



Nissan Primera

RATING	SCORE	Front: 8	Side: 11
 ADULT OCCUPANT ★★☆☆☆	19		
 PEDESTRIAN ★☆☆☆☆	10	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

Safety equipment

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

Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

Car details

Hand of drive	RHD
Tested model	Nissan Primera 1.6 GX
Body type	5 door hatchback
Year of publication	1997
Kerb weight	1219

Comments

The new Primera, launched in October 1996, earned a three-star front- and side-impact rating. It performed well in the frontal-impact test, although footwell intrusion was extensive and stiff structures in the lower fascia area posed a hazard to the driver's knees, thighs and pelvis. The Primera met coming 1998 side-impact legislation for new models. The car tested had a standard driver airbag that worked well. Side impact airbags will be offered as options later this year.

Front impact

The front screen pillar was pushed back by only 58mm (2.3in). The passenger compartment remained structurally stable during the impact, though the driver's door was jammed shut and could not be opened by hand: tools had to be used. However, the passenger's door could be opened normally. The impact pushed the steering wheel backwards by 80mm (3.1in) and upwards by 64mm (2.5in). There was excessive intrusion into the footwell and the brake pedal was displaced rearwards by 250mm (9.9in). Head and neck protection for the driver was 'good' and the head contact on the airbag was stable. The restraint system was effective in keeping the driver's chest away from the steering wheel. The driver's left knee struck the column cladding, the column adjustment lever and then the lower fascia. Had it impacted the fascia in a slightly different position horizontally, it could have had hit the steering adjustment lever harder and also struck the ignition lock, adding to the risk of injury. If that knee had penetrated the fascia further than it did, injury risks would have risen still further. The steering adjustment lever could also have caused localised loading damage to that knee. The driver's right knee scuffed the column cladding and struck the fascia. Had this knee been in a slightly different horizontal position, it

would have hit the column adjuster mechanism and even the steering lock, which is sited higher on the column. And if this knee had penetrated slightly further, injury risk would have increased significantly. The edge of the column adjuster bracket could have acted on the knee, again increasing the threat of major injury. Intrusion into the footwell was excessive, resulting in poor protection for the feet and ankles. The passenger was generally well protected – the head, neck, both knees, thighs and pelvis and the left and right lower leg all earned a good rating in the frontal-impact test. The one exception was the passenger's chest, where forces acting on the seat belt did present some injury risk. The results from the passenger dummy were not modified on the basis of any structural damage to the car.

Side impact

The driver's chest, abdomen and pelvis was struck by the Primera's door, posing risks of injury and earning a 'weak' rating for chest protection, and an 'adequate' rating for the abdomen and pelvis. Protection for his head was assessed as good, though.

Child occupant

There are slight mismatches between the child and adult seats, but these are not thought sufficient to jeopardise safety.

Pedestrian

Child head impact Four of the six test locations met proposed legislation. One other point came close to satisfying the requirements. That one point, situated above a suspension strut, performed better than the group average. One point, at the join between bonnet and wing, was worse than average. **Upper leg impact** No tests met proposed legislation, although one, on the bonnet hinge, came close. Three points were better than average, three points were worse: one situated on the left-hand wiper spindle. One area of the bonnet proved particularly hazardous even though there was no stiff structure underneath. **Adult head impact** No tests met proposed legislation, although one, on the bonnet hinge, came close. Three points were better than average, three points were worse: one situated on the left-hand wiper spindle. One area of the bonnet proved particularly hazardous even though there was no stiff structure underneath. **Leg impact** None of the three tests met the proposed requirements: all were worse than average.