

건축물 안전성 확보를 위한 감리제도 개선방향
Improvement of Building Supervision System to Enhance Safety

김상호 Kim, Sang-Ho
윤주선 Yoon, Zoosun

(a u r i

A study on the improvement of the construction inspection and supervision system

Kim, Sang Ho
Yoon, Zoosun

Although 20 years have elapsed since the collapse of Sampoong department store collapse, a series of building collapse disasters, such as the Mauna Ocean Resort collapse, a blaze in a Sanatorium in Jangseong, and the vent grate collapse in Pangyo, has still happened. The current construction inspection and supervision system does not control safety measures sufficiently. Experts' groups have pointed out that a reform for the construction inspection system is required to prevent building collapses and to promote a building structural safety. The prevailing low wage rates in the construction inspection system with a vague regulation from a relating Act seem to led to less-skilled inspectors and unsafe buildings. Recently, regulators have discussed to change charging standards on construction inspections and supervision to solve widespread low wage problems. However, few studies have been discussed the problem of low supervision charging standards.

Thus, this study aims to verify limitations of the construction inspection and supervision system, to examine alternative construction charging methods, and to review a range of the construction inspection and supervision.

We explored and summarized the limitations of the construction inspection and supervision by reviewing relative literature. The limitations are as followings. (1) A fuzzy definition of the construction inspection and supervision. There is a uncertainty of the construction “Kam-li”, referring inspections or supervision in Architects Act, and Building Act. Furthermore, the definitions of construction inspections and supervision among each Act are different. (2) A vague defined range of works. While there are two construction inspection and supervision types according to whether or not field inspectors reside in local construction sites, the Acts do not indicate a clear defined range of works by different types. (3) A vague definition of field inspectors’ responsibility. A missing of marking mandatory inspection period and time in the regulating Acts seems to cause arguments about field inspectors’ responsibility. (4) The absence of charging standards. As charging standards for private construction inspection and supervision has been abolished, building owners are likely to pay minimum costs for the inspections and supervision. In the Mauna Resort’s case, the cost for construction inspections and supervision was 30% lower, compared to a public charging standard.

To examine the charging methods in construction inspections and supervision, a review of Japanese Architect Act revised in June 25, 2015 was conducted for this study. Japan experienced similar problems in construction inspections and supervision. To tackle and overcome those fore-mentioned limitations, Japanese National Government revised Architects Act. As a result, the inspection and supervision charging standards in both the private sector’s and the public sectors’ construction changed by reflecting practical demands. Also, joining construction inspection insurances became imperative. The quality of construction inspections and supervision is therefore managed by regulations and Insurance companies. The Japanese experiences of the revision of

Architects Act regarding construction inspections are expected to provide implications for future potential revision of Korean relating Acts.