



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2023 FIRST QUARTER CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY REPORT

Community Development Department
Information Services Division
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596
(434) 296-5832

INDEX

- I. Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units (Table I & Chart A)
- II. Comparison of Residential Dwelling Units by Type (Tables II, III, & IV)
- III. Comparison of All Building Permits (Table V)

KEY TO TYPES OF HOUSING REFERRED TO IN REPORT

SF	Single-Family (includes modular)
SFA	Single-Family Attached
SF/TH	Single-Family Townhouse
SFC	Single-Family Condominium
DUP	Duplex
MF	Multi-Family
MHC	Mobile Home in the County (not in an existing park)
AA	Accessory Apartment


During the 1st Quarter of 2023, 91 certificates of occupancy were issued for 196 dwelling units. There was one -1- permit issued for a mobile home in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500/unit, for a total of -\$2,500-. There were no certificates of occupancy issued for the conversion of an apartment to a condominium.

I. Comparison of Residential Dwelling Units

Table I. Nine Year Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units by Comprehensive Plan Development Area and Rural Area

Quarter	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		2023 Totals
	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	
1st Quarter	57	30	56	22	92	37	187	31	102	19	165	24	184	23	107	22	164	32	196
2nd Quarter	102	41	71	33	110	22	119	44	118	29	349	29	110	26	185	23	0	0	0
3rd Quarter	69	26	89	30	117	16	228	34	161	35	152	31	88	27	184	36	0	0	0
4th Quarter	58	25	93	23	164	35	188	39	171	30	371	22	467	35	191	31	0	0	0
COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS	286	122	309	108	483	110	722	148	552	113	1037	106	849	111	667	112	164	32	196
YEAR TO DATE TOTALS	408		417		593		870		665		1143		960		779		196		

Chart A. Nine Year Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units by Comprehensive Plan Development Area and Rural Area



1st Quarter 2023

II. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE

Table II. Breakdown of New Residential Dwelling Units by Magisterial District and Dwelling Unit Type

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT	DWELLING UNIT TYPE								TOTAL UNITS	% TOTAL UNITS
	SF	SFA	SF/TH	SFC	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
RIO	4	0	12	0	0	72	0	0	88	45%
JACK JOUETT	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
RIVANNA	8	0	1	0	0	48	0	1	58	30%
SAMUEL MILLER	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6%
SCOTTSVILLE	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	6%
WHITE HALL	17	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	25	13%
TOTAL	47	1	26	0	0	120	0	2	196	100%

Table III. Breakdown of New Residential Dwelling Units by Comprehensive Plan Area and Dwelling Unit Type

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AREA	DWELLING UNIT TYPE								TOTAL UNITS	% TOTAL UNITS
	SF	SFA	SF/TH	SFC	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 1	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	2%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	1	0	0	0	0	48	0	0	49	25%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	4%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN AREAS SUBTOTAL	4	1	18	0	0	48	0	0	71	36%
CROZET COMMUNITY	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	17	9%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	0	0	1	0	0	72	0	0	73	37%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL	9	0	8	0	0	72	0	1	90	46%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2%
VILLAGE SUBTOTAL	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2%
TOWN OF SCOTTSVILLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOWN SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
DEVELOPMENT AREA SUBTOTAL	16	1	26	0	0	120	0	1	164	84%
RURAL AREA 1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7%
RURAL AREA 2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4%
RURAL AREA 3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5%
RURAL AREA 4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	16%
TOTAL	47	1	26	0	0	120	0	2	196	100%

II. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE (continued)

Table IV. Breakdown of Residential Dwelling Units by Elementary School District and Dwelling Unit Type

SCHOOL DISTRICT	DWELLING UNIT TYPE								TOTAL	% TOTAL
	SF	SFA	SF/TH	SFC	DUP	MF	MHC	AA	UNITS	UNITS
Agnor-Hurt	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5%
Baker Butler	1	0	0	0	0	72	0	0	73	37%
Broadus Wood	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4%
Brownsville	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	7%
Crozet	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	4%
Greer	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	2%
Hollymead	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Meriwether Lewis	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3%
Mountain View	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5%
Murray	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Red Hill	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3%
Scottsville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Stone Robinson	8	0	0	0	0	48	0	1	57	29%
Stony Point	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2%
Woodbrook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOTAL	47	1	26	0	0	120	0	2	196	100%

III. COMPARISON OF ALL BUILDING PERMITS

Table V. Estimated Cost of Construction by Magisterial District and Construction Type

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT	*NEW RESIDENTIAL		*NEW NON-RES & ALTER. RES		* NEW COMMERCIAL & NEW		FARM BUILDING & ALTER. COMM.		TOTAL	
	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$
RIO	19	9,383,496	0	0	1	0	1	50,000	21	9,433,496
JOUETT	2	2,687,000	0	0	0	0	2	475,000	4	3,162,000
RIVANNA	11	10,708,326	0	0	1	1,200,000	1	15,000,000	13	26,908,326
SAMUEL MILLER	11	11,276,777	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11,276,777
SCOTTSVILLE	12	3,281,000	2	70,000	1	6,000,000	2	700,000	17	10,051,000
WHITE HALL	25	11,811,431	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11,811,431
TOTAL	80	49,148,030	2	70,000	3	7,200,000	6	16,225,000	91	72,643,030

* Additional value of mobile homes placed in existing parks is included in the Alteration Residential category.

* Additional value of Single-Family Condominium Conversions is included in the Alteration Residential category.

* Additional value of condominium shell buildings is included in the New Non-Residential category. Additional permitting associated with the residential component of condominium shell buildings will be necessary and reported in other tables of the Building Report as permitting occurs.

** Additional value of mixed use buildings is included in the New Commercial category. Mixed use buildings are comprised of residential and commercial uses. Additional permitting associated with the residential component of mixed use buildings will be necessary and reported in other tables of the Building Report as permitting occurs.