

2004 FIRST QUARTER 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 first quarter of 2004, 76 building permits were issued for 77 dwelling units. In addition, 1 permit was issued for a mobile home in an existing park at an average exchange value of \$2,500, for a total of \$2,500.

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	
MAY	63	118	65	55	72	196	198	90	
JUN	41	89	85	75	50	181	117	64	
JUL	87	59	74	69	56	46	235	54	
AUG	105	34	221	56	65	55	64	61	
SEP	64	48	68	68	49	32	72	60	
OCT	186	216	61	48	48	86	308	74	
NOV	43	49	48	42	49	36	48	41	
DEC	44	62	48	57	49	36	138	330	
TOTAL	835	905	874	770	650	875	1720	1079	77

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



Quarter 1, 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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4%
JACK JOUETT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	13%
SAMUEL MILLER	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14%
SCOTTSVILLE	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	23%
WHITE HALL	27	0	7	0	0	0	1	35	45%
TOTAL	65	4	7	0	0	0	1	77	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	8%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
CROZET COMMUNITY	18	0	7	0	0	0	0	25	32%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10%
DEVELOPMENT AREA SUBTOTAL	40	4	7	0	0	0	0	51	66%
RURAL AREA 1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6%
RURAL AREA 2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6%
RURAL AREA 3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16%
RURAL AREA 4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	34%
TOTAL	65	4	7	0	0	0	1	77	100%

Quarter 1, 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Baker Butler	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4%
Broadus Wood	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5%
Brownsville	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16%
Crozet	13	0	7	0	0	0	0	20	26%
Greer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Hollymead	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5%
Meriwether Lewis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Murray	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6%
Red Hill	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3%
Cale	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	12%
Scottsville	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Stone Robinson	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14%
Stony Point	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4%
Woodbrook	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Yancey	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
TOTAL	65	4	7	0	0	0	1	77	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	3	\$ 435,000	18	\$ 216,321	0	\$ -	11	\$ 156,665	32	\$ 807,986
JOUETT	0	\$ -	13	\$ 1,349,890	0	\$ -	1	\$ 134,000	14	\$ 1,483,890
RIVANNA	10	\$ 1,997,100	22	\$ 712,173	1	\$ 375,000	15	\$ 2,144,180	48	\$ 5,228,453
S. MILLER	11	\$ 3,809,500	23	\$ 765,017	1	\$ 2,700	0	\$ -	35	\$ 4,577,217
SCOTTSVILLE	18	\$ 4,568,130	18	\$ 430,830	0	\$ -	2	\$ 8,300	38	\$ 5,007,260
WHITE HALL	34	\$ 6,201,974	21	\$ 870,700	3	\$ 103,900	4	\$ 17,600	62	\$ 7,194,174
TOTAL	76	\$ 17,011,704	115	\$ 4,344,931	5	\$ 481,600	33	\$ 2,460,745	229	\$ 24,298,980

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