

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE
AT PUNE

APPEAL NO. 92/2024 WZ

TANAJI BALASAHEB GAMBHIRE

APPELLANT

V/s

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

INDEX

| SR NO | ANNE XURE | PARTICULARS | PAGE NOS. | |
|----------|--------------|---|--------------|-----------|
| | | | From | To |
| 1. | | Index | - | 46 |
| 2. | | Reply | 47 | 68 |
| 3. | | Affidavit in Support | - | 69 |
| 4. | R-1 | Copy of Minutes 186 th meeting of the SEAC | 70 | 76 |
| 5. | R-2 | Copy of the 274 th Meeting of SEIAA dated 3rd January 2024 | 77 | 83 |
| | | LAST PAGE NO. | | 83 |

PUNE

DATE : 18/11/2024



ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT NO. 04

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE
AT PUNE

APPEAL NO. 131/2024 WZ

TANAJI BALASAHEB GAMBHIRE

APPELLANT

V/s

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

REPLY ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT NO.4,
(DILIP BABURAO TUPE FOR HOLYSTICO GROUP)

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. At the outset, it is submitted that, the contents of the Appeal are not admitted by the Respondent No.4 and that the contents therein of are false and incorrect. The Respondent No.4 submits that the statements and averments made in the said Appeal are not admitted by the Respondent No.4 except so far they are expressly admitted herein under. It is further submitted that, the Respondent No.4 craves leave of this Hon'ble Tribunal to file a detailed Reply, if necessary in the present proceedings. At the outset, the Appeal filed by the Appellant is devoid of any merit and is liable to be dismissed with the compensatory cost. The Appellant herein is neither resident of the concerned area nor an aggrieved party. The Applicant herein is

claiming relief, which is beyond the purview of this Hon'ble Tribunal.

2. The Respondent No.4 submits that no substantial issue has been made out for adjudication of this Hon'ble Tribunal. The statutory authorities are already performing their statutory duties. The Respondent No.4 further submits that the Appellant herein has no locus to file the present Appeal and it is also not an aggrieved party to the present proceedings. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the bonafides of the litigant are to be tested before proceeding with the proceedings for adjudication.
3. The present Appeal is filed by the Appellant whereby he has sought quashing and setting aside of Environment Clearance (EC) dated 7th February 2024 issued by the Respondent No.2 **(which is annexed at ANNEXURE – A-1 of the Appeal at Pg No.14 of the Appeal Paper Book)**.
4. The present Appeal is clearly abuse of process of law and has been wrongfully filed by the Appellant, lacking any merit in its assertions against the Respondent No.4. The Appeal is entirely founded on baseless assumptions, speculation, and conjectures, and thus holds no substance.

I. PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS:

5. Appeal Not Maintainable Due to MoEFCC's 2ND AUGUST 2023

Notification Allowing SEIAA Members to Grant EC Post-Tenure:

- a. The sole ground for the Appellant's challenge in the present appeal is the claim that the EC, granted to Respondent No.4 by SEIAA, was issued during a period when SEIAA was allegedly not operational. However, this assertion is wholly unfounded and misleading as Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change vide its notification/office memorandum dated 2nd August 2023 explicitly grants authority to Member of SEIAAs to issue/grant Environment Clearance letter for category B proposals even after expiry of its tenure for certain period where after approval to grant EC the SEIAA has become non-functional.
- b. The Respondent No.4 submits that since the decision of the present case is clearly covered by the *de-facto* doctrine as the decision both SEAC AND SEIAA regarding EC to be granted were taken before the tenure of SEIAA ended, the

were administrative process was completed subsequently and thus was taken in good faith and the law on the said aspect is clear.

6. Compliance of Due Process by Respondent No. 4:

- a. Respondent No.4 has scrupulously followed the due process prescribed for seeking Environmental Clearance (EC) for its project categorized under Category B as per the EIA Notification, 2006. Environmental Clearance has been granted to Respondent No. 4 in absolute compliance with the provisions of the EIA Rules and Regulations and after a thorough and proper appraisal process.
- b. Both SEAC II vide its 186th meeting dated 28th November 2023 and SEIAA vide its 273rd meeting dated 3rd January 2024 have granted approval to the proposal of Respondent No.4 in all their meetings whenever the proposal was listed for appraisal. The said approvals were granted by the competent authorities within their tenure, following due deliberation and careful consideration. Thus, there has been no deviation from the prescribed procedures at any stage of the process.

- c. The Respondent. No.4 submits that the Respondent No.4 has complied with all rules/regulations/procedures prevailing at that period of time. The Respondent No.4 thus cannot be denied the due benefits of the EC which has been obtained in accordance with the law.

7. Baseless Allegations of Misrepresentation and Non-Compliance by Appellant:

- a. The Appellant's claims that Respondent No. 4 submitted a false, defective, and misleading application for the grant of Environmental Clearance (EC) and failed to comply with the conditions imposed by SEAC and SEIAA are entirely baseless and without merit. The allegations made by the Appellant are a generic allegation with nothing to substantiate the same.
- b. Respondent No.4 has meticulously adhered to all regulatory requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) framework and has acted in full compliance with the stipulated procedures. Respondent No. 4 has not only submitted its application in strict accordance with the

provisions of the EIA and appropriate by the SEAC and SEIAA as per law.

- c. It is stated that the EC was granted to Respondent No.4 by the SEIAA after carefully considering all the aforementioned submissions and ensuring that Respondent No.4 had fully complied with all procedural and regulatory requirements. The SEIAA's decision was based on a thorough appraisal of the application. Thus, the Appellant's allegations of non-compliance and misrepresentation are devoid of any factual basis and are simply an attempt to mislead this Hon'ble Tribunal.

8. No Prejudice to Environmental Safeguards:

- a. The Appellant has entirely failed to specially demonstrate any harm or prejudice to environmental safeguards as a result of the Environmental Clearance (EC) granted to Respondent No.4. There is no specific assertion in the appeal in flow the project in question will cause any environmental damage or degradation rendering the allegations of Appellant baseless.

b. Respondent No.4 has adhered to all environmental regulations and requirements as mandated by law. The EC was granted after a thorough and lawful appraisal process conducted by the appropriate authorities, ensuring that all environmental conditions were met. The Appellant's allegations lack any specifics other on factual basis and do not provide any evidence of non-compliance with environmental safeguards. The absence of any concrete assertion regarding potential environmental harm demonstrates that the appeal is unfounded and serves no legitimate purpose other than to obstruct Respondent No.4's lawful activities.

BRIEF FACTS OF THE PRESENT CASE:

9. The brief facts of the present case are enumerated as under: -
 - a. Respondent No.4, is an individual developer firm under the laws of India, having its registered office at the address mentioned in the caption of the Appeal.

- b. Respondent No.4 filed an application bearing No.SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023 with the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change seeking Environment Clearance (*EC*) for proposed residential cum commercial building located at Survey No.207 (P), 208/1A/3(P), 208/1B(P) & 208/3 at BS Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune. The application of Respondent No.4 has been registered in “*Category B*” projects vide proposal no.SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023.
- c. After recommendation of SEAC II to SEIAA for grant of EC to Respondent No.4 in its 186th meeting, the proposal was taken up by SEIAA for appraisal in its 273rd Meeting dated 3rd January 2024. SEIAA after considering the documents was pleased to grant Environment Clearance. After grant of EC on 3rd January 2024, the computer-generated copy of the same has been received by Respondent No.4 on 7th February 2024. Copy of Minutes 186th meeting of the SEAC and 274th Meeting of SEIAA dated 3rd January 2024 in reference to Respondent No.4 is

annexed herewith as ANNEXURE – R-1 and R-2 respectively.

PARAWISE REPLY

10. The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 1 of the appeal are a matter of record and hence needs no reply.

11. The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 2 of the Appeal to an extent are a matter of record and needs no response. Rest of the contents of the said para are denied being ill-motivated, false and incorrect. It is stated that the present appeal at the outset is not maintainable as the same wrongly challenges the issuance of EC to the answering Respondent by Respondent Nos.2 & 3. It is further stated that the contention of the Appellant that SEIAA was non-functional and hence cannot grant EC is misconceived. The Respondent's proposal was approved by SEIAA on 3rd January 2024, i.e., when the SEIAA was operational and was administratively processed and uploaded on online portal (PARIVESH) on 7th February 2024.

12. The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 3 of the appeal are denied being false and incorrect as the appeal filed by the Appellant is misconceived, without merit, and lacks any cause of action. The issues raised by the Appellant as mixed questions of law and facts are wholly untenable and do not warrant consideration by this Hon'ble Tribunal. The appeal is not maintainable and should be dismissed at the outset.

Rebuttal to Issues Raised by the Appellant:

13.1. Whether the impugned EC can be granted when SEIAA is not in operation & functioning due to its expiry of tenure since 10th January 2024?

- The Appellant's contention regarding the invalidity of the Environmental Clearance (EC) due to the alleged non-operation of SEIAA is fundamentally flawed.

13.2. Whether the SEIAA have followed the due process of law and also, the procedures under EIA Notification, 2006, law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court and by Hon'ble NGT Rulings?

- Respondent No.4 submits that the SEIAA, through its authorized representatives, followed

due process and adhered to the procedures prescribed under the EIA Notification, 2006, as well as the precedents set by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble NGT. The granting of the impugned EC was conducted in strict compliance with all applicable legal requirements, leaving no room for questioning its validity. The Appellant's suggestion that due process was not followed is speculative and baseless.

13.3. Whether the Conduct of Member Secretary of SEIAA, Respondent No.4 is in collusion and needs strict Legal action?

- The allegation of collusion between the Member Secretary of SEIAA and the Respondent No.4 is entirely unfounded and unsupported by any credible evidence. Respondent No.4 strongly denies any collusion or wrongdoing in the process of granting the EC. The entire process was conducted with transparency and in accordance with the law. The Appellant's wild,

generic and baseless allegations are an attempt to jeopardize the authority vested in SEIAA and SEAC.

13.4. Whether the impugned EC is tenable in the eyes of law being granted by ex-officio in absence of any powers and without authority?

- The impugned EC was granted by officials who were vested with the necessary authority to act on behalf of SEIAA. The delegation of authority in such circumstances is well within the legal framework and ensures the uninterrupted functioning of administrative duties. The Appellant's challenge to the authority of these officials is without merit, and the EC remains fully tenable in the eyes of the law.

13.5. Whether there is compliance to the conditions imposed in SEAC & SEIAA minutes and who have verified the 6 month compliance report same in the absence of SEIAA?

- The compliance with the conditions imposed by an aspect of the clearance by competent

authority and not by SEIAA. The Appellant's doubts regarding verification are unfounded. It is stated that Respondent No. 4 has duly replied to each and every concern raised by both SEIAA and SEAC. Contents of para 8 of the preliminary objections may be read as part and parcel of the reply to the present para as the same has not been repeated herein for the sake of brevity.

13.6. Whether the Respondent No. 3-Shri. Pravin C. Darade has powers in personal capacity to grant impugned EC? And is there any abuse of process of law by Respondent No. 3-Shri. Pravin C. Darade?

13. The said question as framed appear to be for reason best known to the Appellant. The procedure for hearing, meetings, approval and decision were all done well before the alleged lapse of tenure of the SEAC and SEIAA. The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.1. of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect. The Appellant appears to be indulging in extortive acts by abusing legal process. It is stated that the present appeal is without any merit as the EC has been granted to

Respondent No.4 in absolute compliance of the provisions of EIA Rules and Regulation.

14.The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.2 of the appeal is a matter record and needs no response.

15.The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.3 of the appeal are denied being false and incorrect. It is denied that Respondent No.4 has procured the subject EC from SEIAA false, baseless and misleading information without following the due process. Respondent No.4 states that it has taken part in each and every meeting of both SEAC and SEIAA. The Respondent No.4 appraised by the both the committees as per the procedure established under the law.

16.The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 of the appeal are matter of record and needs no response.

17.The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.7 to the extent are a matter of record and needs no response. Rest of the contents are denied being false and incorrect.

18.The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.8 of the appeal are matter of record and needs no response.

19. The Respondent No.4 submits that with respect to the contents of Para 4.9 of the appeal are denied being false, incorrect and an afterthought. The present appeal is without any substantive basis and are an attempt to misconstrue the facts and the law. The appeal itself is misconceived, lacks any cause of action, and is therefore not maintainable.

REPLY TO GROUNDS:

20. Ground 5.2 of the appeal is denied being false, incorrect and misconceived. It is denied EC granted to Respondent No.4 has been approved illegal manner and in abuse of process of law.

21. Ground 5.3 of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect. It is stated that subject EC has been granted to Respondent No.4 after following due process and procedure by both Respondent Nos.2 & 3 and Respondent No.4.

22. Ground 5.4 and 5.5 of the appeal is categorically denied being false and incorrect. Respondent No.4 at no point of time submitted any false and baseless information before SEIAA. Respondent No.4 has time and again provided the required documents and information as sought by SEAC II and SEIAA in its meetings. The

Appellant's allegation that false, baseless, or misleading information was submitted to the SEIAA during the process of obtaining EC . It is stated that all information provided by Respondent No. 4 was accurate, truthful, and in compliance with the applicable regulations and guidelines. The accusation of "*Suppressio Veri Suggestio Falsi*" is without any basis in fact or law. The process of obtaining the EC was by thorough scrutiny by SEIAA, which included multiple levels of review and verification of the information provided by Respondent No.4. The SEIAA, being a competent authority, would not have granted the EC if any discrepancies or falsehoods had been detected in the application submitted by Respondent No. 4.

23.Ground 5.6 of the appeal is denied being false, incorrect and untenable in the eye of law. It is denied that EC granted to Respondent No.4 by SEIAA valid and correct and issued in due compliance of the relevant rules and regulations.

24.Ground 5.6 of the appeal is denied being false, incorrect and untenable in the eye of law. It is denied that the EC granted is illegal or that it warrants quashing along with any legal action or costs. The EC was granted following all due processes under the law, including proper evaluation and compliance with all

applicable norms and guidelines. The Appellant's demand for quashing the EC is baseless and devoid of merit, and the prayer for legal action against Respondent No.4 is entirely unwarranted.

25. Ground 6(b) of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect.

Clearly, the Appellant has failed to establish any prima-facie case that justifies the quashing of the EC or the imposition of a stay on its operation. The EC was granted in compliance with all legal requirements, and Respondent No. 4 is not engaged in any illegal construction activity. The demand for a stay is entirely without merit and would unjustly halt a legally approved project, causing irreparable harm to Respondent No.4 and other stakeholders. There is no basis for any prohibition or stay, and the Hon'ble Tribunal is urged to dismiss this request.

26. Ground 6(c) of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect.

Respondent No. 4 firmly denies the baseless and defamatory characterization as a "*white-collar defaulter*" or "*violator*." The EC was obtained through a lawful and transparent process, with all due diligence exercised. The insinuation of corruption or impropriety is wholly unfounded and intended to malign Respondent No. 4 without any supporting evidence. Respondent

No. 4 maintains that the EC process was conducted with full integrity and in accordance with the law.

27. Ground 6(d) of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect.

Respondent No. 4 states that the Appellant's allegations of "*intentional violations of laws*" are entirely unfounded. The Appellant has not demonstrated any specific legal violation by Respondent No.4. The EC was granted following the legal procedures established under the NGT Act, 2010, and related rules. The Appellant's invocation of this Hon'ble Tribunal's jurisdiction is an attempt to obstruct a legally compliant project, and the appeal lacks merit.

28. Ground 6(e) of the appeal is denied being false and incorrect.

Respondent No. 4 takes note of this submission and has no further comments on this point as it does not raise any substantive legal issue against Respondent No. 4.

29. Ground 6(f) is denied being false and incorrect. It is stated that the

Appellant's actions are not based on any genuine public interest concern. Instead, the appeal appears to be driven by a desire to obstruct a legally compliant project without any substantial legal grounds.

30. Contents of Para 6(g) and 6(h) of the appeal is not maintainable and is illegal. Respondent No. 4 reserves the right to respond to any such additional grounds or documents as per the directions of this Hon'ble Tribunal.

31. Contents of Para 6(i) of the appeal calls for no reply.

32. Contents of Para 6(j) of the appeal denied being incorrect. It is stated that there is no prima facie case in favour of the appellant and the present appeal does not call for any relief as sought by appellant.

33. Contents of para 7 of the appeal are denied being false and incorrect. It is specifically denied that the present appeals consist question of public importance.

34. Contents of para 8 of the appeal are denied being false and incorrect. It is, however, submitted that the present appeal is not maintainable and without jurisdiction as the same is without any cause of action.

35. Contents of para 9 of the appeal are denied being false and incorrect. It is stated that there is no cause of action in favour of the Appellant and against the Respondent No.4.

36. Contents of para 11 of the appeal, i.e., Prayer clause is incorrect and vehemently denied. The Appellant is by instituting this appeal

is only trying to harass the Respondent No.4 and waste the precious time of this Hon'ble Tribunal.

37.The Appellant has not provided any concrete evidence to support the allegations of misrepresentation, non-compliance, or submission of a defective application by Respondent No. 4. The claims made by the Appellant are speculative, unsupported by facts, and appear to be an attempt to obstruct the lawful grant of EC. It is stated that in the absence of any substantive evidence, the appeal lacks merit and should be dismissed.

38.It is stated that Respondent No. 4 has followed the due process prescribed for seeking EC in respect of projects categorized under Category B. The EC has been granted to Respondent No.4 in absolute compliance of the provisions of EIA Rules and Regulation.

39.The Appellant has failed to demonstrate any actual harm or prejudice to environmental safeguards resulting from the grant of EC to Respondent No.4. On the contrary, Respondent No.4 has complied with all environmental conditions and requirements imposed by SEAC and SEIAA, thereby ensuring that the environmental integrity of the project is maintained. The

appellant's appeal is thus not only baseless but also an abuse of the legal process.

40. The present appeal is a vexatious attempt to delay and hinder the lawful operations of Respondent No.4, despite the latter's compliance with all legal and procedural requirements. The appellant's continued pursuit of this appeal, despite the lack of any substantive grounds, constitutes an abuse of process.

41. Given the baseless nature of the Appellant's claims, it is evident that the appeal is an abuse of the judicial process, aimed at causing undue delay and prejudice to Respondent No.4. The Appellant's conduct warrants the imposition of heavy costs to deter such frivolous and malicious litigation in the future.

42. In light of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and in view of the comprehensive submissions made by Respondent No.4, a para-wise reply to the appeal is not warranted. The baseless and unsubstantiated nature of the Appellant's allegations does not necessitate a detailed response, as the grounds for rejection of the appeal are clear and evident.

PRAYER

In the aforesaid premise, it is most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to:

A. Dismiss the appeal filed by the appellant with exemplary costs;

And/or

B. Pass any such other further orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case and in the interests of justice.

Pune

Date: 18/11/2024

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S. S. ...', is written over a horizontal line.

Advocate for Respondent No.4

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE
AT PUNE

APPEAL NO. 131/2024 WZ

TANAJI BALASAHEB GAMBHIRE

APPELLANT

V/s

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

A F F I D A V I T

MAY IT PLEASE THE HON'BLE TRIBUNAL:

I Tupe Dilip Baburao adult, Occu.- Business, having office at Office No.5010, Marvel Fuego Commercial Premises, Magarpatta Road, Hadapsar Pune 28 do hereby state on solemn affirmation as under: -

I am the Tupe Dilip Baburao of the Respondent No.4 above named and responsible for day to day administration of my business. As such, I have gone through the Reply and annexure thereto being filed today. I find that the contents therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and which may be treated as part and parcel of the present affidavit.

WHATEVER STATED ABOVE is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. In witness whereof I have signed hereunder at 18th on Monday of November 2024.

BEFORE ME

[Signature]
VISHNU B. BHAGAT

ADVOCATE & NOTARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
PUNE DISTRICT
REGN. NO. 15303/2019
UPTO 6/11/2029

[Signature]
DEPONENT

Noted And Registered at
Serial Number 1438/2024



| | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 4. | SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023 | Proposed Residential and Commercial Project ‘ASTRANA’ by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028 by Mr. Dilip Tupe |
|----|---------------------------|---|

Representative of PP was present during the meeting along with environmental consultant M/s. Green Circle Inc.

It is noted that, the PP has submitted the application for prior environment clearance for proposed project with total plot area of 25,613.00 m², FSI area of 1,11,547.50 m², Non FSI area of 93,332.50 m² and total BUA of 2,04,880 m².

Brief information of the proposal is as below:

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 1. | Proposal Number | SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023 | |
| 2. | Name of Project | Proposed Residential and Commercial Project ‘ASTRANA’ by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028 by Mr. Dilip Tupe | |
| 3. | Project category | Schedule 8(b) Category B1 | |
| 4. | Type of Institution | Private | |
| 5. | Project Proponent | Name | Mr. Dilip Baburao Tupe |
| | | Regd. Office address | Holystico Group, Office No. 5010, Marvel Feugo Commercial Premises, Magarpatta Road, Hadapsar, Pune, Maharashtra 411028 |
| | | Contact number | 9860562213 |
| | | e-mail | praveenbodke3011@gmail.com |
| 6. | Consultant | Green Circle Inc. NABET Certificate No.: NABET/EIA/2124/RA0219 valid upto Jan 26, 2024 | |
| 7. | Applied for | Fresh EC | |
| 8. | Details of previous EC | NA | |
| 9. | Location of the project | Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3, B. S. Tupe Road, Hadapsar, Pune. | |
| 10. | Latitude and Longitude | 18°30'33.79"N, 73°56'27.41"E | |
| 11. | Total Plot Area (m ²) | 25,613.00 Sqm | |
| 12. | Deductions (m ²) | 1,450 Sqm | |
| 13. | Net Plot area (m ²) | 24,163 Sqm | |
| 14. | Proposed FSI area (m ²) | 1,11,547.50 Sqm | |
| 15. | Proposed Non-FSI area (m ²) | 93,332.50 Sqm | |
| 16. | Proposed TBUA (m ²) | 2,04,880 Sqm | |

Member Secretary

Chairman

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|
| 17. | TBUA (m2) approved by Planning Authority till date | 2,04,880 Sqm | | | | |
| 18. | Ground Coverage (m2) & % | 8561 sqm | | | | |
| 19. | Total Project Cost (Rs.) | Rs. 600 Crore | | | | |
| 20. | CER as per MoEF & CC circular dated 01/05/2018 | Activity | Location | Cost(Cr.) | Duration | |
| | | Solar Street Lights | Tupe Nagar, Hadapsar | 0.45 | | During Construction Phase |
| | | Solar Electrical Pannel | Housing Societies – 15 Nos. | 2.0 | | |
| | | Ambulance Facility | KEM Hospital Advance Ambulance Facility -3 nos. | 3.0 | | |
| | | School Development | Sane Guruji School Development Computers, RO System, etc. | 0.80 | | |
| | | Providing RO Water filters | Providing 3 nos. of RO Water Filters to Shewalewadi | 0.75 | | |
| River Rejuvenation | Mula-Mutha River Rejuvenation in consultation with local authority | 5.0 | | | | |
| 21. | Details of Building Configuration : | | | Reason for Modification / Change | | |
| | Proposed Configuration | | | | | |
| | Building Name | Configuration | Height (m) | NA | | |

Member Secretary

Chairman

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------|
| | Tower A | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower B | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors+ Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower C | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower D | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower E | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 121.10 m | | |
| | Tower F | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 29 Floors + Terrace | 114.20 m | | |
| | Commercial | B1+ G+ 2 Floors | 12.90 m | | |
| | Hotel | B1+ L.G+ U.G+ 8 Floors+ Terrace | 32.70 m | | |
| | Inclusive Housing | P1+ 13 Floors+ Terrace | 40.70 m | | |
| | Club House | G + 1 Floor + Terrace | 7.20 m | | |
| 22. | Total number of tenements | Residential Tenements- 761 Nos., Commercial Area- 13968 sqm Floating Population- 1333 Nos., Hotel population- 794 Nos. | | | |
| 23. | Water Budget | Dry Season (CMD) | | Wet Season (CMD) | |
| | | Fresh Water | 415.07 | Fresh Water | 415.07 |
| | | Recycled | 248.18 | Recycled | 216.54 |
| | | Swimming Pool | 113.10 | Swimming Pool | 113.10 |
| | | Flushing | 216.54 | Flushing | 216.54 |
| | | Total | 632 | Total | 632 |
| | | Waste water generation | 320.27 | Waste water generation | 351.41 |
| 24. | Water Storage Capacity for Firefighting / UGT (m3) | Tank Name | Details | Capacity | |
| | | UGT 1 | Fire Water Tank | 75,000 liters | |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | 25,000 liters | |
| | | UGT 2 | Fire Water Tank | 2,00,000 liters | |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | 25,000 liters | |
| | | UGT 3 | Fire Water Tank | 4,50,000 liters | |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | 2,62,000 liters | |

Member Secretary

Chairman

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------|----------|--|
| | | | Raw Water Tank | 1,00,000 liters | | | |
| | | | Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | |
| | | UGT 4 | Fire Water Tank | 4,50,000 liters | | | |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | 2,62,000 liters | | | |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | 1,00,000 liters | | | |
| | | | Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | |
| 25. | Source of water | Construction phase- Tanker Water, Operation phase- PMC | | | | | |
| 26. | Rainwater Harvesting (RWH) | Level of the Ground water table | Pre- monsoon 8 – 10 m BGL Post- monsoon 10 – 12 m BGL | | | | |
| | | Size and no of RWH tank(s) and Quantity | | | NA | | |
| | | Qty. & size of recharge pits | Surface Recharge Pits – 8 Nos. of size 2 x 2 x 3 m Rooftop Recharge Pits – 6 Nos. of size 1.5 x 2 x 3 m | | | | |
| | | Details of UGT tanks if any | UGT 1 | Tank Name | Details | Capacity | |
| | | | | Fire Water Tank | 75,000 liters | | |
| | | | | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | |
| | | | UGT 2 | Fire Water Tank | 2,00,000 liters | | |
| | | | | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | |
| | | | | Raw Water Tank | 25,000 liters | | |
| | | | UGT 3 | Fire Water Tank | 4,50,000 liters | | |
| Domestic Water Tank | 2,62,000 liters | | | | | | |
| Raw Water Tank | 1,00,000 liters | | | | | | |
| Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | | | | |
| UGT 4 | Fire Water Tank | | 4,50,000 liters | | | | |
| | Domestic Water Tank | | 2,62,000 liters | | | | |
| | Raw Water Tank | | 1,00,000 liters | | | | |
| | Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | | | |
| 27. | Sewage and Wastewater | Sewage generation in CMD | | 562 CMD | | | |
| | | STP technology | MBBR | | | | |
| | | Capacity of STP (CMD) | 3 nos. of STP of capacity – STP 1 – 500 KLD (Residential & Commercial) STP 2 – 50 KLD (Inclusive Housing) STP 3 – 45 KLD (Hotel) | | | | |
| 28. | Solid Waste Management during Construction Phase | Type | Quantity (kg/d) | Treatment / disposal | | | |
| | | Dry waste | 37 | Through authorized agency | | | |
| | | Wet waste | 56 | Through authorized agency | | | |
| | | Construction waste | 6 | Through authorized agency | | | |
| 29. | | Type | Quantity (kg/d) | Treatment / disposal | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|----------------|-----------------|
| Solid Waste Management during Operation Phase | Dry waste | 1199 | Through authorized agency | | |
| | Wet waste | 1632 | In-situ Composting | | |
| | Hazardous waste | 2.5 | Used/ Spent Oil - To authorized recycler/ reprocessor | | |
| | Biomedical waste | 0 | N.A. | | |
| | E-Waste | 19 | Handed over to Authorized Dismantler/Recycler | | |
| | STP Sludge (dry) | 3.3 | In-situ Composting | | |
| 30. Green Belt Development | Total RG area (m2) | | 2,416.30 sqm | | |
| | Existing Trees on plot: | | 09 Nos. | | |
| | Number of trees to be planted | | 303 Nos. | | |
| | Number of trees to be cut | | 0 | | |
| | Number of trees to be transplanted | | 05 Nos. | | |
| 31. Power requirement | Source of power supply | | MSEDCL | | |
| | During Construction Phase (Demand Load) | | 75 kW | | |
| | During Operation phase (Connected load) | | 11343 kW | | |
| | During Operation phase (Demand load) | | 5366 kW | | |
| | Transformer | 6 Nos. of 999 kVA | | | |
| | DG set | 2 Nos. of 400 kVA, 1 Nos. of 62.5 kVA, 1 No. of 125 kVA, 1 No. of 320 kVA | | | |
| Fuel used | HSD | | | | |
| 32. Details of Energy saving | <p>Most of the common area & external lighting are proposed to work on high energy efficient lamps (LED) as specified in bureau of energy efficiency which again results in saving in general consumption</p> <p>Low loss Transformers due to which 6.22% losses are saved against conventional transformer.</p> <p>Power Capacitors are proposed for load power factor correction and to maintain a healthy power situation. This also results in less demand load factor for the project.</p> <p>Solar PV, Hot Water, Solar Street Lights, Energy Efficient Motors are proposed. Maximum Demand Load is 5366 KW. Energy savings due to solar and other energy conservation measures is 21.72 % of Maximum Demand Load.</p> | | | | |
| 33. Environmental Management plan budget during Construction phase | No. | Details | | Cost (Lacs/Y) | |
| | 1 | Water for Construction, labour & Dust Suppression | | 9 | |
| | 2 | Site Sanitation & Health & Safety PPE Kits | | 7 | |
| | 3 | Environmental Monitoring | | 3 | |
| | 4 | Disinfection & Health & Safety | | 12 | |
| | 5 | Health Check up | | 2 | |
| 34. Environmental | Component | Details | | Capital (Lacs) | O&M (Lacs/Year) |

Member Secretary

Chairman

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Management plan Budget during Operation phase | Storm water | Storm water management and plumbing networks | | 33 | 3.3 |
| | Sewage Treatment | 3 nos. of STP of capacity 500 KLD, 50 KLD & 45 KLD | | 97 | 11 |
| | RWH | Rainwater Harvesting Pits | | 20 | 1.5 |
| | Swimming Pool | Swimming Pool | | 130 | 6.5 |
| | Solid waste | Organic waste composter | | 44.25 | 15.08 |
| | Hazardous waste | Management of Hazardous Waste | | 0.20 | 0.5 |
| | e-waste | e-waste management | | 0.76 | 2 |
| | Green belt development | Tree Plantation and Maintenance | | 121.96 | 5.39 |
| | Energy Saving | Energy conservation measures | | 273.54 | 15.59 |
| | Environmental Monitoring | Monitoring of Ambient Air, Noise, Water, Soil, etc. | | 10 | 20 |
| | Disaster Management | Fire Fighting measures & Lightening Arrestor | | 456.27 | 22.81 |
| 35. Traffic Management | Type | Required as per DCR | Actual Provided | Area per parking (m2) | Total parking area (m2) |
| | 4-Wheeler | 1032 | 1503 | 12.50 | 18787.5 |
| | 2-Wheeler | 1519 | 1519 | 2.00 | 3038 |
| 36. | Details of Court cases / litigations w.r.t. the project and project location if any | | | | NA |

Deliberations:

PP stated that, the application is for Proposed Residential and Commercial Project 'ASTRANA' by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028. PP has received ToR on 27.10.2023 and submitted EIA report accordingly.

The proposed configuration is as below:

| Building Name | Configuration | Height (m) |
|---------------|---|------------|
| Tower A | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower B | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors+ Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower C | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower D | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |

Member Secretary

Chairman

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| Tower E | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 121.10 m |
| Tower F | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 29 Floors + Terrace | 114.20 m |
| Commercial | B1+ G+ 2 Floors | 12.90 m |
| Hotel | B1+ L.G+ U.G+ 8 Floors+ Terrace | 32.70 m |
| Inclusive Housing | P1+ 13 Floors+ Terrace | 40.70 m |
| Club House | G + 1 Floor + Terrace | 7.20 m |

PP clarified that the mandatory RG is provided on ground.

The case was discussed on the basis of the documents submitted and presentation made by the proponent. All issues relating to environment, including air, water, land, soil, ecology, biodiversity and social aspects were examined. The proposal is appraised as category 8(a) b2.

During discussion following points emerged:

1. PP to incorporate cost of operation and maintenance of STP in EMP and submit revised EMP.
2. PP to provide electric charging facility by providing charging points at suitable places as per Maharashtra Electric Vehicle Policy, 2021.
3. PP to ensure that, the water proposed to be used for construction phase should not be drinking water. They can use recycled water or tanker water for proposed construction.

Decision: - After deliberation, Committee decided to recommend the proposal for Environmental Clearance to SEIAA, subject to compliance of above points.



Member Secretary

Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

Item no. 01

Proposal No.:- SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023

Type of Project: EC

Subject- Environmental Clearance for Proposed Residential and Commercial Project 'ASTRANA' by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028 by Mr. Dilip Tupe

Project Details-

Representative of PP was present during the meeting along with environmental consultant M/s. Green Circle Inc.

It is noted that, the PP has submitted the application for prior environment clearance for proposed project with total plot area of 25,613.00 m², FSI area of 1,11,547.50 m², Non FSI area of 93,332.50 m² and total BUA of 2,04,880 m².

Brief information of the proposal is as below:

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 1. | Proposal Number | SIA/MH/INFRA2/450689/2023 | |
| 2. | Name of Project | Proposed Residential and Commercial Project 'ASTRANA' by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028 by Mr. Dilip Tupe | |
| 3. | Project category | Schedule 8(b) Category B1 | |
| 4. | Type of Institution | Private | |
| 5. | Project Proponent | Name | Mr. Dilip Baburao Tupe |
| | | Regd. Office address | Holystico Group, Office No. 5010, Marvel Feugo Commercial Premises, Magarpatta Road, Hadapsar, Pune, Maharashtra 411028 |
| | | Contact number | 9860562213 |
| | | e-mail | praveenbodke3011@gmail.com |
| 6. | Consultant | Green Circle Inc. NABET Certificate No.: NABET/EIA/2124/RA0219 valid upto Jan 26, 2024 | |
| 7. | Applied for | Fresh EC | |
| 8. | Details of previous EC | NA | |
| 9. | Location of the project | Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3, B. S. Tupe Road, Hadapsar, Pune. | |
| 10. | Latitude and Longitude | 18°30'33.79"N, 73°56'27.41"E | |
| 11. | Total Plot Area (m ²) | 25,613.00 Sqm | |
| 12. | Deductions (m ²) | 1,450 Sqm | |
| 13. | Net Plot area (m ²) | 24,163 Sqm | |
| 14. | Proposed FSI area (m ²) | 1,11,547.50 Sqm | |
| 15. | Proposed Non-FSI area (m ²) | 93,332.50 Sqm | |
| 16. | Proposed TBUA (m ²) | 2,04,880 Sqm | |
| 17. | TBUA (m ²) approved by Planning Authority till date | 2,04,880 Sqm | |
| 18. | Ground Coverage (m ²) & % | 8561 sqm | |


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024


| | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--|-----------|----------------------------------|
| 19 | Total Project Cost (Rs.) | Rs. 600 Crore | | | |
| 20 | CER as per MoEF & CC circular dated 01/05/2018 | Activity | Location | Cost(Cr.) | Duration |
| | | Solar Street Lights | Tupe Nagar, Hadapsar | 0.45 | |
| | | Solar Electrical Pannel | Housing Societies – 15 Nos. | 2.0 | |
| | | Ambulance Facility | KEM Hospital Advance Ambulance Facility -3 nos. | 3.0 | |
| | | School Development | Sane Guruji School Development Computers, RO System, etc. | 0.80 | |
| | | Providing RO Water filters | Providing 3 nos. of RO Water Filters to Shewalewadi | 0.75 | |
| | | River Rejuvenation | Mula-Mutha River Rejuvenation in consultation with local authority | 5.0 | |
| 21 | Details of Building Configuration : | | | | Reason for Modification / Change |
| Proposed Configuration | | | | | |
| | Building Name | Configuration | Height (m) | NA | |
| | Tower A | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower B | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors+ Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower C | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|------------------------|-----------------|
| | Tower D | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m | | |
| | Tower E | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 121.10 m | | |
| | Tower F | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 29 Floors + Terrace | 114.20 m | | |
| | Commercial | B1+ G+ 2 Floors | 12.90 m | | |
| | Hotel | B1+ L.G+ U.G+ 8 Floors+ Terrace | 32.70 m | | |
| | Inclusive Housing | P1+ 13 Floors+ Terrace | 40.70 m | | |
| | Club House | G + 1 Floor + Terrace | 7.20 m | | |
| 22 | Total number of tenements | Residential Tenements- 761 Nos., Commercial Area- 13968 sqm Floating Population- 1333 Nos., Hotel population- 794 Nos. | | | |
| 23 | Water Budget | Dry Season (CMD) | | Wet Season (CMD) | |
| | | Fresh Water | 415.07 | Fresh Water | 415.07 |
| | | Recycled | 248.18 | Recycled | 216.54 |
| | | Swimming Pool | 113.10 | Swimming Pool | 113.10 |
| | | Flushing | 216.54 | Flushing | 216.54 |
| | | Total | 632 | Total | 632 |
| | | Waste water generation | 320.27 | Waste water generation | 351.41 |
| 24 | Water Storage Capacity for Firefighting / UGT (m3) | Tank Name | Details | | Capacity |
| | | UGT 1 | Fire Water Tank | | 75,000 liters |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | | 50,000 liters |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | | 25,000 liters |
| | | UGT 2 | Fire Water Tank | | 2,00,000 liters |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | | 50,000 liters |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | | 25,000 liters |
| | | UGT 3 | Fire Water Tank | | 4,50,000 liters |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | | 2,62,000 liters |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | | 1,00,000 liters |
| | | | Commercial Water Tank | | 50,000 liters |
| | | UGT 4 | Fire Water Tank | | 4,50,000 liters |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | | 2,62,000 liters |
| | Raw Water Tank | | 1,00,000 liters | | |
| | Commercial Water Tank | | 50,000 liters | | |
| 25 | Source of water | Construction phase- Tanker Water, Operation phase- PMC | | | |
| 26 | Rainwater Harvesting (RWH) | Level of the Ground water table | Pre- monsoon 8 – 10 m BGL Post- monsoon 10 – 12 m BGL | | |
| | | Size and no of RWH tank(s) and Quantity | | NA | |
| | | Qty.& size of recharge pits | Surface Recharge Pits – 8 Nos. of size 2 x 2 x 3 m Rooftop Recharge Pits – 6 Nos. of size 1.5 x 2 x 3 m | | |


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

| | | Details of UGT tanks if any | Tank Name | Details | Capacity |
|-------|--|---|---|---|---------------|
| | | | UGT 1 | Fire Water Tank | 75,000 liters |
| | | | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | |
| | | | Raw Water Tank | 25,000 liters | |
| UGT 2 | Fire Water Tank | 2,00,000 liters | | | |
| | Domestic Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | |
| | Raw Water Tank | 25,000 liters | | | |
| UGT 3 | Fire Water Tank | 4,50,000 liters | | | |
| | Domestic Water Tank | 2,62,000 liters | | | |
| | Raw Water Tank | 1,00,000 liters | | | |
| | Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | |
| UGT 4 | Fire Water Tank | 4,50,000 liters | | | |
| | Domestic Water Tank | 2,62,000 liters | | | |
| | Raw Water Tank | 1,00,000 liters | | | |
| | Commercial Water Tank | 50,000 liters | | | |
| 27 | Sewage and Wastewater | Sewage generation in CMD | 562 CMD | | |
| | | STP technology | MBBR | | |
| | | Capacity of STP (CMD) | 3 nos. of STP of capacity – STP 1 – 500 KLD (Residential & Commercial) STP 2 – 50 KLD (Inclusive Housing) STP 3 – 45 KLD (Hotel) | | |
| 28 | Solid Waste Management during Construction Phase | Type | Quantity (kg/d) | Treatment / disposal | |
| | | Dry waste | 37 | Through authorized agency | |
| | | Wet waste | 56 | Through authorized agency | |
| | | Construction waste | 6 | Through authorized agency | |
| 29 | Solid Waste Management during Operation Phase | Type | Quantity (kg/d) | Treatment / disposal | |
| | | Dry waste | 1199 | Through authorized agency | |
| | | Wet waste | 1632 | In-situ Composting | |
| | | Hazardous waste | 2.5 | Used/ Spent Oil - To authorized recycler/ reprocessor | |
| | | Biomedical waste | 0 | N.A. | |
| | | E-Waste | 19 | Handed over to Authorized Dismantler/Recycler | |
| | | STP Sludge (dry) | 3.3 | In-situ Composting | |
| 30 | Green Belt Development | Total RG area (m2) | | 2,416.30 sqm | |
| | | Existing Trees on plot: | | 09 Nos. | |
| | | Number of trees to be planted | | 303 Nos. | |
| | | Number of trees to be cut | | 0 | |
| | | Number of trees to be transplanted | | 05 Nos. | |
| 31 | Power requirement | Source of power supply | | MSEDCL | |
| | | During Construction Phase (Demand Load) | | 75 kW | |
| | | During Operation phase (Connected load) | | 11343 kW | |
| | | During Operation phase (Demand load) | | 5366 kW | |
| | | Transformer | | 6 Nos. of 999 kVA | |


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | DG set | 2 Nos. of 400 kVA, 1 Nos. of 62.5 kVA, 1 No. of 125 kVA, 1 No. of 320 kVA | | | |
| | | Fuel used | HSD | | | |
| 32 | Details of Energy saving | <p>Most of the common area & external lighting are proposed to work on high energy efficient lamps (LED) as specified in bureau of energy efficiency which again results in saving in general consumption</p> <p>Low loss Transformers due to which 6.22% losses are saved against conventional transformer.</p> <p>Power Capacitors are proposed for load power factor correction and to maintain a healthy power situation. This also results in less demand load factor for the project.</p> <p>Solar PV, Hot Water, Solar Street Lights, Energy Efficient Motors are proposed. Maximum Demand Load is 5366 KW. Energy savings due to solar and other energy conservation measures is 21.72 % of Maximum Demand Load.</p> | | | | |
| 33 | Environmental Management plan budget during Construction phase | No. | Details | | | Cost (Lacs/Y) |
| | | 1 | Water for Construction, labour & Dust Suppression | | | 9 |
| | | 2 | Site Sanitation & Health & Safety PPE Kits | | | 7 |
| | | 3 | Environmental Monitoring | | | 3 |
| | | 4 | Disinfection & Health & Safety | | | 12 |
| | | 5 | Health Check up | | | 2 |
| 34 | Environmental Management plan Budget during Operation phase | Component | Details | | Capital (Lacs) | O&M (Lacs/Year) |
| | | Storm water | Storm water management and plumbing networks | | 33 | 3.3 |
| | | Sewage Treatment | 3 nos. of STP of capacity 500 KLD, 50 KLD & 45 KLD | | 97 | 11 |
| | | RWH | Rainwater Harvesting Pits | | 20 | 1.5 |
| | | Swimming Pool | Swimming Pool | | 130 | 6.5 |
| | | Solid waste | Organic waste composter | | 44.25 | 15.08 |
| | | Hazardous waste | Management of Hazardous Waste | | 0.20 | 0.5 |
| | | e-waste | e-waste management | | 0.76 | 2 |
| | | Green belt development | Tree Plantation and Maintenance | | 121.96 | 5.39 |
| | | Energy Saving | Energy conservation measures | | 273.54 | 15.59 |
| | | Environmental Monitoring | Monitoring of Ambient Air, Noise, Water, Soil, etc. | | 10 | 20 |
| | | Disaster Management | Fire Fighting measures & Lightning Arrestor | | 456.27 | 22.81 |
| 35 | Traffic | Type | Required as per DCR | Actual Provided | Area per parking (m ²) | Total parking area (m ²) |


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------|------|-------|---------|
| Management | 4-Wheeler | 1032 | 1503 | 12.50 | 18787.5 |
| | 2-Wheeler | 1519 | 1519 | 2.00 | 3038 |
| 36) Details of Court cases / litigations w.r.t. the project and project location if any | | | | | NA |

SEAC Deliberation –

PP stated that, the application is for Proposed Residential and Commercial Project 'ASTRANA' by M/s. Holystico Group at Sr. No. 207(P), 208/ 1A/ 3 (P), 208/1B (P) & 208/3; B. S. Tupe Road, Malwadi, Hadapsar, Pune 411028. PP has received ToR on 27.10.2023 and submitted EIA report accordingly.

The proposed configuration is as below:

| Building Name | Configuration | Height (m) |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| Tower A | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower B | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors+ Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower C | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower D | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 117.30 m |
| Tower E | B1+ G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 30 Floors + Terrace | 121.10 m |
| Tower F | G+ P1+ P2+ P3+ P4+ Amenity Floor+ 29 Floors + Terrace | 114.20 m |
| Commercial | B1+ G+ 2 Floors | 12.90 m |
| Hotel | B1+ L.G+ U.G+ 8 Floors+ Terrace | 32.70 m |
| Inclusive Housing | P1+ 13 Floors+ Terrace | 40.70 m |
| Club House | G + 1 Floor + Terrace | 7.20 m |

PP clarified that the mandatory RG is provided on ground.

The case was discussed on the basis of the documents submitted and presentation made by the proponent. All issues relating to environment, including air, water, land, soil, ecology, biodiversity and social aspects were examined. The proposal is appraised as category 8(a) b2.

During discussion following points emerged:

1. PP to incorporate cost of operation and maintenance of STP in EMP and submit revised EMP.
2. PP to provide electric charging facility by providing charging points at suitable places as per Maharashtra Electric Vehicle Policy, 2021.
3. PP to ensure that, the water proposed to be used for construction phase should not be drinking water. They can use recycled water or tanker water for proposed construction.

Recommendations of SEAC-

After deliberation, Committee decided to recommend the proposal for Environmental Clearance to SEIAA, subject to compliance of above points.


Member Secretary


Chairman

Minutes of 273rd Day – 1 (Part A) meeting of SEIAA held on 03rd January, 2024

Deliberation in SEIAA-

Proposal is a new construction project. Proposal is recommended by SEAC-3 in its 186th meeting for grant of Environment Clearance for total plot area of 25,613.00 m², FSI area of 1,11,547.50 m², Non FSI area of 93,332.50 m² and total BUA of 2,04,880 m².

During the meeting, SEIAA asked PP regarding the provision of RG. PP submitted that, they have provided mandatory RG having area of 2416.30 m² on mother earth without any construction i.e. Club House etc. SEIAA asked PP to submit area undertaking to that effect. PP submitted the same dated 03.01.2024.

SEIAA after deliberation decided to grant EC for-FSI-1,11,547.50 m², Non FSI-93,332.50 m², total BUA-2,04,880.00 m². (Plan approval No-5/3797, dated-24.11.2023)

SEIAA after deliberation decided to grant Environment Clearance subject to compliance of following conditions-

1. PP has provided mandatory RG area of 2416.30 m² on mother earth without any construction i.e. Club House etc. Local planning authority to ensure the compliance of the same.
2. PP to keep open space unpaved so as to ensure permeability of water. However, whenever paving is deemed necessary, PP to provide grass pavers of suitable types & strength to increase the water permeable area as well as to allow effective fire tender movement.
3. PP to achieve at least 5% of total energy requirement from solar/other renewable sources.
4. PP Shall comply with Standard EC conditions mentioned in the Office Memorandum issued by MoEF& CC vide F.No.22-34/2018-IA III dt.04.01.2019.
5. SEIAA after deliberation decided to grant EC for-FSI-1,11,547.50 m², Non FSI-93,332.50 m², total BUA-2,04,880.00 m². (Plan approval No-5/3797, dated-24.11.2023)

SEIAA Decision-

SEIAA after deliberation decided to grant Environment Clearance.



Smak

Member Secretary

M
Chairman