
Subject: Horn flare survey

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 19:44:35 GMT

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

This weekend, I plan to setup an inventory for my online store. I'd like some feedback from each of you on a particular subject. Eminence H290 or Peavey CH-3. I'd like to also make available the nice wood horns that Bill Martinelli is making, but for an entry level horn flare, I need to decide on one of the above. Here's the deal. I can get Eminence H290 horn flares for thirty bucks and Peavey CH-3's for forty-five. That's the price you'll find 'em at from places like Parts Express. I personally like the looks of the CH-3 better in large cabinets over about 6 cubic feet, but when crossed at 1.6Khz, there is very little difference acoustically. The CH-3 is an 800Hz horn and the H290 is a 1kHz horn, so they are really the same thing, and you can't tell them apart by listening to them. The difference is truly aesthetic only. Well, that and the price. So two options I'm considering are to offer the horn specified in the existing plans, or change all models to use the

CH-3, and this is what many of you have built with and that I always use. But lots of you have built with the H290 too, and really, your speakers look great. There is no acoustic difference, so it

kit having a Peavey CH-3, it will cost \$241.91. The exact same kit, substituting an Eminence

kit form, but the pair having Peavey flares is a little over thirty dollars more, being \$16.46 more a piece. So what do you all think? Leave 'em as-is, providing the Peavey flares or switch to using all Eminence?

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey

Posted by [bmar](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 20:00:04 GMT

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

personally, I like the look of the H290 better than the Two piece peavey with a crack showing all the way through it. if there is no acoustic difference from the finished speaker with either horn, it's possible the DIY people buying kits would also like to save the additional 33 bucks for a pair. just my opinion. bmar

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [dbeardsl](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 20:45:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd go with the H-290, most people who buy a kit are proly trying to save money. Get the H-290 from Image Communications for \$23.50. Infact all of their eminence prices are good.

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [replay](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 21:50:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i prefer the looks of the h290 and they're easy to buy. seems few places stock peavey. i had a hell of a time locating them in canada. cheers, george

Subject: H 290 (nt)
Posted by [Rex Mills](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 22:29:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [steve f](#) on Fri, 12 Apr 2002 23:37:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Wayne, I'll add my vote for the h290. Know what though, I wish a cool looking flare was available that would extend beyond the cabinet face. Add an automotive paint finish, well I'd

like it anyway.Cheers,Steve

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [BillEpstein](#) on Sat, 13 Apr 2002 00:10:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hate the soft plastic of the CH-3; but it looks better on the Theatre without a doubt.OTOH, it should be easy enough to simulate recessing the 290 with a molding thereby extending it's apparent size.Make the front baffle three piece: inner 24X36 to mount the horn, mid also 24X36 with a slot cut beyond the outer dimension of the horn far enough to accomodate 3/4 round trim to flare the baffle and finally the 24X ? for whichever manner you choose to recess the woofer.Any takers?

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [Garland](#) on Sat, 13 Apr 2002 07:21:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The H 290 worked for me but there was the problem of the bolt holes for mounting the driver needing modification to get the bolts through. That may be a problem for some DIYers and a problem in customer satisfaction for you!G.

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [trancemitr](#) on Sat, 13 Apr 2002 20:01:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll place my vote for the CH-3. I'll admit that I'm the kind of guy that will pay a little bit more for

aesthetics. I really prefer the looks of it, but that's just me. Kevin

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [boblaz](#) on Sat, 13 Apr 2002 21:06:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I vote for the H-290 with the CH-3 as a special order only.

Subject: Take 290, stick to Eminence for whole speaker (nt)
Posted by [Erik from Holand](#) on Mon, 15 Apr 2002 05:05:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(nt)

Subject: 290 - Same bang, less buck (nt)
Posted by [JLapaire](#) on Mon, 15 Apr 2002 10:48:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.

Subject: Re: Horn flare survey
Posted by [Hodel](#) on Mon, 15 Apr 2002 17:01:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

290's are fine if you can resolve the bolt hole problem.

Subject: I'm sure Wayne will provide proper bolts
Posted by [Sam P.](#) on Mon, 15 Apr 2002 20:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so I vote for the H290. I don't care for the prominent seam on the CH3. I would have used some nice socket head bolts...of course the hardware store had only 3! SamBTW, you all DID put the bolts thru the holes in the horn first, and then put the driver in position, slowly turning the bolts into the holes threaded in the driver, right? I don't recall interference...

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

Subject: What can be done about the inconsistent bolt holes?(nt)

Posted by [Garland](#) on Tue, 16 Apr 2002 11:49:27 GMT

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

nt

Subject: Use 1/4"-20 x 3/4" bolts

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Apr 2002 14:38:59 GMT

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

I've never had a problem with the bolt holes. The throat is very close, this is true. But when I've used 1/4"-20 bolts that were 3/4" long, I've never had to modify the horn to install the bolts.