
# Renault Laguna

| RATING | | SCORE | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ADULT OCCUPANT | ★★★½☆☆ | 17 | Front: 6<br>Side: 11 |
| PEDESTRIAN | ☆☆☆☆ | N/A | Pre 2002 rating |

**Adult occupant protection**

*Frontal impact driver*

*Frontal impact passenger*

*Side impact driver*


**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** | ☑ |
| **Front seatbelt load limiters** | ☑ |
| **Driver frontal airbag** | ☑ |
| **Front passenger frontal airbag** | ☐ |
| **Side body airbags** | ☐ |
| **Side head airbags** | ☐ |
| **Driver knee airbag** | ☐ |

**Car details**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Hand of drive** | RHD |
| **Tested model** | Renault Laguna 2.0 RT |
| **Body type** | 5 door hatchback |
| **Year of publication** | 1997 |
| **Kerb weight** | 1313 |

**Comments**

Detailed improvements made to side impact and driver knee protection from May 1997. Rating given here applies to cars built before 30 April 1997.

**Front impact**

The driver's screen pillar was pushed backwards by 145mm (5.7in). The driver's door could not be opened by hand after the test and tools had to be used. The passenger's door could be opened normally. The steering wheel moved backwards by 94mm (3.7in) and downwards by 42mm (1.7in). There was moderate footwell intrusion, with the brake pedal being displaced rearwards by 200mm (7.9in). The driver's head protection would have been judged as good on the basis of the instrumentation, but was down-rated because head contact on the airbag was unstable. Neck protection was good, however, and the restraint system was effective in keeping the driver's chest away from the steering wheel. Load-limiting seat belt mounts worked effectively and the dummy measured a low risk of chest injury, although intrusion into the cabin at facia level posed a hazard to different-sized drivers or those seated much nearer to or farther away from the steering wheel. The driver's left knee hit the steering column cladding and the column adjustment lever, posing a significant level of injury risk, though this would not have increased had the knee struck in a slightly different position horizontally or vertically. However the column adjuster bracket could have caused localised damage to the knee. The driver's right knee hit the facia near the fuse box. He ran a major risk of knee, thigh and pelvis injury. If that

knee had hit slightly to the left, the column support beam or the ignition lock could have been struck. A slightly higher knee position would also have led to contact with the ignition lock. If the knee had penetrated slightly further, the column lock and support beam could have been hit and both of these could have produced localised damage to his knee. Readings from the test dummy suggested 'poor' protection for its left lower leg and 'weak' protection available for its right lower leg. The amount of footwell intrusion suggested a likelihood of both feet and ankle injury. The passenger in the front impact rated as a low injury risk generally, although there was a slightly higher chance of left lower leg injury noted. The results for the passenger dummy were not modified on the basis of any structural damage to the car.

**Side impact**
High-impact forces from the Laguna's side were measured by the dummy's ribs, resulting in protection to the chest being assessed as poor. Head and pelvis protection for the driver were judged as good, while protection for his abdomen was assessed as 'adequate'.

**Child occupant**
The dummy experienced high head accelerations during the side impact. There is strong evidence that the dummy's head hit the wing of its seat. The position of the belt anchorages, the shape of the child restraint and how well it matches the car's seat, where the adult belt's buckle lies and also the springiness of the car seat cushion were all factors that Euro NCAP assessed.

**Pedestrian**
Child head impact Only one of the six test locations met proposed legislation, above the air intake housing. However, two were better than average, one of which came close to meeting legislative standards. Three were worse: one above the coolant reservoir cap, one above a suspension strut and another above the bonnet stay support. Upper leg impact None of the tests met proposed legislation. Two were better than average, one was worse: in line with the headlight centre. Adult head impact Three tests met proposed legislation: above the wiper blade, on the bonnet lip and at a chosen point. One other point was above average and came close to meeting requirements. Two points were worse than average: one over the bonnet hinge was particularly hazardous. Leg impact None of the three tests met the requirements. One of the tests on the bumper was better than average, two were worse.