

---

Subject: Thanks for all your input!

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Apr 2002 05:21:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, the vote was 10 out of 13 preferred the H290. Hmm. I hate these difficult-to-make split decisions. Actually, the two of the votes I counted weren't really votes - Garland and Till E. commented on the H290 without actually stating a preference. But since Garland used the H290 and Till used the CH-3, it seemed appropriate to count one for each of them. I guess I'm a contrarian because I like the CH-3 much better. It looks better to me in large cabinets, and the seam can't be seen from just a few feet away. But I suspect it's what scares many people away - I know it did me when I first saw it but it's too small to be an acoustic issue and I've never found them to break loose or buzz. Still, since almost everyone likes the H290, I'll change all the plans that use 1.6kHz crossovers to use this horn instead. That really sucks. It's the only reason I even asked - I hoped more of you would like the CH-3 so I wouldn't have to change the plans. But it is less expensive, and it is attractive. You must all admit - The speakers we've seen with both horn types looked absolutely great. I'm going to fudge just a little bit though. I'm not really going to change all the plans to use the CH-3. I'll just move the "threshold" up from 4 cubic feet to 8 - any cabinet larger than 8 cubic feet will still use the CH-3. The larger cabinets really do benefit from the larger horn. As you all have noticed, the speakers between 6 and 8 cubic feet look great with either horn. Speakers less than 4 cubic feet need the H290 and speakers greater than 8 need the models. But as far as obtaining Peavey products for larger speakers is concerned - Don't worry about that. I'll supply CH-3's. I actually have some in inventory, and I maintain this for my own