Padel Sites in Metropolitan France: Spatial and Sociodemographic Characterization of Residents Potential Noise Exposure

Jean-Charles Dufour*[1,2], Christophe Bonnet[2]

* Corresponding author: jean-charles.dufour@univ-amu.fr

1. Aix Marseille Univ, APHM, Inserm, IRD, SESSTIM, *Sciences Economiques & Sociales de la Santé & Traitement de l'Information Médicale*, ISSPAM, Hop Timone, BioSTIC, *Biostatistique et Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication*, Marseille, France.

2. Collectif NAMP, France

Abstract

Background. *The rapid expansion of padel in France is raising coexistence issues with nearby residents due to its distinctive acoustic signature (impulsive, repetitive sounds). Several guides and recommendations advise minimum setback distances between padel courts and dwellings, yet no national-scale quantification of at-risk configurations was available for France or elsewhere.*

Objective. *To characterize, at the national level, the number of padel sites in high-risk configurations based on distance and surrounding built environment, and to estimate the population potentially affected by substantial noise nuisance.*

Methods. *We conducted a spatial analysis of sites and their residential surroundings (here, a "padel site" denotes a place hosting one or more padel courts). Using aggregated open sources (878 sites), two independent examiners classified each site by distance-screen-structure criteria into three categories of potential exposure (Cohen's κ = 0.83). QGIS analysis then characterized, for at-risk (Class 1) sites, residential buildings located <100 m, their visibility (line-of-sight, LoS) and distance bands (0–50 m; 50–100 m). Populations/households were estimated by dasymetric floor-area allocation (INSEE FILOSOFI 2019) proportional to floor area, with 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs) reflecting allocation uncertainty. We examined heterogeneity (χ^2), trend by INSEE density grid (Cochran-Armitage), and over-representation (standardized over-representation ratio, SIR; exact Garwood CIs).*

Results. Nearly one third of sites (271/878, 30.87%) fell into Class 1 (at risk of noise nuisance). Distribution by density was heterogeneous (χ^2 = 11.20; p = 0.0476) with a significant trend toward less-dense contexts (Z = 2.66; p = 0.0078); "Small towns" were over-represented (SIR = 1.39; 95% CI [1.06–1.74]). Around the 271 at-risk sites, we identified 3,037 residential buildings (<100 m), estimating 17,117 people (95% UI [16,916–17,318]) and 7,822 households (95% UI [7,686–7,958]); mean distance was 71.9

m (±21.0). Buildings in direct line of sight were closer (65.8 m vs. 76.7 m) and accounted for 75% of people located 0–50 m from the reference court.

Conclusions. The combination of distance and visibility structures nearby residents' potential exposure. These findings support enforceable minimum setbacks, a pre-implementation acoustic study (notably when <100 m), and post-implementation follow-up to balance the sport's growth with population protection.

Keywords. padel sites; environmental noise; nearby residents; distance; line-of-sight visibility; geomatics.

Introduction

Padel is a four-player sport played with solid, stringless rackets, using a ball similar to a tennis ball, on a 20 × 10 m court enclosed by glass walls and metal mesh fencing [1]. The sport has sustained growth in many countries [2]. In France, the number of participants rose from 110,000 in 2020 to 500,000 in 2025 [3]. The French Tennis Federation (FFT), which has held ministerial delegation for the sport since 2014, plans a 170.5% increase in the number of courts (2,218 in 2024) to reach 6,000 by 2029 in order to meet persistent demand [4].

However, the siting of padel courts, especially in residential, urban, or peri-urban settings, raises coexistence issues with nearby residents [5]. The sport's acoustic signature, comprising dry, impulsive sounds from ball-racket and ball-glass impacts; metallic clangs on the wire-mesh fence; and players' vocalizations, makes it particularly disturbing to nearby residents [6]. Multiple studies, reviewed by Leroy T. and Kaiser X., have documented that the sound power of padel activity generally ranges from 89 to 91 dB(A), with peaks up to 102 dB(A) [7]. This combination produces perceived annoyance higher than for other racket sports such as tennis [8] and is the leading cause of legal disputes concerning this sport [9].

Environmental noise has deleterious effects on the physical and mental health of exposed populations [10–14]. The risk of depression and anxiety increases by about 30% among adults aged ≥35 years who are regularly exposed to noise nuisance [15]. Repetitive and impulsive noises, in particular, have psychoacoustic characteristics that make them especially difficult to tolerate[16] and harmful to health [17–19]. Prolonged exposure to the repetitive, impulsive noises specific to padel has been documented in cases of anxiety-depressive disorders that resulted in criminal convictions in Spain [20]. In France, the Hauts-de-France Regional Health Agency (Agence régionale de santé des Hauts-de-France, ARS Hauts-de-France) has added padel activity to the list of developments requiring particular vigilance, alongside shooting ranges, car-wash facilities, and venues broadcasting amplified sound, because of the substantial noise nuisance they can generate [21,22].

To prevent noise nuisance from padel courts, some of the countries where the activity is most developed have adopted regulations or recommendations based on setback distances from dwellings. In the Netherlands, a collaborative effort between the Royal Dutch Lawn Tennis and Padel Association

(Koninklijke Nederlandse Lawn Tennis Bond, KNLTB), the National Olympic Committee*National Sports Federation (NOC*NSF), the sports-court builders' association, the association of municipalities, and the Dutch Noise Abatement Foundation produced the "Handreiking Padel en Geluid" (*Padel and Noise Guide*) in January 2023, which now serves as a national reference standard. It recommends a minimum distance of 100 m between padel courts and dwellings, indicates that 160 m is preferable in a quiet residential area, and extends that distance to 210 m when the site comprises four courts [23]. This recommendation is among the most explicit and quantified internationally and serves as a reference for local authorities and Dutch courts. In Wallonia (Belgium), the Public Service of Wallonia's guide, based on other acoustic studies, likewise concludes that a distance "beyond 100 m" is necessary [7]. In France, the FFT's technical study concludes that beyond 100 m from a dwelling, the risk of nuisance is low; between 75–100 m, the risk is probable; between 50–75 m, the risk is high and corrective measures are needed; and at <50 m, siting a padel court is "not recommended without substantial acoustic treatment" [24,25]. The French Noise Information Center (Centre d'Information sur le Bruit, CidB) reports that the regional health agencies (ARS) recommend a prior acoustic study and, in all cases, avoiding siting padel courts within 50 m of dwellings [6].

However, in France, municipalities that grant the permits required to install padel courts within their Local Urban Plan (*Plan local d'urbanisme*, PLU) framework [26], are not obliged to follow the FFT's recommendations [24] or those issued by the ARS [21]. As a result, the sport's expansion, without binding regulatory safeguards, has led to courts being sited close to residential areas, generating environmental nuisances for nearby residents: noise, but also visual and light pollution [5]. Noise nuisance from padel sites located near dwellings has become a national issue, raised in a specific question at the French National Assembly [27] and noise control is a stated objective of the National Health-Environment Plan 4 (PNSE 4), "One Environment, One Health" [28,29].

To date, no national study in France, or elsewhere, has systematically inventoried padel sites in close proximity to dwellings or quantified the potential scale of the associated noise nuisance. We address this gap with a national spatial analysis of padel sites in metropolitan France to (i) quantify the number that fall below recommended setback thresholds (FFT and ARS) and (ii) estimate the scale and distribution of potential noise-exposure configurations. We discuss possible public-health implications.

Materials and Methods

Identification and categorization of sites

We compiled a database of active padel sites by aggregating and deduplicating the public "Padel Speak" directory [30] and open government datasets for sports facilities labeled "padel" [31]. Each site, hosting one or more courts, was geocoded from its address using Google Maps. We used a mixed approach combining quantitative spatial analysis and qualitative review of publicly available information sources to categorize padel sites.

Criteria for potential noise exposure

For each padel site, the potential noise exposure of nearby dwellings was classified into three categories using the criteria described below. This classification relied on GIS tools (Google Earth Pro, Google Maps, OpenStreetMap, Géoportail) for distance measurements and topographic review, and was complemented by open imagery (Google Street View; photographs on club websites and social media; press photos).

Each padel site was classified into one of the following three mutually exclusive categories according to these criteria:

Class 1: Potentially high exposure

This class groups sites with a high-risk configuration for noise nuisance. A site was assigned here if it met at least one of the two criteria below:

> A) Open or semi-covered courts. The distance from the edge of the nearest court to the closest dwelling façade is ≤ 100 m, with no major acoustic screen (continuous, massive building; noise barrier; or significant topographic relief) on the direct line of sight (LoS) between the source (court) and the receptor (dwelling).
>
> B) Covered but non-insulated courts. The distance from the structure to the closest dwelling façade is ≤ 50 m, and the structure is lightweight with no evident acoustic insulation (e.g., single-sheet metal panels, bubble-type enclosure, non-masonry shed).

Class 2: Potentially low or no exposure

This category includes padel sites where the risk of noise nuisance is considered negligible. A site was assigned to this class if it met at least one of the following criteria:

> A) Sufficient setback. The distance from the court (or its enclosing structure) to the closest dwelling façade is > 100 m.
>
> B) Structural acoustic insulation. The court is fully enclosed within a masonry building (e.g., concrete, cinder blocks) or shows clear acoustic treatment (e.g., acoustic sandwich panels), even when the distance is < 100 m.
>
> C) Presence of another, closer dominant noise source than the padel site (e.g., highway, railway).

Class 3: Indeterminate exposure

This category is reserved for cases where the available data did not allow a reliable assignment to Class 1 or 2. The reasons for Class 3 were documented and included, in particular:

A) Measurement impossible. Satellite imagery was obscured or outdated, or photographic evidence was unavailable, preventing confirmation of the presence or absence of dwellings within 100 m.

B) Ambiguous acoustic screening. Partial obstacles (e.g., low-rise buildings, discontinuous walls) made it impossible to determine with confidence their sound-attenuation capacity.

C) Uncharacterizable structure. Street View/photos were missing or unusable, preventing determination of the materials and construction of a covered structure.

Noise-exposure assessment workflow

Two examiners classified the padel sites in three phases:

1. Phase 1. Independent classification.
   Each examiner independently reviewed and classified all sites in the database, recording their rationale and supporting evidence in a worksheet.

2. Phase 2. Blind cross-review and re-assessment.
   Sites with discrepant classifications were flagged. The examiners exchanged worksheets to see each other's initial label, notes, and evidence. Based on this cross-review and additional independent checks, each examiner either revised or confirmed their own classification, still without consultation.

3. Phase 3. Consensus meeting.
   Remaining disagreements were isolated and resolved by discussion to assign a consensus class.

Inter-examiner agreement was assessed with Cohen's kappa (κ) computed from the classification contingency matrix, with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) obtained by bootstrap. To limit observer bias, every site assigned to Class 1 was verified via an automated geometric test in QGIS: the presence of at least one residential building at ≤ 100 m in direct LoS, operationalized as the minimum edge-to-edge distance segment not intersecting any intervening building polygon (line-of-sight/acoustic screen).

Spatial distribution of sites

We examined the regional and municipal distribution of Class 1 padel sites using a standardized over-representation ratio (SIR), defined as Observed/Expected, where Expected = area total × national proportion of Class 1. 95% CIs for SIR were obtained by exact Poisson inversion (Garwood method). Overall heterogeneity was tested with a Pearson χ^2 test.

Sites were grouped according to INSEE's communal density grid [32], after merging the two rarest categories into a single "Rural (dispersed + very dispersed)" class. Given the ordinal nature of the INSEE categories, we applied a Cochran-Armitage trend test (scores 1→6), weighted by stratum size. 95% CIs

for category-specific SIRs were computed using the exact Garwood method. Class 1 proportions by category are reported descriptively.

Exploration of residents' exposure

The analysis of potential noise exposure for dwellings was carried out in QGIS (v. 3.34 LTS) and focused on Class 1 padel sites. The 2D ground footprint of the reference court (visually selected as the court closest to surrounding dwellings) was modeled by a circular buffer with a 5 m radius centered on the court's midpoint. This circle is mathematically inscribed within the court's true footprint (20 × 10 m rectangle), regardless of orientation, making the approach replicable and azimuth-invariant. Because the circle lies inside the real rectangle, the building-to-footprint distance measured to the circle overestimates the distance to the true court edge by up to 5 m along the longitudinal axis (and by 0 m along the transverse axis). All vector data were projected to RGF93 / Lambert-93 (EPSG:2154) to ensure metric accuracy. Data on buildings within 100 m were extracted from IGN's BD TOPO® (June 2025 edition), which provides, among other attributes, 3D building footprints and a classification of primary use [33].

To improve the reliability of building-use classification, we conducted a quality-control check to address limitations of BD TOPO. Buildings labeled Unspecified ("Indifférencié", BD TOPO), potentially dwellings not identified as such, were manually verified using iconographic sources (IGN orthophotography, Google Earth Pro). When confirmed, these buildings were reclassified as Residential ("Résidentiel"). Buildings labeled Residential were retained for the exposure analysis. Non-residential buildings were nevertheless kept in the dataset to evaluate screening effects in the line-of-sight visibility analysis.

Visibility analysis

For each padel site, we performed a 2D proximity analysis in QGIS. First, buildings within 100 m were selected based on the shortest Euclidean edge-to-edge distance between the reference-court footprint and each building footprint (represented as a straight-line segment). We then conducted a line-of-sight analysis to classify buildings: a building was labeled "direct" if the segment was uninterrupted; it was labeled "masked" if any other building, regardless of use or height, intersected that segment (i.e., acted as an intervening screen).

Floor-area-weighted sociodemographic allocation and uncertainty intervals

To characterize exposed populations, for each residential building b within INSEE tile c (FILOSOFI 2019, carroyage 200 m [34]), we compute a floor area as $S_b = A_b \times \max(1, E_b)$ (building footprint × total number of floors, including the ground floor; default floor count = 1 if missing). The tile's total floor area is $S_c = \sum_{k \in B_c} S_k$, and the allocation weight for building b is $P_b = S_b / S_c$. INSEE tile totals (individuals, households) are then redistributed in proportion to this weight so that the sum over buildings within a tile exactly matches the observed tile totals.

To quantify allocation uncertainty for a subset Z (e.g., *direct* 0–50 m), we compute, for each tile, the share $p_c = \sum_{b \in Z \cap B_c} P_b$, bounded in $[0,1]$. Assuming individuals (or households) within the tile are randomly assigned according to this share, the exposed count follows $Y_c \sim \mathrm{Binomial}(X_c, p_c)$ (with X_c = INSEE total for the tile). The overall estimate is $\hat{\mu} = \sum_c X_c p_c$ and the variance $\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}(\hat{\mu}) = \sum_c X_c p_c (1 - p_c)$; the 95% uncertainty interval (UI) is $\hat{\mu} \pm 1.96\sqrt{\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}(\hat{\mu})}$. These UIs reflect intra-tile allocation uncertainty, not sampling error.

Distances were summarized at the building level (unweighted) using the mean and the sample standard deviation. Distance bands were 0–50 m and 50–100 m.

Residential buildings located in tiles without available INSEE aggregates (statistical confidentiality) could not be allocated and were excluded from the sociodemographic analysis.

This procedure yielded an enriched dataset in which each exposed building is characterized by its distance to the reference court, its line-of-sight status (*direct* or *masked*), and floor-area-weighted estimates of resident population and households.

Sensitivity analyses. We conducted two pre-specified checks: (A) exclusion of buildings within 45–55 m of the court proxy to stress-test the 50 m cut-off, and (B) exclusion of borderline line-of-sight ("grazing") cases identified by intersecting a +1 m buffer of third-party buildings without intersecting their true polygon after line trimming. All analyses reused the ≤ 100 m inclusion, dasymetric floor-area allocation, and binomial intra-tile 95% uncertainty intervals.

Results

Identification and categorization of sites

As of 1 September 2025, our database contained 878 padel sites, each comprising one or more courts. The variables recorded were: club name, address, municipality, department, and region.
Sites were distributed across 747 of metropolitan France's 34,805 communes, 89 of its 96 departments, and all 13 regions.

The three-phase assessment by the two examiners was conducted over 15 days, from 2 to 16 September 2025. The GIS layers and open imagery consulted correspond to the versions available during this period.

Final distribution (Phase 3, consensus):

- Class 1 (potentially high exposure): 271 sites (30.87%)
- Class 2 (potentially low or no exposure): 567 sites (64.58%)
- Class 3 (indeterminate exposure): 40 sites (4.56%)

Inter-examiner agreement at Phase 1 was 91.23% (κ = 0.83; 95% CI [0.79–0.87]), and all remaining discrepancies were resolved in the subsequent phases. For all Class 1 sites, QGIS measurements confirmed the presence of at least one residential building within 100 m with direct LoS (i.e., no intervening built screens; see end of "Resident exposure around Class 1 sites" section below).

Spatial distribution of sites

Table 1 shows that the regional distribution of Class 1 padel sites is not homogeneous in France (χ^2 = 24.85; p = 0.0156). Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur accounts for 14.24% of all sites nationally but 22.88% of Class 1 sites; the within-region proportion classified as Class 1 is 49.6% (SIR = 1.61; 95% CI [1.35–1.87]). Conversely, Grand Est (SIR = 0.58; 95% CI [0.30–0.89]) and Centre-Val de Loire (SIR = 0.22; 95% CI [0.00–0.67]) are under-represented.

Table 1. Distribution of padel sites by region in metropolitan France.

Region	Padel sites (n)	National share of sites (%)	Class 1 sites (n)	Within-region Class 1 (%)	National share of Class 1 sites (%)	Class 1 SIR (over-representation ratio) (95% CI)	Regional pop. density (inh./km²)
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	125	14.24%	62	49.60%	22.88%	1.61 [1.35–1.87]	166.9
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	128	14.58%	43	33.59%	15.87%	1.09 [0.84–1.34]	118.5
Occitanie	153	17.43%	50	32.68%	18.45%	1.06 [0.85–1.27]	85.3
Normandie	29	3.30%	9	31.03%	3.32%	1.01 [0.46–1.55]	111.7
Pays de la Loire	39	4.44%	12	30.77%	4.43%	1.00 [0.56–1.48]	122.7
Nouvelle-Aquitaine	123	14.01%	34	27.64%	12.55%	0.90 [0.65–1.13]	73.7
Île-de-France	81	9.23%	22	27.16%	8.12%	0.88 [0.58–1.19]	1036.5
Bourgogne-Franche-Comté	20	2.28%	5	25.00%	1.85%	0.81 [0.18–1.45]	58.5
Bretagne	37	4.21%	9	24.32%	3.32%	0.79 [0.36–1.26]	127.8
Hauts-de-France	55	6.26%	11	20.00%	4.06%	0.65 [0.33–1.00]	187.8
Grand Est	67	7.63%	12	17.91%	4.43%	0.58 [0.30–0.89]	96.5
Corse	6	0.68%	1	16.67%	0.37%	0.54 [0.00–1.65]	41.5
Centre-Val de Loire	15	1.71%	1	6.67%	0.37%	0.22 [0.00–0.67]	65.9
All regions (Metropol. France)	878	100%	271	30.87%	100%		

Population density (inhab./km²) : INSEE source, « Estimations de population au 1er janvier 2025 » [35]. *Values computed/reported using the current regional boundaries.*

The spatial distribution of sites across France is shown in Figure 1. Site locations were aggregated to the centroid of their respective communes. Point displacement symbology was used to visualize multiple sites in the same commune.

Figure 1. Geographic distribution of padel sites across metropolitan France's regions.



On INSEE's 6-level communal density grid [32], the distribution of Class 1 padel sites shows overall heterogeneity ($\chi^2 = 11.20$; $p = 0.0476$). A significant trend also emerges along the density gradient: the proportion of Class 1 sites increases as density decreases (Cochran-Armitage trend test: $Z = 2.66$; $p = 0.0078$). The "Small towns" category is significantly over-represented (SIR = 1.39; 95% CI [1.06–1.74]).

Table 2. Distribution of padel sites by INSEE's communal population density grid.

INSEE communal density category	Sites (n)	National Share of sites (%)	Class 1 sites (n)	Within-category Class 1 (%)	National share of Class 1 sites (%)	Class 1 SIR (over-representation ratio) (95% CI)
Large urban centers	276	31.44%	72	26.09%	26.57%	0.85 [0.70–0.99]
Intermediate urban centers	181	20.62%	59	32.60%	21.77%	1.06 [0.86–1.25]
Urban belts	153	17.43%	43	28.10%	15.87%	0.91 [0.70–1.13]
Rural towns	139	15.83%	43	30.94%	15.87%	1.00 [0.77–1.24]
Small towns	79	9.00%	34	43.04%	12.55%	1.39 [1.06–1.74]
Rural (dispersed + very dispersed)	50	5.69%	20	40.00%	7.38%	1.30 [0.88–1.73]
All INSEE categories (Metropol. France)	878	100%	271	30.87%	100%	

The INSEE categories "Rural dispersed" and "Rural very dispersed" were merged.

For the 271 Class 1 sites, we counted 534 outdoor courts, 37 covered but non-enclosed courts, and 21 courts housed within lightweight enclosed structures. Projecting a 5 m circular buffer around the midpoint of the court closest to dwellings, then computing edge-to-edge distances to buildings labeled Residential in BD TOPO, revealed inconsistencies for 11 sites: the minimum distance to a residential building exceeded 100 m, which did not match the situation observed by the examiners. Review indicated these discrepancies stemmed from incomplete labeling in BD TOPO. To correct this bias, 32 buildings initially classified as Unspecified ("Indifférencié", BD TOPO) were reclassified as Residential ("Résidentiel") after manual verification using GIS sources (Google Earth Pro satellite imagery and IGN aerial orthophotography). These reclassified buildings were then included in the final building set.

Exploration of residents' exposure

The dataset comprises 7,471 buildings within 100 m of 271 padel sites. Figure 2 shows an example of a 2D QGIS display of buildings within 100 m of a padel court (circular buffer). Each building is described by its distance to the site (straight-line segment), its visibility status (solid = direct; dashed = masked), and the sociodemographic indicators of its INSEE FILOSOFI 2019 tile (not shown in Figure 2). Of these buildings, 3,097 are residential (red, orange, sand, yellow) and 4,374 non-residential (gray), the latter retained solely to characterize visibility/masking. Residential buildings are split into 1,379 with direct LoS and 1,718 masked.

However, the sociodemographic analyses (Figure 2) are based on a final dataset of 3,037 residential buildings with complete information and 608 INSEE tiles; tiles subject to statistical confidentiality were

excluded from allocation, resulting in the exclusion of 60 residential buildings (≈ 1.9% of the initial 3,097). No cases of invalid tile floor area (≤ 0) were observed.

Figure 2. Example of a 2D QGIS representation of buildings within 100 m of a padel court.



Figure 3. Hierarchical summary of residential buildings within 100 m of Class 1 padel sites, by visibility (direct vs masked) and distance band (0–50 m; 50–100 m).

Residential buildings not subject to statistical confidentiality		reference totals (≤ 100 m)
Buildings	3,037	100 %
People	17,116 [16,952 – 17,280]	100 %
Households	7,821 [7,710 – 7,932]	100 %
Mean distance	71.9 m (±21.0)	n/a

Masked		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,688	55.6%
People	8,400 [8,258 – 8,543]	49.1 % [48.4–49.7]
Households	3,876 [3,780 – 3,972]	49.6 % [48.6–50.5]
Mean distance	76.8 m (±18.4)	n/a

Direct		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,349	44.4%
People	8,717 [8,588 – 8,846]	50.9 % [50.3–51.6]
Households	3,945 [3,859 – 4,032]	50.4 % [49.5–51.4]
Mean distance	65.8 m (±22.5)	n/a

0 – 50 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	170	5.6%
People	1,092 [1,033 – 1,151]	6.4 % [6.0–6.7]
Households	509 [469 – 549]	6.5 % [6.0–7.0]
Mean distance	38.1 m (±8.6)	n/a

50 – 100 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,450	47.7%
People	6,861 [6,725 – 6,996]	42.7 % [42.1–43.3]
Households	3,150 [3,059 – 3,242]	43.0 % [42.1–44.0]
Mean distance	81.4 m (±12.2)	n/a

0 – 50 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	337	11.1%
People	3,278 [3,194 – 3,362]	19.2 % [18.7–19.6]
Households	1,411 [1,355 – 1,466]	18.0 % [17.3–18.7]
Mean distance	34.3 m (±10.9)	n/a

50 – 100 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,012	33.3%
People	5,439 [3,930 – 4,128]	31.8 % [31.2–32.3]
Households	2,535 [2,464 – 2,606]	32.4 % [31.6–33.2]
Mean distance	76.3 m (±14.0)	n/a

Among the 3,037 residential buildings not subject to statistical confidentiality, 44.4% have direct LoS and 55.6% are masked. Overall, the floor-area allocation yields an estimated 17,116 people (95% UI

[16,952–17,280]) and 7,821 households (95% UI [7,710–7,932]) within 100 m of the installation's reference court, with a mean distance of 71.9 m (±21.0).

Direct buildings account for 8,717 people (95% UI [8,588–8,846]) and 3,945 households (95% UI [3,859–4,032]), at a shorter mean distance (65.8 m, ±22.5) than masked buildings (76.8 m, ±18.4). The share of buildings located at 0–50 m is roughly doubled under direct visibility (11.1%) vs masked (5.6%), and the majority of people at 0–50 m are in direct buildings (3,278/4,370 ≈ 75%).

Sensitivity analyses. Option B (excluding "grazing" LoS) reduced totals modestly (buildings 2,834; people 16,480; households 7,527), preserving the visibility-distance pattern. Option A (excluding 45–55 m) yielded 2,783 buildings, 15,264 people, and 6,962 households. The combined Option A+B gave 2,595 buildings, 14,678 people, and 6,692 households (95% UIs in Table S3, supplemental materials).

Discussion

The close siting of some padel sites near dwellings, combined with an acoustic signature of impulsive, repetitive sounds, exposes nearby residents to noise nuisance that may adversely affect quality of life. Our national analysis shows that the distance-visibility coupling structures potential exposure: direct line-of-sight configurations are more often associated with very short distances and concentrate the most sensitive situations. In a context where recommendations exist but are unevenly known or implemented, these findings argue for clearer siting conditions.

To our knowledge, while GIS-population approaches exist for other noise sources (e.g., road traffic) [36], they have not been applied to padel. To date, there is no peer-reviewed national study that characterizes resident exposure around padel sites using a spatial approach coupled with sociodemographic allocation. Available bibliometric overviews place padel research largely in the fields of play analysis, performance, and biomechanics, with environmental nuisance and built-environment proximity not treated as primary objects of study [37]. Our work therefore fills a gap by documenting, at the national scale, potential exposure configurations and the order of magnitude of the populations concerned.

At the scale of metropolitan France, our work shows that about one third of padel sites do not meet recommended setback distances, suggesting noise-nuisance exposure for thousands of nearby residents. Moreover, the over-representation of the most problematic sites in certain density categories (notably "Small towns") and the shorter distances observed under direct line-of-sight converge on the idea that the distance-visibility coupling is a major determinant of potential exposure. These findings arise in a regulatory and guidance landscape (France, the Netherlands, Belgium) that is heterogeneous and, in practice, does not ensure effective control of siting near housing.

Our observations are consistent with existing recommendations and technical guides that advocate minimum distances (often ≥100 m, modulated by the number of courts and the urban context) precisely to limit the impact of the activity's impulsive, repetitive sounds. The fact that some sites lie below these benchmarks helps explain the frequently reported mismatch between the sport's rapid growth and the rise in neighborhood complaints. In this context, our spatial approach provides a national quantification

of a previously undocumented phenomenon and pinpoints the highest-risk configurations, useful for prioritizing actions (prevention, mediation, urban planning and noise nuisance mitigation) [28,38].

The overall heterogeneity and the significant trend along the density gradient (from dense urban to rural) suggest that urban-integration constraints (built fabric, available land, and building screens) and the degree of land-use leeway modulate the likelihood of “too-close” sitings. In dense urban environments, most courts are indoors, housed in solid, acoustically insulated buildings, which is why we did not classify them as Class 1. In lower-density settings, building screens are less common and outdoor courts are more frequent, exposing dwellings at short distances; this helps explain SIR > 1 in certain categories. As expected, direct LoS is accompanied by shorter distances and concentrates the majority of people very close (0–50 m). Viewed through the psychoacoustics of impulsive sounds, this distance-visibility coupling strengthens the plausibility of greater disturbance, independent of the sheer number of dwellings affected.

Forces. Our database lists 878 active padel sites, designed to be exhaustive as of 1 September 2025, whereas the FFT reported 834 in metropolitan France over the same period [39]. The study benefits from national coverage, a documented, reproducible GIS workflow, and a cautious two-examiner classification, including an Indeterminate class when information was ambiguous or missing, plus formal spatial verification via QGIS distance and line-of-sight calculations, which limits the risk of false positives. The reported 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs) for counts (people, households) stem from intra-tile statistical allocation; they are imputation margins, not sampling error. Sensitivity analyses indicate that our conclusions are robust to borderline visibility classification (Option B), and that the 50 m split is not driving the results spuriously, although excluding the 45–55 m band (Option A) unsurprisingly lowers counts near the threshold. Operational implications therefore hinge primarily on the distance-visibility configuration rather than edge-case geometry.

Limitations. Our database coverage, though broad, may still be incomplete, leading to under-ascertainment of sites. The approximation of the proxy court footprint (5 m inscribed circle) may overestimate building distances and thus undercount buildings in the 0–50 m and 50–100 m bands; any bias is limited to cases lying within 5 m of the band thresholds. The visibility analysis relies on a 2D model (shortest Euclidean distance between entities) without 3D modeling (altimetry, heights, materials), which may over- or underestimate actual screening. For multi-court sites, using a single proxy court may understate cumulative exposure. Sociodemographic data (INSEE FILOSOFI 2019) are projected onto the 2025 building stock; local changes (construction/demolition, population movements) may introduce temporal mismatch. We used dasymetric allocation proportional to floor area; alternative schemes (footprint-only, different occupancy assumptions, inclusion of structural attributes) could have been considered and may locally alter redistributed totals. The reported 95% UIs reflect intra-tile allocation uncertainty. Application of statistical confidentiality led to the exclusion of some buildings, causing localized underestimation despite prorated allocation on other tiles. Finally, we did not model contextual factors (traffic, ambient noise, usage rules), and our exposure indicators (distance-visibility) remain indirect, warranting caution for any health inference.

Operationally, the results support a clearer framework for siting conditions: minimum setback distances modulated by configuration (number of courts, built context), enhanced review for projects < 100 m from dwellings, and tailored mitigation (effective barriers, enclosure/acoustic treatment, hours-of-use management). Mapping direct line-of-sight situations at very short distances provides a pragmatic lever to prioritize interventions.

Finally, several research avenues emerge: coupling 3D geometry and acoustic-propagation modeling with multi-period in-situ measurements; linking these exposures to indicators of annoyance and health (housing turnover/sales, complaints, sleep disturbance, mental health) using existing sources or ad-hoc data collected in experimental settings[40]; and evaluating the effectiveness and cost-benefit of mitigation measures to inform operational decisions.

Conclusion

Our results document a gap between recommendations and certain padel site implementations near housing. In a context of rapid growth, this represents both a public-health concern and a spatial-planning challenge. Three priorities emerge:

1. an enforceable national framework (distance/typology thresholds, modulated by number of courts and urban context);
2. a pre-implementation acoustic study using a reproducible protocol for every new project, incorporating in situ measurements and usage scenarios;
3. post-implementation follow-up (complaints, measurements, mediation) to adjust problematic configurations through appropriate engineering solutions (effective barriers, enclosure/acoustic treatment of structures), and, if necessary, relocation of sites.

Taken together, the distance and visibility criteria provide an operational framework to reconcile the sport's expansion with the protection of nearby residents.

Data availability

Aggregated datasets supporting this study are available on Zenodo (concept DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17290320). Versioned releases will include any subsequent code and documentation updates.

Competing interests

This research was conducted jointly as part of the corresponding author's academic activities and the national citizen collective NAMP, a non-profit organization of individuals affected by nuisances

associated with padel or pickleball activities. All authors are members of these entities, as indicated in their affiliations. They declare no other competing interests.

Ethics

No human participants or animals were involved. We used publicly available spatial data; ethics approval was not required.

Funding

No specific funding was received.

Statement on the use of AI tools

The authors used an AI-based writing assistant (ChatGPT 5, OpenAI; Gemini Pro, Google) for paraphrasing and translating some sentences. The authors verified and approved all final formulations, and no non-public data were provided to these tools. All responsibility for the content rests with the authors.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the members of the NAMP collective for their support and Professor Jean Gaudart for helpful discussions and methodological advice.

References

1. Martín-Miguel I, Escudero-Tena A, Muñoz D, Sánchez-Alcaraz BJ. Performance Analysis in Padel: A Systematic Review. J Hum Kinet. 2023 July 6;89:213–30.

2. International Padel Federation. World padel report [Internet]. International Padel Federation; 2024 [cited 2025 Oct 7] p. 52. Available from: https://www.padelfip.com/world-padel-report/

3. Quel est le nombre de joueurs de padel en France ? [Internet]. Modelesdebusinessplan.com. 2025 [cited 2025 July 25]. Available from: https://modelesdebusinessplan.com/blogs/infos/nombre-joueurs-padel-france

4. FFT. Plan Fédéral 2025-2028 [Internet]. Available from: https://www.fft.fr/actualites/plan-federal-2025-2028-la-feuille-de-route-fft

5. Vieau T. When padel disturbs: outdoor courts at the heart of noise complaints | Padel Magazine [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://padel-magazine.co.uk/when-padel-disturbs-outdoor-courts-at-the-heart-of-noise-complaints/

6. CidB. Padel : publication d'une étude technique [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://www.bruit.fr/documentation/dossiers-thematiques/bruits-des-activites/bruit-du-padel-publication-dun-etude-technique

7. Leroy T, Kaiser X, SGS BELGIUM S.A. Étude acoustique bruit généré par les activités de padel en Wallonie - Service public de Wallonie [Internet]. Belgique: Service public de Wallonie; 2023 June. Report No.: CSC N° O3.09.01-22-4659. Available from: https://environnement.wallonie.be/home/gestion-environnementale/risques-continus-et-pollutions/nuisances-sonores/sources-specifiques/padel.html

8. Clarke E, MacArthur I, Whiffin B. Differences in sound characteristics of padel and tennis [Internet]. Clarke Saunders Acoustics; 2023 Aug. Available from: https://clarkesaunders.com

9. Gimalac L. Padel et nuisances sonores : un nouveau terrain d'affrontement juridique [Internet]. Avocat.fr Publication. [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://consultation.avocat.fr/blog/laurent-gimalac/article-2970523-padel-et-nuisances-sonores-un-nouveau-terrain-d-affrontement-juridique.html

10. Clark C, Vienneau D, Aasvang GM. Noise and Effects on Health and Well-Being. In: van Kamp I, Woudenberg F, editors. A Sound Approach to Noise and Health [Internet]. Singapore: Springer Nature; 2025 [cited 2025 Sept 11]. p. 51–74. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-6121-0_4

11. WHO. Environmental noise guidelines for the European Region [Internet]. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2018 [cited 2025 Sept 11]. Available from: https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/279952

12. Hahad O, Kuntic M, Al-Kindi S, Kuntic I, Gilan D, Petrowski K, Daiber A, Münzel T. Noise and mental health: evidence, mechanisms, and consequences. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol. 2025 Jan;35(1):16–23.

13. Basner M, Babisch W, Davis A, Brink M, Clark C, Janssen S, Stansfeld S. Auditory and non-auditory effects of noise on health. Lancet. 2014 Apr 12;383(9925):1325–32.

14. Mehrotra A, Shukla SP, Shukla AK, Manar MK, Singh SK, Mehrotra M. A Comprehensive Review of Auditory and Non-Auditory Effects of Noise on Human Health. Noise and Health. 2024 June;26(121):59.

15. Hu X. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Association between Environmental Noise Exposure and Depression and Anxiety Symptoms in Community-Dwelling Adults. Noise Health. 2025 Aug 1;27(127):320–32.

16. Romito KM, Fink D. Pickleball noise: The physiological and psychological effects on nearby residents. Proc Mtgs Acoust. 2025 June 13;56(1):050001.

17. Yamamura Kō, Aoshima K, Hiramatsu S, Hikichi T, Hiramatsu S. An investigation of the effects of impulse noise exposure on man. Europ J Appl Physiol. 1980 Mar 1;43(2):135–42.

18. Rajala V, Hongisto V. Annoyance of impulsive sounds – a psychoacoustic experiment involving synthetic sounds. Proceedings of the ICA 2019 and EAA Euroregio : 23rd International Congress on Acoustics. 2019;integrating 4th EAA Euroregio 2019 : 9-13 September 2019:9 Sep 201913 Sep 2019; Aachen (2019).

19. Radun J, Maula H, Rajala V, Scheinin M, Hongisto V. Acute stress effects of impulsive noise during mental work. Journal of Environmental Psychology. 2022 June 1;81:101819.

20. Audiencia Provincial de Sevilla, Sección 1. Sentencia 328/2023. 2023.

21. Binisti F. Padel and noise: ARS recommendations | Padel Magazine [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://padel-magazine.co.uk/Padel-and-noise%3A-Lars%27-recommendations/

22. Critères de consultation de l'ARS par les services instructeurs | Agence Régionale de Santé des Hauts-de-France [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Oct 2]. Available from: https://www.hauts-de-france.ars.sante.fr/media/93063/download?inline

23. Wadman F, Ahlgren V, Hildén M, Herrey C, Björneklett O, Nobelius E. Buller från padelbanor utomhus - En jämförelse mellan padel och tennis. 2021 [cited 2025 July 28]; Available from: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12380/302423

24. Binisti F. Padel and noise pollution: the FFT publishes a technical study | Padel Magazine [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://padel-magazine.co.uk/Padel-faces-noise-pollution%3A-the-FFT-publishes-a-technical-study/

25. FFT. Procédure ADCP piste de padel et terrains de pickleball. 2025.

26. Les plans locaux d'urbanisme | collectivites-locales.gouv.fr [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sept 14]. Available from: https://www.collectivites-locales.gouv.fr/competences/les-plans-locaux-durbanisme

27. Question écrite n° 8578 [Internet]. [cited 2025 July 25]. Available from: https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/17/questions/QANR5L17QE8578

28. Plan National Santé-Environnement 4 (PNSE 4) : 'un environnement, une santé' (2021-2025) [Internet]. Ministère du Travail, de la Santé, des Solidarités et des Familles. 2023 [cited 2025 Oct 3]. Available from: https://sante.gouv.fr/sante-et-environnement/les-plans-nationaux-sante-environnement/article/plan-national-sante-environnement-4-pnse-4-un-environnement-une-sante-2021-2025

29. Le label Quiet [Internet]. CidB. 2025 [cited 2025 Oct 4]. Available from: https://www.bruit.fr/nos-actions/le-label-quiet

30. Padel Speak. Padel Autour De Moi : Annuaire Des Clubs En France [Internet]. https://padelspeak.com/. [cited 2025 Sept 19]. Available from: https://padelspeak.com/club-padel/

31. Ministère des sports et des Jeux Olympiques et Paralympique. Recensement des équipements sportifs, espaces et sites de pratiques [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sept 19]. Available from: https://www.data.gouv.fr/datasets/recensement-des-equipements-sportifs-espaces-et-sites-de-pratiques

32. La grille de densité 2025 | Insee [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sept 19]. Available from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/information/8571524

33. Institut national de l'information géographique et forestière (IGN). BD TOPO® – Base de données topographique (édition juin 2025) [Internet]. BD TOPO®. Saint-Mandé, France: IGN; 2025. Available from: https://geoservices.ign.fr/bdtopo

34. Insee. Données au carreau de 200m (y compris données imputées) − Revenus, pauvreté et niveau de vie en 2019 - Données carroyées [Internet]. Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques; 2023 [cited 2025 Sept 10]. Available from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/7655475?sommaire=7655515

35. Estimation de la population au 1er janvier 2025 | Insee [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sept 19]. Available from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/8331297

36. Kephalopoulos S, Paviotti M, Anfosso-Lédée F, Van Maercke D, Shilton S, Jones N. Advances in the development of common noise assessment methods in Europe: The CNOSSOS-EU framework for strategic environmental noise mapping. Science of The Total Environment. 2014 June 1;482–483:400–10.

37. Denche-Zamorano A, Escudero-Tena A, Pereira-Payo D, Adsuar JC, Muñoz D. Scientific mapping of the state-of-the-art in padel. A bibliometric analysis. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching. 2024 June 1;19(3):1275–85.

38. Conseil National du Bruit. Les guides du CNB pour une implantation et une gestion avisées des aires de sports de plein air en milieu habité [Internet]. 2011 Dec. Available from: https://www.bruit.fr/images/particuliers/Ressources/Guides_Cnb/guide_cnb_aires_sports_plein_air-min.pdf

39. Carte interactive des clubs de Padel | FFT [Internet]. Fédération Française de Tennis. [cited 2025 Sept 1]. Available from: https://www.fft.fr/nos-sports/padel

40. ISO. Acoustics — Assessment of noise annoyance by means of social and socio-acoustic surveys [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2025 Oct 7]. Report No.: ISO/TS 15666:2021. Available from: https://www.iso.org/standard/74048.html


Hauts-de-France
Normandie
Île-de-France
Grand Est
Bretagne
Pays de la Loire
Centre-Val de Loire
Bourgogne-Franche-Comté
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes
Nouvelle-Aquitaine
Occitanie
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur
Corse
Padel Sites [878]
Class 1 [271]
Class 2 [567]
Class 3 [40]


Proxy padel court
Buildings
Residential direct < 50 m
Residential direct >=50 m
Residential masked < 50 m
Residential masked >= 50 m
Non-residential
straight-line segment
direct
masked

Residential buildings not subject to statistical confidentiality		reference totals (≤ 100 m)
Buildings	3,037	100 %
People	17,116 [16,952 – 17,280]	100 %
Households	7,821 [7,710 – 7,932]	100 %
Mean distance	71.9 m (±21.0)	n/a

Masked		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,688	55.6%
People	8,400 [8,258 – 8,543]	49.1 % [48.4–49.7]
Households	3,876 [3,780 – 3,972]	49.6 % [48.6–50.5]
Mean distance	76.8 m (±18.4)	n/a

Direct		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,349	44.4%
People	8,717 [8,588 – 8,846]	50.9 % [50.3–51.6]
Households	3,945 [3,859 – 4,032]	50.4 % [49.5–51.4]
Mean distance	65.8 m (±22.5)	n/a

0 – 50 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	170	5.6%
People	1,092 [1,033 – 1,151]	6.4 % [6.0–6.7]
Households	509 [469 – 549]	6.5 % [6.0–7.0]
Mean distance	38.1 m (±8.6)	n/a

50 – 100 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,450	47.7%
People	6,861 [6,725 – 6,996]	42.7 % [42.1–43.3]
Households	3,150 [3,059 – 3,242]	43.0 % [42.1–44.0]
Mean distance	81.4 m (±12.2)	n/a

0 – 50 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	337	11.1%
People	3,278 [3,194 – 3,362]	19.2 % [18.7–19.6]
Households	1,411 [1,355 – 1,466]	18.0 % [17.3–18.7]
Mean distance	34.3 m (±10.9)	n/a

50 – 100 m		Share of ≤ 100 m total
Buildings	1,012	33.3%
People	5,439 [3,930 – 4,128]	31.8 % [31.2–32.3]
Households	2,535 [2,464 – 2,606]	32.4 % [31.6–33.2]
Mean distance	76.3 m (±14.0)	n/a