Research Summary:
Small Balance CRE Loan Performance

May 15, 2025

www.FoundationSpecialtyFinance.com

Research Summary: Small Balance CRE Loan Performance: 2000–2025 Cycles

The following summary provides an overview of the U.S. small-balance commercial (SBC) real estate loan market from 2000 to 2025, focusing on its performance across different economic cycles. They define SBC loans, discuss key loan products like bridge loans and DSCR loans, and trace the market's evolution, notably highlighting the impact of the Great Financial Crisis (GFC) and the rise of non-bank lenders. The analysis contrasts the relative resilience seen in milder downturns (like 2001 and the initial COVID-19 shock) with the severe distress experienced during the GFC, and examines the emerging challenges posed by the current high-interest-rate environment, including the "maturity wall" and sector-specific issues like those in office properties. Strategic considerations for investors, such as risk management, due diligence, and capitalizing on distressed asset opportunities, are also discussed.

Based on the provided sources, this executive summary outlines the performance of U.S. Small-Balance Commercial (SBC) real estate loans across major economic cycles since 2000, with an extended analysis of the Great Financial Crisis period.

Small-balance commercial (SBC) real estate loans are generally defined as mortgages between $500,000 and $5,000,000. These loans are typically used by individual investors, small businesses, and local developers to finance small income-producing properties such as 1–4 unit residential investment properties, small multifamily buildings, neighborhood retail, small office, or mixed-use buildings. Common SBC loan products include short-term bridge loans, permanent loans underwritten to property cash flows (often measured by Debt Service Coverage Ratio or DSCR), and hybrid products. Modern "DSCR loans" for single-family rental portfolios also serve a similar role. These loans are often offered by community and regional banks, specialized private credit funds, and agency programs like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

The performance of SBC loans has been examined across major economic cycles from 2000 to 2025, including the 2001 dot-com recession, the 2007–2009 Great Financial Crisis (GFC), the 2020–2021 COVID-19 pandemic, and the recent 2022–2023 Fed interest rate hike cycle.

Performance Across Economic Cycles

- **2001 Dot-Com Recession:** This was a mild recession for commercial real estate. The Federal Reserve aggressively cut interest rates from around 6.5% in 2000 to about 1.75% by 2002, which helped stimulate recovery and provided liquidity to borrowers. Bank CRE loan delinquency rates rose only slightly, peaking at around 1.9% in late 2001, a much smaller increase than seen in the GFC. By 2003, delinquencies were falling back to nearly 1%. Most small-balance loans weathered this downturn without major losses, although some distress was concentrated in tech office markets and hospitality properties after 9/11. Overall, the dot-com recession caused only a modest ripple in the SBC market, with a temporary rise in delinquencies and a brief slowdown in new lending; swift monetary easing helped the market stabilize quickly. SBC lenders generally achieved solid returns.
- **COVID-19 Shock (2020–2021):** The pandemic caused an immediate, sharp economic contraction and disrupted commercial real estate cash flows. Small businesses struggled to pay rent, and delinquencies spiked suddenly in Q2 2020. CMBS delinquency, driven by lodging and retail loans, spiked to around 10.3% by June 2020, matching GFC peak levels. However, the policy response was unprecedentedly swift and strong, including temporary loan forbearance programs (allowed without classifying loans as "troubled" under the CARES Act), massive fiscal support like PPP loans keeping borrowers afloat, and federal rental assistance. The Federal Reserve cut rates back to zero and injected liquidity, helping credit markets function and reviving CMBS. Thanks to these supports, actual defaults remained much lower than feared, and many delinquencies were short-lived, curing by late 2020/early 2021. Bank CRE delinquencies fell back to near pre-pandemic levels by late 2021. Hospitality and retail were worst hit, but multifamily and 1–4 unit rentals held up better than expected, aided by economic recovery and stimulus checks. The pandemic highlighted

that liquidity and policy support can drastically alter default outcomes. Lenders' portfolios largely emerged intact, and many benefited from the low interest rate/refinancing boom in 2021.

- **2022–2023 Interest Rate Hike Cycle:** Rapid inflation led the Fed to raise rates sharply from 0% to over 5% by mid-2023, the fastest hikes since the 1980s. This significantly increased financing costs and put pressure on commercial property values, which fell 15–25% (more in some sectors like office) from 2021 peaks. Higher debt costs and tighter credit are now challenging refinancing, creating a "maturity default" risk. Banks have tightened lending standards and reduced CRE exposure, and non-bank lenders also face difficulties. CRE loan delinquency rates have started to tick up from historic lows, reaching 1.40% in Q1 2024 and 1.59% in Q1 2025. The stress pattern is somewhat different this time, with large loans (especially office) initially rising faster than smaller loans due to high-profile defaults on big properties. However, pressure is growing on small loans, particularly those backed by properties with weakening performance (e.g., older offices, rent-regulated multifamily). Freddie Mac's Small Balance Loan (SBL) program saw a notable uptick in delinquency in late 2023, concentrated in areas like New York City rent-stabilized buildings. DSCR loans on 1–4 unit properties face their first high-rate environment, with refinancing becoming more challenging, though current default rates remain relatively low. Loss severity potential is significant in defaults due to lower market values, but lenders are trying to avoid fire-sales by extending loans. Regulatory bodies are increasingly vocal, warning banks about CRE concentration and proposing stricter capital rules (potential Basel III "Endgame"). The full impact of this cycle is still unfolding, and performance will depend on interest rates and the economy.

Detailed Analysis of the Great Financial Crisis (2007–2009)

The Great Financial Crisis was a defining stress test for commercial real estate debt of all sizes. The crisis originated in the U.S. housing sector with a surge in subprime mortgage defaults and the collapse of the housing bubble, leading to a severe economic recession and a drastic devaluation of housing-related securities. Property values ultimately plummeted 30–40% from their peak by 2008–2009, and rentals faced rising vacancies and falling rents. Crucially, credit markets seized up, and refinancing became extraordinarily difficult, leaving many bridge loans and maturing SBC mortgages stranded without take-out financing.

- **SBC Loan Delinquency and Default Rates:** Small-balance CRE loans experienced a dramatic deterioration in performance during the GFC. Delinquency rates on commercial real estate loans at banks climbed relentlessly from about 1% in 2006 to a peak of 8.75% by early 2010. This was an unprecedented default wave, the worst since the 1990–91 crash and far above minor recession levels. Many delinquencies turned into outright defaults and foreclosures. The Small Business Administration's (SBA) loan guarantee program, which includes loans relevant to the SBC segment, saw its failure rate escalate from 2.4% in fiscal year 2004 to 11.9% in fiscal year 2008.
- **Impact on Community Banks:** A number of community banks that had concentrated in small CRE loans failed during 2009–2011. These banks often had a high share of their portfolio in local commercial real estate. When real estate values collapsed, their loan losses wiped out capital. Empirical studies found that small banks (< $5B in assets) held over 27% of total bank CRE loans and had proportionately far greater exposure than large banks. Many of the 300+ bank failures in 2009–2011 were tied to outsized CRE loan losses. Pre-crisis, community banks had significantly increased their average CRE concentration, rising from 192.8% in 2000 to 286.8% in 2006. This, coupled with acknowledged "weak underwriting standards" during that time, contributed to systemic risk and the severity of the GFC's impact on banks.
- **Performance of Specific SBC Loan Types:** Short-term bridge financing proved especially vulnerable. Developers or investors with bridge loans maturing in 2008–2010 often could not refinance or sell properties at a price that would pay off the loan, leading to maturity defaults. Construction and land development loans, often small and local projects, had the highest default rates of any CRE category. It's notable that investor mortgages on 1–4 unit rentals or flips defaulted at extremely high rates, even higher than owner-occupied homes. Many small investors had taken out "no doc" or Alt-A loans based on optimistic assumptions. Investor-owned homes were a disproportionate part of the default pool during 2007–2009.

- **Recovery Rates (Loss Severities):** Recovery rates on defaulted loans were quite low during 2008–2012 due to the glut of distressed properties. About half of loan principal on average was lost on defaulted commercial mortgages during the GFC. Small-balance loans sometimes fared a little better in recovery than large loans, which some studies attribute to community bankers' efforts to work out loans and local investors buying smaller properties. One study finds "small banks that specialize in CRE have higher loan recovery rates than their larger competitors". However, the same study noted small banks' loans defaulted more often, though late-stage delinquencies and charge-offs were higher for large banks. Conversely, Freddie Mac's analysis found smaller multifamily loans had higher loss severities on average (total loss of 33% vs 26% for larger loans), partly because fixed foreclosure costs consume a larger share of smaller loan principal. Thus, SBC lenders often recovered less of each dollar in default.
- **Comparison with Other Asset Classes:**
    - **Large-Balance CRE Loans:** Large-balance commercial loan performance was likewise poor. CMBS (Commercial Mortgage-Backed Securities), mostly containing loans > $5M, had delinquency rates that went from under 1% in 2007 to above 10% by 2012, similar in magnitude to the bank small-loan experience. Losses on defaulted CMBS loans averaged around 50% severity.
    - **Life Insurance Company Loans:** Life insurance companies' mortgage portfolios fared somewhat better. Life insurers tend to lend conservatively on high-quality properties. Their commercial mortgage defaults peaked at only around 1% or less (cumulative ~0.3–0.5% during 2008–2010), far below other lenders. They avoided much risky construction lending and had lower LTVs.
    - **Public Equity REITs:** Publicly traded equity REITs saw their stock prices plunge nearly 70% from their 2007 peak to 2009 trough, reflecting investors' expectations of distressed asset values. REITs that held lots of debt were hit hardest, and some filed bankruptcy. However, compared to smaller private owners who often lost properties to foreclosure, REITs often had better access to capital to recapitalize, enabling many to avoid liquidating properties at the bottom.
    - **Overall:** While small loans often have higher default frequency, large loans can create bigger headlines and incur very large losses when they default. Recovery rates on small loans tend to be lower percentage wise due to fixed workout costs and less institutional buyer interest in distressed small assets, while large loans may recover more proportionally. Life insurance lenders had lower yields but very low loss rates, providing good risk-adjusted returns through cycles. Equity REITs experienced high volatility but generally avoided mortgage default due to moderate leverage.
- **Regulatory Changes Post-GFC:** The GFC prompted significant regulatory overhauls. The Dodd-Frank Act (2010) imposed stricter capital and liquidity requirements, stress testing, and risk retention rules for securitizations. For small banks, this meant higher compliance costs and supervision, leading many to pivot to safer portfolios. Post-2010, big banks disproportionately cut back on small business and small CRE loans, creating a gap often filled by non-bank lenders. Basel III raised capital requirements, notably creating the High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE) category for certain acquisition, development, or construction loans requiring 150% risk-weight, making banks more cautious. The total outstanding small-balance CRE loan portfolios fell by ~25% from the 2008 peak in the ensuing years, while the overall CRE loan market grew, indicating a secular decline in the small-balance market share for banks. This was partly regulatory-driven and partly due to community bank consolidation.
- **Market Response:** The post-GFC era saw the rise of alternative lenders (private debt funds, mortgage REITs, crowdfunding) in the SBC space to provide bridge and mezzanine loans banks avoided. These non-bank lenders operate outside the traditional regulatory framework, allowing them to serve higher-risk borrowers at higher interest rates. This shift fundamentally reshaped the SBC financing ecosystem.

In summary, the Great Financial Crisis dealt a major blow to SBC loan performance, with default rates reaching historic highs and recovery rates low. SBC loans were hit as hard as, and in some cases harder than, large loans, especially because small properties had fewer refinancing options and smaller owners had shallower pockets. The crisis prompted a tightening of credit standards and lasting changes in the market structure, with more regulation for banks and increased non-bank capital in small CRE lending. While small local lenders showed a relative advantage in working out distressed loans efficiently, the GFC underscored that small CRE loans are not immune to big macro shocks and can be a point of vulnerability for the banking system given their concentration in smaller banks.