














Rover 100

RATING	SCORE
 ADULT OCCUPANT     	N/A
 PEDESTRIAN    	N/A <small>Pre 2002 rating</small>

Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver



Frontal impact passenger



Side impact driver

	GOOD
	ADEQUATE
	MARGINAL
	WEAK
	POOR

Child restraints

18 month old Child	None fitted
3 year old Child	Klippan Superdream, forward facing

Safety equipment

Front seatbelt pretensioners	<input 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	Rover 111i
Body type	3 door hatchback
Year of publication	1997
Kerb weight	815

Comments

The Rover 100 was awarded only one star for protection in frontal and side impact. However, with a little improvement it would move into the two-star category. In the frontal-impact test, the head and loadings on both knees failed to meet the new criteria. Furthermore, the rearward and upward displacement of the steering wheel also failed to comply. Under side-impact crash test conditions, loadings to the chest and abdomen were greater than those which are to be permitted by the future requirements. In frontal impact, the major problems related to excessive intrusion and instability of the passenger compartment. Better control of steering wheel displacement would be needed to overcome the Rover 100's head protection problems. For protection of the lower limbs, reducing intrusion and improving the knee-impact area would be most beneficial. In side impact, reduced loading of the chest and abdomen is needed, while at the same time controlling the loading on the pelvis.

Front impact

The Rover suffered excessive deformation of the passenger compartment in the frontal impact – the A-pillar on the driver's side was pushed back by 488mm – and the structure became unstable. This was because the driver's door split apart, allowing excessive collapse of the door aperture and intrusion of the fascia, which had partially come away from the car's side. Following frontal impact, the driver's door could only be opened by using tools. However, the passenger's door could be opened normally. The steering wheel was pushed back by an excessive 312mm. There was excessive intrusion of the footwell. The Rover suffered excessive deformation of the passenger compartment in the frontal impact – the A-pillar on the driver's side was pushed back by 488mm – and the structure became unstable. This was because the driver's door

split apart, allowing excessive collapse of the door aperture and intrusion of the fascia, which had partially come away from the car's side. Following frontal impact, the driver's door could only be opened by using tools. However, the passenger's door could be opened normally. The steering wheel was pushed back by an excessive 312mm. There was excessive intrusion of the footwell. Protection of the passenger's head, neck, chest, left knee/femur/pelvis, lower legs and feet and ankles was good. Protection of the right knee/femur/pelvis was judged to be adequate.

Side impact

Head protection offered by the Rover 100 in side impact was good, pelvis protection adequate. Owing to loading on the dummy's top rib, the protection from injury of the chest was poor, and so was the rating given to protection of the abdomen.

Child occupant

A forward-facing Klippan Superdream child seat was fitted, as recommended by Rover. Under frontal-impact crash conditions, the forward movement of the child restraint was found to be well controlled. However, there was considered to be insufficient restraint afforded to the child's upper body that, in turn, allowed a large forward movement of the child's head to take place. The lateral movement of the child restraint under side impact crash testing was rated as poor. In this case, the upper part of the restraint was allowed to move across as far as the mid line of the car. The child's head was then able to move well beyond the protective sides of the child restraint.

Pedestrian

Four of the six test points gave better-than-average protection. Areas of the bonnet above a battery terminal and suspension turret provided poorer protection. Upper leg impact Two of the three test points gave better-than-average protection. Less protection was available in the centre of the car near the bonnet latch and badge. Adult head impact Two of the three test points gave better-than-average protection. Worse-than-average protection was provided on the bonnet above the hinge. Leg impact One of the test points – at the centre of the bumper – provided protection better than that required to meet proposed legislation. Areas of the bumper ahead of the mount and in line with the inside edge of the headlight gave better-than-average protection.