adopted for the meeting. The Details of deliberations, discussion held and decision taken in the meeting are as under;

Agenda Item:

Proposed Development of “WEST POINT”- Integrated Commercial cum MLCP Complex at Old West Point School Area, Near M.G Marg, Gangtok, East Sikkim by MESASO Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. – Environment Clearance.

Proposal No. SIA/SK/MIS/244081/2021

1. The Project Proponent, M/S MESASO Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. along with their consultant, M/S Envirotech East made a presentation on the key parameters, salient features of the project before the members of SEAC. After hearing from the Project

Proponent, the SEAC took note of the following key parameters and salient features of the project as presented, provided in the reports and application for the project.

- i). The project is located at Plot / Survey / Khasra No.686/P, 715, 716 at Gangtok Revenue Block / City, East District, Sikkim with coordinates 27°19'47.24" N Latitude and 88°36'40.93" E Longitude.
 - ii). The project is construction of integrated commercial cum multi level car parking facility, hotel and allied services and has been submitted for prior Environment Clearance.
 - iii). The total land area is 5665.55 sqm with Built Up Area of 33801.25 sqm. The mixed use development building of configuration 4G+10 (Fourteen storey) shall comprise of Parking for 448 car park in the lower 4 floors; Mall with multiplex (52 retail outlets + 6 anchor stores) and food court; Boutique hotel having 55 keys (49 deluxe rooms + 6 suites) with a roof top swimming pool.
 - iv). Other details and requirement during construction and operational phase of the project are as under;

a. Population	5374 persons
b. Total water requirement	153 KLD
c. Fresh water requirement	105 KLD
d. Waste water generation (to STP)	100 KLD
e. Treated waste water from STP	98 KLD
f. Treated waste water recycling	48 KLD
g. Treated waste water discharged	50 KLD
h. Solid waste generation	664.4 kg/day
i. No. of car parking	443 nos.
j. Power requirement	1606 KW
k. Backup power	3x650 KVA and 2x500 KVA
l. Project cost	Rs.298.2 crores
 - v). Project is not located in critically polluted area.
 - vi). Project is not located within the Eco-Sensitive Zone
 - vii). Forest clearance is not required as no forest land is involved as stated.
 - viii). Proposed area is devoid of vegetation and no felling requires as per the statement.
2. The SEAC noted that the project is covered under category 'B' item No.8 (a) "Building and Construction Projects" of the Schedule of the EIA Notification, 2006 and requires appraisal at State Level by the SEAC.
 3. The SEAC observed following certain discrepancies, inconsistencies and incomplete information during its meeting and details submitted by Project Proponent in Form – I, Form – IA and many facts and figures are not given correctly;

- i. Project Proponent made statement that waste water shall be dispose in Municipal Sewage. This is not permissible unless permitted by the concerned department.
- ii. Noise Pollution, Soil pollution, dust pollution, Air pollution are not sufficiently spelled out.
- iii. The report submitted by project proponent doesn't include the E-waste and Mitigation Plan during construction and operational phase of the project.
- iv. Point 6.2 of Form – IA needs detailed elaboration regarding adverse impacts from new constructions on the existing structures, especially spill over due to weight of the present structure.
- v. Point 7.2, Demographic details needs to be elaborated. Employment and other opportunities during construction and operational phase of the project should be provided to the locals as per state government rules and policy.
- vi. Point 9.4 of Form IA, what efforts will be taken needs to be elaborated.
- vii. Point 9.6 of Form IA, How much energy saving is effected needs elaboration.
- viii. Point 9.7 of Form IA, regarding CFC and HCFC free chillers - needs reply on this because it's affecting environment.
- ix. Point 9.10, the report which submitted for fire emergency plan is for 1 year and what needs to be done after that is not mentioned. Clear statement should be in place for the project.
- x. Load Impact Assessment and its sustenance later is required to build the 14 storey building and that needs the approval from the Concerned, Department of Govt. of Sikkim, approved Blue Print / document from GMC/UDD needs to be submitted. A clear permission to go ahead with the project may be enclosed.
- xi. Vertical profiling / carrying capacity needs to be carried out from Indira Bye Pass road below the project site to Gangtok by competent agency / Department. Member suggested that this can be done by a geologist. Geologist appointed by a competent/authorized agency should do the study.
- xii. The report which User Agency has submitted doesn't mention the range and height of construction / building.
- xiii. Reports submitted by project proponent needs to be signed by the Authorized Department page wise.
- xiv. The information given by the Project proponent in application form are not consistent as car parking 448 and 443 are mismatching and also NH31 is now NH10. Needs correction.
- xv. More car parking facilities can do by increasing up to 500 nos by replacing 5 g so that the natural beauty of mountains can be seen as usual.
- xvi. MFR should be clearly mentioned in the report.
- xvii. Huge quantity of quarry materials like stone chips, sand, aggregates and cement are being used, their total weight to be assessed properly and the load bearing capacity of the area needs elaboration.
- xviii. Proper Drainage system is properly required.
- xix. Sikkim falls within seismic Zone IV/V in regard to earthquake that needs to be properly mentioned. The Mines and Geology report categorically mentioned at the last para that *micro seismic studies in the area and load impact assessment of the surrounding areas to be carried out prior to construction of multi –storey*

structures and provide a suitable mitigation measures if required to avoid future complications. Needs to be complied and completed.

- xx. Type of jobs / employment that are being generated needs to be properly mentioned in the DPR following the Sikkim Govt rules and policies.
- xxi. Geological figure is not correct in the DPR.
- xxii. Summing pool at the top floor is not advisable considering the earthquake zone in Sikkim.
- xxiii. The four parking floors, auditoria and other huge halls can be considered as 'soft floors' and they must be provided special seismic load bearing shear walls and/or especially designed/size columns. The project proponent must incorporate these provisions without fail considering the high Seismicity prone nature of Sikkim Himalaya.
- xxiv. The Doors in the building seems to be opening provision from outside. This should be open from inside the floor considering the fact that in case of emergency / disaster the people can evacuate easily.
- xxv. Roofs can be removed because of high load or justification for stability may be provided.
- xxvi. The Report which the Project Proponent has submitted, has no stability report. The Notification no.17/DMG/20-21 dated 19/03/2021 has specified the maximum allowable number of floors for construction as 5 and half storey. In the present condition 14 storied building concrete structure is not permitted as per the notification. Needs approval from the concerned Department for proposed 14 storey building.
- xxvii. Have the PP obtained the approval of the structural design from the competent department?
- xxviii. The report which project proponent has submitted doesn't have the document proof of 14-storey building.
- xxix. Point 1.8 of Form I, how much excavated material will be utilized and how much quantity will be disposed off, excess quantity if any and where the excess muck will be disposed of, needs to be properly elaborated.
- xxx. Point 8.3 of Form I, the PP doesn't mention the regular health check-ups of labours.
- xxxi. Some important names of Schools, Colleges, places of worships are missing as asked in the Standard Format of the Form 1 under Environmental Sensitivity like Nar Bahadur Bhandari Degree College, Masjid nearby the construction site, Enchey Monastery, Thakurbari Temple etc.
- xxxii. Page 5 of Form 1A, Under Water Environment 48KLD waste water shall be recycled for flushing, landscaping and Car washing purpose. How will the PP propose to manage or dispose car washed waste water, needs to be properly elaborated.
- xxxiii. Point 2.3 of Form IA, whatever has been desired in this points needs to be elaborated with quality, physicochemical and biological characteristics of the water requirement with source of water to be collected in tankers.
- xxxiv. Point 2.7 Form 1A, 2nd Paragraph to be elaborated clearly.

- xxxv. Under sl.no.6.1 of Form IA, the PP states that ... there will be no obstruction of a view, scenic amenity or landscape. The SEAC observed that there will be some obstructions of the aesthetics.
 - xxxvi. At 1.4 of Form IA, the PP states that no history of major earthquake has been recorded in the region. This statement is not correct.
4. The SEAC decided to defer the proposal and asked the project proponent to provide / clarify above details and submit additional information. Resubmit Form – I and Form – IA with amendments. The project proposal may be restructured and resubmitted in a standard approved format.