



Redevelopment of the Central Transport Hub

Module Title : Project Management

Module code: LCLM5003

Assessment: A Project portfolio.

Student Name: Matilda Jace

Student Number: 2415101

Lecturer's Name: Samson Oladejo

Dr. Xavier Matieni

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Project Background and Rationale	2
Project Aims and Objectives	3
Project Scope and Boundaries	4
Key Stakeholders	5
Project Risks and Trade-Offs	6
Strategic Value of the Project	7
Project Management Approach	8
Project Success Measures	9
Project Timeline and Key Milestones	10
Project Vision and Conclusion	11
References	12



CENTRAL TRANSPORT HUB REGENERATION PROJECT

A sustainable, accessible and digitally connected transport hub for the future

Stronger Connections
Better City

PROJECT PROPOSAL

PROJECT BACKGROUND & RATIONALE

The central transport hub has been closed following a structural inspection which found the facility, built over 40 years ago, no longer meets modern safety and accessibility standards.

The closure has caused major disruption to commuter travel, supply chains and local businesses, resulting in economic losses and public dissatisfaction.

This project will redevelop the hub into a safe, resilient, accessible and future-ready multimodal transport facility, integrating rail, bus and freight services, digital technologies and sustainable design to meet today's needs and tomorrow's challenges.



SAFE &
ACCESSIBLE
FOR ALL



SEAMLESS
MULTIMODAL
CONNECTIONS



SUSTAINABLE &
NET-ZERO
FOCUSED



DIGITAL &
DATA-DRIVEN
OPERATIONS



INCLUSIVE
URBAN
DESIGN

PROJECT AIMS & OBJECTIVES

- ✓ Redevelop a safe, accessible and modern transport hub.
- ✓ Restore and increase transport capacity for passengers and freight.
- ✓ Enhance passenger experience through digital innovation and real-time information.
- ✓ Deliver a sustainable, low-carbon facility aligned with net-zero targets.
- ✓ Support economic growth, job creation and inclusive communities.

SCOPE & BOUNDARIES

IN SCOPE

- Design and construction of new transport hub (rail, bus and freight).
- Integration of digital systems for passenger flow and logistics.
- Sustainable features: renewable energy, green infrastructure, carbon reduction.
- Public realm improvements and accessibility upgrades.

OUT OF SCOPE

- Operations and day-to-day management (after handover).
- Development of external road networks beyond immediate access.
- Private retail and commercial developments (by others).

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

- Local Authority (Project Sponsor)
- Transport Operators (Rail, Bus, Freight Companies)
- Commuters & General Public
- Local Businesses & Community Groups
- Regulators & Safety Bodies
- Investors & Funding Bodies
- Design & Construction Partners
- Environmental Organisations

HIGH-LEVEL RISKS & TRADE-OFFS

KEY RISKS

- ⚠ Construction delays
- ⚠ Budget overrun from inflation and scope changes
- ⚠ Disruption to commuters during construction
- ⚠ Stakeholder misalignment or resistance
- ⚠ Environmental risks (weather, contamination)

TRADE-OFFS

- ⚖ Speed of delivery vs. design quality
- ⚖ Cost efficiency vs. sustainability investment
- ⚖ Temporary transport solutions vs. long-term convenience
- ⚖ Innovation implementation vs. system compatibility

STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE PROJECT



ECONOMIC
Boosts productivity, trade and local business.



SOCIAL
Improves accessibility, inclusion and quality of life.



ENVIRONMENTAL
Supports net-zero targets and climate resilience.



DIGITAL
Creates a smart, connected and future-ready hub.



STRATEGIC
Provides a safe, reliable and future-proof transport asset.



A HUB FOR TODAY.
A LEGACY FOR TOMORROW.

PROPOSED SUCCESS MEASURES

- ✓ **Safety:** 100% compliance with modern safety regulations before reopening
- ✓ **Accessibility:** Step-free access and inclusive facilities throughout the hub
- ✓ **Time:** Completion within 36 months of project approval
- ✓ **Sustainability:** Reduced operational carbon emissions and energy-efficient systems
- ✓ **Digital:** Real-time passenger information and smart ticketing operational at opening
- ✓ **Stakeholder Satisfaction:** Positive feedback from passengers and stakeholders

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT	Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project
LOCATION	Major Metropolitan UK City
DURATION	36 Months
ESTIMATED START	Q1 2026
ESTIMATED COMPLETION	Q1 2029
SPONSOR	Local Authority
PROJECT MANAGER	To be Appointed

PROJECT VISION

“To deliver a safer, greener, more accessible and digitally connected transport hub that reconnects the city and supports its future growth.”



Working together to build a connected, sustainable and inclusive transport future for our city.



Presentation

Today I am presenting the Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project.

The project aims to replace the old, unsafe transport hub with a modern, safe and accessible facility connecting rail, bus and freight services.

The main objectives are to improve passenger experience, accessibility, sustainability and digital connectivity, while also supporting local businesses and economic growth.

Key risks include construction delays, rising costs, disruption and environmental challenges. Good stakeholder communication and careful project management will help control these risks.

The project is planned to take 36 months, from Q1 2026 to Q1 2029.

Overall, the vision is to create a safer, greener and smarter transport hub that supports the city's future growth.

Thank you.

PART B : Reflection

Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project

1. Introduction

The feedback received from the tutor and peers following the presentation of the Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project provided useful guidance for improving the final Project Management Plan. The feedback highlighted several strengths in the original proposal, particularly its clear rationale, stakeholder identification and focus on sustainability. However, it also identified areas where more detail and stronger project management techniques were required. The feedback was therefore used to improve the scope, risk management, scheduling and stakeholder sections of the final plan.

2. Key Strengths

One of the main strengths identified was the clear justification for the proposed redevelopment of the central transport hub. The proposal explained how the closure of the hub affected commuters, freight services, local businesses and the wider economy. This demonstrated that the project was not only a construction project but also an important economic and social regeneration initiative.

Another strength was the focus on **sustainability and accessibility**. The proposal recognised the importance of creating a transport hub that is safe and inclusive while also supporting environmental objectives. The inclusion of renewable energy, energy-efficient systems, step-free access and improved passenger facilities demonstrated awareness of modern transport requirements.

The feedback also recognised the stakeholder section as a positive aspect. The proposal identified important stakeholders, including the local authority, transport operators, passengers, local businesses, residents, contractors and accessibility groups. This demonstrated an understanding that successful project delivery depends on effective communication and stakeholder involvement.

3. Areas for Improvement

The main area for improvement was the need to provide greater detail about how the project would be managed throughout its life cycle. The original proposal identified the main project activities but did not explain sufficiently how time, cost, resources, quality and risks would be controlled.

The project scope also required clearer boundaries. The feedback highlighted the importance of identifying exactly what was included and excluded from the project. This would help prevent scope creep, unnecessary costs and delays.

Risk management was another area requiring improvement. Although the initial proposal identified several risks, the final plan needed to assess their likelihood and impact and provide clear mitigation actions. This would make the risk management process more systematic and practical.

The project schedule also required further development. A detailed Gantt chart was needed to demonstrate the sequence and duration of activities and to show how the proposed 36-month project could be achieved.

4. How Feedback Informed the Final Project Management Plan

The feedback directly influenced the final Project Management Plan. The project scope was strengthened by clearly defining in-scope and out-of-scope activities. A **Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)** was introduced to divide the project into manageable work packages and connect project objectives with specific activities and deliverables.

A **Gantt chart** was also developed to present the proposed 36-month schedule and key project milestones. This provides stakeholders with a clearer understanding of project timing and dependencies.

The stakeholder section was expanded using a **power-interest approach**, allowing the project team to identify which stakeholders require close management, regular communication or monitoring.

Finally, the risk register was improved by including probability, impact, risk ratings and mitigation actions. This provides a stronger basis for monitoring and controlling potential problems throughout the project.

5. Conclusion

Overall, the tutor and peer feedback was valuable because it helped develop the initial proposal into a more detailed and realistic Project Management Plan. The final plan provides stronger attention to **scope control, scheduling, stakeholder engagement, resource allocation, risk management, sustainability and measurable project outcomes**. The

changes demonstrate how feedback can be used constructively to improve project planning and increase the likelihood of successful project delivery.

PART C – PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project

A sustainable, accessible and digitally enabled transport hub | Proposed delivery period: 36 months

1. Introduction

The closure of the central transport hub following a structural inspection creates an urgent requirement

for coordinated regeneration. The facility is more than 40 years old and no longer meets modern safety

and accessibility expectations. Its closure disrupts commuter travel, freight logistics, local businesses and

wider economic activity.

This Project Management Plan (PMP) proposes the redevelopment of the existing transport hub into a

safe, accessible, sustainable and digitally enabled multimodal facility. The project combines physical

redevelopment with digital infrastructure, inclusive urban design and environmental improvements.

The proposed delivery period is 36 months, beginning with detailed investigations and planning and

ending with commissioning and reopening. The plan applies project management tools including a Work

Breakdown Structure (WBS), stakeholder analysis, risk assessment, resource allocation and Gantt

scheduling.

Project success will not be measured only through cost, time and quality. Atkinson (1999) argues that the

traditional project-management triangle does not capture all dimensions of project success.

Wider

measures such as stakeholder satisfaction, sustainability, benefits and strategic value are therefore

included.

2. Project Description

The Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project (CTHRP) will redevelop the existing closed transport

facility. The project will deliver a structurally safe transport hub, improved rail and bus interchange facilities, improved freight and logistics coordination, step-free passenger access, lifts and accessible facilities, passenger information systems, smart ticketing, improved security and emergency systems, energy-efficient infrastructure and renewable energy solutions where feasible. The project responds directly to the scenario because it addresses the immediate transport problem while also creating longer-term economic, environmental and social value. The project will use a structured governance approach combined with iterative stakeholder engagement. A PRINCE2-informed governance structure is suitable because the project involves public-sector accountability, defined responsibilities, stage controls and significant stakeholder interests (AXELOS, 2017).

3. Scope

3.1 In-Scope Activities

The scope includes structural surveys and technical investigations; environmental and accessibility assessments; design development and planning approvals; procurement and contractor appointment; removal of unsafe structures; construction; rail and bus interchange improvements; freight and logistics facilities; accessible passenger infrastructure; energy-efficient systems; digital passenger information; smart ticketing; passenger-flow systems; security and safety infrastructure; testing and commissioning;

staff training; stakeholder communication; and final handover and reopening.

3.2 Out-of-Scope Activities

The following are excluded: construction of completely new railway lines outside the hub; major redevelopment of private properties around the hub; unrelated city-wide road projects; changes to national transport policy; and long-term operational management after handover. Clear boundaries reduce the likelihood of scope creep and help the project team maintain control over cost and schedule.

3.3 Project Success Criteria

The project will be considered successful when the facility satisfies safety requirements, accessibility requirements are achieved, transport capacity is restored, digital systems operate effectively,

sustainability objectives are achieved, the project is delivered within the approved baseline, stakeholders accept the completed facility and the hub can reopen safely. This reflects a broader understanding of project success across the project life cycle (Jugdev and Müller, 2005).

4. Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

The WBS divides the project into manageable deliverables and work packages. A well-structured WBS supports project planning, resource management and project control (de Heredia and Santana, 1991).

Table 1. Work Breakdown Structure summary

Level 1	Level 2 / Major Work Package
1	Project Initiation: business case; project charter; feasibility; governance.
2	Investigation and Planning: structural survey; environmental assessment; accessibility assessment; transport impact; cost and schedule baseline.
3	Design and Approvals: architecture; engineering; sustainable design; digital infrastructure; planning/statutory approvals.
4	Procurement: procurement strategy; tender documents; contractor selection; supplier appointment.
5	Construction: site preparation; structural works; rail/bus facilities; freight; passenger facilities; accessibility infrastructure.
6	Digital and Sustainable Systems: passenger information; smart ticketing; passenger-flow technology; energy efficiency; renewable energy.
7	Testing and Commissioning: safety; accessibility; digital; emergency testing; staff training.
8	Handover and Closure: final inspection; stakeholder acceptance; handover; reopening; project review.

Level 1 Level 2 / Major Work Package

- 1 Project Initiation: business case; project charter; feasibility; governance.
- 2 Investigation and Planning: structural survey; environmental assessment; accessibility assessment; transport impact; cost and schedule baseline.
- 3 Design and Approvals: architecture; engineering; sustainable design; digital infrastructure; planning/statutory approvals.
- 4 Procurement: procurement strategy; tender documents; contractor selection; supplier appointment.
- 5 Construction: site preparation; structural works; rail/bus facilities; freight; passenger facilities; accessibility infrastructure.
- 6 Digital and Sustainable Systems: passenger information; smart ticketing; passenger-flow technology; energy efficiency; renewable energy.
- 7 Testing and Commissioning: safety; accessibility; digital; emergency testing; staff training.
- 8 Handover and Closure: final inspection; stakeholder acceptance; handover; reopening; project review.

The WBS becomes the basis for cost allocation, responsibility assignment, scheduling and

progress
monitoring.

5. Quad Chart

PROJECT GOAL	EXPECTED BENEFITS
Redevelop the central transport hub within 36 months, restoring safe multimodal capacity while integrating accessibility, sustainability and digital systems.	Safer infrastructure; restored capacity; improved accessibility; better passenger experience; stronger local economy; lower environmental impact; improved digital connectivity.
KEY RISKS	KEY MILESTONES

The Quad Chart provides senior stakeholders with a concise summary of the project's strategic position.

Table 2. Project Quad Chart

PROJECT GOAL EXPECTED BENEFITS

Redevelop the central transport hub within 36 months, restoring safe multimodal capacity while integrating accessibility, sustainability and digital systems.

Safer infrastructure; restored capacity; improved accessibility; better passenger experience; stronger local economy; lower environmental impact; improved digital connectivity.

KEY RISKS KEY MILESTONES

Structural surprises; cost escalation; construction delays; stakeholder conflict; supply-chain disruption; technology failure; planning delays.

Approval M1; surveys M1–4; design M3–9; procurement M8–13; construction M13–29; testing M29–33; commissioning M33–35; reopening M36.

6. Gantt Chart

The Gantt schedule provides a high-level 36-month delivery plan. The overlap between activities allows

design, procurement, construction and systems integration to progress efficiently while retaining formal approval points.

Table 3. High-level Gantt Chart (n = activity; u = milestone)

Table 3. High-level Gantt Chart (■ = activity; ◆ = milestone)

Activity	M1-3	M4-6	M7-9	M10-12	M13-16	M17-20	M21-23	M24-27	M28-30
Initiation	■								
Surveys & investigations	■	■							
Design		■	■						
Approvals		■	■	■					
Procurement			■	■					
Construction				■	■	■	■		
Digital systems					■	■	■	■	
Sustainability works					■	■	■		
Testing & training								■	
Commissioning & reopening									◆

7. Stakeholders' Involvement

Stakeholder management is essential because the project affects a large number of organisations and communities. Stakeholder salience can be assessed through power, legitimacy and urgency (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997).

Table 4. Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

Stakeholder	Influence / Interest	Engagement approach
Local authority	High / High	Manage closely, monthly governance meetings.
Project sponsor	High / High	Weekly reporting and stage approvals.
Transport operators	High / High	Design workshops and operational meetings.
Main contractor	High / High	Weekly delivery meetings.
Passengers	High / Medium	Surveys, consultations and information campaigns.
Businesses / residents	Medium / Medium	Community meetings and construction updates.
Accessibility groups	High / Medium	Design reviews and accessibility testing.
Emergency services	High / Medium	Safety planning and emergency testing.
Technology suppliers	High / Medium	Technical workshops and system testing.

Engagement will begin during planning rather than after key decisions have already been made. A

Stakeholder Advisory Group will include representatives from transport operators, local businesses,

passengers, accessibility groups and residents. The project manager will provide monthly reports

covering progress, cost, risk, safety and major decisions. Stakeholder theory is particularly relevant to

complex infrastructure projects because different groups can have competing expectations

(Littau, Jujagiri and Adlbrecht, 2010).

8. Allocation of Resources

Human resources will include a Project Sponsor, Project Manager, Project Management Office,

Commercial/Cost Manager, Programme Planner, structural and civil engineers, architects, sustainability

and accessibility specialists, digital/IT specialists, procurement specialists, a Health and Safety Manager,

Communications Manager, main contractor, specialist subcontractors and testing/commissioning teams.

The project manager will coordinate resources and ensure responsibilities are clearly assigned. A

detailed cost baseline will be established after surveys and feasibility studies. The budget will cover

construction, design and consultancy, technology, project management, contingency and risk allowances.

Because transport infrastructure projects can experience inaccurate cost forecasts, reference class

forecasting should be used where comparable projects are available (Flyvbjerg, 2006). This provides an

external comparison against overly optimistic internal estimates. Physical and technical resources will

include construction equipment, materials, digital infrastructure, energy systems, passenger information

displays, security technology and temporary transport arrangements. Resource requirements will be

reviewed monthly against the schedule.

9. Risk Analysis

Risk management will be proactive rather than reactive. Ward and Chapman (2003) argue that project

uncertainty should be considered more broadly than individual negative events. The project will therefore

consider both threats and opportunities.

Table 5. Project Risk Register

Risk	Prob.	Impact	Rating	Mitigation
Unknown structural defects	High	High	Very High	Early surveys, contingency and specialist engineering.
Cost escalation	High	High	Very High	Cost control, market testing and contingency.
Construction delay	Medium	High	High	Detailed programme and milestone monitoring.
Planning/approval delays	Medium	High	High	Early engagement with authorities.
Supply chain disruption	Medium	High	High	Alternative suppliers and early procurement.
Public disruption	High	Medium	High	Phased construction and communication.
Technology integration failure	Medium	High	High	Early testing and technical assurance.
Safety incident	Low	Very High	High	Strict H&S, systems and independent inspections.
Stakeholder conflict	Medium	Medium	Medium	Stakeholder forum and escalation process.
Environmental targets missed	Medium	High	High	Sustainability requirements embedded in design.

The highest risks will be reviewed at every Project Board meeting. Each risk will have a named risk owner. The risk register will be updated continuously, and risks exceeding agreed thresholds will be escalated to the project sponsor. Four main responses will be used: avoid, reduce, transfer and accept.

Reference class forecasting is particularly relevant because large transport projects can suffer from optimism bias and inaccurate cost or demand forecasts (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

10. Project Governance and Control

The Project Board will include the Project Sponsor, Local Authority representative, Transport Authority representative, senior Finance/Commercial representative and Project Manager. The Board will approve major changes, monitor strategic performance and make decisions on issues exceeding the project manager's authority.

Project controls will include schedule control, cost control, scope control, quality control, risk control and formal change control. Actual progress will be compared with the Gantt baseline, expenditure will be compared with approved budgets, and change requests will be assessed before approval.

Design reviews, inspections and testing will support quality assurance. Monthly performance reports will provide stakeholders with information about cost, schedule, risks, quality and benefits. Clear governance is important because projects require a connection between outputs and organisational strategy

(Too and Weaver, 2014).

11. Sustainability and Strategic Value

Sustainability is embedded throughout the project rather than treated as an additional feature. Sustainable project management can support organisational change and long-term value creation

(Silvius and Schipper, 2014). The redevelopment will seek lower operational energy consumption,

renewable energy generation where feasible, efficient lighting and heating, sustainable construction

materials, improved public transport integration, reduced dependence on private vehicles, improved

pedestrian and cycling connections, waste reduction and climate-resilient infrastructure.

The project also creates social value through accessibility. Step-free access, clear signage, accessible

toilets, lifts and inclusive passenger information will benefit passengers with disabilities, older people,

families and passengers with temporary mobility limitations. The strategic value therefore extends

beyond reopening the hub. The project supports economic regeneration, social inclusion, environmental

objectives and digital transformation.

12. Conclusion

The Central Transport Hub Regeneration Project provides a comprehensive response to the closure of

the city's key transport interchange. Redevelopment is preferable to simply restoring the existing facility

because the current infrastructure is more than 40 years old and does not meet modern safety and

accessibility requirements.

The Project Management Plan provides a structured approach for controlling scope, time, resources,

risks, stakeholders and quality. The WBS provides a logical breakdown of deliverables, while the Gantt

chart establishes a 36-month programme. The Quad Chart gives senior stakeholders a concise overview

of objectives, benefits, risks and milestones.

Stakeholder involvement is central because the project affects commuters, businesses, residents,

transport operators and public authorities. A structured stakeholder strategy will support communication, consultation and decision-making. Risk management will focus particularly on structural uncertainty, cost escalation, construction delay, supply-chain disruption and technology integration. Reference class forecasting will be used to challenge overly optimistic cost and schedule assumptions. Most importantly, project success will be assessed using broader criteria than cost, time and quality. Safety, accessibility, sustainability, passenger experience, stakeholder satisfaction and long-term strategic benefits will also be considered. The redevelopment therefore provides an opportunity not

simply to replace an old transport facility but to create a modern, inclusive, sustainable and digitally connected transport hub that supports the city's future economic and social development.

13. References

- Atkinson, R. (1999) 'Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria', *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), pp. 337–342.
- AXELOS (2017) *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2*. 6th edn. London: The Stationery Office.
- Cooke-Davies, T. (2002) 'The “real” success factors on projects', *International Journal of Project Management*, 20(3), pp. 185–190.
- de Heredia, R. and Santana, G. (1991) 'Project-breakdown structure: the tool for representing the project system in project management', *International Journal of Project Management*, 9(3), pp. 157–161.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) 'From Nobel Prize to project management: getting risks right', *Project Management Journal*, 37(3), pp. 5–15.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Jugdev, K. and Müller, R. (2005) 'A retrospective look at our evolving understanding of project success', *Project Management Journal*, 36(4), pp. 19–31.
- Kerzner, H. (2009) *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. 10th edn. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Littau, P., Jujagiri, N.J. and Adlbrecht, G. (2010) '25 years of stakeholder theory in project management literature (1984–2009)', *Project Management Journal*, 41(4), pp. 17–29.
- Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. and Wood, D.J. (1997) 'Toward a theory of stakeholder

identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts', *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), pp. 853–886.

Serrador, P. and Turner, R. (2015) 'The relationship between project success and project efficiency', *Project Management Journal*, 46(1), pp. 30–39.

Silvius, A.J.G. and Schipper, R.P.J. (2014) 'Sustainability in project management competencies: analysing the competence gap of project managers', *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 2(2), pp. 40–48.

Too, E.G. and Weaver, P. (2014) 'The management of project management: a conceptual framework for project governance', *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), pp. 1382–1394.

Turner, J.R., Huemann, M., Anbari, F.T. and Bredillet, C.N. (2010) *Perspectives on Projects*. New York: Routledge.

Ward, S. and Chapman, C. (2003) 'Transforming project risk management into project uncertainty management', *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(2), pp. 97–105.

Zwikael, O. and Globerson, S. (2006) 'Benchmarking of project planning and success in selected industries', *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 13(6), pp. 688–