

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No.3-072 / 92-621

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF SUSAN J. HOWARD AND
GREGORY P. HOWARD

FILED

MAR 30 1993

CLERK SUPREME COURT

Upon the Petition of

SUSAN J. HOWARD,

Petitioner-Appellee,

And Concerning

GREGORY P. HOWARD

Respondent-Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Lee County,
William L. Dowell, Judge.

The respondent appeals from a judgment of the
district court denying his request to modify the visitation
provisions of the original dissolution decree. **AFFIRMED.**

Timothy W. Greene of Borseth & Holmes, Pleasant Hill,
for appellant.

Cynthia W. Danielson of Danielson Law Office, P.C.,
Mount Pleasant, for appellee.

Heard by Schlegel, P.J., and Sackett, and Habhab, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant Gregory P. Howard appeals the trial court's denial of his application to modify the visitation provisions of his dissolution decree. Gregory contends the trial court should have granted modification of the visitation provision because petitioner-appellee Susan J. Howard n/k/a Susan J. Sanford's working schedule makes it difficult for him to exercise visitation. We affirm.

The sole question in this appeal is whether a dissolution decree should be modified to increase the visitation schedule of respondent-appellant Gregory P. Howard with his son, Jared.

Gregory and Susan were divorced in 1990. The parties were granted joint custody. Susan was awarded physical care of Jared. In granting the dissolution, the trial court approved a stipulation of the parties that provided Gregory have visitation with his son every other weekend from 5:00 p.m. Friday to 5:00 p.m. Sunday, one evening each week from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., a holiday schedule for every other holiday, Father's Day from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Gregory's birthday from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., the child's birthday every other year, and four weeks in the summer. To justify a change in visitation, Gregory must show there has been a change of circumstances since the dissolution decree. In re Marriage of Fortelka, 425 N.W.2d 671, 672 (Iowa App. 1988). Generally, a much less

extensive change of circumstances need be shown in visitation right cases. In re Marriage of Jerome, 378 N.W.2d 302, 305 (Iowa App. 1985). However, to modify visitation privileges, the party seeking modification must show a change of circumstances has occurred since the entry of the dissolution decree. See In re Marriage of Burwinkel, 426 N.W.2d 664, 665 (Iowa App. 1988).

Currently Susan lives with Jared in Fort Madison. Gregory lives in Fort Madison and visitation is easily accomplished. The visitation provisions in the decree are liberal and the evidence indicates Gregory has been able to exercise these rights. Susan continues to work the same swing shift and for the same employer as when the dissolution decree was entered. At the time of trial, Gregory was self-employed.

Jared is in good health and doing well in school.

We recognize both parents love Jared very much. Children of a divorce have a need to maintain meaningful relationships with both parents. Fortelka, 425 N.W.2d at 672.

Our review of the **record reveals** Gregory has failed to show a substantial **change in** circumstances since the entry of the dissolution **decree**.

We affirm the trial court

AFFIRMED.