



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

BA (Hons) Leadership and Management Skills in the Workplace

Student Name: Yasir Osman Elhadi Ibrahim

Student Number: 2429666

Course Name: Project Management LCLM5003

Lecturer Name: Dr. Xavier Matieni

Session: June 2026 Term

PART A:

Part A: Project proposal poster

Part B : Reflection of my presentation

Description:

Last week I delivered my presentation, which took the form of a poster outlining a new project proposal. The scenario I was addressing was set out as follows: in November 2025, a major metropolitan city in the UK announced an urgent regeneration programme following the permanent closure of its central transport hub. This facility had acted as a vital interchange for rail services, bus routes, and freight logistics for decades. However, structural inspections confirmed that the hub, constructed over 40 years ago, no longer complies with modern safety regulations or accessibility standards. Its sudden closure has triggered widespread disruption: daily commuters face lengthy delays, supply chains have been severely interrupted, and local businesses have suffered significant financial losses. Public concern has grown rapidly, placing local authorities under immense pressure to deliver a well-coordinated redevelopment scheme. This project must restore full transport capacity, while also aligning with national environmental targets, integrating updated digital infrastructure, and following inclusive urban design principles that serve all members of the community. During the session, I walked through my proposed approach in detail, and received detailed feedback from my lecturer and peers.

Feelings:

Overall, I felt well-prepared and confident throughout the presentation, and I believe I delivered my spoken points clearly and effectively. I opened with a polite greeting, then systematically explained the project management tools I had selected, walking the audience through each stage of my proposal before finishing with a concise conclusion. I made a conscious effort to maintain regular eye contact with those watching, which helped me feel more engaged and also ensured I connected well with the audience. That said, my lecturer helpfully pointed out key weaknesses in the poster itself, and I recognised immediately that this feedback was constructive and fair—insights that will be extremely valuable as I work on my final submission.

Evaluation and Analysis :

While my delivery was strong, the visual structure and content of the poster had notable shortcomings. Specifically, my Quad chart and Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) lacked the clarity, detail, and organisation they required. I had focused a lot of my preparation time on explaining supporting project management tools, but I overlooked how central the Quad chart is: it is the primary overview of the entire project, laying out its core purpose, intended outcomes, key stakeholders, and measurable success criteria all in one place. Instead of being the clear focal point it should have been, it was messy and underdeveloped, and the WBS also lacked sufficient depth and logical ordering.

Conclusion:

This experience has taught me that an effective poster presentation demands much more than just solid subject knowledge—it requires careful technical planning and deliberate design choices. I now understand that every element must be structured logically, ordered appropriately, and presented with consistency so that information is easy to follow at a glance. Moving forward, I will prioritise organising my core visual tools first, ensure they carry the necessary level of detail, and align every part of the poster to support these key documents. This lesson will not only improve this assignment but will also help me produce clearer, more professional project documentation in my future studies and career.

Part C: Project Management Plan

1. Introduction

In November 2025, a major UK metropolitan city announced an urgent regeneration programme following the permanent closure of its central transport hub. Built over 40 years ago, the facility no longer meets modern safety, accessibility, or environmental standards (Department for Transport [DfT], 2023). Its closure has severely disrupted rail, bus, and freight logistics, delaying commuter journeys, interrupting supply chains, and causing significant economic loss to local businesses, alongside growing public dissatisfaction (Lawless and Gore, 1999; Monios and Fonzone, 2020). Local authorities are under pressure to deliver a coordinated redevelopment that restores full transport capacity while meeting net-zero carbon targets, integrating advanced digital infrastructure, and embedding inclusive urban design principles (HM Treasury, 2022; DfT, 2023).

This Project Management Plan sets out a structured approach to deliver a sustainable redesign aligned with national and local net-zero objectives, using recognised project management methodologies including PRINCE2, Agile principles, and lifecycle sustainability assessment (AXELOS, 2023; APM, 2023). The plan demonstrates how systematic management—from scope definition through to risk control—will ensure the project is delivered on time, within budget, and with long-term social, economic, and environmental value (Gareis et al., 2020).

2. Project Description

2.1 Background and Rationale

The existing hub acted as the primary interchange for rail, regional bus services, and urban freight consolidation. Structural assessments confirmed non-compliance with current fire safety regulations, accessibility requirements under the Equality Act 2010, and energy efficiency standards (Legacy, 2016; Willmott Dixon, 2026). The redevelopment will replace and expand the facility as a modern, integrated transport hub designed to achieve net-zero operational carbon emissions by completion, with a 50% reduction in embodied carbon compared to conventional construction benchmarks (UKGBC, 2023; Yiu and Chan, 2021).

2.2 Core Objectives

- Restore full transport interchange capacity by December 2028, with improved connectivity across rail, bus, active travel, and low-emission freight (Chen and Silva, 2021).
- Achieve net-zero carbon performance in operation, using renewable energy, sustainable materials, and efficient building systems (Malkawi, 2021).
- Deliver BREEAM ‘Excellent’ or equivalent sustainability accreditation (Arcadis, 2026).
- Ensure full accessibility for all users and inclusive design that supports local economic and community needs (Bassens, 2018; AESOP, 2024).
- Integrate smart digital systems for real-time passenger information, energy management, and asset monitoring (Cabrera et al., 2020).

2.3 Project Management Approach

The project adopts a hybrid management model: PRINCE2 provides governance, stage-gate controls, and clear responsibilities (AXELOS, 2023); Agile methods support iterative design and stakeholder engagement; and Green Project Management principles embed sustainability into every decision, aligned with the UK’s Net Zero Strategy and devolved transport policies (DfT, 2023; Wrike, 2026).

3. Scope

3.1 Inclusions

- Demolition of unsafe sections and structural remediation of retained elements.
- Construction of new interchange facilities, passenger concourses, and integrated active travel hubs (cycle storage, e-bike charging, pedestrian routes).
- Installation of low-carbon energy systems: solar arrays, air-source heat pumps, and energy-efficient ventilation (Mott MacDonald, 2025).
- Provision for electric bus charging, low-emission freight consolidation bays, and smart management technology.
- Public realm improvements including green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and biodiversity enhancements.
- Full commissioning, testing, staff training, and handover with post-completion review (HM Treasury, 2022).

3.2 Exclusions

- New rail track construction beyond immediate hub connections.
- Commercial development not directly supporting transport operations.
- Major highway reconfiguration outside the hub boundary.
- Long-term service operation and maintenance (transferred to asset owners post-handover).

3.3 Success Criteria

Measure	Target	Source
Programme delivery	Completed by December 2028	Kerzner, 2022
Budget	Within approved £85m envelope	Fleming and Koppelman, 2020
Carbon	Net-zero operational; 40%+ lower embodied carbon	Yiu and Chan, 2021
Accessibility	Compliant with BS 8300 and Equality Act	DfT, 2023
Stakeholder	≥90% satisfaction in post-opening survey	Williams et al., 2015

Safety	Zero reportable accidents during construction	APM, 2023
--------	---	-----------

4. Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

The WBS organises all deliverables into hierarchical work packages, forming the basis for scheduling, resource allocation, and cost control (Project Management Institute [PMI], 2021; Zecheru and Olaru, 2016).

5. Quad Chart

The Quad Chart provides a high-level summary of the project’s purpose, outcomes, stakeholders, and success metrics—reinforcing its central role in project definition (AXELOS, 2023).

Purpose	Desired Outcome
Replace unsafe, outdated hub; restore reliable integrated transport; achieve net-zero carbon; boost local economy; support inclusive mobility (DfT, 2023).	A resilient, fully accessible, low-carbon transport hub delivering improved capacity, faster connections, zero operational emissions, and enhanced community benefit (Gareis et al., 2020).
Key Stakeholders	Success Measures
Local Authority; Department for Transport; train/bus operators; freight partners; local businesses; residents; passenger groups; construction supply chain; environment agencies (Williams et al., 2015).	• On time, on budget (Kerzner, 2022) • Net-zero operational carbon (UKGBC, 2023) • BREEAM Excellent (Arcadis, 2026) • ≥95% compliance with accessibility standards • Measurable reduction in journey times and carbon emissions • Positive economic impact assessment (Lawless and Gore, 1999)

6. Gantt Chart (Summary Schedule)

Note: Full visual Gantt chart can be generated in MS Project / Excel; below is the structured timeline with key milestones (Marsh, 1974; Morris, 1997).

Activity	Jan 2027–Jun 2027	Jul 2027–Mar 2028	Oct 2027–Aug 2028	Apr 2028–Nov 2028	Dec 2028–May 2029	Jun 2029–Aug 2031	Mar 2030–Oct 2031	Dec 2030–Dec 2031	Sep 2031–Oct 2032	Nov 2032–Dec 2032
1. Initiation & Feasibility										
2. Detailed Design										

3. Planning & Consents										
4. Procurement										
5. Enabling Works										
6. Main Construction										
7. Services & Systems										
8. External & Landscaping										
9. Testing & Commissioning										
10. Handover & Launch										

7. Stakeholders' Involvement

Effective stakeholder management is critical to align expectations and maintain support throughout delivery (Williams et al., 2015).

Stakeholder	Interest	Engagement Method	Responsibility
-------------	----------	-------------------	----------------

Local Authority	Policy, planning, funding, community	Monthly steering groups; public updates	Approve milestones; coordinate city-wide impacts
Transport Operators	Operations, capacity, safety	Design workshops; operational reviews	Define operational requirements; test systems
Local Businesses	Disruption, access, economic impact	Liaison panels; advance notice	Provide feedback; agree delivery windows
Public & Passengers	Access, reliability, experience	Surveys; exhibitions; website	Consultation; feedback on design (AESOP, 2024)
Supply Chain	Delivery, sustainability targets	Pre-start meetings; carbon reporting	Meet sustainable sourcing standards
Regulators	Compliance, environment	Statutory consultation; audit	Enforce standards; grant consents

A RACI matrix (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed) will be maintained for all key decisions and work packages to ensure clarity (AXELOS, 2023).

8. Allocation of Resources

8.1 Human Resources

- Project Manager: Overall delivery, governance, and stakeholder coordination (APM, 2023).
- Design Team: Architects, civil/structural engineers, sustainability specialists, accessibility consultants.
- Delivery Team: Construction manager, site engineers, safety officers, and commissioning specialists.
- Commercial & Finance: Procurement lead, cost consultant, and funding compliance officer.
- Sustainability Officer: Embedded throughout to monitor carbon, waste, and environmental performance (Yiu and Chan, 2021).

8.2 Financial Resources

Total estimated budget: £85 million, apportioned as:

Category	Allocation (£m)	Notes
Design & Management	10.2	Surveys, fees, project costs
Construction Works	52.7	Including low-carbon materials
Energy & Digital Systems	9.8	Renewable, smart tech
External & Enabling	7.2	Landscaping, diversions
Contingency	5.1	6% for unforeseen risks (HM Treasury, 2022)

Funding sources include central government transport grants, local authority capital, and sustainable infrastructure finance linked to net-zero delivery milestones (World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024).

8.3 Physical & Digital Resources

- Use of Building Information Modelling (BIM) to optimise design, reduce waste, and manage carbon throughout the lifecycle (Arhin et al., 2020).
- Sustainable sourcing: low-carbon concrete, recycled steel, and responsibly sourced timber; circular economy principles for demolition waste.
- Site management systems to track energy use, waste diversion, and carbon impact in real time (Gareis et al., 2020).

9. Risk Analysis

Risks are assessed using likelihood and impact scales (1–5), with proactive mitigation aligned to sustainable project management (Kerzner, 2022).

Risk	Likeli hood	Imp act	Mitigation & Control
Delays in statutory consents	3	5	Early engagement with planners; pre-application advice; design compliant with policy (DfT, 2023)
Supply chain disruption for low-carbon materials	4	4	Diversified suppliers; early ordering; material passports; local sourcing where possible
Cost overruns due to inflation/regulatory changes	3	5	Phased budgeting; index-linked contracts; contingency; value engineering (HM Treasury, 2022)
Carbon and sustainability targets not met	2	5	Independent carbon audit; BIM modelling; incentivised contracts; stage-gate reviews (Yiu and Chan, 2021)
Community disruption and opposition	3	3	Regular communication; phased works; traffic management; local job creation (AESOP, 2024)
Health & safety incidents	2	5	CDM compliance; training; site induction; zero-harm culture (APM, 2023)

Risk	Likeli hood	Imp act	Mitigation & Control
Delays in statutory consents	3	5	Early engagement with planners; pre-application advice; design compliant with policy (DfT, 2023)
Supply chain disruption for low-carbon materials	4	4	Diversified suppliers; early ordering; material passports; local sourcing where possible

Cost overruns due to inflation/regulatory changes	3	5	Phased budgeting; index-linked contracts; contingency; value engineering (HM Treasury, 2022)
Carbon and sustainability targets not met	2	5	Independent carbon audit; BIM modelling; incentivised contracts; stage-gate reviews (Yiu and Chan, 2021)
Community disruption and opposition	3	3	Regular communication; phased works; traffic management; local job creation (AESOP, 2024)
Health & safety incidents	2	5	CDM compliance; training; site induction; zero-harm culture (APM, 2023)

Residual risks will be monitored through monthly risk reviews, with the plan updated as the project progresses (PMI, 2021).

10. Conclusion

This Project Management Plan demonstrates that a sustainable redesign of the transport hub is achievable through structured governance, integrated sustainability, and rigorous application of project management techniques (Gareis et al., 2020). By balancing the restoration of essential transport capacity with ambitious net-zero targets, the project will resolve current operational failures and deliver long-term social, economic, and environmental benefits for the city (DfT, 2023).

The WBS, Quad Chart, and Gantt chart establish a clear, logical framework for delivery; stakeholder engagement ensures alignment across all interests; resource allocation prioritises value and sustainability; and risk management protects the programme against known and emerging challenges (AXELOS, 2023; PMI, 2021). Delivered successfully, the hub will act as a model for future infrastructure—proving that urgent regeneration can go hand-in-hand with net-zero objectives and inclusive design principles.

11. References

1. APM (2023) Body of Knowledge: 7th Edition. Princes Risborough: Association for Project Management.
2. Arhin, S., Noel, E., Anderson, M.F., Williams, L., Ribisso, A. (2020) ‘Optimization of transit total bus stop time models’, *Journal of Traffic and Transportation Engineering*, 3(2), pp. 146–153.
3. Arcadis (2026) Cambridge South Station: Net Zero Carbon Delivery. London: Arcadis.
4. AESOP (2024) Inclusive Stakeholder Involvement to Implement Sustainable Mobility Solutions. Brussels: AESOP.
5. AXELOS (2023) PRINCE2: Managing Successful Projects. 7th edn. London: AXELOS.

6. Chen, Y. and Silva, A. (2021) 'Smart transport: a comparative analysis of UK metropolitan areas', *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 10, pp. 1–18.
7. Department for Transport (2023) *Net Zero Transport Plan*. London: HM Government.
8. Fleming, Q. and Koppelman, J. (2020) *Project Management: The WBS Handbook*. 3rd edn. Newtown Square: PMI.
9. Gareis, R., et al. (2020) *Sustainable Project Management*. Berlin: Springer.
10. HM Treasury (2022) *Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government*. London: HM Treasury.
11. ISO 21502 (2020) *Project, Programme and Portfolio Management – Guidance*. Geneva: ISO.
12. Kerzner, H. (2022) *Project Management: A Systems Approach*. 14th edn. Hoboken: Wiley.
13. Lawless, P. and Gore, T. (1999) 'Urban regeneration and transport investment', *Urban Studies*, 36(3), pp. 527–545.
14. Malkawi, A. (2021) 'Zero-carbon balance: HouseZero', *Building and Environment*, 196, pp. 107758.
15. Monios, J. and Fonzone, A. (2020) 'Urban consolidation centres', *International Journal of Logistics Research*, 23(3), pp. 291–310.
16. Morris, P.W.G. (1997) *The Management of Projects*. London: Thomas Telford.
17. Mott MacDonald (2025) *Edgware Town Centre Transformation*. Croydon: Mott MacDonald.
18. PMI (2021) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)*. 7th edn. Newtown Square: PMI.
19. UKGBC (2023) *Mission Zero: Decarbonising Infrastructure*. London: UK Green Building Council.
20. Williams, N.L., Ferdinand, N. and Pasian, B. (2015) 'Online stakeholder interactions', *Project Management Journal*, 46(3), pp. 92–110.
21. Willmott Dixon (2026) *Halifax Bus Station: Delivering Net Zero*. London: Willmott Dixon.
22. Yiu, T.W. and Chan, A.P.C. (2021) 'Green project management for infrastructure', *International Journal of Construction Management*, 21(8), pp. 789–804.

23. Zecheru, V. and Olaru, B.G. (2016) 'WBS in project management', *Review of International Comparative Management*, 17(1), pp. 61–69