THE GREAT WALLS OF VERSATILITY

VERSALOK®
Engineered Retaining Wall Systems
From R.I. Lampus Company

Talk about versatility!

Whether it be curved, straight, 90-degree turns or even steps in tan, brown, gray or custom colors, VERSA-LOK provides a beautiful, durable and economical solution to any retaining wall problems.

No need for footings or mortar, VERSA-LOK is an interlocking modular system for walls up to 20 feet in height that automatically steps back when the units are stacked to form the correct slope.

For more information on achieving your own "great walls of versatility" plus a copy of the VERSA-LOK design and installation guide, "Great Walls Made Easy," contact:

R.I. LAMPUS CO.

816 Railroad Street, Springdale, PA 15144
1-800-872-7310 (Western PA only)
or 412/362/3800
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About the Cover
Built in 1888, the Furness Building is the University of Pennsylvania's library. After a "selective restoration and adaptive reuse" of the building was completed it was recognized as a National Historic Landmark.
The complete story of this beautiful building, designed by 19th century architect Frank Furness, can be found on page 20.
How To Stay On Top Of Your Building Without Going Through The Roof.

ARRIS F/X and Sun's SPARCstation IPC give you the right combination for superior facilities management. ARRIS F/X ties directly into your company's databases, giving you everything you need for planning, designing and managing your facility. And it's all accessible through one simple, easy-to-use interface.

Here's what you get with the economical, complete SPARCstation IPC/ARRIS F/X system:

- 207 MB Hard Disk
- 3.5" Floppy Disk Drive
- 8 MB RAM
- 16" Color Monitor
- Mouse
- Sun Operating System
- Networking
- ARRIS BD&D
- ARRIS F/X Management
- ARRIS F/X Planning

So if you need an easy way to stay on top of things, ask us for a demonstration of ARRIS F/X on the SPARCstation IPC.

PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Professional Liability Insurance
- Competitive
- High Limits: From $100,000 to $15,000,000
- Low Deductibles: As low as $2,500
- Stability: Coverage available from A+XV rated companies

Workers' Compensation Insurance
- Solid Protection: A+XIV rated insurance company
- 15% deviation from manual rates
- Dividend: has averaged 31.7% for past 7 years

Call or Write our Program Administrator for Details:

Sedgwick James of Pennsylvania Inc.
P.O. Box 1675
Harrisburg, PA 17105
Attention: Brian Rabena
(717) 763-7261
(800) 382-1422
Recently as I looked up at the Meridian Tower in Philadelphia wearing its orange protective netting to keep the granite in place, it struck me that you can't just admit a sick building to a hospital to get well. It must remain in place exposed for all to see while it dies or the cure takes place. Its very presence reminds us of the tragedy.

What is important to focus upon is the reality that the high-tech world in which we live is still influenced by human beings who make decisions in good faith which cause hazardous and sometimes deadly conditions. Someone turns off a valve, locks an exit or leaves a mess. No one ever thought that a thing like this could happen, but it did and the costs in terms of lives lost and lives affected will be borne for a long time.

Of course there will be an official reaction to the fire as governing agencies and boards throughout the country seek to strengthen codes so as to prevent a recurrence of this type of disaster. Can we complain about an overreaction when we as architects should be in the vanguard of this effort.

We can't afford to rail against the structures of regulations which inhibit our careful planning, require exits which get in the way and materials which dilute our clarity of expression. Let's remember that person who once worked in that destroyed office or the watchman who nearly became a victim or the firefighters who did.

John A. Fatula, A.I.A.
Editor-in-Chief
Robert F. Brown, Jr., FAIA and Susan A. Maxman, FAIA are among the 90 architects who have been elevated to The American Institute of Architects (AIA) College of Fellows, an honor awarded to members who have made significant contributions to the profession.

Robert F. Brown, Jr., FAIA was recognized for his work in urban design which is significantly transforming cities and towns throughout the country, bringing together the demands for a beautiful environment, a workable and economical urban order and a humane quality of life. Mr. Brown lives in Philadelphia and is a principal in the firm of Geddes Brecher Qualls Cunningham.

Susan A. Maxman, FAIA received her Fellowship for her leadership role at the AIA to expand the influence of the architect. Her efforts have resulted in the establishment of a Public Affairs Commission and the Accent on Architecture program at AIA. She is presently serving as a Vice President of AIA. Susan is a principal in her own architectural firm in Philadelphia.

Fellowship is the highest honor the AIA can bestow on any member with the exception of the Gold Medal. It is conferred on members with at least ten years of membership who have made significant contributions to the aesthetic, scientific and practical efficiency of the profession; to the standards of architectural education, training and practice; to the building industry through leadership of the AIA and other related professional organizations; to the advancement of the living standards of people through their improved environment; and to society through significant public service.

The new Fellows will be invested in the College of Fellows at the 1991 AIA Convention in Washington, DC, May 17-20.

James Wentling/Architects Receives Builder's Choice Award

James Wentling/Architects recently received a Grand Award in the Builder's Choice Awards Program for Excellence in Design and Planning, sponsored by Builder magazine. Wentling's affordable residential community of Breckenridge in Durham, NC was honored by the jury in the category of Best Detached Community at a density of over five units to the acre.

Breckenridge was also honored with an Aurora Award from the Southeast Builders Conference at their annual awards program in Orlando, FL.

James Wentling/Architects specializes in design for single and multi-family communities. The firm is active in Pennsylvania as well as in ten eastern seaboard states and Canada.

Dial 1-800-321-NANE For Your Personalized Impression

Glen-Gery Brick introduces its new 'name brick'-a distinctive way to 'say it permanently' with engraved, personal brick-and leave an everlasting impression.

Whatever name, logo or message you desire, Glen-Gery will engrave your name brick with the desired inscription. Each brick is custom crafted at Glen-Gery's manufacturing facility in Bigler, PA.

For additional information or to receive an order form, call Glen-Gery Personal Brick, toll-free, 8 AM to 5 PM EST weekdays at 1-800-321-NAME. Fax orders may be sent to 1-814-857-5151. Visa/Mastercard credit cards are accepted.

American Architectural Foundation Names New National Leadership

Twelve national leaders from the design and public realms were elected to The American Architectural Foundation's (AAF) Board of Regents by The American Institute of Architects' (AIA) Board of Directors at the Foundation's annual members meeting in December.

One of those twelve was immediate past AIA President Sylvester Damianos, FAIA, chairman of Damianos Brown Andrews Inc., Pittsburgh, who will serve a two-year term as Regent chairman.
Copyright Protection For Architectural Works Becomes Law

By: Franklin A. Miles, Jr., Esquire

Don't even think about copying that unusual building that you saw on your trip to the West Coast last week. As of December 1, 1990, architectural works are now expressly protected by the United States copyright laws. Prior to December 1, there was a debate over whether and to what extent such works were protected under existing laws. The changes to the United States Copyright Act expressly include "architectural works" within its coverage, and provide significant protections.

Background

While architectural plans themselves have always been protectible under the copyright laws of the United States, there has always been a real question about whether the owner of those plans can prevent someone from building the structure depicted in the drawing. Moreover, heretofore it has not been possible to secure a copyright in the building itself. (See "How Far Does It Go? Copyright Protection of Architectural Plans," Pennsylvania Architect, Fall 1989.) Courts have struggled over what to do when a structure is built from plans which admittedly have been copied. Should it be torn down? What are the damages to the owner of the copyrighted plans? The Copyright Act protects only the "expression of an idea," and not the useful or "utilitarian" aspects of a work. Courts, therefore, have had a difficult time fashioning a remedy to address the problem created when a building depicted in copyrighted plans is constructed without the copyright owner's permission.

The issue really came to a head when the United States became a signatory to the Berne Convention, the most important international copyright treaty. That membership became effective on March 1, 1989.

Among other things, the Berne Convention requires that works of architecture be accorded copyright protection. While several changes to the United States copyright laws were required to bring them into compliance with the Berne Convention, there was disagreement over whether the U.S. Copyright Act already provided adequate protection for works of architecture. During hearings on the enabling legislation respected copyrights scholars testified that the creation of a separate provision for works of architecture might not be required. As a result, proposed language on works of architecture was dropped from the implementing legislation.

Don't even think about copying that unusual building that you saw on your trip to the West Coast last week. As of December 1, 1990, architectural works are now expressly protected by the United States copyright laws.

Debate over whether architectural works were protected continued, however, and a subsequent report concluded that, while it was unclear whether the United States copyright laws provided copyright protection for the design of works of architecture, it was evident that the Berne Convention required such protection. Therefore, on February 7, 1990, legislation was introduced to place the United States unequivocally in compliance with its Berne obligations.

In reporting the bill out of committee the House Judiciary Committee observed that the legislation should not be measured solely by the purpose of placing the United States in compliance with its Berne Convention obligations. The new law is also significant, said the Committee, because it furthers one of the goals of Article 1 to the United States Constitution, which is to "promote the progress of science." In its report the Committee stated: "Architecture plays a central role in our daily lives, not only as a form of shelter or as an investment, but also as a work of art. It is an art form that performs a very public, social purpose." Quoting Winston Churchill ("We shape our buildings and our buildings shape us") and Frank Lloyd Wright ("Buildings will always remain the most valuable in a people's environment, the one most capable of cultural reaction"), the Judiciary Committee noted that, at their best, works of architecture "serve to express the goals and aspirations of the entire community."

What Is Protected

Under the new law an "architectural work" is defined as "the design of a building as embodied in any tangible medium of expression, including a building, architectural plans, or drawings." The work includes "the overall form as well as the arrangement and composition of spaces and elements in the design, but does not include individual standard features." The report of the House Judiciary Committee provides some illumination on this very broad definition.

What is protected is the "design" of the building. The "design" includes the overall form as well as the arrangement and composition of spaces and elements in the design.

continues on page 30
A Search For The Architect: A Confession
By: Beth Kephart Sulit

Let him be educated, skillful with the pencil, instructed in geometry, know much history, have followed the philosopher with attention, understand music, have some knowledge of medicine, know the opinion of the jurists, and be acquainted with astronomy and the theory of the heavens.

Vitruvius
First Century, BC

(The architect) must have a thorough insight into the noblest and most curious sciences.

Leone Battista Alberti
Fifteenth Century

Lloyd Morgan's Tarrytown, New York studio was tucked in the far corner of a house, past crowded stairs. It was steeped in the tools of the old man's trade—rules of every color and scale, paper rolled or in sheaves, shrunken and over-bruised charcoal. A life of letters and sketches clutched in boxes on the floor. A telescope poised by the sill, its faithful eye on the universe beyond.

Lloyd Morgan's studio was a place where architecture was made and remembered. It was a place where the man himself would go to retrace the buildings that long before had taken form beneath his hands, when he, as a principal designer in the New York firm of Shultze and Weaver, created the Waldorf Astoria, the Boca Raton, and other vintage edifices. It was, as well, the place in which I, the young great niece of an aging great man, first dared to stare into the kaleidoscopic soul of an architect.

Lacking all the requisite talent, I grew up, after Great Uncle Lloyd's death, watching architecture, not making it. I converted a University of Pennsylvania history degree into an excuse to work for a center city design firm and, once entrenched, I met and married an architect whose work and architectural spirit soared, even then, above the rest. I made a career of working beside architects: writing for them, seeking golden opportunities for them, even—politely cloaked in anonymity—speaking for them.

My challenges, back then, lay not in personal creation, but in finding, understanding, and packaging the creations that happened to others. Perhaps I was too busy, perhaps it seemed superfluous, but in all the architectural exchanges of my professional youth, I never asked the simple question: What is an architect, and what, finally, does an architect do?

Not until PSA Executive Director Lela Shultz asked me to put down some words on the distinctive, defining qualities of the architect did I begin to realize how little I still know about the profession I've been living with for the past several years. Dismayed and somewhat embarrassed, I yet drew comfort from the certainty that the answer to Lela's question was lurking somewhere beneath the surface of my books.

And so I turned to my shelves for guidance—consulting Spiro Kostoff, Christian Norberg-Shultz, Manfredo Tafuri, Charles Moore, biographies of every sort, text books. I compared the wisdom of the dictionaries. I got reacquainted with Ayn Rand's fiery prototype, Howard Roark. I re-read the myths of Daedalus, that "skillful artificer" who numbers as the Greek's first architect. But the answer was not to be had. For every pragmatic definition I uncovered, an esoteric voice would shout it down. My head

"Protection from the inclemency of the seasons was the mother of architecture.

Joseph Gru

"And where does the architect sit? He sits right there; he is the one who conveys the beauty of spaces, which is the every meaning of architecture.

Louis Kahn
ached with competing estimations:

"...he must care for the best interests of the client, whose affairs are in his trust."
University of Pennsylvania Bulletin, School of Fine Arts Announcement 1934-1935

"The walls of a building belong to the architect. There he rules at will."
Adolf Loos

"Protection from the inclemency of the seasons was the mother of architecture."
Joseph Gault

"If we can speak of architecture as a defense against the terror of space, we must also recognize that from the beginning it has provided defenses against the terror of time."
Karsten Harries

"...he must care for the best interests of the client, whose affairs are in his trust."
University of Pennsylvania Bulletin, School of Fine Arts Announcement 1934-1935

I knew I required a different sort of insight. I found my fingers dialing the numbers of architectural friends, and my voice asking for a meaningful response to Lela's request.

In retrospect, this is not a research method I can recommend. It took but two conversations for me to perceive that my definition was getting broader, not narrower. All seemingly common threads were fraying. Not all architects draw: some only write; some command through computer keys. Not all architects begin by looking for a concept; some are technicians who, construction detail by construction detail, aspire toward another's ideal. Not all architects watch their buildings rise from the ground; some plan and program, retrofit and rehab an already familiar architectural treasure—or embarrassment.

The same ambiguity, I began to remember, speaks through clients. I have seen architectural clients walk through the door who—confident in their preconceptions and precise in their expectations—are prepared to lay down money for a hired hand, rather than an independent thinker. I

have seen others arrive with nothing more than a site and a dream and a desire to be seduced by the previously unimagined. Some clients spend even more time on the building site than do their architects; others wait until moving day to experience the space and place that has become their own.

Truth is, I was beginning to enjoy my dilemma: our high-tech, quick-response culture doesn't readily offer up so many unanswerables, and I was pleased that the architect's mystique has not been eroded by time and data. I was glad that the inscrutable spirit of Great Uncle Lloyd remained just that, and that the work of my friends was not about to yield to a simple summing up.

And I was glad, too, that in the private morning hour, when I rise to survey the ink spilled out across my husband's drawing board, when I dare to touch ideas conjured at midnight, I can still believe in the profundity of architecture, and those who make it.

Beth Kephart Sulit is a freelance writer residing in Glenside, PA. Copies of the "What is an Architect?" brochure are available from the Pennsylvania Society of Architects.
Architecture was an old man's game

By: G. Peter Vander Heide, AIA, CPM

Will the old man's game succumb to the video age?

Architecture, the profession, has been described in many terms. One description calls it an old man's game. At the 1990 Kahn Lecture in Philadelphia, Mikito Maki made reference to Lou Kahn's comments about one of Maki's buildings. He said, "It isn't a bad building—for an architect of your age." Most of our gold medal winners and truly famous architects are no longer young. All of us feel that we learn something from almost every building we work on. This has proven to be the case for some time now. Ours is a complex profession which takes time and experience to mature in.

I question whether we are on the verge of an era where the age factor may become less important.

Two reasons that age has been so important are the length of the building cycle, and the public nature of our art.

First, when we dream up a good solution to a particular client's need, we apply it graphically to paper. In the process, we fine tune it a little bit as we see the idea take shape on the sheet. We draw from our own experiences with the building type, and we put plenty of thought into it to make it work as well as possible. Of course, we also put a lot of effort into making it look as good as possible on the paper. Then we present the solution to the client with a combination of graphics and word pictures of how things will work. This takes from a few days to a few months each time we go through the process.

Once we decide what we want to do, it takes days to months to document it so that it can be built. Building it also takes months or years. Then as it is being built, and finally as it is finished and starts performing its required role, we can walk through it and experience it. We can get the feedback that allows us to fine tune our judgement about what is appropriate for various situations. Experiencing the building in use is the experience that tells us how hard to fight for various items as we make the compromises that determine the final work product. It's a long time between dream and reality.

This may be changing in this decade. The advances in computer speed and power that continue to evolve, are making their way into our profession in a big way. Many of us are drafting with computers today. PCs populate our offices as welcome tools that extend our ability to manipulate numbers, words and graphics. Services are available now that allow us to visualize unconstructed details, rooms, buildings and even cities, much more realistically and with more variety than was possible before.

We have all heard these types of claims before. I have investigated many of them, only to find that I was severely disappointed with the gap between the promise and the delivery. This year I have seen the promise fulfilled. Enough pixels, enough colors and enough speed enables photo-realistic rendering of computer models which are mathematically accurate. The combination of photo-realism and accurate views of models greatly heightens the ability to perceive a realistic visualization. I assume that when we have an excellent visualization we will be able to evaluate that vision. The more subjective qualities in buildings that we strive for are much more evidently achieved or not in these visualizations.

I would think that a trained architect can look at the result and say, no, this is too heavy, or this is too light, or, the color is too bland. If this is so, then we have rather rapid feedback about how well we are executing our dream. Depending on the effectiveness of the feedback, it may not take us the decades of the past to predict the current dream, and to dream better the next time.

Second, the buildings we design become a part of the built environment, they are experienced by many users, including the general public; therefore, a natural part of the criteria for success of a building is derived from the reaction to the building by its various publics. This is also a long process.

The visualization that will be available in the coming decade is coming via a communication device that is a rather public one. VCRs abound in our nation. Copy a video tape and show it to users in a corporate setting, or a teacher's group in a school. The clients or users see the same images that the architect sees. Now the public part of our art comes into play earlier. Images speak a universal language that our word pictures cannot. Interpretation of the images are still subjective, but then so is the interpretation of the finished building.

So, in essence it will be possible to go somewhat public earlier. Sometimes, I would imagine, the feedback we get, or our client gets from others will also help us

continues on page 32
One of the most striking aspects of the project was the conversion of the attic into faculty offices and seminar rooms.

Offices and seminar rooms for the Department of Management. The massive wooden trusses were used as an attractive design feature which were complimented by high ceilings and existing brick walls. The historical significance of the building meant that the roof line of Glatfelter Hall could not be changed; therefore, it was necessary to maximize the natural light from the existing dormers which were 10 to 12 ft. above the attic floor. This was accomplished by providing sloped glass ceilings over the faculty offices which line the east and west walls of the attic. The second phase of this renovation project also included construction of an elevator/stair tower to the south of the building. This tower was necessary to provide handicapped accessibility to all levels of the building as well as meet exit requirements of current building codes. The exterior of the tower was designed to meet exit requirements of
The exterior of the tower was designed to harmonize with the lines of the existing structure and to meet the requirements of the Pennsylvania Museum Commission. At the same time the entire ground floor of Glatfelter Hall was renovated, becoming the academic computer center for the campus.

The final phase was the renovation of the Hall’s first, second and third floors. Keeping with the original requirements for the renovation of this building, building systems were replaced and all building finishes were either replaced or upgraded. The stately manner of this building was maintained inside by refurbishing the large open central stair tower. The existing intricate door casings were duplicated and the rooms are highlighted by raised panel oak doors.

Glatfelter Hall was selected for display in the 1990 Exhibition of Schools and Architecture held in San Francisco that was organized by the American Association of School Administrations and the A.I.A.
The original part of this early Victorian church was built in 1848 at a time when Doylestown was growing rapidly. The Church is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is in a Certified Historic District. The congregation has a strong commitment to the church and its in-town location. It was their wish to preserve as many of the original details as possible and also to pass on to future generations a sound and useful building that would serve the community for the next 150 years.

In 1985 they first discussed with the architect the rebuilding of a balcony for the organ and choir. The original balcony had been removed during previous renovations. For many years, the organ and choir had been in the chancel, distancing the altar from the congregation. In addition, the exterior stone side walls of the nave had a significant bow, due to the outward thrust of the roof trusses. Structural failure was also discovered in the old wood floor framing of the nave and chancel.

The decision was made to remove the existing floor and to replace it with a clear spanning steel structure with concrete slab. This provides flexibility in the future use of the lower level, fireproofing and the opportunity to use the steel beams as tension rods to prevent further movement of the side walls. New stone buttresses work in concert with the steel beams and add scale and detail to the facade.

In the sanctuary, the congregation desired an atmosphere of spaciousness and spareness. The new nave and chancel floors are paved with locally made decorative tile in keeping with the spirit of the existing Moravian Tile altar. New hot water radiant heat under the floor eliminated all heating apparatus. The center aisle was widened and new pews were constructed reminiscent of the old pews.

Wrought iron communion and balcony rails enlarged on an existing decorative motif. Bold Victorian colors were chosen for the ribbed vaulted ceiling of the chancel and the high ceiling of the nave.

A new chapel was made in the lower apse and the offices and meeting rooms of the undercroft were completely renovated. Plans have been completed for a columbarium garden in an existing courtyard. The burial niches will be in the masonry walls that support a trellis along the length of the auditorium building. In the confines of a church that is now surrounded by town, this will be their burial ground. With the completion of this garden in the summer of 1991, the parish will have successfully completed major renovations to their church.
The church's new nave and chancel floors were paved with locally made decorative tile.
Construction on the major portion of Philadelphia's 30th Street Station began almost simultaneously with the onset of the Great Depression. The evolution of its design reflected variations of the classical style popular during that period.

As first envisioned in 1927, the Station was to have been a Beaux Arts structure inspired by the Baths of Caracalla and based on the interplay of two axes. In the final design by Chicago architects Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, the exterior, with its Corinthian porticoes, maintained a strict neo-classicism, while inside, the classical canon was more freely interpreted. With its completion in 1934, the 30th Street Station gave Philadelphia a major transportation center for the Pennsylvania Railroad lines, suburban lines and a Greyhound Bus terminal. Over the ensuing years various changes, improvements and renovations were made and in 1978 the Station building and its immediate site were entered into the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1985 Amtrak decided to seek a public/private endeavor to fund a major rehabilitation of the 30th Street Station and in 1988 construction began to restore the building's interior and exterior appearance to its original grandeur.

There were many goals to be accomplished in the rehabilitation including the importance that the Station be identified more prominently to reinforce its presence as a public amenity in the city. This was accomplished by making its environment more attractive to pedestrians with new landscaping, seating, lighting and other features.

continues
On the exterior the limestone walls and granite base were repaired, pointed and cleaned at the cornices and windows were repaired and repainted with original colors. New low landscaping with granite seatwalls and precast paving created a pleasant approach to the Station and new signage, reduced driveways and street level parking increased pedestrian access. A sculptured granite waterwall with inset bronze letters identifies 30th Street Station and Amtrak at the East Plaza.

On the interior, all Roman travertine walls and Tennessee marble floors were cleaned and damaged stone walls repaired. Additionally, wood seats were refinished, original storefronts in the main concourse were reconstructed and plaster ceilings were repaired and repainted in the original polychrome colors.

Station services were also upgraded with public restrooms receiving new fixtures, finishes and lighting. Passenger platforms were cleaned, painted and relighted and a new conveyor was installed in the baggage area and check-in counter. The mezzanine
Photography: b&h photographics

was revitalized with new lighting and signage and the Station and office floors made accessible to the handicapped. The retail and public spaces of the Station were enhanced with a new skylight, landscaping and seating along with refinishing of the original bronze storefronts and cast iron frames.

Architects need reliable engineers.

Engineers who know the construction process inside and out. Specialists who both the architect and owner can trust. But most of all, engineers who aren't afraid to discuss costs and materials up front when it counts.

Straight talk is rare in our business—but it's our way of working with clients. We always give you the most efficient design, without any last-minute budget surprises.

Why not put our word to the test on your next project?

O'DONNELL & NACCARATO
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

INGENUITY IN ENGINEERING.

BOURSE BUILDING • INDEPENDENCE MALL EAST • PHILA, PA 19106 215-925-3788
DOYLESTOWN, PA • PHILADELPHIA, PA • WEST PALM BEACH, FL
When the University of Pennsylvania proposed to build a new library in 1888, it was with the intent of producing “the best college library in America.” That high standard was resolved by retaining Philadelphia’s most important late 19th century architect, Frank Furness, and the pre-eminent library consultants of their day, Melvil Dewey, inventor of the Dewey Decimal System, and Justin Winsor, head librarian of Harvard University. Working from the dual models of the cathedral and the train shed, Furness created a masterpiece realized in crimson brick, terra-cotta, tile, sandstone, leaded glass and copper whose force resonates in our era. Its red exterior tones contrast with its bright, skylit reading rooms of buff-colored terra-cotta and red brick.

Over its first 80 years, the library accommodated a tenfold increase in books and readers, accomplished by various wing additions and by inserting a floor within the volume of the main reading room. After generations of proposals to demolish the library, modern critics led by Lewis Mumford recognized its merits, leading to its preservation as the Fine Arts Library of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Restoration

The restoration of the library has been an exemplary project under the leadership of Lee Copeland, FAIA, Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts and a Building Committee which included architecture and art history faculties headed by David DeLong, Chairman of the University’s Historic

KEY
A. Portico
B. Memorial Stair Tower
C. Circulation Desk
D. Main Reading Room
E. Rotunda Reading Room
F. Catalog Room
G. Reference Book Alcove
H. Seminar Room
K. Periodicals Room
M. Library Offices
N. Perkins Rare Book Library
P. Bookstacks & Study Carrels
Q. Arthur Ross Gallery
R. Faculty Offices
Preservation Program. With their guidance the team, comprising the architects, historical consultants and restoration consultant Marianna Thomas, AIA, undertook a "selective restoration and adaptive reuse" of the building which was recognized as a National Historic Landmark in 1985. A year of historical research in the University Archives, discussion with various building users, and design studies by the architects produced a three-volume master plan for the selective restoration and continued use of the building. It called for paying careful attention to the original logic and clarity of the plan so that modern uses would be found for appropriate spaces including accommodation of an architectural archives at the underutilized lower level of the building. It also called for restoring the historic exterior; for stabilizing the structure; for restoring the reading rooms, and bringing the building up to modern standards for climate control, computer capability and security systems without damaging the aesthetic character or historic fabric of the building.

The R.M. Shoemaker Co. began exterior restoration of the building in 1987, under the guidance of the Keast and Hood Co., structural engineers. Terra-cotta roof tiles and ornaments, copper work and skylights were repaired and recreated. The brick and terra-cotta exterior walls were repaired, cleaned and repointed,
employing red mortar to match the original; the rusticated and battered sandstone base was repaired and stabilized with a consolidant; leaded-glass was restored; and wood sash, doors and trim were restored to match their original finishes and tones. On the interior, the original glass and iron multi-tier bookstacks which could not be made structurally stable and fire safe were replaced with a similarly utilitarian concrete flat plate and column interior structure, while the enclosing copper clad shed was restored including recreation of perimeter skylights above study carrel areas. To ensure the survival and continued usefulness of the Furness designed bookstack, a two-tier, five-bay portion was rebuilt behind the circulation desk to hold the reserve collection. This work was followed by the restoration of the great leaded-glass skylight of the main reading room which was carefully dismantled, releaded and restored to its place as the glowing crown of the building. After generations of paint were removed from the interior masonry walls of the reading room, the inserted concrete slab floor was removed and five feet of damage at mid-level all around the room was carefully repaired, including recreation of carved terra-cotta foliated bands and window surrounds using gypsum reinforced fiberglass. Recreated historical lighting fixtures were designed with the assistance of Jules Fisher and Paul Marantz, lighting consultants. Modern environmental control systems designed by Marvin Waxman Consulting Engineers and other modern building systems were installed. With the installation of custom furnishings, designed to recall lost Furness pieces, the interior restoration has been completed in time for the centennial of the completion of the building, February 7, 1991.
The house is a product of two historical periods. The rear is an example of farmhouse colonial while the front is an example of Federal architecture. Concealed HVAC and electrical systems were added and new lighting was designed throughout the building.
Vernon House

Location: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Architect: Susan Maxman Architects
Contractor: W. S. Cumby & Son, Inc.

Since the mid-1800s, Vernon House has established a proud history as a private residence, as a branch of the Philadelphia Free Library and as a site for various community based and cultural organizations including the Site and Relic Society, now the Germantown Historical Society. By the late 1970s, however, the building had become abandoned and neglected and it stood forlornly in the center of Vernon Park, an underutilized urban park.

The existing structure is a product of two historical periods. The rear wing, constructed in the mid-1700s, is a straightforward example of farmhouse colonial, while the front section, built in 1805, is a significant example of Federal architecture. The house was owned by the John Wister family from 1812 to 1892, when the City of Philadelphia acquired it for a library. The City removed the original central stairs and hallway to accommodate the library use. However, still remaining from the original 1805 design are exterior cornices, a fanlight over the entrance door, and carved columns at the front door and dormers. At the interior, four richly carved fireplaces, paneled wainscot and window returns, existing ornamental millwork such as fluting, reeding, gouge work and recessed interior shutters remain largely intact.

Once Vernon House became vacant, the building as well as the surrounding park began to deteriorate. The community recognized the importance of both the house and the park and it became clear that Vernon’s renovation would not only save a significant structure but also revitalize a central area of the community.

Unfortunately, no single individual or organization could fully orchestrate and realize the renovation project. The Philadelphia Department of Recreation, owner of the building and the park, could authorize improvements, but had no money. The Philadelphia Department of Commerce could provide funding for consultant fees and construction, but could not enter into a contract with an architect. The Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority could enter into contracts with the architectural consultant and represent the client during the documentation and construction observation process, but could not provide the program. Tenants with strong roots in the community were identified to provide the program for the building. They also provided an understanding of the role that the renovated building would play as an anchor in the park and in the entire community. It was agreed that a caretaker’s apartment would also be designed so that the park could have a watchful eye 24 hours a day.

In addition, other groups had agendas for the renovation of Vernon. The Friends of Vernon Park had been involved in a Master Plan...
Vernon House continued

for the park and were interested in how the building renovations could be integrated into the overall plans for park improvements. The building is located in a Historic District, which meant that the Philadelphia Historical Commission required review and approval of proposed improvements. Because the project made use of City funds on a City owned building, the Art Commission also reviewed the project.

The architectural improvements to the building include the addition of a new stair to restore the central hall plan. The stair is similar in configuration and scale to the original, but with more contemporary detailing. At the rear of the building, where structural deterioration had occurred due to water damage, existing partitions had to be demolished and the spaces were reconfigured to accommodate use of the space as offices. Concealed HVAC and electrical systems were added to the building, replacing the existing exposed ductwork and wiring. New lighting was designed throughout the building.

Because the work was done within a very limited budget, the treatment of historic materials and detailing was limited to maintenance of existing finishes. Primary exterior work included painting, rain water conductor work and replacement of the front stair rail. The paint colors were similar to samples taken from the building. Minor repairs to the scored stucco pattern on the exterior were deferred until the funds were available to correctly restore the stucco.

The decision was made not to remove paint from existing ornamental millwork such as composition mantels, the exterior and interior fluting, reeding, gouge work and recessed interior shutters. Instead, this ornamental work was minimally prepared for a single layer of finish paint, with the intent that the work would be more comprehensively prepared for paint in the future. □
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Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter Awards

Architect: Schoonover, Strunk & Vanderhoo F, East Stroudsburg, PA
Project: Walnut Grove Complex, East Stroudsburg, PA

Architect: Bonsall/Shaffer, Bethlehem, PA
Project: Consolidated Specialties, Fogelsville, PA

Architect: Breslin Ridyard Fadero, Allentown, PA
Project: Physical Education and Athletic Center, Alvernia College, Reading, PA
Bucks County
Chapter Awards

Architect
Lynn Taylor Associates
Architects,
Doylestown, PA

Project:
Country Residence,
Bucks County, PA

Jury Comments:
The house provides several galleries, some two story, to showcase the owner’s collection of stoneware and art. The layout of rooms permits long views to the south and within the interior spaces. The materials, Shaker-like in appearance, work well with off-white walls, wood floors and careful detailing.

Interior and Architectural Design Award

Architect:
Chorno Associates,
Quakertown, PA

Project:
Renewal Centers for Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation,
Quakertown, PA

Jury Comments:
The Renewal Centers for Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation received awards in Architecture and Interior Design. The plan respected the “early house,” mastered the setbacks and maximized the use of the site within the limitations of the footprint. The interior spaces used modest means to advantage. Bold combinations of materials and bright colors energized the lobby. The direct handling of the interior showed a sensitivity to the buildings use. The presentation panels clearly communicated the problem and solution.
This explanation recognizes that creativity in architecture frequently takes the form of a selection, coordination or arrangement of what would otherwise be considered unprotectible elements. An architect may also incorporate new and protectible design elements into an otherwise standard unprotectible building feature. Moreover, interior architecture may be protected.

It is important to note that individual standard features are not protected. Thus, standard components of buildings, such as common windows and doors will not be protected under the Copyright Act. To do so would be anti-competitive, and would reek havoc in the construction industry.

Nevertheless, the new law is not intended to exclude from copyright protection any individual features that reflect the architect’s creativity. Whether a feature is standard, and unprotectible, or the result of creativity, is something which will have to be decided on a case-by-case basis.

**What if a company, having seen but not copied an architect’s plans, first constructs the building? Is the company relieved of any liability because it did not copy either the plans or an actual building?**

There is some debate about what will happen if the owner of copyrighted plans has not yet constructed the building depicted in those plans. What if another company, having seen but not copied those plans, first constructs the building? Is the company relieved of any liability because it did not copy either the plans or any actual building?

The better view seems to be that there would still be a finding of copyright infringement. It has long been the law that copyright infringement may occur even if the works involved are in two different media. For example, a movie may infringe upon the copyrights in the book upon which the movie is based. The copyright laws do not require exact copying—the issue is whether the allegedly infringing work is “substantially similar.” Thus, so long as the owner of the architectural plans can show that the builder had access to the plans, the builder may still be liable for copyright infringement.

The practical lesson to be gleaned from the foregoing discussion, however, is that an architect should secure a copyright in both the plans and the building which is ultimately constructed. It appears that it is the intention of the new law to keep these two forms of protection separate.

**The Buildings In Public Places Exception**

A natural question is whether a photograph or drawing of a structure which is in an area generally available to the public amounts to copyright infringement. For example, will a picture of a skyline infringe the copyrights for the buildings which actually comprise the skyline? To address this issue, the law permits the unauthorized making, distributing or public display of pictures, paintings, photographs or other particular representations of the architectural work, so long as the building is located in or is ordinarily visible from a public place.

The Judiciary Committee included such a provision because it found architecture to be a public art form. “Millions of people visit our cities every year and take back home photographs, posters, and other pictorial representations of prominent works of architecture as memory of their trip,” the report notes. “Additionally, numerous scholarly books on architecture are based on the ability to use photographs of architectural works.” These uses will continue to be permitted.

What will be interesting to see is whether a copyright owner ever brings a lawsuit claiming copyright infringement on the basis that his building is not “located in or ordinarily visible from a public place.” Presumably, the sky is a public place. If one takes a picture from a helicopter of a building which is generally not accessible to the public, have copyrights been infringed? One can already envision the field day which lawyers and judges will have with these arguments.

**Stop That Building!**

Perhaps no feature of the legislation regarding architectural works was more hotly debated than the issue of whether or not to permit courts to stop the construction of an infringing building once it has begun. As the legislation was being crafted it proceeded on the assumption that injunctions-orders issued by a judge compelling a party to take certain actions—against allegedly infringing buildings may present issues different from other copyrightable works. The Judiciary Committee observed that “architectural works are the only form of copyrightable subject matter that are habitable. Large scale architectural projects involve an almost bewildering number of state and local permit processes that must be navigated, and typically involve a considerable number of interests in addition to the architect and client, including lending institutions, contractors, subcontractors, unions and suppliers.”

In testimony before the Committee, the American Institute of Architects stated that they generally were not in favor of the destruction of useful buildings. On the other hand, the AIA stated that “it is not at all inconceivable that a situation could arise where with the very existence of an infringing structure is an irreparable injury to the copyright owner. In that case, the court should not be precluded from ordering a halt to construction...”
an irreparable injury to the copyright owner. In that case, the court should not be precluded from ordering a halt to construction, [or] a substantial alteration so as to make the building not infringing, or even to tear the building down if the evidence properly supports that conclusion."

In the end, it was decided that injunctive relief should not be precluded. Nevertheless, it is clear that it will not be a simple task for a copyright owner to convince a court to order an allegedly infringing builder to tear down or change a particular building. The Judiciary Committee agreed with the AIA's statement that copyright owners "may have to make a strong showing of entitlement to remedial relief in cases where an allegedly infringing structure has been substantially begun or completed." The Judiciary Committee therefore expects that injunctions will be "sparingly used" in such cases. The first case in which a copyright owner seeks to obtain injunctive relief under the new law is certain to be watched closely by the industry.

Some Observations

It may be that in amending the United States Copyright Act to include express provisions for the protection of architectural works Congress has provided more questions than answers. The House Judiciary Committee was careful to explain that the impetus for these changes was to bring the United States clearly in compliance with the Berne Convention requirements regarding architectural works. But what are the practical ramifications of this new law? Will creativity be stymied because architects are concerned that their new design may infringe upon a pre-existing work? Will builders require contractual guarantees form architects that the plans, and the building to be created from those plans, do not infringe any copyrights? What will the liability of an architect be if the builder is sued for copyright infringement—especially if the project is stopped in mid-construction? Will architects now need to secure insurance to cover such potential claims, and will insurers provide it?

On the legal front, how is an architect to know what is a standard feature, unprotected by the copyright laws? What makes a window "standard" and another protectible? A gray area is certain to develop and, as in other areas of copyright law, architects will have to look to judges' construction of this new law for guidance. One thing is certain: Architects and developers should take a close look at the law, and its implications are far-reaching.

Copyright 1991 Franklin A. Miles, Jr.

Franklin A. Miles, Jr. is a partner in the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania law firm of McNees, Wallace & Nurick where he is chairman of the firm's Intellectual Property Group.
improve the end result. Decision makers are almost always influenced in some ways by others. In one scenario, a board member can show the tape to an important customer or someone else whose opinion is important to him to get their reaction to the building before it’s built. It may be a headache to consider a lot of input, but it may also allow us to avoid adverse reactions. Design changes may be necessary, but changes in the design stage are always quicker, easier, and cheaper than when the building is being built, or has been finished.

If public reaction and acceptance or criticism is something we learn and improve from, then we can benefit from that input in less time as well.

If we shorten the feedback cycle in two important ways, why won’t we help architects gain more experience sooner and develop their potential at an earlier age? Why won’t we have fewer mistakes on our skylines?

Architecture may change from an old man’s game to a game of video visualization that can be win/win for architects of all ages, their clients and the public.

---

**The Pennsylvania Architect**

**Editorial Schedule 1991/92**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1991</td>
<td>July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches and associated buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1991</td>
<td>October 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary schools including private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1992</td>
<td>January 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1991 Pennsylvania Society of Architects Design Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**WHO CAN MAKE THE MOST OF YOUR CADD SYSTEM?**

**WE’LL DRAW YOU A PICTURE.**

TSA/ADVET provides better tools for CADD users.

We’ve been around long enough to develop a solid reputation for innovative, cost-effective hardware and software solutions to a variety of engineering and design questions.

But, did you know that TSA/ADVET has also assisted many of Pennsylvania’s leading architectural and engineering firms in realizing the full potential of their CADD systems with our on-call service/support team?

Our specialists are available to give you a detailed plan to complete your project, help you get the most out of your system, or design a complete new system from the ground up. One workstation or an office full.

TSA/ADVET. We give you more than a line, we give you the whole picture.
Wood-Mode
FINE CUSTOM CABINETRY

The look. The feel. The quality.
Wood-Mode creates kitchens built to order in a wide range of contemporary and traditional styles, hand-rubbed finishes, and innovative special storage cabinets . . . all with a five year limited warranty. Wood-Mode. A heritage of fine craftsmanship spanning nearly fifty years.

FOR THE NAME AND LOCATION OF A NEARBY WOOD-MODE SHOWROOM

MANUFACTURERS REPRESENTATIVES

CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA
Battram Company
800-326-9302

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA
Marcus Kitchens, Inc.
412-661-9704

METROPOLITAN PHILADELPHIA
Wall & Walsh, Inc.
215-789-8530
The most successful projects begin with the right tools. At Duquesne Light, we have the information and the experience to help you identify the energy options that give you maximum design flexibility, help your customers save energy and money, and increase occupant comfort.

Whether you are planning to build or renovate, ask us about the latest advances in energy processes and management, thermal controls, space conditioning, lighting and other applications of electric technology. A Duquesne Light consultant also can provide an energy options analysis of your specific building plan.

Call us at 393-6344 or 393-6503 to explore your alternatives. We think you'll benefit from what you discover.