



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2020 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 third quarter of 2019, 188 certificates of occupancy were issued for 196 dwelling units. There was 1 permit issued for a mobile home in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500, 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	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2020 Totals
	Dev	Rural																	
1st Quarter	95	10	104	10	38	20	57	30	56	22	92	37	187	31	102	19	165	24	189
2nd Quarter	108	21	260	22	72	28	102	41	71	33	110	22	119	44	118	29	0	0	0
3rd Quarter	215	22	81	17	77	20	69	26	89	30	117	16	228	34	161	35	0	0	0
4th Quarter	258	23	55	29	70	50	58	25	93	23	164	35	188	39	171	30	0	0	0
COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS	676	76	500	78	257	118	286	122	309	108	483	110	722	148	552	113	165	24	189
YEAR TO DATE TOTALS	752		578		375		408		417		593		870		665		189		

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



* Year-to-date total only

1st Quarter 2020

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	7	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	25	13%
JACK JOUETT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	7%
SAMUEL MILLER	18	0	0	0	0	56	0	0	74	39%
SCOTTSVILLE	15	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	34	18%
WHITE HALL	26	2	14	0	0	0	1	0	43	23%
TOTAL	70	3	59	0	0	56	1	0	189	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	6%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	12	6%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	8%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	7	0	0	0	0	56	0	0	63	33%
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	15	1	31	0	0	56	0	0	103	54%
CROZET COMMUNITY	21	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	37	20%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	3%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	4%
COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL	23	2	24	0	0	0	0	0	49	26%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	7%
VILLAGE SUBTOTAL	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	7%
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	47	3	59	0	0	56	0	0	165	87%
RURAL AREA 1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	2%
RURAL AREA 2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
RURAL AREA 3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4%
RURAL AREA 4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	24	13%
TOTAL	70	3	59	0	0	56	1	0	189	100%

1st Quarter 2020

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 UNITS	% TOTAL UNITS
	SF	SFA	SF/TH	SFC	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
Agnor-Hurt	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	6%
Baker Butler	3	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	13	7%
Broadus Wood	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1%
Brownsville	17	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	31	16%
Cale	11	0	15	0	0	56	0	0	82	43%
Crozet	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	4%
Greer	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Hollymead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Meriwether Lewis	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Murray	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Red Hill	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3%
Scottsville	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2%
Stone Robinson	13	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	26	14%
Stony Point	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2%
Woodbrook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOTAL	70	3	59	0	0	56	1	0	189	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 INSTITUT.		FARM BUILDING & ALTER. COMM.		TOTAL	
	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$
RIO	25	\$ 4,863,050	3	\$ 585,000	1	\$ 15,700,000	3	\$ 850,000	32	\$ 21,998,050
JOUETT	0	\$ -	6	\$ 362,000	0	\$ -	0	\$ -	6	\$ 362,000
RIVANNA	13	\$ 3,772,300	13	\$ 301,700	0	\$ -	5	\$ 1,621,643	31	\$ 5,695,643
S. MILLER	20	\$ 11,918,200	14	\$ 842,634	1	\$ 500,000	2	\$ 694,227	37	\$ 13,955,061
SCOTTSVILLE	34	\$ 6,341,744	6	\$ 397,500	2	\$ 275,000	4	\$ 1,395,000	46	\$ 8,409,244
WHITE HALL	43	\$ 10,336,384	17	\$ 786,441	0	\$ -	1	\$ 400,000	61	\$ 11,522,825
TOTAL	135	\$ 37,231,678	59	\$ 3,275,275	4	\$ 16,475,000	15	\$ 4,960,870	213	\$ 61,942,823

* 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.