

STATE EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE – TAMIL NADU

Minutes of the 153rd Agenda Meeting of the State Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) held on 4th June 2020 (Thursday) for Appraisal of Building and Construction Projects, Townships and Area Development projects & Mining projects conducted through video conferences.

Agenda No. 153-01

File No. 7526/2020

Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 0.81.0 ha in S.F.Nos 662/1 (P-3) of Ayelam village, Walajah Taluk, Ranipet District, TamilNadu by M/s. K.P. Blue Metal – Environmental Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIN/146831/2020)

The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The details of the project furnished by the proponent is enclosed as Annexure.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, M/s. K.P. Blue Metal has applied for Environmental Clearance for the proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 0.81.0 ha in S.F.Nos 662/1 (P-3) of Ayelam village, Walajah Taluk, Ranipet District, TamilNadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B2" of Item 1(a) "Mining of Mineral Projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. Ground water quality monitoring should be conducted once in every Six months and the report should be submitted to TNPCB.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

2. After mining is completed, proper levelling should be done by the Project proponent & Environmental Management Plan furnished by the Proponent should be strictly followed.
3. The proponent shall provide the fencing around the boundary of the proposed area and shall furnish the photocopies of the same before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
4. The Project proponent shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc.
5. Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level and to combat the dust pollution shall be established like providing Green Belt along the boundary of the quarrying site, etc. and to prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration.
6. The operation of the quarry should not affect the agriculture activities & water bodies near the project site.
7. Transportation of the quarried materials shall not cause any hindrance to the Village people/Existing Village road.
8. The Project Proponent shall comply with the mining and other relevant rules and regulations where ever applicable.
9. The proponent shall develop adequate green belt with native species on the periphery of the mine lease area before commencement of the mining activity, in consultation with DFO of the concern district/agriculture university.
10. The quarrying activity shall be stopped if the entire quantity indicated in the Mining plan is quarried even before the expiry of the quarry lease period and the same shall be monitored by the District Authorities.
11. The recommendation for the issue of environmental clearance is subject to the outcome of the Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A No.186 of 2016 (M.A.No.350/2016) and O.A. No.200/2016 and O.A.No.580/2016 (M.A.No.1182/2016) and O.A.No.102/2017 and O.A.No.404/2016 (M.A.No. 758/2016,M.A.No.920/2016,M.A.No.1122/2016, M.A.No.12/2017 & M.A. No.

843/2017) and O.A.No.405/2016 and O.A.No.520 of 2016 (M.A.No. 981 /2016, M.A.No.982/2016 & M.A.No.384/2017).

12. Prior clearance from Forestry & Wild Life including clearance from committee of the National Board for Wild life as applicable shall be obtained before starting the quarrying operation, if the project site attracts the NBWL clearance.
13. To ensure safety measures along the boundary of the quarry site, security guards are to be posted during the entire period of mining operation.
14. The mine closure plan submitted by the project proponent shall be strictly followed after the lapse of the mine.
15. The amount of Rs. 1,30,600 (2% of the total project cost) shall be utilized as CER activities to carry out the development of the Toilet Facilities & Drinking Water Facilities for Ayelam village Government School as reported before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
16. The proponent shall provide the fencing all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.
17. The proponent shall plant tree saplings all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.

Agenda No. 153-02

File No. 7382/2019

**Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 4.80.0 ha in S.F.Nos 271(P) of Sivanthipathi village, Kovilpatti Taluk, Thoothukudi District, TamilNadu by Thiru. R. Liaquot Ali Khan – Environmental Clearance.
(SIA/TN/MIN/135764/2019)**

The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The details of the project furnished by the proponent is enclosed as Annexure.

The SEAC noted the following:

Chairman
SEAC-TN

1. The Proponent, Thiru. R. Liaquot Ali Khan has applied for Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 4.80.0 ha in S.F.Nos 271(P) of Sivanthipathi village, Kovilpatti Taluk, Thoothukudi District, TamilNadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B2" of Item 1(a) "Mining of Mineral Projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. Ground water quality monitoring should be conducted once in every Six months and the report should be submitted to TNPCB.
2. After mining is completed, proper levelling should be done by the Project proponent & Environmental Management Plan furnished by the Proponent should be strictly followed.
3. The proponent shall provide the fencing around the boundary of the proposed area and shall furnish the photocopies of the same before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
4. The Project proponent shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc.
5. Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level and to combat the dust pollution shall be established like providing Green Belt along the boundary of the quarrying site, etc. and to prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration.
6. The operation of the quarry should not affect the agriculture activities & water bodies near the project site.
7. Transportation of the quarried materials shall not cause any hindrance to the Village people/Existing Village road.

8. The Project Proponent shall comply with the mining and other relevant rules and regulations where ever applicable.
9. The proponent shall develop adequate green belt with native species on the periphery of the mine lease area before commencement of the mining activity, in consultation with DFO of the concern district/agriculture university.
10. The quarrying activity shall be stopped if the entire quantity indicated in the Mining plan is quarried even before the expiry of the quarry lease period and the same shall be monitored by the District Authorities.
11. The recommendation for the issue of environmental clearance is subject to the outcome of the Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A No.186 of 2016 (M.A.No.350/2016) and O.A. No.200/2016 and O.A.No.580/2016 (M.A.No.1182/2016) and O.A.No.102/2017 and O.A.No.404/2016 (M.A.No. 758/2016,M.A.No.920/2016,M.A.No.1122/2016, M.A.No.12/2017 & M.A. No. 843/2017) and O.A.No.405/2016 and O.A.No.520 of 2016 (M.A.No. 981 /2016, M.A.No.982/2016 & M.A.No.384/2017).
12. Prior clearance from Forestry & Wild Life including clearance from committee of the National Board for Wild life as applicable shall be obtained before starting the quarrying operation, if the project site attracts the NBWL clearance.
13. To ensure safety measures along the boundary of the quarry site, security guards are to be posted during the entire period of mining operation.
14. The mine closure plan submitted by the project proponent shall be strictly followed after the lapse of the mine.
15. The amount of Rs. 7,06,600 (2% of the total project cost) shall be utilized as CER activities to carry out the development of the Toilet Facilities & Drinking Water Facilities for Sivanthipathi village Government School as reported before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
16. The proponent shall provide the fencing all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.

17. The proponent shall plant tree saplings all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation .

Agenda No. 153-03

File No. 7235/2020

Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 2.02.50 ha in S.F.Nos 347/1B2 of Thondamanthurai village, Veppanthattai Taluk, Perambalur District, TamilNadu by Thiru. S. Periyasamy – Environmental Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIN/45355/2020)

The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The details of the project furnished by the proponent is enclosed as Annexure.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru. S. Periyasamy has applied for Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 2.02.50 ha in S.F.Nos 347/1B2 of Thondamanthurai village, Veppanthattai Taluk, Perambalur District, TamilNadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B2" of Item 1(a) "Mining of Mineral Projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. Ground water quality monitoring should be conducted once in every Six months and the report should be submitted to TNPCB.
2. After mining is completed, proper levelling should be done by the Project proponent & Environmental Management Plan furnished by the Proponent should be strictly followed.

3. The proponent shall provide the fencing around the boundary of the proposed area and shall furnish the photocopies of the same before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
4. The Project proponent shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc.
5. Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level and to combat the dust pollution shall be established like providing Green Belt along the boundary of the quarrying site, etc. and to prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration.
6. The operation of the quarry should not affect the agriculture activities & water bodies near the project site.
7. Transportation of the quarried materials shall not cause any hindrance to the Village people/Existing Village road.
8. The Project Proponent shall comply with the mining and other relevant rules and regulations where ever applicable.
9. The proponent shall develop adequate green belt with native species on the periphery of the mine lease area before commencement of the mining activity, in consultation with DFO of the concern district/agriculture university.
10. The quarrying activity shall be stopped if the entire quantity indicated in the Mining plan is quarried even before the expiry of the quarry lease period and the same shall be monitored by the District Authorities.
11. The recommendation for the issue of environmental clearance is subject to the outcome of the Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A No.186 of 2016 (M.A.No.350/2016) and O.A. No.200/2016 and O.A.No.580/2016 (M.A.No.1182/2016) and O.A.No.102/2017 and O.A.No.404/2016 (M.A.No. 758/2016,M.A.No.920/2016,M.A.No.1122/2016, M.A.No.12/2017 & M.A. No. 843/2017) and O.A.No.405/2016 and O.A.No.520 of 2016 (M.A.No. 981 /2016, M.A.No.982/2016 & M.A.No.384/2017).

12. Prior clearance from Forestry & Wild Life including clearance from committee of the National Board for Wild life as applicable shall be obtained before starting the quarrying operation, if the project site attracts the NBWL clearance.
13. To ensure safety measures along the boundary of the quarry site, security guards are to be posted during the entire period of mining operation.
14. The mine closure plan submitted by the project proponent shall be strictly followed after the lapse of the mine.
15. The amount of Rs. 67,600 (2% of the total project cost) shall be utilized as CER activities to carry out the development of the Toilet Facilities & Drinking Water Facilities for Thondamanthurai village Government School as reported before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
16. The proponent shall provide the fencing all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.
17. The proponent shall plant tree saplings all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.

Agenda No. 153-04

File No. 7270/2019

Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 2.24.0 ha in S.F.Nos 745/1 of Koothampoondi village, Oddanchatiram Taluk, Dindigul District, TamilNadu by Thiru. K. Subburathinam– Environmental Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIN/45253/2019)

The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The details of the project furnished by the proponent is enclosed as Annexure.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru. K. Subburathinam has applied for Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an extent of 2.24.0 ha in S.F.Nos 745/1 of Koothampoondi village, Oddanchatiram Taluk, Dindigul District, TamilNadu.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B2" of Item 1(a) "Mining of Mineral Projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. Ground water quality monitoring should be conducted once in every Six months and the report should be submitted to TNPCB.
2. After mining is completed, proper levelling should be done by the Project proponent & Environmental Management Plan furnished by the Proponent should be strictly followed.
3. The proponent shall provide the fencing around the boundary of the proposed area and shall furnish the photocopies of the same before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
4. The Project proponent shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc.
5. Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level and to combat the dust pollution shall be established like providing Green Belt along the boundary of the quarrying site, etc. and to prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration.
6. The operation of the quarry should not affect the agriculture activities & water bodies near the project site.
7. Transportation of the quarried materials shall not cause any hindrance to the Village people/Existing Village road.
8. The Project Proponent shall comply with the mining and other relevant rules and regulations where ever applicable.

9. The proponent shall develop adequate green belt with native species on the periphery of the mine lease area before commencement of the mining activity, in consultation with DFO of the concern district/agriculture university.
10. The quarrying activity shall be stopped if the entire quantity indicated in the Mining plan is quarried even before the expiry of the quarry lease period and the same shall be monitored by the District Authorities.
11. The recommendation for the issue of environmental clearance is subject to the outcome of the Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A No.186 of 2016 (M.A.No.350/2016) and O.A. No.200/2016 and O.A.No.580/2016 (M.A.No.1182/2016) and O.A.No.102/2017 and O.A.No.404/2016 (M.A.No. 758/2016, M.A.No.920/2016, M.A.No.1122/2016, M.A.No.12/2017 & M.A. No. 843/2017) and O.A.No.405/2016 and O.A.No.520 of 2016 (M.A.No. 981 /2016, M.A.No.982/2016 & M.A.No.384/2017).
12. Prior clearance from Forestry & Wild Life including clearance from committee of the National Board for Wild life as applicable shall be obtained before starting the quarrying operation, if the project site attracts the NBWL clearance.
13. To ensure safety measures along the boundary of the quarry site, security guards are to be posted during the entire period of mining operation.
14. The mine closure plan submitted by the project proponent shall be strictly followed after the lapse of the mine.
15. The amount of Rs. 98,000 (2% of the total project cost) shall be utilized as CER activities to carry out the development of the Toilet Facilities & Drinking Water Facilities for Koothampoondi village Government School as reported before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
16. The proponent shall provide the fencing all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.
17. The proponent shall plant tree saplings all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation .

Agenda No. 153-05

File No. 1926/2013

Expansion of INFO Technology park by M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Moonlight Stop, Nandampakkam Post, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram District Chennai, Tamil Nadu - For Environmental Clearance.
(SIA/TN/NCP/30498/2018)

The proposal was placed in the 129th SEAC Meeting held on 17.05.2019 & 18.05.2019.
The project proponent gave detailed presentation.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited has applied for EC to SEIAA-TN for the Expansion of INFO Technology Park at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Moonlight Stop, Nandampakkam Post, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram District Chennai, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B" of Item 8(a) "Building and Construction projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the committee instructed the project proponent to furnish the following details for the existing and proposed expansion activity to SEAC:

1. A detailed write up on the safety precaution, Air pollution, Noise pollution for the existing occupants.
2. A copy of the village map, FMB sketch and A Register shall be furnished.
3. The project proponent shall provide the provision for utilization of OSR for the public purpose. The Entry and Exit shall be provided for the OSR for public usage such away layout plan shall be revised.
4. The structural stability for the proposed expansion project from the reputed government institutions like Anna University, IIT, NIT, etc shall be furnished.
5. The Solid waste management for the existing facility shall be furnished.
6. The Hazardous waste management for the existing and proposed expansion.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

7. The Solid waste generation calculation for the proposed expansion involves accommodation of canteen. Hence Solid waste generation calculation shall be properly done and shall be revised based on the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC for the 8(b) "Township and area development projects". Further, a detailed report on the solid waste storage area, final disposal of solid waste as per the Solid waste management rules, 2016 shall be furnished. For the proposed expansion, the project will generate 7,554 Kg/day. Hence, the project proponent may explore the possibilities for implementation of Bio Methanation plant. The design details of the Bio Methanation plant shall be furnished.
8. For the existing facility request to furnish the E waste generation, storage and disposal mechanism carried out with the proof. Further, it is requested to furnish the detail estimation with calculation of E waste generation for the proposed expansion and management plan.
9. Detail traffic study shall be conducted considering the proposed expansion load on traffic with maximum intensity on load.
10. Detail on Rain water harvesting pits with capacity for storage of roof run off shall be furnished.
11. The project proponent has informed that the proposed expansion of building will be utilized for canteen purpose. The waste generated from the washing of plates, vegetables, cleaning etc will content high organic content. Hence, the proponent may explore the suitable ETP for treating the waste generated from the above activities.
12. The project proponent shall furnish the flood and inundation with recommendation certificate considering the 2015 flood obtained from PWD.
13. The proponent shall earmark the area of green belt already developed in the Campus and the proposed green belt area to be developed with dimension and GPS coordinates in the layout plan.

The project proponent is requested to submit the aforesaid details to SEIAA-TN. On receipt of above details (Sl.No.1 to 13) from the project proponent, SEAC decided to make an on - the - spot inspection to assess the present status and compliance of the

Chairman
SEAC-TN

Expansion of INFO Technology park by M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Moonlight Stop, Nandampakkam Post, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram District Chennai, Tamil Nadu by the sub-committee constituted by the SEAC. Based on the inspection report and the data required as per S.NO.1 to 13 stated above, SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action.

The proponent has submitted his reply on 05.07.2019

As per the order Lr.No.SEAC-TN/F.No. 1926/2019 dated: 23.07.2019 of the Chairman, SEAC, Sub Committee was constituted to inspect and study the field conditions for the Proposal Seeking Environmental Clearance for the proposed Expansion of INFO Technology park by M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram District Chennai, Tamil Nadu. The date of the Inspection on 27.07.2019 (Saturday).

1. The Sub Committee inspected the site on 27.07.2019, to start with, the Technical Team held discussions with the project proponent regarding the proposed Expansion of INFO Technology park by M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram District Chennai, Tamil Nadu.
2. The committee has inspected the project site, during the inspection, the committee was observed that the following points:
3. Based on the observation & documents submitted by the project proponent the sub Committee members has requested the project proponent to further the following details and the project proponent has furnished the details vide in their letter dated 13.08.2019 received by SEUAA on 19.08.2019. The Detail are tabulated as below:

S.No	OBSERVATION & DETAILS SOUGHT BY SUB-COMMITTEE OF SEAC	Additional Details / Replies Submitted by the proponent
1.	Village map shall be marked with the site occupied area and the blocks developed in respective Survey Numbers	The FMB Super imposed over Village Plan is submitted. Site plan Superimposed over combined FMB depicting blocks and their respective survey numbers are furnished.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

2.	Furnish the extracts of A-register for all Survey Numbers of project site falls in Manapakkam & Mugalivakkam Villages; Also, to secure the extract of Survey Numbers 56/p & 58 of PWD Drain	Extract of A-register for all Survey Numbers of Manapakkam, Mugalivakkam Villages& PWD Canal is furnished.
3.	Built-up area of individual blocks constructed and that is proposed is required to record that the construction is within already granted EC.	Tower Wise area details submitted.
4.	Structural certificate for the proposed block 12 to be obtained from Anna University/IIT/NIT like Institutions.	Structural Stability Certificate for the proposed block 12 from the consultant OPTIMAL. The same will be got vetted by IIT-Roorkee with whom DLF has an MOU for all its projects;
5.	PWD permission for constructing a RCC Rectangular structure for using it for road crossing. Measurement of canal at the entry and exit of the site shall be as mentioned in the village Map/extract of A-register	Details regarding PWD permission for constructing a RCC Rectangular structure above the Ramavaram Drain. Measurements are complying with PWD permission and village map as well.
6.	An Environmental cell should have been formed as per EC conditions; conditions not fulfilled	A designated Environmental cell will be formed. Existing Environment Cell details given.
7.	Provisions to maintain the OSR by the Developer in SEZ is acceptable based on the GO. During site visit, observed the entire area is used for construction activities and for play ground	A detailed action plan for redevelopment of OSR with timeline is given.
8.	Green belt area is very less & no. of trees planted is also not adequate. The committee insisted to find additional space for increasing the greenbelt area.	Existing & Proposed tree details are submitted.
9.	Proposed site coordinated to be marked in the site plan	Site Coordinates as measured using DGPS will be provided once the agency for carrying out the same is contracted.

		<p>However, the coordinated of the proposed Tower using GPS is given below:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>Tower 12</td><td>Tower 7K</td></tr> <tr> <td>Latitude</td><td>13°01'19.72"N</td><td>13°01'13.25"N</td></tr> <tr> <td>Longitude</td><td>80°10'30.12"E</td><td>80°10'24.57"E</td></tr> </table>		Tower 12	Tower 7K	Latitude	13°01'19.72"N	13°01'13.25"N	Longitude	80°10'30.12"E	80°10'24.57"E
	Tower 12	Tower 7K									
Latitude	13°01'19.72"N	13°01'13.25"N									
Longitude	80°10'30.12"E	80°10'24.57"E									
10.	Being occupier of the IT Park, Instructed to maintain the inventory of F&B units and clients as well so that no bio-degradable waste is being disposed without treatment	<p>Bio-degradable wastes of 0.7-0.8 TPD is generated which is collected and treated in OWC.</p> <p>As per the advice of the Committee , details of wastes generated at individual Lessee and F&B units, handed over to DLF for treatment and that taken back by individual F&B units, and other details will also be maintained .</p>									
11.	Hazardous Waste storage is not properly maintained	<p>1. Proper Fencing and signage will be made and maintained as per HWM Rules</p> <p>2. Signage will be made at the entrance and at the storage site as well</p> <p>Proposed area for the Hazardous Waste Storage Yard is shown in Layout drawings.</p>									
12.	Records of E-waste generation and disposal,	<p>E-waste collection and storage at a designated storage yard is being maintained by M/s DLF. The Location of E-Waste Collection room is given.</p> <p>However, as the owner of the IT park, the records of e-waste returns or similar documents as maintained by all occupants also will be maintained by M/s. DLF.</p> <p>List of Authorized E-waste Collection Centre with whom DLF has contract [M/s Trittech Systems], Bills for e-waste collection and Agreement copy are attached.</p>									
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STP operation is not proper, the operators/ in-charge is not fully aware of SOP, No proper equipment available at STP site take samples and monitor Operating parameters Centrifuge is not properly working. 	<p>STP operation Procedure is furnished. All required measuring Jar and other instruments for the proper operation of the STP is made available. Photographs are given.</p> <p>Maintenance of Centrifuge undertaken and operation restored. Photograph showing centrifuge functioning is given.</p>									

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sludge drying bed is not adequate. 	<p>Photograph for Sludge Drying bed is given. A solar Evaporated Sludge Drying bed will be constructed during expansion activities at site.</p>
14.	<p>Since the occupants exceed 10,000 numbers, fulltime medical Centre should be under functioning. But part-time Facilities only available, weekly twice Doctor is visiting.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> DLF has entered with MIOT for setting up a full-fledged, 24/7 working, Medical Facility within the IT Park complex to meet emergency and accidental requirements of inmates. Photographs showing Work in progress towards setting up required Facilities and Instruments at site along with Bio-medical Authorization & disposal contract MIOT had with GJ Multiclave are given. DLF/MIOT shall ensure that the Doctors being appointed in the Medical Centre of the IT park will have AFIH qualification post his MBBS / Higher qualifications DLF shall initiate and ensure Bio-medical waste authorization for not only DLF maintaining Medical Centre but also clients' maintaining clinics as well
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage for Emergency evacuation are inadequate Emergency Response Plan / Evacuation plans are not in place Mock-up drills to be conducted 	<p>Adequate Signage is provided, mainly at remote locations and basements. Necessary PAS and Alarms shall also be made available</p> <p>Copy of ERP/evacuation plan is attached.</p> <p>Records of Mock-up drills conducted is attached.</p>
16.	<p>Specific Conditions laid in Issued TOR Clearance from National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) is required. Submit the status of application for NBWL clearance for the project</p>	<p>No Sanctuary is available within 10 Km radius to project Boundary. The Nearest ESZ declared Sanctuary i.e. "Ossudu Sanctuary" is 127 Km SW to project site.</p>

After perusal of the above detail by the subcommittee the following observations are

Chairman
SEAC-TN

Noted.

1. The committee insist the project proponent to furnish the Structural adequacy certificate for the proposed block 12 to be obtained from Anna University/IIT/NIT like Institutions.

Reply by the proponent;

Structural Stability Certificate for the proposed block 12 from the consultant OPTIMAL. The same is being vetted by the IIT-Roorkee.

Observation by the Sub-Committee

The Proponent has not furnished the details.

2. An Environmental cell should have been formed as per EC conditions: conditions not fulfilled.

Reply by the proponent;

A designated Environmental cell will be formed.

Observation by the Sub-Committee

As per the Environmental Clearance obtained by the project proponent the condition imposed was not complied.

3. Provisions to maintain the OSR by the Developer in SEZ is acceptable based on the GO. During site visit, observed the entire area is used for construction activities and for play ground

Reply by the proponent;

A detailed action plan for redevelopment of OSR with timeline is given.

Observation by the Sub-Committee

The Project proponent has enclosed the OSR layout without signature and without specifying the timeline for redevelopment of OSR Land.

4. Green belt area is very less & no. of trees planted is also not adequate. The committee insisted to find additional space for increasing the greenbelt area.

Reply by the proponent; Existing & Proposed tree details are submitted.

Observation by the Sub-Committee

As per the details furnished by the proponent the tree inventory carried out it was reported that 6659 Number of trees present. The proponent was silent for the detail requested by the Sub-Committee to find additional space for increasing

the greenbelt area. Since, the greenbelt area allotted by the project proponent is inadequate (Below 15% of the total plot area).

5. Specific Conditions laid in Issued TOR Clearance from National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) is required. Submit the status of application for NBWL clearance for the project.

Reply by the proponent;

No Sanctuary is available within 10 Km radius to project Boundary. The Nearest ESZ declared Sanctuary i.e. "Ossudu Sanctuary" is 127 Km SW to project site.

Observation by the Sub-Committee

The proponent has reported that No Sanctuary is available within 10km from the project boundary. But, Guindy National park is located within 10 km from the project site.

The proponent has not furnished satisfactory reply for the above five points has requested by the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee has noted earlier that the project proponent has obtained Environmental Clearance from MoEF, New Delhi vide letter no. 21-202/2007-IA-111 dated 13-08-2007. Subsequently, An Extension of Environmental Clearance was granted by SEIAA, Tamil Nadu vide letter no. SE1AA-TN/F-1926/2013/EC-Ext/2015 dated 24.02.2015 valid up to 12.08.2017.

The compliance report obtained from the Regional office, MoEF&CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018. It was reported that the construction work is under progress for the Block7K & Block 7L. During inspection the construction work is under progress for Block 7K. Hence the proponent may request to submit the reply for the validity of the EC during the construction of the above said blocks mentioned in the compliance report issued by the Regional office, MoEF& CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018 Further, the project proponent has not submitted flood and inundation with recommendation certificate considering the 2015 flood obtained from PWD.

The Sub Committee submit the inspection report in the 136th SEAC meeting on 21.09.2019 SEAC for the further course of action regarding the proposal of the proposed Expansion of INFO Technology park by M/s. DLF Home Developers Limited at 1/124 Shivaji Gardens, Manapakkam Village, Sriperumbudur-Taluk, Kancheepuram

Chairman
SEAC-TN

District Chennai, Tamil Nadu. After perusal of the detail submitted by the project proponent & inspection report the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details,

1. The project proponent has obtained Environmental Clearance from MoEF, New Delhi vide letter no. 21-202/2007-IA-III dated 13-08-2007. Subsequently, An Extension of Environmental Clearance was granted by SEIAA, Tamil Nadu vide letter no. SEIAA-TN/F-1926/2013/EC-Ext/2015 dated 24.02.2015 valid up to 12.08.2017.

The compliance report obtained from the Regional office, MoEF&CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018. It was reported that the construction work is under progress for the Block 7K & Block 7L. During inspection the construction work is under progress for Block 7K. Hence the proponent may request to submit the reply for the validity of the EC during the construction of the above said blocks mentioned in the compliance report issued by the Regional office, MoEF& CC. Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018

2. The project proponent to furnish the Structural certificate for the proposed block 12 to be obtained from Anna University/IIT/NIT other Government Institution.
3. The proponent has reported that No Sanctuary is available within 10km from the project boundary. But, Guindy National park is located within 10 km from the project site. Hence the project proponent shall furnish the aerial distance between the project site and Guindy National park
4. The project proponent shall furnish the flood and inundation with recommendation certificate considering the 2015 flood obtained from PWD.
5. The proponent shall earmark the area of green belt already developed in the Campus and the proposed green belt area to be developed with dimension and GPS coordinates in the layout plan.
6. An Environmental cell should have been formed as per EC conditions

After the submission of the above said details by the proponent, the SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action.

The proponent has submitted the reply on 06.11.2019

The proposal was placed once again in the 139th SEAC Meeting held on 23.11.2019. After perusal of the reply submitted by the proponent, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details since the earlier reply submitted by the proponent has not furnished the following details as instructed by the SEAC in the 136th SEAC meeting on 21.09.2019

1. The project proponent to furnish the Structural certificate for the proposed block 12 to be obtained from Anna University/IIT/NIT, other Government Institution.
2. The project proponent shall furnish the flood and inundation with recommendation certificate considering the 2015 flood obtained from PWD.
3. The proponent shall earmark the area of green belt already developed in the Campus and the proposed green belt area to be developed with dimension and GPS coordinates in the layout plan.
4. An Environmental cell should have been formed as per EC conditions.

The proponent has submitted his reply on 15.05.2020 as follows ,

S.NO	QUERIES	REPLIES
1	<p>The project proponent has obtained Environmental clearance from MOEF, New Delhi vide letter no. 21-202/2007-IA-III dated 13-08-2007. Subsequently, An Extension of Environmental Clearance was granted by SEIAA, Tamil Nadu vide letter no. SEIAA-TN/F-1926/2013/Ec-Ext/2015 dated 24.02.2015 valid upto 12.08.2017.</p> <p>The compliance report obtained from the Regional office, MOEF & CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018. it was reported that the construction work is under progress for the Block 7K & Block 7L. During Inspection ,</p>	<p>We bring to your attention the OM issued by MOEF & CC- vide No : 22-27/ 2015/IA-III dated 12th April 2016 wherein the validity of EC period has been extended for 7 years;</p> <p>The extension of validity of the above said Environmental Clearance issued on 24.02.2015. The extension issued has been valid till 13.08.2019 and the construction has been carried out in conformance and in compliance with the EC granted. We enclose relevant O&M F. No: 22-27/2015/IA-III dated 12.04.2016 & Gazette Notifications: S.O. No:1141(E) dated</p>

Chairman
SEAC-TN

	construction work is under progress for Block 7K. Hence the proponent may submit the reply for the validity of the EC during the construction of the above said blocks mentioned in the compliance report issued by the Regional office. MOEF & CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018.	29.04.2015 and S.O.No:2571(E) dated 31.08..2015 .
2	The project proponent to furnish the structural certificate for the proposal block 12 to be obtained from Anna University/IIT/NIT, other Government Institution.	IIT-Chennai has issued Structural stability Certificate for the proposed Block 12 on 21.11.2019.
3	The proponent has reported that No sanctuary is available within 10 Km from the project boundary. But, Guindy National park is located within 10 Km from the project site. Hence the project proponent shall furnish the aerial distance between the project site and Guindy National park.	Guindy National Park is not a wildlife sanctuary under wildlife protection Act 1972. Guindy National Park is at a distance 6.98 km from our site
4	The project proponent shall furnish the flood and inundation with recommendation certificate considering the 2015 flood obtained from PWD.	DLF has already been accorded NOC to construct and maintain as well as use of the culvert from PWD. The NOC is based on our submission to PWD regarding Flood Control measures proposed to be taken to avert any flooding situation such as one in 2015. In addition, to comply with the directive of SEAC we have secured an

		NOC from the Chief Engineer -PWD, Chennai .
5	The proponent Shall earmark the area of green belt already developed in the campus and the proposed green belt area to be developed with dimension and GPS coordinates in the layout plan.	The landscaped plan showing the existing and the proposed landscape/green belt area is enclosed. GPS coordinates of the proposed redevelopment of the OSR area also is made.
6	An Environmental cell should have been formed as per EC conditions	A Post Graduate Environment Engineer with 2 years field experience has been appointed at the site in August 2019.

The proposal was placed once again in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. After perusal of the reply submitted by the proponent, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details,

1. The project proponent has obtained Environmental Clearance from MoEF, New Delhi vide letter no. 21-202/2007-IA-III dated 13-08-2007. Subsequently, an extension of Environmental Clearance was granted by SEIAA, Tamil Nadu vide letter no. SEIAA-TN/F-1926/2013/EC-Ext/2015 dated 24.02.2015 valid up to 12.08.2017. The compliance report obtained from the Regional office, MoEF&CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018. It was reported that the construction work is under progress for the Block 7K & Block 7L. During inspection the construction work is under progress for Block 7K.

In the office memorandum of MoEF&CC's dated 12.04.2016, stated that "The environmental clearance of the project which had not completed five years on the date of publication of notification i.e 29.04.2015 there validity will stand automatically extended up to 7years".

Chairman
SEAC-TN

For this project the original EC validity was completed by 11.08.2012. Further the proponent has applied for extension of EC validity vide his application dated 16.05.2013 and the extension for validity of the EC was issued up to 12.08.2017 by SEIAA-TN vide SEIAA Letter dated 24.02.2015.

Now the proponent has mentioned the OM dated 12.04.2016 and also claimed another two years for the extension of validity of the EC for the above said extension of validity for the Environmental clearance issue by the SEIAA-TN.

Hence, the SEAC decided to get the clarification from SEIAA-TN/MoEF&CC since the reply submitted by the proponent is not satisfactory for the validity for the EC extension since the proponent has carried out the construction work for Block 7K during the inspection of sub-committee of the SEAC on 27.07.2019. Further it was reported that the construction work is under progress for the Block 7K & Block 7L in the compliance report issued by the Regional office. MOEF & CC, Chennai vide letter dated 01.02.2018.

2. The proponent shall earmark the area of green belt already developed in the Campus and the proposed green belt area to be developed with dimension and GPS coordinates in the layout plan since the proponent has not submitted the detail of green belt area.

On receipt of the above said details, the SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action.

Agenda No. 153-06

File No. 6440/2019

Proposed Tuna Fishing Harbor at S.F.No. 7/4, 39, 40, 41, 42 & 49, Thiruvottriyur Kuppam Village, Ennore Taluk, Thiruvallur District, Tamil Nadu by M/s. Fisheries Department – For Environmental Clearance(SIA/TN/MIS/19435/2017)

The proposal was placed in this 141st SEAC Meeting held on 16.12.2019. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The salient features of the project and the environmental impact assessment as presented by the proponent are as follows:

Chairman
SEAC-TN

1. The project is located at 13°09'41.37"N to 13°10'10.22" N latitude and 80°18'31.34" E to 80°18'42.33" E longitude.
2. The fishing harbour includes Northern breakwater – 852 m, Southern breakwater – 1088m, Quays (RCC bored pile) for MFVs – 730m, Quays (RCC bored pile) for FRPs – 110m.
3. Also, fish handling and auction hall for MFVs – 1273 sq.m, Tuna fish handling and packing hall – 1200 sq.m, Fish handling and auction hall for FRP boats – 258 sq.m, Fishery administrative office – 163 sq.m, Fishermen gear sheds – 1591.83 sq.m, Net mending sheds – 1032.4 sq.m, Fishermen rest sheds – 654.00 sq.m, Boat repair shop – 200.90 sq.m, Restaurant – 137.79 sq.m, Dormitory – 320.90 sq.m and dredging – 200700 cu.m.
4. The proponent was issued ToR vide Lr No: SEIAA-TN vide F.No.6440/SEAC-C/7(e)/ToR-301/2017 dated 22.01.2018

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent M/s. Fisheries Department has applied for Environmental Clearance "Tune Fishing Harbour" at S.F.No. 7/4, 39, 40, 41, 42 & 49, Thiruvottriyur Kuppam Village, Ennore Taluk, Thiruvallur District, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B1" of Item 7(e) "Port, Harbour, Fishing Harbour" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

The SEAC noted that presentation does not include various essential impact studies and the following details

1. ToR compliance report was found to be not specific according to ToR Conditions
2. The quantification of sediment deposition and sediment erosion including the locations should be predicted and suitable environmental management plans for reducing the same should be furnished.
3. Impact in Tourism, Shoreline and Fish movements due to the proposed project needs to be studied and reported

4. Proposal for emergency response plan, risk assessment and mitigation plan for oil spill events.
5. The impact on the Ennoore creek due to implementation of the project.
6. The proponent shall explore the options of hollow structures instead of solid structure to reduce the erosion/deposition.
7. Overall the EIA report and presentation is not up to the mark.

Hence, the SEAC directed the proponent and the consultant to prepare the appropriate EIA and to appear for presentation once again with aforesaid details and other Environmental Impact data and studies in full shape. The proponent has submitted the reply to SEIAA-TN.

The proposal was once again placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 and the proponent gave the detailed presentation. Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. The Project proponent shall ensure that no creeks or rivers are blocked due to any activities at the project site and free flow of water is maintained.
2. Appropriate measures must be taken while undertaking digging activities to avoid any likely degradation of water quality. Silt curtains shall be used to contain the spreading of suspended sediment during dredging within the dredging area.
3. Measures should be taken to contain, control and recover the accidental spills of fuel and cargo handle.
4. Spillage of fuel / engine oil and lubricants from the construction site are a source of organic pollution which impacts marine life. This shall be prevented by suitable precautions and also by providing necessary mechanisms to trap the spillage.
5. No diversion of the natural course of the river shall be made without prior permission from the Ministry of Water resources.

6. All the erosion control measures shall be taken at water front facilities. Earth protection work shall be carried out to avoid erosion of soil from the shoreline/boundary line from the land area into the marine water body.
7. Dredged material shall be disposed safely in the designated areas.
8. Shoreline should not be disturbed due to dumping. Periodical study on shore line changes shall be conducted and mitigation carried out, if necessary. The details shall be submitted along with the six monthly monitoring report.
9. Dredging shall not be carried out during the fish breeding and spawning seasons.
10. The project proponent shall ensure that water traffic does not impact the aquatic wildlife sanctuaries that fall along the stretch of the river.
11. A detailed marine biodiversity management plan shall be prepared through the NIOS or any other institute of repute on marine, brackish water and fresh water ecology and biodiversity and submitted to and implemented to the satisfaction of the State Biodiversity Board and the CRZ authority. The report shall be based on a study of the impact of the project activities on the intertidal biotopes, corals and coral communities, molluscs, sea grasses, sea weeds, sub-tidal habitats, fishes, other marine and aquatic micro, macro and mega flora and fauna including benthos, plankton, turtles, birds etc. as also the productivity. The data collection and impact assessment shall be as per standards survey methods and include underwater photography.
12. Marine ecology shall be monitored regularly also in terms of sea weeds, sea grasses, mudflats, sand dunes, fisheries, echinoderms, shrimps, turtles, corals, coastal vegetation, mangroves and other marine biodiversity components including all micro, macro and mega floral and faunal components of marine biodiversity

Agenda No. 153-07

File No. 6467/2017

Proposed Construction of Port in S.F.Nos. 6, 104 at Thillaiyadi Village, Tharangambadi Taluk, Nagapattinam District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. R. Ravichandran Assistant Director Of Fisheries - For Environmental Clearance.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

(SIA/TN/MIS/70589/2019)

The proposal was placed once again in the 1461h SEAC meeting on 29.02.2020 the Project proponent has gave detailed presentation. The salient feature of the project Presented (furnished) by the proponent is enclosed in the annexure

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru. R. Ravichandran Assistant Director of Fisheries has applied for Environmental Clearance for the proposed construction of Port in S.F.Nos. 6, 104 at Thillaiyadi Village, Tharangambadi Taluk, Nagapattinam District, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "8" of Item 7(e) "Ports & Harbour" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the Committee decided to defer the proposal for want of following additional details

- a. The proponent shall furnish the details on the identified flora and Fauna at the site and how many to be removed/cut due to the proposed project.
- b. The proponent shall furnish the details on the impact on Flora and Fauna due to oil/Kerosene leak in case of accident.
- c. Impact on the construction of the fishing port on fish movement in that area by analyzing the achieve data available with fishers Department and prediction through modeling and furnish the details.
- d. As per the report, a littoral drift, the net northerly movement of sand will be at the rate of 50,000 m³/month. This will result in the deposition in the southern side of the harbour, whereas will lead to erosion in the north. A detailed report in the measures to mitigate there problem need to be submitted, as the villages in the northern side will be affected by the harbour.

On receipt of the aforesaid details, the SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action. The proponent has submitted his reply to SEIAA-TN.

The proposal was once again placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 and the proponent gave the detailed presentation . Based on the presentation made by

Chairman
SEAC-TN

the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. The Project proponent shall ensure that no creeks or rivers are blocked due to any activities at the project site and free flow of water is maintained.
2. Appropriate measures must be taken while undertaking digging activities to avoid any likely degradation of water quality. Silt curtains shall be used to contain the spreading of suspended sediment during dredging within the dredging area.
3. Measures should be taken to contain, control and recover the accidental spills of fuel and cargo handle.
4. Spillage of fuel / engine oil and lubricants from the construction site are a source of organic pollution which impacts marine life. This shall be prevented by suitable precautions and also by providing necessary mechanisms to trap the spillage.
5. No diversion of the natural course of the river shall be made without prior permission from the Ministry of Water resources.
6. All the erosion control measures shall be taken at water front facilities. Earth protection work shall be carried out to avoid erosion of soil from the shoreline/boundary line from the land area into the marine water body.
7. Dredged material shall be disposed safely in the designated areas.
8. Shoreline should not be disturbed due to dumping. Periodical study on shore line changes shall be conducted and mitigation carried out, if necessary. The details shall be submitted along with the six monthly monitoring report.
9. Dredging shall not be carried out during the fish breeding and spawning seasons.
10. The project proponent shall ensure that water traffic does not impact the aquatic wildlife sanctuaries that fall along the stretch of the river.
11. A detailed marine biodiversity management plan shall be prepared through the NIOS or any other institute of repute on marine, brackish water and fresh water ecology and biodiversity and submitted to and implemented to the satisfaction of the State Biodiversity Board and the CRZ authority. The report shall be based on a study of the impact of the project activities on the intertidal biotopes, corals and

coral communities, molluscs, sea grasses, sea weeds, sub-tidal habitats, fishes, other marine and aquatic micro, macro and mega flora and fauna including benthos, plankton, turtles, birds etc. as also the productivity. The data collection and impact assessment shall be as per standards survey methods and include underwater photography.

12. Marine ecology shall be monitored regularly also in terms of sea weeds, sea grasses, mudflats, sand dunes, fisheries, echinoderms, shrimps, turtles, corals, coastal vegetation, mangroves and other marine biodiversity components including all micro, macro and mega floral and faunal components of marine biodiversity

Agenda No. 153-08

File No. 6487/2017

Proposed reconstruction of residential tenements of Gowdhamapuram by M/s. Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board in R.S.No. 782/8 of Perambur Village, Purasawakkam – Perambur Taluk, Chennai District, Tamil Nadu – Activity 8(a) & Category “B2” - Building & Construction Projects - Environmental Clearance – Regarding.

The Project Proponent **M/s. Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board** has applied for Environment Clearance for the proposed reconstruction of residential tenements of Gowdhamapuram with a total built up area of 41708.6 Sq.m at R.S.No. 782/8 of Perambur Village, Purasawakkam – Perambur Taluk, Chennai District, Tamil Nadu on 27.12.2017.

The proposal was placed in the 106th SEAC meeting held on 04.04.2018. The proponent made a presentation about the project proposal. The SEAC decided to defer the proposal for want of following additional particulars:

1. The project proponent shall furnish the planning permit/approved plan from CMDA for the proposed buildings.
2. The project proponent shall furnish the approval from the competent authority for the demolition of existing building.

3. The project proponent shall furnish the proposal to treat the part of the sewage generated from the proposed project by providing STP and the treated sewage shall be utilized for gardening.
4. The proponent shall furnish the photographs of the existing sewage pumping station in the project site.
5. The proponent shall furnish the photographs of the existing green belt area.
6. Details on environmental management measures proposed for the disposal of the demolition waste.

The above minutes were communicated to the proponent vide SEIAA-TN letter dated: 07.04.2018. The proponent has furnished a reply to SEIAA-TN on 23.07.2018. The details furnished by the proponent were placed in the 117th SEAC Meeting held on 28.07.2018. The proponent made a presentation. The SEAC noted that the proponent was not ready with the details/documents already asked for in the earlier communication of the SEAC and hence directed the proponent to submit the details/documents already asked for. The SEAC decided to consider the proposal after the receipt of the details/document from the proponent.

The project proponent has submitted the following reply on 26.02.2020,

S. No.	Query	Response
1.	The project proponent shall furnish the planning permit / approved plan from CMDA for the proposed buildings.	We have applied for Planning Permit to Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority (CMDA) and acknowledgement copy has been submitted earlier. Now CMDA has send demand notice to make payments for development charge, balance scrutiny fee, infrastructure fee, etc. TNSCB already paid the amount and handed over the OSR area to Corporation and submitted the document to CMDA (Copy Enclosed as Annexure I). Final approval awaited.
2.	The project proponent shall furnish the approval from the competent authority for the demolition of existing building.	The existing buildings are demolished without any approval from Greater Chennai Corporation. But the demolition waste has been disposed

Chairman
SEAC-TN

		into the site identified by GCC under Construction & Demolition Waste Rules, 2016.
3.	The project proponent shall furnish the proposal to treat the part of the sewage generated from the proposed project by providing STP and the treated sewage shall be utilized for gardening.	The part of sewage generated will be treated through Sewage Treatment Plant of 225 KLD and the treated sewage will be utilized for gardening and flushing.
4.	The proponent shall furnish the photographs of the existing sewage pumping station in the project site.	The photographs of existing sewage pumping station is enclosed ,
5.	The proponent shall furnish the photographs of the existing green belt area.	The photographs of existing green belt area is enclosed .
6.	Details on environmental management measures proposed for the disposal of the demolition waste.	The environmental management measures proposed for the disposal of demolition waste is enclosed .

The SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 . After the detailed deliberation, the SEAC has decided to recommend the proposal for the issue of environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. The proponent has informed that the existing buildings are demolished without any approval from Greater Chennai Corporation, after the detail discussion about this issue, the SEAC has decided to direct the **proponent to pay Rs,10000** as Environmental compensation for demolishing the building without approval before the subject to be placed before SEIAA.
2. Necessary permission shall be obtained from the competent authority for the drawl / outsourcing of fresh water before obtaining consent from TNPCB.
3. The Proponent shall provide the dispenser for the disposal of Sanitary Napkins.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

4. The proponent has to prepare the layout out plan to be submitted for CMDA/DTCP approval in which earmarked the greenbelt area with dimension and GPS coordinates for the green belt area all along the boundary of the project site as submitted to SEIAA.
5. All the mitigation measures committed by the proponent for the flood management, Solid waste disposal, Sewage treatment & disposal etc., shall be followed strictly.
6. Solar energy should be at least 10% of total energy utilization. Application of solar energy should be utilized maximum for illumination of common areas, street lighting etc.
7. The height of the stack of DG sets shall be provided as per the CPCB norms.
8. The project proponent shall continuously operate and maintain the Sewage treatment plant to achieve the standards prescribed by the TNPCB/CPCB.
9. The project proponent has to provide separate standby D.G set for the STP proposed for the continuous operation of the STP in case of power failure.
10. The project Proponent shall provide Bio Methanation plant for the disposal of the Organic waste since the generation biodegradable waste is more than one Tons and Non-Bio degradable waste to be regularly collected and disposed through TNPCB authorized recycler.
11. No waste of any type to be disposed of in any watercourse including drains, canals and the surrounding environment.
12. The proponent shall spent the CER amount of Rs.219Lakhs as per the office memorandum of MoEF& CC dated 01.05.2018 for the following activities as proposed by the proponent, before obtaining the CTO from the TNPCB,

S. No.	Activity	Total Budget in Rs.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

1	Tree plantation: Planting of additional trees of native species within the Park at Peramur	4,200,000
3	Rain water harvesting: Construction of rain water harvesting pits/bore wells to harness rain water harvesting potential at Peramur Park.	4,800,000
4	Solar energy harvesting: Installation of 30 kWp capacity roof top solar PV panels to harness solar energy at Peramur.	7,880,000
5	Sanitation: Toilet facility for Chennai Girl's higher sec. school, Perambur .	1,200,000
5	Sanitation: Toilet facility for Government Higher Sec. School at Vysarpasdi.	1,300,000
8	Infrastructure: Provision of library equipment/ furnitures at Chennai Girl's higher sec. school, Perambur.	460,000
8	Infrastructure: Provision of library equipment/ furnitures at Government Higher Sec. School at Vysarpasdi.	480,000
6	Green initiative: Organic waste converter (50 Kg/day capacity) for canteen waste and plant leaves at Anganvadi (Behind Project Site).	550,000
7	Drinking water: Rectification Of RO system at Chennai Government Higher Sec. School at Vysarpasdi.	450,000
8	Infrastructure: Provision of library equipment/ furnitures at Vysarpasdi	600,000
	Total	21,920,000

Agenda No. 153-09

File No. 6553/2018

Proposed Construction of 6877 EWS Flats by M/s. Tamil Nadu Housing Board at T.S.No. 2, Old S.No. 29/2PT, 3, 4pt of Ernavoor Village, Tiruvottiyur Taluk, Tiruvallur District, Tamil Nadu- For Environmental Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIS/32466/2018, dated: 02.05.2019)

The proposal was placed in the 130th SEAC Meeting held on 10.06.2019. The SEAC noted the following:

Chairman
SEAC-TN

1. The Proponent, M/s. Tamil Nadu Housing Board has applied for EC to SEIAA-TN for the Proposed Construction of 6877 EWS Flats, at T.S.No. 2. Old S.No. 29/2PT, 3, 4pt of Ernavoor Village, Tiruvottiyur Taluk, Tiruvallur District. Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B" of Item 8(b) "Township and area development projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.
3. The SEAC noted that the project proponent has obtained Terms of Reference vide Lr.No.SEIAA-TN/F.No.6553/SEAC-CXII/8(b)/foR-497/2018 dated 14.06.2018.

The proponent made a presentation about the project proposal. Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished. The SEAC instructed the project proponent to furnish the following details:

- 1) The project site lies very close to the Buckingham canal (at 0.48 m), Korattalaiyar River (at 0.53 km) & Bay of Bengal (at 0.65m). There is a great possibility of the project site getting flooded during heavy monsoons. The proponent should take all structural measures to ensure the safety of the building and safe living for the residents. The proponent should obtain flood inundation certificate with recommendation of PWD considering the magnitude of 2015 flood and accordingly flood management measure need to be evolved.
- 2) Copy of the village map. FMB sketch and "A- register shall be furnished.
- 3) The proponent has to earmark the greenbelt area with dimension and GPS coordinates for the green belt area, along the periphery of the site.
- 4) In the presentation the total plot area is informed at 1,21,445.15 Sq.m. But, in the application submitted for EC it has been mentioned as 1,21,445.45 Sq.m. and this needs to be clarified.
- 5) The proponent informed that the treated sewage of 2686 kLD will be sent to Ennore Thermal Power plant/CMWSSB Sewer line. The project proponent is requested to revise the water balance for the maximum utilization of treated sewage instead of leading out into Ennore Thermal Power plant/CMWSSB sewer line, which is not under the control.

- 6) The plan for OSR area shall be revised in order to provide exit and entry to the public.
- 7) Buckingham canal is located at 0.48 km from the project site, Korattalaiyar River is located at 0.53 km from the project site & Bay of Bengal is located at 0.65 km from the project site. The Committee felt that the project may fall under the CRZ zone, and if so, the CRZ clearance needs to be obtained.
- 8) Detail of Evacuation plan in case of emergent shall be submitted.

In the Terms of Reference one of the conditions is mentioned as

"As per National building 2005 suggest that design solutions such as barriers blocks should be used to reduce external LA10 noise level, to at least 60-70 dB (A) at any point 1.0 m from any inward looking facade. Green belts and landscaping could act as an effective means to control noise pollution. In case of railway tracks, a minimum distance of 50m to 70m may be provided between the buildings and the tracks. Hence, the proponent is directed to leave a minimum distance of 50m between the building and the tracks and plan accordingly."

But the proponent has not provided minimum distance of 50m between the building and the tracks.

After the details for S.No. a) to h) stated above are submitted by the proponent, the SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action.

The proponent has submitted his reply to SEIAA and the proposal was placed once again in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. After perusal of the reply submitted by the proponent, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details,

1. The proponent shall obtain the necessary clarification from the competent authority whether the proposed project site attracts the CRZ clearance or not since the CRZ map submitted by the proponent is not clear.
2. The proponent should treat the grey water separately. Accordingly proponent shall revise water balance sheet and furnish the design detail of the grey water treatment and STP.

3. The proponent shall earmark the greenbelt area with dimension and GPS coordinates for the green belt area all along the boundary of the project site with minimum of 15% of the total land area and the same shall be included in the layout out plan to be submitted for CMDA/DTCP approval.

Agenda No. 153-10

File No. 6439

Expansion in Production of Water based Latex Polymer from 40000 MTA to 70000 MTA & Latex Polymer cake from 407 MTA to 1462 MTA in two phases in existing Emulsion Plant by M/s. Dow Chemical international Private Limited located at Plot No. L-7, SIPCOT industrial Park (Phase-II), Mambakkam Post, Sriperumbudur Village, Kanchipuram District, Tamil Nadu – for Environmental Clearance.

A Consent to Establish Water based Latex Polymer & Latex Polymer cake in their existing Emulsion Plant in the name of M/s. ROHM and HARS India Private Limited was issued vide proceeding dated: 05.06.2006. Subsequently, the proponent has obtained Consent to Operate vide proceedings dated: 07.09.2007 for the Water Based Latex Polymer and Latex Polymer Cake from TNPCB.

In 2016, the name of the company has been changed from M/s. ROHM and HARS India Private Limited to M/s. Dow Chemical's International Private Limited.

The project proponent has applied for ToR on 21.08.2017 for the proposed capacity expansion of Water based Latex Polymer from 40000 MT/ Year to 70000 MT/Year & Latex Polymer cake from 407 MT/Year to 1462 MT/Year and the subject was placed in the 94th SEAC Meeting held on 08.09.2017. Subsequently, the matter was placed in the 241st SEIAA Meeting held on 09.10.2017. Both the Committee and the Authority decided to recommend for ToR subject to applicability of EIA Notification, S.O. 60 (E), dated: 27.01.1994 for the project vide Lr.No. SEIAA-TN/F.No. 6439/2017/5(f)/SOC/ToR- 291/2017 dated: 09.10.2017.

Now, M/s. The Dow Chemical International Private Limited has applied for Environment Clearance by submitting the EIA report for the proposed capacity expansion on 08.12.2017.

The application was scrutinized and additional details were requested vide letter dated: 18.01.2018 and the project proponent has submitted the details on 31.01.2018.

The project proposal was placed in the 102nd meeting of the SEAC held on 01.02.2018. The proponent also made a presentation about the salient features of the project proposal. The SEAC Members interacted with the proponent regarding the regulatory aspects and environmental aspects related to the project.

1. From regulatory point of view, the SEAC members noted that as per EIA Notification, S.O. 60 (E), dated: 27.01.1994, the project requires Environmental Clearance. As per the Schedule – I, integrated paint complex including manufacture of resins and basic raw materials required in the manufacture of paints will require EC. When this was pointed out to the proponent, the proponent was of the opinion that his project does not require EC according to his interpretation of the rule.
2. The salient features of the project are as follows:
 - a) Water based Latex polymer – 40000 (MT/year) & Latex Polymer Cake - 407 (MT/year)
 - b) For setting up the proposed expansion there will be no additional land purchased as adequate land is available at the existing facility.
3. The proponent informed that appropriate gaseous emission control, effluent treatment and hazardous waste management measures will be implemented.

The SEAC felt that it is better to make an on the spot inspection of the industry to assess the current status of the environmental compliance of the industry and then take a decision regarding their request for future expansion.

As per the order Lr.No.SEAC-TN/F.No. 6439/2017 dated: 01.02.2018 of the Chairman, SEAC, and a Technical Team was constituted to inspect and study the field conditions in the proposed capacity expansion of Water based Latex Polymer & Latex

Chairman
SEAC-TN

Polymer cake by M/s. The Dow Chemical International Private Limited in their existing Emulsion Plant located at Plot No.L-7, SIPCOT Industrial Park (Phase II), Mambakkam Post, Sriperumbudur Village, Kancheepuram District on 10.02.2018.

The Technical Team made the inspection on 10.02.2018 and submitted the report on 19.02.2018. The report of the Technical team was placed in the 103rd meeting of SEAC held on 23.02.2018.

The SEAC noted that, during the inspection, the Technical Team has instructed the proponent to revise the EIA report to include various pollution control measures. The proponent has revised the EIA report and submitted the same to the SEAC on 23.02.2018.

Considering the inspection report and the revised EIA report of the proponent, the SEAC decided to recommend to SEIAA to consider the grant of EC to M/s. Dow Chemical's International Private Limited for the proposed capacity expansion of Water based Latex Polymer from 40000 MT/ Year to 70000 MT/Year & Latex Polymer cake from 407 MT/Year to 1462 MT/Year, subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions in addition to the normal conditions:

1. Due to the expansion of the industry, there will be increased air emission. At present the air emission (mainly monomers) is estimated to be 2860 kg/annum. After expansion this will increase to 4960 kg/annum. To manage the increased air emission, the proponent should implement the following additional air pollution control measures.
 - a) The scrubber column internal packing must be revamped by going for a combination of structured packing and random packing to improve the caustic scrubber efficiency to 80% from 60%.
 - b) Caustic circulation pump capacity must be increased from 17cu.m/hr. to 25 cu.m/hr. after checking the flooding conditions.
 - c) The forced draft caustic blower capacity must be increased from 170 cu.m/hr. to 250 cu.m/hr. by change of impeller / motor.

2. The ETP treats at present 79 KLD from process vessel and equipment flushing and 8 KLD from domestic use. Thus, the total flow into the ETP now is 87 KLD. This flow will increase to 147.5 KLD in future (138 + 9.5 KLD). Since the process effluent flow has almost doubled, the ETP capacity also needs to be doubled. Hence, the industry is directed to go for an additional ETP of similar configuration as it is existing now.
3. Regarding hazardous waste, the industry produces pump seal oil, expired raw materials, empty raw material drums, bag liners which are contaminated with chemical powders and ETP sludge. The total hazardous waste now generated is 296 T/annum which will increase to 525.25 T/annum after expansion. The future hazardous waste should also be managed as per the existing Hazardous Waste and Other Waste (Management) Rules, 2016.
4. The industry should install an additional VOC monitor at the ground floor in the process area and the data generated should be fed to the TNPCB CARE AIR CENTRE.
5. Only approved species should be planted following proper planting technique in future for green belt development:
 - i) Calophyllum inophyllum (Punnai)
 - ii) Derris indica (pungan)
 - iii) Ficus religiosa (Arassa Maram)
 - iv) Ficus bengalensis (Ala Maram)
 - v) Mimosa elengi (Magilan Maram)
 - vi) Syzygium cumini (Naaval)
 - vii) Azadirachta indica (Vempu)
 - viii) Thespesia populnea (Poovarasu)
6. Regarding the Occupational Health Services (OHS), the surgeon or medical officer appointed for the purpose shall be trained in OHS by the expertise in the respective fields. Besides, the documents related to periodical medical examination carried out shall be maintained in all aspects.
7. The plant safety committee shall be constituted if not done earlier, incorporating the members representing the management and workmen

representing the different working areas to review the existence of the safety standards. Ensuring the safety standards on day to day basis must be carried out.

8. Safety audit shall be carried out for all the working places including the functional components as per norms and at least once in a year whichever is earlier. The same shall be considered as a basis for reviewing the safety standards during the plant safety committee meeting.
9. Regarding CSR activities, the technical team noted that the industry has spent Rs. 10.10 Lakhs for the 3 years (2014-2015, 2015-2016 & 2016-2017). As per the norms, for this period, an amount of Rs. 25.30 Lakhs should have been spent on CSR activities. Thus, the industry has to spend the balance Rs. 15.20 Lakhs (25.3 Lakhs – 10.10 Lakhs). The amount of Rs. 15.20 Lakhs should be deposited with SMC (SSA), PU Primary School, Mullandiram Village, Tiruvannamalai District, for the construction of compound wall, providing toilet facilities for the school children and for the procurement of school furniture, in the form of DD before the receipt of EC. The proof for having transferred the funds should be produced to SEIAA.

For the years 2017-2018 onwards, the industry has to spend at least Rs. 25 Lakhs per annum towards CSR activities as per the norms. The amount should be utilised only for infrastructure, useful for local communities for the cause of education and sports.

From regulatory point of view, the SEAC members noted that as per EIA Notification, S.O. 60 (E), dated: 27.01.1994, the project requires Environmental Clearance. As per the Schedule – I, “integrated paint complex including manufacture of resins and basic raw materials required in the manufacture of paints will require EC”. When this was pointed out to the proponent, the proponent was of the opinion that his project does not require EC according to his interpretation of the rule. This recommendation made by the SEAC is subject to the resolution of the point whether the EIA notification, 1994 was applicable in the case of this project in the year 2006 when the proponent planned to start the industry.

The above recommendation of SEAC was placed in the 325th SEIAA Meeting held on 19.07.2018. The SEIAA decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC with the following remarks:

1. The SEAC recommendation is not clear (obviously referring to the applicability of EIA Notification, 1994).
2. The proponent plea that there is no violation under Environment Impact Assessment notification, 1994, has not been supported by any documents. This needs to be examined appropriately by SEAC.

The project proposal along with SEIAA remarks were placed in the 117th SEAC Meeting held on 28.07.2018. The members of the SEAC discussed the matter and decided to offer the following response to the two points raised by SEIAA:

As stated in the SEAC recommendation itself, the recommendation of the project for issue of EC was subject to the resolution of the point whether the EIA notification, 1994 was applicable for the project in 2006. The SEAC and the proponent had different opinion on this issue. Obviously, the MoEF & CC may be in a position to offer the final judgment on this issue. The statement which conveys the opinion of the proponent did not influence the decision of the SEAC and as part of the proceedings of the SEAC, this statement was included. The SEAC took an independent decision.

The proponent in his letter dated: 22.11.2018 stated that they have approached MoEF & CC seeking clarification regarding the non-availability of EIA Notification 1994 to the unit but no reply was received. Hence, the proponent has requested the Authority to send a letter to MoEF & CC to seek clarification regarding the non-availability of EIA Notification 1994 to the unit.

The proposal was placed before the 333rd Authority meeting held on 29.11.2018. The Authority decided to seek clarification from MoEF & CC regarding the non-applicability of EIA Notification, 1994 to the project. The proposal will be further processed only after the reply from MoEF & CC for the same.

Accordingly, clarification was requested from MoEF&CC vide this office letter dated 12.12.2018. The MoEF&CC send the clarifications vide in their letter dated 25.03.2019 received by this office on 03.04.2019.

The proposal was placed before the 343rd Authority meeting held on 03.05.2019. The SEIAA decided to refer back the proposal along with the clarification issued by the MoEF & CC vide in their letter dated 25.03.2019 to SEAC for appraisal.

The SEAC noted that the clarification received from the MoEF&CC vide F.No.22-7/2019-IA.III dated 25.03.2019 inferred that

“This has reference to your letter vide SEIAA-TN/F.NO.6439/SEAC/2017 dated 12th December, 2018 regarding clarification on applicability of the provisions of EIA Notification, 2006 for requirement of Environmental Clearance for manufacture of water based latex Polymer.

The matter was examined by the ministry and referred to Expert Committee for streamlining environmental clearance procedures including examination and recommendation on various technical issues like review of projects /activities for its inclusion under EIA notification, 2006. The Committee deliberated the issues in its meeting held on 5th march, 2019 and after detailed deliberation the committee was of the opinion that water based latex is a natural polymer and does not attract the provisions of EIA Notification 1994 or EIA Notification 2006.

Based on the recommendation of the Expert Committee, the ministry hereby clarifies that water based latex is a natural polymer and does not attract the provisions of EIA Notification 1994 or EIA Notification 2006.”

The proposal was placed in the 131st SEAC Meeting held on 17.07.2019. The proponent during presentation the proponent has informed that their product Water based Latex polymer & Latex Polymer Cake are synthetic polymer (not natural polymers) and further the raw material used are styrene, Butyl Acralate, VAM (Vinyl Acetate Monomer), Methyl methacrylate, Butyl Acralate, 2-EHA (2-Ethyl Hexyl Acrylate), Ethyl acralate, AN (Acrylonitrile) which are synthetic. The clarification received from the MoEF&CC that water based latex is a natural polymer and does not attract the provisions of EIA Notification 1994 or EIA Notification 2006.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

Hence, The SEAC decided to send the proposal to IIT/Anna University to know whether the proposal submitted by the proponent for the manufacturing of Water based Latex polymer & Latex Polymer Cake from the raw materials such as styrene, Butyl Acralate, VAM (Vinyl Acetate Monomer), Methyl methacrylate, Butyl Acralate, 2-EHA (2-Ethyl Hexyl Acrylate), Ethyl acralate, AN (Acrylonitrile) is natural polymer or synthetic polymer.

After receipt of the above detail from IIT/Anna University, further course of action will be taken on the proposal.

The report from the IIT Madras was received for the clarification regarding whether the products which are producing by the unit are synthetic organic chemicals or natural organic chemicals, was received from SEIAA office on 23rd May 2020 and the same was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 . The SEAC noted that the report from the IIT Madras has confirmed as synthetic organics and it is clearly shows that the unit activity attracts both the EIA Notification 2006 and EIA notification 1994.

In the view of the above, the SEAC decided to forward the application to SEIAA for further course of action according to the law.

Agenda No. 153-11

File No. 6970

Proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an Extent of 3.79.5Ha in S.F.Nos177/5, 177/6, 177/7 & 178/1 at Mannarkottai Village, Virudhunagar Taluk, Virudhunagar District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. E. Mariappan — For Environment Clearance (SIA/TN/M1N/38562/2019)

The proposal was placed in this 136th SEAC Meeting held on 20.09.2019. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The salient features of the project and the environmental impact assessment as presented by the proponent. Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished (SEAC Minutes Enclosed). The SEAC decided that the project proponent has to furnish the following details:

Chairman
SEAC-TN

- i. It was noted in the Google image that mining activity was already been carried out in the leased area. It is requested to furnish the following details from AD, mines
 - a. What was the period of the operation and stoppage of the earlier mines?
 - b. Quantity of minerals mined out.
 - c. Depth of mining.
 - d. Name of the person already mined in that leases area.
- ii. The detail of Fugitive emission should be modelled and mitigation measures shall be furnished.

On submission of the above details, SEAC decided to make an on the spot inspection to assess the present status of the project by the sub-committee constituted by the SEAC. The proponent furnished above said details vide letter dated 25/11/2019.

As per the order Lr.No.SEAC-TN/F.No.6970/2019 dated: 30.01.2020 of the Chairman, SEAC, a Sub-Committee Team comprising of the SEAC Members was constituted to inspect and study the field conditions

The Sub-Committee inspected the site on 01.02.2020. The Sub-Committee held discussions with the project proponent and the committee inspected the project site and observed the following.

1. It was observed that proposed site was an existing pit with a mined out approximately up to a depth of 25m.
2. No fencing arrangements were provided around the periphery of the mining site.
3. It was noticed that safety distance of 50m was stipulated for the Odai located at S.F no 176/4 vide letter dated 23/02/2019 by Department of Geology and Mining, Virudhunagar However there was no safety distance left.
4. There was no green belt developed by the proponent.

Inspection report by the Sub-Committee is submitted to the Chairman, SEAC for the further course of action regarding the proposal seeking Environment Clearance by Thiru. E. Mariappan for the proposed Rough stone quarry lease over an Extent of 3.79.5Ha in S.F.Nos 177/5, 177/6, 177/7 & 178/1 at Mannarkottai Village, Virudhunagar Taluk, Virudhunagar District, Tamil Nadu with the following remarks.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

The project proponent has not complied with mandatory measures as stipulated above. Hence the subcommittee decided not to recommend the project proposal for the issuance of EC.

The Inspection report of the sub-committee was placed in this 144th SEAC meeting held on 17.02.2020. After detail deliberations, the SEAC decided to defer the proposal for the next SEAC meeting.

The proposal was placed before SEAC once again in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 , after the detail deliberation the SEAC decided to get the following details from AD Mines, Virudunagar District,

During inspection of the sub-committee of SEAC on 30.01.2020, It was noticed that safety distance of 50m was stipulated for the Odai located at S.F no 176/4 vide letter dated 23/02/2019 by Department of Geology and Mining, Virudhunagar. However there was no safety distance left. Hence the SEAC has decided to impose the Environmental compensation for carried out the mining in the safety distance of 50m from Odai .In this regards the SEIAA may request the AD mines to furnish the quantity of mineral mined out from the said safety zone and value of the same.

On receipt of the above detail from AD,Mines of the Viruthunagar District, the SEAC will decide further course of action on the proposal.

Agenda No. 153-12

File No. 7057

Proposed Rough stone and Gravel quarry over an extent of 1.85.5Ha in S.F.Nos. 655 at Therkkukaraseri Village, Srivalkundarn Taluk, Thoothukudi District by Tmt.D.Jothi - For Environmental Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIN/36593/2019)

The proposal was placed in this 137th SEAC Meeting held on 17.10.2019. The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Tmt.D.Jothi has applied for Environment Clearance to SEIAA-TN for the Proposed Rough stone and Gravel quarry over an Extent of 1.85.5 Ha in S.F.No. 655 at Therkkukaraseri Village, Srivaikundam Taluk, Thoothukudi District.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B" of Item 1(a) "Mining of Mineral Projects" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

The project proponent gave detailed presentation. Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details:

1. The proponent shall furnish the road map for transporting trucks coming out from mining site along with dust compression system for vehicular movement.
2. Detail of Mine closure plan should be submitted.
3. The detail of the air quality data, fugitive emission & water quality of ground water data furnished during the meeting was found to be Incorrect. Hence, request to furnish the above data correctly.
4. Details of open well present within 500 meter from the project site and depth of the open well shall be furnished.
5. It was noted from Google image that proponent has already carried out the mining activity that in the leased area. Hence, it is requested that furnish the following details from AD, mines
 - a. What was the period of the operation and stoppage of the earlier mines?
 - b. Quantity of minerals mined out.
 - c. Depth of mining

On receipt of the above details, SEAC will decide the further course of action on the proposal.

The Project proponent has submitted his reply on 06.12.2019.

The proposal was placed in the 144th SEAC meeting held on 17.02.2020. SEAC noted that from the reply, it was mentioned that the period of operation and stoppage of earlier mines has 13.07.2011 to 12.07.2011. Hence, the proponent is requested to furnish the correct detail of period of operation and stoppage of earlier mines from AD/DD mines, Thoothukudi.

On receipt of the above details, SEAC will decide the further course of action on the proposal.

The proponent has submitted his reply to SEIAA and the same was placed before the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020. The SEAC has noticed that the proponent was not submitted the following details from AD, Mines,

- a. What was the period of the operation and stoppage of the earlier mines?
- b. Quantity of minerals mined out.
- c. Depth of mining already carried out.

Hence the SEAC direct the proponent to submit the above said detail from AD, Mines, Thoothukudi District. On receipt of the above details, SEAC will decide the further course of action on the proposal.

Agenda No. 153-13

File No. 7344

**Proposed Black Granite quarry lease over an extent of 1.78.5 Ha in S.F.Nos. 181/3, 182/7, 185/4, 185/5, Odayandahalli Village, Denkanikottai Taluk, Krishnagiri District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. Narra Rupesh – For Environmental Clearance.
(SIA/TN/MIN/133900/2019)**

The proposal was placed in the 146th SEAC meeting on 29.02.2020 the project proponent has gave detailed presentation. The salient feature of the project presented (furnished) by the proponent is enclosed in the annexure

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru. Narra Rupesh applied for Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Black Granite quarry lease over an extent of 1.78.5 Ha in S.F.Nos. 181/3, 182/7, 185/4, 185/5, Odayandahalli Village, Denkanikottai Taluk, Krishnagiri District, Tamil Nadu
2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B” of Item 1(a) “Mining of Minerals Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, after the detailed deliberation, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to submit the furnish the following detail

1. The proponent shall carry out the study for fugitive dust emissions and carried out the impact of this mining on surrounding environment shall be studied through suitable model for open cast mining by using the background sampling data and furnish the photographs.
2. The proponent shall contribute CER to the nearby villages like providing water supply and water reservoir recreation. Accordingly the proponent shall furnish the CER proposal. On receipt of the above, the SEAC will decide the further course of action.

The proponent has submitted the detail to SEIAA. The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting on 04.06.2020. The SEAC noted that the proponent has not submitted the following detail

- i. In the reply submitted by the proponent given in the company name **M/s Sri Sukaracharya Minerals** whether the Environmental clearance in the name of **Thiru. Narra Rupesh or M/s Sri Sukaracharya Minerals**
- ii. **Baseline data for the fugitive** dust emissions model.
- iii. The proponent shall furnish the detail of water bodies such as river, odai, canal, etc., since the proponent has not furnished detail other water bodies in the surroundings other than one Vari but the safety zone of 50m will be left out for the Vari situated in S.F.No.182/3 on the western side of the applied

On receipt of the above details, SEAC will decide the further course of action on the proposal.

Agenda No. 153-14

File No. 7143

The Medical College & Hospital at Survey Numbers 37/5, 37/6, 38/2, 38/3, 38/4(part), 38/5, 38/6, 38/7, 38/9, 38/10, 38/11, 38/12, 38/13, 38/14, 38/15, 38/16, 38/17, 38/18,

Chairman
SEAC-TN

38/19, 38/20, 38/21, 38/22, 38/23, 38/24, 38/25, 39/2, 39/3, 39/4A, 39/4B, 39/6, 39/7, 39/8, 39/9, 39/10, 39/11, 39/12, 40/2, 40/3, 40/4, at Kombadi Patti village S. No. 1/1A, 1/1B, 1/2, 1/3A, 1/3B, 1/4A, 1/4B, 1/4C, 1/4D, 1/4E, 1/5, 1/6A, 1/6B, 1/7, 1/8A, 1/8B, 1/8C, 2/2, 2/3C, 2/3D, 2/3E, 2/3F, 2/7 at Rakkipatti Village S. No. 10/1, 10/3A, 10/4A, 10/5A, 10/6 at KadathruAgraharam Village, Salem Taluk, Salem District by M/s Annapoorana Medical College & Hospital– For Environmental Clearance under violation
(SIA/TN/MIS/130698/2019)

The proposal was placed in the 143rd SEAC Meeting held on 03.02.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The salient features of the project and the environmental impact assessment as presented by the proponent are as follows

1. The project site is located at 11°34'37.44"N latitude and 78° 2'13.81"E longitude
2. The total land area of the project is 156533.05 sqm with built up area of 103374.17 sqm; OSR 15661.33 sq.m; Ground coverage 25644.04 sq.m; Road & pavements 20882.28 sq.m; Green Belt 24106.09 sqm; Surface parking area 9598.4 sq.m, STP, Solid Waste Disposal and Other Utilities Area 1000 sq.m; Vacant Area 59640.91 sqm with expected occupancy load of 6484 Nos.
3. The project consists of medical College (SF + GF + 3), Hospital block (SF + GF + 4), Boys Hostel (GF+3), Girls Hostel (GF+3), Animal House, Mortuary and Staff Quarters (64 Houses)
4. Water requirement Total water requirement is 555 kLD of which Total Fresh water requirement is 405 kLD and Recycled water is 150 kLD sourced from local body
5. The wastewater generation from the project is estimated to be about 495 kLD which will be treated in the proposed STP and effluent generated is 5 kLD which will be treated in ETP; the treated waste water was reused for toilet flushing, gardening, HVAC cooling and OSR maintenance.
6. Total waste estimated to be generated is as follows;
 - Biodegradable Waste: 943.8 kg/day will be treated in Biogas plant
 - Non-biodegradable Waste: 629.2 kg/day will be disposed to authorized recyclers
 - STP Sludge: 50 kg/day used for green belt development

Chairman
SEAC-TN

- Bio-medical waste: 273.75 kg/day will be disposed to common bio medical treatment facility RAMKY Enviro Engineers Ltd.
7. Parking area provided is reported to be 9598.4Sq.m.
 8. Power Requirement is reported to be 600KVA from TANGEDCO.
 9. Power backup purposes, DG sets of capacity 250kVA-3Nos and 82.5kVA-1 No have been installed.
 10. Project cost is reported to be Rs.118.41Crores and EMP cost is reported to be for Rs.215.74 Lakhs.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, M/s Annapoorana Medical College & Hospital, Kancheepuram, has applied for Terms of Reference for Medical College & Hospital project at Survey Numbers 37/5, 37/6, 38/2, 38/3, 38/4(part), 38/5, 38/6, 38/7, 38/9, 38/10, 38/11, 38/12, 38/13, 38/14, 38/15, 38/16, 38/17, 38/18, 38/19, 38/20, 38/21, 38/22, 38/23, 38/24, 38/25, 39/2, 39/3, 39/4A, 39/4B, 39/6, 39/7, 39/8, 39/9, 39/10, 39/11, 39/12, 40/2, 40/3, 40/4, at Kombadi Patti village S. No. 1/1A, 1/1B, 1/2, 1/3A, 1/3B, 1/4A, 1/4B, 1/4C, 1/4D, 1/4E, 1/5, 1/6A, 1/6B, 1/7, 1/8A, 1/8B, 1/8C, 2/2, 2/3C, 2/3D, 2/3E, 2/3F, 2/7, at Rakkipatti Village S. No. 10/1, 10/3A, 10/4A, 10/5A, 10/6 at Kadathru Agraharam Village, Salem Taluk, Salem District
2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B” of Item 8(a) “Building and Construction Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.
3. ToR was issued by SEIAA-TN vide Lr.No.SEIAA-TN/F.No.7143/Violation/ToR-666/2019 dated: 06.11.2019.
4. The proposal is falling under violation category, Earlier As per the order Lr.No.SEAC-TN/F.No.7143/2019 dated: 12.12.2019 of the Chairman, SEAC, a Sub-Committee Team was constituted to inspect and study the field conditions for the Proposal seeking Environmental Clearance under violation. During inspection on 15.12.2019, the proponent was directed to furnish the certain details and the proponent has furnished details vide letter dated 3/01/2020. Based on the presentation made by the proponent and earlier inspection made, the SEAC directed the proponent to the furnish the following details.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

1. NOC/Permission obtained from TWAD to source the water supply for the quantity of 415kLD.
2. Detailed and revised compliance report for ToR Conditions specific to site conditions.
3. The proponent shall furnish the NOC/permission for constructing the buildings near by the High tension electrical line which is passing in between the ladies hostel and class room building.
4. Storm water drainage plan shall be designed for the project area and the same shall be submitted.
5. STP Adequacy report obtained from Government Institutions.
6. Details on Any credible action against the proponent under provision of the Section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 for the violation.

On receipt of the aforesaid details from the proponent, the SEAC would further deliberate on this project and decide the further course of action on the proposal. The proponent has submitted the above said details to SEIAA.

The proposal was placed once again in the 153rd SEAC meeting held on 04.06.2020 and the proponent has informed about the CER activities already carried out .

Based on the inspection report and the violation notification, the SEAC classified the level of damages by the following criteria:

1. Low level Ecological damage:
 - a. Only procedural violations (started the construction at site without obtaining EC)
2. Medium level Ecological damage:
 - a. Procedural violations (started the construction at site without obtaining EC)
 - b. Infrastructural violation such as deviation from CMDA/local body approval.
 - c. Non operation of the project (not occupied).
3. High level Ecological damage:

- a. Procedural violations (started the construction at site without obtaining EC)
- b. Infrastructural violation such as deviation from CMDA/local body approval.
- c. Under Operation (occupied).

As per the OM of MoEF & CC dated: 01.05.2018, the SEAC deliberated the fund allocation for Corporate Environment Responsibility which shall be to a maximum of 2% of the project cost.

In view of the above and based on the inspection report & the Ecological damage, remediation plan and natural & community resource augmentation plan furnished by the proponent, the SEAC decided the fund allocation for Ecological remediation, natural resource augmentation & community resource augmentation and penalty by following the below mentioned criteria.

Level of damages	Ecological remediation cost (% of project cost)	natural resource augmentation cost (% of project cost)	community resource augmentation cost (% of project cost)	CER (% of project cost)	Total (% of project cost)
Low level Ecological damage	0.25	0.10	0.15	0.25	0.75
Medium level Ecological damage	0.35	0.15	0.25	0.5	1.25
High level Ecological damage	0.50	0.20	0.30	1.00	2.00

The project cost of this proposal under violation is Rs.11841 Lakhs.

The Committee observes that the project of M/s Annapoorana Medical College & Hospital at Survey Numbers 37/5, 37/6, 38/2, 38/3, 38/4(part), 38/5, 38/6, 38/7, 38/9, 38/10, 38/11, 38/12, 38/13, 38/14, 38/15, 38/16, 38/17, 38/18, 38/19, 38/20,

38/21, 38/22, 38/23, 38/24, 38/25, 39/2, 39/3, 39/4A, 39/4B, 39/6, 39/7, 39/8, 39/9, 39/10, 39/11, 39/12, 40/2, 40/3, 40/4, at Kombadi Patti village S. No. 1/1A, 1/1B, 1/2, 1/3A, 1/3B, 1/4A, 1/4B, 1/4C, 1/4D, 1/4E, 1/5, 1/6A, 1/6B, 1/7, 1/8A, 1/8B, 1/8C, 2/2, 2/3C, 2/3D, 2/3E, 2/3F, 2/7 at Rakkipatti Village S. No. 10/1, 10/3A, 10/4A, 10/5A, 10/6 at KadathruAgraharam Village, Salem Taluk, Salem District For Environmental Clearance under violation comes under the **“High level Ecological damage category”**. The Committee decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for grant of post construction EC subject to the following conditions in addition to the normal conditions:

1. The amount prescribed for Ecological remediation(Rs. 59.21 lakhs), natural resource augmentation(Rs. 23.68 lakhs) & community resource augmentation (Rs. 35.52 lakhs), totalling Rs. 118.41 lakhs shall be remitted in the form of bank guarantee to Tamil Nadu Pollution Control board, before obtaining Environmental Clearance and submit the acknowledgement of the same to SEIAA-TN. The funds should be utilized for the remediation plan, Natural resource augmentation plan & Community resource augmentation plan as indicated in the EIA/EMP report.
2. The project proponent shall carry out the works assigned under ecological damage, natural resource augmentation and community resource augmentation within a period of six months. If not the bank guarantee will be forfeited to TNPCB without further notice.
3. Regarding CER the proponent has submitted the details activities as below which are already completed and same was authorized by the Auditor. Further the proponent has requested to consider the same for the CER to be remitted before the issue of EC. The proponent has also requested the SEIAA to insist the remaining CER amount to be spent nearby Government schools namely Panchayath Union Government Middle School at Rakkipatti Village, & Kombaimpatti village, Government Girls Higher secondary School, Veeraganur Vilage at Salem District for providing infrastructure for Toilet facilities& Drinking water facilities and water bodies namely for strengthening of bunds and tree plantation as per the OM of

MoEF&CC dated 01.05.2018. Expenses towards the activities specified therein, in aggregate during the financial years from 2015-16 to 2019-20;

Particulars	Rs. in lakhs
Erection of streetlights	2.90
Construction of toilets	3.80
Drinking water storage tank arrangements and maintenance of Government Schools	5.30
Cleaning and desilting water bodies	52.00
Maintenance of religious places	0.70
Planting saplings	2.50
Traffic barricades	11.00
Total	78.20

From the above the SEAC has decided to consider the activities of Drinking water storage tank arrangements and maintenance of Government Schools and Cleaning & desalting water bodies as CER activities. The total amount spent for the said activities is 57.3 Lakhs .

The amount specified as CER (Rs.61.11 Lakhs) shall be remitted in the form of DD to the beneficiary before issue of EC for the following activities. A copy of receipt from the beneficiary shall be submitted before issue of EC.

Sl.No	Activities	Name and address of the beneficiary	Amount
a)	Providing infrastructure facility for Drinking water and Toilet facility	(i)Panchayath Union Government Middle School at Rakkipatti Village and Kombaimpatti village, Salem District (ii) Panchayath Union Government Middle School at Kombaimpatti village, Salem District (iii) Government Girls Higher secondary School, Veeraganur Vilage at Salem District	Rs 10Lakhs Rs 10Lakhs Rs.10 Lakhs
b)	strengthening of bunds and tree plantation around the lake Rakkipatti	Lake at Rakkipatti Village, Salem District	Rs.30.11 Lakhs

	Village in consolation with competent Authority		
--	----------------------------------------------------------	--	--

1. The proponent shall operate the STP effectively and continuously so as to achieve standards prescribed by the TNPCB for treated sewage.
2. The proponent shall operate the ETP effectively and continuously so as to achieve standards prescribed by the TNPCB for treated effluent.
3. The proponent shall utilize the treated sewage for the development of green belt and toilet flushing after achieve the standards prescribed by the TNPCB.
4. The project Proponent shall operate Bio Methanation plant efficiently and continuously for the disposal of the Organic waste generated from the campus and Non-Bio degradable waste to be regularly collected and disposed through TNPCB authorized recycler.
5. The proponent shall continuously collect the Biomedical waste and same should be disposed through the Common TSDF for Biomedical waste disposal as per the Bio Medical waste management Rules 2016.
6. The proponent shall collect & dispose the hazardous waste through TNPC Authorized vendors/recyclers as per the Hazardous and other wastes (Movement and Transboundary Movement), Rules 2016.
7. The proponent shall collect and dispose the E-Waste through TNPC Authorized vendors/recycler as per the E-Waste Management Rules 2016.
8. Necessary permission shall be obtained from the competent authority for the drawl / outsourcing of fresh water before obtaining consent from TNPCB.
9. All the mitigation measures committed by the proponent for the flood management, Solid waste disposal, Sewage treatment & disposal etc., shall be followed strictly.
10. Solar energy should be at least 10% of total energy utilization. Application of solar energy should be utilized maximum for illumination of common areas, street lighting etc.,

11. The project proponent has to provide separate standby D.G set for the STP proposed for the continuous operation of the STP in case of power failure.
12. No waste of any type to be disposed of in any watercourse including drains, canals and the surrounding environment.
13. The proponent shall submit the proof for the credible action taken by the state Government/TNPCB against the proponent under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 before placing the subject to SEIAA.

As per the MoEF & CC Notification, S.O.1030 (E) dated:08.03.2018, "The project proponent will be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan with the State Pollution Control Board and the quantification will be recommended by the Expert Appraisal Committee for category A projects or by the State or Union territory level Expert Appraisal Committee for category B projects, as the case may be, and finalized by the concerned Regulatory Authority, and the bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of environmental clearance".

Agenda No. 153-15

File No. 6849

Proposed Gravel quarry over an Extent of 1.95.5Ha in S.F.No.91/1, 91/2 & 96A/1 at KeelaTiruchendur Village, Tiruchendur Taluk, Thoothukudi District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru.S. Balasubramanian– for Environment Clearance.

(SIA/TN/MIN/36703/2019)

The proposal was placed in the 130th SEAC Meeting held on 10.06.2019. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The salient features of the project and the environmental impact assessment as presented by the proponent are as follows:

1. Government order/ Lease details:

The Quarry lease was applied in the name of Thiru. S. Balasubramanian, Thoothukudi District, Precise Area Communication letter was issued by the District Collector, Thoothukudi District vide Rc.No.G.M.1/87/2019 Dated: 02.05.2019 for a period of one year. It is a Fresh lease for Gravel Quarry

over an Extent of 1.95.5Ha in S.F.No. 91/1, 91/2 & 96A/1 at KeelaTiruchendur Village, Tiruchendur Taluk, Thoothukudi District.

2. Mining Plan/Scheme of Mining approval details:

Mining plan was prepared for a period of 1 year. The Mining Plan was approved by the Deputy Director, Department of Geology and Mining, Thoothukudi District vide Rc.No.87/G&M/2019 Dated: 10.05.2019.

3. As per the Department of Geology and Mining, Thoothukudi District. The production schedule for 1 year states that the total quantity of Gravel should not exceed 16,100m³ upto a depth of 1.0m below ground level.

For First year- 16,100m³

4. There is no wastage encountered during the quarrying operation, the entire Gravel will be directly loaded into tippers for filling and levelling of low lying areas for road projects and other infrastructures development work in and around the District.

5. Opencast method of shallow mining is proposed, Machineries like excavator has been proposed for this quarrying operation. No drilling or blasting is proposed for this type of Gravel quarrying, it is a conventional eco-friendly quarrying operation.

6. Gravel is to be transported by tippers of 10/20 T Capacity.

7. The Assistant Director, Dept. of Geology and mining, Virudhunagar vide in his letter Roc.No.87/G&M/2019 dated 10.05.2019 stated that there are no quarries located within 500 m radius from the proposed area for clearance.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru. S. Balasubramanian has applied for Environmental Clearance to SEIAA-TN for the Proposed for Gravel quarry from over an Extent of 1.95.5Ha in S.F.Nos. 91/1, 91/2 & 96A/1 at Keela Tiruchendur Village, Tiruchendur Taluk, Thoothukudi District, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B2” of Item 1(a) “Mining of Mineral Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details:

1. Bay of Bengal is located at a distance of 500 m from the project site. Hence, the project proponent is requested to clarify whether the proposed quarrying site falls in the CRZ or not from the competent Authority.
2. The mineral composition of the proposed Gravel shall be analysed by a reputed institution and furnished.
3. The details of annual rate of replenishment and timeframe for replenishment after mining closure in the area shall be furnished.
4. Detail of the Lithology of the proposed mining lease area shall be furnished.
5. Proposal for establishing Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level shall be furnished.
6. To prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration and the report should be submitted as valaiyaru village is located at a distance of 400 m from the project site.
7. Detailed action plan proposed for mining closure shall be submitted with the approval of Geology and mining Department.

On receipt of the above details, SEAC will decide the further course of action on the proposal.

The project proponent has submitted the above details to SEIAA on 06.08.2019. The proposal along with the detail submitted by the project proponent was placed in the 133rd SEAC meeting held on 24.08.2019. After detail deliberation, the SEAC noted that the proponent informed that the proposed gravel quarry is located at a distance of 548 m from the High Tide line of Bay of Bengal and furnished the distance between the project site and coastal zone in the CZMP map.

The SEAC decided to address the above issue to the Department of Environment to know whether the proposed project falls within the CRZ as per the MoEF&CC notification 2019 with specific remarks if any.

On receipt of the above details, the further course of action may be taken by the SEAC.

The proponent has submitted the reply to SEIAA and the proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting on 04.06.2020. The SEAC noted that the proponent has submitted the CRZ Map prepared by the Anna University.

The SEAC decided to address the above issue to the Department of Environment to know whether the proposed project falls within the CRZ as per the MoEF&CC notification 2019 with specific remarks if any.

Agenda No. 153-16

File No. 6809/2019

Proposed Rough Stone and Gravel Quarry over an area of 3.49.22Ha in Survey Nos. 14/2F, 14/2G, 14/4E, 14/3B, 14/4B, 14/1B2, 14/3A, 14/4A, 14/2E1 and 14/4C1 at Kurayur Bit-I Village, Kallikudi Taluk, Madurai District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru.D.Sakthivel - For Environmental Clearance (SIA/TN/MIN/42177/2019)

The proposal was placed in the 135th SEAC Meeting held on 06.09.2019. The project proponent gave detailed presentation.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, Thiru.D.Sakthivel has applied for Environmental Clearance to SEIAA-TN for the proposed Rough stone and gravel Quarry for over an extent of 3.49.22 Ha in S.F.Nos. 14/2F, 14/2G, 14/4E, 14/3B, 14/4B, 14/1B2, 14/3A, 14/4A, 14/2E1 and 14/4C1 at Kurayur Bit-I Village of Kallikudi Taluk, Madurai District.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B2” of Item 1(a) “Mining of Mineral Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to seek following details from the project proponent:

1. Periyakulam kanmai is located very adjacent to the Mining lease area. The project proponent proposed to mine upto a depth of 46 meter. Hence, PWD NOC shall be obtained that operation of the quarry does not affect the storage capacity of the Periyakulam kanmai.
2. The study shall be conducted for PM_{2.5} & PM₁₀ and the report shall be furnished.

3. The safety distance proposed from the mining lease area to the Periyakulam kanmai shall be furnished with the layout plan.
4. The project proponent has not furnished the letter obtained from AD/DD mines in the following format in terms of Existing quarries/ abandoned quarries/ Present Proposed quarries/ Future Proposed quarries. Hence, the SEAC decided that the project proponent may get the following information from the AD/DD Mines,

“ Letter from the AD/DD Mines about the details (Name of the Owner, S F No, Extent & distance from the boundary of this quarry) of other quarries (proposed/Existing/Abandoned quarries) within a radius of 500 m from the boundary of the proposed quarry site This details has to be submitted before placing the subject to SEIAA.

5. Lithology of the project site shall be studied and furnished.
6. Impact of the Operation of the proposed Mining quarry shall be studied by Modeling for Fugitive Emission and Air Emission.

On receipt of the above details, the further course of action may be taken by the SEAC.

The proponent has submitted the reply to SEIAA and the same was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting on 04.06.2020. After the detailed deliberation, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance to SEIAA subject to the following conditions in addition to normal conditions:

1. The proponent shall strictly adhere to the conditions imposed by the Executive Engineer for this quarry vide his letter dated 09.12.2019.
2. The depth of the mining should be restricted to 41m .Accordingly the proponent should not excavated more than a quantities of 510020 Cubic meters of Rough stone, 48984 cubic meters of Gravel and 90960 cubic meters of weathered rocks.
3. Ground water quality monitoring should be conducted once in every Six months and the report should be submitted to TNPCB.

4. After mining is completed, proper levelling should be done by the Project proponent & Environmental Management Plan furnished by the Proponent should be strictly followed.
5. The proponent shall provide the fencing around the boundary of the proposed area and shall furnish the photocopies of the same before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
6. The Project proponent shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc.
7. Proper barrier for reducing the Noise level and to combat the dust pollution shall be established like providing Green Belt along the boundary of the quarrying site, etc. and to prevent dust pollution, suitable working methodology needs to be adopted taking wind direction into consideration.
8. The operation of the quarry should not affect the agriculture activities & water bodies near the project site.
9. Transportation of the quarried materials shall not cause any hindrance to the Village people/Existing Village road.
10. The Project Proponent shall comply with the mining and other relevant rules and regulations where ever applicable.
11. The proponent shall develop adequate green belt with native species on the periphery of the mine lease area before commencement of the mining activity, in consultation with DFO of the concern district/agriculture university.
12. The quarrying activity shall be stopped if the entire quantity indicated in the Mining plan is quarried even before the expiry of the quarry lease period and the same shall be monitored by the District Authorities.
13. The recommendation for the issue of environmental clearance is subject to the outcome of the Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A No.186 of 2016 (M.A.No.350/2016) and O.A. No.200/2016 and O.A.No.580/2016

(M.A.No.1182/2016) and O.A.No.102/2017 and O.A.No.404/2016 (M.A.No. 758/2016,M.A.No.920/2016,M.A.No.1122/2016, M.A.No.12/2017 & M.A. No. 843/2017) and O.A.No.405/2016 and O.A.No.520 of 2016 (M.A.No. 981 /2016, M.A.No.982/2016 & M.A.No.384/2017).

14. Prior clearance from Forestry & Wild Life including clearance from committee of the National Board for Wild life as applicable shall be obtained before starting the quarrying operation, if the project site attracts the NBWL clearance.
15. To ensure safety measures along the boundary of the quarry site, security guards are to be posted during the entire period of mining operation.
16. The mine closure plan submitted by the project proponent shall be strictly followed after the lapse of the mine.
17. The amount of Rs. 2.5Lakhs (2% of the total project cost) shall be utilized as CER activities to carry out the development of the Toilet Facilities & Drinking Water Facilities for Thirumal village Government School at Madurai District as reported before obtaining the CTO from TNPCB.
18. The proponent shall provide the fencing all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.
19. The proponent shall plant tree saplings all around the mine lease area before commencement of the mining operation.

Agenda No. 153-17

File No. 6853/2019

Proposed construction of Residential Building at S. No. 470, 471, 472/1, 472/2 & 476/1B, Perumbakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram District, Tamil Nadu by M/s Danub Homes LLP - For Environment Clearance

[SIA/TN/NCP/35669/2019]

The proposal was placed in this 1381h SEAC Meeting held on 09.11.2019. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent M/s. Danub Homes LLP has applied for the proposed construction of Residential Building at S.No. 470, 471, 472/1, 472/2 & 476/18, Perumbakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram District, Tamil Nadu
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B" of Item 8(b) "Townships and Area Development projects " of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the committee instructed the project proponent to furnish the following details:

1. A detailed storm water plan to drain out the water from site shall be prepared in accordance with the contour levels of the proposed project considering the flood occurred in the year 2015 and also considering the surrounding development environment.
2. The proponent was directed to furnish the steps to be taken to ensure that the site will not be flooded in future, along with the flood management including evacuation plan.
3. The proponent shall revise the water balance as per the MoEF&CC guidelines for the building projects.
4. The proponent shall furnish the full-fledged adequate grey water treatment system with disinfection unit for grey water to be generated from the project premises.
5. The proponent shall furnish the design details of STP and Grey water treatment system after revising the water balance.
6. The layout plan furnished for the greenbelt area earmarked with GPS coordinates by the project proponent on the periphery of the site and the same shall be submitted for CMDA/DTCP approval. The green belt width may be of 3m all along the boundaries of the project site.
7. The proponent shall propose the biomethanation system to treat and dispose the bio-degradable waste generated and further the proponent shall furnish the design details for the proposed biomethanation system.
8. The data furnished for the ground water quality parameters of the water samples are differing from the normal values of ground water quality parameters. Also some parameters values are absurd. Hence the water

samples should be analyzed through any reputed government laboratory and report of analysis of the ground water may be furnished to SEAC.

9. The proponent shall submit the Gross Fixed value include the land value and construction cost as per the PWD guideline value.
10. The proposal for CER shall be furnished as per the office memorandum of MoEF&CC dated 01.05.2018 after working out the cost of project.

On receipt of the above details, the SEAC decided to direct the proponent make a presentation for the further course of action on the proposal. The proponent has submitted the additional particulars to SEIAA.

The subject was placed once again in this 1461h SEAC meeting held on 28.02.2020, the proponent gave the detailed presentation. After the detailed deliberation the SEAC decided to direct the proponent to furnish the following details,

1. The Proponent shall submit detailed storm water plan to drain out the water from site after conservation shall be prepared in accordance with the contour levels of the proposed project considering the flood occurred in the year 2015 and also considering the surrounding development.
2. The proponent shall submit the name of the utilities provided in between the proposed green Belt area and the same should be specified in the site plan.
3. The proponent shall provide the approval copy of the TANGEDCO for the HT line passed nearby the Green Belt development area.
4. The proponent shall analyze the parameters of Ground water quality by the reputed Government labs/Institution

On receipt of the above details, the SEAC will take further course of action on the proposal.

The proponent has submitted the reply to SEIAA on 21.05.2020 and the same was placed in the 153rd SEAC meeting on 04.06.2020. After the detailed deliberations, the SEAC decided to issue EC subject following conditions in addition with the normal conditions,

1. Necessary permission shall be obtained from the competent authority for the drawl / outsourcing of fresh water before obtaining consent from TNPCB.
2. The Proponent shall provide the dispenser for the disposal of Sanitary Napkins.
3. The proponent shall submit the same layout plan to CMDA/DTCP approval which is submitted to SEIAA with earmarked the greenbelt area with dimension and GPS coordinates for the green belt area (not less than 15% of total land area)all along the boundary of the project site
4. All the mitigation measures committed by the proponent for the flood management, Solid waste disposal, Sewage treatment & disposal etc., shall be followed strictly.
5. Solar energy should be at least 10% of total energy utilization. Application of solar energy should be utilized maximum for illumination of common areas, street lighting etc.
6. The height of the stack of DG sets shall be provided as per the CPCB norms.
7. The project proponent shall efficiently & continuously operate and maintain the Sewage treatment plant and grey water treatment plant to achieve the standards prescribed by the TNPCB/CPCB.
8. The project proponent has to provide separate standby D.G set for the STP proposed for the continuous operation of the STP and Grey water treatment system in case of power failure.
9. The project Proponent shall provide Bio-Methanation plant for the disposal of the Organic waste and Non-Bio degradable waste to be regularly collected and disposed through TNPCB authorized recycler.
10. No waste of any type to be disposed of in any watercourse including drains, canals and the surrounding environment.
11. The proponent shall utilize the treated sewage/grey water for the development of green belt and toilet flushing after achieve the standards prescribed by the TNPCB.

12. The proponent shall collect & dispose the hazardous waste through TNPC Authorized vendors/recyclers as per the Hazardous and other wastes (Movement and Transboundary Movement), Rules 2016.
13. The proponent shall collect and dispose the E-Waste through TNPC Authorized vendors/recycler as per the E-Waste Management Rules 2016.
14. The proponent shall spend the CER amount of Rs511.5 Lakhs as per the office memorandum of MoEF& CC dated 01.05.2018 for the following activities as proposed by the proponent, before obtaining the CTO from the TNPCB,

S. No.	CER Activity	Capital cost Allocation (in Lakhs)
1	Provision of basic amenities for proper sanitations such as Safe drinking water and Hygienic Toilets facilities to Government Higher Secondary School, Sholinganallur – 2.13 km (E), Sithalapakkam Primary School – 2.61 km (SW), Government High School, Sithalapakkam -2.63 (W)	50.3
2	Fund for restoration and development of Arasankazhani Lake, Sithalapakkam Lake	254.6
3	Maintenance of nearest lake (Perumbakkam Lake 1.67 km, W), bund strengthening. Plantation of trees & grass cover in bunds to prevent soil erosion.	104.3
4	Funds for the restoration of Okkiyam Maduvu	102.3
Total Cost Allocation		511.5

Agenda No. 153-18

File No. 7465/2020

Proposal for the expansion of Casting Industry for the production of Ferrous casting from 2790 T/M to 6125 T/M at S.F No. 39A & 39B at Kathivakkam village, Tiruvottiyur taluk, Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu by M/s. Ashok Leyland Limited- Foundry Division - For the issue of Terms of Reference (SIA/TN/|N D/47461/20 1 9 Dt.6.12.2019)

Chairman
SEAC-TN

The proposal was placed in the 153rd SEAC Meeting held on 04.06.2020. The project proponent gave detailed presentation. The details of the project furnished by the proponent is enclosed as Annexure.

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Proponent, M/s. Ashok Leyland Limited-Foundry Division has applied for Terms of Reference for the Proposal for the expansion of Casting Industry for the production of Ferrous casting from 2790 T/M to 6125 T/M at S.F No. 39A & 39B at Kathivakkam village, Tiruvottiyur taluk, Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category "B1" of Item 3(a) "Metallurgical Industries (Ferrous & Non-Ferrous)" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

Based on the presentation made by the proponent and the documents furnished, the SEAC decided to recommend the proposal for the grant of Terms of References (ToR) (Annexure) to SEIAA with Public Hearing. The Proponent should furnish the details/particulars in respect of the following additional ToR in the EIA report, in addition to the standard ToR:

1. The proponent shall furnish the production detail submitted in the Commercial Tax department for the last 5 years.
2. The proponent shall submit the copy of the consent to operate and latest renewal consent order issued by the TNPCB.
3. The proponent shall submit the compliance report from TNPCB for the conditions imposed in the consent order issued by the TNPCB and Environmental Clearance.
4. The proponent shall submit the CRZ clearance for the expansion activity under CRZ notification since it attract the CRZ Notification. The layout of the plant should be super imposed in CRZ map.
5. The proponent shall implement the cleaner technologies for the expansion activity and the detail should be included in the EIA report.
6. The proponent shall furnish the flood management plan in consideration with flood level in 2015 at the project site.

Chairman
SEAC-TN

7. The Environmental pollution control measures proposed to deal with increased Air pollution, effluent generation and slag generation should be detailed.
8. Even though the industry has been there for long years, no adequate green belt has been developed. The proponent is directed to submit a detailed report on the present green belt developed including number of trees with age, area covered and species. In addition, a detailed proposal for green belt development should be submitted along with EIA. Green belt should be established along the boundaries to neutralize pollutants. Hence ever green trees with good foliage and broad leaves should be planted. Trees like Teak, Coconut, Delonix regia, Rain tree may be avoided. Trees like Neem, Poovarasu, Magilam, Ficus retusa, Ficus religiosa, Mahogany, Pungan may be planted as per norms. The dimensions & DGPS (Differential Global Positioning System) co-ordinates of areas allocated for green belt (33%) shall be provided.
9. Regarding CER activities, the proponent is instructed to submit the details of activities so far carried out with copies of the receipts. They should concentrate more on infrastructure facilities useful to the local community. Detailed proposal shall be submitted.
10. The project proponent has to strengthen the air pollution control measures of the existing system and furnish an adequacy report on the revamped system from a reputed institution like Anna University or IIT, Madras along with the EIA report. The revamping of the existing air pollution control measures should include the interlinking of position of the hood system and furnace to ensure that the emission from the furnace shall be treated and routed through wet scrubber and stack.



Chairman, SEAC-TN