FOLLOW THE THREADS

INDEPENDENT CUSTOMER JOURNEY RESEARCH

Before the guest decides to book.

HOLLY LODGE / ALNWICK / HOSPITALITY



THE ASSIGNMENT

A prospective guest wants a three-night stay, a fair direct-booking offer and clear information about the room before committing. The public pages give useful answers — but four points still need explaining.

4 substantiated questions • 5 public sources • 1 decision journey

An honest, source-attributed example of the £250 founding-client service. This was not commissioned by Holly Lodge. No purchase, availability booking, code redemption, customer interview or private analytics were performed.

WHAT THE OWNER WOULD GET

Plain-English findings, evidence links, priority decisions, proposed wording and a practical recheck list — not imagined lost revenue.

PREPARED BY NATASHA & CHATEROONUS

02 NOVEMBER 2026 • V3

THE DECISION BRIEF

What a guest needs to know.

A high-impact overview, not a severity certification. Priorities are editorial judgments about where uncertainty could affect a booking.

THE CENTRAL CUSTOMER QUESTION

Can I understand the offer, cancellation terms and room suitability well enough to choose a booking route without a clarifying call?

01 Cancellation cut-off

HIGH

Two phrases leave the refund deadline open to interpretation.

S1 + S2

02 Access information

HIGH

A specialist-room description meets a blanket platform warning.

S3 + S4

03 Direct-booking offers

MED

Four visible code names; relationship and eligibility unclear.

S1 + S2

04 Room inventory

MED

A public directory uses both five and six; first-party site says five.

S3 + S5

WHAT IS ALREADY WORKING

The official site puts direct online booking and a phone number in plain sight; a useful foundation for clearer offer and policy details.

MAPPED CUSTOMER ROUTE

Five moments of truth.

Scenario: a prospective adult guest compares three nights, promotional terms and step-free needs. The path is hypothetical; page content was reviewed, not a completed user test.

01

DISCOVER

S3 ↗

Visit Alnwick directory

A property description introduces a ground-floor modified room and conflicting bedroom totals.

02

VALIDATE

S1 ↗

Holly Lodge official homepage

The guest sees five rooms, visible direct-booking links, multiple promotional codes and a refund statement.

03

EXPLORE

S5 ↗

Holly Lodge accommodation page

The website says five bedrooms and describes bathrooms, but does not give a feature-by-feature access specification.

04

COMPARE

S2 ↗

Direct-booking engine

The reservation service shows a cancellation phrase worded differently from the main website. No booking was attempted.

05

DECIDE

S4 ↗

WHAT THIS MAP PROVES

The customer faces reconciliation work across separate public surfaces. The report does not establish whether anyone abandoned a booking, what rates were available, or how the property operates internally.

EVIDENCE FILE / HIGH PRIORITY

Clarify the decision-critical facts.

Two differences merit an owner decision before replacement wording is published.

01

CANCELLATION: WHEN IS THE LAST REFUNDABLE MOMENT?

HIGH

OFFICIAL HOMEPAGE S1

“up to 48 hours prior”

The site describes a full deposit refund using a before-arrival phrase.

DIRECT BOOKING ENGINE S2

“within 48 hours of arrival date”

The booking platform uses a phrase that could suggest the final 48 hours.

Interpretation: A cautious guest cannot safely infer the final eligible date and time from these two phrasings alone. We have not checked the contractual policy or a rate-specific condition.

OWNER DECISION + ACCEPTANCE TEST

Confirm the actual deadline, arrival time, time zone, deposit treatment and exceptions. Publish one plain-language rule and an illustrative date/time example on both surfaces; recheck a fresh booking session.

02

ACCESS: WHAT CAN A GUEST RELY ON?

HIGH

VISITOR DIRECTORY S3

“ground floor disabled room”

A directory uses a broad modified-room description.

BOOKING PLATFORM S4

“does not have disability access”

Booking.com presents a blanket warning.

Interpretation: The statements may reflect different definitions. Neither establishes whether a specific room or route meets an individual guest’s needs. The safe answer is feature-level information.

OWNER DECISION + ACCEPTANCE TEST

Verify the entrance, thresholds, room location, doorway sizes, bathroom design, parking and assistance. Publish a factual access guide and align all active listings; avoid unverified blanket labels.

EVIDENCE FILE / MEDIUM PRIORITY

Make the offer simple to trust.

Neither of these is proof of a broken system. Both are public wording questions worth resolving.

03

PROMOTIONS: WHICH CODE SHOULD THE GUEST ENTER?

MED

HOMEPAGE PROMOTIONS S1

“3NIGHT, 4NIGHT, 5NIGHT”

Three codes are displayed without a comparison.

ANOTHER HOMEPAGE CALL-OUT S1

“USE CODE 2026”

The same page advertises 5% for three or more nights.

Interpretation: The visitor is shown four codes but no concise map of savings, eligible dates, stacking or which to choose. An offer may be valid without being easy to select. No code was submitted or tested.

OWNER DECISION + ACCEPTANCE TEST

Confirm which codes are currently active and eligible. Add a small offer table showing code, nights, saving, stay dates and exclusions. Test each claim against the live booking platform before publishing.

04

INVENTORY: FIVE ROOMS OR SIX?

MED

FIRST-PARTY ACCOMMODATION S5

“5 individual bedrooms”

The property site consistently presents five.

VISITOR DIRECTORY S3

“Our 6 contemporary bedrooms”

The same directory also states five elsewhere.

Interpretation: The directory copy is internally inconsistent and differs from the first-party site. We have not verified the number of currently sellable rooms with the owner.

OWNER DECISION + ACCEPTANCE TEST

Confirm current room count, type and photographs. Supply one corrected summary to the visitor-directory editor and verify the live revision; do not edit the first-party count unless the owner confirms it is wrong.

EVIDENCE REGISTER

Five sources. Every claim traceable.

Source extracts were read on 2 November 2026 using live page retrieval. These are short text extracts, not screenshots; the linked pages may subsequently change.

S1

Official homepage

Direct-booking codes 3NIGHT / 4NIGHT / 5NIGHT and 2026; five rooms; 48-hour refund wording.

OPEN ORIGINAL SOURCE ↗

S2

Direct booking engine

Shows 48-hour deposit-refund phrase and five named room entries. No booking or code use.

OPEN ORIGINAL SOURCE ↗

S3

Visit Alnwick

Uses five- and six-room descriptions and describes a modified ground-floor room.

OPEN ORIGINAL SOURCE ↗

S4

Booking.com

Displays an access warning and booking conditions that vary by room/rate.

OPEN ORIGINAL SOURCE ↗

S5

Accommodation page

REPRODUCIBILITY NOTE

All source links are clickable in this PDF. Extracts identify public wording at the inspection date, not legally operative terms or proof that a guest experienced the described issue.

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Make the corrections testable.

The owner confirms facts; the web or booking-platform administrator applies edits. This is a proposed plan, not a record of changes performed.

P1

Clarify cancellations

Owner + booking provider

Write one unambiguous cut-off with an example time; reconcile deposits, exceptions and platform rate terms.

Pass when: Same rule on both channels; owner signs off on an example booking.

P1

Publish verified access facts

Owner + property team

Record step-free route, thresholds, room position, bathroom and parking facts. Replace broad claims with specifics.

Pass when: First-party guide and third-party descriptions accurately match physical features.

P2

Simplify promotion selection

Owner + booking provider

Check active code eligibility, stay dates, stacking rules and actual savings; remove expired text.

Pass when: One comparison table; test each advertised code and document result.

P2

Correct room listings

Owner + Visit Alnwick editor

Confirm inventory and send a single approved listing description.

Pass when: Five/six contradiction removed from current public listing.

P2

Repeat the public journey

Independent reviewer

Revisit the same route after publication; timestamp public evidence and exceptions.

Pass when: Source ledger updated and each issue recorded as fixed, unresolved or changed.

METHOD / VALUE / NEXT STEP

Receipts, not reassurances.

A credible investigation names what it inspected, what it did not inspect, and the decisions its evidence can support.

WORK PERFORMED

Read public text from the official homepage, accommodation page, direct-booking engine, visitor directory and booking platform; compared overlapping claims; mapped one hypothetical booking decision; recorded four issues and proposed owner-verifiable fixes.

NOT PERFORMED

No commission or endorsement by Holly Lodge. No customer study, personal visit, accessibility inspection, checkout, reservation, promo-code redemption, screenshot capture, owner interview, access to analytics or evidence of revenue loss.

WHAT A PAID CUSTOMER RECEIVES

A one-off £250 founding-client public digital journey review: a defined customer scenario, up to five documented findings, evidence links, prioritised fix recommendations and a concise written report. Fewer than five findings is acceptable if fewer issues are supportable. We confirm the scope and delivery date by email before starting.

VIEW THE VERIFIED £250 PAYMENT LINK ↗

HOW AN OWNER CAN MEASURE IMPROVEMENT

After a correction, log enquiries mentioning refunds, access, room totals or offers; compare the clarity of the amended pages with the recorded source register. If the business has booking funnel analytics, examine those separately, with baseline and date ranges. No uplift, conversion rate or financial ROI is claimed here.

CONTACT

chateroonus@gmail.com ↗

Follow the Threads — research with evidence, uncertainty where it belongs, and no invented outcomes. Prepared by Natasha and Chateroonus.