



**GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
(ROAD SECTION)**

**WORKING PAPER**

**PART A**

**Date of receipt of PC-I in P&D Board: 27-03-2025**

**PROJECT PROFILE:**

1. Project Title: **CONSTRUCTION OF FLYOVER AT KHAWAJA CORPORATION AT ADYALA ROAD, DISTRICT RAWALPINDI.**
2. Location: District Rawalpindi
3. Sponsoring Agency: Communication & Works Department
4. Executing Agency: Punjab Highway Department
5. Operation & Maintenance Punjab Highway Department
6. Name of the Relevant Department (s) /Pre-PDWP meeting was held on **18.04.2024** under the Stakeholder(s) invited in chairmanship of Member (ID) Pre-PDWP
7. Name of the Sector's specialist / consultants / advisor / expert / invited in Pre-PDWP
8. Cost:

**(Rs. in million)**

<b>Original</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Revised</b>	<b>Increase</b>
Rs. 2113.612 (26.08.2024)	Rs. 3736.927 <b>(Proposed)</b>	<b>1623.315</b>

9. Source of Financing Provincial ADP 2024-25 reflected at G. Sr. No. 1723
10. Allocation (2024-25) Rs. 2113.000 Million

11. **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT:**

The proposed road project has been reflected in the Annual Development Programme (ADP) for the fiscal year 2024-25 at GS No. 1723. The scheme was approved by PDWP in its 21<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 26.08.2024 and administrative approval was issued by Secretary, Government of the Punjab, Communication & Works Department, Lahore, vide order No.SOH-II(C&W)2-12/2023 dated 30-08-2024, for an amount of Rs. 2,113.612 million. Subsequently, technical sanction was accorded by the Chief Engineer (North Zone), Punjab Highway Department, Lahore, vide Memo No. ADP-1723-2024-25/Rawalpindi/561/Plg dated 15-10-2024.

The project scope includes the construction of a flyover located at Km No. 4 of Adiala Road, which originates from Katchery Chowk Rawalpindi (Mile 170 of G.T. Road). The alignment traverses several settlements, including Gorakhpur, Adyala, Khalsa Khurd, Khasala Kalan, Dhalla, Jarrar Camp, Dhoke Awan, and Village Sangral, and connects to Rawalpindi–Chakri Road near

Village Ladian. This corridor is of strategic importance as it serves as a vital link between Rawalpindi and the Chakri Interchange (M-2), providing access to District Chakwal. The total length of Adiala Road is approximately 39 kilometers.

Upon completion of the proposed flyover at Khawaja Corporation Chowk, improved accessibility will be ensured for traffic bound to and from Jarrar Camp, the Rawalpindi Ring Road, and Jourian. The project is expected to significantly reduce travel time and alleviate chronic congestion at this critical junction, thereby enhancing overall traffic flow.

A substantial increase in the project cost has occurred due to several factors, including actual demand notices received from various service departments related to utility shifting, the requirement of land acquisition, and modifications in the design prepared by M/s NESPAK. These developments have necessitated financial adjustments to accommodate the revised scope and ensure timely implementation of the scheme.

Now, the C&W Department has submitted the revised PC-I / cost estimate amounting to **Rs. 3736.927 Million** for consideration of PDWP.

### **REASONS OF REVISION:**

- i. Due to change in cost of flyover due to increase in ramp retaining walls height, decrease in depth of piles, addition of pier and steel as per detailed drawings issued by consultant.
- ii. Due to provision of retaining walls along side service roads and dismantled sub structure.
- iii. Due to provision of granular backfill material (better filled) in pockets created due to demolishing of substructure of buildings demolished.
- iv. Due to increase in length of approach roads from 50 meter to 250 meter.
- v. Due to increase in width of service roads from 22 ft to varying from 22 ft to 28 ft.
- vi. Due to addition of slip roads on Caltex and School roads.
- vii. Due to increase in land acquisition area measuring 03 K 10 M for slip roads on Caltex and School roads.
- viii. Due to provisions for rehabilitation of Rah-e-Aman road (L = 1.50 Km).
- ix. Due to provision of drain on both sides, pipe culverts and construction of bridge over drain at School road.
- x. Due to construction of boundary walls, main gates, mosque, rooms and washrooms of Askari-7 demolished.
- xi. Due to provision for construction of retaining wall along Askari-7 (East Side)
- xii. Due to provision of box culverts at start and near point of flyover.
- xiii. Due to increase in length of drain and change in specification of drain from brick masonry to RCC.
- xiv. Due to increase in cost of Land Acquisition & Building Compensation as per demand notice received from LAC and due to additional proposed land measuring 03 K 10 M.
- xv. Due to increase in cost provision of shifting of services as per demand notices received from concerned line agencies.
- xvi. Due to provision of horticulture charges.
- xvii. Due to provision of Architectural and Aesthetic work over Flyover.

## **DESIGN & SCOPE:**

i.	Length of Bridge	1915 Rft
ii.	Width	52 ft
iii.	No of Spans	08 No
iv.	Width of Service Road	28 ft (Both Sides)
v.	Sub Base	08 inch
vi.	Base Course	08 inch
vii.	Asphalt on road & Approaches	3.5 inch (2" ABC + 1.5" AWC)
viii.	Asphalt on bridge	02 inch (AWC)
ix.	Land to be acquired	5.60 Kanal
x.	Total Traffic at Intersection	79,425 VPD
xi.	Conflicting Traffic	56,791 VPD
xii.	Proposed Flyover Traffic	32,810 VPD

### **12. a) Sector Issues**

Insufficient availability of funds against the ever-increasing demand of road infrastructure, resulting in generation of excessive throw forward

### **b) Sector Strategy**

The provincial sectoral strategy envisages construction of a high quality infrastructure as planning, constructing and maintaining road network in public sector under need driven and cost effective regimes aiming at providing best possible means of communication to the general public

### **13. Relationship of the project with the Sectoral policy /Growth Strategy, 2023.**

Project is aligned with the growth strategy, 2023

### **14. Alignment with the Punjab Spatial Strategy, 2047(Comments of urban unit)**

N/A

### **15. Other major ongoing projects in the Sector**

- CONSTRUCTION OF FLYOVER AT KHAWAJA CORPORATION AT ADYALA ROAD, DISTRICT RAWALPINDI (REVISED).

### **16. BREAK DOWN OF THE CAPITAL COST**

(Rs. in Million)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>As per Approved PC-I</b>	<b>As per Revised PC-I</b>	<b>Difference</b>
1.	Road Work	140.510	304.190	163.680
2.	Structures (Flyover)	1063.352	1003.681	-59.671
3.	Structures (RCC Walls for Flyover)	110.948	246.028	135.080
4.	Drainage & Erosion Works	78.418	300.136	221.718
5.	Allied Development Work	0.000	200.576	200.576
6.	Ancillary Works/Road Furniture	27.582	239.981	212.399
7.	Electrical Works	38.808	47.856	9.048
8.	Reconstruction of Rah-e-Aman Road	0.000	54.034	54.034
9.	Architectural Features / Aesthetics Works	0.000	50.000	50.000
10.	Shifting of Services	90.000	389.169	299.169
11.	Soil Investigation, Design Charges and Environmental Report	5.000	5.000	0.000
12.	Land Acquisition + Building Compensation	420.331	639.395	219.064
13.	Horticulture Charges	0.000	24.465	24.465
14.	2% Contingency	29.192	48.930	19.738
15.	0.5% Design Charges	7.298	12.232	4.934
16.	2% Consultancy	29.192	48.930	19.738
17.	5% PST Charges	72.981	122.324	49.343

	<b>Total</b>	<b>2113.612</b>	<b>3736.927</b>	<b>1623.315</b>
--	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

**17. UNIT COST**

Rs.16,044 per SFT

**18. PERIOD OF IMPLEMENTATION**

24 Months (Till June 2026)

**19. ANNUAL RECURRING EXPENDITURE**

Rs.1.600 Million

**20. ANNUAL INCOME AFTER COMPLETION**

N/A

**21. REQUIREMENT OF VEHICLES/STAFF/CONSULTANCY (WITH JUSTIFICATION)**

N/A

**22. EXISTING FACILITIES**

**PART – B**

**23. TECHNICAL APPRAISAL**

(Comments of R&B)

Pre-PDWP meeting was held on **18.04.2025** under the chairmanship of Member (ID), wherein project's salient features, design & scope was discussed. Imperative discussion was made on reasons of revision of this PC-1, Physical & financial progress of the scheme and details of price variations. Point wise discussion is listed as under:-

Sr. No	Observation	Reply of the Department	Recommendations of pre-PDWP
1.	RD wise pictorial evidences of road and drone video may be provided in view of guidelines issued by P&D Board vide No. 12(14)PO(COORD-II)P&D/2022 dated 11.09.2023	Compliance has been made.	Noted
2.	Justification for increase in provision of earthwork (from borrow area) from 510,021 CFT to 1,521,939 CFT with a cost impact of Rs. 28.236 million and earthwork (from project area) from 102428 CFT to 239,470 CFT with a cost impact of Rs. 1.573 million is to be provided along with cogent reason for increase.  Layout plan of area and EGL & PGL may also be provided in lieu of making this provision.	The quantity of the borrow area has increased on a/c of increase in the height of ramp along with extension of requisite extension involving the location of boundary walls at Askari-VII side to achieve the serviceable width of service roads.  The increase in earthwork from project area on account of reuse of reclaimed earth from structure excavation of retaining walls and pile caps.	Not Accepted  The original estimate submitted by the sponsoring agency was based on the detailed design; therefore, the height of the ramps, the width of the service roads, and the depth determined by the difference between the road level and the existing ground level (EGL) should have been finalized at the time of the initial approval.
3.	The sponsoring agency shall provide a detailed technical justification for the inclusion of the newly proposed item, namely selective granular backfill material, which has been	The provision of granular backfill material has been taken from Pier 3 till retaining wall of abutment 1 due to dismantling of acquired property, the pockets in the areas of	Not Accepted  After thorough deliberations and examination of photographic evidence depicting the formation of pockets

	<p>incorporated in the estimate over a length of 575 feet on both sides of the carriageway, with a width of 23 feet and a depth of 11.5 feet, amounting to Rs. 41.800 million. The justification must include site-specific requirements necessitating this provision and confirmation that no alternative or less costly option is feasible. The rationale must also clarify whether the said provision is in compliance with standard design guidelines and is essential for achieving the required stability and performance of subgrade at the identified location.</p>	<p>service road has developed needs to be filled with granular fill material.</p>	<p>following the demolition of the substructure at multiple levels, it was concluded that backfilling with engineered fill may not be warranted, as it would represent an uneconomical solution. Furthermore, retaining walls at some locations along dismantled substructure were also proposed wherein backfilling with engineered fill is not required. The executing agency may proceed with conventional backfilling practices or explore other cost-effective alternatives deemed technically feasible.</p>
4.	<p>Justification for increase in quantity provision of item i.e. dismantling of road metalling and road pavement structure proposed in revised estimate is to be provided.</p> <p>Pavement evaluation report duly recommended by RR&amp;MTI is to be provided in lieu of making this provision.</p>	<p>Due to Correction of Length as per project area, originally 630 m Flyover area was taken, while the at grade start and end portion was erroneously neglected, while during excavation 03 layers of asphalt has been encountered. Rectification resulted impact of 9.7 M.</p>	<p>The sponsor is required to justify the rationale behind the increase in the length of the approaches from 50 meters to 250 meters. Furthermore, the pavement evaluation report, duly recommended by the RR&amp;MTI, is to be provided to substantiate the increase in the depth of the pavement structure reflected in the estimate.</p>
5.	<p>It has been observed that the quantities of Sub-Base, Base Course and asphalt course have increased significantly in the revised estimate. The sponsoring agency is required to provide a detailed technical justification for this substantial variation, clearly outlining the factors contributing to the</p>	<p>Due to correction of number of lanes at grade portion, slip roads length have increased from 50m to 250m, increase in width of cross roads as per land acquisition done at site, pavement design has been kept same.</p>	<p>Not Accepted</p> <p>The increase in the length of the approach roads is not justified. Furthermore, the service road, initially conceived as 22 feet wide and now varying between 22 feet and 28 feet for the provision of auxiliary lanes and slip roads at the Caltex</p>

	increase, such as changes in pavement design, cross-sectional geometry, or site-specific conditions.		Road and the School Road, on additionally proposed land to be acquired measuring 03 Kanal and 10 Marla, should have been included in the original estimate.
6.	Sponsor to elucidate the reasons in detail behind change in cost of flyover structure with cost impact of Rs. 75.409 million.	Due to decrease in length of piles and decrease in length of flyover portion by 10 m, while increase in height of Ramp has resulted in the net impact of Rs75.409 M	Noted The Chief Engineer (Concerned) shall obtain the recommendations of the Bridge Directorate for the validation of the design of the bridge.
7.	Sponsor to provide detailed drawings of flyover provided by consultant.	Compliance has been made.	Noted
8.	The sponsor to specify which design parameters/inputs have been changed in the design provided by the consultant, compared to the initial assumptions made at the time of approval, that have resulted in the increased cost of the flyover.	Changes observed in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease in length of Pile</li> <li>• Change in Length of one span</li> <li>• Decrease in length of Flyover</li> <li>• Increase in height of ramps retaining wall</li> <li>• Retaining walls section and steel has increased as per final decision.</li> </ul> Item wise comparison is already attached in PC-1 submitted	Noted The Chief Engineer (Concerned) shall obtain the recommendations of the Bridge Directorate for the validation of the design of the bridge.
9.	Sponsor may also share the detailed comparison of items affected by the design change, indicating the incurred modifications.	-do-	-do-
10.	Sponsor to justify the increase in length of drain from 5710 Rft to 10,000 Rft with a cost impact of Rs. 97.077 million.  Layout plan duly marked on google image along with disposal point in lieu of increase in this provision is to be provided.	As per correction the length has been rationalised to 9000 Rft, correction has been made as per actual length of roads in the project area. Disposal Plan Attached.	The increase in the drain length due to the provision of drains on both sides of the School Road is not justified. The sponsor may opt for the disposal of stormwater into the existing drain at this specified location.
11.	It has been observed that unit rate of drain is	Change in unit rate of drain is due to depressed nature	Not Accepted Provision of RCC drain

	increased from Rs. 13,733.37/RFT to Rs. 17,549.50/Rft in instant estimate which is to be justified and rate analysis of item may also be provided.	of drains in significant length under road way, dictating the need of RCC drain instead of Brick Masonary.	instead of brick masonry is to be deleted.
12.	<p>Sponsor to justify the new provision of following items made under Drainage and Erosion work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 02 No Box Culverts with a cost impact of Rs. 28.756 million</li> <li>• Dismantling of PCC &amp; RCC with a cost impact of Rs. 32.628 million</li> <li>• Disposal of unusable material with a cost impact of Rs. 15.081 million</li> </ul>	<p>As per disposal plan one box culvert is needed 0+025 to connect the new proposed drain with existing drainage on other side of the road.</p> <p>While provision of second box culvert has been made at between Pier 1 and Abutment 1, as existing culvert is depleted needs replacement.</p> <p>Dismantling of existing road drains and removal of basement walls in result of acquisition.</p> <p>Disposal of building material/ debris from site in result of acquisition.</p>	The location of the existing culvert near the start point and the crossing of the stone masonry nullah near the end point, where box culverts are now being proposed, should have been identified during the initial survey and estimation of the project in the original PC-I.
13.	Justification for new provision of construction of submersible bridge over nullah at School road taken in estimate at cost of Rs. 26.600 million is to be provided.	The school road has been used as part of diversion plan having a small bridge on it, the said bridge already in depleted condition has been proposed to be reconstructed.	<p>Not Accepted</p> <p>The inclusion of scope in the estimate pertaining to the School Road, including the provision of drains along both sides, reconstruction of the boundary wall of Askari-7, construction of a bridge over the drain, and the provision of pipe culverts, is not warranted under the scope of the instant scheme and should be deleted.</p>
14.	Justification for new provision of construction of 4ft span culvert and 48" dia pipe culvert at School road taken in estimate at cumulative cost of Rs. 9.231 million is to be provided.	As a allied structure of the bridge at school road, the provision of 4ft span culvert and 48 inch dia pipe has is also required.	-do-
15.	It has been observed that new item of works related to earthwork, construction of boundary wall and structure are	The earthwork has been taken in low lying area near depilated bridge and construction of boundary wall also taken for	-do-

	taken under Drainage works head at School road with cost impact of Rs. 16.211 million which is to be justified.	separation of ASKARI side.	
16.	Layout plan of all items proposed to be taken at School road duly marked on google image is to be provided.	Compliance has been made.	-do-
17.	<p>It has been observed that new provisions pertaining to allied development works—including dismantling of the existing boundary wall, drain, main gates, mosque, rooms, and washrooms, as well as the reconstruction of these components—have been incorporated in the cost estimate at a cumulative cost of Rs. 200.576 million. These provisions require detailed justification.</p> <p>Accordingly, the sponsoring agency is requested to provide item-wise pictorial evidence and corresponding layout plans for each component of the allied development works, along with clear and cogent technical grounds for their inclusion in the estimate. The justification should demonstrate the necessity of these works in relation to the overall scope and functionality of the scheme.</p>	At the start of the project the Askari Colony Phase 7 east and west is present, while the requisite width of service was not available, in result of coordination it was decided that land will be provided by them without any cost, while the establishments/ components disturbed will reconstructed. Resultantly the provision of RCC Wall, drain, main gate, washroom and guard room has been taken up with the accumulative cost of Rs. 200.576 m.	Not Accepted After detailed deliberations, it was concurred that if the sponsor had planned the use of Askari-7 land for the provision of service roads, then the associated costs related to the reconstruction of the boundary wall, retaining wall, and the area of structure required to be demolished should have been included in the original estimate.
18.	<p>Increase in provisions of road furniture items with a cost impact of Rs. 212.399 million is to be justified.</p> <p>RD wise linear plan depicting location of proposed traffic informatory, regulatory and directional sign</p>	New item Jotashield paint, vision barriers, pipe delineator over bridge barriers, angle reflectors on side barriers, increase in tuff pavers & Kerb stone quantity due to increase in project length, minor variation in quantity of approved road furniture has caused this time cost impact	Painting on surface of flyover with jota shield paint and provision of vision barrier in scope of instant PC-I is not justified and be deleted.



	boards may be shared and annexed with PC-I.		
19.	Sponsor to justify new provisions i.e. vision barrier and jotashield paint in instant estimate is to be provided.	Provision of Vision Barrier is due to high priority individuals residing in Askari Area. Jotashield paint is to enhance the aesthetic appearance of exposed concrete work.	-do-
20.	It has been observed that provision for construction of inauguration monument amounting to Rs. 5.250 million is taken in instant estimate which is not justified and may be deleted.	Inauguration of this flag ship project is expected at the end of this fiscal year by CM Punjab, for which this provision has been incorporated.	Not Accepted Provision is to be deleted from instant estimate.
21.	The sponsoring agency is required to justify the provision of Rs. 54.034 million for the reconstruction of Rah-e-Aman Road (L = 1.50 Km) as reflected in the instant estimate.  In this regard, the layout plan, linear plan, and Z-section of the subject road must be furnished. Additionally, clear and cogent reasons shall be provided to substantiate the inclusion of this road in the current scope, along with an explanation of its functional relevance and connectivity to the main project area. The justification should establish the necessity of this reconstruction within the context of the overall scheme.	The said road was used as a traffic diversion, has undergone deterioration. Resultantly been incorporated in this project.	Not Accepted The inclusion of scope pertaining to the rehabilitation of Rah-e-Aman road is not justified and does not fall within the scope of the current PC-I. This work should be excluded as it is not aligned with the objectives or requirements of the project at hand.
22.	The sponsoring agency is required to justify the lump sum provision of Rs. 50.000 million earmarked for architectural features and aesthetic works as reflected in the instant estimate.  In this regard, detailed information must be provided, including the	The flyover is in the urban area, to enhance the aesthetic value of the under portion of the flyover portion, the L.S provision has been incorporated. Upon approval the actual item wise detail will be made part of TS estimate.	Not Accepted The sponsor should have prepared the estimate based solely on basis of BOQ rather than taking lump sum provision. Additionally, the inclusion of work related to architectural and aesthetic features is not warranted

	scope of work and an item-wise cost breakdown, to substantiate the cost provision.		under the scope of the current PC-I.
23.	Justification for increase in quantity provision of electrical items with a cost impact of Rs. 9.048 million is to be provided.	Number of poles has been increased on account of increase in project area length.	Provision is subject to the approval of increase in length of approach roads as discussed above.
24.	Sponsor to justify the increase in cost provision of shifting of utility services charges (IESCO, SNGPL, PTCL etc) from Rs. 90.000 million to 389.169 million by providing demand notices received from concerned line agency.	Compliance has been made.	Noted
25.	Increase in provision of land acquisition and building compensation charges may be justified by providing following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demarcation of area (Demarcation plan) marked on google image along with area statement be provided.</li> <li>• Demand of LAC</li> <li>• Minutes of DPAC</li> <li>• Assessment of Buildings by concerned Building Division.</li> </ul>	Compliance has been made.	Initially, land measuring 09 K 01 M was identified for land acquisition and now additional area of land measuring 03 K 10 M was proposed to be acquired for slip roads at Caltex road and Slip road. (Cumulative Land Area: 12 K 11 M) It has been observed that Section-04 notified on 02.09.2024 indicates land measuring 16 K 11 M and Section-04 notified on 10.02.2025 indicates land area of 03 K 10 M (Cumulative Land Area: 20 K 01 M) which requires justification. Furthermore, cost basis of additional proposed land measuring 03 K 10 M was based on lump sum basis and no demand notice from LAC has been provided to justify this cost provision.
26.	Sponsor to justify new provision of horticulture charges at cost of Rs.	Provision Island, Green Belts along the road and main intersection has been	Not Accepted The provision for horticulture charges in

	<p>24.465 million in estimate.</p> <p>Furthermore, Horticulture charges taken in estimate based on lump sum basis is not justified and must be based on actual estimate/DN of concerned PHA for tree plantation on or along instant road as per PDWP decision.</p> <p>Additionally, the sponsor must provide comments on whether the ROW is available for tree plantation along this road or not.</p>	<p>developed to beautify the area. The Provision of 1% as per policy has been incorporated, if agreed the payment to relevant agency will be made as per Demand Notice.</p>	<p>road schemes pertains to tree plantation and horticultural works along the road, contingent on the availability of the ROW, demand notice from the concerned Forest Division, along with a detailed horticulture plan, which has not been attached to the PC-I and be provided for further consideration.</p>
27.	<p>Increase in cost provision of contingency charges in instant estimate is not justified and must be freed to original approval</p>	<p>Agreed. Will be rationalised.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
28.	<p>Lump sum provision of consultancy and design charges in revised estimate is not justified and must be actualized based on actual agreement with consultants.</p>	<p>Project is in running position, upon submission of final approval for Price Variation, the provision of consultancy that is on man month basis will be rationalised.</p>	<p>Not Accepted Provision is to be rationalized/ freed to original approval.</p>
29.	<p>Sponsor to provide revised economic analysis based on proposed revised cost of scheme and must also be vetted from P&amp;DD of CWD.</p>	<p>Agreed, will be provided before PDWP/</p>	<p>Not provided Sponsor must provide revised economic analysis before PDWP meeting.</p>
30.	<p>Sponsor to share financial and physical progress of scheme.</p>	<p>Brief showing physical and financial Progress attached</p>	<p>Noted</p>

#### **PART – C**

#### **24. ECONOMIC / FINANCIAL APPRAISAL**

(Comments of Economic Appraisal Section and Finance Department)

#### **PART – D**

#### **25. ENVIRONMENTAL APPRAISAL.**

(Comments of Environment Department)

#### **26. CONSIDERATION BY PRE-PDWP**

The scheme is submitted by the C&W Department for revised approval at a cost of **Rs.3736.927 Million.**

#### **27. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The scheme is placed before PDWP for consideration.