Land Leases in the Restaurant Industry: Why Operators Choose Them—And When They Don't Make Sense

By Eric Faber, Founder & CEO of U.S. Restaurant Consultants   April 2025

For decades, land leases have quietly powered some of America's most successful restaurant chains. From QSR drive-thrus to full-service casual dining brands, leasing land instead of owning it has become a strategic financial tool—one that can accelerate growth, reduce cash exposure, and provide valuable tax advantages. But like any financing structure, land leases aren't universal solutions. They benefit certain operators, in certain markets, with certain long-term strategies—and they can create long-term challenges if misused.

As restaurant consultants, we help owners understand whether a land lease fits their brand's growth plan, financial structure, and future exit strategy. Here is what every operator should know.

Why Restaurants Choose Land Leases

1. Lower Upfront Capital Requirements

Buying real estate is expensive—especially in high-traffic corners, near highway interchanges, or in fast-growing suburban trade areas.
With a land lease, operators can:

- Avoid tying up millions in land acquisition
- Use capital instead to build the building, expand the concept, or open additional units
- Move faster in competitive development markets

This reduced capital burden is often the reason QSR chains scale so rapidly.

2. Faster Expansion for Multi-Unit Operators

Land leases let growing concepts allocate capital toward what actually generates revenue: **units, equipment, staffing, and operations**, not dirt.

Franchisors especially favor land leases because:

- Franchisees can open more stores with the same investment capital
- Corporate can secure premium locations without holding real estate on the balance sheet
- Expansion becomes replicable and predictable

In short: land leases fuel growth.

3. Tax Advantages

Lease payments are typically deductible as a business expense. For restaurants operating on tight margins, those deductions can offset other taxable income. In contrast, owning land offers no depreciation benefit—only the building depreciates.

For operators with strong cash flow, the ongoing deductibility of lease payments can create meaningful tax savings.

4. Strategic Locations Where Land Isn't For Sale

In many markets, high-value parcels are *only* available via leased land—especially:

- Shopping centers
- Lifestyle centers
- Airports and transit developments
- Redeveloped master-planned districts
- Properties owned by REITs or major developers

If a corner location is essential for the concept, a land lease is often the only option.

5. Flexible Exit Strategies

Some operators prefer not to own real estate because it complicates:

- Selling the business
- Bringing in investors
- Transitioning franchise ownership

A well-structured land lease keeps the operator focused on the restaurant business—not real estate management.

When Land Leases Don't Make Sense

1. Extremely Long-Term Costs Can Outweigh Benefits

A 20-, 30-, or 50-year land lease can become significantly more expensive than simply buying the land.
Common issues include:

- Escalating rent clauses
- Re-negotiation challenges
- Loss of appreciation value
- No equity buildup

Eventually operators look back and realize they spent far more leasing the land than they would have spent owning it.

2. Limited Control Over the Property

Operators in land-lease arrangements typically need landlord approval for:

- Remodels
- Expansions
- Signage
- Drive-thru alterations
- Conversions or rebranding

This slows down modernization and can restrict innovation.

3. Reduced Collateral Value for Financing

Banks often prefer borrowers who own real estate because it creates collateral.
With a land lease:

- Operators may face more complex financing structures
- Interest rates can be higher
- Expansion loans can require stronger guarantees

This can hinder mom-and-pop operators or concepts without strong cash flow.

4. Expiration Risk

When a 30-year land lease matures, the building on it often reverts to the landowner unless a new deal is negotiated.
This creates real risk:

- You could lose a successful location
- The landowner may demand sharply higher rent
- The site may be redeveloped

Smart operators negotiate extensions and renewal options early—but not all leases allow it.

5. It's Not Ideal for Legacy Restaurants

Independent restaurants that want to build generational wealth often prefer to **own the land**. Land ownership allows operators to:

- Build equity
- Sell both the business and real estate as a package
- Pass appreciating assets to the next generation
- Borrow against the property in future expansions

A land lease eliminates these wealth-building opportunities.

What We Tell Clients: Land Leases Are a Tool—Not a Strategy

At U.S. Restaurant Consultants, our message is simple:

Land leases work best for growth-minded operators whose priority is speed, capital efficiency, and prime locations.

They are **not** ideal for operators focused on:

- Long-term control
- Real estate investment
- Brand legacy
- Lower lifetime operating costs

The right decision depends entirely on your growth plan, your financial position, and the dynamics of your market.

How We Help Operators Decide

Our consulting team evaluates:

- Total lifetime cost of leasing vs. ownership
- Impact on EBITDA and cash flow
- Franchise or multi-unit expansion plans

- Trade-area demand and site competition
- Future remodel requirements
- Investor or lender expectations
- Market valuation trends

We build a customized financial model showing what your restaurant's real estate decision means over 10, 20, and 30 years—helping you make the smartest long-term choice.

Final Thought

Land leases are neither good nor bad—they are strategic.
When used correctly, they are one of the most powerful expansion tools in the restaurant industry.
When misused, they can become one of the most expensive mistakes a restaurant ever makes.

The smartest operators understand both sides of the equation before they break ground.