

2008 THIRD 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 (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 third quarter of 2008, 94 building permits were issued for 94 dwelling units. There were no permits issued for mobile homes in existing parks. 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	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007		2008*		2008 Totals
	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	Dev	Rural	
1st Quarter	98	51	88	57	381	96	184	52	51	26	157	123	81	64	267	57	78	49	127
2nd Quarter	103	82	351	88	292	86	133	90	105	107	121	66	101	80	232	38	86	53	139
3rd Quarter	90	80	78	55	305	66	103	72	72	82	188	46	65	67	73	67	47	47	94
4th Quarter	78	68	105	53	426	68	361	84	90	66	68	61	68	49	57	40			
COMP PLAN AREA TOTALS	369	281	622	253	1404	316	781	298	318	281	534	296	315	260	629	202	211	149	
YEAR TO DATE TOTALS	650		875		1720		1079		599		830		575		831		360		

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



3rd Quarter 2008

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	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	21%
JACK JOUETT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RIVANNA	10	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	26	28%
SAMUEL MILLER	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15%
SCOTTSVILLE	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15%
WHITE HALL	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21%
TOTAL	60	17	16	0	0	0	0	1	94	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 3	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16	17%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD 5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
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	5	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	22	23%
CROZET COMMUNITY	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9%
HOLLYMEAD COMMUNITY	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17%
PINEY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
COMMUNITIES SUBTOTAL	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	27%
RIVANNA VILLAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
VILLAGE SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
DEVELOPMENT AREA SUBTOTAL	15	15	16	0	0	0	0	1	47	50%
RURAL AREA 1	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15%
RURAL AREA 2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9%
RURAL AREA 3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15%
RURAL AREA 4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12%
RURAL AREA SUBTOTAL	45	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	50%
TOTAL	60	17	16	0	0	0	0	1	94	100%

3rd Quarter 2008

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3%
Baker Butler	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Broadus Wood	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10%
Brownsville	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10%
Cale	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Crozet	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4%
Greer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Hollymead	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17%
Meriwether Lewis	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2%
Murray	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4%
Red Hill	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5%
Scottsville	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7%
Stone Robinson	3	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	19	20%
Stony Point	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4%
Woodbrook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1%
Yancey	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7%
TOTAL	60	17	16	0	0	0	0	1	94	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	20	\$ 4,782,150	29	\$ 708,100	2	\$ 210,000	46	\$ 5,042,400	97	\$ 10,742,650
JOUETT	0	\$ -	16	\$ 481,495	0	\$ -	7	\$ 385,569	23	\$ 867,064
RIVANNA	26	\$ 7,611,500	40	\$ 1,701,615	1	\$ 850,000	27	\$ 1,566,500	94	\$ 11,729,615
S. MILLER	14	\$ 6,313,000	35	\$ 2,921,110	1	\$ 29,000	14	\$ 12,370,140	64	\$ 21,633,250
SCOTTSVILLE	14	\$ 2,045,499	24	\$ 986,763	3	\$ 8,521,500	8	\$ 154,500	49	\$ 11,708,262
WHITE HALL	20	\$ 8,437,500	44	\$ 4,851,328	3	\$ 5,073,000	18	\$ 7,374,457	85	\$ 25,736,285
TOTAL	94	\$ 29,189,649	188	\$ 11,650,411	10	\$ 14,683,500	120	\$ 26,893,566	412	\$ 82,417,126

* 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.