

Hyde & Co.

FREE RESOURCE · NO. XIV

AI for your website, *afterwards*

Where it genuinely helps, where it quietly wrecks a site, and
the rule that tells you which.

The capstone of the series, and deliberately last. **Automate only what you
could do yourself and could check afterwards** — because AI is confidently
wrong in ways that look exactly like being right.

FREE TO USE AND SHARE
THE CAPSTONE — READ THE OTHER THIRTEEN FIRST

AN AGENCY FOR BUSINESS OWNERS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA



Why this one comes last

Every other guide in this library teaches you to do something by hand: audit your own site, diagnose why it is not producing leads, fix your Google Business Profile, write your own pages, read your own numbers.

You could have used AI for most of that. It would have been faster.

This guide exists to explain why you should not have, and what changes now that you have.

The reason is not that AI is bad at these tasks. It is often very good. The reason is that AI is *confidently* wrong in ways that look exactly like being right, and the only defence is a person who knows the subject well enough to notice. If you have never audited a website, you cannot evaluate an AI's audit of yours. You can only accept it.

This is the difference between a tool and a dependency. A tool makes a capable person faster. A dependency makes an incapable person feel capable, right up until something breaks and nobody in the building knows why.

So: fundamentals first, automation second. Not because automation is dangerous, but because judgement is the part you cannot outsource, and judgement only comes from having done the thing.

YOU MAY AUTOMATE ANY TASK YOU COULD DO YOURSELF, AND COULD CHECK AFTERWARDS

That is the whole rule. It has two halves and both matter.

"Could do yourself" means you understand what a good output looks like. You know what a page title is for, what makes a location page thin, what a form field costs you.

"Could check afterwards" means you can spot an error. If AI writes you a paragraph about your industry's regulations and you cannot tell whether it is accurate, you have not saved time — you have moved risk somewhere you cannot see it.

Applying it

TASK	COULD YOU DO IT?	COULD YOU CHECK IT?	VERDICT
Rewrite 50 page titles	Yes	Yes, by reading them	Automate
Write alt text for 200 images	Yes	Yes, by looking	Automate
Turn your notes into a first draft	Yes	Yes, you wrote the notes	Automate
Summarise 300 reviews into themes	Yes, slowly	Yes, by spot-checking	Automate
Write about a trade you do not know	No	No	Do not
Decide which of your problems matters most	—	This is judgement, not output	Do not
Generate 40 location pages	No, not honestly	No	Do not
Answer a compliance question	No	No	Do not

Notice that the "do not" rows are not about capability. AI can produce all of them. They are about whether *you* would catch it being wrong.

Not vibes. Policy, quoted.

AI content is allowed

"Appropriate use of AI or automation is not against our guidelines."

Google has been explicit about this since 2023. There is no penalty for using AI.

What is not allowed

"Using automation — including AI — to generate content with the primary purpose of manipulating ranking in search results is a violation of our spam policies."

The relevant policy is **scaled content abuse**:

"Scaled content abuse is when many pages are generated for the primary purpose of manipulating search rankings and not helping users."

With this example listed directly: *"Using generative AI tools or other similar tools to generate many pages without adding value for users."*

The detail that clarifies everything

When Google updated this policy in March 2024, it made explicit that it applies **whether the content was produced by automation or by humans**.

Google's objection is not the tool. It is scale without value. A thousand AI-written pages that help nobody are spam. So are a thousand human-written ones. One AI-assisted page that genuinely answers a question is fine.

That framing should be reassuring, because it means the standard has not changed. It is the same standard the rest of this library describes: be useful to a real person.

The three questions Google asks

- **Who** — *"Is it self-evident to your visitors who authored your content?"*
- **How** — *"Is the use of automation, including AI-generation, self-evident to visitors through disclosures or in other ways?"*
- **Why** — *"The 'why' should be that you're creating content primarily to help people, content that is useful to visitors if they come to your site directly."*

That last clause is the test to keep. Would this page be useful to someone who arrived at it directly, with no search engine involved? If not, you are writing for a machine — and that is precisely what the scaled content policy is aimed at.

And one warning sign Google names directly

Among the questions Google publishes for assessing your own content:

"Is the content mass-produced by or outsourced to a large number of creators, so that individual pages don't get as much attention or care?"

Google wrote that before the current wave of AI tools, and it describes exactly what happens when you generate fifty pages in an afternoon.

Organised by the guide it relates to, so you can see the prerequisite in each case.

Auditing and diagnosis

Do manually first: at least one full audit of your own site, by hand.

Then automate: summarising a long list of issues into priorities you then review; explaining a technical term a developer used; drafting the brief you hand to whoever fixes things.

Never automate: deciding which problem costs you the most. That requires knowing your margins, your seasonality and your customers.

Content

Do manually first: write your first five pages yourself. Build the customer-question list from your own phone calls.

Then automate: turning your rough notes into a structured draft; generating outlines from a list of questions; drafting fifty unique meta descriptions; writing alt text; converting a recorded conversation into an article skeleton; tightening something you wrote too long.

Never automate: claims about your own work, anything with a number in it you have not verified, or content in a field where you cannot check accuracy.

The best pattern by far: talk for ten minutes about a job you did — the problem, what you found, what you did, how it turned out. Transcribe it. Have AI structure it. Then edit it back into your own voice. You get expertise no competitor can generate, in a fraction of the time, and every fact came from you.

Copy

Do manually first: write your own homepage headline. Sit with why it is hard.

Then automate: generating twenty variations of a headline you already wrote, to react against; rewriting a paragraph at three different lengths; converting features into benefits so you can see which land.

Never automate: your differentiators. AI will produce "quality service you can trust," because that is the average of everything ever written. Your actual difference is a specific fact only you know.

Local presence

Do manually first: claim your profile, set your category, write your own review replies for a month.

Then automate: drafting replies you personalise before sending; summarising themes across hundreds of reviews; turning a job list into location-page material.

Never automate: sending review replies unedited. Ten AI-smooth, near-identical replies read exactly like what they are, and they signal a business that does not read its reviews.

Analytics

Do manually first: three monthly reviews, by hand, following the six-numbers routine.

Then automate: explaining what a metric means; summarising a data export into plain language; drafting a monthly summary you check against the source.

Never automate: deciding what to do next. Every AI will suggest the plausible average action, which is rarely your best one.

Technical work

Do manually first: understand what the three Core Web Vitals measure and how to read field data.

Then automate: explaining an error message; drafting a robots.txt you then read line by line; generating structured data you validate with Google's testing tool.

Never automate: applying generated code to a live site without a backup and someone who understands it. AI-generated robots.txt files that accidentally block a whole site are a real and recurring problem — and it is the most expensive mistake in this entire library.

These are not hypotheticals. They are the recurring failure patterns.

It invents things that sound right

Statistics, studies, citations, case law, product specifications, regulatory requirements. Plausible, specific, and false. The failure mode is not gibberish — it is *confident correctness*, which is far harder to catch.

If you cannot verify a fact yourself, do not publish it. Every guide in this library cites its sources for exactly this reason.

It produces the average of everything

Trained on the whole internet, AI reliably outputs the middle of it. That is precisely the "we pride ourselves on quality service" voice you are trying to escape. **The average is what your competitors already sound like.**

It makes thin content at unprecedented speed

Forty location pages in an afternoon is now trivial. It is also the exact pattern Google's spam policies call **doorway abuse** — *"having multiple domain names or pages targeted at specific regions or cities that funnel users to one page."*

Before AI, this was too much work to do accidentally. Now it takes one prompt.

It cannot know what it does not have

AI does not know your response times, your warranty, the three objections your sales team hears, or what went wrong on that job in March. Those are the only things that differentiate you — and they are the only things AI structurally cannot supply.

It creates compliance exposure

Ask AI to draft a review request and it may cheerfully suggest offering a discount — which violates Google's policy outright and sits uncomfortably against the FTC's rule on consumer reviews. Ask it about a regulated trade and it may state a requirement that does not apply in your state.

AI does not know which rules apply to you, and it will not tell you it does not know.

It degrades your judgement, quietly

The subtlest cost. Delegate something long enough without checking and you lose the ability to check. Six months later you cannot evaluate your own website, your agency, or the next tool you are sold.

That is the real argument for doing it manually first. Not that manual is better — it is that manual is what makes you able to supervise.

A routine for anything AI produces that you intend to publish.

1. **Every fact, individually.** Numbers, dates, names, claims about your business, claims about the law. If you cannot verify it, cut it.
2. **Every citation.** AI invents plausible-looking sources. If it names a study, find the study. If you cannot find it, it may not exist.
3. **Every claim about your own work.** Did you actually do that? In that timeframe? For that kind of customer?
4. **The voice.** Read it out loud. Where you would not say it to a customer, rewrite it.
5. **The average-sentence test.** Could a competitor publish this unchanged? If yes, you have published the average.
6. **The direct-arrival test.** Would this be useful to someone who landed here with no search engine involved? This is Google's own "why" question.
7. **What is missing.** AI produces what you asked for. It does not tell you what you should have asked for. That gap is your job, and it is the part experience fills.

Where it is actually required

Google Merchant Center, if you sell products: since 2024, AI-generated product text must be disclosed through specific structured attributes, and AI-generated images must retain their origin metadata identifying them as machine-generated. These are requirements, not suggestions.

Reviews and testimonials, under the FTC rule in effect since October 2024: fake reviews are prohibited, and civil penalties apply to knowing violations. An AI-generated review of your own business is a fake review. There is no ambiguity here.

Anyone connected to your business who writes a review must disclose the relationship. That includes reviews assisted or drafted by a tool on their behalf.

Where it is a judgement call

Ordinary website content. Google's position is that disclosure is useful *"for content where someone might think 'How was this created?'"*

A practical standard: **disclose where the reader would feel misled to learn the truth**. A product description drafted with AI and edited by you needs no notice. An article presented as your personal account of a job, written entirely by a machine, does.

The honest framing

You do not need a banner on every page. You do need to not claim experience you did not have. "Written by our team, with AI assistance" is a perfectly respectable line, and it costs you nothing with readers who are — by now — assuming it anyway.

The AI-visibility market is where SEO snake oil went in 2026. Google has addressed most of it directly.

"You need an llms.txt file to appear in AI answers."

Google, May 2026: *"You don't need to create new machine readable files, AI text files, markup, or Markdown to appear in generative AI search."*

"Add schema markup and you'll get cited by AI."

Google: *"Structured data isn't required for generative AI search, and there's no special schema.org markup you need to add."* A 2026 Ahrefs analysis found no meaningful causal link between adding schema and being cited by AI features.

"You must chunk your content for AI to parse it."

Google: *"There's no requirement to break your content into tiny pieces for AI to better understand it."*

"You need to write in a special AI-friendly style."

Google: *"You don't need to write in a specific way just for generative AI search."*

"Buy mentions across the web to build AI authority."

Google: *"Seeking inauthentic 'mentions' across the web isn't as helpful as it might seem."*

And the sentence that should settle it

"The best practices for SEO continue to be relevant because our generative AI features on Google Search are rooted in our core Search ranking and quality systems."

There is no separate AI strategy to buy. There is writing genuinely useful pages, which is what the other thirteen guides describe. Anyone selling you an "AI visibility package" is selling you the thing you already have, at a markup, on the strength of your uncertainty.

The prerequisite table

The whole library, as a sequence. Master the left column before automating the right.

GUIDE	DO THIS MANUALLY FIRST	THEN YOU MAY AUTOMATE
The Website Playbook	Work through the eight phases for your own site	Explaining concepts, drafting briefs
The Audit Scorecard	One full 50-point audit, by hand	Summarising findings, prioritisation drafts you review
Why You're Not Getting Leads	Diagnose your own three gaps	Drafting fixes for problems you identified
The Local SEO Playbook	Claim, categorise, and reply for a month	Draft replies, review theme summaries
The Conversion Playbook	Test one change and measure it	Generating variations to test
Hiring a Developer	Read one contract properly	Explaining clauses — never replacing legal advice
The Content Engine	Build the question list from real calls	Outlines, drafts, meta descriptions, alt text
The Copy Kit	Write your own headline	Twenty variations of it
Speed & the Invisible Stuff	Read your own field data	Explaining errors, drafting configuration you check
The Numbers That Matter	Three monthly reviews by hand	Summaries you verify against source
The Online Store Playbook	Complete your own checkout on a phone	Product descriptions from real specifications
Reviews & Reputation	Reply to every review for a month	Draft replies you personalise
Launch & Handoff	One launch, with the checklist	Nothing. This one is all judgement

The short version

1. Automate only what you could do yourself **and could check afterwards**
2. Google allows AI content — what it penalises is **scale without value**, by machine or by human
3. The test: would this page help someone who arrived directly, with no search engine?
4. AI cannot know your response times, your warranty, or your customers' real objections — and those are your only differentiators
5. Verify every fact and every citation. AI invents plausible ones
6. Read it aloud. If you would not say it to a customer, rewrite it
7. Never publish generated content in a field you cannot fact-check
8. Never let AI touch reviews or compliance
9. Disclose where a reader would feel misled to learn the truth
10. You do not need llms.txt, special schema, chunking, or an AI-visibility package
11. The best AI workflow is still: **you talk, it structures, you edit**

— JUDGEMENT IS THE PART YOU CANNOT OUTSOURCE

We use these tools. We still *check* them.

Everything in this guide applies to us as much as to you. We use AI daily, for the repetitive parts, and we check every fact it produces.

That discipline is most of what you are buying from any firm worth hiring. **Hyde & Co. is an agency for business owners** — built with judgement, hosted, watched, and owned by you.

i. We tell you which parts of your work are worth automating.

ii. We tell you which are not, and why that is the more useful answer.

iii. You keep the judgement, because that is the part that compounds.

No obligation, and no charge for the conversation.

[Book a consultation](#)

hyde-co.com

HYDE & CO. · ORLANDO, FLORIDA

WE BUILD ASSETS, NOT JUST WEBSITES

Sources

USED IN	SOURCE
Part 2 — AI content allowed	Google Search blog, <i>Google Search and AI-generated content</i> (February 2023); Google Search Central, <i>Using generative AI content</i>
Part 2 — scaled content abuse	Google Search Central, <i>Spam policies for Google web search</i> — scaled content abuse, with generative AI named as an example; March 2024 update clarifying it applies to human-produced content equally
Parts 2, 4 — quality questions	Google, <i>Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content</i> — the Who/How/Why framework and the self-assessment questions, including mass production
Part 4 — doorway abuse	Google Search Central, <i>Spam policies</i> — pages targeted at specific regions or cities funnelling users to one page
Part 6 — Merchant Center	Google Merchant Center announcements — AI-generated text disclosure via structured attributes (2024); AI-generated image origin metadata requirement (2024)
Part 6 — reviews	FTC, <i>Rule on the Use of Consumer Reviews and Testimonials</i> , effective 21 October 2024 — civil penalties for knowing violations; disclosure required for insider reviews
Part 7 — AI visibility myths	Google Search Central, <i>Optimizing your website for generative AI features on Google Search</i> (May 2026); Ahrefs analysis of structured data and AI citations (2026)

This guide is free to use and share.

The only goal is better websites and better results.

Read the other thirteen first. That is not a marketing line — it is the actual argument of this document.