



Toyota C-HR
Standard Safety Equipment

2024



Adult Occupant



85%

Child Occupant



86%

Vulnerable Road Users



86%

Safety Assist



79%

SPECIFICATION

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Tested Model | New Toyota C-HR |
| Body Type | - 5 door SUV |
| Year Of Publication | 2024 |
| Kerb Weight | 1463kg |
| VIN From Which Rating Applies | - all C-HRs |
| Class | Small SUV |

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

| | Driver | Passenger | Rear |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------|------|
| FRONTAL CRASH PROTECTION | | | |
| Frontal airbag | ● | ● | — |
| Belt pretensioner | ● | ● | ● |
| Belt loadlimiter | ● | ● | ● |
| Knee airbag | ● | ✘ | — |
| LATERAL CRASH PROTECTION | | | |
| Side head airbag | ● | ● | ● |
| Side chest airbag | ● | ● | ✘ |
| Side pelvis airbag | ● | ● | ✘ |
| Centre Airbag | ● | ● | — |

| | Driver | Passenger | Rear |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------|------|
| CHILD PROTECTION | | | |
| Isifix/i-Size | — | ✘ | ● |
| Integrated CRS | — | ✘ | ✘ |
| Airbag cut-off switch | — | ● | — |
| Child presence detection | — | ● | ● |
| SAFETY ASSIST | | | |
| Seat Belt Reminder | ● | ● | ● |

SAFETY EQUIPMENT (NEXT)

| OTHER SYSTEMS | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Active Bonnet | ✘ |
| AEB Vulnerable Road Users | ● |
| AEB Pedestrian - Reverse | ○ |
| Cyclist Dooring Prevention | ● |
| AEB Motorcyclist | ● |
| AEB Car-to-Car | ● |
| Speed Assistance | ● |
| Lane Assist System | ● |
| Fatigue / Distraction Detection | ● |

Note: Other equipment may be available on the vehicle but was not considered in the test year.

- Fitted to the vehicle as standard
 ○ Fitted to the vehicle as part of the safety pack
○ Not fitted to the test vehicle but available as option or as part of the safety pack
 ✘ Not available
 — Not applicable

ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 34.0 Pts / 85%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Frontal Impact 11.6 / 16 Pts

Mobile Progressive Deformable Barrier

Full Width Rigid Barrier

Lateral Impact 16.0 / 16 Pts

Side Mobile Barrier

Side Pole

Far-Side Excursion

Occupant Interaction

Rear Impact 3.8 / 4 Pts

Rear Seat

Front Seat

ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 34.0 Pts / 85%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

| Rescue and Extrication | | 2.7 / 4 Pts |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Rescue Sheet | Available, ISO compliant | |
| Advanced eCall | Available | |
| Multi Collision Brake | Available | |
| Submergence Check | Compliant | |

Comments

The passenger compartment of the C-HR remained stable in the frontal offset test. Dummy numbers showed good protection of the knees and femurs of both the driver and passenger. Toyota showed that a similar level of protection would be provided to occupants of different sizes and to those sitting in different positions. Dummy readings of compression indicated marginal protection for the driver's chest. All other critical body regions were well or adequately protected, for both driver and passenger. Analysis of the deceleration of the impact trolley during the test, and of the deformable barrier after the test, revealed that the C-HR would be a benign impact partner in a frontal collision. In the full-width rigid barrier test, protection of protection of the chest was rated as marginal both for the driver and the rear passenger. Moreover, post-test analysis revealed that the abdomen of the rear passenger dummy had slipped underneath the lap section of the seatbelt, a phenomenon known as 'submarining'. A penalty was applied and protection of this body region rated as poor. In both the side barrier test and the more severe side pole impact, dummy readings indicated good protection of all critical body areas and the C-HR scored maximum points in this part of the assessment. Control of excursion (the extent to which a body is thrown to the other side of the vehicle when it is hit from the far side) was adequate. The C-HR has a centre airbag mounted on the driver's seat to mitigate against occupant to occupant injuries in such impacts. Dummy numbers were good in Euro NCAP's test, with equal protection to the front driver and passenger. Tests on the front seats and head restraints demonstrated good protection against whiplash injuries in the event of a rear-end collision. A geometric analysis of the rear seats also indicated good whiplash protection. The C-HR has an advanced eCall system which alerts the emergency services in the event of a crash. The car also has a system which applies the brakes after an impact, to avoid secondary collisions. Toyota demonstrated that if the car entered water the doors, if locked, could be opened within two minutes of power being lost and that electric windows would remain functional long enough to allow occupants to escape.

CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 42.6 Pts / 86%

GOOD ADEQUATE MARGINAL WEAK POOR

Crash Test Performance based on 6 & 10 year old children

23.6 / 24 Pts

Frontal Impact 15.6 Pts



Lateral Impact 8 Pts



Restraint for 6 year old child: *Kidfix i-Size*
 Restraint for 10 year old child: *Graco Booster*

Safety Features

7.0 / 13 Pts

| | Front Passenger | 2nd row outboard | 2nd row center |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Isofix | ✗ | ● | ✗ |
| i-Size | ✗ | ● | ✗ |
| Integrated CRS | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Top tether | ✗ | ● | ✗ |
| Child Presence Detection | ● | ● | ● |

● Fitted to test car as standard ○ Not on test car but available as option ✗ Not available

CRS Installation Check

12.0 / 12 Pts

| i-Size | Seat Position | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---|---------|--------|-------|
| | Front | | 2nd row | | |
| | | | Left | center | Right |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |

● Easy ○ Difficult ● Safety critical ✗ Not allowed
 Airbag ON Rearward facing restraint installation not allowed Airbag OFF

CHILD OCCUPANT


Total 42.6 Pts / 86%

| Isofix | Seat Position | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---|---------|--------|-------|
| | Front | | 2nd row | | |
| | | | Left | center | Right |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |
| | ✗ | ✗ | ● | ✗ | ● |

● Easy
 ● Difficult
 ● Safety critical
 ✗ Not allowed
 Airbag ON
 Rearward facing restraint installation not allowed
 Airbag OFF

| Seatbelt Attached | Seat Position | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|---------|--------|-------|
| | Front | | 2nd row | | |
| | | | Left | center | Right |
| | ✗ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | ✗ | ● | ● | ● | ● |

● Easy
 ● Difficult
 ● Safety critical
 ✗ Not allowed
 Airbag ON
 Rearward facing restraint installation not allowed
 Airbag OFF

 CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 42.6 Pts / 86%

Comments

In both the frontal offset and side barrier tests, good protection was provided to all critical body areas for both child dummies, and the Toyota C-HR scored maximum points in this part of the assessment. The front passenger airbag can be disabled to allow a rearward-facing child restraint to be used in that seating position. Clear information is provided to the driver regarding the status of the airbag and the system was rewarded. The C-HR is equipped with an indirect 'child presence detection' system, which issues a warning when it recognises that a child or infant may have been left in the car. All of the child restraint types for which the C-HR is designed could be properly installed and accommodated in the car.

VULNERABLE ROAD USERS

Total 54.4 Pts / 86%



VRU Impact Protection

30.3 / 36 Pts



| | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Pedestrian & Cyclist Head | 12.3 Pts |
| Pelvis | 4.5 Pts |
| Femur | 4.5 Pts |
| Knee & Tibia | 9.0 Pts |

VRU Impact Mitigation

24.1 / 27 Pts

| | |
|------------------|---|
| System Name | Pre-Collision System with Pedestrian Detection as part of Toyota Safety Sense |
| Type | Auto-Brake with Forward Collision Warning |
| Operational From | 50 km/h |
| PERFORMANCE | |

AEB Pedestrian

6.5 / 9 Pts

| Scenario | Day time | Night time |
|---|----------|------------|
| Car reversing into adult or child | | — |
| Adult crossing a road into which a car is turning | | — |
| Adult crossing the road | | |
| Child running from behind parked vehicles | | |
| Adult along the roadside | | |

— Currently not tested

AEB Cyclist

7.8 / 8 Pts

| Scenario | Day time |
|---|----------|
| Approaching cyclist crossing from behind parked parked vehicles | |
| Turning across path of an oncoming cyclist | |
| Approaching a crossing cyclist | |
| Approaching a cyclist along the roadside | |

VULNERABLE ROAD USERS

Total 54.4 Pts / 86%

■ GOOD ■ ADEQUATE ■ MARGINAL ■ WEAK ■ POOR

Cyclist Dooring Prevention ■ 0.8 / 1 Pts

| Scenario | |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Dooring a passing cyclist | information" |

AEB Motorcyclist ■ 6.0 / 6 Pts

| Scenario | Autobrake function only | Driver reacts to warning |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Approaching a stationary motorcyclist | ■ | ■ |
| Approaching a braking motorcyclist | ■ | ■ |
| Turn across the path of an oncoming motorcyclist | ■ | — |

— Currently not tested

Lane Support Motorcyclist ■ 3.0 / 3 Pts

| Scenario | Day time |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Changing lane across the path of an oncoming motorcyclist | ■ |
| Changing lane across the path of an overtaking motorcyclist | ■ |

Comments

Protection of the head of a struck pedestrian or cyclist was predominantly good or adequate, with poor results recorded only on the stiff windscreen pillars. Protection of the pelvis, femur and the knee and tibia was good across the whole width of the car and the C-HR scored maximum points in this part of the assessment. The autonomous emergency braking (AEB) system of the Toyota can respond to vulnerable road users as well as to other vehicles. In tests of its reaction to pedestrians, performance was adequate and was good when tested in cyclist scenarios. Similarly, the AEB system performed well in all tests of its response to motorcyclists and the lane support function also performed well in this regard.

SAFETY ASSIST

Total 14.3 Pts / 79%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Speed Assistance

■ 2.1 / 3 Pts

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| System Name | Road Sign Assist with Speed Limiter |
| Speed Limit Information Function | Camera & Map, subsigns supported |
| Speed Limitation Function | Intelligent ACC (accurate to 5km/h) |

Occupant Status Monitoring

■ 1.3 / 3 Pts

> Seatbelt Reminder

■ 1.0 / 1 Pts

| Applies To | Front and rear seats | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Driver Seat | Front Passenger(s) | Rear Passenger(s) |
| Warning | | | |
| Visual | ● | ● | ● |
| Audible | ● | ● | ● |
| Occupant Detection | — | ● | ● |

● Pass
 ● Fail
 — Not available

> Driver Monitoring

■ 0.3 / 2 Pts

| | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| System Name | Driver Monitor |
| Type | Indirect monitoring |
| Operational From | 30 km/h |
| Fatigue | Drowsiness |

Version 110724

SAFETY ASSIST

Total 14.3 Pts / 79%

Lane Support

3.0 / 3 Pts

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| System Name | Lane Tracing Assist (LTA) |
| Type | LKA and ELK |
| Operational From | 50 km/h |
| PERFORMANCE | |
| Emergency Lane Keeping | GOOD |
| Lane Keep Assist | GOOD |
| Human Machine Interface | GOOD |

AEB Car-to-Car

8.0 / 9 Pts

| | |
|------------------|--|
| System Name | Pre-Collision System |
| Type | Autonomous emergency braking and forward collision warning |
| Operational From | 5 km/h |
| Sensor Used | Camera and Radar |

| Scenario | Autobrake function only | Driver reacts to warning |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Approaching a car crossing a junction | | |
| Approaching a car head-on | | — |
| Turning across the path of an oncoming car | | — |
| Approaching a stationary car | | |
| Approaching a slower moving car | | — |
| Approaching a braking car | | — |

— Currently not tested



SAFETY ASSIST

Total 14.3 Pts / 79%

Comments

Overall, the autonomous emergency braking (AEB) system of the Toyota C-HR performed very well in tests of its reaction to other vehicles, including in the head-on test scenarios. In Euro NCAP's tests, collisions were avoided in almost all scenarios. A seatbelt reminder system is fitted as standard to the front and rear seats but the driver status monitoring system did not score highly, detecting only driver fatigue, not distraction. The lane support system gently corrects the vehicle's path if it is drifting out of lane and also intervenes in some more critical situations. The speed assistance system identifies the local speed limit, and the driver can choose to allow the limiter to be set automatically by the system.

RATING VALIDITY

Variants of Model Range

| Body Type | Engine & Transmission | Model Name/Code | Drivetrain | Rating Applies | |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----|
| | | | | LHD | RHD |
| 5 door SUV | 1.8L Hybrid | Toyota C-HR Hybrid 140* | 4 x 2 | ✓ | ✓ |
| 5 door SUV | 2.0L Hybrid | Toyota C-HR Hybrid 200 | 4 x 2 | ✓ | ✓ |
| 5 door SUV | 2.0L Hybrid AWD-i | Toyota C-HR Hybrid 200 AWD-i | 4 x 4 | ✓ | ✓ |

*Tested variant

Annual Reviews and Facelifts

| Date | Event | Outcome |
|------------|------------------|------------------|
| April 2024 | Rating Published | 2024 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ✓ |