



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2023 FIRST QUARTER BUILDING 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, 433 building permits were issued for 94 dwelling units. There were zero -0- permits issued for a mobile home in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500/unit, for a total of \$-0-. There were no permits 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
	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Totals
1st Quarter	90	15	92	31	222	41	487	37	512	18	435	29	191	41	132	45	64	30	94
2nd Quarter	79	51	266	40	219	35	265	40	166	32	294	30	121	30	231	45	0	0	0
3rd Quarter	144	38	127	53	114	42	76	29	190	47	408	41	99	23	390	29	0	0	0
4th Quarter	56	41	205	42	132	46	99	42	132	37	75	30	295	38	20	22	0	0	0
COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS	369	145	690	166	687	164	927	148	1000	134	1212	130	706	132	773	141	64	30	94
YEAR TO DATE TOTALS	514		856		851		1075		1134		1342		838		914		94		

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
JACK JOUETT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11%
SAMUEL MILLER	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	10%
SCOTTSVILLE	7	0	19	0	0	6	1	0	33	35%
WHITE HALL	16	0	23	0	0	0	0	2	41	44%
TOTAL	41	0	43	0	0	6	2	2	94	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	0	0	19	0	0	6	0	0	25	27%
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	1	0	20	0	0	6	0	0	27	29%
CROZET COMMUNITY	6	0	23	0	0	0	0	2	31	33%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL	11	0	23	0	0	0	0	2	36	38%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
VILLAGE SUBTOTAL	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
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	13	0	43	0	0	6	0	2	64	68%
RURAL AREA 1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9%
RURAL AREA 2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6%
RURAL AREA 3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5%
RURAL AREA 4	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	12%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	30	32%
TOTAL	41	0	43	0	0	6	2	2	94	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Baker Butler	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5%
Broadus Wood	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Brownsville	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	6%
Crozet	7	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	30	32%
Greer	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Hollymead	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Meriwether Lewis	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5%
Mountain View	1	0	19	0	0	6	0	0	26	28%
Murray	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Red Hill	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	5%
Scottsville	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	6%
Stone Robinson	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4%
Stony Point	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Woodbrook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOTAL	41	0	43	0	0	6	2	2	94	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	1	150,000	36	1,604,918	0	0	9	648,900	46	2,403,818
JOUETT	0	0	25	3,215,422	0	0	8	1,295,201	33	4,510,623
RIVANNA	10	6,323,279	52	3,775,534	0	0	8	904,000	70	11,002,813
SAMUEL MILLER	9	7,415,000	76	11,255,378	2	520,000	5	557,486	92	19,747,864
SCOTTSVILLE	27	7,606,639	43	4,133,046	0	0	8	16,324,500	78	28,064,185
WHITE HALL	40	11,586,500	64	4,745,784	3	15,200	6	1,759,000	113	18,106,484
TOTAL	87	33,081,418	296	28,730,083	5	535,200	44	21,489,087	432	83,835,788

* 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.