

2004 YEAR END BUILDING REPORT

County of Albemarle
Community Development Department
Office of Geographic Data Services
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596
(434) 296-5832

INDEX

- I. Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units by Month (Charts A & B)
- II. Comparison of Residential Dwelling Units by Type (Charts C, D, & E)
- III. Comparison of All Building Permits (Chart F)

KEY TO TYPES OF HOUSING REFERRED TO IN REPORT

SF	Single-Family (includes modular)
SFA	Single-Family Attached
SF/TH	Single-Family Townhouse
DUP	Duplex
MF	Multi-Family
MHC	Mobile Home in the County (not in an existing park)
AA	Accessory Apartment


During the year of 2004, 581 building permits were issued for 599 dwelling units. In addition, 26 permits were issued for mobile homes in existing parks at an average exchange value of \$2,500, for a total of \$65,000.

I. Comparison of Residential Dwelling Units by Type

Chart A. Nine Year Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units by Month

MONTH	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
JAN	26	54	38	49	52	52	55	96	50
FEB	44	44	39	84	43	39	348	34	4
MAR	61	57	65	65	54	54	74	106	23
APR	71	75	62	102	63	62	63	69	89
MAY	63	118	65	55	72	196	198	90	77
JUN	41	89	85	75	50	181	117	64	46
JUL	87	59	74	69	56	46	235	54	56
AUG	105	34	221	56	65	55	64	61	62
SEP	64	48	68	68	49	32	72	60	36
OCT	186	216	61	48	48	86	308	74	70
NOV	43	49	48	42	49	36	48	41	43
DEC	44	62	48	57	49	36	138	330	43
TOTAL	835	905	874	770	650	875	1720	1079	599

Chart B. Three Year Comparison of New Residential Dwelling Units by Month



Year End 2004

II. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE

Chart C. 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	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
RIO	44	0	5	0	19	0	2	70	12%
JACK JOUETT	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1%
RIVANNA	59	6	8	0	0	3	3	79	13%
SAMUEL MILLER	100	0	0	0	0	2	0	102	17%
SCOTTSVILLE	100	18	0	0	0	7	0	125	21%
WHITE HALL	176	7	26	0	0	3	4	216	36%
TOTAL	484	31	39	0	19	15	11	599	100%

Chart D. 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	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 1	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	10	2%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2	14	0	0	0	14	0	1	29	5%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	18	3%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	27	5%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	6%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
CROZET COMMUNITY	94	7	26	0	0	0	0	127	21%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	32	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	6%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	7%
DEVELOPMENT AREA SUBTOTAL	228	31	39	0	19	0	1	318	53%
RURAL AREA 1	75	0	0	0	0	2	6	83	14%
RURAL AREA 2	39	0	0	0	0	3	3	45	8%
RURAL AREA 3	79	0	0	0	0	2	1	82	14%
RURAL AREA 4	63	0	0	0	0	8	0	71	12%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	256	0	0	0	0	15	10	281	47%
TOTAL	484	31	39	0	19	15	11	599	100%

Year End 2004

II. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE (continued)

Chart E. 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	DUP	MF	MHC	AA		
Agnor-Hurt	10	0	5	0	5	0	2	22	4%
Baker Butler	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	3%
Broadus Wood	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	54	9%
Brownsville	57	0	9	0	0	0	0	66	11%
Crozet	71	7	17	0	0	3	0	98	16%
Greer	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0%
Hollymead	33	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	6%
Meriwether Lewis	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4%
Murray	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5%
Red Hill	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	45	8%
Cale	23	18	0	0	0	1	0	42	7%
Scottsville	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	23	4%
Stone Robinson	68	4	8	0	0	3	0	83	14%
Stony Point	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	3%
Woodbrook	9	0	0	0	14	0	0	23	4%
Yancey	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	19	3%
TOTAL	484	31	39	0	19	15	11	599	100%

III. COMPARISON OF ALL BUILDING PERMITS

Chart F. 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	54	\$ 12,931,343	103	\$ 1,532,990	14	\$ 211,489,942	72	\$ 1,319,631	243	\$ 227,273,906
JOUETT	7	\$ 2,656,000	50	\$ 4,296,990	0	\$ -	38	\$ 805,300	95	\$ 7,758,290
RIVANNA	79	\$ 19,745,760	142	\$ 3,543,429	8	\$ 4,328,006	74	\$ 4,921,296	303	\$ 32,538,491
S. MILLER	102	\$ 32,634,102	165	\$ 10,111,088	10	\$ 834,879	17	\$ 507,830	294	\$ 44,087,899
SCOTTSVILLE	125	\$ 31,980,262	130	\$ 4,116,060	13	\$ 3,300,500	40	\$ 1,300,780	308	\$ 40,697,602
WHITE HALL	214	\$ 46,379,474	155	\$ 5,861,003	7	\$ 2,443,900	57	\$ 1,926,000	433	\$ 56,610,377
TOTAL	581	\$ 146,326,941	745	\$ 29,461,560	52	\$ 222,397,227	298	\$ 10,780,837	1,676	\$ 408,966,565

* Additional value of mobile homes placed in existing parks is included in Residential Alteration Category.