



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2022 FOURTH 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 4thquarter of 2022, 136 certificates of occupancy were issued for 222 dwelling units. There were three -4- permits issued for a mobile home in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500/unit, for a total of -\$10,000-. 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	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2021
	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Totals
1st Quarter	38	20	57	30	56	22	92	37	187	31	102	19	165	24	177	23	108	21	129
2nd Quarter	72	28	102	41	71	33	110	22	119	44	118	29	349	29	121	25	185	24	209
3rd Quarter	77	20	69	26	89	30	117	16	228	34	161	35	152	31	97	28	186	36	222
4th Quarter	70	50	58	25	93	23	164	35	188	39	171	30	371	22	130	35	191	31	222
COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS	257	118	286	122	309	108	483	110	722	148	552	113	1037	106	525	111	670	112	782
YEAR TO DATE TOTALS	375		408		417		593		870		665		1143		636		782		

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



* Year-to-date total only

4th Quarter 2022

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	1	0	18	0	0	46	0	0	65	29%
JACK JOUETT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA	18	0	0	0	0	42	0	0	60	27%
SAMUEL MILLER	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	5%
SCOTTSVILLE	7	0	16	0	0	24	0	0	47	21%
WHITE HALL	29	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	39	18%
TOTAL	65	0	44	0	0	112	1	0	222	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	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	4%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	0	0	16	0	0	24	0	0	40	18%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
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	2	0	34	0	0	24	0	0	60	27%
CROZET COMMUNITY	16	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	26	12%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	12	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	100	45%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL	28	0	10	0	0	88	0	0	126	57%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2%
VILLAGE SUBTOTAL	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	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	35	0	44	0	0	112	0	0	191	86%
RURAL AREA 1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3%
RURAL AREA 2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2%
RURAL AREA 3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6%
RURAL AREA 4	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	3%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	31	14%
TOTAL	65	0	44	0	0	112	1	0	222	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	18	0	0	0	0	0	19	9%
Baker Butler	13	0	0	0	0	46	0	0	59	27%
Broadus Wood	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Brownsville	20	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	10%
Crozet	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5%
Greer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Hollymead	0	0	0	0	0	42	0	0	42	19%
Meriwether Lewis	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Mountain View	0	0	16	0	0	24	0	0	40	18%
Murray	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Red Hill	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	3%
Scottsville	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Stone Robinson	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4%
Stony Point	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Woodbrook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOTAL	65	0	44	0	0	112	1	0	222	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.		TOTAL	
	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$	No.	Amount-\$
RIO	21	7,902,928	0	0	3	2,144,404	4	1,368,972	28	11,416,304
JOUETT	0	0	1	950,000	1	10,000	2	516,000	4	1,476,000
RIVANNA	21	14,383,425	0	0	1	9,732,986	0	0	22	24,116,411
SAMUEL MILLER	11	7,908,624	0	0	0	0	1	45,000	12	7,953,624
SCOTTSDALE	25	8,921,605	4	62,000	1	765,724	0	0	30	9,749,329
WHITE HALL	39	17,850,600	0	0	1	744,990	0	0	40	18,595,590
TOTAL	117	56,967,182	5	1,012,000	7	13,398,104	7	1,929,972	136	73,307,258

* 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.