

Distr.: General  
11 August 2022

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe**

Inland Transport Committee

**Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety**

**Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals**

**Seventh Informal session**








Geneva, 6 September 2022

Item 3 of the provisional agenda

**“Cycle crossings located at pedestrian crossings” – proposed road sign images**

**Submitted by S. Egger (FSV)**

At the last informal session (23 June 2022), the Group of Experts invited Mr. S. Egger (FSV) to create and submit high quality images of cycle crossing signs (for A and E categories) and a “combined” pedestrian and cycle crossing sign (E category only). This document contains these images.

<p>The 'pedestrian crossing' sign (E, 12, see figure 1 to the right), which the Expert Group had agreed upon in its previous sessions rightly focusses on the prominent and large depiction of the graphical figure representing the pedestrian. This implies that the depiction of the element representing the road marking, which was agreed upon to look as actually applied to the road surface – where the bars (or „stripes“) are of the same width as the distance between bars – has none the less been slightly distorted to accustom the large display of the 'pedestrian'.</p>	 <p>1) E, 12 'Pedestrian crossing'</p>	
<p>As the Group faces the requirement of introducing a 'cycle crossing'- or even a 'pedestrian and cycle crossing'-sign, the necessity of differentiating both forms of crossings as efficiently as possible seems essential. To achieve this, the most potent solution seems – aside of course from the depiction of the graphical figures 'pedestrian' and 'cycle' – to show the road markings („bars“ for pedestrian crossing and „squares“ for cycle crossing) as accurately as possible, which includes that the markings have dimensions in relation to the 'cycle' and 'pedestrian' that attempts to resemble reality, resulting in the following signs: Examples 2 and 3.</p>	 <p>2) E, 12 –amended</p>  <p>3) Cycle crossing</p>	
<p>The strength of this approach becomes evident when both signs are combined into the 'pedestrian and cycle crossing'-sign. The two road markings remain well differentiated and discriminable. The fact that the 'cycle crossing's squares have a count of four while the 'stripes' of the 'pedestrian crossing' remains at three elements additionally supports differentiation. The dimensions of graphical figures 'pedestrian' and 'cycle' allow for easy visual discrimination. See example 4 (right).</p>	 <p>4) Pedestrian and cycle crossing</p>	
<p>The omission of a second line of square markings in sign 'cycle crossing' (see example 3, above) has purpose, following some of the opinions given at the last Session of the Group. This second line would A) need to be positioned „behind“ the 'cycle', which would make the appearance of the 'cycle' less clear (less easily discriminable), B) would require to reduce the dimension (size) of the squares in order to fit them into spaces within the graphical figure 'cycle', which would not correspond to the known actual size of square road markings, and C) would need to be omitted in sign 'pedestrian and cycle crossing' (see 4) in order to keep graphical detail as low as possible, in order for the sign to be easily and swiftly understood.</p>	<p>As stated in the first paragraph, it is suggested to amend the depiction of the sign 'pedestrian crossing' on a mere graphical level ('pedestrian' slightly smaller, road markings more in line with real life application), while not altering the image content of the sign. This of course would require to carry this change over to the respective danger warning sign A, 12a, see example 5 (right).</p>	 <p>5) A, 12a, amended</p>
<p>Further danger warning signs concerning 'cycle crossing' and 'pedestrian and cycle crossing', examples 6 and 7.</p>	 <p>6)</p>  <p>7)</p>	
<p>Of course, if 'pedestrian crossing' is not altered as described above, the sign 'pedestrian and cycle crossing' would look like this (example 8), which is, for the reasons stated, is found not to be recommended.</p>	 <p>8)</p>	