IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 4-129 / 93-1403

FILED
APR 26 1994
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF CLAUDIA J. ROBINSON AND WILLIAM R. ROBINSON

Upon the Petition of
CLAUDIA J. RODENBURG,
f/k/a CLAUDIA J. ROBINSON,

Appellee,

And Concerning
WILLIAM R. ROBINSON,

Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Pottawattamie County, Keith Burgett, Judge.

William appeals a judgment modifying his visitation privileges. **AFFIRMED.**

Lyle W. Ditmars and Matthew G. Woods of the Peters Law Firm, Council Bluffs, for appellant.

Curtis J. Heithoff of Pratt and Heithoff, Council Bluffs, for appellee.

Considered by Hayden, P.J., and Cady and Huitink, JJ.

HUITINK, J.

William appeals from a judgment modifying his visitation privileges. We affirm.

This marriage was dissolved in 1991. The decree awarded Claudia physical care of the parties' two minor children. William was awarded visitation including thirty-nine Sundays, thirteen Saturdays, twelve Fridays, two evenings each week, and at least three full weeks during the summer.

William and Claudia both petitioned for modification alleging there had been a substantial change in circumstances warranting a change in their visitation arrangements. The trial court agreed and modified the visitation schedule providing that William should have visitation every other weekend from 5 p.m. on Friday until 5 p.m. on Sunday. William was also awarded visitation every Tuesday from after school until 8:30 p.m. and two separate two-week visits in the summer.

William contends the modification results in an unfair reduction of his visitation rights that is not in the children's best interest. He argues the court should have ordered the four-week rotating schedule he proposed as an alternative to the original schedule.

Our review is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. We give weight to the trial court's findings of fact, but we are not bound by them. Iowa R. App. P. 14(f)(7).

The visitation schedule included in the original decree proved to be impractical because it lacked specificity. Neither party was able to accommodate the other's schedule, and the resulting conflicts were problematical for the children. We agree with the trial court's finding that there was a change of circumstances requiring modification.

The court's governing consideration when establishing visitation rights is the best interests of the children and, generally, liberal visitation rights are in the children's best interest. In re Marriage of Stepp, 485 N.W.2d 846, 849 (Iowa App. 1992). Although liberal visitation is the rule, Iowa Code section 598.41(1) does not require the court to apportion at least half of available time to the noncustodial parent. In re Marriage of Bunch, 460 N.W.2d 890, 892 (Iowa App. 1990). Visitation should be reasonable and should not cause instability by unduly disrupting the children's routine. See In re Marriage of Weidner, 338 N.W.2d 351, 359 (Iowa 1983).

The visitation schedule ordered by the trial court is both reasonable and adequate. It accomplishes the stated objectives of Iowa Code section 598.41(1) by providing the children with the opportunity for the maximum continuing physical and emotional contact with both parents. It also minimizes the disruption and potential conflict that plagued the original arrangement.

We, however, cannot say the same for the arrangement proposed by William. It, in contrast to that ordered, is

less stable and more disruptive for the children. Contrary to William's assertions, it is not the only arrangement that will alleviate the problems the parties are experiencing with their children. William's proposal is essentially one of divided physical care which is generally opposed in the absence of circumstances that are not present in this case. See In re Marriage of Burham, 283 N.W.2d 269, 273 (Iowa 1979).

We therefore affirm the judgment of the district court.

AFFIRMED.