



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2017 YEAR END 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 2017, 488 certificates of occupancy were issued for 593 dwelling units. There were two permits issued for a mobile home in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500, for a total of \$5,000.. 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 | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 | | 2012 | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | 2017 |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|
| | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Totals |
| 1st Quarter | 57 | 47 | 92 | 89 | 32 | 22 | 95 | 10 | 104 | 10 | 38 | 20 | 57 | 30 | 56 | 22 | 92 | 37 | 129 |
| 2nd Quarter | 52 | 32 | 111 | 22 | 69 | 25 | 108 | 21 | 260 | 22 | 72 | 28 | 102 | 41 | 71 | 33 | 110 | 22 | 132 |
| 3rd Quarter | 168 | 30 | 76 | 18 | 52 | 17 | 215 | 22 | 81 | 17 | 77 | 20 | 69 | 26 | 89 | 30 | 117 | 16 | 133 |
| 4th Quarter | 69 | 63 | 52 | 24 | 268 | 22 | 258 | 23 | 55 | 29 | 70 | 50 | 58 | 25 | 93 | 23 | 164 | 35 | 199 |
| COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS | 346 | 172 | 331 | 153 | 421 | 86 | 676 | 76 | 500 | 78 | 257 | 118 | 286 | 122 | 309 | 108 | 483 | 110 | |
| YEAR TO DATE TOTALS | 518 | | 484 | | 507 | | 752 | | 578 | | 375 | | 408 | | 417 | | 593 | | |

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



Year End 2017

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 | 40 | 4 | 44 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 91 | 15% |
| JACK JOUETT | 11 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 4% |
| RIVANNA | 77 | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 132 | 22% |
| SAMUEL MILLER | 84 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 91 | 15% |
| SCOTTSVILLE | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 20% |
| WHITE HALL | 108 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 139 | 23% |
| TOTAL | 336 | 26 | 111 | 0 | 2 | 104 | 2 | 12 | 593 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 6% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3 | 43 | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 98 | 17% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 25% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 7 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 2% |
| URBAN AREAS SUBTOTAL | 118 | 20 | 46 | 0 | 2 | 102 | 0 | 8 | 296 | 50% |
| CROZET COMMUNITY | 80 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 109 | 18% |
| HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY | 16 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 7% |
| PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY | 11 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5% |
| COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL | 107 | 6 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 180 | 30% |
| RIVANNA VILLAGE | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1% |
| VILLAGE SUBTOTAL | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 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 | 232 | 26 | 108 | 0 | 2 | 104 | 0 | 11 | 483 | 81% |
| RURAL AREA 1 | 24 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 5% |
| RURAL AREA 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3% |
| RURAL AREA 3 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 46 | 8% |
| RURAL AREA 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3% |
| RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL | 104 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 110 | 19% |
| TOTAL | 336 | 26 | 111 | 0 | 2 | 104 | 2 | 12 | 593 | 100% |

Year End 2017

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 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 6% |
| Baker Butler | 32 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 13% |
| Broadus Wood | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1% |
| Brownsville | 78 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 105 | 18% |
| Cale | 47 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 26% |
| Crozet | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 5% |
| Greer | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 2% |
| Hollymead | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0% |
| Meriwether Lewis | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 3% |
| Murray | 16 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3% |
| Red Hill | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1% |
| Scottsville | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 3% |
| Stone Robinson | 40 | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 95 | 16% |
| Stony Point | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3% |
| Woodbrook | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Yancey | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1% |
| TOTAL | 336 | 26 | 111 | 0 | 2 | 104 | 2 | 12 | 593 | 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 | 89 | \$ 12,055,000 | 21 | \$ 1,467,566 | 4 | \$ 3,974,458 | 4 | 1,505,280 | 118 | \$ 19,002,304 |
| JOUETT | 21 | \$ 20,139,430 | 11 | \$ 3,087,522 | 1 | \$ 20,000 | 2 | 1,750,000 | 35 | \$ 24,996,952 |
| RIVANNA | 126 | \$ 34,571,055 | 28 | \$ 552,334 | 1 | \$ 25,000 | 4 | 606,500 | 159 | \$ 35,754,889 |
| S. MILLER | 91 | \$ 34,500,156 | 37 | \$ 3,332,130 | 0 | \$ - | 0 | - | 128 | \$ 37,832,286 |
| SCOTTSVILLE | 25 | \$ 19,829,254 | 22 | \$ 1,460,400 | 2 | \$ 1,850,000 | 4 | 1,023,092 | 53 | \$ 24,162,746 |
| WHITE HALL | 136 | \$ 43,679,423 | 39 | \$ 4,302,451 | 1 | \$ 39,000 | 5 | 156,000 | 181 | \$ 48,176,874 |
| TOTAL | 488 | \$ 164,774,318 | 158 | \$ 14,202,403 | 9 | \$ 5,908,458 | 19 | \$ 5,040,872 | 674 | \$ 189,926,051 |


* 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.

..



Prepared by: Kinsey Blumenthal
 Department of Community Development
 This Map is for Display Purposes Only.



Issued Certificates of Occupancy Year End 2017



- Permit Type**
- New Duplex Residences
 - New Single Family Residences
 - New Multi Family Residences
 - New Accessory Apartments
 - New Mobile Homes

- Work Valuation**
- < \$200,000
 - \$200,000 to \$299,999
 - \$300,000 to \$399,999
 - \$400,000 to \$499,999
 - > \$499,999
 - Not available