



ALBEMARLE COUNTY 2016 YEAR END 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 |

Note: In Table III, the Town of Scottsville has been added as a Comprehensive Plan Area, and is considered in the Development Areas for tracking purposes. In previous years, activity occurring in the of the Town of Scottsville was grouped in the Rural Area 4 Comprehensive Plan Area. Only activity occurring in the section of the Town of Scottsville that lies within Albemarle County will be included in this report. (There were no permits issued for residential dwelling units, in the Town of Scottsville area, in the 2016 1st Quarter Building Report.)


During 2016, 592 building permits were issued for 856 dwelling units. There were two permits issued for mobile homes in an existing park, at an exchange rate of \$2,500, for a total of \$5,000. 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 | 2008 | | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 | | 2012 | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2016 Totals |
|-----------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------------|
| | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | Dev | Rural | |
| 1st Quarter | 78 | 49 | 38 | 20 | 91 | 24 | 372 | 26 | 70 | 25 | 102 | 26 | 89 | 30 | 90 | 15 | 92 | 31 | 123 |
| 2nd Quarter | 86 | 53 | 71 | 26 | 65 | 27 | 58 | 29 | 310 | 25 | 110 | 37 | 83 | 36 | 79 | 51 | 266 | 40 | 306 |
| 3rd Quarter | 47 | 47 | 50 | 30 | 358 | 23 | 82 | 37 | 47 | 28 | 71 | 41 | 90 | 48 | 144 | 38 | 127 | 53 | 180 |
| 4th Quarter | 28 | 30 | 91 | 13 | 29 | 33 | 62 | 28 | 50 | 33 | 55 | 26 | 61 | 38 | 56 | 41 | 205 | 42 | 247 |
| COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS | 239 | 179 | 250 | 89 | 543 | 107 | 574 | 120 | 477 | 111 | 338 | 130 | 323 | 152 | 369 | 145 | 690 | 166 | |
| YEAR TO DATE TOTALS | 418 | | 339 | | 650 | | 694 | | 588 | | 468 | | 475 | | 514 | | 856 | | |

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



Year End 2016

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 | 49 | 2 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 10% |
| JACK JOUETT | 9 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 4% |
| RIVANNA | 92 | 7 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 139 | 16% |
| SAMUEL MILLER | 82 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 92 | 11% |
| SCOTTSVILLE | 31 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 2 | 1 | 314 | 37% |
| WHITE HALL | 157 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 189 | 22% |
| TOTAL | 420 | 9 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 8 | 6 | 856 | 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 | 37 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 5% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3 | 48 | 7 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 94 | 11% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 35% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0% |
| URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 7 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 3% |
| URBAN AREAS SUBTOTAL | 114 | 9 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 2 | 477 | 56% |
| CROZET COMMUNITY | 108 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 137 | 16% |
| HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY | 22 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 4% |
| PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY | 10 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 3% |
| COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL | 140 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 195 | 23% |
| RIVANNA VILLAGE | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2% |
| VILLAGE SUBTOTAL | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2% |
| TOWN OF SCOTTSVILLE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0% |
| TOWN SUBTOTAL | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0% |
| DEVELOPMENT AREA SUBTOTAL | 271 | 9 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 1 | 3 | 690 | 80% |
| RURAL AREA 1 | 39 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 48 | 6% |
| RURAL AREA 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 3% |
| RURAL AREA 3 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 65 | 8% |
| RURAL AREA 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 3% |
| RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL | 149 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 166 | 19% |
| TOTAL | 420 | 9 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 8 | 6 | 856 | 100% |

Year End 2016

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 | 30 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 5% |
| Baker Butler | 39 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 8% |
| Broadus Wood | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 3% |
| Brownsville | 104 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 128 | 15% |
| Cale | 29 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 36% |
| Crozet | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 41 | 5% |
| Greer | 4 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 4% |
| Hollymead | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1% |
| Meriwether Lewis | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2% |
| Murray | 18 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 3% |
| Red Hill | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2% |
| Scottsville | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 2% |
| Stone Robinson | 41 | 7 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 78 | 9% |
| Stony Point | 35 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 5% |
| Woodbrook | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1% |
| Yancey | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1% |
| TOTAL | 420 | 9 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 8 | 6 | 856 | 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 | 85 | \$ 14,136,050 | 94 | \$ 2,519,589 | 9 | \$ 21,573,000 | 147 | \$ 9,300,543 | 335 | \$ 47,529,182 |
| JOUETT | 37 | \$ 12,800,137 | 68 | \$ 8,519,536 | 14 | \$ 3,023,277 | 62 | \$ 4,993,396 | 181 | \$ 29,336,346 |
| RIVANNA | 137 | \$ 41,594,611 | 124 | \$ 10,566,418 | 4 | \$ 1,411,000 | 81 | \$ 5,844,267 | 346 | \$ 59,416,296 |
| S. MILLER | 92 | \$ 41,255,442 | 113 | \$ 12,340,953 | 1 | \$ 54,000 | 56 | \$ 5,759,188 | 262 | \$ 59,409,583 |
| SCOTTSVILLE | 53 | \$ 44,658,227 | 72 | \$ 3,483,218 | 14 | \$ 17,970,609 | 115 | \$ 11,539,898 | 254 | \$ 77,651,952 |
| WHITE HALL | 188 | \$ 59,112,255 | 120 | \$ 7,757,943 | 6 | \$ 1,707,000 | 62 | \$ 4,269,595 | 376 | \$ 72,846,792 |
| TOTAL | 592 | \$ 213,556,722 | 591 | \$ 45,187,657 | 48 | \$ 45,738,886 | 523 | \$ 41,706,887 | 1,754 | \$ 346,190,151 |

* 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.



Issued Building Permits Year End 2016

Prepared by: Ruth Emerick
 Department of Community Development
 This Map is for Display Purposes Only.

Map last edited: 1/30/2017



Permit Type

- 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