


Toyota Picnic

RATING	SCORE
 ADULT OCCUPANT ★★★★★	25 Front: 10 Side: 15
 PEDESTRIAN ★★★★★	16 Pre 2002 rating



Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver



Frontal impact passenger



Side impact driver

- GOOD
- ADEQUATE
- MARGINAL
- WEAK
- POOR

Child restraints

18 month old Child	No information available
3 year old Child	No information available

Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

Safety equipment

Front seatbelt pretensioners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front seatbelt load limiters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Driver frontal airbag	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front passenger frontal airbag	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Side body airbags	<input type="checkbox"/>
Side head airbags	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driver knee airbag	<input type="checkbox"/>

Car details

Hand of drive	RHD
Tested model	Toyota Picnic 2.0 GS
Body type	7-seat MPV
Year of publication	1999
Kerb weight	1450
VIN from which rating applies	SXM10-0 132207, SXM10-7 090876

Comments

The Picnic gives good all round crash protection and, even though it was one of the smaller MPVs tested, it ran a close second to the group leader, the Renault Espace. Euro NCAP noted, however, that knee and upper leg protection needed improving for the driver and front passenger in a frontal impact, while the driver's feet were also at risk. Side-impact protection was good but there was a small risk of chest injury for the driver. Thought had been given to child protection including the dangers of the passenger airbag for an infant, and the type of rear belts fitted. All the more surprising, then, that Toyota do not recommend to buyers any particular model of child seat for this car.

Front impact

The cabin structure protected its occupants well, although the driver's footwell ruptured. Both front airbags worked well. However, Euro NCAP noted that the steering column shroud lacked padding, and they also spotted hard areas underneath it which could damage the driver's knees and upper legs. The front passenger also risked injury if his legs hit a support bracket. Also, the centre rear seat had just a lap belt, not a three-point harness.

Side impact

The Picnic protected its occupants, although the driver ran a small risk of chest injury. Like others here, the Picnic's height gives it an advantage if struck by an average sized car.

Child occupant

Euro NCAP praised the label on the driver's sun visor which explained in three languages the risk of injury or death to children if placed in rear-facing restraints on the front seat. It would have been better if this label had been duplicated on the passenger's visor so that it could easily be read by anyone installing a restraint, however. Toyota does not recommend to buyers which child restraints should be fitted although they did recommend which ones should be used in these tests. In general these performed reasonably in side impact but in frontal impact they failed to control the forward movement of the older child. The rear outer belts were three-point with an auto-lock to help secure child restraints. Instructions for use were given on a suitable label.

Pedestrian

Head protection for adults and children was about average for this type of vehicle. The upper leg impact area was particularly likely to injure anyone it struck, although the bumper gave more protection. Much needs to be done to improve protection.