The statement of Lemma 1 at page 9 is only proved locally, i.e. such a d is shown to exist in some (sufficiently small) neighborhood of any point $x \in \Gamma$. I still believe the statement is correct and can be proved by glueing suitably the different local constructions (e.g. using a partition of unity). This is however inessential since in fact it is only the (proved) local version of the lemma which is used in the sequel. The mistake is actually propagated from Lemma 4.25 in reference [10].

Thanks to Ian Fleschler for pointing this out.