As an editor, I don't expect the reviewers to have all of the right answers, so the authors are free to move ahead as they wish.

What I do like to see is that when reviewer comments are not incorporated, not only do the authors provide reasoning for not doing what the reviewer has suggested, but also contemplate whether working that reasoning into the paper would be useful. Even when authors don't agree with a reviewer's comment, that comment often reveals needed context for the paper, and thus an opportunity to shore up the arguments in the paper.

I think of these reviewers as proxies for the reader, so comments could be a place to add more context to address questions readers may have, even if you don't agree with them.

I would take those comments from reviewer #1, assimilate those that make the paper better, and if you find you don't agree with some comments, address them directly in the paper (often in the Discussion or maybe even Introduction are the most common places to do it) so other readers who have the same viewpoint as reviewer #1 won't dismiss your paper, but will notice you acknowledge their concerns, but have presented what you present for certain reasons.